



**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
CABINET**

TUESDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2020

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

PRESENT:

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

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors A Brennan, B Gray, R Jones, R Mallender and S Mallender

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

K Marriott

Chief Executive

P Linfield

Executive Manager - Finance and
Corporate Services

D Mitchell

Executive Manager - Communities

S Sull

Monitoring Officer

H Tambini

Democratic Services Manager

APOLOGIES:

There were no apologies.

43 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

44 Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 January 2020

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 14 January 2020 were declared
a true record and signed by the Chairman.

45 Opposition Group Leaders' Questions

Question from Councillor B Gray to Councillor G Moore.

“Given that NET recharges are at a level of $\frac{2}{5}$ of the total employee charges in
the budget, can you please provide a breakdown of the recharges, particularly
how they relate to community centres?”

Councillor Moore responded by saying that recharges related to the allocation
of support service costs (for example Legal, Human Resources, Property,
Finance, Senior Management etc) and related to employees, premises,
supplies and services costs etc not just employees. The proportion of cost
regarding the revenue budget (excluding capital charges) was 13.2%. A
breakdown of the budgeted recharges for 2020/21 for West Bridgford
Community facilities were as follows:

	20/21
Lutterell Hall	£50,000
Gamston Community Hall	£42,100
Sir Julien Cahn Pavilion	£43,700
Gresham	£80,600
West Park	£32,900

Councillor B Gray asked a supplementary question to Councillor G Moore.

“Given that the total value of those is around £250,000, do we believe that these facilities get the best value out of the resources they are paying for in their proportion of the recharge?”

Councillor Moore responded that yes that was correct.

46 **Citizens' Questions**

There were no questions.

47 **Budget and Financial Strategy 2020/21**

The Portfolio Holder for Finance presented the report of the Executive Manger – Finance and Corporate Services outlining the Council’s proposed budget for 2020/21, the five year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) from 2020/21 to 2024/25, which incorporated the revenue budget, proposed Capital Programme, the Transformation Strategy and the Capital and Investment Strategy.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance advised that the Council continued to face challenges, as the uncertainty remained regarding Council-funding streams. The proposed budget was designed to meet both local and national challenges. The Council continued to be committed to delivering growth and prosperity, supporting the most vulnerable in the community and promoting health and well-being and protecting the environment. Nationally there was continued uncertainty regarding the New Homes Bonus and Business Rates and those risks had been built into the budget. The Council recognised the ongoing pressures on the retail sector, with car parking fees remaining the same for the past three years, and there would be no increase this year. Garden waste collection charges had also not increased in three years; however, with inflationary increases and anticipated budget pressures going forward, it was proposed to increase charges by £5 for the first and subsequent bins. This charged would not be increased for a further three years. Councillor Moore referred to an amendment in the report in respect of paragraph 4.2(g) and page 4 of the Executive Summary, which incorrectly referred to the second green bin price being £35. The correct price was £25; therefore all references to £35 in the report would be amended to £25. This service represented excellent value for money for Rushcliffe residents. An important issue for the Council was its commitment to commercial investments and the income derived from it, which was anticipated to rise to £2.1m over the period of the MTFS. The fund was well managed and proportional to the risks and opportunities associated with those investments. The Council’s Capital Programme over the next five years would be substantial, with all available

capital receipts being used to fund the programme, to reduce borrowing to a minimum. The new leisure centre at Bingham and the crematorium were ambitious projects requiring careful financial planning and that had been built into this project. Maintaining an appropriate level of reserve to manage risk and maintain resilience was important. The Budget predicted reserves of £5.9m by 2024, against a current reserve of £5.5m. Measures to improve the environment and reduce carbon omissions had already affected both the revenue and capital budgets and would continue to do so. It was therefore proposed to transfer £1m from the Organisation Stabilisation Reserve to a new Climate Change Action Reserve. In line with Government recommendations, the budget for Council Tax proposed an increase of 3.59% to £142.74, which equated to an increase of £4.95 or a 10 pence increase per week for an average Band D property, which ensured that Rushcliffe's Council Tax would remain the lowest in Nottinghamshire and within the lowest quartile nationally. The budget continued recent progress to ensure Council plans were robust, affordable and deliverable. The budget was designed to ensure that the Council provided high quality services and was financially and environmentally stable. The Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services and his team were thanked for all of their hard work.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Edyvean referred to the well-balanced budget which underpinned the sound financial management of this Council and he thanked all the officers involved for their hard work. He hoped that all members of the Council recognised the ethos behind the Council's approach to commercialisation in its broadest sense.

Councillor Upton stated that he was pleased to support the recommendations as it again illustrated the Council's sound financial management. The Council provided excellent services and good value for money, which were regularly shown to be valued by local residents through the customer survey results. He thanked officers for their hard work.

