CITY OF EXETER

A meeting of **EXETER CITY COUNCIL** will be held at the **GUILDHALL, HIGH STREET, EXETER** on **TUESDAY 21 JULY 2026,** at 6.00 pm, at which you are hereby summoned to attend.

If you have an enquiry regarding any items on this agenda, please contact the Democratic Services Manager - democratic.services@exeter.gov.uk

The following business is proposed to be transacted:

Agenda

1 **Minutes**

To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2026. (Pages 7 - 20)

2 **Declarations of Interest**

Councillors are reminded of the need to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests that relate to business on the agenda and which have not already been included in the register of interests, before any discussion takes place on the item. Unless the interest is sensitive, you must also disclose the nature of the interest. In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct, you must then leave the room and must not participate in any further discussion of the item. Councillors requiring clarification should seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer prior to the day of the meeting.

3 **Local Government Act 1972 - Exclusion of the Press and Public**

It is considered that the Council would be unlikely to exclude the press and public during consideration of any of the items on the agenda, but if it should wish to do so, the following resolution should be passed:

RECOMMENDED that, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the consideration of the particular item(s) on the grounds that it (they) involve(s) the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the relevant paragraphs of Part 1, Schedule 12A of the Act.

Or

RECOMMENDED that, under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for item X and X on the grounds that it/they involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs X of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

4 **Official Communications**

To receive official communications of the Lord Mayor.

5 **Public Questions**

To receive questions relating to items on the agenda from members of the public and responses.

Details of questions should be notified to Democratic Services by 10am at least three clear working days prior to the meeting which for this meeting will be Wednesday 15 July 2026.

Further information about speaking at a committee can be found here: Public Speaking at Meetings.

TO RECEIVE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEES AND TO DETERMINE THEREON:

6 **Minutes of Planning Committee - 1 June 2026** (Pages 21 - 26)

7 **Minutes of Strategic Scrutiny Committee - 4 June 2026** (Pages 27 - 36)

8 **Minutes of Exeter Harbour Board - 11 June 2026** (Pages 37 - 40)

9 **Minutes of Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee - 18 June 2026** (Pages 41 - 46)

10 **Minutes of Executive Committee - 22 June 2026** (Pages 47 - 54)

REPORTS TO COUNCIL

11 **Cathedral & Quay Multi-Storey Car Park(MSCP)**

To consider the report of the Strategic Director for Corporate Resources. (Pages 55 - 58)

NOTICES OF MOTION

12 **Notice of Motion by Councillor Michael Mitchell under Standing Order No. 6**

Planned redundancies by the Royal Devon University NHS Foundation Trust and Exeter University.

The Council on behalf of the citizens of Exeter are concerned about the recent decisions of the Royal Devon University NHS Foundation Trust and Exeter University to each embark on a staff redundancy programme to stabilise their financial positions.

Both NHS Foundation Trust and university play a key role in the city, as employers, as service providers, as institutions and they have made Exeter a centre of excellence in both their respective fields.

Council is concerned about the wider implications to the city and residents of proposed cuts by both bodies.

Council resolves to:

Seek appropriate communication with the university and hospital trust with regards to the proposed cuts to departments and the impact on the services they provide to the wider community; and

Requests that the Leader ask that both organisations participate in a meaningful consultation process and listen to the views of staff and other key stakeholders such as students and health service partners.

Proposer: Councillor Michael Mitchell

13 **Notice of Motion by Councillor Chelvanayagam under Standing Order No. 6**

Protecting Exeter's Public Sector Institutions and Local Economy

Council notes that:

1. Public sector organisations, including the University of Exeter, the Royal Devon University Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, Exeter City Council and Devon County Council, are major anchor institutions within Exeter and the wider region, providing employment, education, healthcare and essential public services while making a substantial contribution to the local economy and civic life.

2. Recent announcements demonstrate growing financial pressures across the public sector, including:
    - ○ the University of Exeter placing around 500 members of staff at risk of redundancy;
    - ○ the Royal Devon University Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust seeking substantial voluntary staffing reductions as part of major financial savings;
    - ○ the ongoing reorganisation of local government in Devon, which is expected to lead to significant changes in employment across local authorities.

3. These developments take place against a wider national context of prolonged financial pressures affecting higher education, the NHS and local government, including reductions in public funding, the increasing marketisation of higher education, restrictions affecting international student recruitment, and continuing pressures on local government finance.

4. The cumulative impact of these developments has the potential to reduce employment opportunities, weaken local economic resilience, diminish Exeter's internationally recognised research and educational capacity, increase pressure on local communities, and adversely affect demand for local businesses and services.

Council believes that:

1. Strong public institutions are fundamental to Exeter's long-term prosperity, economic resilience and social wellbeing.

2. Decisions affecting major public employers should be informed by meaningful consultation with staff, recognised trade unions, students, patients and local communities.

3. Public sector restructuring should seek wherever possible to minimise compulsory redundancies, retain valuable skills and expertise, and protect the long-term capacity of public services.

4. International staff and students make an invaluable contribution to Exeter's economy, culture, research excellence and public life, and should be welcomed and supported.

Council resolves to:

1. Express its concern to the Government and Exeter MPs regarding the scale of proposed and anticipated job losses across Exeter's major public sector institutions and the potential consequences for the city's economy and communities.

2. Call on the heads of anchor public sector organisations to work constructively with recognised trade unions and staff representatives to minimise compulsory redundancies, explore all reasonable alternatives to job losses, and engage transparently with stakeholders throughout periods of organisational change.

3. Request that the Leader reports to Council on the potential economic implications for Exeter arising from significant reductions in employment within major public sector organisations, including impacts on housing demand, local businesses, employment, skills, and economic development, together with any actions that the Council and its partners may take to mitigate those impacts.

4. Reaffirm the Council's commitment to working with local public sector partners, employers, educational institutions, businesses and community organisations to support employment, skills development, economic resilience and inclusive growth across Exeter.

5. Share the content of this motion with residents through council communications.

Proposer: Councillor Chelvanayagam

14 **Notice of Motion by Councillor Wetenhall under Standing Order No. 6**

Historic CIL allocations

"This council notes that:

- the recently strengthened process agreed by Council in June this year, for reaching decisions on Community Infrastructure Levy allocations.

- that previous decisions were made using a process characterised, in the words of SWAP Internal Audit as follows : "*the absence of an overarching governance framework for the prioritisation of CIL receipts poses a risk of inconsistent decision-making and potential non-compliance with legislative requirements. The lack of a structured framework may also lead to ambiguity and lack of transparency in the allocation and expenditure of CIL funds."*

- projects on the Infrastructure List are ones which "*could benefit from CIL funding in future. It does not however provide financial commitments to any project set out in the Statement."* Also, that*: It should be noted that while this Infrastructure List is a statement of the Council's intentions, it is subject to review and does not commit to funding a particular project. Budget commitments regarding how CIL is spent are made via the capital programme which is determined by the Full Council.*

This council therefore believes that:

- Given the acknowledged flaws in the previous regime for CIL allocation, CIL allocations made before June 2026, should be subject to a review process using the new CIL governance process to ensure that significant sums of public money are allocated in a fair and transparent way.

This council resolves to:

- Carry out a review of CIL allocation decisions covering those made before June 2026

- Bring a report based on the review process to the Councillor CIL Governance Forum as soon as possible, which will include any proposed changes arising from applying the new criteria-based system.

Proposer: Cllr Wetenhall

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

15 **Questions from Members of the Council under Standing Order No. 8**

To receive questions from Members on any matter for which the Council has powers, duties or affects the City.

A plan of seating in the Guildhall is attached

Date: 13 July 2026

Bindu Arjoon
Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL

Tuesday 16 June 2026

Present:
The Right Worshipful the Lord Mayor Councillor Rolstone (Chair)
Councillor Lucy Haigh (Deputy Lord Mayor)
Councillors Baker, Begley, Bialyk, Chelvanayagam, Cookson, Darling, Findlay MBE, Fullam, Harding, Hughes, Hussain, Jobson, Ketchin, Knott, Miller-Boam, Mitchell, K, Mitchell, M, Moore, Patrick, Payne, Pole, Rappert, Reed, Richards, Sheridan, Smith, Snow, Terry, Wardle, Williams, M, Williams, N, Williams, R and Wood

Apologies:
Councillors Banyard, Palmer and Wetenhall

Also present:
Chief Executive, Head of Legal and Democratic Services & Monitoring Officer, Strategic Director for Corporate Resources, Democratic Services Officer, Strategic Director for Place, Strategic Director of Operations and Democratic Services Manager.

1 MINUTES

The minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of Council held on 24 March 2026 were moved by the Lord Mayor, taken as read, approved, and signed as a correct record.

The minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 7 April 2026 were moved by the Lord Mayor, taken as read, approved, and signed as a correct record.

The minutes of the Annual Meeting of Council held on 20 May 2026 were moved by the Lord Mayor, taken as read, approved, and signed as a correct record.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made by Members.

3 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

The Lord Mayor advised Members that she and the Deputy Lord Mayor had attended a wide range of community and civic events since taking office, such as:

- the Devon County Show;
- Exeter University's Employment Award; and
- the first charity coffee morning for the Lord Mayor's Charity, Baby Bank.

She highlighted some upcoming events that she and the Deputy Lord Mayor would be attending, including:

- Armed Forces Day;
- Windrush Celebrations;
- Lammas Fair;
- the Northcott production of Daphne;
- a charity coffee morning at the Guildhall; and
- the opening of Custard Town.

The Lord Mayor also wished the teams taking part in the Race Across Devon the best of luck.

4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Lord Mayor advised that four public questions had been received.

Question from Colleen Natola:
“Residents have received no funding support from any authority and are expected to self-fund remedial sewer and drainage works. As residents must the use the correct legal mechanism, what assistance and guidance will ECC provide to help them navigate the process and ensure works are carried out lawfully?”

The Portfolio Holder for City Development, Councillor Susannah Patrick, responded to the question in the following terms:
“Ward councillors were working closely with the community and Exeter City Councillor Officers were supporting residents as best as they would over the unfinished infrastructure at Home Farm, however, residents are advised to contact South West Water concerning the legal mechanisms for unfinished sewer and drainage works as they are the relevant statutory undertaker for this infrastructure.”

In a supplementary question, Colleen highlighted that the ward councillors and South West Water were supposed to meet, but this had been cancelled with no prospect of another meeting in place.
The Portfolio Holder for City Development advised that ward councillors were currently trying to facilitate this meeting.

Question from Patrick Langdon:
With reference to planning application 19/0255/RES (Home Farm), as the local planning authority, what can Exeter City Council do to work with South West Water to secure the fixing of the drains and sewers on the estate?

The Portfolio Holder for City Development responded to this question in the following terms:
Exeter City Council were not responsible for the drains and sewers on the estate but were supporting South West Water in assisting them in the planning history of the site and the status of conditions and S106 obligations, should this aid South West Water in fulfilling its statutory duties.

In a supplementary question Patrick asked what specific changes would be made by Exeter City Council and South West Water to ensure that future developments were not permitted to proceed like this in the future.

The Portfolio Holder for City Development advised that he should send her an email with this question as she would like to investigate thoroughly.

Question from Franco Natola:
With the developer now insolvent, leaving green spaces and playgrounds unfinished, what options are available to complete these works? Residents already face the cost of maintaining the sewers and drains. Does the council expect residents to also fund the completion and upkeep of these community spaces?

The Portfolio Holder for City Development responded to the question in the following terms:
Application 16/1576/OUT was granted following the refusal of application 13/4802/OUT and subsequent appeal allowing the development. The legal agreement accompanying planning permission 16/1576/OUT put the

responsibility for maintaining the informal open space and play area onto the developer. That common approach has been operational policy over the past 15 years or so, as local authority budgets have reduced following changes to the way they have been funded nationally.
Exeter City Council have occasionally adopted public open space in exceptional circumstances with a commuted sum from the developer to support maintenance for a set period of time. Although adoption could be considered in principle, without a secured commuted sum to support ongoing maintenance, it is unlikely to be feasible under current financial constraints, and she was hoping for a resolution with stakeholders.

In a supplementary question the issue of unfinished green spaces and playground funding was raised as well as what alternative funding sources were available. Councillor Patrick responded to the supplementary question advising that this would be discussed later in this meeting and that she would respond to Mr Natola outside of the meeting.

