

CABINET – TUESDAY, 21 JANUARY 2025

DECISION NOTICE

The following decisions were taken on Tuesday, 21 January 2025 by Cabinet.

Date notified to all Members: **Wednesday 22 January 2025**

End of the call-in period is **12 noon on Monday 27 January 2025**

These decisions will not be implemented until after this date and time.

Present: P Peacock, R Cozens, L Brazier, C Penny, P Taylor and J Kellas

<u>Agenda Item No.</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Decision</u>	<u>Action By</u>
6.	2025/26 Housing Revenue Account Budget and Rent Setting (Key Decision)	<p>That Cabinet recommend to Council at its meeting on 11 February 2025:</p> <p>a) the HRA budget for 2025/26, as set out in Appendix A to the report;</p> <p>b) an increase of 2.7% in the 2025/26 rents of all current HRA tenancies will be applied from 7 April 2025;</p> <p>c) the 2025/26 service charges, as set out in Appendix C to the report; and</p> <p>d) the Capital Budget set out in Appendix D to the report are committed expenditure in the Capital Programme for 2025/26 to 2028/29.</p> <p><u>Reasons for Decision:</u> To advise Members of the proposed HRA budget and charges in rent and service charge levels for 2025/26 and for these to be recommended to Council at its meeting on 11 February 2025.</p> <p><u>Options Considered:</u> Various modelling was undertaken to assess the impact of different rent levels on the viability of the HRA 30-year business plan to arrive at the recommendation above.</p> <p>Consideration was also given to varying increases between general needs and supported (sheltered and extra care) accommodation but no rationale was found to support this, alongside the equitable nature of any decision to do so.</p>	<p>Nick Wilson, Business Manager – Financial Services</p> <p>David Price, Business Manager – Housing Income & Leasehold Management</p>

8.	Implementation of an Information Security Management System	<p>That Cabinet approve the Implementation of the Information Security Management System for the Council.</p> <p><u>Reasons for Decision:</u> To align with the community plan objective 8: To be a top performing, modern and accessible Council.</p> <p>Community trust in the Council to manage and use their data in a secure and compliant way, whilst demonstrating transparency.</p> <p><u>Options Considered:</u> Various alternative frameworks and the option to take no action have been evaluated. However, this international standard for information security is mandated by the Council for procuring systems and technology, where applicable.</p>	Dave Richardson, Business Manager- ICT & Digital Services
9.	Lowfield Lane Disposal (Key Decision)	<p>That Cabinet approve the revised sale price of £XXXXXX for the land at Lowfield Lane, Balderton as detailed in the report, subject to confirmation from Nottinghamshire County Council on the Green Adoption at £XXXXXX; any adjustment in the offer in relation to the Green Adoption sum to be delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Performance and Finance for decision following consultation with the Cabinet.</p> <p><u>Reasons for Decision:</u> In order to ensure that the Council secures the best consideration for the land which was previously purchased by the Council for residential redevelopment on the basis that it was both a largely allocated housing site and was entirely within the Newark Urban Area where the principle of residential development is acceptable.</p> <p><u>Options Considered:</u> The Council could refuse the revised offer outright and request Arkwood to proceed to complete the sale on the original terms or seek to negotiate a higher sale value somewhere between the original and revised offers. Neither of these options are considered realistic, deliverable or in the Council's interest. Arkwood has set out its position that it is entitled to terminate the contract for sale in the circumstances if the revised offer is not accepted; Officers consider this position to be justified as the viability of the development has been materially affected due to the factors set out in exempt Appendix A. The revised offer exceeds the independent valuations obtained and detailed at paragraph 2.6 above,</p>	Nick Wilson, Business Manager – Financial Services Shanade Bradley, Estates Officer – Corporate Property

		<p>therefore it is not considered necessary to seek to negotiate a higher sale value.</p> <p>The Policy & Finance Committee report of 27 January 2022 explored the alternative option of selling the land on the open market; this option was rejected as it did not deliver the Council’s strategic aims of both housing delivery, and financial sustainability relative to the Council’s Medium Term Financial Plan provided by Arkwood’s involvement. In addition, as the Council’s wholly owned company, Arkwood does not seek as high a commercial return as other developers and is therefore able to deliver a more diverse mix of housing including lower value units which generate lower returns, but which are much needed in the community. The position on this alternative option has not changed, in particular with reference to the independent valuations referenced at paragraph 2.6 of this report. The Council’s Acquisitions and Disposals Policy allows for disposal to be negotiated with a single party such as Arkwood. There is also a risk that by going to the open market the Council could fail to secure a buyer at all if Arkwood withdraw interest.</p> <p>The Policy & Finance Committee report of 29 June 2017 confirmed the land purchase based on use for strategic residential development, as most of the land was already allocated for that purpose. The proposal offers the best disposal value that can reasonably be obtained, together with associated benefits of delivering much needed housing especially considering new targets now being introduced by Government, and the Medium-Term Financial Plan benefits already set out in this report. There are no alternative uses that would offer a viable and comparable return which achieves Best Value to the Council as landowner given the constraints of the site.</p>	
10.	Jubilee Bridge Refurbishment	<p>That Cabinet approve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) option 3 as set out in the report, to continue to carry out annual safety inspections and the required remedial maintenance, until the next Principal Bridge Inspection is due in 2030 at a cost of up to £XXXXXX; and b) the Capital budget be reduced from £333,500 to £XXXXXX which will decommit £XXXXXX from the Asset Maintenance Reserve. <p><u>Reasons for Decision:</u> To ensure the bridge remains in a safe condition, the most viable option to the Council, based on the current condition of the bridge.</p>	Kevin Shutt, Development Manager – Corporate Property

		<p><u>Options Considered:</u></p> <p>Option 1 - Pay Commuted sum to Nottinghamshire County Council to have the bridge adopted and to remove future liability of the bridge from NSDC.</p> <p>Option 2 - To retain the bridge and to carry out a bridge major refurbishment.</p> <p>Option 3 - Continue to carry out annual safety inspections, remedial and recommended maintenance, until the next Principal Bridge Inspection is due, 2030.</p> <p>Option 4 - Close the bridge and decommission</p>	
11.	Motion for the Ocean - Action Plan Update	<p>That Cabinet defer any decision on the allocation of funds to further Motion for the Ocean activities given the impending review of Community Plan objectives.</p> <p><u>Reasons for Decision:</u> To further consider allocation of budgets linking into the review of Community Plan priorities.</p> <p><u>Options Considered:</u> Alternative options in relation to Motion for the Ocean activities were set out in detail in paragraph 6 of the report and summarised at paragraph 7.</p>	<p>Matt Adey, Environmental Development Manager</p> <p>Danielle Davies, Environmental Development Officer</p>