

CABINET	<i>Gloucestershire County Council</i>
30 March 2022	
Minutes	

PRESENT

MEMBERSHIP:

Cllr Stephen Davies	- Cabinet Member for Children’s SafeGuarding and Early Years
Cllr Philip Robinson	- Cabinet Member for Economy, Education and Skills
Cllr Mark Hawthorne MBE	- Leader of Council
Cllr Carole Allaway-Martin	- Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care Commissioning
Cllr Tim Harman	- Cabinet Member for Public Health and Communities
Cllr David Norman MBE	- Cabinet Member for Public Protection, Parking and Libraries
Cllr Vernon Smith	- Cabinet Member for Highways and Flood
Cllr Lynden Stowe	- Cabinet Member for Finance and Change
Cllr Kathy Williams	- Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care (Delivery)

Apologies: Cllr David Gray

1. Apologies

See above

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on 23 February 2022 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Declarations of Interest

No declarations were made at the meeting.

4. Questions at Cabinet Meetings

Five public questions were received.

Twenty-eight member questions were received

Question 1 - Cllr Jeremy Hilton asked why the Cabinet Member was not considering the refitting of Bohanam House to enable it to be a first class care home for elderly people.

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin welcomed the questions on the report and, in relation to the refurbishment of Bohanam house, stated that sustainability and viability of the wider market had to be considered. In the case of Bohanam House, the works needed to refurbish the home to modern standards would lead to a reduction in its overall capacity which would, in turn, be likely to make it unviable.

Question 2 – Cllr Jeremy Hilton asked for the occupancy rate of the last 5 years, to be provided for two years before pandemic began.

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin replied that accessing appropriate data would rely on the Order of St John. She would request that the data be provided, but it may take her some time to get back to the member.

Question 3 – Cllr Jeremy Hilton asked why consideration was not being given to refitting Bohanam House in order to keep it in use, given that it had been rated good, whereas some of the other homes within Gloucester required improvement.

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin replied that the Council needed to take a view on sustainability. The only things the Council can directly control are those within it's own contracts and estate. Beyond this, the Council was constrained on what it could do. The purpose of the Cabinet paper was to seek agreement to go out for consultation.

Question 4 – Cllr Jeremy Hilton detailed that across the care homes in the city of Gloucester there was 72% occupancy rate, the minimum for viability was 60%. He asked why Bohanam House was set for closure when there were two other inadequate homes?

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin replied that the recommendation today was to go to consultation with a decision to be made in June depending on the information that was received.

Question 5 – Cllr Jeremy Hilton stated that there was a 55% occupancy rate at Bohanam house. He asked whether, with refurbishment, the overall capacity could be reduced, bringing it up to the required occupancy level.

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin reiterated that the decision before Cabinet today was merely to consult on the proposals. She commented that the price of refurbishment was speculative at this time

Question 6 – Cllr Jeremy Hilton asked for details of the terms and conditions of staff working at the two inadequate care homes.

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin replied that she would check the information, but noted that the Council doesn't have a right to access private care homes information.

Question 7 – Cllr Jeremy Hilton referred to staff with many years service at Bohanam House and asked why this experience would be lost.

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin replied that she welcomed that experience and commitment and would await the consultation information and would encourage those individuals to respond to the consultation.

Question 8 – Cllr Colin Hay asked about the revisions to the forecast outturn position that had occurred since the Council set the budget. He suggested that this appeared to be Cabinet suppressing the amount of funding that appeared to be available until the budget was set, in order to allow Cabinet to spend it at a later date. He noted that the amount would have funded all of the opposition group budget proposals.

Cllr Lynden Stowe replied that this remained a projected underspend until final year-end figures came in and, with regards to overall position, that 11 months into a budget the council was close to delivering a balanced budget. This was a good outcome.

Question 9 – Cllr Colin Hay asked to what extent the Cabinet Member took into account the option of borrowing to fund the Capital Programme rather than selling land that could provide young farmers with opportunities and experience. He suggested that the capital receipts did not warrant the selling of the land.

Cllr Lynden Stowe replied that there was an opportunity cost involved in foregoing potential income from releasing land for development. He agreed that the Council needed to encourage young farmers but there was also a need for housing. Once a capital receipt was obtained it was then a decision as to whether to reinvest into farmland or into other council priorities.