Question from Peter Cleasby:
What plans does the Leader have for the Council to help restore public trust in politics and politicians.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Bialyk, responded in the following terms:
The moment of reflection lead by the Lord Mayor on the death of Jo Cox was important, and there was a large amount of discourse in politics currently. Councillors had to follow the Council's Code of Conduct, they tried to answer everything they could and highlighted that they were not professional full time politicians.

In response to a supplementary question, the Leader advised that elections in Exeter were carried out by thirds, and that Councillors who had been elected in previous years terms had to be respected.

5 **MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE - 27 APRIL 2026**

The Minutes of the Planning Committee of 27 April 2026 were presented by the Chair, Councillor Knott, and taken as read.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 27 April 2026 were received.

6 **MINUTES OF AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE - 26 MARCH 2026**

The Minutes of the Audit and Governance Committee of 26 March 2026 were presented by the Chair, Councillor Moore, and taken as read.

In respect of **Minute No.104 – JCNC Terms of Reference**, Councillor Moore moved the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Knott. Following a vote the recommendation was CARRIED.

In respect of **Minute No.109 – Code of Corporate Governance,** Councillor Moore moved the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Wardle. Following a vote the recommendation was CARRIED.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Audit and Governance Committee held on 26 March 2026 were received.

7 **MINUTES OF EXETER HARBOUR BOARD - 18 MARCH 2026**

The Minutes of the Exeter Harbour Board of 18 March 2026 were presented by the Chair, Councillor R Williams, and taken as read.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Exeter Harbour Board held on 18 March 2026 were received.

8 **MINUTES OF STRATEGIC SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 2 APRIL 2026**

The Minutes of the Strategic Scrutiny Committee of 2 April 2026 were presented by the Chair, Councillor Rappert, and taken as read.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Strategic Scrutiny Committee 2 April 2026 were received.

9 **MINUTES OF CUSTOMER FOCUS SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 19 MARCH 2026**

The Minutes of the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee of 19 March 2026 were presented by the Chair, Councillor Fullam, and taken as read.

In respect of **Minute No.110 – Eton Walk Refuse Bin Petition**, Councillor Moore asked the Chair how residents were able to have their matter progressed. The Chair advised that the Petitioner had not been present at the meeting and that members of the public could make a direct approach to the Council in terms of individual bin requests.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee held on 19 March 2026 were received.

10 **MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - 28 APRIL 2026**

The Minutes of the Executive Committee of 28 April 2026 were presented by the Chair, the Leader of the Council, and taken as read.

In respect of **Minute No. 129 – Chair's Closing Remarks** the Leader thanked Laura Wright and Matthew Vizard for their hard work as Portfolio Holders and members of the Executive Committee.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Executive Committee held on 28 April 2026 were received.

11 **OVERVIEW OF GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET 2025/26 - QUARTER 4**

The Leader, Councillor Bialyk, moved the recommendations, which were seconded by the Deputy Leader, Councillor R Williams.

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources presented the report making the following points:

- a supplement had been published earlier that day as the figures that were received on Friday regarding the business rates changed the report materially;
- a windfall amount of approximately £3.5 million had been identified from business rates;

- Members were advised that business rates were held in the business rates collection fund, which was separate from the Council's main accounts;
- the balance would be held and released in future years, with the windfall expected to be recognised in 2027/28;
- it was clarified that this did not change the overall financial position and did not provide an additional £3.5million immediately available to the Council;
- proposed earmarked reserves were no longer required, as the funds would be received in the year required, removing the need to identify £1.5million;
- the key sections of the report were identified as section 10.11 and Appendix 4, which set out the supplementary budgets; and
- section 10.14 was required as financial regulations in the Constitution had been updated, with Council being responsible for writing off debts over £100,000.

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources and the Strategic Director for Operations responded to Members' questions in the following terms:

- there had been an underspend within the homelessness budget due to a restructure within the service;
- Members were advised that Exeter had been awarded funding over a 10-year period for Pride in Place, and that the amount being carried forward related to grant funding to support the establishment of the governance structure, with approval sought for spend in the current year;
- the business rates reset had been discussed previously and the same level of variation in amounts was not expected next year;
- a previous issue with the service charge on the Guildhall Shopping Centre had resulted in two charges during one financial year but this would not happen again;
- empty property levels were generally low;
- there were some notable vacant properties where reletting was affected by works at the Corn Exchange, or damage by previous tenants;
- vacant Council-owned properties were advertised on the Council's website;
- business rates were dependent on the type of occupier, social enterprises did not always pay rent and charities could receive business rate relief; and
- business rate income received by the Council could be affected by meanwhile use contracts.

During debate a Member commented on the amount of money that needed to be written off because of a vessel in the river. The Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Support Services and City Management advised that efforts had been made to reclaim the debt but it had not been possible. She hoped that following the Harbour Revision Order officers would hopefully have more powers.

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources advised that he would reply to Councillor Moore's questions regarding bailiffs outside of the meeting.

Following a vote the recommendations were CARRIED.

12 **2025/26 GENERAL FUND CAPITAL MONITORING 2024/25 AND REVISED CAPITAL PROGRAMME FOR 2026/27 AND FUTURE YEARS**

The Leader, Councillor Bialyk, moved the recommendations, which were seconded by the Deputy Leader, Councillor R Williams.

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources presented the report making the following points:

- £5.49 million had been spent and the Strategic Asset Management Board had fully reviewed the capital programme;
- the revised capital programme for 2026/27 totalled £36.4 million;
- section 10.5 set out expenditure variances, including the Paris Street car park scheme;
- Devon County Council had advised that the cost of the Paris Street car park work had more than doubled, making the scheme financially unviable;
- section 10.7 set out further funding requests, including brownfield land release funding for the demolition of the Harlequins Shopping Centre;
- additional funding was sought for solar panels at the Matford Centre. The tender price was higher than originally requested but the business case remained strong;
- Members were advised that additional grant funding had been received from Devon County Council for disabled facilities grants;
- the replacement boiler for the Guildhall would cost £36,000; and
- a budget of £100,000 was sought to bring Market Street Car Park(MSCP) back into use and make it fit for purpose.

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources and the Strategic Director for Operations responded to Members' questions in the following terms:

- the Commercial Assets and Planning Teams had spent a long time working with the developer on the works due to start at Mary Arches;
- the new Materials Reclamation Facility (MRF) was now in the possession of the Council;
- substantial building work needed to be carried out at the MRF;
- it had been negotiated that a temporary car park would be operated whilst the Harlequin's car park was closed;
- the quote from Devon County Council for the potential City Point car park was double what had originally been proposed which was not viable;
- Council had approved the closure of the Mary Arches car park for development, and the funds from the government were in line with the proposal;
- materials were increasing in price which explained why the prices of works were increasing;
- an air source heat pump had been considered for the Guildhall but a direct replacement had been deemed a better option; and
- the Director assured Members that there would be an open and transparent procurement process for the Mary Arches development.

During debate Members discussed the development of Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) and Co-Living Accommodation. The Leader responded to debate highlighting that the sale of the Mary Arches car park was an important capital receipt for the Council.

Following a vote, the recommendations were CARRIED.

13 **2025/26 HRA BUDGET MONITORING REPORT – OUTTURN**

The Leader, Councillor Bialyk, moved the recommendations, which were seconded by the Deputy Leader, Councillor R Williams.

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources presented the report making the following points:

- there were no significant issues with the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget;

- significant underspend had been due to a new repairs and maintenance contract;
- there had been a significant reduction in void properties;
- a number of supplementary budgets had been proposed; and
- there were two further requests for additional capital funding, for the land refurbishment project, and the Rennes House demolition.

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources and the Strategic Director for Operations responded to Members' questions in the following terms:
- there had been a delay in the Rennes House demolition due to issues surrounding a communication mast on the roof;
- Rennes House also had more asbestos than expected, which had slowed progress;
- the HRA covered a number of properties, not just council homes;
- work was being planned to renew and repair door entry systems on Council owned buildings to help reduce anti-social behaviour(ASB).

During debate, a Member highlighted that there were a large amount of acronyms in this report, that made it difficult to read and could potentially cause issues for members of the public.

The Leader advised Councillor Fullam that he would provide an answer outside of the meeting regarding redevelopment.

Following a unanimous vote, the recommendations were CARRIED.

14 **TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2025/26**

The Leader introduced the item and highlighted that the recommendation was for Council to receive this report.

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources presented the report advising Members that this was a statutory report to inform Members and there were no instances of diversion from what had previously been approved.

RESOLVED that the Treasury Management 2025/26 report be received.

15 **UPDATE OF EXETER CITY COUNCIL'S COMPANIES, ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY MODELS AND CHARITIES. HALF YEAR UPDATE**

The Leader, Councillor Bialyk, introduced the item and highlighted that the recommendation was to note the report.

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources presented the update advising Members that there was nothing of significant concern to report and there would be a new Chief Executive Officer(CEO) of Exeter Science Park Ltd following the retirement of the current CEO. He informed Members that they could expect a report on the future of the Exeter Business Centre.

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources responded to questions from Members' in the following terms:
- tenants had not been formally involved in the review of the Exeter Business Centre;
- the Guildhall residential flats had been relet;

- he would respond to Councillor Darling's question regarding the RAMM project outside of the meeting; and
- the finances of the Exeter Science Park Ltd remained on track.

RESOLVED that Council note the Update of Exeter City Council's Companies, Alternative Delivery Models and Charities Half Year Update.

16 **CIL AND S106 GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK AND ADVISORY FORUM**

The Leader, Councillor Bialyk, moved the recommendations, seconded by Deputy Leader, Councillor R Williams.

The Strategic Director for Place presented the report making the following points:

- this report sought the approval for a new decision-making framework for CIL and aggregated S106 funding;
- it set out principles and a process which would apply to strategic CIL, but not neighbourhood CIL;
- the report was not seeking approval of individual projects;
- decisions made on individual applications would not change and would continue to be taken by the Executive or Council;
- the report sought to respond to issues identified following an internal audit review;
- the main proposal was to establish a cross-party, politically balanced Advisory Forum to assist decision making;
- the Terms of Reference for the Advisory Forum were set out in Appendix A;
- projects would be scored by officers using a matrix set out in Appendix C
- the Strategic Management Board(SMB) would review projects for strategic fit; and
- a report would be presented to Members' with recommendations for a final decision after it had been to the Advisory Forum.

In response to questions from Members' the Strategic Director for Place provided the following answers:

- Members were advised that the Infrastructure Funding Schedule set out the original project list;
- procurement matters would be responded to outside of the meeting;
- comments from the Advisory Forum would be reported to Members, and regular monitoring and review of projects would be reported quarterly to the Strategic Management Board;
- the framework had been prepared by officers, informed by guidance and approaches taken by other local authorities;
- the community engagement criterion was intended to confirm that engagement had taken place, rather than assess the quality of that engagement;
- Members were advised that community benefit would be considered as part of the overall judgement; and
- there was no requirement to undertake consultation when projects came forward, but there was an expectation that engagement would be carried out.

During debate Members' made the following comments:

- support was expressed for the proposals and for the opportunity for open and frank cross-party discussion on spending for large projects;
- the Planning Team were thanked for their work, and it was stated that the new framework and forum would support transparent decision-making; and
- there had previously been a lack of process.

Under Standing Order 10 (13) (a), Councillor Moore, Green Group Leader, moved two additional recommendations:

1. The Advisory Forum to receive monitoring and review reports.
2. That the Framework be updated to include a scoring criteria for mitigation and adaptation to climate change.

The Leader, Councillor Bialyk, advised that he was happy for the second amendment to be included in the recommendations.

During debate on the substantive motion as amended, Members' made the following comments:

- this would help to balance process and efficiency of decision making; and
- this would work towards making a subjective process objective.

In summing up the Leader made the following comments:

- he was happy to take the amendment from Councillor Moore, and her contribution was appreciated;
- this was not an oversight committee, and matters would not be devolved to this group;
- the Exeter Plan would be a guiding factor when it was, hopefully, adopted; and
- if this needed to be amended it could be brought back to Council in the future.

Following a vote, the recommendations were CARRIED as amended.

17 **COMMITTEE ALLOCATION CHANGES**

The Leader moved the recommendations, seconded by the Deputy Leader, Councillor R Williams.

The Leader informed Members that there would also be a change to the Community Grants Panel from Councillor Darling to Councillor Begley.

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services & Monitoring Officer presented the report highlighting that these changes had been discussed between Group Leaders and the political balance remained the same.

