

Initial response to reasons set out in the notice for calling-in the decision by Cabinet on the Future of Cuffley Camp

Reasons for calling the decision in

- 1. Failure to by Cabinet to adequately consider the year by year usage and financial deficits data to enable full and proper consideration of the impact.***

The decision made by Cabinet included consideration of usage and financial information. This was provided in the Part 1 Addendum and in the revised EQIA.

- 2. Failure by Cabinet to consider how the current running deficit — which was £31,467 in 2016-17 could be addressed in future years to ensure a break even position.***

The Part 1 Addendum to Cabinet set out how the centre had been incurring net costs for the last few years and how it was expected to be self-financing. Further information about options was included in the Part II report to Cabinet.

- 3. Failure to provide to the Cabinet the full details of the availability on a month by month basis of alternative outdoor centres and their availability to meet the expected needs of Cuffley Camp users which in 2016/17 numbered 8203.***

The Part 1 Addendum provided Cabinet with information about alternative outdoor centres and their capacity. Month by month availability was not available nor considered to be material to the decisions.

- 4. Failure to provide any explanations as to why the lease and the covenanted investment amounts totalling just short of £300,000 had not been made to GHL despite this being known to certain members and officers by early 2016.***

The Part 1 Addendum considered by Cabinet included a section on the operational context and the failure to implement lease obligations.

- 5. Failure to consider: the effect on the 5 permanent staff members on the termination of the lease and the effect on their 'required to reside " status meaning that premises occupied by them would have to be vacated on termination.***

Information regarding staffing implications was included in Part II of the Cabinet report.

- 6. Cabinet incorrectly placed an emphasis on the statement in para 4.15 that wrongly stated a "noticeable decline in bookings" when the decline is just 11% (thus not noticeable) for the period 2011 to 2017 or that the % of individuals attending I the first six months had increased in 2016/17 compared to both 2014 to 2016 years and 2011 to 2012 years.***

Cabinet's decision was informed by a revised EQIA which included usage figures for 2011 – 2017.

- 7. That Cabinet did not give any due consideration to the statement "more likely to have a negative differential impact for children given that 97% of users from schools. 82% of users are from primary schools." And that cabinet gave un-due weight to the financial issues and did not adequately consider the differential impact.***

The revised Equalities Impact Assessment was considered by Cabinet when making the decision.

- 8. Failure of Cabinet to consider an option to maintain the lease until the freeholders of the site had secured an alternative long- term outdoor use for young people.***

Cabinet agreed to commit to further engage with the landlord in order to promote the site's continued use as an outdoor education centre serving young people