

When telephoning, please ask for: Helen Tambini
Direct dial 0115 914 8320
Email democraticservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: Monday, 1 March 2021

To all Members of the Cabinet

Dear Councillor

A Virtual Meeting of the Cabinet will be held via Zoom on Tuesday, 9 March 2021 at 7.00 pm to consider the following items of business.

The meeting will be live streamed via YouTube for the public to listen and view via the link: <https://www.youtube.com/user/RushcliffeBC>

Note: 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



Sanjit Sull
Monitoring Officer

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 9 February 2021 (Pages 1 - 12)
4. Citizens' Questions

To answer questions submitted by citizens on the Council or its services.

5. Opposition Group Leaders' Questions

To answer questions submitted by Opposition Group Leaders on items on the agenda.

Rushcliffe Borough
Council Customer
Service Centre

Fountain Court
Gordon Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham
NG2 5LN

Email:
customerservices
@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Telephone:
0115 981 9911

www.rushcliffe.gov.uk

Opening hours:
**Monday, Tuesday and
Thursday**
8.30am - 5pm
Wednesday
9.30am - 5pm
Friday
8.30am - 4.30pm

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



NON-KEY DECISIONS

6. Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring 2020/21 - Financial and Covid Update Quarter 3 (Pages 13 - 44)

The report of the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services is attached.

7. Management of Open Spaces in New Developments (Pages 45 - 50)

The report of the Executive Manager – Communities is attached.

8. Edwalton Golf Course Strategic Review (Pages 51 - 56)

The report of the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services is attached.

9. Use of Fireworks at Borough Council Events (Pages 57 - 66)

The report of the Executive Manager – Communities is attached.

10. Government call for STEP sites (Pages 67 - 72)

The report of the Chief Executive is attached.

Membership

Chairman: Councillor S J Robinson

Vice-Chairman: Councillor A Edyvean

Councillors: A Brennan, R Inglis, G Moore and R Upton

Meeting Room Guidance

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

Recording at Meetings

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 allows 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
CABINET
TUESDAY, 9 FEBRUARY 2021**

Held virtually at 7.00 pm and livestreamed on the
Rushcliffe Borough Council You Tube channel

PRESENT:

Councillors S J Robinson (Chairman), A Edyvean (Vice-Chairman), A Brennan,
R Inglis, G Moore and R Upton

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors B Gray and C Thomas

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

L Ashmore	Executive Manager - Transformation
D Banks	Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods
P Linfield	Executive Manager - Finance and Corporate Services
K Marriott	Chief Executive
S Sull	Monitoring Officer
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager
L Webb	Democratic Services Officer

APOLOGIES:

There were no apologies

40 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

41 Minutes of the Meeting held on 12 January 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 12 January 2021, were declared
a true record and signed by the Chairman.

42 Citizens' Questions

The following question was submitted by Ms Rebecca Collison.

“The sixth objective of the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy is to ‘Seek to ensure positive impact (Biodiversity Net Gain) of development on wildlife and biodiversity whilst eliminating negative impact’ and the report sets out six initiatives designed to meet this objective, including a reference to local planning policy and using Hedgerow Regulations and Tree Preservation Orders. Without meaningful targets; however, to measure the Council’s performance in protecting biodiversity and hedgerows on large housing developments, residents are blind to what we may be losing. Would the

Council consider including measurable targets:

- setting a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain target to be included as a condition in all large site planning permissions and including the 10% biodiversity net gain target for large site developments in the conservation strategy document;
- setting a target in the conservation strategy of zero net loss of hedgerows in Rushcliffe as a result of large housing development;
- and making a commitment to publishing hedgerow and biodiversity net gains / losses annually for large housing developments in Rushcliffe.”

Councillor Upton responded by advising that the Cabinet would be considering the Council’s Nature Conservation Strategy later in the meeting and Recommendation ‘c’ of the Strategy report stated:

‘that the Council should work with neighbouring local planning authorities and partner organisations to introduce biodiversity net gain policies that complement the Nature Conservation Strategy’s objectives’

Councillor Upton thanked Ms Collison for her question and stated that this would provide an opportunity to discuss and evaluate her suggestions. It was also the Government’s intention to introduce legislation that would require developments to achieve a 10% net gain for biodiversity. This requirement would be applied to relevant planning permissions when it became a legal requirement and the Borough Council would monitor the implementation of the 10% net gain requirement, in accordance with the arrangements established at the time. Councillor Upton suggested that it would be appropriate to wait for the outcomes of the proposed Environment Act, to allow the Council to align any new biodiversity and hedgerow targets with the national ones, before considering other suggestions.

The following question was submitted by Mr Geoff East.

“Having read through the updated Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy; 2021-2025, I am heartened by the importance our council is putting on the fight against habitat loss and climate change. I would agree that it is important to encourage creation of new sites and nature's recovery requires us to link and connect sites to allow the spread of wild native plants and animals. Hedges and grassy verges are nature's highways, so yes, we should be seeking to protect areas and encourage sympathetic management of our grassland.

Would the Borough add a KPI to their Natural Conservation Strategy that includes a numerical target for councils to reduce, and eventually stop altogether, the use of herbicides and pesticides throughout our Parishes and WB wards?”

Councillor Brennan thanked Mr East for his question and stated that this was an important issue and advised that the use of herbicides and pesticides invoked strong emotive responses from people both for and against. It was encouraging to note that the Nature Conservation Strategy on the agenda for consideration included numerous references to the management of verges and roadside hedges to protect plants and wildlife. Councillor Brennan advised that

she did not believe that the Strategy could go any further at this time to set targets or restrict the use of herbicides and pesticides as those areas were often managed and maintained by organisations and companies outside the control of the Council. However, Councillor Brennan was sure that the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Group would consider Mr East's views as the Group moved forward. As a Council, and working with its contractors, Rushcliffe already considered how best to minimise the use of herbicides on land that it owned, and as part of the implementation of the Strategy the Council would work to ensure that it continued to look for opportunities for alternative means of controlling vegetation in areas where it was necessary to do so.

43 Opposition Group Leaders' Questions

Question from Councillor Gray to Councillor Inglis

"How have we considered the full implications of this change in policy for parking enforcement and its knock on effects to partner and former partner organisations?"

Councillor Inglis responded by saying that there had been considerable dialogue and liaison between the Council and key partners on this topic to ensure a satisfactory position and the report presented to Cabinet contained an assessment of the potential issues, risks and mitigation measures for Cabinet's full consideration.

Question from Councillor Thomas to Councillor Inglis

"Parking enforcement staff are very rarely seen in East Leake despite ongoing resident concerns about highway obstruction and infringements in the parking bays with time limits. Will we see any improvement under the new arrangement?"

Councillor Inglis responded by confirming that the Council's Civil Enforcement Officers visited all areas of the Borough to check for parking compliance but could only enforce if they witnessed infringements taking place at that time. In a normal year, the Council would visit East Leake at least once a week and had issued Fixed Penalty Notices for a range of parking related offences including parking on or adjacent to yellow lines.

44 Car Parking County Partnership

The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods presented the report of the Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods providing an update on the Car Parking County Partnership and outlined suggested recommendations for how the Council would manage its car parking provision both efficiently and cost effectively going forward, to ensure that it fulfilled its statutory obligations.

The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods gave a brief overview of the history of the District Partnership Agreement, which the Council had been part of since 2008, and the Cabinet noted that the partnership had worked very effectively. In 2014, under the partnership agreement, Rushcliffe had become responsible

for managing the County Council's on-street parking in the Borough, and it had been agreed that any surplus should be re-invested in the service and not passed to the Council; however, the Council would still be liable to cover any deficits. It was noted that until recently that risk had been unlikely; however, that position had now changed because of several pressures on the County Council's on-street surplus, details of which were highlighted in the report.

The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods confirmed that at the end of the financial year, the cost of Broxtowe Borough Council managing Rushcliffe's on-street parking would be passed directly to Rushcliffe, at an additional charge of £20,000 per annum, rather than being covered by the County Council. That change would lead to a doubling of the current service management fee from £21,000 to £41,000 per annum.

The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods advised that the County Council had asked councils in the partnership, which services they would like to continue with under the next round of procurement, and that had provided Rushcliffe with a great opportunity to review its service, in line with the Council's governance practice for best value for money. The report highlighted various cost savings that had been identified, including the direct employment of enforcement officers and the use of Broxtowe Borough Council's contractor for cash collections. It was proposed that under a separate agreement, the Council would continue to retain use of the County Council's Central Processing Unit, which processed Rushcliffe's penalty notices and administered the appeals process. It was suggested that the Council could also plan for developing the enforcement role into a wider Community Warden function, to cover various roles, details of which were highlighted in the report.

The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods advised that it had been agreed with the County Council that Rushcliffe could withdraw from the partnership on or before June 2022. It was reiterated that the proposed changes would provide cost savings and efficiencies going forward.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Brennan stated that given the proposed changes to the partnership, it was timely to review the Council's management of its car parking provision. The previous arrangements had worked effectively; however, it was always prudent to keep such arrangements under review, to ensure that they remained fit for purpose and provided value for money. The proposal to directly employ enforcement officers was welcomed, as it would allow the role to be broadened out to encompass a more community ambassador type role going forward, to provide additional reassurance to residents and help to create a sense of place for all residents across the Borough.

It was RESOLVED that

- a) the withdrawal from the Car Parking District Partnership be approved, which includes withdrawal from using the procured County services for enforcement officers and cash collection, withdrawal from managing Nottinghamshire County Council's on-street enforcement and responsibility for deficit liability;

- b) the employment of enforcement officers be approved;
- c) the use of Broxtowe Borough Council's cash collection service be approved; and
- d) the Executive Manager for Neighbourhoods be granted delegated authority to negotiate an agreement for the continued use of the processing unit of Nottinghamshire County Council for managing the Council's penalty notices.

45 **2021/22 Budget and Financial Strategy**

The Portfolio Holder for Finance presented the report of the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services outlining the Council's proposed budget for 2021/22, the five-year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) from 2021/22 to 2025/26, which incorporated the revenue budget, the proposed Capital Programme, the Transformation Strategy and the Capital and Investment Strategy.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance referred to the unprecedented events, which had taken place during the last year, and to the significant economic impact on local government finances. It was noted that this Council had always managed its finances prudently, which had enabled it to deal with the current financial difficulties. The proposed budget would ensure that the Council remained financially resilient, would continue to deliver its statutory services and to focus on much needed economic recovery. The budget would ensure continued support for the most vulnerable in the community, whilst remaining committed to carbon reduction and supporting the environment. Cabinet was advised that the economic situation going forward remained uncertain, and it was therefore important to remain prudent, with substantial reserves in place and that any opportunities to increase the Council's reserves to deliver its Corporate Priorities and to mitigate future risks would be taken. It was noted that the projected loss of income and increased expenditure for 2021/22 would equate to an anticipated budget deficit of £1.5m over the next two years, and it was confirmed that this would be a manageable risk.

In respect of the Council's Capital Programme, the Portfolio Holder for Finance reiterated that the Council continued to have an ambitious programme, with over £38m planned investment over the next few years, details of which were highlighted in the report. To fund those investments, it was noted that it was likely that some external borrowing would be required; however, it was confirmed that the repayments had been built into both the budget and the revised MTFS.

In respect of Council Tax, the Portfolio Holder for Finance advised that it was proposed to raise Council Tax by 3.24%, which ensured that Rushcliffe's Council Tax remained the lowest in Nottinghamshire and in the lowest quartile nationally.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance acknowledged the additional financial support provided by Central Government to local councils, which had been invaluable to mitigate loss of income and to reduce some of the financial pressures. The

Government's' support for local businesses was also acknowledged, with over £38m being distributed locally.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance referred to the proposed funding for the first year of the Development Corporation and reiterated the importance of this project going forward.