Following a unanimous vote the recommendations were CARRIED.

18 **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL UNDER STANDING ORDER NO. 8**

In accordance with Standing Order No.8, the following question was put by Councillor Hughes to the Leader, Councillor Bialyk:
I would like to refer the Leader to the motion passed in this hall on 22nd July 2025, which was written by me, as an Independent, and Cllr Kevin Mitchell from the Liberal Democrats. As a community, the LGBT+ residents of Exeter are understandably getting increasingly nervous as the 30th of June deadline looms for the adoption or otherwise of the new draft EHRC guidance, which has come out since mine and Cllr Kevin Mitchell's motion.
This anxiety is not being helped by the motions and challenges being presented to Devon County Council by ex-Advance UK County councillors, who do not sit on our city council. These have already had a demonstrable, negative impact on the LGBT+ community of Exeter and our very own Exeter

library. I am aware that as a city council, we have read the new EHRC draft and as the Leader will be aware - discussions are taking place at Westminster as to whether our Labour government should adopt this guidance.
Can I please have confirmation and reassurance from the Leader that as the current draft guidance stands, Exeter City Council is under no legal obligation to change the policy we adopted on 25th July 2025, irrespective of which decision our government chooses to take after 30th June?
My understanding of the current legalities is that services which wish to remain inclusive and supportive of gender-neutral facilities and ensure trans men and trans-women can use facilities comfortably and with dignity, may continue to do so. Just because the guidance offers the permission to those who wish to be exclusionary and LGBT+ phobic, it is not actually requiring it.
Inclusivity and dignity is the stance we adopted in July 2025 when we determined to make Exeter a safe city in all of our council run services for trans, non-binary and intersex people.
Will the leader please confirm that my legal understanding (as it currently stands) is accurate and therefore no further action needs to be taken by any of us - officers or members, regarding our current commitment to this agreed motion?

The Leader responded to this question in the following terms:
"The guidance you refer to is currently in draft form and does not in itself change the law. As such, it does not automatically require Exeter City Council to amend the position agreed in July 2025.

The position reflected the Supreme Court judgement and confirmed that protections under the Equality Act 2010 remain in place, and that the Council would not implement changes to policy or practice until the updated EHRC Code of Practice is issued.

The Council will continue to operate in line with the law and will keep its policies under review in light of any final guidance or changes to the legal position. At this stage, there is no requirement for the Council to take further action, and we will review this position once the guidance is confirmed and published."

Councillor Hughes in a supplementary question asked for confirmation that the Council would not currently make any changes unless required by law. The Leader confirmed that this would be the case.

In accordance with Standing Order No.8, the following question was put by Councillor Chelvanayagam to the Leader, Councillor Bialyk:
Does the Leader agree with me that the former bus station site presents an opportunity to support independent traders, start-up businesses, cultural activity, community use and improved public space while longer-term plans for the site are developed. If so, will he commit to commissioning a feasibility study into potential meanwhile uses for the site, including but not limited to a covered market, space for independent traders and start-up businesses, cultural activities, children's play provision and enhanced planting?
Given that the Section 151 Officer has confirmed that up to £50,000 may be available to support such a study, will he further commit to reporting the findings of that study to the Executive, together with recommendations, no later than December 2026?

The Leader responded to Councillor Chelvanayagam making the following points:

He did agree that the bus station offered an opportunity to support small businesses but as mentioned earlier tonight, the proposed temporary car park had been rendered financially unviable owing to additional cost requirements from the County Council.
There would be a report to the Executive shortly setting out the long term plans for the wider City Point site. In the meantime, a feasibility study into potential options for a meanwhile use of the site was something that would look to be implemented.

In a supplementary question, Councillor Chelvanayagam asked the Leader to confirm that there would be a feasibility study and asked that this be before December 2026.
The Leader advised that he did not have the authority to spend £50,000 and it had to be done through the Executive.

In accordance with Standing Order No.8, the following question was put by Councillor Wetenhall to the Deputy Leader, Councillor Ruth Williams:
According to the Council website, there will be a consultation on a draft air quality strategy 'this summer', and a draft air quality strategy and air quality action plan will be produced by the end of this month. There is nothing in the latest Forward Plan or Work Plan which covers this working coming to Executive or Council.
Can the portfolio holder clarify whether all of this work is being carried out as delegated powers to officers, or whether Councillors can expect to have sight of and input to the two draft documents before the consultation is launched and whether the timetable on the Council website is still correct?

The Deputy Leader responded to the question in the following terms:

She welcomed the opportunity to update Members on this very important piece of work. This would be rectified in the forward plan, and an updated forward plan would be circulated to members in the coming days. The consultation regarding the Air Quality Action Plan and Strategy would be launched during the week commencing the 29 June 2026.

The consultation would last 6 weeks. Following the consultation it was scheduled to be heard by Strategic Scrutiny on 19 November 2026, Executive on 15 December 2026 before being presented to Council on 12 January 2027.

As Portfolio Holder she had been involved in the work of the Steering Group pulling together the draft Strategy and plan. As part of the consultation process, Councillors would have the opportunity to participate in a dedicated workshop run by the company commissioned to develop the strategy and action plan which would be held in July.

In accordance with Standing Order No.8, the following question was put by Councillor Moore to the Leader:
Please can an update be given on work to prepare for the Community Governance Review and when will that review be undertaken?

The Leader responded to Councillor Moore advising that he had undertaken to consider the implementation of a Community Governance Review. I have now received advice from officers and will be arranging to discuss with Members in the next three weeks.

In a supplementary question Councillor Moore asked the Leader when this was likely to start. The Leader advised that this needed to be done the correct way. There was the added complication of LGR, which would bring forward proposals and discussions with Members. He would like to see similar mechanisms of parishes within the city but he assured Members that the team were working very hard on this and had taken a lot of specialist advice.

In accordance with Standing Order No.8, the following question was put by Councillor Ketchin to the Deputy Leader:
The government's Simple Recycling guidance 27 March 2025 mandates that packaging glass by March 2026 and film plastics by March 2027 must be collected directly from household doorsteps as an extension of and complement to current statutory domestic refuse collections by collection authorities.

The Deputy Leader responded to Councillor Ketchin in the following terms:
With the roll-out of food waste recycling completed as scheduled, Member colleagues would be aware that the current main priority for the Waste Service management team was the development of a new Materials Reclamation Facility (MRF) for the City.
She was pleased to report that acquisition of the new premises where the MRF will be based was completed last Friday and work was well underway planning the procurement of building works and the purchase of all required machinery in order to commence working from a new modern MRF in 2027.
Regarding collection of specific recyclates:
Exeter City Council had been recycling film plastics as part of its kerbside collection scheme for the last 26 years. Paper and card contamination came from glass being mixed into the co-mingled recycling process. Exeter City Council received over a million from recycling.
Therefore, the Council has no immediate plans to change its current co-mingled recycling scheme as this is the most technically, economically and environmentally practicable method of collecting the majority of recycling across the city. We were currently collecting a high percentage of glass through the glass bank methodology. It had been independently estimated that a kerbside collection scheme would yield between 1% and 1.5% extra glass.
Officers were currently preparing a number of costed option proposals for doorstep glass recycling which were likely to be presented in the latter half of this year.

In accordance with Standing Order No.8, the following question was put by Councillor Ketchin to Councillor Patrick
Does the Portfolio holder agree that once the new CIL Governance arrangements are in place, reviewing unused past allocations under the new system should be carried out as a matter of some urgency, to ensure transparency and fair process is applied and to ensure the money, well over a million, is spent on Exeter's residents before LRG is complete?

In response to Councillor Ketchin, Councillor Patrick provided the following answer:
Unspent CIL was for big, expensive projects. There was not money sat there doing nothing and it did not feel that there was something lacking. She was open to reviewing the role and effectiveness in the future.

In a supplementary question Councillor Ketchin asked the Portfolio Holder if she would commit to publishing a report on the unused CIL.
Councillor Patrick advised that she would discuss with officers.

(The meeting commenced at 6.03 pm and closed at 9.04 pm)

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Monday 1 June 2026

Present:
Councillor Knott (Chair)
Councillors Cookson, Baker, Chelvanayagam, Hussain, Jobson, Ketchin, Miller-Boam, Mitchell, M and Richards

Apologies:
Councillor Darling

Also Present:
Strategic Director for Place, Principal Project Manager - Development Management, Team Lead - Property, Planning & Non-Contentious, Planning Property and Contracts Lawyer and Democratic Services Manager

1 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2026 were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as correct.

2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made by Members.

3 **PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 25/0676/FUL - HEAVITREE ROAD POLICE STATION**

The **Principal Project Manager (Development Management)** presented the application **No. 25/0676/FUL – Heavitree Road Police Station** which included:

- the site location plan with red line;
- reason for this decision being before the committee: this exact proposal had been considered by planning committee on 8 December 2025. The committee resolved to approve the application subject to changes proposed on the amendment sheet and to a further minor change to the officer recommendation in regard of a public path through the scheme.
- there were two reasons for returning the application to committee: firstly, six months had been given to negotiate and sign the section 106 agreement. This period will expire on 08 June 2026 and more time is needed. Secondly, the applicants had requested one minor change to the proposal in respect of the affordable housing it would deliver (which applied only to the co-living proportion of the development and not the PBSA part). The previous scheme proposed that 20% (83 units) of the Co-Living studios be affordable housing, the applicant had requested that the level be reduced in line with national policy for Vacant Building Credit(VBC). This did not change the nature of the scheme;
- officers accepted that VBC was applicable and that a lower level of affordable housing was required, as the planning balance on which planning committee took their decision on 08 December 2025 had changed. It was necessary for planning committee to consider the application;
- the limited impacts that this change had on the overall scheme, relevant parts of the appended report had been highlighted;
- changes from the December update sheet (which included changes to proposed conditions) were now incorporated into the updated officer recommendation;

- the amendment made by the committee regarding the public path through the development remaining open 24hours a day, rather than being closed at night was now fully incorporated into the proposal;
- whilst the December decision was relevant as a change to the level of affordable housing would change the planning balance and required a further committee decision, the focus of the presentation was on the affordable housing issue;
- the report was comprehensive and covered all issues; and
- officers were happy to respond to questions on any aspect of the application.

A short break due to technical issues was taken at 5.51pm and the meeting recommenced at 5.58pm

The **Principal Project Manager (Development Management)** continued to present the application for **No. 25/0676/FUL – Heavitree Road Police Station** which included:

- outlining the national policy (NPPF) and guidance (PPG) which established VBC, including an example. The objective of VBC was to incentivise development on previously developed (brownfield) land and as such it allowed existing floorspace to be offset from the affordable housing requirement such that it was liable only on any net increase in floorspace proposed;
- VBC was considered prior to the 8 December 2025 committee, and member's attention was drawn to a paragraph in that report which explained that it may apply, but that the applicant had not requested it;
- Since the December resolution the applicant had made a formal approach and asked that VBC be applied;
- VBC was a legitimate policy for this site and legal advice had confirmed that the credit should apply to the 20% requirement (which was applicable to the development under national NPPF policy on 'Build To Rent' housing) or to the 35% which was usually required by the local plan;
- there was disagreement between officers and the applicant about the methodology for calculating VBC: officers considered that the proposed floorspace to be included in the calculation should be that of the whole development whilst the applicant argued that only the co-living floorspace should be included. The two approaches resulted in a significantly different affordable housing requirement for this application;
- the amount of existing floorspace on site had been subject to discussion with the applicant and had increased significantly since the application was first submitted. This impacted on the level of affordable housing required following the application of VBC. Officers drew attention to existing buildings in two particular areas of the site;
- the table on page 34 presented several different scenarios based upon different floorspace inputs and the methodology preferred by both officers and the applicant. This generated affordable housing requirements varying from the applicant's preferred 9.34% (39 units) to the 64 units (15.49%) included in the December 2025 committee report;
- Officers considered that the requirement should be 14.5% which resulted in 60 affordable studios plus a residual commuted sum of £10,179.86;
- officers suggested that the S106 agreement allow the number of units to be rounded up to 61 if the applicant preferred not to pay the commuted sum;
- planning obligations were set out with only those highlighted in yellow within the report being different from those considered in December 2025;
- within the December report and presentation, the proposal had been compared to the appeal scheme and it had been determined that the

impact on neighbours was less and the design significantly improved. Some harm had been acknowledged in the loss of trees but new tree planting was deemed sufficient to overcome the loss of trees. Officers considered that the multitude of benefits would outweigh the harm;

- officers considered that this conclusion remained: despite a proposed reduction in the affordable housing provision, the outcome of the planning balance remained the same. Officers recommended approval subject to the planning obligations and conditions set out in the report;
- it was acknowledged that the reduction was unfortunate but it would not significantly change the planning balance;
- there were two further details to share, an objection from Exeter Civic Society had been received on Thursday 28 May which objected on the basis that affordable housing was too important to delegate to officers; and
- secondly the applicant's agent had written to officers only a matter of hours before the meeting. The Principal Project Manager (Development Management) read key aspects of the letter to the committee. The letter confirmed that despite discussions so far they accepted the officer preferred position in terms of VBC of 60.07 plus £10,179.86 and asked that their acceptance be conveyed to the planning committee. They explained that there was no clear methodology provided and maintained that their approach was valid but in the interests of moving the application forward they would accept the officer's methodology.

