

## **Call-in Request for Executive Decision 26/00007 – Heritage Conservation Strategy Amendment**

**Call-in request submitted by:** Mr Hood, Ms Russell & Mrs Hudson

### **Reasons for calling in the decision:**

#### **Reason One: The decision was not taken in accordance with the principles of decision making set out in 8.5 (f) explanation of the options considered and giving reasons for decisions**

During the Growth, Environment & Transport Cabinet Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> March, Mr Mark Hood put forward an amendment to set up a Kent Windmills Trust to coordinate the future management of Kent's windmills and support current and future volunteer groups intending to own or manage Kent windmills. The Chair put the amendment to the vote and the recommendation passed. It was recommended that the Cabinet Member consider the Committee's agreed recommendation to section 3.4 when taking the key decision.

The Record of Decision notes the Cabinet Committee recommendation but states that it was not followed on the basis that it goes beyond the scope of the accompanying decision, which is limited to adopting amendments to the Strategy and delegating authority for its implementation.

However, while this explains why the recommendation was considered outside the formal scope of the decision, it does not set out any analysis of the option itself, nor does it explain why the recommendation was not considered appropriate in terms of value for money, deliverability, or achievement of the Strategy's aims.

As such, the decision does not clearly demonstrate compliance with constitutional principle (f), which requires an explanation of the options considered and the reasons for decisions, supported by sufficient analysis to allow effective scrutiny.

The call-in seeks assurance that the explanation for rejecting a formally agreed committee option is supported by sufficient analysis, as required by the constitution.

#### **Reason Two: The decision is not in line with the Council's Policy Framework – Reforming Kent.**

The Council's Strategic Statement identifies the delivery of best value for residents as a core priority, including securing sustainable outcomes and minimising long-term risk to the public purse. The key decision is justified on the basis of cost reduction and the sustainable divestment of heritage assets, and therefore depends not only on achieving short-term savings but also on ensuring that assets are transferred in a way that is deliverable, resilient, and capable of being sustained over time.

While the Cabinet Committee put forward a recommendation that raised potential implications for the effectiveness of the divestment process, including the coordination of ownership and the identification and support of suitable future custodians, the Record of

Decision does not set out any analysis demonstrating how this option was assessed in relation to the Council's best-value objective. In the absence of such analysis, it is unclear how the chosen approach was tested against reasonable alternatives that may affect long-term value, sustainability, and risk, as envisaged by the Strategic Statement's commitment to securing best value for residents.