In conclusion, the Portfolio for Finance confirmed that the uncertain financial future remained a challenge, the Council's financial strategies continued the progress already made to ensure that the Council's financial plans were robust, affordable and deliverable. The budget had been designed to ensure the continued delivery of high-quality services, whilst being financially and environmentally sustainable and the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services, the Financial Services Manager and their team were thanked for their continuing hard work.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Edyvean reiterated the comments made regarding the unprecedented year that the Council had faced and agreed that to produce such a comprehensive, prudent budget had been a challenge. It was noted that the Council remained ambitious, with several significant schemes on course to be delivered through the Capital Programme, including the Bingham Hub and the Crematorium, and the Council's continued support of the Development Corporation was also welcomed.

The Leader conveyed his thanks to the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services and his team for their hard work during this challenging time. The continued ambition of this Council was reiterated, and it was a credit to all those involved currently and previously that the Council remained in such a strong, resilient financial position going forward.

It was RESOLVED that Cabinet recommends that Council

- a) adopts the budget setting report and associated financial strategies 2021/22 to 2025/26, as set out in the Annex to the report, including the Transformation Strategy and Efficiency Plan, as set out in Appendix 3 of the Annex, to deliver efficiencies over the five-year period;
- b) adopts the Capital Programme as set out in Appendix 4 of the Annex;
- c) adopts the Capital Investment Strategy as set out in Appendix 5 of the Annex;
- d) sets Rushcliffe's 2021/22 Council Tax for a Band D property at £147.36 (increase from 2020/21 of £4.62 or 3.24%);
- e) sets the Special Expenses for West Bridgford, Ruddington and Keyworth, as set out in Appendix 1 of the Annex, resulting in the following Band D Council Tax levels for the Special Expense Areas:
 - i) West Bridgford £49.65 (£48.51 in 2020/21);
 - ii) Keyworth £3.41 (£3.76 in 2020/21);

- iii) Ruddington £4.00 (£4.12 in 2020/21);
- f) adopts the Pay Policy Statement as set out in Appendix 7 of the Annex; and
- g) agrees the proposal that the Year 1 funding for the Development Corporation be approved prior to receiving formal Government approval and financial support for the scheme (capped at £0.17m along with the conditions as set out at paragraph 4.2 (l) of the report).

46 **Crematorium Update**

The Portfolio Holder for Business and Transformation presented the report of the Executive Manager – Transformation providing an update on the Crematorium.

The Portfolio Holder for Business and Transformation reinforced the need for the development of a crematorium, to meet the needs of a continually growing population, and the importance of ensuring that the new facility was built to the highest specification possible. Cabinet was advised that officers had identified that an additional £2m would be required, as three factors had been identified that had impacted on the pre-tender estimate: the VAT position of the project; enhanced landscaping costs to encourage bio-diversity across the site, tree planting and maintenance of green space; and the cost of an electric cremator, which although more expensive, would be better for the environment, have a longer working life span and would be more cost effective in the long term. Cabinet noted that detailed benchmarking had been undertaken to ensure value for money and that had been confirmed.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Moore stated that it was important that ambitious projects were developed, and this project would form part of the £38m capital investment referred to in the budget report, and it was acknowledged that such schemes would help the Council as it emerged from the pandemic.

The Leader referred to previous discussions at Cabinet meetings regarding the importance of this project and that it was key to enhancing community facilities to bring the project forward. The financial changes were acknowledged, and it was positive that officers were continuing to move this project forward.

Councillor Upton confirmed that it was essential that the new facility was as environmentally sustainable as possible, and the proposed budget would provide the best value going forward.

It was RESOLVED that the allocation of an additional £2m in the 2021/22 capital programme for the delivery of a new crematorium, to be included in the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy be supported.

47 Covid 19 Update Report

The Leader presented the report of the Chief Executive, providing an update on the work completed to date on response and recovery due to the Covid 19 pandemic since December 2020.

The Leader highlighted the key headlines in the report, which reflected the work undertaken both internally and externally by the Council during the pandemic and Cabinet noted the changes to lockdown levels since November 2020, and the overview of restrictions placed on both residents and businesses. As part of that national lockdown, the significant impact to the Council's finances caused by the closure of the Borough's leisure centres was acknowledged. The Leader referred to the actions taken by the Council in response to the changing lockdown restrictions, details of which were highlighted in the report. Cabinet was advised that the Council had applied for funding to help with the loss of income from its leisure centres and it was hoped that it would be successful, to ensure continued support for such key community facilities.

The Leader reiterated the importance of the financial support given to businesses throughout the pandemic, with a further £7m paid out since December 2020, and paid tribute to officers who had worked so hard to facilitate that.

The Leader referred to the successful running of the test and trace facility at the Arena and the community vaccine centre at Gamston, both of which would continue to play an important role going forward.

In conclusion, the Leader thanked officers and Councillors for their continued hard work during such unprecedented times.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Edyvean referred to the vital funding from Central Government to support local businesses, many of which would not have survived such unprecedented times without it. Officers had acted swiftly to ensure the effective distribution of those funds and many businesses had expressed their thanks to the Council. The Cabinet acknowledged the work undertaken by other services, in particular, the excellent refuse collection service, which had continued throughout the pandemic, Planning Services and Customer Service support for residents.

The Leader referred to the continued adaptability of the Council, in its working practices and service delivery and the considerable challenges that had been faced over the past 12 months. The Leader also acknowledged the work undertaken by the various services, together with the ongoing aspirations of the Council in respect of its capital projects, and the work being undertaken to bring those projects to fruition.

It was RESOLVED that the work of officers of the Council and partners in responding to and supporting the recovery from Covid 19 be noted.

48 Electoral Review of Rushcliffe

The Leader presented the report of the Chief Executive outlining the proposed electoral review of Rushcliffe.

The Leader advised that the review had been requested by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), which had asked the Council to consider how many Councillors were required to effectively represent the electorate, and it was noted that the report would be submitted to Council in March 2021 for approval. The Leader explained that a key consideration was the anticipated 18% growth in population size over the review period of 2020-2027, which would result in an increase in the average number of electors per Councillor rising from 2,058 to 2,509, based on the current number of Councillors. That anticipated growth would be substantial and would be driven in particular by two significant housing developments at Gamston and Fairham.

The Leader confirmed that as part of the review, Councillors had been asked about their workloads and the LGBCE had provided a very comprehensive template, to cover all aspects of how the Council operated, details of which were highlighted in the report. Cabinet was advised that following the review it was being recommended that the number of Councillors should increase by two, to 46.

The Leader welcomed the forthcoming review of ward boundaries, due to take place over the summer 2021, which would also help to minimise the variance in the number of electors per Councillor.

In respect of financial implications, the Leader advised that with an increase of two Councillors, there would be an additional £11,000 per annum in basic allowances, and potentially additional expenses and training costs and if approved, that would be included within the revenue budget for 2023/24.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Edyvean referred to the significant projected rise to the Borough's population up to 2027 and stated that the proposed increase of two Councillors would help to mitigate against the associated additional workload and ensure that Councillors could continue to fulfil their roles in the community. Councillor Edyvean also welcomed the forthcoming review of ward boundaries, which would reflect the changing pattern of population growth.

It was RESOLVED that

- a) the Review of Council Size, which proposes an increase in the number of Councillors for Rushcliffe Borough Council to 46 Councillors subject to Full Council approval in March 2021 be endorsed; and
- b) the Chief Executive be requested to make arrangements for the Review to be sent to the Commission as the Council's draft submission subject to Full Council approval in March 2021.

49 **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy**

The Portfolio Holder for Community and the Environment presented the report of the Executive Manager – Communities outlining the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy 2021-2025.

The Portfolio Holder for Community and the Environment welcomed the implementation of the new Strategy and advised that it reflected the Council's commitment and ambition to this important issue. The Council was proud of the Borough's natural heritage and was committed to ensure its enhancement and sustainability going forward. Cabinet was advised that given the significant growth forecast for the Borough, it was essential that any growth was sustainable, took account of conservation issues, and the bio-diversity net gains that were likely to be required from the emerging Environment Bill.

The Portfolio Holder for Community and the Environment gave a brief overview of the history of the previous Strategy and its achievements, details of which were highlighted in the report. Cabinet was advised that in order to protect and build upon those previous achievements, a new Strategy had been required and that had been developed by the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group (RNCSIG), which was jointly heading by the Council and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, together with a broad range of key partners. It was noted that as part of the recommendations in the report, funding to extend the Council's very successful Free Tree Scheme over 2021-2025 should be approved, together with the introduction of wildflower seed distribution in line with the Strategy's lifecycle. The Portfolio Holder for Community and the Environment gave a brief overview of the key points and objectives within the Strategy, details of which were highlighted in the report and advised that the Strategy had been considered by the Communities Scrutiny Group and undergone a public consultation process in November and December 2020.

In conclusion, the Portfolio Holder for Community and the Environment referred to the hard work and dedication of the numerous partner organisations and volunteers and stated that it was important to recognise their hard work and achievements and encourage more people to become involved.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Upton agreed that it had been timely to review the previous Strategy, and now adopt the new one. Cabinet noted that significant pressures including climate change, population increase, and associated housing growth would all put pressure on the natural environment. Councillor Upton stated that new housing developments should be as sustainable as possible and include bio-diversity measures, with the forthcoming Environment Bill proposing at least a 10% bio-diversity net gain for all new developments. It was pleasing to note that the Free Tree Scheme would be extended, and the introduction of the wildflower seeding was to be applauded.

The Leader endorsed the thanks given to the volunteers and partner organisations that had worked extremely hard, and stated that without their help, the implementation of the Strategy would be almost impossible to achieve. The Borough was fortunate to have a unique and diverse landscape,

which should be nurtured and preserved, and it was pleasing to note that the Council would be working with other local planning authorities to ensure that high standards were driven up and maintained. In conclusion, the Leader welcomed the ambition of the Strategy and looked forward to its implementation.

Councillor Edyvean added that the implementation of the Strategy would also be welcomed by parish councils across the Borough.

It was RESOLVED that

- a) the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy 2021 – 2025 be adopted;
- b) the funding for the Free Tree Scheme be extended to include funding of £50,000 over 2021 – 2025 within the Strategy, to cover planting of trees and to support the introduction of wildflowers seed distribution in line with the Strategy lifecycle; and
- c) that the Council should work with neighbouring local planning authorities and partner organisations to introduce biodiversity net gain policies that complement the Nature Conservation Strategy's objectives.

The meeting closed at 8.00 pm.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

**Cabinet****Tuesday, 9 March 2021****Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring 2020/21 – Financial and Covid Update Quarter 3****Report of the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services****Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Finance, Councillor G Moore****1. Purpose of report**

- 1.1. This report presents the budget position for revenue and capital as at 31 December 2020 and an update to the report to Cabinet on 10 November 2020 and includes the in-year variances along with variances resulting from Covid.
- 1.2. Given the current financial climate, particularly relating to the impact of Covid, it is imperative that the Council maintains due diligence with regards to its finances and ensures necessary action is taken to ensure a balanced budget is maintained.
- 1.3. Previous estimates have been reported to Cabinet; however, further lockdowns announced on 14 October 2020, have exacerbated the negative impact on the Council's finances, albeit offset by additional government funding and these are reflected in the projections. The overall anticipated budget position is a positive budget efficiency of £0.721m. This takes into account financial challenges caused by the pandemic, additional Government funding and importantly in-year net efficiency savings.
- 1.4. The positive budget position will help replenish the Organisation Stabilisation Reserve, so the Council has the resources to meet a potential future Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) budget deficit; and significant financial risks going forward. Such risks include the Covid legacy or Government policy changes, such as Business Rates reform. In terms of upside risk, it enables reserves to be appropriated for opportunities to support the Council's Corporate Objectives such as improving the local economy and sustainable growth.
- 1.5. At Quarter 3, the planned underspend on capital is £7.3m (net of carry forwards agreed in the Quarter 2 finance report). This is as a result of uncommitted funds in the Asset Investment Strategy; reprofiling of Bingham Hub expenditure based on a revised cash flow position; and an underspend on Disabled Facilities Grants. It has been recommended to Cabinet and Council, as part of the MTFS, to remove the remaining Asset Investment Strategy provision.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet approve the attached report noting:

- a) the expected net revenue efficiency for the year of £0.721m;

- b) the capital budget efficiencies of £7.3m; and
- c) the expected outturn position for Special Expenses of £0.087m deficit.