Question 10 – Cllr Colin Hay asked would you consider retaining the land in the best interest of young farmers.

Cllr Lynden Stowe noted the question and welcomed his interest, stating that as it was part of the County Council's budget and member could bring forward proposals through the budget process.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

Question 16 – Cllr Roger Whyborn asked what plans and aspirations the Cabinet Member had to promote greater use of the bus network to those who are hampered by cost of fares, particularly young people and families.

Cllr Philip Robinson replied that the Bus Service Improvement Plan and Enhanced Partnership were asking those questions and the detail would be there.

Question 18 – Cllr Roger Whyborn asked would the Cabinet be committing to conduct a holistic review of the whole bus network within that partnership?

Cllr Philip Robinson replied that a holistic review was what the Improvement Plan and Enhanced Plan were in effect. With regards to a franchising approach, it would not do anything to address declining demand in rural areas and would require vast sums of money.

Question 23 – Cllr John Bloxsom asked whether the cabinet member was saying there would be no improvement in community services or domiciliary care as a result of homes closing?

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin replied that she was not saying that. The paper was about going to consultation. The June Cabinet paper would be supported by information gathered through that consultation, and improvements to domiciliary care were very much on Cabinet's agenda.

Question 25 – Cllr John Bloxsom asked that, given that the cabinet Member accepted that care homes were essential to meet the needs of some people, why were some residents potentially being moved from 'pillar to post'?

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin replied that there would always be a place for care homes in Gloucestershire. The Council also had to consider the quality of our homes and how demographics was affecting that care home population. . The Council needs to respond to changing needs and expectations.

Question 26 – Cllr John Bloxsom asked how closing homes where residents were settled would ensure the best outcomes for those involved?

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin replied that the first step was to engage with families and residents, staff and community in the consultation process. The Cabinet would then have a better understanding on how to sustain the market as well as meet people's needs and aspirations.

Question 27 – Cllr John Bloxsom referred to Southfield house, plans for which had taken three years to reach fruition. he asked how many years would it take for new provision to be made available.

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin replied that once a decision was made, the Cabinet would look to move as speedily as it could. Covid had slowed up the process in recent years.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

Question 28 – Cllr John Bloxsom asked what comfort would it be to those dispersed across the County? He gave the example of people relocated as a result of previous closures to homes that were now subject to potential closure.

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin replied that there was a commitment to support residents regarding any change that might occur.

An additional twenty-six public questions were received after the deadline but were accepted as urgent questions by the Chair. Written answers were provided.

5. Financial Monitoring Report 2021/22

Cllr Lynden Stowe provided an update on the year-end forecast for the 2021/22 County Council's Revenue and Capital Budgets.

The forecast revenue year end position based on February 2022 (Period 11) forecasts for the 2021/22 financial year was an underspend of £640k all of which is non Covid-19 related.

A balanced position is forecast in relation to Covid-19 expenditure and income.

The largest non-Covid-19 budget variance was the £8.665 million forecast overspend in Children and Families – this overspend is offset by the £6.524 million underspend in Technical & Countywide and £2.18 million underspend in Adult Social Care budget

Cabinet was also informed of the request for approval of one-off funding of £480k to support the Education, Health and Care plans (EHCP) and Education Psychology (EP) service

Capital –The forecast outturn position for 2021/22 was £130.023 million, against the budget of £153.425 million, giving a forecast in-year slippage of £23.402 million.

The overall capital programme would decrease by £70k. This related to a decrease of £90k in the Schools Capital Programme, and an increase of £20k in the Highways capital budget.

The £12.5 million slippage on Investing in Self-funded income schemes would be carried forward for self-funded income schemes in the future.

Having considered all of the information, cabinet noted the report and

RESOLVED to:

1. Note the forecast revenue year end position based on February 2022 (Period 11) forecasts for the 2021/22 financial year, which is an underspend of £640k all of

which relates to non-Covid-19 expenditure. The Covid-19 related expenditure and income outturn is forecast to be a balanced position.

