

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee – CALL IN REQUEST

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Cabinet, Individual Cabinet Member Decision or Key Officer Decision and date of decision.</p>                       | <p>Cabinet Decision on Wednesday 13th September 2023</p>  |
| <p><b>DECISION FOR CALL IN</b><br/><br/>(title of report and specific decision to be called in with minute number)</p> | <p>Minute 7: Creation of a Regional Park and relating to 7/VII resolution to close Perivale Park Golf Course in council year 2023-2024 subject to future consultation.</p>  |
| <p><b>CALLED IN BY</b><br/><br/>(List names of those calling in decision)</p>  | <p>Cllrs Julian Gallant, Connie Hersch, Anthony Young, Seema Kumar, Fabio Conti, Gregory Stafford and Anthony Young, Gary Malcolm, Athena Zissimos, Gary Busuttil, Jon Ball and Andrew Steed.</p>   |
| <p><b>Which of the following principles do you believe the decision did not take into account:</b></p>                 | <p><i>Please give detailed reasons in the boxes below why you believe the principles of decision making have not been taken into account</i></p>  |
| <p>Proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome)</p>                                  | <p>In Sustainability &amp; Accessibility (i) there is no consideration of the flat and level nature of the golf course which makes it accessible to the elderly, or the fact that it enables access to sport for hard to reach groups through its pay and play payment structure. The limited analysis is flawed and has excluded pay and play users who are likely to be those who are most disadvantaged financially challenged and vulnerable groups of the community including age, ethnicity and gender disproportionately.</p> <p>In Economy &amp; Culture (iii) there is no evidence that that Perivale Golf course is a financial burden and unviable or a drain on the public purse.</p> <p>There are already approx. 2,000 petitioners have signed up to keep access to Perivale Golf Course.</p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers</p>                           | <p>To question why a decision has been taken to close Perivale Park Golf Course BEFORE due consultation with golfers, other users and the Ealing public.</p>   |
| <p>Respect for human rights and equalities</p>  | <p>Elderly golfers will be disadvantaged by the closure of the Perivale Park Golf Club as it is affordable compared to most golf courses.</p> <p>There is indirect discrimination taking place here against hard to reach groups such as elderly users, ethnic minority users and women who use the site to improve their health on a pay and play basis as well as a season ticket holders. In addition, the pay and play function enables low income users access to public golf course (1 of only 2) in Ealing. They are effectively excluded from private clubs on the basis of cost.</p>  |
| <p>A presumption in favour of openness</p>  | <p>This decision was introduced suddenly and at short notice.</p>  |
| <p>Clarity of aims and desired outcomes (i.e. link between corporate strategy and implementation)</p> | <p>To question whether the effect on nature of removing an existing golf course has been taken into account.</p> <p>To question whether the Perivale Park Golf Course, open to other users, needs to be closed.</p> <p>To state that demand for golf is decreasing on the basis of national estimates rather than local examination.</p> <p>To question whether the fundamental differences between Ealing golf courses have been fully taken into account.</p> <p>To give details of any negative effect on the flora and fauna in the area caused by any works relating to the creation of the Regional Park.</p> <p>To question whether the substantial existing green spaces, including an underused rugby pitch, are not sufficient to meet the needs of the Ealing public and visitors.</p> <p>There is a focus on rewilding Perivale Golf Course whilst dewilding Warren Farm – all of which suggests a lack of method or approach across Ealing.</p> <p>The report does not appear to allow for the golf club to exist within a Regional Park. We ask whether the course might be altered to allow for a golf club and other leisure activities to co-exist within a larger Regional Park.</p> <p>With regard to the make-up of the regional park will the officers confirm that a regional park will include ponds, wetlands and meadows?</p> |

Consistency with the Council's Budget and Policy Framework, Contract, Financial and other Procedure Rules, legislative requirements and any other requirements set out in this Constitution.

To question whether removal of a sporting facility can ever be considered beneficial for the Council's stated aim of improving public health outcomes.

Is the provision of a Regional Park good value for money given the costs involved and current economic instability?

We question whether the basis for consideration of the closure of Perivale Golf Course is indeed to address health outcomes, as these are already being addressed through provision of pay and play (not only annual) membership and accessibility which accommodates a broad spectrum of age, gender and ethnicity.

The most up to date figures for golf playing appear not to have been used in making the decision. Will the Council agree to view the up to date figures when it reviews its decision?

Notes:

Cabinet decisions may be called in for further consideration upon receipt by the proper officer, within *five* clear days of the publication of a decision, of a requisition:

- i) signed by five members of the council, from more than one political group\*, who are not members of the cabinet or:
- ii) signed by all the members representing a ward where the decision affects that ward only (unless a pecuniary interest exists in the matter in which case action may be initiated by the remaining ward member{s}); or.
- iii) Signed by the chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

*\*A member sitting independently from political group arrangements being included on a call-in would also satisfy this requirement.*

Cabinet decisions may also be called in by Overview and Scrutiny Committee or by any Standing Scrutiny Panel, in accordance with Article 6 of the Council constitution.

A decision may only be the subject of one call in.

All requisitions for call in shall refer to a specific decision (or decisions) within a report and provide a detailed reason. A decision may only be the subject of one call in. A decision may only be called in if, when taking the decision, the decision maker didn't follow the principles of decision making as outlined above. The signatories to the call-in must give a clear explanation as to how these principles were not followed when the decision was taken:

*Please return this signed form to [Democraticservices@ealing.gov.uk](mailto:Democraticservices@ealing.gov.uk)  
(copy in Sam Bailey [baileysa@ealing.gov.uk](mailto:baileysa@ealing.gov.uk) Head of Democratic Services and  
Linda Zimmerman [zimmermal@ealing.gov.uk](mailto:zimmermal@ealing.gov.uk) Committee Team Manager)*