

## **Notice of call-in – Cabinet decision published 6<sup>th</sup> April 2023 – Agenda Item 9 Nominations to the Gloucester City Homes Board**

We the undersigned wish to call-in the decision made by cabinet on the 5<sup>th</sup> of April about agenda item nine, nominations to the Gloucester City Homes Board.

It is noted that the decision notice clearly identifies this decision by cabinet is subject to the call-in procedure if done by the deadline on the 17<sup>th</sup> of April 2023.

**The decision made by cabinet reads as follows: -**

*“That council agrees to surrender their right to appoint up to two Council Board Members to the Gloucester City Homes Board.”*

Our reasons for the call-in is that the cabinet failed to comply with article 12.02 of the council’s constitution, The Principles of Decision Making, which reads:

### **12.02 Principles of Decision Making**

All decisions of the Council (whether they are the responsibility of the Leader or Cabinet or not) will be made in accordance with the following principles:

- Proportionality (i.e. the action should be proportionate to the desired outcome);
- Due consideration of professional advice from officers;
- Respect for human rights;
- Presumption in favour of openness; and
- Clarity of aims and desired outcomes.

### **Our reasons**

#### **1. Presumption in favour of openness; and clarity of aims and desired outcomes.**

The proposal first appeared in the cabinet forward plan published in the Scrutiny Committee papers for the meeting of the 27<sup>th</sup> of March, with a misleading description suggesting that the paper was about appointing new directors rather than the council surrendering its rights to nominate two members to the board of Gloucester City Homes.

It described the report as **Appointments to the Gloucester City Homes (GCH) Board**

With a summary of the decision: *“To appoint new members to the GCH Board of Directors.”*

This was incorrect and quite clearly misleading and was written without regard to openness.

The Agenda front sheet for cabinet was also misleading on agenda item 9, which was titled **Nominations to the Gloucester City Homes Board**

The summary said: “To consider the report of the Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing Strategy seeking Members to review the current approach to the nominating Members to sit on the Gloucester City Homes Board.”

Again this was misleading in that the cabinet member had not sought the view of members of the council and it did not suggest that it was on her mind to surrender nomination rights.

2. Presumption in favour of openness; and clarity of aims and desired outcomes.

The decision notice published on the 6<sup>th</sup> of April quite clearly indicates that the proposal affected all wards, but there was no consultation with members of the council, except for those sitting in cabinet about the plan to remove nomination rights to the board of GCH.

The cabinet sat for just ten minutes to discuss nine agenda items. The minutes say the meeting started at 6pm and finished at 6.10pm. This indicates that cabinet members just nodded the decision through, without proper consideration.

There is no evidence that the tenants and leaseholders have been consulted by Gloucester City Homes about the removal of the council's right to nominate two members to the board, which makes up just 15% of its membership.

3. Clarity of aims and desired outcomes.

The report does not adequately explain the pros and cons of the council retaining or surrendering its right to nominate two members to the board of GCH and how the retention of the right to nominate might better protect the interests of GCH's tenants and leaseholders. The report doesn't provide any evidence from GCH that the retention of two directors appointed by Gloucester City Council is frustrating their ambitions to better serve their customers.

Signed by

Jeremy Hilton  
Anne Radley  
Angela Conder  
Linda Castle  
Rebecca Trimnell

Friday 14<sup>th</sup> April 2023.