

**MINUTES** of a **MEETING** of the **CABINET** held on 4 February 2025 at 5.15 pm

**Present  
Councillors**

L Taylor, S J Clist, J Lock, J Buczkowski,  
S Keable, J Wright and D Wulff

**Apologies  
Councillor(s)**

N Bradshaw and G DuChesne (online)

**Also Present  
Councillor(s)**

E Buczkowski and C Harrower

**Also Present  
Officer(s):**

Stephen Walford (Chief Executive), Maria De Leiburne (Director of Legal, People & Governance (Monitoring Officer)), Matthew Page (Head of People, Performance & Waste), Simon Newcombe (Head of Housing & Health), Paul Deal (Head of Finance, Property & Climate Resilience), Darren Beer (Operations Manager for Street Scene and Open Spaces) and Laura Woon (Democratic Services Manager)

**Councillors  
Online**

G Czapiewski, M Farrell, L Knight and R Roberts

**Officers Online**

Dean Emery (Head of Revenue, Benefits and Leisure,  
Kieran Knowles ( Operation Manager for Finance Services)  
Luke Howard ( Environment and Enforcement Manager)  
and Jan Moreland ( Finance Business partner)

**125. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors: N Bradshaw and G DuChesne (online)

**126. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

Paul Elstone

Agenda Item 5 2025/26 Budget and in particular Annex 2 HRA Capital Programme 2025 to 2030.

**Question 1:**

I note that the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Programme document now shows most if not all the names of the HRA Projects as opposed to just Project Numbers. Additionally, there was a column showing previous years' expenditure.

Thank you for taking on board the request to have this information provided.

However there remain four very important omissions.

- There was no initial budget forecast column.
- There was no total expenditure to date column.
- There was no final budget expenditure column for completed projects.
- There was no description provided explaining the reason for any budget overspend against initial forecast.

Would Cabinet give full consideration to these requirements? Requirements that fully support good cost management, good governance plus openness and transparency?

### **Question 2:**

Project 41 – Fir Close Shows an expenditure to date of £111,000 and a further expenditure of £185,000 this if I read the confusing budget sheet correctly or a total of £296,000

It had been noted the budget had increased by £10,000 in the last month.

To put this cost into perspective, Fir Close module was a demonstration unit first built around 6 years ago and never intended for occupancy. It had been converted for single person occupancy only.

A module that was now costing an exorbitant £8,000 per square metre.

The 5 properties remaining for sale at Haddon Heights, Bampton and using sale price and not build cost, had a cost of £2,900 per square metre. For the 39 properties at St Georges Court their cost was under £3,300 per square metre.

There was irrevocable evidence available to show that by any measure this Council was paying an exorbitant cost for its new build social homes.

Would Cabinet implement a fully independent Value for Money Assessment, and if not precisely why not?

### **Question 3:**

Given there had now been substantial payments made on certain HRA projects:

HRA Project 20 shows a project spend to date of £363K out of a total project value of £16.49 million.

HRA Project 8 shows project spend to date of £371K.

Project 33 a spend of £162K.

Project 29 a spend of £62K.

Spends that should already or would form part of budget statements and also which should already clearly show on the supplier invoice payments data base.

Where precisely were these individual HRA projects?

**Response from Cabinet Member for Finance, Governance and Risk:**

Project 8 – Roundhill, Lower Cotteylands – project now live and progressing.

Project 33 – Churchill Drive, Crediton – project now live and progressing

Project 29 – Glebelands, Cheriton Bishop – project no longer going ahead

Project 20 – This project was currently paused, but may come forward again in future years. As such, naming the project would be inappropriate without full consultation to the local residents and community.

As had previously been advised, the Council publish the names of the projects once they reach a point where the viability of the development had been established through careful planning and design, and importantly where we had undertaken appropriate consultation with local tenants and communities.

I was glad that the additional information relating to prior year spend had been helpful.

**Question 4: Supplementary Question.**

Given the answer received to Question 3 it was now a difficult question to ask.

Can it be confirmed that the £16.49 million project i.e. Project 20 related to Knightswood, Cullompton as there was information in the public domain.

The Leader stated that Mr Elstone would receive a written response to his questions 1, 2 and the supplementary question in the usual way.

**127. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT**

Members were reminded of the need to make declarations of interest where appropriate.

**128. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING ON THE 7 JANUARY 2025**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 7 January 2025 were **APPROVED** as a correct record and **SIGNED** by the Leader.