2. Approve one-off funding of £480k to support the Education, Health and Care plans (EHCP) and Education Psychology (EP) service, funded from general reserves. The short-term one-off investment will place the service in a stronger position to undertake its service transformation programme and prepare for the Local Area SEND Inspection anticipated in 2023.

3. Approve the acceptance of the Homes England capital grant of £1.5m via Tewkesbury Borough Council for M5 Jct.9 development costs should we be successful in the bid.

4. Approve, in principle, the acceptance of the Active Travel Fund Tranche 3 DfT grant whilst awaiting confirmation of its award and value. Any funding will have to be accounted for before the end of March 2022.

5. Note the forecast capital year end position as at the end of January 2022 of £130.023 million against the current budget of £153.425 million.

6. Approve the recommended transfer of £4.7 million of the Local Council Tax Support Grant to the Rates Retention Reserve as referred to later in this report.

7. Approve the £70k decrease to the capital programme as outlined in Section B.

6. Southfield House Semi-independent Accommodation and Support Services for Young People

Cllr Stephen Davies sought Cabinet approval for the re-modelling of Southfield House, to support the implementation of the Sufficiency Strategy, by developing quality semi-independent accommodation and support services for vulnerable young people.

The report outlined Gloucestershire's ambition to build on the success of Trevone House by proposing plans to use Southfield House for services to young people. Southfield House was owned by Gloucestershire County Council and was previously used as an older people's residential home.

Accommodation for the 16 – 25 age groups was particularly needed, and the proposal would provide accommodation for that age group, which was the second biggest cohort to enter care and also had the poorest outcomes. Placements for this cohort were scarce and generally high cost and there was a real need for higher quality placements at a reasonable cost. This allowed for a pathway to independence and alleviated budget pressures on the external agency budget.

Having considered all of the information, cabinet noted the report and

RESOLVED to:

1) Approve an allocation of £3.35million of capital funding to the proposed remodelling of Southfield Site (both Main and Old House buildings) for the purpose of delivering accommodation for care experienced young people who may also be in employment, training or apprenticeships.

2) Delegate authority to the Executive Director of Children's Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economy, Education and Skills, and the Cabinet Member for Children's Safeguarding and Early Years to:

a) Conduct a competitive procurement process in respect of a contract for the delivery of day-to-day delivery of accommodation and support services, with 24/7 staffing to support the young people placed. The successful tenderer for such services will also finance all 'fit out' costs for the re-modelled accommodation. Such contract shall continue for an initial period of 5 years and include an option to extend its term for a further period of 2 years.

b) Award such contract to the preferred tenderer.

c) Determine whether to exercise the option to extend the term of such contract for a further period of 2 years on its fifth anniversary.

3) Delegates authority to the Assistant Director for AMPS in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Change to:

a) Conduct a competitive procurement process under the Gloucestershire County Council's Major Project Framework (or its replacement) in respect of a call-off contract for the supply of remodelling works in respect of:

- **Southfield Main House:** for the purpose of providing the following accommodation for care leavers.
 - 13 studio flats, 2 two-bedroom flats
 - 2 well-being flats
 - 1 single bedroom flat (used as an emergency/Police And Criminal Evidence bed)

- **Southfield Old House:** for the purpose of providing the following accommodation for young people who are in employment, training, or apprenticeships

○ 7 one bed flats

○ 1 two bed flat

○ 1 crash pad

b) Award such call-off contract to the preferred tenderer.

7. Market Shaping and Review of the Estates & Commissioning Strategies

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin introduced the report and sought approval for the recommendations to influence and aid the sustainability of the Independent Health & Social Care Market of Gloucestershire.

The Cabinet Member welcomed the questions and comments from the public on this item.

The purpose of the paper and its focus was to begin consultation on the potential closure of four care homes.

The council has a duty to work in partnership with providers to sustain the market. This paper comes forward following extensive engagement with residential and domiciliary care providers. This engagement confirmed the need to fundamentally change the market as a result of trends that begun before the recent COVID-19 pandemic.

Cllr Allaway Martin praised the heroic efforts of the care system to respond to the pandemic, but also reflected that the pandemic had demonstrated that the Council's residential home estate was not well suited or easily adapted to infection control.