Councillor Robinson reiterated the thanks already conveyed to officers and referred to the challenging situation externally faced by the Council. The Council was now beginning to see a positive financial return from the income streams from its commercial investments, with the goal to become self-sustainable in the future. The highlight of the budget involved the capital projects and it was wonderful to see the continued ambition and diversity of this Council to deliver the best services to residents whilst maintaining a well-balanced budget.

It was RESOLVED that Cabinet recommends that Council

- a) adopts the budget setting report and associated financial strategies 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 and Investment Strategy as set out in Appendix 5 of the Annex;
- d) sets Rushcliffe's 2020/21 Council Tax for a Band D property at £142.74;

and

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 expenses Areas:

i) West Bridgford £48.51

ii) Keyworth £3.76

iii) Ruddington £4.12

48 **East Midlands Development Corporation**

The Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, presented the report of the Chief Executive providing an update on the Midlands Engine Development Corporation.

The Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership referred to the Midlands Engine Development Corporation, which had been allocated funding in 2018 of £2m. The Development Corporation would cover three geographical areas, including the Ratcliffe on Soar power station in Rushcliffe. An Oversight Board had been established, chaired by Sir John Peace, with Councillor Robinson representing Rushcliffe. A Business Case setting out preferred options would be submitted to Government in March 2020, with it proposed to go through Parliament by 2023. The future use of the power station site was the Council's main interest, as it would become a major development area for Rushcliffe and this report reflected the key role that Rushcliffe would play in the future shaping of the site itself. The emerging proposals included extensive housing and employment options, leading to significant economic growth for the region. It had been recognised previously that the East Midlands had lagged behind other areas of the country in terms of investment, and the Development Corporation would play a key role in re-energising the area. It was important that Rushcliffe was involved in the process and the recommendations in the report reflected that. The importance of this issue was recognised across both the Council and political parties and it was proposed to establish a Member Working Group to be regularly consulted on the progress of the Development Corporation over the next two years, during the interim delivery period.

In seconding the proposal, Councillor Mason stated that she was pleased to see the Statement of Intent and the establishment of the Member Working Group. The project would attract both national and international interest and investment and this was a very positive way forward, especially for the East Midlands, which in the past had suffered from under investment. All partners on the project would need to work together as progress could not be achieved in isolation.

Councillor Robinson confirmed that the Government announcement that the HS2 project would be going ahead had removed the previous uncertainty, and would be welcomed by the Development Corporation.

Councillor Edyvean referred to the exciting opportunities ahead to bring

strategic sites within the East Midlands together, and provide a major opportunity to address the historical lack of investment in the region.

It was RESOLVED that

- a) the statement of intent prepared and approved by the Development Corporation Oversight Board be endorsed;
- b) Rushcliffe Borough Council's involvement in the establishment of the Development Corporation and the required interim arrangements be supported;
- c) the potential budget impact of the interim arrangements be noted;
- d) a Member Working Group be set up and be regularly consulted on the progress of the development corporation work over the next two years, during the period of the interim delivery vehicle; and
- e) the report be referred to Council on 5 March 2020 for endorsement.

49 **Colston Bassett Neighbourhood Plan**

The Portfolio Holder for Housing presented the report of the Executive Manager – Communities providing information on the Colston Bassett Neighbourhood Plan. The documents had been introduced by the Localism Act 2011 and were recognised by the National Planning Policy Framework, with local residents empowered to shape the future of their community. A plan had to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local planning authority and if the plan was made part of the Local Development Plan, then planning applications within that area would be determined in accordance with both the Rushcliffe Local Plan and the relevant Neighbourhood Plan. The Plan had been promoted by the Parish Council, publicised, consulted on, examined by an independent Examiner and considered by the Borough Council. If the Plan was approved it would then proceed to a referendum and if more than 50% of those voting voted "yes" then the Borough Council was required to "adopt" the Plan. If the result was "no", then the Parish Council would have to decide what it wanted to do.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Inglis commended all those involved for their hard work and acknowledged that the Parish had accepted the Examiner's recommendations. The Neighbourhood Plan was an important statutory document and would help shape future development in the village. The recommendation ensured that the adoption of the Plan would be decided by the local community by a referendum.

Councillor Robinson referred to the increasing prevalence of Neighbourhood Plans and the important role they played, in particular as part of the planning process. The hard work of residents should be commended and it was hoped that if adopted, the Plan would prove beneficial to the local community.

It was RESOLVED that

- a) all of the Examiner's recommended modifications to the Colston Bassett

Neighbourhood Plan be accepted;

- b) the Colston Bassett Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement and its publication be approved; and
- c) the holding of a referendum for the Colston Bassett Neighbourhood Plan, with the area for the referendum being the Parish of Colston Bassett be approved; and
- d) the Executive Manager – Communities be granted delegated authority to make any necessary final minor external graphical and presentational changes required to the referendum version of the Colston Bassett Neighbourhood Plan.

The meeting closed at 7.26 pm.

CHAIRMAN