The **Principal Project Manager (Development Management)** responded to Member questions and clarification points as follows:-

- VBC was seen infrequently as where a site had existing buildings a developer often had the opportunity to gain financial incentive through a reduction in CIL payment. Developers were not able to offset through both CIL and Vacant Building Credit;
- CIL relief was not applicable in this case as the site had not been in use for six months during the previous three years as it had been vacant since 2021. It was unusual for buildings to stand vacant for this length of time;
- officers could not give assurance that the applicant would not come back with further viability elements as these processes were set nationally;
- this particular type of affordable housing was Affordable Private Rent where properties were rented at a twenty percent discount to the market;
- the five year housing land supply would be updated in light of the local plan. If the plan was found sound and adopted, the Council was likely to find itself with a 5 year supply, but as a result of the target changing rather than the number of houses with planning permission in the supply. The process did not allow for a planning authority to delay a decision to await an update which would allow a different decision to be reached. Local Plan officers had stated that the planned 813 homes would contribute towards housing supply which would have a large impact;
- harm would arise from the loss of trees but this harm had been flagged as a landscape impact rather than ecological, however officers acknowledged the multiple benefits trees delivered. The appeal scheme had been refused with loss of trees cited as a reason but the council had conceded that the loss could be mitigated;
- Biodiversity Net Gain(BNG) was subject to strict rules and methodology and exact BNG would only be confirmed after a decision had been made. This scheme was showing as plus 14%. There was no ability to request off-site or early tree planting as a mitigation. If the resolution were granted it would allow the scheme to be built in two phases and the condition wording proposed by officers had been drafted to try to prevent unnecessary premature loss of trees if the scheme is built out in phases;

- none of the proposed building were designated tall buildings under the Act;
- the local planning authority's view was that contributions requested by the hospital were not fully justified or compliant with CIL regulations and the reasons for this were complex; notwithstanding any issues about justification the RDUH had not requested contributions on this occasion;
- South West Water had commented but raised no issues and confirmed that works planned by them would ensure that adequate foul sewerage capacity would exist; and
- officers accepted that VBC did apply therefore the 83 affordable housing units would be superseded and untenable. 61 would therefore be policy compliant and the applicant had acknowledged that they accepted the methodology.

The Strategic Director for Place responded to members' questions in the following terms:

- the local plan examination had heard the reasons for the police vacating the site, being that it was no longer fit for purpose and they wished to move to a new headquarters;
- the information before the committee was that upon which a decision must be made and speculation could not be made about what might happen in the future with regard to the five year land supply;
- having an adopted local plan would strengthen the council's position in relation to housing supply. The contribution that the 813 units proposed would make to housing supply was significant. The government approach has also changed such that a 20% buffer would need to be included in the housing land supply calculation going forward. This may make it more difficult to achieve a five year land supply;
- compared to the original application, which was an outline application with landscaping reserved, the landscaping proposed was significantly better;
- height references were likely in relation to Above Ordinance Datum(AOD), with regard to street scene rather than building height;
- there had been discussions about the collection of S106 planning obligations towards the Royal Devon University Hospital in future. These had arrived at a suitable position and had put this to the planning inspector for the local plan; and
- in future s106 and CIL contributions toward health infrastructure would be considered on a site-by-site basis in accordance with CIL test regulations but the authority would await the outcome of the local plan examination.

Councillor Mitchell moved, and the Chair, Councillor Knott, seconded the recommendation.

It was proposed by Councillor Jobson and seconded by Councillor Ketchin that the following amendment be made:

1) the words "agreed by the Head of City Development, in consultation with the Chair, under delegated authority" under the heading of "Affordable Housing" close to the top of page 43 of the report be replaced with "as per the letter from the applicant today: 60 units of Affordable Private Rent plus a contribution of £10,179.86, or 61 units of Affordable Private Rent"

On a vote, the amendment was CARRIED unanimously.

Following a unanimous vote the recommendation as set out in the report and amended was CARRIED.

RESOLVED to:

a) delegate to the Head of City Development to GRANT permission subject to completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as set out in the report and amended; and

b) REFUSE permission for the reasons set out below if the legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) is not completed by 01 December 2026 or such extended time as agreed in writing by the Head of City Development:

In the absence of a Section 106 legal agreement in terms that are satisfactory to the Local Planning Authority being completed within an appropriate timescale, and which makes provision for obligations to address the matters identified as being required in Part a) of the recommendation set out within this report, the proposal is contrary to Exeter Core Strategy 2012 Objectives 3, 6 and 10, and policies CP7, CP10 and CP18, and Exeter City Council Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2014.

4 REPRESENTATION ON PLANNING MEMBER WORKING GROUP 2026-27

The committee discussed representation on the Planning Member Working Group and following advice from the Solicitor eight members put their names forward as detailed below:

Councillor Cookson (Chair)
Councillor Baker
Councillor Chelvanayagam
Councillor Hussain
Councillor Jobson
Councillor Ketchin
Councillor Knott
Councillor Mitchell, M

5 LIST OF DECISIONS MADE AND WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

The Chair invited questions or comments but none were raised.

The report of the Strategic Director for Place was noted.

6 APPEALS REPORT

The report of the Strategic Director for Place was noted.

(The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 7.26 pm)

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

STRATEGIC SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

4 June 2026

Present:
Councillor Brian Rappert (Chair)
Councillors Begley, Darling, Haigh, Harding, Miller-Boam, Mitchell, K, Moore and Payne

Present as substitute:
Councillors Chelvanayagam and Cookson

Apologies:
Councillors Wetenhall and Williams

Present as Portfolio Holder:
Councillors Atkinson, Bialyk and Pole

In Attendance:
Head of Service - City Centre and Net Zero, Team Lead - Property, Planning & Non-Contentious and Democratic Services Manager

1 **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 April 2026 were taken as read, approved and signed by the Chair as correct.

2 **Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made by Members.

3 **Questions from Members of the Public Under Standing Order No.19**

There were no questions submitted by the public.

4 **Questions from Members of the Council Under Standing Order No.20**

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was submitted by Councillor Moore in relation to the Portfolio of the Leader of the Council who attended the meeting.

Question
Devon County Council have set up a scrutiny committee for local government reorganisation - will the administration support the setting up of a scrutiny committee for the 5 stages of LGR as set out in the Centre for scrutiny guidance: Scrutiny and local government reorganisation - a practice guide - CfGS?

Response
"MHCLG has produced comprehensive guidance that sets out how it expects local areas to establish Transitional Governance Arrangements for LGR. This includes the establishment of Joint Committees who will have statutory responsibilities for overseeing the first phase of transition (decision to shadow council election) which will be set out in the underpinning Structural Change (SCO) order. Both the MHCLG guidance and the SCO are clear that predecessor (sovereign) council's role is to

maintain business as usual during all transition phases. The establishment of the transitional governance arrangements combined with the existing scrutiny structure will enable effective scrutiny of BaU services and transitional arrangements as advised by the Centre for Scrutiny Guidance."

Supplementary Question and Response
In a supplementary question Councillor Moore asked what sort of scrutiny would be helpful and the Leader responded stating that all member briefings such as the one held earlier the same week gave all members of the council a chance to hear reports and ask questions and that this was an inclusive process ahead of the inception of a shadow authority.

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was submitted by Councillor Moore in relation to the Portfolio of the Leader of the Council who attended the meeting.

Question
The City Wall in St Bartholomew's Cemetery has had Herras fencing along it for years. What outcomes are there of any monitoring that is taking place of the stability of the wall, and what action is the council taking to prepare for its repair so the fencing can be removed?

Response
"The Heras fencing and the associated section of the City Wall is checked on a monthly basis by one of the Council's Assets Surveyors and whilst there are concerns over the stability of the wall, there has been no notable deterioration observed as part of the ongoing inspection process.
Works to fully address the structural issues requires the consolidation of loose masonry, underpinning, and the installation of steel rods and ties to stabilise the wall. All works would be subject to approved design and Scheduled Monument Consent. These works are extensive and are currently estimated to cost in the region of £250,000.
Members will be aware that similar structural issues exist at other points of the City Wall and, for areas where pedestrian footfall is highest, these areas need to be prioritised for repair ahead of the St Bartholomew's Cemetery site. Most recently, a large section of the City Wall was repaired in Bartholomew Street East (City Gate)."
Supplementary Question and Response
In a supplementary question Councillor Moore asked when this work would be carried out and the Leader responded stating that this would be a large capital project which it was intended to carry out when funds allowed and with the new capital monitoring the Strategic Management Board would bring works forward.

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was submitted by Councillor Moore in relation to the Portfolio of the Councillor Patrick who was not in attendance and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Bialyk responded.

Question
The consideration of the Mary Arches Planning application relied heavily on the London Local plan policy for co-living. The policy in the emerging plan is scant compared to that. In the last year the administration committed to bring forward a co-living policy for this council to use - will that policy be developed this year?

Response
"The City Council has previously suggested the need for a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to cover co-living. However, further clarity has been provided by the

Government on the future of SPDs as part of widespread planning reforms. It is now clear that it is not possible for Councils to adopt new SPDs after 30 June 2026. On this basis, it will no longer be possible to produce an SPD on co-living. An alternative would be to produce co-living guidance for development management purposes. The City Council would look to do this after the adoption of the Exeter Plan which is scheduled in March 2027. This timing would mean that the final text of the co-living element of the Exeter Plan would be known in advance of preparing the guidance."

In a supplementary question Councillor Moore asked if any preliminary work would be undertaken before 2027 and the Leader responded that he would like to see this but there may be a resource issue as the Planning officers were working on the plan.

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was submitted by Councillor Moore in relation to the Portfolio of the Councillor Patrick who was not in attendance and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Bialyk responded.

Question

Please can you set out the Councils' position on allowing the operators of Purpose Built Student Accommodation to use this accommodation for Air BNB, if it has not been specifically approved as part of the planning application?

Response
"Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) is typically approved as a *sui generis* use specifically for student occupation, often secured through planning conditions or legal agreements. The use of such accommodation for short-term letting (including AirBnB or similar) would normally fall outside that approved use unless it has been expressly authorised as part of the planning permission."

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was submitted by Councillor Chelvanayagam in relation to the Portfolio of the Councillor Pole who was in attendance.

Question
For each of the council operations, to what extent is adaptation to the impact of climate change being considered and costed?

Response
"As my predecessor reported on 11 September 2025 the Net Zero team attend the Devon, Cornwall & Isles of Scilly Climate Impacts Group, where adaptation measures and progress are discussed. The Net Zero Risk Register had been expanded to cover adaptation measures to support service delivery and to protect our communities in Exeter. This supported our People strategy, with Intended Outcomes that Communities would be more resilient and Exeter would be a safe and thriving city with great things to see and do for everyone.
The 22 January 2026 Executive Committee resolved to consider strengthening the Climate Action Plan by adding an Adaptation and Resilience plan.
The June Exeter Partnership Climate and Nature Group meeting earlier this week focused on adaptation for Exeter, and the team are following up with attendees on ways to deliver tangible outcomes on adaptation.
Today I attended the SWEEG (SW Environment and Energy Group) and Adaptation is one of three sprints being worked on by the Devon Emergency Partnership. They are looking at adaptation indicators, they are "getting there" and meeting soon to finalise the adaptation indicators.
Through our membership of SWEEG, an adaptation strategy is being developed for Devon, which will be adapted for each District Council including Exeter City Council.