Note\* Cllr J Lock abstained from voting due to not being present at the last meeting.

**129. MEETING MANAGEMENT**

The Leader **MOVED** that he would be bring forward the following Agenda Items:-

- (i) 6 Business Rate tax Base to the next item.

### 130. BUSINESS RATES TAX BASE

The Cabinet had before it a report \* from the Deputy Chief Executive (S151) presenting the Business Rate Tax Base.

The Cabinet Member for Governance, Finance and Risk outlined the contents of the report with particular reference to the following:

- Officers were thanked for their diligent work in preparing this report. Their expertise and efforts ensured that work continued to manage business rates effectively, despite the many changes imposed by Central Government over the last few years, business rates had indeed become more and more complex since 2013.
- The business rates and financial implications for this Council. It was important to be absolutely clear from the outset: that this Council did not set business rates in the same way as Council Tax—the calculation of rates was set by the Government. The Valuation Office Agency calculated the rateable values from which bills were worked out by billing authorities. Whilst this Council administered the collection, the rates themselves along with many relief schemes were entirely outside of the Council’s control.
- The Government had made a number of adjustments to the Business Rates that would, in some cases, materially alter the amount of rates due for businesses. Changes to some reliefs were ‘unfunded’ and others funded by Government via s31, an example of this would be Retail, Hospitality and Leisure Relief.
- The key changes taking effect from April 2025 included:
  - A reduction in Retail, Hospitality and Leisure Relief, which would drop from 75% to 40%. This meant businesses in those sectors would see an increase in the amount they were required to pay.
  - Private schools would no longer qualify for Charity Relief, following changes to primary legislation.
  - The restriction preventing councils from awarding discretionary relief more than six months after the end of the financial year had been removed, giving the Council greater flexibility in decision-making.
- Those changes could have a significant impact on some businesses, and for those that were affected, the Council would be in contact when annual bills were issued in March 2025.

Discussion took place with regards to:

- The local businesses would face a significant impact due to the increases in business rates tax base and the effects of national insurance employer’s contributions.
- Would advice and assistance be available for those that were affected?
- Retail Hospitality and Leisure Relief had been reduced from 75% to 40%.
- Approximately 300 business would be affected in key economic sectors.
- There were concerns about whether some businesses could afford their bills or would have to release some of their staff.
- What support would the Council offer to businesses to pay their bills, would the changes to the discretion relief make any difference?

- What was the collective figure for the sector in the region and what was the overall additional cost within this area?

**RESOLVED** that Cabinet recommend to Council that:

1. The calculation of the NNDR1 net yield of £19,854,365 from 3,562 business rated properties be **NOTED** and **APPROVED** for 2025/26.
2. The proportions distributed to the respective authorities and Central Government be allocated as per the statutory regulations.
3. Members **NOTE** that Central Government would reimburse the Council through a Section 31 grant to compensate it for the reduction in collectable business rates as a result of introducing various reliefs.
4. Members **AGREE** to Mid Devon re-joining the Devon Business Rates Pool for 2025/26.

(Proposed by Cllr J Buczkowski and seconded by Cllr S Clist)

**Reason for Decision:**

Mid Devon District Council was a Statutory Billing Authority and had a duty to carry out this task each year as part of the budgetary process. It should be noted that due to changes in reliefs, collection of business rates was likely to be challenging in 2025/26.

Note: \* Report previously circulated.

131. **2025/2026 BUDGET**

The Cabinet had before it a report \* from the Deputy Chief Executive (S151) presenting the 2025/2026 draft Budget Report.

The Cabinet Member for Governance, Finance and Risk outlined the contents of the report with particular reference to the following:

- The delivery of a fully balanced budget, not only maintaining the general fund reserves above required minimum, but making a net contribution to earmarked reserves, building resilience for future periods.
- This administration had stayed true to their principles: sound financial management, investment in the future, and delivering for communities, even in the face of adversity. They had demanded better support, funding and decision making for their residents and would continue to do so.
- This budget was the culmination of extensive collaboration over the past year. It had been scrutinised at every level by ten Policy Development Group meetings (PDG's), by this Cabinet five times, by Scrutiny Committee, and in an all-Member briefing.
- Every single Councillor had had the opportunity to contribute, because the funding and delivery of the Council's services was not just a matter for the administration; it was a matter for every elected Member and the residents they served.
- The Capital Programme worth £135.6 million, with £41.6 million of deliverable investment in 2025/26 alone. This was about building the infrastructure, ensuring the Council invested in the future rather than leaving liabilities for the next generation.