3. Reasons for Recommendations

To demonstrate good governance in terms of scrutinising the Council's on-going financial position and compliance with Council Financial Regulations.

4. Supporting Information

Revenue Monitoring

- 4.1 The Revenue Monitoring statement by service area is attached at **Appendix A** with detailed variance analysis as at 31 December 2020, attached at **Appendix B**. For this financial year, the budget variance including Covid related pressures and in-year efficiencies is expected to be a positive budget efficiency of £0.721m. This has moved from a deficit position of £0.244m projected at Quarter 2. The main reason being an increase in Government funding (income loss reimbursement, Council Tax loss reimbursement and National Leisure Recovery funding) from £1.7m (Q2) to £2.9m.
- 4.2 The projections assume that the national lockdown will continue for the remainder of this financial year and, therefore, represents a worst case scenario. The Council applied for an allocation from the National Leisure Recovery Fund to alleviate some of the financial pressure of supporting the Leisure Provider (£0.21m) and we have received notification that this has been successful. The Council has received one payment to date for reimbursement of lost income and it is estimated that a further £0.376m will be claimed for the remainder of the year. Both the above are included in the projections below. Table 1 below summarises the main variations from revenue efficiencies and Covid related pressures.

Table 1: Main Items Impacting on the Current Revenue Budget

	Pressure/(Saving) (£m) 2020/21
<i>Reductions in income</i>	1.140
Hire of Facilities	0.209
Car Parking	0.370
Development Control	0.069
Council Tax Summons	0.100
Impact on Commercial Properties	0.190
Other Lost Income (eg Licensing, Arts and events)	0.202
<i>Additional Costs</i>	1.986
Anti-social behaviour/PPE	0.089
Leisure	1.225
Waste Collection/Street Cleansing	0.171
Increase in Bad Debt Provision	0.100

Environmental Health Enforcement	0.133
Other Costs	0.102
Costs associated with specific grants	0.166
Total Covid Related Budget Pressure	3.126
Covid related savings	(0.270)
Furlough	(0.049)
Specific Grants	(0.166)
Government funding	(2.895)
Total additional funding/savings	(3.380)
Net Budget Pressure (A)	(0.254)
Projected In year costs/(savings) - :	
<i>Staff efficiencies</i>	(0.214)
<i>Rent from new acquisition and lower than expected void periods</i>	(0.182)
<i>Garden Waste Income</i>	(0.078)
<i>Housing Benefit Subsidy</i>	(0.096)
<i>Diesel (price reduction)</i>	(0.043)
<i>Investment Income, saving on interest payments and identified correction of bank charges</i>	(0.244)
Planning Appeals	0.043
Increase tanker waste disposal costs	0.055
Responsive Works	0.076
Other net savings (eg Recycling Credits Business Rates, Postage)	(0.177)
Total projected in-year efficiency savings (B)	(0.860)
Net Revenue Efficiencies (A) + (B)	(1.114)
Business Rates surplus	(3.769)
Nottinghamshire Business Rates Pool surplus	(0.038)
Reserve Commitments	4.200
Total Net Projected Budget Variance	(0.721)

- 4.3 The above table summarises key variances in relation to **Appendices A** and **B**. The overall position shows a £0.721m budget efficiency. This is a positive outcome at a difficult time and enables resources that can be utilised so the Council can continue to achieve its Corporate Objectives and support any future budget deficit position. One nuance that requires further explanation concerns Business Rates. A net surplus of £3.769m is anticipated for Business Rates relating to additional S31 grants to offset the Business Rates deficit as a result of the reliefs provided by Government. Furthermore, Nottinghamshire Pool Business Rates receipts of £0.438m are anticipated (giving a net budget efficiency of £0.038m, £0.4m was the original estimate in the MTFs). Consequently, £4m is being transferred to reserves. Councillors will recall, as approved by Cabinet on 10 November 2020, £0.2m will be transferred into the Development Corporation Reserve. As reported to this Cabinet (agenda item

8), £0.3m may also be required from the in-year budget efficiency position of £0.7m to support the proposed master planning work with regards to Edwalton Golf Course, if approved.

- 4.4 **Appendix A** includes a Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) of £1m. This is a provision that the Council is required to make each year to cover the internal borrowing costs for the Arena which will be funded by the New Homes Bonus. The MRP includes an element of Voluntary Repayment Provision (VRP) and the Council has the option to withhold the VRP element to potentially use to support the budget gap created by Covid; however, for budget setting purposes this is not currently deemed necessary.
- 4.5 As documented at **Appendix B** some of which are highlighted in the table above, the financial position to date reflects a number of positive variances totalling £1.333m. These include staff efficiencies (£0.214m), additional rent from new property acquisitions (£0.182m), additional garden waste income (£0.078m), and cost savings as a result of not delivering activities across the Borough (£0.076m). There are several adverse variances totalling £3.087m. The majority of the adverse variances arise from additional payments to Parkwood – leisure services (£1.225m), lost income from community facility hire (£0.284m), agency costs on planning (£0.142m), and reduced car parking income (£0.370m).
- 4.6 The Council has, since the further lockdown was announced on 14 October 2020, administered a number of grants to support the local economy and these were referenced in the Covid update report to Cabinet in February 2021.
- 4.7 **Appendix E** shows the Quarter 3 position on the Special Expenses budget. Budgets within the Special Expenses area have been impacted by Covid, particularly on the loss of income from hire of venues and bar sales. These projections are included in the total Covid related budget pressure of £3.155m. The expected budget deficit for the year is £0.087m. This deficit is net of a proportion of Covid Government funding intended as reimbursement for lost income. The net deficit will be repaid by way of a loan which was agreed by the West Bridgford CIL and Special Expenses Group on 25 September 2020 due to commence in 2022/23 as part of budget setting in the next financial year. The Special Expenses Budget was approved by Cabinet at its meeting on 9 February 2021, and will be approved Full Council in March 2021, with the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.

Capital Monitoring

- 4.8 The updated summary of the Capital Programme monitoring statement and funding position is shown at **Appendix C** as at 31 December 2020. **Appendix D** provides further details about the progress of the schemes, any necessary re-phasing and highlights efficiencies. The projected variance at this stage is £7.3m.
- 4.9 The revised Capital Programme of £38.371m, less agreed carry forwards of £18.465m, plus an in-year adjustment of £52k gives a revised total of £19.958m. The net expenditure efficiency variance of £7.3m is primarily due to the following:

- a) Bingham Leisure Hub £1.908m as expenditure has been reprofiled;
- b) Crematorium £0.417m;
- c) Car Park resurfacing £0.215m;
- d) Asset Investment Strategy £3.828m – this is uncommitted and will be recommended to Council, as part of the MTFS 2021/22, to be removed from the Capital Programme; and
- e) Capital Contingency £0.15m not yet committed.

4.10 The Council was due to receive capital receipts of £20m in the year, primarily from the disposal of surplus operational and investment property: Abbey Road Depot; land at Hollygate Lane; and also, from an overage agreement in place for Sharphill Wood site. Covid has impacted on the progress of these schemes with receipts projected to be £4.4m in 2020/21. The Abbey Road Depot has now exchanged with receipts expected in 2021/22 and 2022/23. The receipt from Hollygate Lane is now expected in 2021/22. Significant delays or reductions to capital receipts will affect the funding of the Capital Programme and may lead to either internal or external borrowing earlier than planned dependant on the progress of the Capital Programme and any slippage. Alternatively, projects could be delayed or not proceed if deemed economically unviable. The current projected overall variance is likely to mean that any borrowing requirement can be met from internal resources with no recourse to borrow externally this financial year.

Covid-19 Update

- 4.11 The position in relation to Covid was included in the Quarter 2 report to Cabinet on 10 November 2020, and more recently to Cabinet on 9 February 2021, in a specific Covid update report. The paragraphs below provide an update to that position.
- 4.12 Further lockdown measures were announced on 14 October 2020, with the country moving from various tiers into national lockdown since then. All non-essential shops and hospitality and leisure have been forced to close. The Council remains in close dialogue with its leisure providers throughout the pandemic and the support package and financial implications remain fluid. The Council, in conjunction with Parkwood, has recently submitted and been successful in an application to the National Leisure Recovery Fund to seek support of £0.21m toward the financial losses incurred. The projected losses to the Council currently stand at £1.225m (net of the support £1.024m).
- 4.13 It was reported to Cabinet on 10 November 2020, that the value of the Council's Multi Asset investments, which had dropped in value by £1.238m at the year end, had improved by £0.578m. As at the end of December 2020, the position has improved by a further £0.487m with the total value of the investment now recovered by £1.065m. Whilst it is encouraging to see a significant improvement, as expected for assets held over a long period, there is still a risk that these values can fluctuate in response to market conditions, particularly with the uncertainty brought about by Covid.
- 4.14 Data to 31 January 2021, shows collection rates for Council Tax have reduced by 0.9% equating to approximately £0.79m of cash not received. Business Rates are currently ahead by £0.37m (2.7%), mainly due to a large ratepayer paying in full. The aforementioned reduction in cash received will create a deficit

and a burden on future income streams albeit the County Council will take a significant proportion of the Council Tax deficit. Recent government announcements mean this deficit can now be spread over three years and this should reduce the burden in each year, nonetheless the burden will still be there.

- 4.15 The Council has received one payment to date of £0.294m from the income reimbursement scheme announced by government in July. The scheme reimburses local authorities for 75% lost income from sales fees and charges after the Council has absorbed 5% of the losses (subject to some exclusions). An estimate of £0.376m for two further submissions has been included in the projections although the final amount is dependent on total actual losses incurred to the end of March 2021. Part of the total estimated reimbursement has been allocated to the Special Expense fund to support the lost income from closure of facilities in the West Bridgford area (see paragraph 4.7).

Conclusion

- 4.16. The financial position in the revenue budget has improved and is now projecting a budget efficiency of £0.721m (budget deficit of £0.244m projected at Q2). Overall, Covid pressures are balanced by Government funding with in-year efficiencies, additional income from the Nottinghamshire Business Rates Pool accounting for the overall projected budget efficiency. The projections take into account that lockdown is likely to continue for the remainder of this financial year; however, Covid risks could prevail into next year and beyond with the financial impact unknown. There is an anticipated budget deficit in the Council's MTFs over the next two financial years and this positive variance enables the Council to continue to deliver first class services. It is likely that income levels will not return to pre-Covid levels for some time and the impact on the leisure contract is likely to extend beyond next year and therefore the Council must ensure it can support adverse budgetary impact.
- 4.17 The position on capital is currently positive and the delays in the Capital Programme means that it is not anticipated to externally borrow this financial year. Further opportunities and challenges can arise during the year, as demonstrated by the national lockdown currently in place which may still impact on the projected year-end position.
- 4.18 There remain external financial pressures from existing issues such as the uncertainty surrounding Business Rates retention, the Fair Funding review and Comprehensive Spending review that have now been delayed for a second year and the impact of BREXIT remains to be seen. Furthermore, there are the Council's own challenges such as meeting its own environmental objectives. Against such a background, it is imperative that the Council continues to keep a tight control over its expenditure, identifies any impact from changing income streams, maintains progress against its Transformation Strategy and retains a healthy reserves position.

