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