- The Council’s capital investments included social housing development, ensuring that the Council continued to deliver high-quality, affordable homes for residents. Also, the Council was making targeted investments in waste and environmental services, responding to new regulatory requirements and preparing for the future.
- It included a fully funded provision for the Cullompton Town Centre Relief Road, a project that had been promised for many years, and would finally be delivered under this administration.
- The Treasury Management Strategy ensured the Council would remain financially stable and well-governed, taking a prudent approach to borrowing, maximising internal resources, and ensuring that every pound of public money was used wisely.
- The Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy ensured that repaying debt responsibly, secured the long-term financial sustainability of this Council.
- The General Fund and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget had been a huge challenge throughout the budget-setting process, with councils across the country facing relentless financial pressures. This Council had delivered a balanced budget that protected and enhanced key services.
  - Increased funding for tackling Net Zero and Planning Enforcement—investing in sustainability and ensuring that this Council held developers to account.
  - Expansion of Apprenticeship Scheme—investing in the future workforce and providing real opportunities for young people.
  - Continuing an ambitious social housing programme, ensuring the provision of good-quality homes and correcting the historic rent calculation error in a responsible way.
  - Growth in income streams, particularly from thriving leisure memberships and higher recycling levels, ensured that income was generated from services that would benefit the Councils residents.
- Unfortunately, one of the biggest challenges, was Central Government. Once again, this Council had been handed another single-year settlement, making long-term financial planning nearly impossible. The lack of certainty left councils like ours in a constant state of financial firefighting, unable to plan properly for the future.
  - This Council faced an expected additional cost of £466,000 as a result of the Government’s increases to employer’s national insurance contributions. Despite reassurances, the Council would only be receiving £151,000 in funding, essentially diverting the regressive Council Tax away from local services to Central Government. As if that was not enough, the Government had arbitrarily slashed key grants at the last minute, including the Rural Services Delivery Grant, leaving Mid Devon with an 18% cut in real-terms funding. This was a direct hit on rural district councils, making it even harder to deliver essential services without increasing the financial burden on residents, this was in the same week as the Government launched its latest Devolution White Paper.
  - Devolution and reorganisation would not fix the fundamental issue of underfunding, it would only cause higher and higher council tax bills as seen in other parts of the country, and indeed from some towns and parishes, who would be expected to pick up many of the services that district councils provided when they were abolished, or risk them being lost.
  - Despite those challenges, this Council had kept its council tax increase modest and within the cap at £6.96 (2.99%), this remained below inflation and



equated to a 14p per week increase—a small but necessary adjustment to protect the Council’s vital services.

- This budget not only maintained the General Reserve and funded the services residents relied on for the coming year, but it also strengthened the financial position for the future. This Council was making a net contribution to earmarked reserves, setting aside £2.225 million to mitigate future pressures, while carefully drawing down £1.763 million for planned investment.
- The budget was balanced and made provision for the future, the financial challenges ahead remained severe. The Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) continued to forecast a deficit, and the Council must be prepared to make difficult choices. Processes had started now with engaging Members early, and ensuring every possible option was considered in a measured and responsible way.
- Officers were thanked for their outstanding work in producing this budget, and to all the officers across the Council whose dedication had been instrumental in this process. Their hard work was felt to be invaluable.

Discussion took place with regards to:

- The budget setting had been challenging.
- The impact on rural areas, whereas the cities seemed to be receiving a large uplift in funding.
- The recent council tax increases where they had Social Care duties, currently this Council did not have those duties.
- To continue with the Planning Strategy for house building and the funding announcement at Easter about Junction 28 and the benefits of this to the communities.

**RESOLVED** that Cabinet recommend to Council that:

#### **Capital Strategy and 2025/26 – 2029-30 Capital Programme:**

1. That the proposed 2025/26 Capital Strategy be **APPROVED** – Appendix 1;
2. That a Capital Programme consisting of new and existing projects totalling £135,569k with a profiled spend forming a Deliverable Capital Programme for 2025/26 of £41,614k be **APPROVED**– Annexes 1a, 1b and 2 to Appendix 1. (Note this was inclusive of forecast slippage as at Quarter 3 from the existing Capital Programme and would be finalised and formal approval sought as part of 2025/26 Outturn report);
3. The updated Capital MTFP’s for the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account covering the years 2026/27 to 2029/30 be **NOTED**.