5 Alternative options considered and reasons for rejection

There are no other options proposed for consideration.

6 Risks and Uncertainties

- 6.1 Failure to comply with Financial Regulations in terms of reporting on both revenue and capital budgets could result in criticism from stakeholders, including both Councillors and the Council's external auditors.
- 6.2 Areas such as income can be volatile and are particularly influenced by public confidence and the general economic climate and Government legislation. This has been clearly evidenced by the impact of Covid and highlighted in Table 1.
- 6.3 Business Rates is subject to specific risks given the volatile nature of the tax base with a small number of properties accounting for a disproportionate amount of tax revenue, notably in Rushcliffe, Ratcliffe-on-Soar power station. Furthermore, changes in Central Government policy influences Business Rates received and their timing, for example policy changes on small Business Rates relief. Again, Covid is likely to have a large impact on the Business Rates position as reported in the Q1 and Q2 report to Cabinet hence the need to appropriate the in-year Business Rates surplus to smooth deficits in later years.
- 6.4 The Council is committed to improving the environment and reducing its carbon footprint. Addressing such risks will require funding with the Climate Change Reserve now created to facilitate such opportunities.
- 6.5 The Council needs to be properly insulated against such risks hence the need to ensure it has a sufficient level of reserves, as well as having the ability to use reserves to support projects where there is 'upside risk' or there is a change in strategic direction. For example, paragraph 4.3 mentions £0.3m maybe needed for master planning work in relation to Edwalton Golf Courses. The Council continues to ensure it is financially resilient at this most difficult of times.

7 Implications

7.1 Financial Implications

Financial implications are covered in the body of the report.

7.2 Legal Implications

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report. It supports the delivery of a balanced budget.

7.3 Equalities Implications

None.

7.4 Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 Implications

None.

8 Link to Corporate Priorities

Quality of Life	The budget resources the Corporate Plan and therefore resources all Corporate Priorities.
Efficient Services	
Sustainable Growth	
The Environment	

9. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Cabinet approve the attached report noting:

- a) the expected net revenue efficiency for the year of £0.721m;
- b) the capital budget efficiencies of £7.3m; and
- c) the expected outturn position for Special Expenses of £0.087m deficit.

For more information contact:	Peter Linfield Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services 0115 914 8439 plinfield@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers Available for Inspection:	Council 5 March 2020 – 2020-21 Budget and Financial Strategy; Cabinet 8 September 2020 – Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Q1 Cabinet 10 December 2020 – Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Q2 Council 24 September 2020 - Covid 19 Budget 2020/21 and Medium-Term Financial Implications
List of appendices (if any):	Appendix A – Revenue Outturn Position 2020/21 – December 2020 Appendix B – Revenue Variance Explanations Appendix C – Capital Programme 2020/21 – December 2020 Position Appendix D – Capital Variance Explanations Appendix E – Special Expenses Monitoring

Revenue Outturn Position 2020/21 – December 2020

	Original Budget £'000	Revised Budget £'000	Projected Outturn £'000	Projected Outturn Variance £'000
Communities	2,907	2,971	3,350	379
Finance & Corporate Services	3,443	3,493	3,185	(308)
Neighbourhoods	6,521	6,537	8,334	1,797
Transformation	2	141	63	(78)
Sub Total	12,873	13,142	14,932	1,790
Capital Accounting Reversals	-2,131	-2,131	-2,131	0
Minimum Revenue Provision	1,000	1,000	1,000	0
Total Net Service Expenditure	11,742	12,011	13,801	1,790
Grant Income	-2,329	-2,329	-5,233	-2,904
Business Rates (including SBRR)	-3,984	-3,984	-7,753	-3,769
Council Tax	-6,991	-6,991	-6,991	0
Collection Fund Surplus	-444	-444	-482	-38
Total Funding	-13,748	-13,748	-20,459	-6,711
Surplus (-)/Deficit on Revenue Budget	-2,006	-1,737	-6,658	-4,921
Capital Expenditure financed from reserves	147	147	147	0
Net Transfer to/ (-) from Reserves	1,859	1,590	6,511	4,921
Amount Committed from Reserves				
Development Corporation Reserve				(200)
Business Rates Deficit				(4,000)
Net overall surplus transfer to Reserves				721

Revenue Variance Explanations (over £15k)

ADVERSE VARIANCES in excess of £15,000	Reason	Projected Outturn Variance £'000
Communities		
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Loss of income from facility hire	284
	Responsive Works	21
PLANNING & GROWTH	Loss of planning income	65
	Planning Appeals	43
	Agency Costs	142
PLANNING POLICY	Loss of land charges income and additional staffing costs	52
Finance & Corporate Services		
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES	Additional equipment for remote/virtual meetings	50
FINANCIAL SERVICES	Increase in bad debt provision and contingency	128
REVENUES & BENEFITS	Loss of Council Tax costs recovered and cost of professional services	119
ICT	Maintenance Contracts	0
Neighbourhoods		
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH	Loss of licensing income and additional staff costs	24
LEISURE CONTRACTS & CAR PARKS	Increased payments to Parkwood	1,225
	Loss of Car Parking Income	370

ADVERSE VARIANCES in excess of £15,000	Reason	Projected Outturn Variance £'000
STRATEGIC HOUSING	Emergency Accommodation (everybody in scheme) and social distancing measures meaning reduced Housing Benefit income at Hound Lodge	74
WASTE & FLEET MANAGEMENT	Additional agency costs and staffing costs	170
	Increase tanker waste disposal costs partly due to Severn Trent Water disposal costs increasing	55
	Increased fleet maintenance	21
Transformation		
PROPERTY SERVICES	Rent holidays and loss of rental income on planned acquisition	244
Total Adverse Variances		3,087

Revenue Variance Explanations (over £15k)

FAVOURABLE VARIANCES in excess of £15,000		Projected Outturn Variance £'000
Communities		
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	Employee efficiencies	-61
	Reduction in grants paid out	-17
	Reduction in Partnership SLA costs and Arts & Events Activities	-76
	Discretionary grants and Furlough reimbursement	-49
PLANNING POLICY	Contribution to Strategic Sites Delivery Officer post	-30
PLANNING & GROWTH	Staff Efficiencies	-24
Finance		
REVENUES & BENEFITS	Staff efficiencies	-70
	Net Increase in Housing Benefit Subsidy	-96
	Additional Grants	-27
FINANCIAL SERVICES	Investment Income, saving on interest payments and identified bank charge correction	-244
PERFORMANCE, REPTN & COMMS	External Printing	-44
ICT	Partnership Arrangement efficiency	-33
Neighbourhoods		
STRATEGIC HOUSING		
WASTE & FLEET MANAGEMENT	Additional garden waste income, staff efficiencies and plus additional glass recycling	-260

FAVOURABLE VARIANCES in excess of £15,000		Projected Outturn Variance £'000
Transformation		
BSU	Staff efficiencies	-51
ECONOMIC REGENERATION	Staff efficiencies	-25
LEGAL	Staff efficiencies	-44
PROPERTY SERVICES	Rent from new acquisition and lower than expected void periods (not withstanding rent holidays)	-182
Total Favourable Variances		-1,333
Sum of Minor Variances		36
TOTAL VARIANCE		1,790

Capital Programme Summary December 2020

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020				Explanations
EXPENDITURE SUMMARY	Current	Projected	Projected	
	Budget	Actual	Variance	
	£000	£000	£000	
Transformation	6,471	4,228	(2,243)	Significant budget adjustments have been made to reflect the timing of payments for Bingham Hub and the Crematorium. Projected actual for Bingham Hub revised down based on new cash flow. Professional fees and contingency sums held in 20/21 to meet any emerging commitments.
Neighbourhoods	2,333	1,502	(831)	£100k potential saving on vehicle acquisitions. Underspends on Disabled Facilities grants: mandatory and discretionary due to COVID impact. Slippage on Car Park resurfacing works and savings on Car Park Lighting tender.
Communities	2,087	1,941	(146)	£80k balance Skatepark Fund and £24k Other Capital Grants unallocated and likely to be give up as a saving. VE 75th Commemoration deferred due to COVID impact.
Finance & Corporate Services	8,917	4,979	(3,938)	Primarily balance in Asset Investment Strategy to be removed from the programme as part of the MTFS.
Contingency	150	0	(150)	Capital Contingency balance not yet allocated.
	19,958	12,650	(7,308)	
FINANCING ANALYSIS				
Capital Receipts	(11,657)	(6,510)	5,147	Intention to use capital receipts to fund expenditure before recourse to internally/externally borrow.

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020				Explanations
Government Grants	(778)	(639)	139	Underspend on Better Care Funding Schemes: DFGs, Discretionary DFGs
Use of Reserves	(452)	(342)	110	Predicted underspends/unallocated provisions.
Grants/Contributions	(586)	(586)	-	
Section 106 Monies	(1,258)	(1,258)	-	
Borrowing	(5,227)	(3,315)	1,912	Intention to use capital receipts to fund expenditure before recourse to internally/externally borrow.
	(19,958)	(12,650)	7,308	
NET EXPENDITURE	-	-	-	

Capital Programme 2020/21 – December 2020 Position

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020								
	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
TRANSFORMATION								
Manvers Business Park Surface/Drain		42				42		Works complete, awaiting invoice. An additional 50m length of collapsed slot drain is being replaced as part of this project, this will be completed before end of Jan.
Colliers Business Park Surface/Drain		46				28	(18)	Works completed and invoice to follow - works to make foul sewer connection packaged together and £17k provision merged from Colliers Scheme below. Final works spend £28k inclusive of specialist design/PM fees.
Cotgrave Phase 2		1,819	1,792	877	(915)	1,815	(4)	Main contractor appointed; site commencement delayed COVID19. Site construction starting end July with projected completion Mar 21. £570k provision slipped

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
								to 21/22 to meet any emerging commitments. Works back on track and now broadly on programme and tender.
Bingham Leisure Hub	10,000	3,408	500	384	(116)	1,500	(1,908)	Tenders assessed and Cabinet decision December to appoint contractor. All grants now approved: £750k LEP funding for offices; SUD funding £1.6m for offices; £174k LEP funding for Community Hall. Detailed cost plans keep projected overall expenditure within the £20m budget. £11m slipped to 21/22. Projected actual revised down based on new cash flow.
Manvers Business Park Roof Refurbishment								£200k provision slipped to 21/22.
Manvers Business Park Roller Shutters								£100k provision slipped to 21/22.
Bridgford Park Public Toilets		25	22	2	(20)	20	(5)	Site commencement delayed COVID19. Works largely complete, some snagging issues

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
								to address. Reviewing performance of original floor finish, may decide to upgrade in New Year which will see the budget spent.
Water Course Improvements	60					150	150	£60k provision slipped to 21/22. However, urgent restoration works required to be funded by £150k acceleration from £210k provision in 21/22 Capital Programme. Appointment of specialist contractor imminent; works to Rugby Road are underway.
The Point CP Security Gate	20							£20k provision slipped to 21/22.
The Point		15	15	14	(1)	14	(1)	Waterproofing works to Car Park complete.
Colliers Way Industrial Units								Brought forward provision of £17k merged with Colliers BP Surface Drain above.
Abbey Road Redevelopment		340	255	220	(35)	300	(40)	Completion of disposal of this site expected imminently

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
Bingham Market Place Improvements	75	89	61	9	(52)	89		Tree replacement and incidental paving work complete (£22k in 19/20 and £10k in 20/21). Consultant appointed to carry out survey of structure and prepare schedule of works ready for tender. Likely that works will run into Spring 2021.
Bridgford Hall Enhancements		20				20		Contingency allocation for roof and external decoration enhancements. Works will hopefully be completed by end of March.
The Crematorium	4,800	667	220	109	(111)	250	(417)	Land acquired 19/20. Cabinet report 14.07.20 for approval to progress to design stage. Build likely 21/22. Project Management/design costs incurred. £4.5m slipped to 21/22. Costs likely to exceed the original £6.5m. Adjustments made in the budget setting

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
								report to Council in March 2021.
	14,955	6,471	2,865	1,615	(1,250)	4,228	(2,243)	
NEIGHBOURHOODS								
Vehicle Replacement	612	282	184	182	(2)	182	(100)	32t Refuse Freighter bought; £330k slipped to 21/22; £100k balance is uncommitted.
Support for Registered Housing Providers	216	612				532	(80)	£480k contribution committed for second phase garage sites to deliver 30 units of affordable housing. Start on site date to be confirmed. £52k committed for 2 units of Next Steps accommodation for Rough Sleepers and remodelling of Elizabeth House. £40k - £50k committed to provide an adapted bungalow to meet a local housing need likely to be released 21/22. £1m slipped to future years.