From this, we will be able to develop plans for City Council services, in being prepared for the increasing risks posed by climate change, as well as identifying new opportunities.
Partnership work through Devon Community Resilience Forum, Devon Communities Together, SWEEG are all examples of actions in line with the Climate Resilient Devon Cornwall and Isles of Scilly action plan action point HBEC3.
The emerging Exeter Plan does provide a clear policy direction on climate resilience and adaptation, including through policies on adaptive and resilient development, flood risk, green infrastructure, biodiversity net gain and urban greening. This includes:
NEB5 Exeter Plan Climate Change Vision.
D1: Design principles (Strategic policy),
Policies CC1: "Net zero Exeter (Strategic policy)" including Biodiversity Net Gain and CC7: "Development that is adaptive and resilient to climate change" (updated per EVB-CC-11),
S1: Spatial strategy (Strategic policy)
S2: Liveable Exeter Principles (Strategic policy)
NE4: Green infrastructure (Strategic policy)
and the Biodiversity Duty Report.
We are in the early stages of developing our wider approach in areas such as Biodiversity Net Gain delivery, though further work is required and planned.
The Environment Agency's representation to the Exeter Plan states 'In our view the plan is achievable yet ambitious and, whilst promoting sustainable growth, vibrancy and a thriving economy, emphasises the inherent need for restoring and enhancing its environment by promoting a nature-rich, climate resilient and adaptable city"
Adaptation is still at an early stage across many service areas. Some services are considering and adapting to extreme weather conditions to ensure staff and building users are not put at risk. Housing is continuing with increasing the energy efficiency of our homes through a self-delivered retrofit programme, we are decarbonising the Riverside Leisure Centre and increasingly planting climate ready plants, for example at St Sidwell's Point and at The Gardens in Whipton. Once the Devon Climate Partnership have finalised their measures Exeter City Council will be in a position to use these same measures and we are waiting for them to progress their work so that we can make further progress at the Exeter level."

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was submitted by Councillor Chelvanayagam in relation to the Portfolio of the Councillor Pole who was in attendance.

Question

By making the language of net zero and adaptation accessible, what can we as a council do to help residents prepare for change, build resilience, and help future proof our communities and environment? What are your plans to communicate clearly and simply to residents, the risks, the impacts, and the benefits of climate adaptations?

Response

"Over the previous six months we have increased our climate and nature communications with residents, links to recent news features will be included in the minutes.

As part of the Devon Climate Partnership, the City Council has been involved in recent discussions on communicating about climate and adaptation issues. Our communications team will be sharing additional messages, stories, and advice from the Devon Climate Emergency across our social channels in the coming months.

- Exeter residents urged to be 'weather ready' during the heatwave - Exeter City Council News
- Give your views on how nature can thrive in Exeter - Exeter City Council News

Winter energy saving campaign to encourage people to save on bills - Exeter City Council News"

The current ECC "Climate Emergency" web page signposts e.g. Flood Hub, and to the Devon Climate Emergency website where there are adaptation learning resources aimed at adults and children, and our partnership work supports the Climate Resilience Devon Cornwall and Isles of Scilly action plan action HBEA2. I am discussing with the team ideas initiated by the previous PFH and have had some informal discussions with the team earlier today, with a view to having further meetings to discuss.

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was submitted by Councillor Moore in relation to the Portfolio of the Councillor Ruth Williams who was not in attendance and the Leader answered in her absence.

Question
Now that the technology has been upgraded please can the scrutiny meetings to broadcast via the Councils usual Youtube channel enable transparency and accountability on the issues discussed here?

Response

"We are currently working with Strata to develop our capacity to stream more meetings that take place in Rennes. We will work with the portfolio holder to develop a timescale for this and communicate it to members."

In a supplementary question Councillor Moore asked if there was a timescale and the Leader responded that he would ask the Portfolio Holder and Chief Executive.

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was submitted by Councillor Moore in relation to the Portfolio of the Councillor Pole who was in attendance.

Question
In the Costed organisational footprint report (in link) please can you tell us when the business as usual/ Positive Current Trajectory (PCT) measures are expected to (LGR aside) achieve net zero for the Council's Operations?

Response
"We commissioned SWEEG to develop the costed Carbon Reduction Plan to 2030 and not beyond, as a result we do have data beyond 2030 for the 3 scenarios. The only exception was for PV where 2030, 2040 and 2050 were used as a reference to complete all PV installations by."

Measure	BAU Scenario	Mid Scenario	Max Scenario
Domestic PV installation	**Install PV on all suitable homes by 2050** – 70 homes a year	**Install PV on all suitable homes by 2040** – 111 homes a year	**Install PV on all suitable homes by 2030** – 269 homes a year

In discussing this with SWEEG, the further you go into the future, the less accurate the modelling becomes due to technology and data improvements."

In a supplementary question Councillor Moore asked if the Portfolio Holder was contact with the BAU position and what actions could be taken to make further progress. Councillor Pole responded that she was not satisfied but that this was a positive trajectory compared to other authorities and that the research and papers from SWEEG had been cutting edge and innovative. She added that actions identified by officers would be embedded into departmental plans and as portfolio holder she would challenge and scrutinise and push for faster delivery where possible.

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was put by Councillor Darling in relation to the Portfolio of the Councillor Patrick who was in not attendance and the Leader responded in her place.

Question
Is the Portfolio Holder content with following the guidelines which dictate the size of co-living accommodation or were they looking to deliver something better?

Response
This issue was sui generis and the Council would try to get the best possible outcome for the city. Developers were entitled to make a profit and guidance was needed as co-living was an alternative for some people. We don't ask those who live there and it would be good to hear their voice.

Councillor Darling stated that she would welcome consultation with residents of co-living and the Leader responded that co-living could be useful and the Council had a duty to ensure it was appropriate, especially when it may be allocated to people on the housing list but it was clear that it would not be suitable for families.

5 **Working Towards Net Zero - Exeter City Council's Corporate Carbon Footprint Report and Carbon Reduction Action Plan Progress Report**

The Head of Service City Centre and Net Zero presented the report making the following points:

- the carbon reduction plan had been presented and approved at the Executive in March;
- the plan had been developed from the report published by the University of Exeter, which was the first of its kind for a local authority and covered scope 1 and 2 emissions;
- the plan was a live document and would be reviewed every six months;
- grant funding was important in delivery and where grant funding hadn't been secured for projects they represented future ambition;
- section 4.9 provided a highlight of current and recently completed projects;
- project delivery groups would be required for major projects as delivery was dependent on several services working collaboratively as had been the case for the Riverside Leisure Centre decarbonisation project;
- early discussions with Heads of Service on the prioritisation of projects would be required in order to avoid capacity issues;
- promotion of completed projects both internally and externally would be useful to highlight the impact on cost and carbon savings;

- additional benefits brought by delivery of the Carbon Reduction Plan were cost savings to the running of council buildings, energy cost savings to council tenants, healthier and more comfortable homes and buildings, biodiversity enhancement, improved health for workers and residents and decarbonisation work; and
- the next update would include carbon emissions saved for each project on the table seen on page 25.

The Head of Service City Centre and Net Zero responded to questions from Members in the following terms:

- the air source heat pump trial was not underway as yet;
- tree planting plans for this year were not confirmed as yet;
- lessons had been learnt from cavity wall insulation in the private sector and problematic types would not be used;
- solar panels would not be placed on the parts of the Wonford Community Centre which were to be demolished;
- percentages would be included in the next iteration of the report where previously some areas included snapshot figures;
- there was an element of procurement included in section 5 in relation to Scope 3 which showed improvement each year;
- delivery of the action plan was not only to reduce carbon emissions, there may also be cost savings. Retrofit of social housing had cost benefits but the relationship hadn't been determined yet but would form part of future updates;
- Riverside Leisure Centre decarbonisation was a major project with replacement of the roof to enable an air source heat pump to be installed. The project manager would be working with the appointed provider to ensure least impact on service delivery during the works;
- in order to scale the installation of cavity wall and loft insulation external grant funding would be required but a more detailed response would be sought from the Housing service;
- a written response would be provided regarding which plants or where hydrogenated vegetable oil to replace diesel would come from as well as the carbon cost of delivery of fuel;
- the project to install solar PV panels on page 19 had been through a procurement process and work was due to begin imminently;
- a response would be given outside the meeting regarding those sites which did not have covered cycle storage and when it might be installed;
- collaborative work with housing associations would come under City Wide net zero programme of work rather than corporate net zero, discussions were yet to commence but were on the programme;
- action was focussed on tree planting rather than other greening solutions but the team were working with Parks and Open Spaces teams on climate-ready; and
- other biodiversity activity could be included in future reports.

During discussion Members made the following points:

- the importance of any new authority continuing this work;
- the investment plan would be seen as part of the annual budget-setting process; and
- a risk in delivery of the costed carbon reduction plan was availability of funding.

The Chair moved the recommendations as set out in the report, seconded by Councillor Payne which was CARRIED unanimously.

Councillor Moore noted concern that the extent to which the plan would contribute towards the 2030 net zero objective.

6 **Scrutiny Annual Report**

Councillor Cookson presented the report in the absence of Councillor Matthew Williams, Chair of the Scrutiny Programme Board. Councillor Cookson had been a member of the Board.

During discussion members' made the following points:

- it would be useful to speak to officers to see what they found useful about presenting to scrutiny committees and whether any changes could be made;
- learning from officers during budget scrutiny sessions had been helpful for the Customer Focus Scrutiny committee;
- measurement of improvements as a result of scrutiny could be included in the report with attention drawn to communication with petitioners;

Councillor Cookson informed members that this was the second report of this type and that feedback from members of the two scrutiny committees had been included for the first time in this report.

The Chair moved the recommendations as set out in the report, seconded by Councillor Moore, which following a unanimous vote were CARRIED.

7 **Legislative timetable update regarding Community Land Trusts**

The Team Lead – Property, Planning and Non-Contentious presented the briefing note making the following points:

- Community Land Trusts were one tool which could be used to obtain land and the ways in which this could be done had changed recently;
- the changes were set out in the briefing note as well as the implications for the council; and
- Assets of Community Value had been in place for just over a decade and the council received one or two per year but this was likely to increase as the definition expanded.

The Team Lead – Property, Planning and Non-Contentious responded to members' questions in the following terms:

- the Act had passed into law but the provisions had not yet come into force and regulations were awaited;
- changes to the Localism Act had not yet come into force and regulations had yet to be consulted upon;
- the Community Asset Transfer policy dealt with Council assets and how they transfer whereas Assets of Community Value may not belong to the Council;
- members of a community could nominate buildings or land as Assets of Community Value which could include council-owned assets but could be sporting assets, pubs or ski slopes, for example.
- becoming an Asset of Community Value was subject to statutory tests;
- Community Land Trusts would see groups or organisations becoming the recipient of land;
- a timescale for the regulations coming into force could not be given at this stage;
- regarding associated costs, some detail would follow in the regulations but it was likely that some involvement from officers would be necessary, including payment for evaluation and officer time;

- the current scheme of delegation allowed the Estates Team to make decisions in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder, meaning that there was member involvement. A review of a decision to nominate land/building as an Asset of Community Value could only requested by the landowner; and
- the Right to Bid was only a right to bid, the landowner could still decide not to sell but changes to Right to Buy would mean they would be locked in to sell and the regulations would bring about this change.

8 **Forward Plan of Business and Scrutiny Work Plan**

Members commented on the work plan.
Suggestions were made to move items and to hold an additional meeting with a focus on the Local Plan and that the issues in the Rivers Transparency Template be referred to the Harbour Board.

Following a unanimous vote the draft Scrutiny Work Plan as submitted and amended was **AGREED.**

The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 7.38 pm

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

EXETER HARBOUR BOARD

Thursday 11 June 2026

Present

Councillor Williams, R (Chair)
Councillors Cookson, Payne, Reed and Smith

External Members

Prescott, Rhodes, Berkley and Temple

Apologies

The Right Worshipful The Lord Mayor Councillor Rolstone and Lt Col David Marino

Also Present

Head of Service Operations, Harbour Master Exeter Port Authority, Waterways Team Manager, Democratic Services Officer and Harbour Patroller and Democratic Services Officer (JM)

1 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the meetng of the Exeter Harbour Board held on 18 March 2026 were taken as read, approved, and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made by Members.

3 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

The Chair advised that no questions from members of the public had been received.

4 **CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chair welcomed the new members of the Harbour Board, both Councillors and external and gave thanks to the Councillors and external board members that had served on the Exeter Harbour Board the previous year.