#### **Treasury Management Strategy:**

4. The proposed Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy for 2025/26, including the prudential indicators for the next 3 years and the Minimum Revenue Provision Statement (Appendix 2) be **APPROVED**.

#### **2025/26 Revenue Budget:**

5. A Council Tax Requirement of £7,348,850 calculated using a Council Tax of £239.12 for a Band D property, an increase of £6.96 or 2.99% from 2024/25

and a Tax Base of 30,732.91, in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) Regulation 1992, as amended, after the relevant adjustments in respect of the Council tax support scheme approved by Cabinet on 12 November 2024 be **APPROVED**;

6. The overall budgeted Net Cost of Services within the General Fund of £15,356,730 for 2025/26 be **APPROVED** as detailed within Appendix 3 (p2 – 40) and inclusive of the proposed balancing adjustments included within Table 1 in paragraph 5.5;
7. All of the transfers to and from Earmarked Reserves as detailed in Appendix 3 (p41) be **APPROVED**;
8. The HRA budget for 2025/26 as detailed within Appendix 3 (p42 – 51), with total income of £16,058,310, less direct costs of £12,939,410 with internal charges of £2,050,250 and capital financing of £1,068,650 balancing the budget be **APPROVED**;;
9. Work on strategic planning for delivering a balanced budget for 2026/27 and beyond be commenced immediately be **NOTED**.

(Proposed by Cllr J Buczkowski and seconded by Cllr S Keable)

**Reason for Decision:**

The 2025/26 Capital Strategy and Capital programme, the 2025/26 Treasury Management Strategy and the 2025/26 Revenue Budgets for the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account were in line with the Corporate Plan priorities within existing financial resources without materially reducing service delivery. The Local Government Finance Act required a balanced budget to be set by Tuesday 11 March 2025.

Note: \* Report previously circulated.

**132. REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT- ANNUAL REPORT (RIPA)**

The Cabinet had before it a report \* from the Director of Legal, People and Governance (Monitoring Officer) presenting the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act.

The Cabinet Member for Quality of Living, Equalities and Public Health outlined the contents of the report with particular reference to the following:

- The Council had the 3 year review and inspection by the Investigatory Powers Commissioner’s Office in August 2024.
- This was a remote inspection and the Inspector was satisfied with the information provided and that it offered the required assurance that the Council was compliant with both the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) and the Investigatory Powers Act 2016. The Inspector stated that the Council appeared to be in a strong compliance position.
- One observation was made that elected Members should review the authority’s use and set the policy annually. The Inspector did not recommend any changes to the policy, and no changes were recommended after review by the Community & Equalities Policy Development Group on 3rd December 2024 and Scrutiny Committee on 13 January 2025. Therefore, the policy was presented with no changes as Appendix 1.



- There had been no use of those powers since 2014. It should be noted that well-attended front-line training was organised approximately four years ago with an experienced external trainer in RIPA, with further training currently being arranged. In the age of social media, training of wider staff was also being considered to avoid inadvertently carrying out directed or other forms of covert surveillance in breach of the procedures in place. Annex 1 of the Policy set out how and when Open Source Internet Research and RIPA interact and were controlled.

**RESOLVED** that:

1. The Council's policy for ensuring compliance with Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) was appropriate and shall remain as currently drafted.
2. The fact that the Council had not used its powers under RIPA since March 2014 be **NOTED**.

(Proposed by Cllr D Wulff and seconded by Cllr J Lock)

**Reason for Decision:**

The use of RIPA powers was heavily regulated and scrutinised by the Investigatory Powers Commissioner's Office ("IPCO"). The legislation, combined with Codes of Conduct, set the framework for the use of RIPA powers. Statutory guidance required the Council to review the use of RIPA and the RIPA policy annually.

Note: \* Report previously circulated.

**133. HALBERTON- CAR PARKING SPACES REVISION TO OFF STREET PARKING ORDER**

The Cabinet had before it a report \* from the Head of People, Performance and Waste on the Mid Devon Off Street Parking Places Order.