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
Assistive Technology	12	17	12		(12)	17		Provision for Home alarm units for the vulnerable.
Discretionary Top Ups	57	57	43	13	(30)	25	(32)	Grant activity slowed in first quarter due to COVID19 impact. Likely underspend.
Disabled Facilities Grants	490	627	386	309	(77)	525	(102)	Grant activity slowed in first quarter due to COVID19 impact. Likely underspend. £90k additional MHCLG funding made available which can be carried forward.
Hound Lodge Access Control System		25				25		Scheme not yet commissioned but completion anticipated by year end.
Hound Lodge Annexe Patio Doors	35	35	33	5	(28)	8	(27)	Works complete, snagging items being attended to; final cost will be approx. £8k.
Bowls Hall Replacement Furniture	15							£15k provision slipped to 21/22.
Arena Enhancements		115	86	5	(81)	20	(95)	Residual provision to deal with emerging enhancement, health and safety works.

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
Car Park Resurfacing		215					(215)	Design to commence shortly; procurement will follow. Works will be carried out in 2021
Car Park Improvements - Lighting WB		48				30	(18)	Contractor appointed; formal contract documentation being prepared; anticipate works commencing on site in Feb with completion end march/early April; Projected spend of £75k to include this WB scheme, other Car Parks (scheme below), and West Park Lighting scheme in Communities.
Car Park Improvements - Lighting Other		102				34	(68)	See comment above.
CLC Changing Village Enhancements		12	12	3	(9)	3	(9)	Provision for Fire Doors, installation and payment complete.
CLC Pool Lining		25	25	24	(1)	24	(1)	Allocation from Capital Contingency to undertake work during COVID19 closure. Works complete.

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
BLC Improvements		109				25	(84)	Residual provision to deal with emerging health and safety enhancement works prior to construction of new leisure centre. High level cladding to Sports Hall requires upgrade, spend estimated at £25k.
KLC Refurb Pitched/Flat Roof Areas	220							£220k provision slipped to 21/22.
RBC EV Network		52				52		Installation of electric charge points for vehicles in Keyworth and ROT fully funded by a grant from the Department for Transport.
	1,657	2,333	781	541	(240)	1,502	(831)	
COMMUNITIES								
Gresham Pitches and 3 G Lighting	1,000	1,295		10	10	1,295		Contractor appointed and advanced survey/design costs incurred. Scheme funded by £474k grant from Football Foundation; £786k from Section 106 Developer Contribution; £35k

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
								Capital Receipts for lighting. Increased FF bid to be submitted in order to do grass pitches. If approved, the total provision will increase with no extra cost to RBC.
Gamston Community Centre Toilets	45							£45k provision slipped to 21/22. Site currently being used as NHS vaccination centre.
Lutterell Hall Kitchens and Toilets	50	50				50		Scheme paused temporarily whilst operation and operator are reviewed. Additional works may need to be undertaken which will be met by acceleration provision made in 21/22 Capital Programme.
Gresham Upgrade 3G Pitch Lighting	35							To ensure uniformity of lighting and ease of maintenance, Property decided that lighting to existing pitch will be replaced in tandem with installation of lighting to new pitch - scheme

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
								budget merged with that for new pitch above.
RCP Front Footpath Improvements	15							£15k provision slipped to 21/22
RCP Visitor Centre	250	10					(10)	£35k transferred from Education Building. £285k provision to be slipped to 21/22.
VE 75th Commemoration	20	20					(20)	Celebrations on hold due to COVID.
RCP Toilets and Educational Building								Mini refurb on 'log cabin' public toilets was planned in this calendar year to maintain standard. The balance £35k transferred to RCP Visitor Centre for more substantial upgrade to facilities. The mini toilet refurb has been cancelled, £10k moved to main Visitor Centre scheme.
Capital Grant Funding		59				35	(24)	2 grants approved £20k, 1 application pending up to £15k, £24k unallocated can

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
								be given up as a saving.
RCP Vehicle Access Controls								£15k provision to be slipped to 21/22
Bridgford Park Trim Trail		10				10		
Play Areas - Special Expense	50	59				59		£81k allocated to Boundary Road Cycle Track. £10k to be allocated to Bridgford Park Trim Trail replacement. Order to be placed imminently. Design options for the balance of this provision for a scheme to be delivered January 21.
Boundary Rd Cycle Track Special Expense		81				81		£81k allocated from the provision for Play Areas. Contractor appointed, works in Q4.
RCP Skatepark	220	218				218		Works to commence Q4, potential for slippage.
West Park Fencing and Drainage		32		2	2	32		Contractor appointed; site commencement delayed COVID19. Works now complete, invoice to follow. Budget adjusted to

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
								facilitate completion of the fencing element.
West Park Car Park Lighting		18				11	(7)	See comment for Car Park Improvements - Lighting WB in Neighbourhoods above.
West Park Public Toilet Upgrade		20				20		Tender paused whilst Streetwise occupation/requirements reviewed.
West Park Julien Cahn Pavilion								£40k Provision slipped to 21/22. Scheme scope being reviewed.
Skateboard Parks		190				110	(80)	£110k committed to RCP Skatepark. Potential new allocation of £35k being assessed. Balance of £45k unallocated and likely to be offered up as a saving.
Warm Homes on Prescription	54	25	19	2	(17)	20	(5)	Grant activity slowed in first quarter due to COVID19 impact. Likely underspend.
	1,739	2,087	19	14	(5)	1,941	(146)	
FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES								

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
Information Systems Strategy	335	385	370	214	(156)	275	(110)	Acquisitions under the strategy continue to support business development. £50k provision slipped to 21/22 for Edge Switches.
Streetwise Loan 20/21	150	150	150	150		150		Loan advance made 30.10.20 for acquisition of vehicles/plant and upgrade works to Unit 10 Moorbridge.
Asset Investment Strategy		8,382	4,554	4,532	(22)	4,554	(3,828)	Two acquisition of Business Units in West Bridgford completed. Balance of £3.828m to be taken out of the programme as part of the MTFS.
	485	8,917	5,074	4,896	(178)	4,979	(3,938)	
CONTINGENCY								
Contingency	100	150					(150)	Original Estimate £100k plus brought forward £95k less £25k to undertake work to CLC Pool Lining during COVID19 closure; £20k Bridgford Hall Enhancements.

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - DECEMBER 2020

	Original Budget £000	Current Budget £000	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance £000	Projected Actual £000	Variance £'000	
								Balance not yet committed.
	100	150					(150)	
TOTAL	18,936	19,958	8,739	7,066	(1,673)	12,650	(7,308)	

Budget Monitoring for Special Expense Areas - Quarter 3					
	2020/21 Original	2020/21 Revised	Actual to Q3	2020/21 Projected	Reasons for variance
	£	£	£	£	
West Bridgford					
Parks & Playing Fields	404,400	420,300	384,569	507,500	Loss of income from sports hire and additional security on Bridgford Park
West Bridgford Town Centre	55,900	55,900	34,821	55,900	
Community Halls	68,700	77,400	115,518	166,500	Loss of income from facility hire as a result of Covid-19
Contingency	14,700	14,700	0	14,700	
Annuity Charges	76,800	76,800	0	76,800	
RCCO	50,000	50,000	0	50,000	
Sinking Fund (The Hook)	20,000	20,000	0	20,000	
Total	690,500	715,100	534,908	891,400	
Keyworth					
Cemetery	8,800	8,800	6,600	8,800	
Annuity Charge	1,300	1,300	0	1,300	
Total	10,100	10,100	6,600	10,100	

Budget Monitoring for Special Expense Areas - Quarter 3

	2020/21 Original	2020/21 Revised	Actual to Q3	2020/21 Projected	Reasons for variance
	£	£	£	£	
Ruddington					
Cemetery & Annuity Charges	11,300	11,300	8,475	11,300	
Total	11,300	11,300	8,475	11,300	
Government Income Loss reimbursement	0	0	0	(89,800)	
TOTAL SPECIAL EXPENSES	711,900	736,500	549,983	823,000	Budget deficit of £86.5k to be met from loan

This page is intentionally left blank



Cabinet

Tuesday, 9 March 2021

Management of Open Spaces in New Developments

Report of the Executive Manager – Communities

Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Housing and Planning, Councillor R Upton

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1. In January 2020 the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group asked officers to investigate a perceived lack of consistency for fees charged to residents of new developments by management companies, resident concerns relating to the lack of control over price rises, and residents lack of involvement in, and inability to change the management company that looks after the development they live on. Officers reported back to the July 2020 Growth and Development Scrutiny Group having reviewed the situation on nine separate housing developments in the Borough.
- 1.2. Cabinet are asked to review the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group report titled Management of Open Spaces in New Developments from January 2021, and determine if the recommendations might assist the Borough Council to obtain consistent information from housing developers, and asking the Secretary of State to review the matter of the prices charged and exert some control on the issue through relevant measures/legislation.
- 1.3. The matter has already been considered by the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group who have asked that Cabinet be asked to consider their resolutions.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that:

- a) Cabinet support the inclusion of guidance within a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to provide consistency to future Open Space schemes; and
- b) The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Planning write a letter to the Secretary of State highlighting the issues raised and recommends they bring forward guidance to address the issues identified.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1. If drafted and adopted, a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) would provide a policy basis for establishing a standard setting out matters the Council wishes to see for the management and maintenance of open spaces on new housing developments in the Borough. This would allow officers to negotiate the content of open space schemes to include and exclude matters relevant to the scheme, thus providing a greater degree of consistency of the maintenance and management responsibilities across all developments, and hopefully closer parity of costs incurred by residents across the Borough.
- 3.2. Officers can review the wording contained within the Legal Agreements that secure the Open Space Schemes to ensure consistency and clarity. However, the Borough Council has no powers to dictate which management company must be used, or the prices they can charge for the services. Furthermore, the Borough Council has no ability to get involved with disputes over price increases, hidden costs and currently residents have no ability to request / elect a new management company to act on their behalf. These are matters that would require a change in legislation, it is therefore recommended that the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Planning writes a letter to the Secretary of State highlighting the issues and requesting that they bring forward guidance to address them.

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1. Following the July 2020 Growth and Development Scrutiny Group, officers identified a total of fifteen developments that had recently been occupied of a suitable size to require the maintenance of the open spaces and/or play areas and/or drainage facilities. Councillors were asked to engage with their constituents on the relevant developments to answer a series of questions (provided by officers) to identify the management company, the maintenance costs, the facilities that the cost covered and in a general sense a level of satisfaction with the service provided. Local Ward Councillors and the developers responsible for the housing developments were also contacted by officers in an attempt to collate this information.
- 4.2. A range of responses were received from nine of the fifteen developments from residents, Councillors and developers, with varying degrees of engagement. Given the wide ranging scale of developments (61 to 470 dwelling), their locations, and the small sample size, drawing any accurate/meaningful comparisons proved challenging.
- 4.3. The responses showed that residents are charged between £142 and £271 per dwelling. The average cost for the sample being £201 per year/per dwelling (or £16.75 per month). Of the eight developments that provided information regarding the costs paid, five were paying below this average price, and the three paying above it being smaller developments ranging between 75 and 170 dwellings. This was not surprising as the fewer dwellings on the site, the fewer number of parties there are to split the costs amongst. It was also noteworthy that two of the three developments paying above the average annual price to

their management company had open space, drainage facilities and play space to maintain on the developments, which officers acknowledge are costly items to cover on smaller developments. The ninth site (Pasture Lane in Ruddington) advised that they have not yet been charged by their management company and therefore did not know what the fee would be.

