

Public Document Pack

When telephoning, please ask for: Democratic Services
Direct dial 0115 914 8511
Email democraticservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: Tuesday, 7 July 2026

To all Members of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group

Dear Councillor

A Meeting of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group will be held on Wednesday, 15 July 2026 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber Area B, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

This meeting will be accessible and open to the public via the live stream on YouTube and viewed via the link: <https://www.youtube.com/user/RushcliffeBC>
Please be aware that until the meeting starts the live stream video will not be showing on the home page. For this reason, please keep refreshing the home page until you see the video appear.

Yours sincerely



Ifty Ali
Monitoring Officer (Interim)

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Declarations of Interest
[Link to further information in the Council's Constitution](#)
3. Minutes of the Meeting held on (Pages 1 - 6)
4. Freeport Update (Pages 7 - 12)
Report of the Assistant Director for Growth, Property and Projects
5. Work Programme (Pages 13 - 14)
Report of the Director for Finance and Corporate Services



Email:
customerservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Telephone:
0115 981 9911

www.rushcliffe.gov.uk

Postal address
Rushcliffe Borough
Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham
NG2 7YG



Membership

Chair: Councillor T Combellack

Vice-Chair: Councillor J Billin

Councillors: R Bird, A Brown, S Calvert, J Chaplain, S Ellis, D Mason and R Walker

Meeting Room Guidance

Fire Alarm Evacuation: in the event of an alarm sounding please evacuate the building using the nearest fire exit, normally through the Council Chamber. You should assemble at the far side of the plaza outside the main entrance to the building.

Toilets: are located to the rear of the building near the lift and stairs to the first floor.

Mobile Phones: For the benefit of others please ensure that your mobile phone is switched off whilst you are in the meeting.

Microphones: When you are invited to speak please press the button on your microphone, a red light will appear on the stem. Please ensure that you switch this off after you have spoken.

Recording at Meetings

National legislation permits filming and recording by anyone attending a meeting. This is not within the Council's control.

Rushcliffe Borough Council is committed to being open and transparent in its decision making. As such, the Council will undertake audio recording of meetings which are open to the public, except where it is resolved that the public be excluded, as the information being discussed is confidential or otherwise exempt



**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT SCRUTINY GROUP
WEDNESDAY, 25 MARCH 2026**

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West
Bridgford

and live streamed on Rushcliffe Borough Council's YouTube channel

PRESENT:

Councillors T Combellack (Chair), J Billin (Vice-Chair), R Butler (Substitute),
S Calvert, J Chaplain, S Ellis, D Mason, A Phillips (Substitute) and R Walker.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

D Dwyer	Strategic Housing Manager
P Marshall	Principal Policy Planner
C Prendergast	Assistant Director Growth, Property and Projects
S Soar	Democratic Services Officer

APOLOGIES:

Councillors R Bird and A Brown

9 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

10 Minutes of the Meeting held on 28 January 2026

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 28 January 2026 were
approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

11 Shared Ownership and Other Affordable Housing

The Chair, Councillor Combellack, introduced the item as the Group's main
scrutiny topic and explained that the discussion should focus on whether the
current approach to shared ownership and other affordable housing products
was achieving the best outcomes for residents and whether there were
opportunities to improve delivery.

The Strategic Housing Manager presented the report, providing an overview of
the affordable housing products delivered in Rushcliffe, how they were secured
and monitored, and the evidence base informing the Council's approach.
Members were advised that the 2024 Housing Needs Assessment identified a
need for 507 affordable homes per year, comprising 477 rented and 30
affordable home ownership properties. Delivery had increased in recent years,
and rented homes remained most closely aligned to evidenced need. Shared
ownership delivery had grown substantially, while First Homes and discounted

market sale products remained limited, although discounted market sale had recently supported progress on a stalled site.

The Strategic Housing Manager emphasised the Council's main influence through planning policy, Section 106 negotiations and compliance, and monitoring. Matters such as marketing, allocation, service charges and resale arrangements for home ownership products sat with developers and Registered Providers. Policy 8 of the Local Plan, the Affordable Housing SPD and the Housing Needs Assessment shaped the Council's negotiating position, with a clear preference for rented homes where viable. Officers noted that viability and Registered Provider capacity could constrain what was deliverable, necessitating alternative tenures in some cases.

