MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
CABINET
TUESDAY, 10 MARCH 2026

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber Area B, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West Bridgford
and live streamed on Rushcliffe Borough Council's YouTube channel

PRESENT:

Councillors N Clarke (Chair), A Brennan (Vice-Chair), R Inglis, R Upton, D Virdi and J Wheeler

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors T Birch and J Walker

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

L Ashmore	Director of Development and Economic Growth
A Hill	Chief Executive
P Linfield	Director of Finance and Corporate Services
S Pregon	Monitoring Officer
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager

60 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made.

61 **Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 February 2026**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2026 were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

62 **Citizens' Questions**

There were no Citizens' questions.

63 **Opposition Group Leaders' Questions**

Question from Councillor J Walker to Councillor Brennan.

"Ruddington has recently been offered a consultation exercise to explore a possible Masterplan. Meanwhile, Radcliffe on Trent is further advanced in this process and has now secured £1 million from the Asset Management Group to support its town centre improvements towards its Masterplan.

Can you confirm whether Ruddington will be considered for a comparable level of financial support as its plans progress?"

Councillor Brennan advised that there could be no guarantees at this point regarding future levels of funding for any such scheme. Firstly, a Masterplan needed developing, then what opportunities availed themselves, such as potential land acquisition and a fully supported business case would need to be developed. Until then, it would not be prudent to pick particular sums. The objectives in the Radcliffe on Trent Masterplan could be directly linked to the objectives set out in the Council’s Asset Management Strategy.

Councillor Walker asked a supplementary question requesting clarification on what work had been done in preparing the Ratcliffe on Trent Masterplan since it started in 2017.

Councillor Brennan stated that the details were set out in the Cabinet report, which highlighted the various reviews that had been considered by the Parish Council, to form the basis of discussions to form the Masterplan.

Question from Councillor Thomas to Councillor Brennan. Councillor Thomas was unable to attend the meeting, so her question was read out by the Leader, Councillor Clarke MBE.

“How much has the latest Radcliffe on Trent master planning exercise cost the Council to date, including committed amounts not yet paid, and from which part of the budget has this been allocated?”

Councillor Brennan stated that for this phase of the exercise £23,934.30 has been spent, which has been funded by the UK Shared Prosperity Fund. £1m was allocated in the Capital Programme for land acquisition and works, as detailed in the Cabinet report.

Question from Councillor Birch to Councillor Upton.

Before reading out his question, Councillor Birch asked to make a statement, which the Chair did not allow. Councillor Birch read out his question.

“Given the report confirms the Council has purchased around 50 acres of land at Upper Broughton for woodland planting to offset carbon emissions, can the Portfolio Holder explain what assessment was undertaken to ensure this represents the most cost-effective way of achieving carbon sequestration, compared with alternative options, such as large-scale tree planting projects elsewhere in the UK or internationally?”

Councillor Upton stated that the Council’s approach to carbon offsetting was set out in a Cabinet report on 14 May 2024. The approved Carbon Offsetting Framework identified an ambition to acquire land for offsetting within the Borough, which would also enhance local tree cover and biodiversity commitments, as set out in the Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunities Mapping report. In respect of the specific acquisition of land at Upper Broughton, the report approved by Cabinet on 13 May 2025 set out the assessment that was undertaken in line with the Carbon Offsetting Framework.

Councillor Birch asked a supplementary question.

"With some international afforestation schemes reporting planting costs of under 50 pence per tree, the £500,000 spent on the Upper Broughton site could theoretically fund the planting of between one and two million trees, thereby offsetting approximately 300 to 450 times the amount of carbon your scheme will. Why didn't we do this?"

Councillor Upton advised that the detailed reasons why this action was taken were included in the 13 May 2025 Cabinet report.

64 **Asset Management Strategy 2025-2030**

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Business and Growth, Councillor Brennan, presented the report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth, which detailed the Asset Management Strategy 2025-2030.