- 4.4. The review revealed that although there is some disparity in the costs being charged to residents across developments, this is reasonable when factoring in the amenities that require maintenance and the quantum of development to which the fee was applied.
- 4.5. The report noted that the Borough Council does not get involved in the process of appointing the management company (as the responsibility to manage and maintain the land lies with the developer(s)) and that the Borough Council has no powers to control the costs charged by management companies. Nevertheless, the Borough Council does require an "Open Space Scheme" to be submitted for developments of 11 or more dwellings. The content of these schemes can vary dramatically with some developers proposing requirements over and above those that the Borough Council would seek, other submissions require a lot of officer time spent negotiating schemes that are more acceptable if the initial submission is lacking in detail.
- 4.6. Currently, Rushcliffe has no policy requirement setting the details expected to be covered in open space schemes or the frequency with which matters such as grass cutting might reasonably occur. The impact is that on some developments, residents may be being charged a higher maintenance fee as certain works are being undertaken more frequently than otherwise necessary, and officer time is spent negotiating with developers who make poor quality submissions to provide better schemes.
- 4.7. It is also noteworthy that none of the developments surveyed include very large open spaces of the scale that will be provided on the Bingham Sustainable Urban Extension and therefore the impacts of open space provision on developments of this scale has not been considered at this time.
- 4.8. Officers advised that whilst the majority of other local authorities no longer adopt open space on new developments and are dealing with the issue in the same way as Rushcliffe, some local authorities do have Supplementary Planning Guidance to set the standards for open space schemes. It was highlighted that while this cannot control the price a management company chooses to charge; it can at least seek to effect parity and therefore influence prices by trying to standardise the works being required across the Borough. To try and address the matter of cost, officers advised that this would require legislation from Central Government, and the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group therefore recommended that the Portfolio Holder writes to the Secretary of State and asked to review this matter. Finally, officers also advised that they could, with the assistance of Legal, review the wording and definitions of the Open Space Scheme used in S106 agreements to see if there were any matters that might need updating to ensure absolute clarity over what was

expected and remove any areas that might be unnecessarily open to interpretation by developers.

5. Alternative options considered and reasons for rejection

- 5.1. An alternative option is for the Borough Council to revert to adopting the open spaces, play areas and drainage features on new housing developments or maintaining its current position, namely requiring the housing developer(s) to provide an Open Space Scheme detailing how such open space areas will be maintained, but accepting that the cost will be passed on to the new residents.
- 5.2. This option has been discounted at this stage in order to explore working with housing developers to adhere to an SPD. With the SPD in place, there would be greater clarity and parity for developers and residents and would provide a clear, transparent set of guidelines for officers to negotiate against.
- 5.3. With the Local Plan Part 2 sites starting to be developed alongside the Strategic Allocations across the Borough (and looking beyond the current plan period which runs until 2028), it is considered that greater certainty as to what is required would assist developers and officers in securing a fairer baseline of works expected, in a more timely fashion, and provide future residents with greater transparency and parity in the costs charged.

6. Risks and Uncertainties

The adoption of a SPD and sending a letter to the Secretary of State would not raise any risk to for the Council in its ability to deliver its Corporate Priorities nor would it impact on the Council's budget.

7. Implications

7.1. Financial Implications

Any additional officer time in creating and maintaining a SPD (as required) would be contained within existing budgets.

7.2. Legal Implications

There are no legal implications arising from this report.

7.3. Equalities Implications

There are no equalities implications of this report. An SPD, if approved, would apply to all new developments in the Borough.

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

There are no Section 17 implications as a result of this report.

8. Link to Corporate Priorities

Quality of Life	Open space areas on new developments provide a real benefit to the quality of life for residents
Efficient Services	The management of open spaces by management companies ensures that no financial implications fall on the Borough Council
Sustainable Growth	The provision of open space on new housing developments ensures high quality growth
The Environment	Open spaces with new housing developments provide a positive impact on the Environment

9. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that:

- a) Cabinet support the inclusion of guidance within a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to provide consistency to future Open Space schemes; and
- b) The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Planning write a letter to the Secretary of State highlighting the issues raised and recommends they bring forward guidance to address the issues identified.

For more information contact:	Dave Mitchell Executive Manager - Communities Tel: 0115 9148267 dmitchell@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers available for Inspection:	Growth and Development Scrutiny Group Report, January 2021, "Management of Open Spaces in New Development" Growth and Development Scrutiny Group, July 2020, "Open Spaces".
List of appendices:	None

This page is intentionally left blank



Cabinet

Tuesday, 9 March 2021

Edwalton Golf Course Strategic Review

Report of the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services

**Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership,
Councillor S J Robinson**

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1. This report provides an update from the Communities Scrutiny Group on Edwalton Golf Course (EGC) and recommends a way forward for what is a significant asset for the Council.
- 1.2. In January 2020, Cabinet resolved to review ongoing provision of golf at Edwalton. Despite considerable effort, Lex Leisure has struggled to ensure that the golf course retains any viability, given the challenging operational environment (previously reported in financial reporting to both the Corporate Overview Group and Cabinet). Cabinet requested that a report be commissioned to consider whether there is a golfing need for Edwalton Golf Course, and an alternative options appraisal, if a need is not established, for consideration by the Communities Scrutiny Group.
- 1.3. In January 2021, at the Communities Scrutiny Group meeting Knight, Kavanagh and Page (KKP) (which provides specialist services in sport, leisure, culture, regeneration and green spaces) presented the report on the finding of a two-stage study in respect Edwalton Golf Course:

Stage 1: A Golf Needs Assessment.

Stage 2: Edwalton Golf Courses Options Appraisal (Feasibility Study).

- 1.4 This report covers the findings of the Communities Scrutiny Group and proposes next steps for determining the future of the asset to maximise its value to the community and Rushcliffe.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet:

- (a) acknowledges the feedback from the Communities Scrutiny Group which includes the endorsement of a golfing need at Edwalton Golf Course; and

- (b) allocates the utilisation of £0.05m of 2020/21 projected in-year budget efficiencies to undertake a further detailed technical risk assessment of the site and thereafter a further £0.25m for further master planning work, assuming the risks identified are not prohibitive so that a realistic and deliverable masterplan can be achieved for the site.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

To ensure that the Council's Edwalton Golf Course asset continues to deliver maximum value for money for taxpayers across the Borough, whilst providing appropriate community infrastructure and the right level of leisure provision. More work is needed on refining future options for the site which includes further technical assessments of the site.

4. Background

The Council has been pro-active in trying to ensure Edwalton Golf Course maintained financial viability with investment by both the Council and Lex Leisure as reported previously. Lex has been running at a significant loss (around £44k on average over the last three years). This is despite many initiatives including improvements to the clubhouse facilities, enhanced marketing and events, signage and investment in a golf simulator.

5. KKP Findings

5.1. The KKP Stage 1 Golf Needs Assessment recommended (as reported to the Communities Scrutiny Group):

- Keeping the 9-hole standard course (even if at the expense of the par 3). If this is not possible in terms of space, a 6-hole standard course alternative should be considered as part of the Stage 2 options appraisal.
- Developing the driving range bays by increasing the number, covering more bays and providing floodlighting to enhance income generating potential. If this is not possible, the provision does not require retention in its current form given how restricted the provision currently is in terms of how much demand can be accommodated. Investment in the virtual, indoor offer could be sought instead.
- Improving the clubhouse. This should be geared to members, pay and play users and particularly wider community use as well as daytime and evening commercial activity.
- Reconfiguring the course to best enable site master planning that may enable some potential housing development, provided that this ensures that golf facilities of the requisite quality are developed. This would almost certainly enable the Council to further reduce the revenue subsidy needed as well as driving increases in participation, providing a site for further housing development and a capital receipt that can be utilised to support the Capital Programme (where resources are reducing, and future borrowing is anticipated).

- 5.2. Based on the Stage 1 Golf Needs Assessment findings and recommendations, the Stage 2 Edwalton Golf Courses Options Appraisal's key lines of enquiry were amended to reflect that whilst evidence suggests that the facility should not be lost in full, it is also clear that it cannot continue to operate in its current guise given the financial losses being accrued. Therefore, the Stage 2 report looked to identify how Edwalton Golf Courses can be more commercially viable.
- 5.3. The Stage 2 Feasibility Study concluded that no evidence was found to suggest that a 6-hole golf course will be preferable to the current 9-hole offer and should be discounted. The 9-hole standard course should be retained, accompanied by an improved range of additional amenities. The golf offer feasibility of Edwalton Golf Courses only makes financial sense if the current site has capacity to host a driving range and that the residual elements of the par 3 could be made available for housing development.

6. Community Scrutiny Group comments

- 6.1. It should be noted, and was discussed by the Scrutiny Group, that other leisure uses for the course were considered by KKP in the context of both financial viability and the likely outcome of a planning objection by Sport England, if there was a change in leisure use.
- 6.2. It was agreed that the significant asset Edwalton Golf Course should not continue in its current form, given its low usage and the current cost to the taxpayer. Scrutiny members supported a proposal that master planning work be undertaken for the site including a business case with a report to Cabinet in 2021 to tie in with the Local Plan process – i.e. consideration of whether the current designation of “safeguarded” land is appropriate.
- 6.3. The Scrutiny Group was divided as to whether some of the site (current par 3 course) should be considered for development for housing as part of the masterplan work – in any event this can only be determined following further technical work.
- 6.4. The Scrutiny Group recommended ‘that golf and/or other sporting and community use should be retained on the site. This could be achieved by developing and investing in the main golf course, a driving range and community facility and if viable other sporting activities, as part of the masterplan work’.

7. Planning Implications

- 7.1. In the current adopted Local Plan, the Edwalton Golf Courses site is “safeguarded” – not allocated for housing but could become available in the future if it was required to meet Rushcliffe’s housing allocation.
- 7.2. The Council believes it has sufficient housing land supply to meet requirements to 2028, providing the major housing allocations in particular are delivered (e.g. Fairham and Gamston). The Borough’s housing requirement is, however, currently being reviewed as part of preparing a new Local Plan to cover the

period up to 2038. This includes considering whether new sites need to be identified for housing development. It is proposed that as part of the Local Plan review process there is further consideration of whether there is justification to remove the 'safeguarded' designation from all or part of the site, and for it to be identified instead as suitable for other uses including potentially housing. It is proposed that this process is supported by undertaking a master planning exercise for the site.

- 7.3. It is proposed the initial stages of master planning the site should be commissioned to ensure there are no prohibitive risks in relation to, for example, flooding and highways that limit the options available for the future of the site. It is proposed that £0.05m is required to commence the work. By identifying potential risks as early as possible this will ensure resources are not unnecessarily used – a full master planning exercise is likely to require a further £0.25m.