The Cabinet Member for Finance, Governance and Risk outlined the contents of the report with particular reference to the following:

- The Mid Devon Off Street Parking Places Order with recent changes to car parking provision across the district, ensured that parking regulations remained fit for purpose, supporting residents, businesses, and the wider community.
- One of the key amendments was the incorporation of five parking spaces within Halberton known as "The Orchard" into the Off Street Parking Places Order. As Members would be aware, on-street parking in some of the communities was extremely limited, and this measure would enable residents to use those designated spaces while helping to ease congestion on the highway, ensuring the free and expeditious movement of traffic.
- Additionally, the report sought to provide greater clarity around electric vehicle charging infrastructure. The Council had been actively working with contractors to install electric vehicle charging points at numerous locations across the district, improving infrastructure and supporting our climate sustainability goals. The proposed amendments included updated wording to reflect legislative changes and ensured the correct use of electric vehicle bays and charging points.

**RESOLVED** that:

1. On being satisfied that the statutory grounds for amending and varying the OSPPO were met, as detailed in the Report, to authorise Officers to commence statutory consultation for the following proposed amendments to the OSPPO:
  - To incorporate as appropriate references to up to date legislative regulations including The Civil Enforcement of Road Traffic Contraventions (Approved Devices, Charging Guidelines and General Provisions) (England) Regulations 2022. The Civil Enforcement of Road Traffic Contraventions (Representations and Appeals) (England) Regulations 2022.
  - To incorporate within the OSPPO, 5 parking spaces known as 'The Orchard' in Halberton for the purpose of permit only parking.
  - To amend the OSPPO to incorporate the access roads within Carpenter Close, Tiverton to be subject to a restriction in the OSPPO of no parking.
  - For the OSPPO to include new provisions relating to electric vehicles and electric vehicle parking bays. The OSPPO would provide that only electric vehicles could park in an electric vehicle parking bay in order to recharge using the electric charging point provided the electric vehicle met the following definition of an electric vehicle "Electric Vehicle" means an Electric Vehicle or plugin hybrid a vehicle that was powered entirely or partially by electricity and was capable of being recharged from an Electric Charging Point or external electric power source. The Electric Vehicle must be licensed as private or private/light goods and not exceeding 2500kg in weight or 2 metres in height."
  - The wording of the OSPPO to be amended to allow for electronic payment of parking fees along the lines of using the definition below :-  
"“Electronic Payment" means a cashless parking payment method of charges for use in a parking place where facilities at that parking place allowed payment by telephone or electronic means, allowing vehicles of such classes, in such positions, on such days, during such hours and for such periods as are specified at each parking place and specified in the Schedule of Parking Places to be parked for the period of time for which electronic payment has been made. A transaction fee (convenience charge) may be incurred in addition to the scale of current charges as specified on site and specified in the schedule, for the use of this electronic payment method."
2. Delegated authority to be granted to the Director of Legal, People & Governance (Monitoring Officer) to draft the order amending the OSPPO above including making such minor amendments to go out to consultation.
3. In the event that there were no material objections to the proposed amendments and variations as determined by the Operations Manager for Street Scene and Open Spaces, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Service Delivery and Continuous Improvement, to grant delegated authority to the Director of Legal, People & Governance (Monitoring Officer) to make the order amending the OSPPO as recommended in the report.

(Proposed by Cllr J Buczkowski and seconded by Cllr J Wright)

**Reason for Decision:**

The OSPPO was designed to accurately reflect the Council's parking service and was a legal requirement that allowed the Council to provide such services.

Note: \* Report previously circulated.

**134. UPDATE ON THE FUTURE EPR (EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY FOR PACKAGING)**

The Cabinet had before it a report \* from the Head of People, Performance and Waste updating it on the future Extended Producer Responsibility for Packaging (EPR).

The Cabinet Member for Service Delivery and Continuous Improvement outlined the contents of the report with particular reference to the following:

- From 1 April 2025 Local Authorities (LA) would be compensated by packaging producers for the costs of efficiently and effectively managing household packaging waste collected from households or deposited at Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs).
- Payments would be made to local authorities through a new payment mechanism. The Scheme Administrator (appointed by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) was responsible for calculating producer fees and local authority payments.
- The size of the payment from year two onwards would depend upon an assessment of the LAs effectiveness/efficiency. There would be 10 LA groupings for both recycling and residual that the Council would be placed in. Ground litter, commercial waste collections and packaging in street bins would be excluded in year one.
- In late November 2024 the Council were informed that the indicative payment of funding for 2025/26 would equate to £927K (scheduled to be paid in November 2025). Since then the Council had spoken with other authorities to compare how the award was aligned with their own allocation, recycling performance and number of residents served.
- Following those discussions the Council completed a survey to DEFRA and were awaiting their response to questions the Council had asked in relation to its provisional allocation. The Council were also aware that some other funding streams and income would be impacted. For example, the Shared Savings Scheme which had seen the Council rewarded for its good recycling and residual performance by the County, had had notice served on it already meaning it was coming to an end in 2025/26. The Council would still receive recycling credits and gain income from selling the dry recycling.
- The Council were monitoring Government announcements including notification that the Deposit Return Scheme (DRS) would be launched in October 2027, which would impact how this Council operated.