The Chair provided an update on the A379 bridge replacement and advised that she had written to Devon County Council following the previous meeting of the Exeter Harbour Board in March, and that this letter would be appended to the minutes.

5 **HARBOUR REVISION ORDER UPDATE**

The Chair read a statement that had been provided by Ashfords LLP:
"Each individual or organisation that submitted a response to the formal consultation will receive a response letter from Ashfords LLP on behalf of the Council. There are c.500 letters which will need to be sent, and the majority are expected to be send by the end of the next week. The letters will be clear that is a response is not received within 6 weeks, all correspondence will be passed on to the Marine Management Organisation for consideration."

6 **EXETER PORT ADVISORY GROUP UPDATE**

The Chair advised that the Chair of the Exeter Port Advisory Group was not present, but his update was included in the agenda pack.

7 **SOUTH WEST WATER PRESENTATION**

The Head of Local Government Affairs, South West Water (SWW), gave a presentation on water quality, resilience, storm overflow, and pollution, net zero, and environmental net gains.

He outlines South West Water's statutory planning requirements, including the water resources management plan and the waste water management plan, both of which considered climate change, population change, local development plans, demand, supply, and the capacity of existing assets.

Members heard that the majority of Exeter's water supply came from Wimbleball, with some water also taken from the Otter Valley. South West water was also planning additional reservoir capacity at Cheddar, which would support water supplies across a wider area. It was noted that significant additional water resources would be required by 2040.

Members were advised that the Environment Agency data described the state of the environment and informed required improvements. The current status for the relevant catchment was described as moderate, with the aim of moving water bodies towards good status. South West Water's investment programme included approximately £140 million in the Exeter area, with legally binding schemes to address issues including storm overflows, shellfish waters and bathing water protection.

The Head of Local Government Affairs (SWW) answered questions from Members in the following terms:

- water quality requirements were legally binding and signed off by the Environment Agency;
- only four schemes had not been delivered in the previous year;
- projects were set jointly with the Environment Agency and were based on discharge, quality, volume and the condition of the water environment;
- information on work carried out was publicly available through the Devon East Management Catchment;
- odour issues at Countess Wear were affected by the site location and weather conditions;
- discussions had taken place with Environmental Heal on odour issues; and
- published data was independent Environment Agency data and was

collected by automatic water quality monitors that took readings every 15 minutes.

Members were advised that there was a dedicated email address that could be used by elected Members to contact South West Water.

The Chair thanked the Head of Local Government Affairs (SWW) and confirmed that the slides would be appended to the minutes.

8 EXE ESTUARY MANAGEMENT PARTNERSHIP PRESENTATION

The Exe Estuary Management Partnership (EEMP) delivered a presentation to the Board to update on the work that was being carried out. It was highlighted that the estuary was culturally and socially important and attracted significant interest. This updated approach was intended to simplify previous arrangements and to provide greater flexibility.

The EEMP supported the work of other organisations and promoted collaborative, evidence-based decision making. It was described as a strategic and coordinated framework for cooperation between statutory bodies and partner organisations. The objectives included improving collaboration, reducing adverse impacts and supporting activity that was economically viable and social beneficial.

It was noted that EEMP did not override or replace legal duties, but helped organisations meet legislative requirements. The governance framework explained roles, responsibilities and decision-making principles, and provided a process for organisations to work together and manage potential conflicts.

The Process Triangle identified procedure, substance, and relationships as key elements in addressing environmental issues. The governance structure was not expected to change significantly, with the Partnership Committee, Forum, and Facilitation Group continuing to support the overall partnership arrangements.

The Forum provided opportunities to celebrate and promote the estuary, and support local priorities. A celebration event was being considered for November and education sessions were being offered in schools.

Work on estuary access and safety included a water users' survey, signage audit and biosecurity plan. Coastal coordination work was being led through the Coastal Partnerships Network, including case studies and monitoring evaluation.

In response to questions from Members, the Marine, Estuaries and Coastal Officer, and the Marine, Estuaries and Coastal Support Officer provided the following answers:

- they were open to any form of collaboration with Councillors;
- school sessions were delivered to primary schools for students in years three and four;
- they were currently trialling activities for Natural England; and
- the next Forum meeting was scheduled for mid to late November.

The Chair thanked the Marine, Estuaries and Coastal Officer, and the Marine, Estuaries and Coastal Support Officer for their presentation.

9 **PORT MARINE AND FACILITIES SAFETY CODE MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES**

The Harbour Master advised Members that:

- the Designated Person's report was almost complete and would be discussed with Duty Holders and the members of the Harbour Board;
- agreement had been reached that the MARNIS system would be used for risk assessments;
- work was ongoing to determine which assessments would remain shoreside and which would move to MARNIS;
- a presentation had been received from ABPmer; and
- stakeholder involvement was continuing.

10 **HARBOUR MASTER'S REPORT**

The Harbour Master updated Members on operational matters, including proposed work at Topsham in response to a build-up of silt. It was noted that heavy rainfall had contributed to the build-up and that movement of the silt was being considered.

Members were advised that two abandoned boats had already been dealt with this year, and that if successful the Harbour Revision Order would assist in preventing future abandonment.

A temporary licence had been granted for a pontoon at Topsham Quay. This would be used for passengers travelling to the Turf Locks pub and by Stuart Line Cruises. The pontoon was also able to be used by members of the public.

In response to a question on the pontoon the Harbour Master advised Members that as the pontoon would not be fixed to the Quay, planning permission was not required.

The Waterways Team Manager explained to Members that the Canal and Topsham Quay had two different systems for delivering electric, and that the technology was outdated and being retrofit.

The Chair expressed thanks to the Waterways staff for their contribution to the report, which provided a clear overview of activity across the area of responsibility.

11 **STATUTORY HARBOUR AUTHORITY STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS**

The Board received the statement of accounts for information. It was noted that the information had been extracted from a report to Council.

In response to a question from Councillor J Reed, regarding transport costs and the reported overspend, the Harbour Master advised that this included vehicle costs and that a more in-depth response would be provided outside of the meeting.

(The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 7.00 pm)

Chair

CUSTOMER FOCUS SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

18 June 2026

Present:
Councillor Adrian Fullam (Chair)
Councillors Wardle, Hussain, Knott, Richards, Snow, Terry and Williams, N

Apologies:
Councillors Banyard and Rappert

Also present:
Head of Service – Finance, Head of Service – Customers and Communities and Democratic Services Manager

In attendance as Portfolio Holder:
Councillors Atkinson, Bialyk, Findlay, Williams, R. and Wood

1 **Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on the 22 January 2026 and 19 March 2026 were taken as read and signed by the Chair as correct.

2 **Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made by Members.

3 **Public Surveys**

The Head of Service – Customers and Communities presented a brief update making the following points:

- that he wanted to clarify what the committee wanted from the report later in the year;
- in March 2026 Council agreed the consultation and engagement strategy which included provision for an annual report which would include information from surveys;
- Engage Exeter went live in 2023 since which nine surveys had been carried out, two were live now regarding the city centre and cultural strategies. Over 3000 responses from residents had been received with the top surveys being Wild Exeter, the current Cultural with over 500 responses and the Neighbourhood CIL survey with over 300 responses; and
- levels of reach and participation, accessibility, inclusivity and how consultation has informed decision making would all be included in the annual report.

The Head of Service – Customers and Communities responded to a question from a member stating that co-creation would take place for future surveys.

The Chair stated that the annual report would provide a good overview and members' could look before the next meeting and clarify any further detail required.

4 **Questions from the Public under Standing Order No. 19**

There were no questions submitted by members of the public.

5 **Questions from Members of the Council under Standing Order No. 20**

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was submitted by Councillor Terry in relation to the Portfolio of Councillor Ruth Williams who attended the meeting. The question was circulated at the meeting to Members of the Committee. The response of the Portfolio Holder is set out below:

Question: Brown bin collections contribute well to out waste income stream and contribute to our recycling rates. Could we increase the use of this service? What barriers deter residents subscribing to brown bins?

Response: The garden waste service has been actively promoted over recent years, rising from 8,238 taking up the service in 2022/23 to 12,381 customers being part of the service as of the 31 March 2026. The service in their presentation to Customer Scrutiny in March 2026 set out their communications plans which needs to cover all waste streams that contribute to Exeter's recycling rate. In line with this plan, promotion of the garden waste service took place at the start of the garden waste season with a press release issued on 6 March 2026, an e bulleting circulated to subscribers on 14 March 2026 and a prominent article in the spring edition of the Exeter Citizen informing residents of the service. In addition to this, social media channels including the service's own Denis the Dustcart are used to promote the garden waste service.

Exeter, being an urban area, means that a significant percentage of its 61,810 properties do not have gardens unlike our rural neighbours. In addition, we are a city that can pride itself in producing one of the lowest amounts of waste per head of the household than other parts of England. Those residents who choose not to take up the service can be for a variety of reasons including having effective home composters, wormeries or preferring to take their waste to one of the two household waste recycling centres as and when they produce garden waste. However, our cost-effective garden waste collection service provides a reliable collection service for the keen gardeners of the city that take up the service between February and November each year.

In a supplementary question Councillor Terry ask if a concession might be offered where the cost of a brown bin was prohibitive and Councillor Ruth Williams responded stating that the cost was at the lower end of what was charged by others and a smaller bin was available as well as disposable sacks which worked out at £3.50 each as well as the free option for residents to take their garden waste to one of the two centres and this was working well currently.

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was submitted by Councillor Terry in relation to the Portfolio of Councillor Ruth Williams who attended the meeting. The question was circulated at the meeting to Members of the Committee. The response of the Portfolio Holder is set out below:

Question: I welcome the promise of Cllr Williams (in the minutes from last meeting) to update Heavitree councillors of any issues and delays with the Heavitree Splash Pools – what are the reasons for current delay in re-opening, and how will you keep ward Councillors better informed – before it goes out in a press release?

Response: Officers and operational teams made every effort to bring the Heavitree Splash Pools back into use this season. However, significant issues were identified, including a persistent leak causing the loss of over a third of the water overnight and a blown pump. While these were being managed, the sand filtration system suffered a sudden and terminal failure, with replacement costs exceeding c.£19,000. Given the planned redevelopment, repair timescales, and the fact the existing plant cannot be reused, this was not considered a cost-effective use of public funds. The decision has therefore been taken not to reopen the current facility, with officers instead prioritising delivery of the new splash facility, with works due to commence imminently. Officers will proactively engage ward members where there are substantive and determined operational impacts on service delivery, recognising this may not always be possible in fast-moving situations.

In a supplementary question Councillor Terry asked if ward councillors could be contacted earlier as she had received information via the media which Councillor Ruth Williams noted and stated that she understood the importance of councillors being informed and that use of this facility affected a number of wards as many families used it.

Councillor Wood added that this had been a fast-moving situation and he could confirm that ward councillors were informed before a press release was issued.

In accordance with Standing Order No. 20, the following question was submitted by Councillor Terry in relation to the Portfolio of Councillor Duncan Wood who attended the meeting. The question was circulated at the meeting to Members of the Committee. The response of the Portfolio Holder is set out below:

Question: Please provide an update on the outcome of the Heavitree Park equipment renovation consultation.

Response: The Heavitree Park play area consultation is currently live (15 June–24 July 2026), so no outcomes are available yet. This consultation is taking a targeted, hyper-local approach to capture feedback from actual and potential users via on-site surveys, including gathering the views of children using the facilities. This builds on the 2021 citywide consultation by narrowing the focus to detailed use, barriers, and preferences, specifically to inform equipment choice and inclusive design. Latest results will shape the design brief for the development hoped for later this year.

In a supplementary question Councillor Terry asked how the consultation results would be managed in relation to the expectations of Pride in Place. Councillor Wood responded stating that Pride in Place detail was not yet known and it may be difficult to manage expectations but communications would be clear and provision of play areas would continue to the best ability within the funds available.