Councillor Brennan advised that the Council had a diverse portfolio, which was extremely important in supporting Council services and required careful management. The Strategy sought to align the asset portfolio with organisational needs and manage property as a corporate resource. The Strategy and Action Plan detailed how the Council managed its land and property over a five year period, as well as referring to Local Government Reorganisation (LGR), and its associated implications going forward. Councillor Brennan confirmed that the Strategy had been scrutinised and endorsed by the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group. The aim of the Strategy, together with details of the types of property held were highlighted in paragraph 4 and Appendices B and C to the report. The Strategy set out how the Council would effectively maintain property, together with optimising financial return and supporting local businesses. It also aligned management of the asset portfolio across the organisation to ensure a 'one Council' approach. Councillor Brennan stated that it was particularly important to review the Strategy, with LGR coming forward and the documents set out the Council's proactive approach to managing its portfolio, together with clear objectives, as detailed in the appendices and she thanked officers for their hard work.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Virdi stated that as Portfolio Holder for Finance, he welcomed this review and advised that the Council's assets represented a significant investment and it was important to take a structured and strategic approach to ensure that they continued to support service delivery. Effective asset management was also an element of the Council's broader financial stewardship, to protect the long term valve of assets. The Strategy provided strategic context, supported the principles that assets should be actively managed and was an important piece of work.

It was RESOLVED that the Asset Management Strategy and Plan be approved.

65 **East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document**

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing, Councillor Upton, presented the report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth, which detailed the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development

Framework Supplementary Planning Document.

Before Councillor Upton introduced the item, the Leader reminded everyone that this report was not about granting planning permission, it was considering a Masterplan.

In introducing the report, Councillor Upton reiterated the Leader's comments and advised that the Masterplan would provide guidance to developers going forward, and if approved this evening, it would not provide any planning approval. He reminded Cabinet that this site had been adopted as a strategic site in 2014, and it was hoped that this SPD would give the Council more control over any future development. Councillor Upton referred to the Cabinet meeting on 13 January 2026, when it had been agreed to pause approval, whilst more detailed information was sought, especially on highway related matters, and he confirmed that significant progress had been made, as detailed in the report. The SPD would try to ensure that any development of separate site parcels would be undertaken in a coordinated and complementary manner, providing guidance on a range of topics, to ensure a high quality design, in line with the Council's vision. Councillor Upton advised that for the site to come forward, strategic infrastructure would need to be delivered, as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which would need to be completed before any planning applications were determined and would be secured through Section 106 Agreements. Councillor Upton advised that it was common practice for SPDs to provide guidance and a framework, with more detailed requirements agreed as any site progressed, so it was reasonable for this SPD to be adopted with current highways information, as there were no statutory or national policy requirements for highway matters to be addressed in any more detail.

Council Upton advised that since the Cabinet meeting in January, some revisions had been made to the report, including additional text to emphasise that the primary route for pedestrians and cyclists between the site and Gamston would need to be provided, and that could be a bridge, or controlled crossings on the A52. There was additional information detailing the process for assessing risk from potential land contamination and confirmation that the Tollerton Neighbourhood Plan would form part of the Development Plan for this site. Councillor Upton confirmed that the SPD was included in the draft Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan, which was due to be inspected this summer and that there was cross-party support at the recent Local Development Framework Group meeting. He stated that the recent collaborative and aligned approach between all main landowners, developers, National Highways and the County Council marked a significant and positive change, with a single highways access strategy for the entire site now being put forward. The site could make a vital contribution to the Borough's housing land supply, and without the SPD, there was a risk that developers would take current applications to appeal. Further delays could risk putting pressure on releasing new housing sites to maintain the five year housing supply. Councillor Upton acknowledged concerns raised regarding possible land contamination on parts of the site; however, that issue was not for the SPD, it would be dealt with during the planning application process, and through site investigation and remediation conditions attached to any planning approval. However, this SPD did contain more requirements related to any contamination issues. Councillor Upton concluded by advising that without an SPD in place, there was a significant risk that the Council could lose control over the type and quality of development, and if applications were taken to appeal, the Council would no longer be taking the decision.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Inglis recognised the passion and determination from the lobbying group and reiterated previous comments that approval of the SPD would not mean any planning application approval. He agreed that some decisions were difficult to make, and referred to comments, some misinformation and unfounded allegations against the Council being published on social media. Councillor Inglis referred to his long, personal association with the former airfield, and he felt the passion to resist change, but changes had already happened. He confirmed that the SPD had been drawn up to provide some control over planning applications, and Councillor Upton had referred to the consequences of not having one. The Council was now working to tight deadlines, and whilst he appreciated that the detailed highways infrastructure was not yet included, it was a positive that over the past two months all parties had agreed and were committed to one model. Councillor Inglis stated that any issues surrounding an application would need to be resolved before any planning decision was decided and he felt that it was better for the Council to approve the SPD now, to have some control over the development, rather than it be decided by the Government