Discussion took place with regards to:

- The dry recycling rates, where this Council strived to be and clarity regarding how the Council had been grouped and whether this would have an impact for the future?
- In regards to the grouping, would the tonnage amount paid be different for each category.
- This Council had been collecting food waste for some time and other local authorities that had not been collecting food waste had received funding to do so.
- Some local authorities did not collect certain recycling items such as glass.

**RESOLVED** that the content of the report be **NOTED**.

**Reason for Decision:**

Under Section 46 of the Environmental Protection Act Waste Collection, authorities may by means of notice specify how householders presented their waste for collection. There were legal requirements to adhere to legislation around simpler recycling.

Note: \* Report previously circulated.

135. **DEVON HOUSING COMMISSION REPORT**

The Cabinet had before it a report \* from the Head of Housing and Health on the Devon Housing Commission Report.

The Cabinet Member for Housing Assets and Property Services outlined the contents of the report with particular reference to the following:

- The Devon Housing Commission Report published in July 2024 provided a comprehensive analysis of the housing challenges faced in Devon.
- The report highlighted issues that created a current housing crisis within the county including; affordability, lack of adequate social housing and the growing demand for rental properties with reduction in supply. It emphasised the need for sustainable development, the role of local authorities in addressing those challenges and the importance of balancing housing supply with environmental and community needs.
- The report offered recommendations including increasing affordable housing options, improving planning processes and better support for community-led housing.
- At the September 2024 meeting of the Homes Policy Development Group (PDG), the Head of Housing and Health provided a short presentation summarising the 7 key findings of the commission alongside some local context in terms of the current Council position. It was requested that the presentation be circulated to the PDG after the meeting and that the Devon Housing Commission Report be brought back to the next meeting for further discussion and debate with potential for the PDG to make recommendations.
- Accordingly, it was arranged for the November 2024 Homes PDG to receive a broader presentation on the commission report. This was provided by Matt Dodd of Exeter University (Head of the Commission). The University presentation was attached in Annex A. The PDG subsequently recommended that the Devon Housing Commission report and recommendations be taken into account in the review of the MDDC Housing Strategy due in 2025.

Discussion took place with regards to:

- The property affordability in individual ward areas.
- The wording in 2.1 “Devon population is older than England and was getting older faster”
- Discussions about council coastlines.
- The Housing Enabling Officer and Planning Committees be empowered to set the size and price range of houses, had this been considered?
- The concerns around the lack of mention of Specialist Housing for those with neurodiversity and those with disabilities.
- The impact on Special Educational Needs Schools.

**RESOLVED** that the recommendation of the Devon Housing Commission’s report (July 2024) be taken into account in an update of the Mid Devon District Council (MDDC) Housing Strategy due in 2025.

(Proposed by Cllr S Clist and seconded by Cllr J Lock)

**Reason for Decision:**

Clearly the forward scoping and delivery of new affordable housing alongside the introduction of a Devon-wide and MDDC Housing Strategy in the near future may have significant financial implications which would need to be understood at the appropriate stage.

Note: \* Report previously circulated.

### 136. **NOTIFICATION OF KEY DECISIONS**

The Cabinet had before it, and **NOTED**, the Notification of Key Decisions \*.

The Clerk identified the changes that had been made to the list since it was published with the agenda.

This included the following:

- Replacement PVCU Double Glazed Unit / Entrance Doors added to the meeting in March 2025.
- Public Health Food Safety Service Plan added to the meeting in July 2025.
- Community Engagement Strategy (including Action Plan) added to the meeting in July 2025.
- Strategic Grant review 2025 added to the meeting in December 2025.
- Housing Strategy had moved to the meeting in June 2025.
- Corporate Anti-Social Behaviour Policy had moved to the meeting in December 2025.
- Tenancy Strategy had moved to the meeting in December 2025.

Note: \* Key Decisions report previously circulated.

(The meeting ended at 18.44)

**LEADER**