

Minutes

Cabinet

Tuesday, 9 September 2025



**SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL**

Date of publication: 24 September 2025

**Call in expiry: 1 October 2025. Decisions can
be implemented (if no call-in, where applicable)
on 2 October 2025.**

The Leader: Councillor Ashley Baxter (Chairman)
The Deputy Leader: Councillor Paul Stokes (Vice Chairman)

Cabinet Members present

Councillor Rhys Baker, Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste
Councillor Richard Cleaver, Cabinet Member for Property and Public Engagement
Councillor Phil Dilks, Cabinet Member for Planning
Councillor Philip Knowles, Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance and Licensing
Councillor Virginia Moran, Cabinet Member for Housing

Non-Cabinet Members present

Councillor Tim Harrison
Councillor Ian Selby, Chairman of the Council
Councillor Elvis Stooke

Officers

Karen Bradford, Chief Executive
Richard Wyles, Deputy Chief Executive and Section 151 Officer
Alison Hall-Wright, Director of Housing and Projects (Deputy Monitoring Officer)
Emma Whittaker, Assistant Director (Planning & Growth)
Kay Boasman, Head of Waste Management and Market Services
Chris Prime, Communications Manager
Debbie Roberts, Head of Corporate Projects, Policy and Performance
James Welbourn, Democratic Services Manager
Patrick Astill, Communications Officer
Charles James, Policy Officer

26. Public Open Forum

There were no questions or statements from members of the public.

Cabinet agreed to vary the order of the agenda to allow the financial reports to be taken first.

A minute's silence was taken to remember former Council Chairman Councillor George Chivers, who had recently passed away.

27. Apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence.

28. Disclosure of Interests

There were no disclosures of interests.

29. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2025 were agreed as a correct record.

30. Housing Revenue Account Provisional

Purpose of report

This report provided details of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) outturn position for the financial year 2024/25, and covered the Revenue Budget, Capital Programme and Reserves.

Decision

Cabinet noted the provisional HRA Revenue and Capital Outturn position and the supporting appendices for the financial year 2024/25.

Alternative options considered and rejected

The option of not producing a provisional outturn report was discounted as Cabinet should have oversight of the Council's budgets.

Reasons for the decision

During the course of the financial year, the HRA budgets had continued to focus on meeting the housing needs of tenants, facilitating the delivery of new housing across a range of tenures, and meeting compliance requirements and ensuring resources were allocated appropriately.

The budget set by Council on 29 February 2024 showed a budgeted operating surplus of £7.004m. This surplus was used to provide funding for the external loan and to enable reserve levels to be maintained that subsequently funded the capital programme and service improvements. For the purposes of the outturn variance analysis the budget carry forwards had been removed and the actual surplus for the year was provisionally £5.674m. This surplus reduction was a consequence of an overspend of £1.314m due to investment in addressing the backlog of repairs and ensuring statutory compliance.

During the financial year, there had been significant expenditure in repairs and maintenance which had led to an overspend of £2.3m. This expenditure enabled the Council to reduce the backlog of repairs and to remedy damp and mould cases. Material costs had also increased above standard inflation, in some cases as high as 15%; together with the increase in productivity this had also contributed towards this overspend. There had also been an increased focus to decrease void turnaround times which had contributed towards this overspend but this had led to increased rent receipts of £458k and reduced void times which reduced from 136 days to 79 days.

The budget set by Council on 29 February 2024 for the 2024/25 HRA Capital programme was £21.315m. Budgets have been amended as projects have commenced, and these changes increased the 2024/25 budget to £27.207m.

It was important that members were aware of the financial position of the HRA to ensure they made informed decisions that were affordable and financially sustainable for the Council. Effective budget management was critical to ensuring financial resources were spent in line with the budget and were targeted towards the Council's priorities.

This report had been considered by the Finance and Economic Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC), and the Governance and Audit Committee prior to the summer recess.

31. General Fund Provisional Outturn 2024/2025

Purpose of report

To provide details of the General Fund provisional outturn position for the Financial Year 2024/25, covering the Revenue Budget, Capital Programmes and a Reserves Overview.

Decision

Cabinet noted the provisional General Fund Revenue and Capital Outturn position and the supporting appendices for the financial year 2024/25.

Alternative options considered and rejected

Cabinet should have oversight of the Council's budgets and therefore, the option of not producing a provisional outturn report was discounted.

Reasons for the decision

It was important that members were aware of the financial position of the General Fund to ensure they could make informed decisions that were affordable and financially sustainable. Effective budget management was critical to ensuring financial resources were spent in line with the budget and were targeted towards the Council's priorities.

During the financial year, the Council had managed budgets prudently and had been able to redirect funding where necessary to support the objectives set out in the Corporate Plan. A combination of savings and the generation of additional income had enabled the Council to boost its financial resilience.

