

Appendix 3

Call-in request: Day Options for Adults with Learning Disabilities

The undersigned request that the published Decision on **Item 49 in Cabinet of 17 September 2026 (Day Options for Adults with Learning Disabilities)** be called in as set out in the Council Constitution Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, on the following grounds:

- 13.1.2 the absence of sufficient evidence on which to base a decision
- 13.1.6 insufficient consideration of legal and financial advice
- 13.1.1 insufficient consultation with stakeholders prior to the decision

The reasons for use of these grounds for call-in are as follows:

Absence of Sufficient Evidence

- There was a known gap in the evidence regarding future demand. That gap was raised before the 17 September Cabinet meeting. Steve Hook agreed at POSC that further evidence should be gathered from the special schools. The evidence was readily accessible and actively offered. Cabinet made their decision before that exercise had taken place. We believe evidence about the future population should inform a key decision such as this.
- Relevant stakeholders actively offered evidence on future demand and requested that it be considered while there was still time before Cabinet, but this did not take place.
- The claimed annual saving of £336,563 has not been clearly demonstrated as cash-releasing, as it may include corporate overheads that would remain after closure.
- Replacement transport costs had not been fully quantified at the time of the decision.
- Alternative specialist provision for two existing high-care-needs users was still being developed.
- No quantified modelling was provided of the wider financial risks if alternative placements fail, potentially leading to costly residential care that could outweigh the projected savings.

- External providers are operating at or near capacity and would need to recruit staff once placements were commissioned, raising questions about delivery capacity.
- No professional, quantified assessment was provided of the building condition or adaptation costs at Wellington House, preventing a proper comparison between refurbishment/retention and closure.

Insufficient Consideration of Legal Risk

- We are concerned that the consultation and decision-making process may have been predetermined, undermining legal advice regarding our statutory duty to remain open-minded. Evidence suggests the decision to close Wellington House had effectively been made before consultation concluded, including the statement in scrutiny minutes that *“the decision to close Wellington House was taken in December 2025.”* We do not believe that consultation or scrutiny took place during a period when the outcome remained genuinely open. In light of this, we are concerned that alternatives, including potential revenue-generating options, were not fully considered.

Insufficient Consultation with Stakeholders Prior to the Decision

- Ahead of the POSC on 4 September there was communication from VCS committee members and from head teachers calling for more sufficient consultation with head teachers of special schools. During POSC Steve Hook agreed that further evidence should be gathered from the special schools to better inform this decision. Further consultation did not happen ahead of Cabinet to support their decision.

We hope this provides sufficient basis on which to call this item in for consideration at a meeting of People Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Kind regards,

Ellen McLeay

Sue Shanks

Nadia Barton Ahmad

Ollie Sykes

Steve Davis

Kerry Pickett

Marina Lademacher

Pete West

Bruno de Oliveira

Raphael Hill

Alistair McNair

