

Call-In a Decision Form

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| TITLE OF REPORT | Creating a Better Place Update. |
| DATE DECISION MADE: | 16/06/25 |
| DECISION MADE BY: (Cabinet/officer) | cabinet |
| REFERENCE NO. (If appropriate) | ESR-05-24 |

The following signatories request that the above decision be called in:

| | Name | Signature |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|
| 1* | Mark Kenyon | By email |
| 2* | Sam Al-Hamdani | By email |
| 3 | | |

**Two signatories minimum.*

To be filled out by lead signatory:

Why is the decision being called in? (Continue on another page if necessary)¹

There was not enough information in the report to make the decision. The report is the democratic record of the decision and in order to facilitate scrutiny should show pertinent information that was relied on in order to make the decision. That information is not available in this report.

With reference to Part B of the report:

The Old Library project

“4.2.3 Recommendation to Cabinet – It is recommended to reprofile £2.5m capital funding from the cultural quarter public realm capital allocation to support the challenges reported above Page 26

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

and the additional work needed on the connection bridge, and so ensure the building improvement work is complete.”

That’s a 13% budget uplift. All these risks were known about beforehand, why were they not mitigated? The report should describe what future actions will take place in order to control these types of risk.

¹ The grounds on which an executive decision can be called-in are:

1. The decision falls outside the Council’s agreed Budget or Policy Framework. 2
2. There was not enough information on which to make a decision
3. An alternative policy option or options were not sufficiently explored.
4. The reason(s) for rejection of alternative policy options were not sufficiently explained.
5. Other Committee/Sub-Committees or any other Council body which have a legitimate role to comment were not given the opportunity to do so
6. The decision should have been included in the key decision notice.

George Square

“4.5.4 Recommendation to Cabinet: To support the scheme with a further investment of £2m of Council Capital Funding. Proposed approach is to transfer £1m funding from the Diggle Clock Tower scheme and £1m from unallocated funds within the Capital Programme.”

The report contains little discussion of the impact of this diversion on the delivery of the Diggle clock tower scheme other than to say in sec5.6 on page 31 of part B report that “no future use of the asset has yet been identified”. As well as the impact on delivery, there is no discussion of why budget has been allocated to a project with no aim or objective.

Oldham Coliseum

“4.6.5 Given the information to date, the technical data from the survey work, the team have also requested an uplift in the contingency allocation to provide cover for any further unknowns that may be found during the works.

4.6.6 Recommendation to Cabinet: To note the additional works needed to ensure the building refurbishment provides a water-tight building once opened, and to approve the further investment of £2.25m from a combination of the Community Regeneration Partnership (Co-operative Culture allocation) and Council Capital Funding.”

Given the most recent experience of renovating an historical building, what concrete measures are in place to control risks at this project? The report does not offer any detailed assurances in exchange for this increased funding. The report should contain assurances to members (and the coliseum team) that this 22% increase is the very final increase of budget and that future solutions will not involve additional financing from the authority.

Financial Comments

“5.3 The Capital Programme and Strategy for 2025/30 already assumed that the proposed reallocation of LUF 2 funding for Metropolitan House and Northern Roots would be approved. However, confirmation is still pending from MHCLG and there is a potential risk that this will not be approved. Metropolitan House if is funded £7m from LUF2 and £3m from Housing Revenue Account and Northern Roots is funded £6.133m Town Deal and £8.240m from LUF2.”

The report does not quantify this risk. It should. It should also detail what steps will be taken if permission is not given as well as the consequences for this and other projects.

Risk Assessments

“9.1 The report sets out the opportunity for the Council’s Creating a Better Place ambition which is in line with the Council priorities. All projects will need to have in place risk registers which details the future and current risks for the individual projects, these should be routinely refreshed. The Council will need to ensure that the projects comply with the terms of conditions of the individual grants and ensure that appropriate contract documentation is in place. There are financial risks in relation to projected future costs of the projects as detailed within the report. There are also insurance risks associated with the projects which will need to be managed in what can be a challenging insurance

market.”

This section of the report does not demonstrate any analysis of why these existing procedures did not control a 22%, and 13% uplift on major projects funding requirement. It should. Were these risks identified and quantified early on? Were decisions made to accommodate this uplift? At what stage? Were decisions taken by officers or cabinet members? Or was it a failure of risk management? This section should detail how these uplifts came about and why.

For office use only:

Received by (name of constitution services officer):

Date:

Time:

To be filled out by the Chair of the O&S Board:

Which Officers/Cabinet Members do you wish to attend the Overview & Scrutiny Board meeting to answer the call-in and why?

Date Call In to be heard:

For office use only:

Signature of O&S Board Chair:

Date:

Time: