

MINUTES of a MEETING of the CABINET held on 2 December 2025 at 5.15 pm

**Present
Councillors**

D Wulff (Deputy Leader), J Lock,
N Bradshaw, J M Downes, G Duchesne,
M Fletcher, J Wright and D Wulff

**Apologies
Councillors**

L Taylor and S Keable and L Taylor

**Also Present
Councillors**

L G J Kennedy and L Knight

**Also Present
Officers:**

Stephen Walford (Chief Executive), Andrew Jarrett (Deputy
Chief Executive (S151)), Paul Deal (Head of Finance,
Property & Climate Resilience), Matthew Page (Head of
People, Performance & Waste), Darren Beer (Operations
Manager for Street Scene), Luke Howard (Environment
and Enforcement Manager) and Laura Woon (Democratic
Services Manager) and Tia Carmichael (Democratic
Services Officer)

**Councillors
Online**

J Buczkowski, F J Colthorpe, G Czapiewski and
B Holdman

Officers Online

Elaine Barry, Dr Stephen Carr, Dean Emery, Tristan Peat
and Adrian Welsh (Group Manager for Growth, Economy
and Delivery)

75. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors S Keable and L Taylor.

76. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Paul Elstone

Question 1:

It is noted that the Mid Devon District Council (MDDC) Corporate Risk Report CR 18 Housing Rent Error risk score has increased by 50% or from a score of 8 to 12 over the last month. Given that the Housing Rent Error risk is deemed either reputational

or financial it would not be unreasonable to consider that it is in fact the financial risk that has increased.

It is mentioned that Mid Devon District Council (MDDC) are waiting on a national policy decision from the Department of Work and Pensions.

Research conducted leads me to believe that Department for Working Pension (DWP) are not constrained by the 6-year legal limitation when recovering overpayments. This including Housing Benefit and Universal Credit amounts. That the DWP have mechanisms available and which historically they have used to recover overpayments they have made, this irrespective of time limits.

Does the increase in risk scoring now recognise this potential?

Question 2:

The Council made a rent repayment provision of £1.545 million in the 2023/24 financial statement which was rolled forward and increased to £1.777 million as at the 31 March 2025.

What is the current amount of the rent repayment provision this including when potential Department for Working Pension (DWP) uplifts are factored in?

Question 3:

When the referenced outstanding Department for Working Pension (DWP) communication is received, will it be made available to all elected members?

Question 4:

For the purposes of full openness and transparency will this document be made public?

Question 5:

It is noted that the drawing is an old revision it shows a bike storage area that no longer exist. Additionally, the provision of the ten (10) additional parking spaces is not shown.

A parking area that was contentious and which was rejected by the Mid Devon District Council (MDDC) Planning Committee and only granted on appeal.

Was using an outdated drawing an omission, a mistake, or intentional?

Question 6:

The Appendix 1 drawing is very poorly annotated, and no explanation of the intent of the bold red line is provided. What prevents someone from parking in the location of the previous bike store and unconstrained?

Question 7:

With the ten (10) parking spaces not being shown as part of the Off-Street Parking Area – what is to prevent non-residents parking at this location?

The Deputy Leader stated that Mr Elstone would receive a written response to his questions in 10 working days.

77. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT

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

78. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 4 November 2025 were **APPROVED** as a correct record and **SIGNED** by the Deputy Leader.

79. CORPORATE PERFORMANCE REPORT- QUARTER 2

The Cabinet had before it and **NOTED** a report * from the Head of People, Performance and Waste and the Corporate Performance and Improvement Manager on the Quarter 2 Performance Report, presenting performance information up to September 2025.

The Corporate Performance and Improvement Manager outlined the contents of the report with particular reference to the following:

- The accompanying dashboards were structured according to the five themes of the Corporate Plan.
- The dashboards contained 100 performance measures on how services were performing across the Council, and those indicators that were part of the Corporate Plan were highlighted in yellow text.
- Section 2 of the covering report provided performance analysis on a theme by theme basis, with the focus on Corporate Plan performance indicators.
- The Performance Dashboards had also been reviewed by the relevant Policy Development Groups (PDGs)

Discussion took place with regards to:

- The visited numbers and engagement rates for 'Let's Talk Mid Devon'. A question was raised about whether contributions had increased after the removal of the registration requirement for most interactions. It was explained that the Council had seen an increase in engagement and contribution rate on the basis of the ongoing work around Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) and there was a survey about 'Let's Talk Mid Devon'.
- There was a query on how the quality of engagements was measured. It was explained that each engagement was measured on its own merit and each activity that has had engagement.
- The report stated that 3.4% of available commercial leases were vacant at the end of Quarter 2, which was ahead of the 5% target. It was acknowledged that this was a positive outcome, but a question was asked about why occupancy was higher than the target. It was explained that the dashboard reports in terms of commercial leases and there were just two spaces that were available.
- A question was asked regarding electric car charging points, noting that the target was 4, but the current figure stood at 0, marked as red on the RAG report. What factors were holding the progress back and whether it was feasible to achieve the target of four within the financial year. It was explained that the progress was behind schedule due to delays in the central contract

with Devon County Council for providing EV charging points through the Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (LEVI) scheme. It was confirmed that the target of four charging points would likely be achieved within this financial year.

Note: Report previously circulated.

80. **CORPORATE RISK REPORT**

The Cabinet had before it and **NOTED** a report * from the Head of People, Performance and Waste and the Corporate Performance and Improvement Manager presenting the Council's current corporate risks with their updated position following the most recent review period.

The Corporate Performance and Improvement Manager outlined the contents of the report with particular reference to the following:

- The risks which had been identified that may be most likely to impact the Council meeting its objectives.
- The report was produced quarterly and presented to this meeting for Cabinet Members to comment and feedback.
- At paragraph 2.1 of the report there was a summary table of the 15 corporate risks that the Council was currently managing.
- A risk matrix was presented at Appendix 1 showing the relative position of the corporate risks. Appendix 2 of the report provided further details for each risk in a standard template.
- Any significant changes to the risk register since it was last reported to Cabinet were listed in the covering report, at paragraph 2.3.

Discussion took place with regards to:

- There was no change in the risk rating trends except from CR18 that was increasing.
- The risk CR1B, which was the Culm Garden Village, the current rating was red which was currently at 15 but the target was also 15. Why was it classed as red? It was explained that any risks rated 15 or higher were shown as red on the RAG report. Reference was made to the risk matrix in Appendix 1, which outlined the different RAG ratings for various risk levels. The target risk rating represented the lowest level achievable within the Council's control. It was noted that some risks could not be fully eliminated due to external factors such as funders and project complexities, meaning a residual level of risk had to be accepted.
- Whether or not the CR7 risk was a realistic target of 12? It was explained that it was based on the level of financial reserves the Council held and where it was in terms of target rating. The Council had been very robust and sensible to keep the finances balanced.
- The week commencing 15 December 2025 and the further budget updates, would that include more clarification on infrastructure updates? It was explained that the announcement on the 15 December would be more national level, regarding funding, the Council would update Members in due course.
- The risk CR8 the quality of Planning Committee decisions, it was felt that this should be good not satisfactory. It was explained how the scoring of mitigating actions worked. A rating of "above satisfactory" indicated fully effective, which

was considered a high standard to achieve. While the term “satisfactory” was used, it was clarified that delivery on the mitigating action was taking place, and a more detailed scale would likely show a more positive assessment.

Note: * Report previously circulated.

81. **ANNUAL INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING STATEMENT; THE INFRASTRUCTURE LIST**

The Cabinet had before it a report * from the Deputy Chief Executive (S151) on the infrastructure list inviting Cabinet to approve the updated Infrastructure List for publication on the Council’s website as part of the statutory annual Infrastructure Funding Statement.

The Cabinet Member for People Development outlined the contents of the report with particular reference to the following:

- The Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) must be published annually by 31 December. It included the Infrastructure List and a Section 106 report of funds received, spent and retained in the last financial year.
- The List identified projects that maybe funded wholly or partly by developer contributions. It supported delivery of the current adopted Local Plan and other evidence-based documents.
- The list was a guide to priorities, not a fixed limit. Additional infrastructure could still be secured through planning obligations where they meet legal tests, are necessary, locally relevant, and viable.
- Three changes were proposed to the list:
 - To remove the New Criminal Justice Centre – no longer identified as a priority.
 - Add Silverton Neighbourhood Plan priority: footpath link, landscaping, ecological enhancements, and public open space at the Glebe.
 - Add Willand Neighbourhood Plan priority: e-cargo and electric vehicle hub.
- These additions were drawn from Neighbourhood Plan priorities considered most suitable for inclusion at this stage.
- The Scrutiny Committee had reviewed the process in September 2025 and recommended circulating the list to Town and Parish Councils. This year’s proposed changes had also been reviewed by officers and discussed at Planning Policy Advisory Group (PPAG) and presented to the S106 Board at their November meeting.
- While this decision was about approving the current list, the full review of infrastructure needs would come later with the new Local Plan, when Members could help shape a refreshed list that reflected the priorities in that plan.

RESOLVED that:

1. The list of infrastructure as amended (Appendix 1; the Mid Devon Infrastructure List) that the Council intends to fund, either wholly or partly, by developer contributions be **APPROVED**.
2. The Infrastructure List is included within the annual Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) to be published on the Council’s website by

31st December 2025.

(Proposed by Cllr M Fletcher and seconded by Cllr G DuChesne)

Reason for Decision:

There was a legal requirement placed through Regulation 121A of the Community Infrastructure Levy largely applicable to CIL charging authorities to publish no later than 31st December in each calendar year an annual infrastructure funding statement which comprises “a statement of the infrastructure projects or types of infrastructure which the charging authority intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded by CIL (“the infrastructure list”).

Note: *Report previously circulated

82. MID DEVON OFF STREET PARKING PLACES ORDER

The Cabinet had before it a report * from the Head of People, Governance and Waste and the Environment and Enforcement Manager

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 2016 (the “OSPPO”) as set out in the report through appropriate consultation. This would enable implementation of restrictions and subsequent enforcement to be conducted in the areas of St Georges Court and Wellbrook Green in Tiverton.
- Informal discussions with the Highway Authority had been undertaken and they had indicated no objection to the recommendations.

RESOLVED that:

1. On being satisfied that the statutory grounds for amending and varying the OSPPO are met, as detailed in the report, to allow and authorise the Operations Manager for Street Scene to commence statutory consultation for the following proposed amendments to the OSPPO:
 - To incorporate within the OSPPO parking restrictions, as defined in the report within the area known as ‘St Georges Court’, in Tiverton. This includes entering into a Service Level Agreement with Tiverton Town Council (TTC) to incorporate 3 permit bays currently owned by them into the OSPPO to enable enforcement by Mid Devon District Council (“the Council”) in respect of these bays.
 - To amend the OSPPO to incorporate 18 spaces within the area known as ‘Wellbrook Green’ in Tiverton for the purpose of resident only parking.
2. That Delegated Authority be granted to the Director of Legal, HR & Governance (Monitoring Officer) to draft the order amending the above OSPPO including making the necessary required minor amendments to go out to consultation.
3. In the event that there are 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 then grant delegated authority to the Director

of Legal, HR & Governance (Monitoring Officer) to make the order amending the OSPPO as recommended in the report.

(Proposed by Cllr J Downes and seconded by Cllr J Lock)

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. The Council was at risk of not being able to enforce parking contraventions within new locations and in respect of electric vehicle parking, which could result in reputational damage for not taking appropriate action against offenders.

Note: *Report previously circulated

83. CAR PARKING AND PERMIT PROPOSALS 26/27

The Cabinet had before it a report * from Head of People, Performance & Waste and the Environment & Enforcement Manager recommending proposals to be considered that have come from the Car Parking Consultative Group for future changes to both pay and display as well as permit parking within MDDC car parks for the financial year 2026/27.

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

- The proposed fees and charges for car parks and permits in the upcoming 2026/27 financial year were set out in the report.
- These proposals had been carefully considered and put forward by the Car Parking Consultative Group. The group comprised of a collection of business and community representatives across the district who provided feedback and input to ensure proposals were properly considered and reflective of community views before being sent onto the Economy and Assets Policy Development Group (PDG) for consideration.
- There were three key considerations the parking consultative group have had in mind in making these proposals for consideration;
 - That car parking fees were raised by 5%. There had been no rise in car parking fees since June 2024, during this period inflation was projected to rise by 5.7% cumulatively over the period.
 - That the Council offer a sole day permit to complement the existing day/night permit. At present, customers were only offered the day/night option, however, feedback supported a desire to expand permit options to include a sole day permit option. This to be made available to all residents right across the district.
 - Finally, representatives from Crediton and Cullompton had asked for an additional 3 days of free parking between them, during the year to support local events.
- To note future work to be carried out by the Car Park Consultative Group on how parking permits were made more attractive and accessible for residents

right across the district, as well as consider what can be offered to market traders when operating in all of the towns in the district.

- On page 86 for Westex South Tiverton should be up to four hours, not three.

Discussion took place with regards to:

- It was great to see the group bring forward ideas and proposals to improve access to the Councils town and act on community and business feedback. This marked a real improvement in community engagement.
- Would the Car Parking Consultative Group consider extending free Saturday parking after Christmas, especially during the sales period, to attract more visitors and support local businesses? It was explained this would be feedback to the group to discuss extending the free parking whilst considering the financial impact this could have on the Council.
- Was there representation from Tiverton on the Car Parking Consultative Working Group. It was confirmed that yes there was representation from Tiverton.
- A question was asked around the recommendations that were before Cabinet. It was explained that regarding the reintroduction of a day permit option for car park users this was proposed to be available to use for all residents across the district. A report would come back to a future meeting of the PDG and Cabinet on how the permits were to be made available across the district.

RESOLVED that the following be approved:

1. It reviews the proposals initially made by the Car Parking Consultative Group regarding parking permits and consideration by the Economy and Assets PDG, and agreed the following:
 - The reintroduction of a day permit option for car park users. This to be available to use for all residents across the District.
 - To receive a further report from the Car Parking Consultative Group, to be first considered by the Economy and Assets PDG, regarding new ideas and proposals in relation to new potential parking permits that could be used in car parks across the District.
 - This to include the development of proposals around a new business permit for the Multi Storey Car Park (MSCP), Tiverton and to offer a potential reduction in the cost of permits located on level 1 of the MSCP, as highlighted in this report.
 - Future consideration be given by the Car Parking Consultative Group to extend free parking for market traders to other market towns.
2. A 5% rise for Car Parking charges to be introduced as part of the budget setting process for 2026/2027. This has been proposed by the Car Parking Consultative Group and then carefully considered by the Economy and Assets PDG.
3. The granting of additional free parking days for Crediton and Cullompton Town Councils to designate as they see fit to support their town centre activity.

(Proposed by Cllr J Downes and seconded by Cllr G DuChesne)

Reason for decision:

The report proposes measures to generate additional income to support the delivery of parking services for the Council. It also aligns with the Corporate Plan to deliver sustainable parking options within communities. Therefore, supporting economy and growth within the district.

Note: * Report previously circulated.

84. STRATEGIC GRANTS RENEWAL 2026/27, 2027/28 AND 2028/29

The Cabinet had before it a report * from the Deputy Chief Executive (S151) to agree the level of grant funding for external agencies under the Strategic Grants Programme for a 3-year period (2026/27, 2027/28 and 2028/29).

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

- The report asked Cabinet to agree the level of grant funding for partner organisations under the discretionary strategic grants programme and approve proposed allocations.
- Members had previously stated they did not want any reduction to the strategic grants programme, despite these grants being non-statutory.
- The full £120,000 allocation with no reductions, reflecting recognition of the importance and value of these services for residents, vulnerable people, and the tourism economy.
- The report highlighted that these organisations delivered frontline support aligned with the corporate plan objectives: improving well-being, sustaining strong communities, and supporting local businesses.
- A three-year funding duration was proposed to provide stability during Local Government Reorganisation, ensuring new authorities honoured the awards.
- The Community, People and Equalities Policy Development Group (PDG) recommended guaranteeing only the first year of funding and conducting a full review in 2026/27, noting the review would be a substantial undertaking.
- The 2023 review had assessed financial sustainability, strategic need, and alignment with corporate priorities.
- The strategic grants were described as targeted investments, not general community grants, due to limited resources.
- The Council continued supporting wider community and voluntary sectors through initiatives like the “Meet the Funders” event and economic development schemes.
- Cabinet was asked to consider an amended recommendation to align awards with a three-year commitment.

Discussion took place with regards to:

- Providing long-term, secure support for these initiatives, as they delivered important work for the Council economy and society was welcomed. Consistency was highly valuable and offered very good value for money.

- The strategic fund did not address the Council's net zero targets in the corporate and climate strategies. It was highlighted that the Council was exploring a similar funding scheme to support community sustainability initiatives, which were essential for achieving net zero.
- The importance of working closely with charities, including groups like Sustainable Tiverton, to recognise their contributions and it was suggested that the Council could do more to support them.
- How long the organisations had been on the list and whether other voluntary groups in Mid Devon could have an opportunity to bid for support? It was confirmed those entities had been on the list for a significant amount of time.
- The concerns about future responsibilities and funding for Town and Parishes after Local Government Reorganisation and suggested creating a comprehensive signposting list to guide them, which could serve as a valuable legacy.
- What proportion of the £38,000 contribution to the Grand Western Canal, shown in Table 1 as funded from the New Homes Bonus, was expected to come from that source? It was explained that the Grand Western Canal had been 100% funded from the New Homes Bonus for the past 5–6 years. However, the Government planned to remove this funding mechanism from April 2026. The Council still held earmarked reserves of the New Homes Bonus, which would be sufficient to cover the 2026/27 funding commitment.
- What we do to support various Charities and communities to be promoted more.

RESOLVED that:

Noting the recommendation by the Community, People and Equalities Policy Development Group:

1. A Strategic Grant funding programme of £120,000 per annum be approved for 2026/27, 2027/28 and 2028/29;
2. Grants continue to be allocated to individual organisations as set out within Table 1 (contained within the report).

(Proposed by the Chair)

Reason for Decision:

The Strategic Grants were paid under Grant Funding Agreements (not Service Level Agreements). The current grants were awarded in 2024 for a period of two years, with the funding agreement ending March 2026. Therefore, no guarantee had been made regarding a continuation of funding after this period.

85. TAX BASE CALCULATION 2026/27

The Cabinet had before it a report * from the Deputy Chief Executive (S151) Officer presenting the statutory calculations required to determine the Council Tax Base for the Council for the financial year 2026/27. The calculation followed the formula set out in The Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012.

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

- The recommended Council Tax Base for 2026/27 was 31,180.16 Band D equivalent properties, representing an increase of 447.25 from the previous year.
- The collection rate was maintained at 97.5%, consistent with prior years.
- The calculation incorporated changes such as new property growth, exemptions, discounts, premiums on second homes and long-term empty properties, and the estimated cost of the Council Tax Reduction (CTR) scheme.
- The CTR scheme was estimated to cost £4.774 million and was fully reflected in the tax base calculation.
- The report noted that any changes announced in the Government's Autumn Budget may require a review of these calculations.
- Setting the Tax Base was a statutory requirement and formed the foundation for the Council's budget setting process for 2026/27.

RESOLVED that Cabinet recommend to Council that:

1. That the calculation of the Council's Tax Base for 2026/27 be approved in accordance with The Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012 at 31,180.16, an increase of 447.25 Band D equivalent properties from the previous financial year.
2. That the current collection rate of 97.5% remain the same, detailed in Section 2.

(Proposed by Cllr J Downes and seconded by Cllr J Lock)

Reason for Decision:

The Council was a Statutory Billing Authority and must set its Council Tax each year. If it were not to set a Council Tax then the Authority and all Precepting Authorities would be unable to raise money to pay for all the services they provided.

Note: *Report previously circulated

86. BUDGET UPDATE 2026/27

The Cabinet had before it and **NOTED** a report * from the Deputy Chief Executive (S151) and the Head of Finance, Property and Climate Resilience on the draft Budget update on 2026/27.

The Deputy Chief Executive (S151) outlined the contents of the report with particular reference to the following:

- That recent Government funding changes were classified as major reforms to make the system fairer and more transparent, with greater weighting on deprivation and removal or downgrading of rural benefits like the sparsity grant.
- Transitional protections were to be phased in over three years, the Council was among 60 other councils expected to face a real-terms funding reduction of around 5% over the next settlement period.

- The New Homes Bonus, a key funding source, would not continue into 2026/27.
- A three-year financial settlement was announced, which would help planning but still posed challenges.
- Business rate changes included five new rating multipliers and adjustments for retail, hospitality, and leisure, with transitional relief expected. Local modelling work was underway, and Members would be updated.
- The loss of all business rate growth since 2013/14 was avoided.
- Overall finding reductions were closer to £1 million rather than £3 million, though still significant.
- The national budget had made a few changes for Local Government, aside from impacts like minimum wage increases, National Insurance (NI) changes, fuel duty adjustments, and small allocations for EV charging and planning capacity.
- Further details were expected in mid-December, and Members would receive more briefings as figures became available.

Discussion took place regards to:

- Clarification on the criteria used to determine the 60 authorities facing cuts due to the shift from sparsity to deprivation weighting. It was explained that areas of greatest need and deprivation were typically urban, while sparsity applied to rural parishes. As a result, most of the 60 councils affected including two-thirds of those in Devon fell into the sparsity category and were set to lose 5% of their funding.
- Concerns about how Government generated deprivation data, noting that rural deprivation was significant and compounded by isolation, which limited access to opportunities. Some families in schools did not claim the available support. It was explained that that Devon, including Mid Devon, had pockets of severe deprivation. This was why most funding was targeted to urban areas, and the Council had expressed their concerns and the allocation was based on deprivation metrics.
- How much the proposed 'mansion tax' would generate and be passported back to the Government. It was explained that Mid Devon had relatively few bands F–H properties compared to the national average, so the impact would be minimal. No modelling had been done yet, as the measure was newly announced and the Valuation Office would need to complete the work.
- The multi-year settlements in the past allowed Government to introduce targeted schemes and asked whether this would happen again or if funding would simply be cut back. It was explained that the fair funding changes were about redistributing existing resources rather than adding new money. Future departmental budgets would determine whether extra funding schemes appeared, but currently councils were told to expect a 5% cut. While multi-year settlements could help planning, core funding was still likely to reduce.

Note: *Report previously circulated.

87. **ACCESS TO INFORMATION- EXCLUSION OF PRESS & PUBLIC**

The Deputy Leader indicated that discussion with regard to the following item, may require the Cabinet to pass the following resolution to exclude the press and public having reflected on Article 12 12.02 (d) (a presumption in favour of openness) of the

Constitution. This decision was required because consideration of this matter in public would disclose information falling within one of the descriptions of exempt information in Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

It was **RESOLVED** that the meeting remain in Part 1.

88. **WASTE DEPOT REMODELLING- UPDATE**

The Cabinet had before it a report * from the Deputy Chief Executive (S151) on the progress update on the remodelling project at the Carlu Waste Depot, necessary to meet new Environment Agency permit regulations and requirements and enable the service to accommodate increased volumes of recycling and enable new collections to be trialled in 2026, future proofing the service.

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

- The report provided a progress update on remodelling the Carlu Waste Depot to comply with new Environment Agency permit regulations effective June 2026.
- The project aimed to ensure compliance, increase capacity, and future-proof the service, supporting recycling rates vital for future Extended Producer Responsibility for Packaging (PEPR) funding. Recent work focused on refining specifications and planning, and the schedule of works was ready to begin, with improvements on track and on budget.
- The project also included carbon reduction measures such as solar panels, electric chargers, and energy-efficient systems. Cabinet approval was sought to award the contract for installing a weighbridge, fuel station, and washdown area, with confidential discussion required for tender details.

RESOLVED that:

1. The progress made to date with the planned remodelling of the Carlu Close Depot be noted;
2. The contract award for the installation of a new Weighbridge, fuelling station and wash-down area at the Carlu Close Waste Depot, to Contractor 1 be **APPROVED**.
3. Delegated authority be given to the S151 Officer (in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, Assets and Property Services) to complete the "Civils Contract" award.

(Proposed by the Cllr J Lock and seconded by Cllr N Bradshaw)

Reason for Decision:

The EA published legal guidance that Waste and Recycling services needed to both abide to and meet for its collection services to be permitted and carried out. Recycling services that did not comply with this guidance may be disrupted

89. **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:

- Padel Business Case had been added to the meeting on 13 January 2026.
- Green Enterprise Grants had been added to the meeting on 13 January 2026.
- Crediton GP Surgery additional loan had been added to the meeting on 13 January 2026.
- MSCP Solar Panel had been added to the meeting on 13 January 2026.
- Mid Devon Housing Depot had been added to the meeting on 10 February 2026.

Note: * Key Decisions Report previously circulated.

(The meeting ended at 18.54pm)

LEADER