Councillor Calvert referred to the tables comparing identified need and actual delivery and asked how the two related. Officers explained that the Needs Assessment formed the evidence base for negotiation, while delivery figures reflected what had been secured on individual sites, influenced by viability, site-specific issues, Registered Provider interest and site phasing. It was acknowledged that the Council could not meet the full level of assessed need through new supply alone.

Councillor Calvert also queried whether the Council was able to secure sufficient social and affordable rented homes, as need appeared strongly weighted towards rented provision. Officers advised that the Council's starting point was always to negotiate rented units, but that viability pressures, constraints or the need to unlock stalled sites could lead to changes in tenure mix. Rented homes were typically the most difficult and costly to deliver.

He further referenced the Council's previous decision not to pursue direct council house building, noting that this left the authority reliant on Section 106 delivery and Registered Providers. Officers confirmed that this had been a political decision supported by an independent review and highlighted the resource implications for a stock-transfer authority with a small team.

Councillor Chaplain queried the apparent mismatch between the relatively low need for affordable home ownership and the higher proportion of shared ownership in recent delivery, particularly in 2024/25. Officers stressed that need and delivery did not correlate directly year-by-year, as delivery reflected historic permissions, earlier policy assumptions and phasing. A more detailed breakdown of recent figures could be provided.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the adopted Core Strategy, based on older evidence, set out a tenure mix with a higher proportion of intermediate products, and many currently delivering sites were permitted under that framework. Councillor Combella noted the difficulty of comparing differing frameworks and requested a note clarifying when newer evidence would be more visible in delivery. Councillor Billin echoed this and queried whether the

recent uplift in delivery reflected phased progress following earlier delays.

Officers advised that increased completions stemmed largely from progressing Local Plan allocations, with some uplift due to Covid-related delays. Delivery might reduce over coming years as smaller sites were completed, making outcomes more dependent on major sites such as Clifton and East Gamston. Projections were maintained but were indicative.

Councillor Walker sought clarity on the Council's current aim of securing 75% rented / 25% affordable home ownership, noting that delivery trends seemed lower for rented homes. Officers advised that negotiations had followed the 2024 Needs Assessment since its publication, but that many current completions were based on older policy positions. This explanation was accepted by Councillor Walker.

Councillor Ellis observed that some mismatch between need and delivery was unavoidable and not unique to Rushcliffe. Officers agreed and noted that Rushcliffe's affordability pressures and high waiting list meant that Section 106 delivery alone could not meet annual need. Officers continued to seek full policy compliance unless viability evidence dictated otherwise.

Councillor Butler asked how viability was assessed and whether some developers were more cooperative. The Strategic Housing Manager outlined the Council's robust process, involving open-book assessments and independent valuation based on residual land values. Where a reduced level of affordable housing was evidenced, officers still aimed to prioritise rented units. Variations across developers were described as structural, linked to Registered Provider capacity and regulatory or financial pressures.

Councillor Walker then asked how officers made decisions on tenure when viability constrained delivery. The Strategic Housing Manager confirmed that rented provision was prioritised due to acute need and homelessness pressures, although final decisions had to take account of community balance and deliverability.

Councillor Combellack asked whether the limited affordability of affordable home ownership products for those on the waiting list called their appropriateness into question. Officers noted that such products met the needs of a different cohort—households not eligible for rented housing but unable to access full market ownership.

Councillor Mason asked about the operation of First Homes and how buyers accessed them. Officers explained that developers and Registered Providers handled marketing and allocation; the Council secured numbers and types through planning. Shared ownership tended to be more viable than First Homes in a high-value area. The Council held nomination rights only for rented products.

Councillor Chaplain asked about accessible housing. Officers confirmed that

policy required accessible homes on larger sites and that the Council sought to include these within affordable housing where possible. Given DFG pressures, the Council sometimes used its own funds to support accessibility features. Figures could be provided to the Group.

Councillor Phillips raised several questions on shared ownership, including pricing and resale. Officers confirmed that Registered Providers set prices and rents, and that shared ownership served households unable to access full ownership. Registered Providers usually had the first option to buy back shares; otherwise, homes were sold on the shared ownership market. Staircasing to 100% removed the unit from the affordable stock, although receipts might be recycled depending on funding conditions. Officers noted that Homes England funding required recycling into further provision.

