

APPENDIX A

Councillor Call for Action Proforma

Presentation of information on the changing facilities at Homestall Road and the one o'clock club on Peckham Rye Common.

1. Councillor's name (this will be the 'lead councillor')	Cllr Robert Smeath
2. Please set out here the nature of the issue you wish to raise as a CCfA and the agency responsible – please include reference to any key documents you wish the scrutiny team to include:	I would like OSC to consider the way in which information was presented in the lead up to the decision by the Executive to authorise expenditure on changing facilities at Homestall Road and the one o'clock club on Peckham Rye Common.
3. Please set out chronologically the attempts that have been made to resolve the matter previously and the outcomes of these:	<p>(Note: please include dates and accompanying evidence or references where appropriate).</p> <p>The matter was discussed at a number of meetings of the Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council. I am advised that much of the information is contained within the Council's systems as the matter has been considered at all stages of the complaints procedures.</p>
4. Please set out the purpose of raising the issue as a CCfA and what you would like to happen as a result:	<p>There are three main purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It has been suggested that the way in which information was presented by officers was in breach of the constitution. Clearly any such matter should be thoroughly examined.2. It took officers considerable time to return to Community Council with a proposal on which the Executive could make a decision. In a ward like Peckham Rye with a lack of community space and a well used facility like the one o'clock club which was operating from cramped premises this delay was not welcome. It appeared that one officer was grappling with the matter alone and that there was no clear line management structure which would provide an impetus to a swifter decision.3. A feasibility study was commissioned which was said to favour the split site option but which it has been alleged was not conclusive and missed certain key information or which was misinterpreted. Clearly any decision maker needs the best and clearest information and if this was not the case then the decision is weakened. If this was the case then lessons need to be learned.

	<p>My reason for calling for this action is to see what lessons can be learned for the future and to make recommendations (if appropriate) for a better process for similar projects in future. If as a result of the scrutiny any improvements can be made to the facilities in Peckham Rye Ward that would be good, although as work has already started this seems unlikely.</p>
<p>5. Please set out any suggestions you have for individuals (whether officers of the council, partners or otherwise) who you would like invited to the meeting to contribute to the discussion:</p>	<p>The officers involved with the CGS projects and the MUC proposal in particular as well as those who supervise the team and the process would be useful. In addition, the consultants who prepared the feasibility study should be asked to attend.</p>