8. Alternative options considered and reasons for rejection

- 8.1. The Council could choose to reject the KKP report findings in whole or in part, but this will not address the financial losses currently being experienced by the asset in its current operation.
- 8.2. The Council could decide to close the facility and maintain it as open space; however, this would incur an estimated cost of £88k per annum and would mean the demand for the facility by "pay and play users" and existing members would not be met. It would be difficult to demonstrate this offers best value for money for the Rushcliffe taxpayer. This would mean the site is both lost for "organised sport" which would be contrary to Sport England policy, and also lost for any future development opportunities.
- 8.3. The other extreme is that the whole site could be developed for housing, but this would mean the demand for golf by "pay and play" users and existing members not being met. Bodies such as Sport England could object if it is perceived there is detriment to the leisure provision. Any development of the site would have to be sensitive to alternative leisure provision such as walking and cycling.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

- 9.1. The proposed next stage of a detailed technical assessment of the site, master planning exercise and business case will include further work on risks.
- 9.2. Edwalton Golf Course has been consistently considered within the strategic housing assessments as potential development land. It is identified within the Local Development Plan as safeguarded land, which means, whilst it is marked for future development, the land is not currently required to fulfil the Local Plan housing numbers. For it to be identified as suitable for development would require its allocation through a review of the Local Plan.

9.3. The contract arrangements ensure that further subsidy is payable to the contractor if usage worsens; or if usage improves then profit would be paid to the Council. Based on recent years' performance Edwalton Golf Course is likely to incur financial losses.

10. Implications

10.1. Financial Implications

10.1.1. Edwalton Golf Courses has made a loss year on year with its current activity (on average around £44k per annum, 2017-2019).

10.1.2. It is proposed to allocate £0.05m of 2020/21 projected in-year budget efficiencies to undertake a further detailed technical Risk Assessment of the site and thereafter a further £0.25m for further master planning work, assuming the risks identified are not prohibitive so that a realistic and deliverable masterplan can be achieved for the site

10.1.3. Financial implications will be considered further once there is a more detailed business case supported by a masterplan.

10.2. Legal Implications

There are no immediate legal implications arising from a review of a Council asset. Changes of use for the site/development will be subject to planning approval.

10.3. Equalities Implications

No known equalities implications at this stage but any review would consider the equality and diversity requirements of the residents of the Borough.

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

There are no immediate Section 17 implications at this stage.

11. Link to Corporate Priorities

Quality of Life	EGC is an underutilised asset and changes to its use is likely to improve the quality of life.
Efficient Services	Currently EGC is a loss-making entity and is effectively subsidised by the existing leisure contract and is an inefficient use of Council resources. Future plans for the site should look to address this.
Sustainable Growth	Potential alternative use of EGC should be considered in the context of the growing size of population of the borough and its leisure needs
The Environment	It is accepted that EGC is a large green space and a 'lung' within Rushcliffe. Any alternative use of the asset will have to sensibly take into account environmental issues.

12. Recommendations

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet:

- (a) acknowledges the feedback from the Communities Scrutiny Group which includes the endorsement of a golfing need at Edwalton Golf Course; and
- (b) allocates the utilisation of £0.05m of 2020/21 projected in-year budget efficiencies to undertake a further detailed technical risk assessment of the site and thereafter a further £0.25m for further master planning work, assuming the risks identified are not prohibitive so that a realistic and deliverable masterplan can be achieved for the site.

For more information contact:	Peter Linfield Executive Manager - Finance and Corporate Services Tel: 0115 9148439 plinfield@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers available for Inspection:	Communities Scrutiny Group Report 28 January 2021 Edwalton golf course Strategic Review and minutes of meeting Cabinet Report 14 January 2020 Edwalton golf course Update Cabinet Report 13 June 2017 – Concluding Report of the Edwalton golf course Strategic Asset Review Member Group
List of appendices:	None



Cabinet

Tuesday, 9 March 2021

Use of Fireworks at Borough Council Events

Report of the Executive Manager – Communities

Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Community and the Environment, Councillor A Brennan

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to provide Cabinet with information to be able to consider the future use of fireworks at Council events.
- 1.2 The report follows a Council resolution, 5 March 2020, regarding the adverse effects that loud noise from fireworks can have on the welfare of vulnerable people and animals. The Council resolved to launch a public campaign to raise awareness of these impacts in the Borough, encourage advance advertising of planned firework events and promote alternative forms of activity such as quiet fireworks or other light displays. It also resolved to look at how fireworks are used at Council events with a view to move away from loud fireworks.
- 1.3 On 27 August 2020, the Communities Scrutiny Group was asked to consider the following proposals:
 - Option a) Discontinue the use of loud fireworks at Council events (partial ban);
 - Option b) Discontinue the use of all fireworks at Council events (full ban);
 - Option c) No change to current events arrangements (no change).

Communities Scrutiny Group recommends to Cabinet that the Council pursues Option A, the discontinuation of loud fireworks at Council events.

- 1.4 With only one Borough Council event which has fireworks as part of its programme, it was recognised that an additional recommendation demonstrating the local authority's stance as a community influencer, through positive communications, would have a key role to play in encouraging local councils, community groups and individual residents adopting similar stances in the future.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet:

- a) approves the discontinuation of use of loud fireworks at Council events; and
- b) supports the launch of a public communications campaign to encourage external event operators and residents to adopt the Council's approach to the use of fireworks.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

There is a growing body of evidence regarding the health impacts of firework noise, both upon vulnerable people and animals. By increasing the Council's controls on the use of loud fireworks at Rushcliffe Borough Council (RBC) events, the Council would be demonstrating community leadership and promoting the delivery of more inclusive and considerate events. The recommendation to restrict to the Council's use of fireworks to low / zero noise would replicate a similar policy decision made by a neighbouring district council.

4. Supporting Information

4.1 The Council has been using fireworks as part of its events for over 15 years.

4.1.1 There are no records of any formal noise complaints having been made regarding this use, however in the period 2008-2019, the Council received 12 complaints regarding fireworks at other locations and events across the Borough.

4.1.2 The key line of enquiry as identified and discussed in the scrutiny matrix at Corporate Overview Group in July 2020 follows motion at Council on 5 March 2020.

Key Lines of Enquiry

4.2 Audit of events run by the Council in past three years where fireworks were used.

4.2.1 In the last three years, the Council has used firework displays on three occasions, all within the delivery of the West Bridgford Christmas Lights Switch-On event. This is an annual event promoted in West Bridgford town centre to launch the Christmas retail trading period. The event attracts thousands of visitors each year, including over 1000 people who gather for the lights switch-on countdown and finale firework display which occurs at 5pm.

4.2.2 The table summarises the fireworks used at Council run events in the past three years.

Date	Venue	Duration of display	Cost	Incidents/ Health & Safety reports	Public Feedback Received
23 Nov 2019	Bridgford Park, West Bridgford	4 minutes	£2000	Market stallholder reported a lost dog at the end of the display which was located by the event team after a short search	Positive comments on RBC social media
24 Nov 2018	Bridgford Park, West Bridgford	4 minutes	£1200	None recorded	24 Nov 2018 – complaint received from resident noted that the display was “disappointingly short” and “didn’t include enough fireworks”
2 Dec 2017	Bridgford Park, West Bridgford	4 minutes	£1200	None recorded	None recorded

4.2.3 The display providers contracted by RBC typically use a variety of Category 2 and Category 3 fireworks in their productions; typically items such Chrysanthemums, Crackles, Falling Leaves, Coconuts, Snow Flakes and Comets.

4.2.4 Decibel levels of the displays presented in 2017, 2018 and 2019 were not recorded; however, in the UK, all shows using Category 2 and Category 3 pyrotechnic materials are limited by law to a maximum volume of 120dB at a noise monitoring distance of 150m. This is a condition of the display contract with RBC. 120dB is similar to the level of sound from the siren on an emergency service vehicle or a dog barking in a person’s ear. In the case of fireworks, the sound of each individual firework is relatively short in duration, but the impact felt can be intense depending upon the distance from the firing site and personal sensitivity to noise.

4.3 Review of research and campaigns on the impact of fireworks on the health and wellbeing of children and adults with a range of conditions.

4.3.1 For many people fireworks are considered a fun and enjoyable way of marking significant occasions. However, it is recognised that the sounds of fireworks can be a concern for some people with certain health conditions, in particular:

- i. Children and adults with sensory processing disorders or who are on the autistic spectrum can have hyper sensitivities to sound, light, touch, taste, smell and pain which stimulate anxiety and feelings of being overwhelmed or confused. These feelings are also common for people with conditions that affect the brain or nervous system such as Dementia.

- ii. People with hearing conditions such as Hyperacusis which can cause a difficulty in tolerance and volume of sounds that would not be considered loud by individuals with normal hearing.
- iii. People with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) may have difficulties with loud sounds such as an exaggerated startle response, fear of sound (Phonophobia) or aversion to specific sounds (Misophonia), which may trigger flashbacks or panic attacks.
- iv. People with respiratory conditions such as Asthma, COPD and Lung Disease may also experience adverse impacts of the air pollutants and particulate matter expelled by fireworks, though air quality degradation is short-term.

4.4 Review of research and campaigns on the impact of fireworks on pets, farm animals, horses and wildlife.

4.4.1 In 2019, the RCPA launched the “Bang out of Order” campaign to highlight the impact of fireworks upon animal welfare outlining how aversive stimuli, such as loud noises that are unpredictable and out of an animal’s control, are extremely stressful. Being intermittent and relatively infrequent makes it unlikely that animals will acclimatise to fireworks noise. The RSPCA campaign calls for the following actions:

- i. Greater restrictions on the public sale and use of fireworks.
- ii. Reduction of the maximum noise level of fireworks (down from 120db to 90db) and greater clarity of labelling to allow consumers to make informed decisions.
- iii. Compulsory licensing of all public fireworks displays by local authority Licensing Services, including a process for residents to appeal against the granting of a licence.
- iv. Activities to raise awareness of firework phobias amongst pet owners included treatment and prevention options, plus education about the impact of fireworks on animals to encourage firework users to be more considerate of animal welfare
- v. Further research into the impact of fireworks noise on animals, including the contribution of factors such as loudness and audio spectrum frequencies produced.

4.4.2 Petitions are regularly submitted to Parliament requesting greater regulation and restriction of firework use on animal welfare grounds. A petition currently active on Change.org led by the FAB Firework Campaign UK currently has over 600,000 signatures. Its campaign priorities mirror those of the RSPCA:

- i. Restricting private use (not just purchase) of fireworks to traditional dates such as 5 November, New Year's Eve, Chinese New Year and Diwali.
- ii. Reducing the maximum permitted decibels for private use fireworks from 120, to 97.
- iii. Requiring all public fireworks displays to be licensed.
- iv. Requiring fireworks packaging to be labelled indicating the noise level, to allow consumer choice.

4.4.3 Fireworks, especially when used at unpredictable times of year, have the possibility to frighten livestock, which can lead to lower production and even stock loss. Poultry especially are at risk of a "smother," where birds huddle together which can result in some birds dying. In addition, fireworks can pose a fire risk if hot embers land on barns or in fields of standing crops. This is particularly an issue during the summer when crops are more likely to be dry. While the National Farmers Union does not have a formal position on when it is appropriate for fireworks to be let off, they have called upon fireworks users to consider the safety and wellbeing of their neighbours and neighbours' animals as well as mitigate the impact with advance warning so that precautions can be taken protect animals.

4.5 Research into the availability of quieter/silent fireworks.

4.5.1 Low/reduced noise fireworks are now commonly available on the UK domestic sales market with Asda, Tesco, Morrisons and Aldi all stocking low noise varieties. In 2019, Sainsbury's took the decision to ban firework sales entirely.

4.5.2 Most commercial display companies offer low/reduced noise fireworks as a customisable option on professional displays. There is no significant price premium for reduced noise options. Low noise fireworks, i.e. those under 90dB are not completely silent but are restricted to a comfortable level that are below the level of any accompanying soundtrack.

4.6 Research into alternatives such as laser shows and light shows, and how these options could work at Rushcliffe venues.

4.6.1 Due to their reliance upon expensive technical equipment, laser shows are typically more expensive to procure than a firework show; however, there are potential cost savings to be made by substituting fireworks, in terms of reduced need for enhanced fire protection measures and safety stewarding requirements.