Councillor Billin asked about discounted sale homes in rural areas and the risks of losing affordability over time. Officers explained that discounted market sale discounts were secured in perpetuity.

Councillor Combella noted two outstanding elements of the scrutiny request: ward member involvement in planning and support for shared ownership residents. Officers would seek clarification on ward member involvement. They advised that the Council did not manage shared ownership homes; issues were handled through Registered Provider complaints processes, the Housing Ombudsman and, for systemic concerns, the Regulator of Social Housing. Councillor Walker noted the unique position of shared owners; officers acknowledged this but highlighted the limits of Council control.

Councillor Butler asked about estate management fees; officers advised that planning colleagues would need to comment. Councillor Combella queried whether Registered Providers should be subject to good practice expectations similar to those developed for open space management. Officers explained that the guide related to different issues and that Registered Providers were already regulated.

At the end of discussion, Councillor Combella invited Councillors Billin and Walker to comment on the scrutiny request. Councillor Billin felt it had been addressed as far as possible and noted the complexity of the subject. Both Members were satisfied, subject to follow-up information.

Following a show of hands, it was:

RESOLVED that the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group:

- a) noted the range of affordable housing products in Rushcliffe and their benefits and limitations;
- b) considered the importance of continued collaboration with developers and Registered Providers to support delivery; and
- c) acknowledged the Council's limited role in the allocation and management of affordable home ownership products and supported continued monitoring of

Section 106 compliance and delivery through policy and partnerships.

12 **Work Programme**

It was **RECOMMENDED** that the Group agree a work programme for 2026-2027.

It was agreed the group will have update from the East Midlands Freeport in July. The specific date is to be finalised.

The meeting closed at 8.38 pm.

CHAIR

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank



Growth and Development Scrutiny Group

Wednesday, 15 July 2026

Freeport Update

Report of the Assistant Director Growth, Property and Projects

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1. East Midlands Freeport (EMF) was established in March 2023. It was selected following Government's call for bids for new freeports in 2022. The East Midlands Freeport is the only inland freeport in the country and is made up of 3 sites:
 - East Midlands Airport and Gateway Industrial Cluster (EMAGIC) in Leicestershire
 - East Midlands Intermodal Park (EMIP) in Derbyshire
 - Ratcliffe on Soar (RoS) Power Station site in Rushcliffe, Nottinghamshire.
- 1.2. As Ratcliffe on Soar is within Rushcliffe, it is important that Councillors are aware of the role of EMF, the work being done and plans for the site. The Council's Leader is a member of the EMF Board.
- 1.3. Representatives from EMF and RoS site owner Uniper will attend the Growth and Development Scrutiny Committee to deliver a presentation responding to the key lines of enquiry identified in the scrutiny request, as well answering any questions Councillors have.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Growth and Development Scrutiny Group consider the update provided by EMF at the Committee meeting and identify any further opportunities to be explored or developed.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

EMF is a key stakeholder in the delivery of the redevelopment of the RoS Power Station. This is a gateway site to the Borough with the potential to deliver significant benefits to residents. It is important therefore that Councillors understand the role of EMF in the delivery of the site and have the opportunity to be engaged.

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1. Scrutiny of the East Midlands Freeport was undertaken in July 2025 by the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group. A written update was also provided in October 2025. The Growth and Development Scrutiny Group requested

that this item be returned to the Group so that further progress and outstanding actions can be updated upon. Additional questions from the Group include:

- Securing electricity demand connections to be resolved 2026 - any progress?
- Local Development Order (LDO) transport cap - is this being addressed?
- Indicative timescale - is this being met?
- Future focus plans including decommissioning this year - are they being met?
- Junction 24 modelling - what is being done?
- Transport restrictions to be lifted 2027/28 – what is the latest position?
- Skills plans focus – what does this mean in real terms ie jobs for local people?

4.2. The primary desired outcome for the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group is greater understanding of the Freeport and its governance structure, impact of the development locally and timescales.

5. Risks and Uncertainties

There are no risks associated with the content of this report. One area of focus for the presentation from EMF will be risks and issues associated with the delivery of the ROS site. This will be covered at the Scrutiny meeting.