6 **Quarter 4 Budget Scrutiny**

The Head of Service – Finance presented the reports making the following points:

- that there had been a late revision to the Overview of the General Fund report ahead of its presentation to Council on 16 June, due to the Business Rates Pool;
- the reason for the changes had been that a schedule had been received from Plymouth regarding the Business Rate Pool, which materially affected the figures for closing 2025/26 but was mitigated in 2027/28 due to the way the Business Rates Pool operated;
- the section 151 officer was comfortable that the changes posed no issues to the Council's overall Medium Term Financial Plan;
- this was a report brought on behalf of all services across the council so it may be necessary to refer questions back to the relevant head of service;

- the Capital Monitoring report highlighted the challenges of spending in the capital programme as £5.5million had been spent rather than the planned £40million but the Strategic Asset Management Board were now actively reviewing the programme and there had been increased spend already in this financial year with the acquisition of the new recycling facility; and
- the outturn of the Housing revenue Account(HRA) was broadly in line with the in-year forecast with only two year-end variances to draw to Members attention; an underspend in respect of repairs and maintenance due to the time required to mobilise a new contract, which is requested to be carried forward as a supplementary budget in 2026/27 and there had been additional income from rental of housing stock due to a reduction in voids, in number and duration as well as a reduction in rent arrears.

The Head of Service – Finance responded to Members' questions in the following terms:

- the spend detailed on page 45 to bring an asset back to a serviceable condition was required under the original lease but she would feed back the suggestion that lease clauses were reviewed in relation to reinstatement; and
- an update on the restructure of the assets team and any tangible benefits would be obtained from the relevant Head of Service and reported back to Members.

In response to a question the Chair advised the committee that the Strategic Director for Corporate Resources had advised on the best time to schedule scrutiny of the budget.

Following a unanimous vote the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee noted the Quarter 4 Budget reports.

7 **Medium Term Financial Plan**

The Head of Service – Finance presented the report making the following points:

- the Medium Term Financial Plan was last presented to Council in February as part of approving the 2026/27 budget and covered up to 2028/9 due to the three-year settlement from government;
- the outcome of the fair funding review meant a balanced budget could be set but a saving would be required next year;
- a pay award indication had been received which was 0.8% higher than that budgeted for, an extra £0.25million;
- the year end position had been finalised for the General Fund which was set to benefit from additional business rate income however, this would not be received until the next financial year but was within the Medium Term Financial Plan(MTFP);
- it was possible to set aside funds to support Local Government Reorganisation transition and negate the need to find £1million in savings as well as mitigate the higher pay award; and
- the MTFP was in a healthy position and the section 151 officer was comfortable with the position as Exeter City Council came to an end and a new authority began.

The Head of Service – Finance responded to questions in the following terms:

- any over or underspends in 2025/26 were reflected in the latest MTFP; and
- there would be movement to and from the Council's reserves but the General Fund working balance would not fall below that which was prudent. A risk-

based method of calculation was used to inform the minimum level of reserves; and

- if Members subsequently made decisions to spend additional monies identify compensating savings would need to be identified.

Following a unanimous vote the Customer Focus Scrutiny Committee noted the report.

8 **Scrutiny Annual Report**

The report of the Scrutiny Programme Board was deferred as the Chair, Councillor Matthew Williams was not present.

9 **Petition: Little Exeter**

The Chair informed the committee that the petitioner had chosen not to present their petition to the committee as a similar business was due to open in the unit vacated by Little Exeter.

A member commented that it was a shame that Little Exeter wasn't able to continue but was happy to see that a similar facility would soon open.

The committee noted that the petition had been received.

10 **Scrutiny Work Plan and Proposals Received**

Following a unanimous vote the plan as amended was **AGREED.**

The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 6.10 pm

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

EXECUTIVE

Monday 22 June 2026

Present:
Councillor Bialyk (Chair)
Councillors Williams, R, Atkinson, Findlay MBE, Patrick, Pole and Wood

Also present:
Chief Executive, Strategic Director for Corporate Resources, Legal Services Manager, Head of Service - Customers and Communities, Head of Service - Commercial Assets, Head of Service - Finance, Head of Service - Executive Office and Democratic Services Manager

1 **MINUTES**

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

The Leader welcomed Councillors Atkinson, Pole and Findlay to the Executive as new portfolio holders and also asked that the Anniversary of Windrush be marked as it had been by the raising of a flag at County Hall, which the Chief Executive had attended. The Leader remarked that as a city of sanctuary this showed diversity and that all were welcomed to the city. He also noted that it was disappointing for the Exeter Chiefs not to win but they had done well in reaching the final.

2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

3 **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER NO. 19**

No questions from members of the public had been received.

4 **MATTERS REFERRED BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

There were no matters referred by scrutiny committees for this meeting.

5 **CITIZENS ADVICE EXETER GRANT**

The Head of Service – Customers and Communities presented the report making the following points:

- if approved this award would be made under the General Grants Policy;
- this award would allow Citizens Advice Exeter to continue to provide general advice, free, independent, confidential, online, in-person and by telephone;
- the award would also allow Citizens Advice Exeter to recruit, train and supervise volunteers;
- this award would have a positive impact on people with protected characteristics; and
- the financial commitment was set out and officer time would be identified to oversee and monitor delivery.

During discussion Executive Members raised the following points and questions:

- the positive difference timely advice could make had been seen previously;
- how would the measuring of the outlined outcomes and outputs be reported back to Members';
- Citizens Advice Exeter had provided a lot of information which demonstrated the good work they do; and
- were the Council still supporting with rent.

In response to questions and points raised, the Head of Service – Customers and Communities advised:

- that the General Grants Policy outlined a series of measures which would be put into an agreement with Citizens Advice Exeter;
- regular reporting to the Portfolio Holder would take place as well as a report to the committee; and
- a decision to extend the reduced rent and service charge had been agreed.

Opposition group leaders raised the following points and questions:

- the report was welcomed and would provide continuity for Citizens Advice Exeter but would this help embed them within the budget of a unitary authority;
- Citizens Advice Exeter were to be thanked for their valuable work in the city;
- as the additional budget had been agreed at Council it was enquired as to whether this decision would need to return to Council?

The Chief Executive and Strategic Director for Corporate Resources responded to those points raised by opposition group leaders in the following terms:

- the purpose of the report was to continue support to Citizens Advice Exeter until the end of the life of this council. Any decision about the future council would be considered by the shadow authority and Citizens Advice Exeter should be encouraged to generate any further funding they could and the Council would support where possible; and
- this decision did not require to return to Council, the Executive could allocate funds agreed under delegated powers.

The Leader moved the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Ruth Williams which following a unanimous vote was CARRIED.

RESOLVED that:

The award of a grant of £150,000 (one hundred and fifty thousand pounds) to Citizens' Advice Exeter be awarded in two tranches, namely the sum of £75,000 for the financial year 2026 to 2027 and the sum of £75,000 for the financial year 2027 to 2028 be approved.

6 PARKING PLACES ORDER

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources presented the report making the following points:

- this was a request to amend and add to the Council's Parking Places Order (PPO) and undertake statutory consultation;
- there were two changes requested; one amendment and one addition;
- for Market Street Car Park, where NCP had been the leaseholders, the Council was the freeholder. NCP had ended the lease and handed back the keys and the Council would like to operate the car park;

- a proposal would be brought to Council in July to refurbish the Cathedral and Quay car park which had suffered anti-social behaviour for a number of years;
- in order to implement improvements to security and safety it was proposed to change from pay and display to pay on foot with the benefit that the car park would be staffed; and
- consulting on the amended PPO was a statutory requirement.

The Leader drew Members' attention to the fact that £100,000 to bring the car park back to serviceable use had been agreed at Council.

During discussion Members of the Executive raised the following points and questions:

- it was good to see the speed at which this matter had come forward;
- how long would it take to have the Order drawn up and in place;
- it was pleasing to see that existing equipment could be relocated and reused which would save money as well as improve sustainability;
- as the proposed system was the same as at the Guildhall would there be learning from issues encountered there; and
- both car parks played a vital role in the city centre cultural offer and it would be key to have them open beyond 8pm. Local businesses would be pleased as well as residents and visitors.

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources and Head of Service – Commercial Assets responded to the questions raised in the following terms:

- Market Street car park would be pay and display, utilising machines from Harlequins which would be closing imminently;
- the PPO was subject to statutory consultation; and
- the process would take eight to ten weeks and included advertisements in local press, receiving responses and responding to those.

Opposition group leaders raised the following points and questions:

- would the toilets in Market Street car park be reopened and would they be public or for the welfare of staff;
- as Market Street lay in a police city centre hot spot and had a history of ASB, had pay on foot been considered;
- it was questioned whether there was a chance of predetermination ahead of the Cathedral and Quay report coming to Council in July;
- as rent income could be lost from NCP, what income would the car park generate for the Council; and
- was payment required to NCP as had been the case for leaseholders elsewhere in the city.

In response to the questions raised by opposition group leaders, the Strategic Director for Corporate Resources and Head of Service – Commercial Assets made the following points:

- this report sought permission to consult, if after consultation Members' chose not to go ahead with the works then pay on foot would not be introduced which would not render Members predetermined;
- rent would have been £55,000 and the estimated income from the car park would be £425,000. Business rates and other costs would require to be paid but income would be substantially more than £55,000;
- there was nothing to pay to NCP as they had surrendered the lease rather than being asked to leave;

- the toilets would be a welfare facility within the car park. The intention would be to upgrade these alongside some office space to allow greater presence of car parking officers. The toilets would not be available to the public; and
- pay and display had been chosen following discussion with the car parking team. This was deemed the better option given the turnover of customers at the site coupled with the proposed enhanced on-site staffing arrangements.

The Leader moved the recommendations, seconded by Councillor Ruth Williams, which following a unanimous vote, were CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

(1) To amend the Parking Places Order 2014 as follows:

(a) To incorporate Market Street car park into the Council's Off-Street Parking Places Order as a 'Pay and Display' car park within the Central Zone parking tariff structure.
(b) In respect of the Cathedral & Quay multi storey car park, to introduce 'Pay on Foot' arrangements into the Council's Off-Street Parking Places Order.

(2) To delegate authority to consider the responses to the consultation and determine whether to implement the Order (or parts thereof) to the Head of Service Commercial Assets in consultation with the Strategic Director Corporate Resources and Leader of the Council.

7 CORPORATE DEBT MANAGEMENT POLICY

The Strategic Director for Corporate Resources presented the report making the following points:

- the Council had not previously had a single approach to debt management;
- there were many types of debt, including but not limited to council tax, business rates, housing rent, commercial rents and general sundry debt;
- this policy provided an overarching corporate debt management policy supported by service specific appendices;
- an internal audit report had driven this work but it was good practice to have a single policy in place.

During discussion Members of the Executive raised the following points and questions:

- this policy brought clarity;
- where possible automated and electronic methods were used rather than paper letters;
- had other methods of debt recovery been looked into as some people may ignore a brown envelope;
- was the Port Authority included;
- what difference to the Council's ability to chase council tax debt would the government proposals to increase the amount of time before action may be taken, a proposed increase from 3 weeks to 63 days;
- what steps would this policy make towards more pre-action work;
- this policy would bring consistency and fairness but how would it align with wider commitments to vulnerable residents;
- would there remain a way for those most vulnerable to make a human connection when handling their debt; and

- were households and businesses provided with clarity of payment terms in order to plan ahead and prevent debt in the first instance.

The Head of Service – Finance responded to questions from Members of the Executive in the following terms:

- electronic communications were used where possible but as customers weren't obliged, but were encouraged, to give an email address or telephone number this was not always possible. A service improvement included digital reminders via MyExeter;
- pathways detailed in the proposed policy reflected regulatory frameworks for each type of debt;
- Invoices relating to the Waterways Service were included in sundry debt;
- the proposed policy reflected current practice with a short review period suggested to take into account upcoming legislative changes and the team were currently appraising the impact these may have;
- regarding vulnerable customers the second recommendation would see ten Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) organisations approached who were likely to be advising vulnerable customers or those experiencing financial difficulties to seek their feedback and help ensure the policy provided clear guidance when dealing with vulnerable customers, supporting customers experiencing financial difficulty or problem debt; and
- council tax and business rates had instalments set out on the annual notices, rents were payable in line with tenancy agreements, commercial rents are payable in line with lease agreement and payment terms were included with all invoices for sundry debt.

An opposition group leader asked if this policy met internal audit requirements to which the Head of Service – Finance and Strategic Director for Corporate Resources responded in the following terms:

- the policy had been sent to South West Audit Partnership who were satisfied and had closed the relevant audit actions; and
- last year the annual audit opinion identified sundry debt and the management of as an organisational risk. Work had been undertaken which meant that this was no longer the case.

The Leader moved the recommendations, seconded by Councillor Ruth Williams which following a unanimous vote, were CARRIED.

RECOMMENDED:

(1) that Council approve the revised Corporate Debt Management Policy.

(2) to delegate authority to the Leader, Section 151 Officer and Portfolio Holder to agree amendments to the Policy after targeted engagement with the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector.