The market needed to be sustainable and viable and offer consistency of care and responsive to the changing needs of the people of Gloucestershire. The technical strategy later in the agenda went hand in hand with the actions being taken here

The Cabinet Member detailed the part of the report that considered purchasing models to enable the required flexibility, including the need to expand the domiciliary care market, review the capacity and location of existing residential provision within the council's control and make better provision for reablement. She reiterated the importance of the consultation process and her hope that it will help to allay the fears of those potentially affected by the proposals

The Cabinet Member commented on the importance of ensuring the quality of services being provided and the focus on allowing individuals to remain in their own home as long as possible.

The Leader outlined the importance of the item in ensuring sustainability of the market and the need to act to ensure changing demand was met. He emphasised that unless the Council acted, there was a real risk of market failure and the unplanned closure of good care homes. He stated that the pandemic has raised questions about the suitability of buildings. It has also brought into focus the fact that some of these homes are not of the standard expected by residents and their families.

He recognised that this was a difficult conversation and gave assurances that the team would ensure that caring for individuals would be at the forefront of their minds going forward.

Having considered all of the information, cabinet noted the report and

RESOLVED to:

1) Delegate authority to the Executive Director of Adult Social Care and Public Health, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care Commissioning:

a) To agree the revised purchasing model for the volume and location of care home beds that support frail individuals awaiting hospital discharge under the Enhanced Independence Offer, as approved by GCC Cabinet June 2019. The EIO programme of change is currently underway. Initial findings much of which is predicated on learning from the pandemic, indicate that future purchasing patterns and procurement processes will require a more flexible approach combining the benefits of both block and spot purchasing.

b) To agree the revised purchasing model for a blended model for Home Care and Reablement, currently being developed under phase 2 of the Enhanced Independence Offer, to support collaborative working and therefore investment in Domiciliary care providers

2) Support and stabilise the care home market by approving consultation on the proposed decommissioning and closure of four homes within the Gloucestershire Care Partnership:

- a) Orchard House, Bishops Cleeve, Tewkesbury
- b) Westbury Court, Westbury, Forest of Dean
- c) Bohanam House, Gloucester
- d) The Elms, Stonehouse Stroud

3) Consult on the proposed closures and the potential impact of the closures

4) Delegate authority to the Executive Director of Adult Social Care and Public Health, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care Commissioning, to enter into an agreement with Gloucestershire Care Services to ensure continuity of care for residents during the consultation period set out in Recommendation 2 and other ancillary matters, including reimbursing Gloucestershire Care Partnership for agreed additional costs incurred that arise as a direct result of the consultation process.

5) Agree, following consultation, to return to Cabinet to consider the outcome of the consultation and agree how to take forward outcomes of the consultation.

8. Adult Social Care Technology Strategy 2022 - 2025

Cllr Carole Allaway Martin and Cllr Kathy Williams introduced the Adult Social Care Technology Strategy 2022 - 2025, and asked that it be adopted.

The Strategy set out the vision and ambitions for the role of technology in supporting people to live independently.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

The Council wanted technology to be a greater part of everyday life for vulnerable people in Gloucestershire, and part of everyday practice for adult social care professionals. The pandemic had shown how helpful and influential technology could be, for example in helping people to stay in touch with loved ones by using video calls, or through enabling health and care professionals to monitor people's conditions remotely.

The aim was for Gloucestershire to be at the forefront of accepting new innovations into social work practice as well as to focus the use of digital technologies on supporting people to live independently and on supporting our care market.

The traditional telephone network would be switched off by the end of 2025 affecting every landline in the country (the Digital Switchover). New digital technology would need to be adopted to ensure people continued to be supported to live safely and independently.

The Council was actively testing exciting new devices for people with dementia, and apps for people with mental ill health, as well as technology which could prevent falls, for example, helping people to lead more independent lives in their own communities. In addition, the Council was investing money and staff resources to support the efficiencies and better outcomes that technology could deliver through the Adult Single Programme.

The risks of delivering the strategy included: reliance on an immature market to supply reliable products at a scale which comply with GDPR; a significant culture shift for staff and public; and connectivity in some areas of the county.

Members noted the costs outlined in the paper.

