

At a Special Meeting of the **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** held at the Dartmoor Suite, Council Offices, Kilworthy Park, Drake Road, **TAVISTOCK** on **TUESDAY** the **10th** day of **JULY 2012** at **11.00 am**.

Present: Mrs S C Bailey – Vice-Chairman
Mrs K A Clish-Green Mrs C Hall
Mr L J G Hockridge Mr J B Moody
Mr D Whitcomb

Substitutes: Mrs C M Marsh Mr P Sanders

Chief Executive
Principal Solicitor (Corporate)
Regeneration Officer
Member Services Manager
Member Services Officer

In Attendance: Mr B Baldwin Mr W G Cann OBE
Mrs M Ewings Mr A Leech
Mr R Musgrave Mr R Oxborough
Mr R F D Sampson

***O&S 10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs D K A Sellis, Mr D M Horn and Mr D W Cloke.

***O&S 11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members and officers were asked to declare any interests in the items of business to be considered during the course of this meeting but none were made.

***O&S 12 CALL IN OF DECISION OF COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE RELATING TO NEW WHARF APPLICATION FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION GRANT 2012**

The Chairman introduced the meeting and advised that a decision of the Community Services Committee held on 26 June 2012 (minute CS8 refers) had been called in reasons for the following reasons:

1. The Council has limited resources and there are concerns over the allocation of grant monies to the Wharf out of a relatively small grant budget; and
2. The Council could be contributing towards a feasibility study which might enable an external bid to buy the business.

A Member questioned the reason for the call in, and another Member was concerned that local Members had not been advised.

The Principal Solicitor (Corporate) then advised the Committee of the circumstances under which a call in can proceed. A decision cannot be called in because Members do not agree with it, but can if there are concerns over the way the decision has been arrived at. Now that the decision has been called in, there were three options for this Committee; refer back to Community Services Committee; refer to full Council; or allow the decision to proceed. In response, a Member felt that it was difficult to raise concerns over how the decision was reached, if Members had not been present at the meeting.

The Regeneration Officer then explained that the third party grant scheme was run to help the Council achieve the aims in the economic delivery plan. He outlined the process for a grant application, and stated that in this instance the Chairman of Community Services Committee had requested that the application be taken to Committee to enable a full discussion, rather than be dealt with under delegated authority. The Regeneration Officer then advised Members of the resolution (minute CS8 refers).

Members then discussed the specific concerns that had led to the call in, and the Chairman advised that her particular concern was the small grant budget, rather than concerns over the Wharf project. Members also asked the Regeneration Officer a number of questions, to enable them to better understand the detail of the application.

The Chairman of the Community Services Committee advised the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that a number of the concerns that they were raising had been raised and discussed at the Community Services Committee. These included the size of the grant against the budget, and the corporate arrangements of the organisation that was making the application. As a result of the concerns being raised, the resolution was that £4,000 be granted for the first year, but that the £4,000 for the second year be subject to reasonable progress having been made.

A Member sought clarification on whether other grant monies would be available if the Council refused the grant application. In response, the Regeneration Officer advised that without grant funding from the Council, there was much less chance of support from the Arts Council, who were being asked to fund the most significant amount towards the feasibility study. He also confirmed that, if the Council agreed to the grant application, but that subsequently the Arts Council did not support the project, then it would be unlikely that the project would proceed and in this case the Council grant would not be drawn down.

It was also confirmed that the Regeneration Officer advised the Committee against a conditional resolution, as this may impact on the grant funding from other sources.

The Regeneration Officer took Members through the Risk Register. A Member noted that a further risk was that no assessment had been undertaken of the project reaching capital viability as a vast sum of capital money would need to be raised for the project to continue. The Chairman of Community Services Committee responded that this matter was raised at Committee but the decision related to the feasibility study only.

At this point the Chief Executive summarised the discussion so far, and he also advised Members that processes would be improved which would address some of the concerns raised at the start of the meeting. There being no further points to address, it was then proposed that no further action be taken on this matter. When put to the vote this proposal was carried by six votes to two.

(The Meeting terminated at 12.05 pm)