Councillor J Wheeler reiterated that the Council needed to reach its housing targets and it was encouraging that there was now a uniformed highways approach being put forward. The aim of the SPD was to protect current and future residents as planning applications came forward. He hoped that developers would take on board concerns raised regarding possible land contamination and ensure that the land was safe.

As a Ward Councillor for Gamston, Councillor Virdi acknowledged the strength of feeling and recognised concerns raised by local residents. He stated that it was vital that the Council had a clear framework going forward, and without that uncoordinated development could take place. Adopting the SPD was a rational, structured approach to ensure that the Council retained a strong guiding role.

The Leader acknowledged the tremendous amount of work undertaken to produce this SPD, thanked Planning officers and reminded everyone that approving the SPD did not grant any planning permission, that would be considered during the planning application stage.

It was RESOLVED that:

a) any recommendations made by the Local Development Framework Group be considered;

b) the proposed revisions to the draft East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document be supported;

c) the adoption of the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development

Framework Supplementary Planning Document be approved; and

d) the Director – Development and Economic Growth be granted delegated authority, in consultation with the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing, to make any necessary final graphical, presentational and minor textual changes required to the SPD prior to publication.

66 **Procurement Strategy 2026-2030**

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Finance, Councillor Virdi, presented the report of the Director – Finance and Corporate Services, which detailed the Procurement Strategy 2026-2030.

In introducing the report, Councillor Virdi thanked the Director – Finance and Corporate Services and the Finance Team for preparing the report and advised that the report set out how the Council would continue to ensure that procurement across the authority was transparent, compliant and delivered strong value for money. Procurement played an important role in supporting the delivery of the Corporate Strategy and ensuring the best use of public resources. The Strategy reflected the requirements of the Procurement Act 2023, with a clear emphasis on governance, social value and environmental responsibilities. The Strategy would strengthen the Council's approach to contract management, recognising procurement as a strategic function. The Action Plan included in the Strategy set out practical steps the Council would take to strengthen procurement capability. Councillor Virdi reiterated that members' role was to provide oversight, and whilst the report provided the operational framework, officers had delegated authority to make decisions. The Strategy recognised that working with third party suppliers was a legitimate mechanism to ensure effective service delivery. In conclusion, Councillor Virdi stated that the Strategy provided a clear framework showing how procurement would support the Council's priorities going forward.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Upton stated that the Strategy ensured the Council's legal compliance and he noted that it had been written in conjunction with the Council's procurement partner, Nottinghamshire County Council.

It was RESOLVED that:

a) the adoption of the Procurement Strategy 2026–2030 at Appendix A to this report be approved; and

b) the Implementation Plan and assurance reporting to Governance Scrutiny Group described in the Strategy at Appendix A to this report be noted.

67 **Response to Government Consultation on Proposals for Local Government Reorganisation in Nottinghamshire and Nottingham**

The Leader and Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough-wide Leadership, Councillor Clarke MBE, presented the report of the Chief Executive, which detailed the Council's response to the Government consultation on proposals for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) in Nottinghamshire and Nottingham.