4.6.2 In order to be visible, lasers need a surface off which to project i.e. a body of water or a building. They can also be projected on to mist, such as from a jet or fountain. In West Bridgford there is a shortage of surfaces

on which to project but a good standard of show could be made possible with a combination of approaches and installation of additional SPX lighting equipment such as search lights and cold pyros. It will only be possible to test the visual effect of design in a live event scenario.

4.6.3 A quotation of £3,500 has been obtained for a laser/lights show substitute for fireworks the next West Bridgford Christmas Lights Switch On, comparable to a quotation of £2,000 for a firework display with either traditional or low/reduced noise pyrotechnics.

4.7 Conduct a survey or otherwise gauge public opinion on moving away from louder fireworks to other options.

4.7.1 Due to COVID-19 pressures on local residents and communities, it was considered that public consultation regarding fireworks would not be particularly gainful at this time and may indeed have a negative reputational impact.

4.7.2 Noise controls on firework displays announced by Broxtowe Borough Council in July 2020, and Nottingham City Council in January 2021, were received positively by residents and there is no reason to assume a similar policy would be different in Rushcliffe.

4.7.3 In the period 2008-2019, RBC's Environmental Health service received 12 noise complaints related to fireworks. Of these complaints, eight were logged outside of the normal fireworks season i.e. November to January.

4.8 Work up some options for future events, to consider positive and negative impacts, risk analysis and costs and recommend one of the options.

The below table summarises options for future events

Options	Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts	Cost
Stop using fireworks at RBC events	Removes potential for noise impact and responds to public concerns	<p>May be considered as excessive action by some residents and cause criticism/ reputational damage without full consultation</p> <p>May be misinterpreted as a council cost-cutting exercise, confusing the message of the action</p>	In theory a cost saving, but replacement activity cost needs to be considered

Restrict use of fireworks to low/ reduced noise only at RBC events	Removes potential for noise impact and responds to public concerns Council retains a popular element of its event programme which receives positive media attention/ photographic interest	Option only controls RBC events, issues remain for wider area and need to be communicated clearly	No change
Substitute fireworks for alternative activity e.g. laser/ light show	Removes noise impact Reduces event staffing need as activity does not require enhanced fire protection support or stewarding	Small number of contractors operating in laser market and high value of equipment provided mean costs of shows are higher than fireworks.	Likely increased cost to RBC though some cost savings could be made through reduced safety staffing.

5. Alternative options considered and reasons for rejection

- 5.1. Option B – Discontinue all use of fireworks at Council events (full ban). Option rejected as it was not deemed to be proportionate to issues reported. Key concerns logged were around noise issues from fireworks rather than use of fireworks as a general practice.
- 5.2. Option C – No change to current practice. This was rejected on the basis that it did not address accessibility issues raised by the use of noisy fireworks, primarily upon vulnerable residents who may experience negative impacts to their health and wellbeing.

6. Risks and Uncertainties

- 6.1. There is limited evidence as to any potential environmental benefits from either a full or partial restriction of the use of fireworks at Council events, particularly in relation to Carbon Management.
- 6.2. The recommendation to introduce a restriction on the use of loud fireworks at Council events would not be an outright ban on the use of fireworks on RBC land and open spaces without further discussion and agreement (noting though, that the use of fireworks is already a restricted activity within the Facilities Booking Conditions and would require authorisation of the Facilities Manager).

7. Implications

7.1. Financial Implications

In 2019, Council expenditure on fireworks was £2,000. There is no additional cost implication of the recommendation at this stage, as expenditure would be contained within existing event budgets.

7.2. Legal Implications

There are no legal implications.

7.3. Equalities Implications

The partial ban or full ban of fireworks at RBC events would support the Council to deliver more inclusive events by addressing inequalities experienced by vulnerable people as identified in paragraph 4.3 of the report.

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

There are no crime and disorder implications

8. Link to Corporate Priorities

Quality of Life	The control of loud fireworks at Borough Council organised events supports the Council to deliver more inclusive events by addressing inequalities experienced by vulnerable people.
Efficient Services	The continuous review of the Borough Council operated events and adoption new technologies support the delivery of efficient services to our residents.
Sustainable Growth	
The Environment	

9. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet:

- a) approves the discontinuation of use of loud fireworks at Council events; and
- b) supports the launch of a public communications campaign to encourage external event operators and residents to adopt the Council's approach to the use of fireworks.

For more information contact:	Dave Mitchell Executive Manager - Communities 0115 9148267 dmitchell@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers available for Inspection:	Communities Scrutiny Group paper 27 August 2020 Full Council resolution made on 5 March 2020
List of appendices:	None

This page is intentionally left blank



Cabinet

Tuesday, 9 March 2021

Government call for STEP sites

Report of the Chief Executive

**Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership,
Councillor S J Robinson**

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1. In October 2019, the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy announced £220m funding towards the conceptual design of a fusion power station – Spherical Tokamak for Energy Production (STEP). STEP is an innovative plan for a commercially viable fusion power station, offering the realistic prospect of constructing a powerplant by 2040.
- 1.2. In November 2020, the UK Government released an invitation for expressions of interest to identify sites in the UK that could accommodate a STEP power station.
- 1.3. This report is to seek Cabinet's endorsement for the expression of interest for the Ratcliffe on Soar site to be considered as a site for the STEP power station.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet endorses, in principle, the submission of the expression of interest for the Ratcliffe on Soar site as one of several sites being put forward in the East Midlands to the STEP programme.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1. The site chosen for STEP will have global visibility and will form the centre of a programme of activity supporting thousands of high-quality high-tech jobs. STEP will support economic growth, providing the opportunity to attract £1.5bn of inward investment, and the training of highly skilled engineers. It will also be an integral part of meeting the global net zero challenge.
- 3.2. The proposal complements other opportunities being progressed for the redevelopment of the Ratcliffe on Soar site including the proposals for a Development Corporation and the recently submitted Freeport bid. STEP is an additional option to be explored with potential to complement the decarbonisation and innovation objectives of the region and it is a none binding expression of interest at this stage.

- 3.3. The expression of interest stage for the STEP programme requires relevant local authority endorsement for sites which are being submitted.

4. Supporting Information

The site selection process

- 4.1. STEP is an ambitious programme to design and build a prototype fusion power plant. It is a Government programme, currently with £222 million funding to produce a concept design by 2024. It is hoped that the STEP prototype will demonstrate the commercial viability of fusion. The learning from this will enable the future development of a fleet of commercial fusion plants.
- 4.2. The programme is being run in three phases:
- Phase 1 – produce a concept design by 2024.
 - Phase 2 – design to be developed through detailed engineering designs, while all consents and permissions to build the plant are sought.
 - Phase 3 – construction of the prototype power plant will begin in phase 3, targeting completion around 2040.
- 4.3. The programme is still in design stage so it is not clear yet exactly what buildings and facilities will be needed on site, this will become clearer as the design develops over the next few years. Some of the requirements for STEP though are:
- Site footprint – this is not clear at this stage beyond a requirement for 100Ha minimum overall site area. This is required to accommodate power station infrastructure and to allow the opportunity to expand with associated future development and additional low carbon technology. On site developments will include the reactor itself, associated turbine hall, control facilities and auxiliary plant and development, design and construction facilities.
 - Access to High Voltage Grid.
 - Access to cooling water –access to a major water source is important.
 - Access to a skilled workforce.
 - Strong transport links to facilitate delivery of major components, workforce and international visitors to site (road, rail, air and port access of interest).
 - Site environment – a number of criteria will be set out during site selection to ensure STEP is not impacting on a site of particular environmental or archaeological importance.
 - Office accommodation – for research programmes and power station construction and operations.
- 4.4. The deadline for the submission of expressions of interest for sites is the end of March 2021. The Government will then carry out detailed site assessments to check all sites submitted against the criteria. These are: technical and operational suitability, socio-economic and community benefit implications and support for the commercial progress of the project. A recommendation will be presented to the Secretary of State with a decision expected by the end of 2022.

- 4.5. The expression of interest is being prepared by local partners including D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership and Nottinghamshire County Council with the support of the landowner.

Fusion power

- 4.6. Fusion is the process that takes place in the heart of stars and provides the power that drives the universe. When light nuclei fuse to form a heavier nucleus, they release bursts of energy. This is the opposite of nuclear fission – the reaction that is used in nuclear power stations today, where energy is released when a nucleus splits apart. These reactions can provide a huge amount of energy from a very small amount of fuel.
- 4.7. It is an intrinsic property of the fusion process that it is inherently safe with low environmental impact. There is only a small amount of fuel in the plasma at any time, and over fuelling or overheating the plasma will lead to it being extinguished almost instantly. Extensive studies over the last two decades have shown that no plant failure or accident could result in the need to evacuate public from outside the site. A fusion reactor produces helium, which is an inert gas and no radioactive waste by-products therefore result from the process.
- 4.8. The benefits of fusion power include:
- No carbon emissions – Fusion does not emit harmful toxins like carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. Its major by-product is helium: an inert, non-toxic gas.
 - No other harmful environmental emissions – Fusion process does not result in NO_x, SO_x, particulate or other emissions deleterious to local air quality.
 - Abundant fuel sources – Fusion fuels are widely available and nearly inexhaustible (deuterium can be extracted from water and tritium will be produced inside the power station from lithium, an element abundant in the earth's crust and seawater).
 - Energy efficiency – 1 kg of fusion fuel could provide the same amount of energy as 10 million kg of fossil fuel.
 - Safety – a large scale nuclear accident is not possible in a fusion reactor. It is difficult to reach and maintain the precise conditions necessary for fusion – if any disturbance occurs, the plasma cools within seconds and the reaction stops. The quantity of fuel present in the vessel at any one time is enough for a few seconds only and there is no risk of a chain reaction.
- 4.9. There will only be one site in the UK chosen and so it will be a very competitive process. The next stage of site selection will enable all partners to assess the additional criteria to see if the site meets the needs of Government but also of the Council and other key local stakeholders.

5. Alternative options considered and reasons for rejection

There is the option to not submit the expression of interest; however, this is a very early stage in the process and is a none binding expression of interest. The site meets the criteria for selection set out by Government. Ratcliffe-on-Soar power station will close in line with Government policy by 1 October 2025, which could provide a further opportunity for the site that complements others currently being progressed (Development Corporation and Freeport). In addition, the proposals meet with the Development Corporation’s and Rushcliffe Borough Council’s ambitions that this site has a focus on low carbon and clean energy.

6. Risks and Uncertainties

At this stage there are no risks associated with this report. This is only the expression of interest stage and it is expected that many other sites will be put forward, including others in Nottinghamshire.

7. Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

8. Legal Implications

There are no legal implications associated with this report.

9. Equalities Implications

There are no equalities implications associated with this report.

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

There are no crime and disorder implications associated with this report.

11. Link to Corporate Priorities

Quality of Life	If the site was selected it would create a significant number of high skilled and high value jobs as well as training opportunities.
Efficient Services	
Sustainable Growth	If the site was selected this programme is of international significance and would attract additional new investment into the region. This programme complements other proposals for the site including the Development Corporation and Freeport which will bring significant benefits to Rushcliffe and the region.

The Environment	<p>Fusion energy is an integral part of meeting the global net zero challenge.</p> <p>Fusion offers a secure and abundant source of supply for many thousands of years. Once commercialised, fusion will have a key role to play in the energy market of the future.</p>
-----------------	--

12. Recommendations

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet endorses, in principle, the submission of the expression of interest for the Ratcliffe on Soar site as one of several sites being put forward in the East Midlands to the STEP programme.

For more information contact:	Kath Marriott Chief Executive kmarriott@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers available for Inspection:	None
List of appendices:	None

This page is intentionally left blank