6. Implications

6.1. Financial Implications

There are no direct financial implications associated with this report, it is intended to be an update of EMF activity.

6.2. Legal Implications

There are no legal implications of this report, it is intended to be an update of EMF activity.

6.3. Equalities Implications

There are no equalities implications of this report.

6.4. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 Implications

There are no crime and disorder act implications of this report.

6.5. Biodiversity Net Gain Implications

There are no direct BNG implications associated with this report.

6.6. Local Government Reorganisation

There are no Local Government Reorganisation implications associated with this report.

7. Link to Corporate Priorities

Quality of Life	The Freeport has the potential to benefit local residents' quality of life through the provision of new jobs and green infrastructure.
Efficient Services	Not applicable
Sustainable Growth	The development of Ratcliffe on Soar power station through the Freeport could attract a significant number of new businesses and jobs.
The Environment	The transformation of Ratcliffe on Soar power station from the production of coal-fired energy to other more sustainable forms of energy including Research and Development into clean energy will help the region's plans to become carbon neutral and then net zero.

8. Recommendations

It is RECOMMENDED that Growth and Development Scrutiny Group consider the update provided by EMF at the Committee meeting and identify any further opportunities to be explored or developed.

For more information contact:	Cara Prendergast Assistant Director - Growth, Property and Projects cprendergast@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers available for Inspection:	Minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2025 - Growth and Development Scrutiny Group
List of appendices:	Scrutiny Request

This page is intentionally left blank

Councillor Request for **REPEAT** Scrutiny

Councillor Tina Combellack

Proposed topic of scrutiny ...

East Midlands Freeport

I would like to explore ...

It is helpful to include why you feel this topic requires scrutiny, what concerns you, what concerns are being raised with you, and how scrutiny will lead to better outcomes or services to residents.

Scrutiny of the East Midlands Freeport was undertaken in July 2025 by the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group. A written update was also provided in October 2025.

The Growth and Development Scrutiny Group request that this item returns to the Group so that further progress and outstanding actions can be updated upon.

Additional questions from the Group include:

- Securing electricity demand connections to be resolved 2026 - any progress?
- LDO transport cap - is this being addressed?
- Indicative timescale - is this being met?
- Future focus plans including decommissioning this year - are they being met?
- Junction 24 modelling - what is being done?
- Transport restrictions to be lifted 2027/28 – what is the latest position?
- Skills plans focus – what does this mean in real terms ie jobs for local people?

I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor Performance Identified
<input type="checkbox"/>	Change in Legislation or Local Policy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Resident Concern or Interest
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cabinet Recommendation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Links to the Corporate Strategy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please state reason)

What outcomes are you seeking from this scrutiny?

Greater understanding of the Freeport and its governance structure, impact of the development locally and timescales.

Collaboration

Matrix developed in conjunction with officers?

No

 <p>Rushcliffe Borough Council</p>	<p>Growth and Development Scrutiny Group</p> <p>Wednesday, 15 July 2026</p> <p>Work Programme</p>
---	--

Report of the Director for Finance and Corporate Services

1. Summary

- 1.1. The work programme is a standing item for discussion at each meeting of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group. In determining the proposed work programme due regard is given to matters usually reported to the Group and the timing of issues to ensure best fit within the Council's decision making process.
- 1.2. The work programme does not take into account any items that need to be considered by the Group as special items. These may occur, for example, through changes required to the Constitution or financial regulations, which have an impact on the internal controls of the Council.
- 1.3. The future work programme was updated and agreed at the meeting of the Corporate Overview Group on 16 June 2026, including any items raised via a scrutiny request.

Members are asked to propose future topics to be considered by the Group, in line with the Council's priorities which are:

- Quality of Life;
- Efficient Services;
- Sustainable Growth; and
- The Environment

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Group agrees a work programme for 2026-2027 as follows.

14 October 2026 – There are no scrutiny items scheduled

27 January 2027 – There are no scrutiny items scheduled

24 March 2027 – There are no scrutiny items scheduled

3. Reason for Recommendation

To enable the Council's scrutiny arrangements to operate efficiently and effectively.

For more information contact:	Pete Linfield Director of Finance and Corporate Services 0115 914 8349 plinfeld@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers Available for Inspection:	None.
List of appendices (if any):	None.