Having considered all of the information, Cabinet noted the report and

RESOLVED to:

Approve the adoption of the Adult Social Care Technology Strategy 2022-2025

9. Concessionary fare system procurement

Cllr Philip Robinson sought Cabinet approval to procure and award a contract for the supply of:

- a) bus pass production, management, and statistical analysis services;
- b) a back-office client management system for use by Council staff to manage card production, activity, and auditing;
- c) a customer portal for use by Gloucestershire residents to process orders for concessionary bus passes (applications and/or replacements); and
- d) concessionary fare reimbursement services.

This was for an initial period of 5 years with a potential extension of no more than 2 years. This would allow the council to fulfil its statutory obligations. The total value of the contract was £924,000.

He referred to the Equality Impact Assessment stating that this was a well written and interesting document. He thanked the officers who had written it.

Having considered all of the information, Cabinet noted the report and

RESOLVED to:

Delegate authority to the Executive Director: Economy, Environment and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economy, Education and Skills to:

1. Conduct a compliant procurement process in respect of a contract for the supply of (a) bus pass production, management, and statistical analysis services; (b) a back-office client management system for use by Council staff to manage card production, activity and auditing; (c) a customer portal for use by Gloucestershire residents to process orders for concessionary bus passes (applications and/or replacements); and (d) concessionary fare reimbursement services. Such contract shall continue for an initial period of 5 years and include an option to extend its term for a further period of not more than 2 years.
2. Award such contract to the preferred tenderer. This will enable the Council to continue to fulfil its statutory duty as Local Transport Authority.
3. Determine whether to exercise the option to extend the term of such contract on the expiry of the initial term 5 year term.

10. Bus Back Better - Gloucestershire's Enhanced Partnership

Cllr Philip Robinson updated Cabinet on progress to date on developing the Gloucestershire Bus Enhanced Partnership (EP) document, and updated Cabinet with the initial results of the public consultation process.

The Government's recent 'Bus Back Better' strategy mandated each Local Transport Authority to produce a Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP), setting out its plans to improve bus-based public transport in each area and to establish an Enhanced Partnership agreement with all operators providing public bus services in their area.

Gloucestershire's BSIP document was submitted to the Department for Transport at the end of October 2021. A draft Enhanced Partnership agreement document was now required by the end of April 2022.

The Enhanced Partnership document was a legal framework between the Council and bus operators. It contained a Plan (a summary of the BSIP), and a Scheme (an agreed programme of improvements by the Council and bus operators to provide better bus services and facilities).

The governance of the Enhanced Partnership would be exercised through a Board with three Members – one from the County Council, one from Stagecoach (the major bus operator) and one Member representing the other bus operators and community transport provider. The third Member would be elected at an Enhanced Partnership Forum meeting, to which all operators and community transport providers would be invited.

The main challenge of the Enhanced Partnership would be to establish an attractive sustainable and successful bus network as the basis for future growth of the public transport network as passengers return to the bus after the pandemic. The aim would be to meet the travel needs of residents moving into new developments and to connect Gloucestershire's residents to employment, education, retail, leisure and social opportunities, whilst meeting the Council's ambitious carbon reduction targets.

Having considered all of the information, Cabinet noted the report and

RESOLVED to:

Delegate authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure to:

a) further develop and finalise the Enhanced Partnership in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economy, Education and Skills

b) submit a draft Enhanced Partnership document to the Department for Transport (DfT) by 30/04/22, and subsequently submit the agreed final document by a date yet to be advised, and

c) enter into the Enhanced Partnership agreement with transport operators later in the year once the date for final EP submission referred to in (b) is confirmed by the DfT

11. Social Value – sustaining the recovery and levelling up.

Cllr Philip Robinson sought approval of the updated Social Value policy and reporting measures set out at Annex A and to develop a set of local Themes, Outcomes and Measures ("TOMs") that will assist in leveraging investment in skills, environment, and wellbeing through the Council's ongoing activities (procurement, planning etc.). The revised Social Value policy and reporting measures will also assist in delivering "levelling up" by way of incentivising third parties to deliver

Social Value in both Gloucestershire and, where appropriate, discrete areas within the county.

The Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 came into force on 31 January 2013. It required people who commissioned public services to think about how they could also secure wider social, economic, and environmental benefits – together known as ‘social value’. Those wider benefits were in addition to any Core requirement that might be procured by the council. For example, in procuring an Energy from Waste Facility, the benefits of diversion of waste from landfill and the production of electricity were core benefits, however the creation of apprenticeships and employment opportunities were a wider benefit. Before they start any procurement process, commissioners should think about whether the services they are going to procure, or the way they are going to procure them, could secure these wider benefits for their area or stakeholders.

The Government had signalled its intention to go further with Social Value as part of the levelling up agenda and as part of the Procurement White paper

There was a clear strategic case for Gloucestershire County Council to embed social value in its procurement. The new GCC “Building Back Better in Gloucestershire” Strategy (2022 – 2026) highlighted the Council’s commitment to using a Social Value approach through putting in place a policy and providing officers with the tools needed to build social value, and measure it, into the way the council designs, delivers and commissions its services.

This only applied to procurements which exceeded the public procurement threshold. Social value would have a 15% weighting in tender exercises. As another example, the Electronic Vehicles contract had provided £1m of social value benefits.

Having considered all of the information, Cabinet noted the report and

RESOLVED to:

Adopt the revised Social Value Policy and reporting measures set out at Annexes A to C and to develop a set of local Themes, Outcomes and Measures in connection therewith.

12. Gloucestershire Fire and Rescue Service Community Risk Management Plan 2022-2026

Cllr Dave Norman sought Cabinet approval for the Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP) 2022-2026.

The Fire and Rescue National Framework (2018) set out the Government’s priorities and objectives for Fire and Rescue authorities in England. A key priority is

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

for the Fire and Rescue Authority (FRA) to develop a Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP). The framework placed a legal obligation on all Fire Authorities to develop, produce and publish a Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP) at least once every 3 years.

The CRMP had been developed using a detailed 130-page comprehensive risk profile. The Community Risk Profile had a methodology that was built on professional judgement and robust risk analysis that ensured effective and efficient decisions were made when assessing the hazards and informing the plans to mitigate those hazards.

There had been over 500 responses to the consultation and 1,300 visitors to the consultation page online.

Having considered all of the information, Cabinet noted the report and

RESOLVED to:

1. Approve the adoption of the GFRS Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP) 2022 - 2026.
2. Delegate authority to the Chief Fire Officer to undertake such actions as are necessary to implement the adopted CRMP 2022-26.

13. Schedule of Proposed Disposals

Cllr Lynden Stowe sought approval for the proposed Schedule of Disposals in order to meet capital receipts targets.

Appendix A (Exempt) had been approved in September 2021, and confirmation was required by Cabinet that those sites not yet disposed of remain surplus to requirements

Appendix B (Exempt) was a new Schedule of Disposals, recommended by Property Board as being surplus to requirements. Approval of both Schedules of Disposals and the declaration of those sites as surplus to requirements, would deliver future capital receipts.

Asset Management and Property Services were working towards a four year capital receipt target of £47 million covering the period April 2021 to March 2025.

Capital receipts received and sales agreed to date for 2021/22 currently totalled £6.529 million.

Prior to the discussion, members were advised that, should Cabinet wish to discuss the contents of the exempt information reported at Appendix A and Appendix B of the report, consideration would need to be given as to whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting in accordance with Regulation 4(2)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012.

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

Cabinet agreed to consider this item without having to refer to the exempt information.

The Leader suggested that a calculation be made on how many houses had been enabled by the disposal of council land.

Having considered all of the information, Cabinet noted the report and

RESOLVED to:

1. Confirm that those sites described at Appendix A (Exempt) which have previously been declared surplus by Cabinet in September 2021 and not yet disposed of, continue to be declared surplus to requirements.
2. Declare the sites listed on the proposed Schedule of Disposals Appendix B (Exempt) surplus to the Council's land and property requirements.
3. Delegate authority to the Assistant Director – Asset Management and Property Services to dispose of these sites in consultation with the Deputy Leader/Cabinet Member for Finance and Change and Council's Chief Financial Officer.

Leader of Council

Meeting concluded at 11:25