8 **CORPORATE PLAN ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT**

The Head of Service – Executive Office presented the report making the following points:

- this report was the first half yearly update against the Corporate Plan which had been agreed last year;
- there were a series of intended outcomes and measures against each of the five priorities set out in the Corporate Plan;
- the report provided a summary of the detail contained in the two appendices;

- it was positive that 85% of the measures were on track or exceeding target; and
- areas which were below target had plans in place to address them.

During discussion Members of the Executive raised the following points and questions:
- the work of the CCTV and Community Safety Teams was impressive, it was asked whether there were any ideas on how this could be shared more widely than internally;
- the report was well presented, and the traffic light system user friendly meaning portfolio holders could easily see their areas;
- could more information be provided regarding the red against Being a Welcoming and Inclusive city;
- there had been a drop in spend of ward grants, however, with six out of thirteen wards fully spent, was there any learning which could be shared in order that councillors could support those areas which were not spent;
- how would the council be taking forward the increase in the new homelessness prevention grant from government;
- whilst leisure services were discretionary it was important to maintain their performance and it was good to see how much this Council did over and above its statutory obligations;
- were funds for solar panels on leisure buildings and car parks from operational budgets or an investment which would lead to savings, leading to lower operating costs; and
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could be monitored through this report.

The Chief Executive, Strategic Director for Corporate Resources and Head of Service – Executive Office responded to questions and points raised by Members of the Executive in the following terms:
- learning from ward grant spend would be looked at outside the meeting by the Head of Service - Customers and Communities and Democratic Services Manager;
- how best to use the homelessness prevention grant would be addressed in consultation with the portfolio holder;
- whilst this report would be half yearly the Strategic Management Board would be monitoring on a quarterly basis to ensure focus was on the areas in need of attention;
- CIL was in place to deliver other strategic priorities and progress should be able to be monitored through key projects;
- Council had agreed a capital programme of funding for the solar panels which would be invest to save. The cost would more than be offset by that generated;
- ideas to celebrate what was contained in the report would be worked upon; and
- the inclusive city comments had been taken from the residents' survey and it was possible that the target had been set too high as there was an expectation of 5% improvement.

Opposition group Members raised the following points and questions:
- regarding page 127 of the report, were there any figures, particularly demographics or other known factors for those who felt unsafe at night;
- as the administration had moved away from the 2030 net zero ambition what were the current ambitions;
- the report was accessible and commentary on the right-hand side particularly useful;

- could links to portfolio holders be included in the report; and
- could change be shown as well as markers of current situation.

The Chief Executive responded to opposition group Members in the following terms:

- further detail would be provided with regard to safety at night;
- the Council had not moved away from the Net Zero 2030 ambition; and
- if helpful portfolio holders could be identified within future reports along with direction of travel.

The Leader stated that the Net Zero ambition had not changed.

The Leader moved the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Ruth Williams which following a unanimous vote, were CARRIED.

RESOLVED that the Executive notes the progress that has been made against the priorities and objectives in the Corporate Plan 2025-2028.

(The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 6.38 pm)

Chair

The decisions indicated will normally come into force 5 working days after publication of the Statement of Decisions unless called in by a Scrutiny Committee. Where the matter in question is urgent, the decision will come into force immediately. Decisions regarding the policy framework or corporate objectives or otherwise outside the remit of the Executive will be considered by Council on 21 July 2026.

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT TO COUNCIL

Date of Meeting: 21st July 2026

Report of: Strategic Director of Corporate Resources

Title: Cathedral & Quay MSCP – Refurbishment and Management Arrangements

Is this a Key Decision?

No

Is this an Executive or Council Function?

Council

1. What is the report about?

1.1 To seek a budget to deliver significant enhancement to the Cathedral & Quay Multi Storey Car Park to enable it to return to full use

2. Recommendations:

2.1 It is recommended that:
Council approves a £2,500,000 capital budget for undertaking the refurbishment and upgrade works at Cathedral and Quay MSCP funded through additional borrowing.

3. Reasons for the recommendations:

3.1 The refurbishment of this key commercial and economic asset will enable the entire car park to be returned into beneficial use thereby supporting the Council's economic objectives for the city centre.

4. What are the resource implications including non-financial resources:

4.1 The business case for refurbishment is predicated on increased utilisation and income recovery.

4.2 Borrowing £2.5m over 25 years will cost £195,000 a year.

4.3 Additional income is anticipated to be £157,000 initially rising to over £475,000 after three years. This will require the Council to ensure that the car park investment is protected through maintaining high standards and addressing issues promptly. It is anticipated that the Council will cover the costs of borrowing and the management agreement by year 3 at the latest.

5. Section 151 Officer comments:

5.1 The additional capacity will provide sufficient additional income to cover both the costs of borrowing the funds and the additional arrangements, therefore there is no long-term financial impact for Councillors to address.

For enquiries please contact: democratic.services@exeter.gov.uk

6. What are the legal aspects?

6.1 The provision of car parks by a local authority is a discretionary power pursuant to section 32(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ('the RTA').

6.2 Local authorities in England and Wales have statutory powers to borrow money, primarily governed by the Local Government Act 2003 (LGA 2003). Section 1 of the LGA 2003 provides that a local authority may borrow money for any purpose relevant to its functions under any enactment or for the prudent management of its financial affairs.

6.3 Local authorities must ensure that their borrowing is affordable and prudent, as outlined in the Prudential Code published by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy.

6.4 Works to refurbish Councill assets must be procured in accordance with the Procurement Act 2023 and Council's Procurement and Contract Procedures.

7. Monitoring Officer's comments:

7.1 Members will note the proposals concerning the refurbishment costs together with proposals for funding in relegation to the management of the car park. Members will particularly note the procurement requirements in relation to the construction works.

8. Equality Act 2010 (The Act)

8.1 In recommending this proposal no potential impact has been identified on people with protected characteristics as determined by the Act.

9. Carbon Footprint (Environmental) Implications:

9.1.1 The proposed upgrade works for Cathedral & Quay MSCP will enhance the asset's environmental and sustainability credentials primarily through the replacement of existing mechanical and electrical systems and associated ventilation infrastructure.

10. Report details:

10.1 Capital Enhancements to the Car Park

Cathedral and Quay MSCP is a strategically important city-centre asset supporting Exeter's historic core, the Quayside economy, retail activity and the evening economy.

The car park has experienced a prolonged period of decline, characterised by:

- Limited on-site management presence
- Entrenched anti-social behaviour, vandalism and misuse
- Closure of upper decks, reducing capacity and passive surveillance
- Poor public perceptions of safety and attractiveness
- Reduced utilisation levels

The above circumstances have initiated a self-reinforcing cycle of decline, where poor supervision and management practice enables anti-social behaviour which in turn suppresses demand, encouraging further anti-social behaviour and revenue loss.

Approval is sought from Council for a £2.5m refurbishment programme to improve the physical condition, safety/compliance and appearance of the car park. While this investment is necessary, evidence indicates that capital refurbishment alone is unlikely to reverse the decline without addressing the underlying management and operational challenges which have contributed to its current condition. The scheme will also address landscaping and public realm with improved lighting to improve the surrounding area as well as the car park itself.

The upgrade proposals to Cathedral & Quay also incorporate 3 amendments to the existing Parking Place Order as follows:

Introduction of a barrier pay on foot system - providing the customer with greater flexibility to dwell within the city centre and significantly reducing revenue loss from the car park (arising from customers evading parking charges)

Extending charging periods from 6pm to 10pm thereby better aligning its operation with the other MSCP's located in the city centre

Redesignating from a Zone 2 to a Zone 1 Tariff Band thereby more appropriately reflecting its central location.

A further driver for releasing this capital investment also relates to maintaining an adequate provision of city centre parking spaces. This is particularly in light of the recent closure of Harlequins surface car park and proposals to close Mary Arches MSCP in late 2026, thereby depleting the city centre car park estate by c 500 spaces.

10.2 Forecast Financial Performance and Funding

In the last full financial year 2024/25 C&Q generated £309,555 of gross revenue (net of VAT) and a similar figure is forecast for the current year. This equates to £1,474 per car space from the currently reduced capacity of 210 spaces and £872 per space overall. Given the number of closed spaces and the existing car park condition (it is estimated that the total car park is on average only 20% occupied during charging hours), there is significant potential to improve the trading performance at the car park, particularly as it is currently a Zone 2 car park (with potential to be grouped with Central car parks once the quality of the facility is enhanced post refurbishment). At current tariffs, the forecast impact on revenue of incremental increases in occupancy of 10% is shown below.

Increase in % of capacity utilised	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%
Forecast increase in gross income (net of VAT)	£156,910	£313,820	£470,730	£627,640	£784,550

An increase of 30% to achieve an average of 50% utilisation is forecast to be reasonably achievable post refurbishment. However, as C&Q will be closed to carry out the works it is anticipated that it may take up to 3 years for the potential revenue levels to be fully met. On this basis the following revenues are forecast post works completion:

Year following re-opening	1	2	3
Forecast Gross Revenue (net of VAT)	**£546,200**	**£683,140**	**£786,414**
Per car space (355 spaces)	£1,152.32	£1,441.22	£1,659.10
Increase from 2024/25 Revenue	£236,645	£373,585	£476,859

The forecast year 3 revenue/space is compared to that generated in 2024/25 from other car parks operated by the Council. Given the location of the Cathedral and Quay car park the forecast is deemed to be a prudent and reasonable estimate at this stage.

11. How does the decision contribute to the Council's Corporate Plan?

11.1 The decision would contribute as follows:

- **Well Run Council:** The proposed refurbishment will enable this key asset to re-establish itself as a premier MSCP for the City. Contributing towards an improved image for the city centre, releasing additional economic investment and realising reduced capital repair expenditure (arising from the suppression of any potential anti-social behaviour).

- **Local Economy:** The refurbishment and reopening of Cathedral and Quay is expected to further support the economic vibrancy and vitality of The Quayside and the core retail district adjacent to the Cathedral

- **Sustainable Environment:** The introduction of modern and efficient mechanical and electrical plant is expected to contribute to the Council's sustainability and energy efficiency agenda

12. What risks are there and how can they be reduced?

12.1 We set out a risk assessment summary below:

Risk Item	Mitigation Measure
Slower than forecast demand recovery	Active demand management and monitoring
Contractor underperformance	Strong contractual KPIs and governance

13. Are there any other options?

13.1 None

Director **Strategic Director of Corporate Resources**

Author: Head of Service Commercial Assets

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1972 (as amended)

Background papers used in compiling this report: None

For enquiries please contact: democratic.services@exeter.gov.uk

SEATING IN THE GUILDHALL

Chaplain	S151 Officer		**Lord Mayor Councillor Rolstone (L)**	Chief Executive	Monitoring Officer	

Democratic Services	Strategic Directors

Councillors	Councillors	Councillors
Wardle (L)	Miller-Boam (L)	Bialyk (L)
Williams, M (L)	Snow (L)	Williams, R (L)
	Hussain (L)	Wood (L)
Darling (L)	Knott (L)	Pole (L)
Cookson (L)	Harding (L)	Atkinson (L)
Begley (L)		Findlay (L)
		Patrick (L)

Councillors	Councillors
Moore (G)	Jobson (C)
Banyard (G)	Hughes (I)**
Wetenhall (G)	Terry (G)
Chelvanayagam (G)	Smith (G)
Rappert (G)	Reed (G)
Ketchin (G)	Baker (G)

Fullam (LD)	Mitchell, K (LD)	Palmer (LD)

Mitchell, M (LD)	Richards (LD)	

Sheridan (R)	Payne (R)	Williams, N (R)

Agenda Annex

L:	**Labour:**	**18**
G:	**Green:**	**10**
LD:	**Liberal Democrat**	**5**
C:	**Conservative:**	**1**
I:	**Independent**	**2 ** **
R:	**Reform**	**3**

** **Known as the Equity Independent Group**

<u>Portfolio Holders</u>	**Portfolio Holder for**
Bialyk:	Leader
	Deputy Leader and Corporate Services, Community & City Centre
	Climate, Ecological Change and Communities
Williams, R	City Management
	Housing, Homelessness Prevention and Customer Services
Wood	Leisure Services & Healthy Living
	Arts, Culture & Tourism
Patrick	City Development

<u>Member Champions</u>	**Member Champion for**
Miller-Boam	Community Safety & Engagement
Darling	Culture & City Centre