

## Record of individual Cabinet member decision

Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Decision made by</b>                                      | Councillor David Rouane  |
| <b>Key decision?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Date of decision</b><br>(same as date form signed)        | 11 May 2021  |
| <b>Name and job title of officer requesting the decision</b> | Adrian Lear  |
| <b>Officer contact details</b>                               | Tel: 07801 203503<br>Email: <a href="mailto:Adrian.Lear@southandvale.gov.uk">Adrian.Lear@southandvale.gov.uk</a>   |
| <b>Decision</b>  | To approve a final assessment of Saba's performance in delivering the Car Park Operations contract for the period 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2020 for South Oxfordshire District Council for the period 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2020 as "Good".   |
| <b>Reasons for decision</b>                                  | <p>I have assessed the contractor's overall performance measured against key performance targets, customer satisfaction and client satisfaction and note the actions to be implemented during 2020-21</p> <p>This decision follows the comments made by the Joint Scrutiny committee held on 16 November 2020 where the committee considered the Head of Housing and Environment's annual performance review report of the Performance of Saba (Car Park Operators) 2019 – 2020.</p> <p>The report stated that the overall performance of Saba was "Good" with six out of the eight key performance targets achieving an excellent rating.</p> <p>The Joint Scrutiny committee supported the assessment of Saba's overall performance for the Car Park Operations in 2019 - 20 as "Good".</p> <p>Customer satisfaction was an area highlighted as a failure. In response to councillors' questions, the committee was informed that Saba were implementing a customer satisfaction survey during 2020-21 online with a link attached to correspondence sent out by Saba.</p> |
| <b>Alternative options rejected</b>                          | The performance review allows for an assessment of performance ranging from poor to excellent.   |
| <b>Legal implications</b>                                    | None   |

|  |   |                  |                |               |
|--|---|------------------|----------------|---------------|
| <b>Financial implications</b>  | None  |                  |                |               |
| <b>Other implications</b>  | None  |                  |                |               |
| <b>Background papers considered</b>  | Joint Scrutiny Committee Report of 16 November 2020 - Performance review of Saba (Car Park Operations) 2019-20. |                  |                |               |
| <b>Declarations/conflict of interest?<br/>Declaration of other councillor/officer consulted by the Cabinet member?</b> | None  |                  |                |               |
| <b>List consultees</b>   |   | <b>Name</b>      | <b>Outcome</b> | <b>Date</b>   |
|  | Ward councillors  | N/A              |                |               |
|  | Legal   | Pat Connell      | No Comment     | 10 March 2021 |
|  | Finance   | Emma Creed       | No comment     | 9/02/21       |
|  | Human resources   | David Fairall    | No Comment     | 27/01/21      |
|  | Sustainability  | Heather Saunders | No Comment     | 26/01/21      |
|  | Insurance and Risk  | Allison Holliday | No Comment     | 26/01/21      |
|  | Diversity and equality  | Lynne Mitchell   | No Comment     | 26/01/21      |
|  | Climate and biodiversity  | Michelle Wells   | No Comment     |               |
|  | Communications  | Lucy Billen      | No Comment     | 29/01/21      |
|  | Senior Management Team  |                  |                |               |
| <b>Confidential decision?</b><br>If so, under which exempt category?   | No  |                  |                |               |
| <b>Call-in waived by Scrutiny Committee chairman?</b>  | No  |                  |                |               |
| <b>Has this been discussed by Cabinet members?</b>   | No  |                  |                |               |
| <b>Cabinet portfolio holder's signature</b><br>To confirm the decision as set out in this notice.                      | Signature ____ Councillor David Rouane _____<br>Date _____ 11 May 2021 _____                                    |                  |                |               |

**ONCE SIGNED, THIS FORM MUST BE HANDED TO DEMOCRATIC SERVICES IMMEDIATELY.**

| For Democratic Services office use only |  |             |
|---|--|-------------|
| Form received                           | Date: 10 May 2021                            | Time: 17:20 |
| Date published to all councillors       | Date: 11 May 2021                            |             |
| Call-in deadline                        | Not applicable as this is not a key decision |             |

## Guidance notes

1. This form must be completed by the lead officer who becomes the contact officer. The lead officer is responsible for ensuring that the necessary internal consultees have signed it off, including the chief executive. The lead officer must then seek the Cabinet portfolio holder's agreement and signature.
2. Once satisfied with the decision, the Cabinet portfolio holder must hand-sign and date the form and return it to the lead officer who should send it to Democratic Services immediately to allow the call-in period to commence.  
Tel. 01235 422520 or extension 2520.  
Email: [democratic.services@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@southandvale.gov.uk)
3. Democratic Services will then publish the decision to the website (unless it is confidential) and send it to all councillors to commence the call-in period (five clear working days) if it is a 'key' decision (see the definition of a 'key' decision below). A key decision cannot be implemented until the call-in period expires. The call-in procedure can be found in the council's constitution, part 4, under the Scrutiny Committee procedure rules.
4. Before implementing a key decision, the lead officer is responsible for checking with Democratic Services that the decision has not been called in.
5. If a key decision has been called in, Democratic Services will notify the lead officer and decision-maker. This call-in puts the decision on hold.
6. Democratic Services will liaise with the Scrutiny Committee chairman over the date of the call-in debate. The Cabinet portfolio holder will be requested to attend the Scrutiny Committee meeting to answer the committee's questions.
7. The Scrutiny Committee may:
  - refer the decision back to the Cabinet portfolio holder for reconsideration or
  - refer the matter to Council with an alternative set of proposals (where the final decision rests with full Council) or
  - accept the Cabinet portfolio holder's decision, in which case it can be implemented immediately.

## Key decisions: assessing whether a decision should be classified as 'key'

The South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils' Constitutions now have the same definition of a key decision:

**A key decision is a decision of the Cabinet, an individual Cabinet member, or an officer acting under delegated powers, which is likely:**

- (a) to incur expenditure, make savings or to receive income of more than £75,000;**

- (b) to award a revenue or capital grant of over £25,000; or**
- (c) to agree an action that, in the view of the chief executive or relevant head of service, would be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising more than one ward in the area of the council.**

Key decisions are subject to the scrutiny call-in procedure; non-key decisions are not and can be implemented immediately.

In assessing whether a decision should be classified as 'key', you should consider:

- (a) Will the expenditure, savings or income total more than £75,000 across all financial years?
- (b) Will the grant award to one person or organisation be more than £25,000 across all financial years?
- (c) Does the decision impact on more than one district council ward? And if so, is the impact significant? If residents or property affected by the decision is in one ward but is close to the border of an adjacent ward, it may have a significant impact on that second ward, e.g. through additional traffic, noise, light pollution, odour. Examples of significant impacts on two or more wards are:
  - Decisions to spend Didcot Garden Town funds (significant impact on more than one ward)
  - Changes to the household waste collection policy (affects all households in the district)
  - Reviewing a housing strategy (could have a significant impact on residents in many wards)
  - Adopting a supplementary planning document for a redevelopment site (could significantly affect more than one ward) or a new design guide (affects all wards)
  - Decisions to build new or improve existing leisure facilities (used by residents of more than one ward)

**The overriding principle is that before 'key' decisions are made, they must be published in the Cabinet Work Programme for 28 calendar days. Classifying a decision as non-key when it should be a key decision could expose the decision to challenge and delay its implementation.**