The Leader reminded everyone of the steps already undertaken since the process was started by the Government in December 2024, including the submission of three proposals to Government in November 2025, with Rushcliffe's preferred option being 1b). A Government consultation was due to finish at the end of March and this report detailed the technical responses to the eight questions, which had been considered by the cross-party Task and Finish Group.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Brennan stated that she hoped the Government would give due consideration to the responses and make a decision.

It was RESOLVED that the submission of the Council's response to Government's Consultation on Proposals for Local Government Reorganisation in Nottinghamshire and Nottingham be approved.

68 **Quarter 3 Finance Report**

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Finance, Councillor Virdi, presented the report of the Director – Finance and Corporate Services, which detailed the Quarter 3 budget position for revenue and capital.

Councillor Virdi advised that the Council remained in a strong and resilient position, with a projected revenue budget efficiency of £1.304m, reflecting careful financial management across the organisation and providing an important buffer against local and national pressures. Appendix A set out proposals to carry budget forward and he referred to the favourable variances and budget pressures as detailed in paragraph 4.1 of the report. In respect of the Capital Programme, Councillor Virdi advised that the report currently forecast a £2.043m underspend, largely due to reprofiling of a number of schemes, as detailed in Table 2. The report detailed wider financial pressures, as highlighted in paragraphs 4.9 and 4.10, and Cabinet noted the emerging pressures, including LGR with £0.661m in reserve, with an additional £0.635m proposed to be earmarked. Councillor Virdi confirmed that the Transformation and Efficiency Plan continued to perform strongly, as detailed in paragraph 4.11 and it was noted that Simpler Recycling would create pressures going forward. In conclusion, Councillor Virdi stated that overall, this was a positive message, the Council remained financially well managed, whilst proactively delivering efficiencies.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor J Wheeler referred to the importance of financial resilience and stated that it was important not to under estimate the hard work undertaken by officers and Councillors to maintain this. Given LGR, it was also important not to take things for granted, and to remain robust and resilient.

It was RESOLVED that the report be approved and the following be noted:

a) the projected revenue budget efficiency for the year of £1.304m and proposals to earmark this for cost pressures, as set out in Appendix A and paragraph 4.1 of the report;

b) the projected capital budget efficiencies of £2.043m including the budget changes, as set out in Appendix D to the report; and

c) the projected overspend on Special Expenses of £1.7k, as set out in paragraph 4.6 of the report.

69 Cranmer Neighbourhood Area Application

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing, Councillor Upton, presented the report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth, which detailed the Cranmer Neighbourhood Area Application.

Councillor Upton referred to paragraph 1.1 of the report, which detailed the parishes proposed to be covered by this Area Application, and advised that the Council had a statutory duty to consider this. Paragraph 4.6 listed the reasons for this designation, and it was noted that a public consultation had been undertaken, with a summary of comments in Appendix 2. Councillor Upton confirmed that as no issues had been raised to justify rejecting the application, the report was recommending that this Neighbourhood Area be designated. The relevant parishes would then be able to prepare their Plan, which if adopted, following an examination by an Inspector and having overall support for it in a community referendum, then any decisions on future planning applications must be in general conformity with it.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor J Wheeler stated that it was good to see this collaboration and agreed that it was sensible given the commonality between the areas.

It was RESOLVED that:

a) the Cranmer Neighbourhood Area as proposed be supported; and

b) the designation of the Cranmer Neighbourhood Area be approved.

70 Exclusion of the Public

It was resolved that under Regulation 4 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

71 Radcliffe On Trent Masterplan

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Business and Growth, Councillor Brennan, presented the report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth, which detailed the Ratcliffe on Trent Masterplan.

The recommendation was proposed by Councillor Brennan and seconded by Inglis.

It was RESOLVED that:

a) the Radcliffe on Trent Masterplan and the allocation of £1m to the capital budget (which is included in the budget to be approved by Full Council) to achieve master planning outcomes be endorsed; and

b) the land acquisitions and works to deliver the initial phase of the Masterplan, as detailed in the body of the report, up to a limit of £1m be approved, with delegated authority provided to the Director – Development and Economic Growth to negotiate terms and complete appropriate due diligence.

The meeting closed at 8.00 pm.

CHAIR