The Council had delivered a number of key projects in recent months. Alongside this, Governance and Audit Committee, in considering this report agreed to create a Leisure Investment Reserve for leisure centres in Bourne and Grantham, as well as the SK Stadium in Grantham.

This report had also been considered by Finance and Economic OSC prior to the summer recess.

32. Finance Update Report – April to July 2025

Purpose of report

To present the Council's forecasted 2025/26 financial position as at the end of July 2025. The report covered the General Fund Revenue Budget, Housing Revenue Account Budget, and the Capital Programmes for the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account.

Decision

Cabinet noted the forecasted 2025/26 outturn position for the General Fund, HRA Revenue and Capital budgets as at the end of July 2025.

Alternative options considered and rejected

None.

Reasons for the decision

A similar report would be presented to the Finance and Economic OSC on 23 September 2025, and that Committee were urged to take note of the Cabinet proceedings in advance of their meeting.

There were several variances at Table 2 of the report, which would be monitored through the year. Emerging concerns on level of spend on repairs and maintenance would be managed by members and officers. Expenditure needed to be within approved budgets; maintenance was a significant cost to both the General Fund and HRA. There was a backlog of maintenance, which had been added to the Finance Risk Register.

One significant variance to the HRA was new builds, which was below budget for a number of reasons. Work continued to find potential housing development sites.

Staff salaries were the biggest single biggest cost to the Council, so it paid for the Council to make savings here where it was possible to do so. Spend levels within service areas would be monitored, and where there was natural turnover of staff, the

Finance department would work to explore other ways in which that vacancy could be filled. Recruitment of that vacancy may be held back for a period of time to allow savings to be made if this was a viable option. Agency staffing was an area that the Council looked to minimise spending. The vacancy factor within the budget had always been achieved in previous years, and there was confidence that this would be the case again this year.

Members should be kept updated on the financial position of the Authority, as effective budget management was critical to ensuring financial resources were targeted towards the Council's priorities. Monitoring enabled early identification of variations against the plan and timely corrective action.

33. People Strategy (2025 - 2028)

Purpose of report

To present the Employment Committee's recommendation to Cabinet for the approval of the People Strategy 2025 - 2028.

Decision

That Cabinet:

- 1. Approves the People Strategy 2025 – 2028.**
- 2. Delegates minor amendments (including grammar or typographical errors) to the People Strategy 2025-2028 to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council (Cabinet Member for Finance, HR and Economic Development).**

Alternative options considered and rejected

The Council could have maintained the existing People Strategy without substantial revision, however this would not have reflected the evolving workforce needs or the significant changes in organisational context, therefore this option was rejected.

Reasons for the decision

The refreshed People Strategy ensured the Council had a skilled, engaged and resilient workforce to deliver high quality services now and into the future. It provided a clear framework for how the Council would attract, develop, support and retain great people, equipping them to deliver excellent services for residents and communities.

The previous People Strategy covered 2022-2025. Progress had been made over the previous three years meaning there was a need for a refreshed Strategy.

The six key priorities were:

- Workforce Planning - Building a resilient, agile workforce aligned to future service needs
- Learning and Development – Fostering a culture of continuous learning and development
- Employee Experience – Creating an inclusive, engaging and supportive workplace
- Equality, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging (EDIB) – Embedding inclusive practices and celebrating diversity
- Wellbeing – Promoting mental and physical wellbeing through proactive support
- Reward and Recognition – Ensuring staff feel valued and motivated through fair and meaningful recognition

The refreshed Strategy had been discussed with the People Panel, Senior Leadership Team, the Trade Union and Councillors.

34. Weekly Food Waste Collection Service Update

Purpose of report

An update on the progress of the mandatory weekly kerbside food waste collection service rollout. The report asked Cabinet to recommend to Council an additional revenue budget allocation for service provision within the current financial year. The report also asked Cabinet to recommend to Council acceptance of the additional £953,377.03 Extended Producer Responsibility (pEPR) payment for the financial year 2025/26.

Decision

That Cabinet recommend to Council:

- 1. The formation of a revenue budget of £542,195 for the 2025/26 financial year to facilitate the rollout of the weekly food waste collection service.**
- 2. The use of £400,125.45 from the allocated revenue transitional funding and an additional £142,069.55 from the Waste Service Reserve to create the revenue budget.**
- 3. An increase to the vehicle replacement capital budget of £171,850 from the Waste Service Reserve to contribute towards funding the food waste collection vehicles and caddies.**
- 4. Acceptance of the additional pEPR payment of £935,377.03 for the financial year 2025/26 and to allocate this funding to the established Waste Services Reserve.**

Alternative options considered and rejected

Do nothing until the ongoing revenue funding is released by DEFRA – this option was not feasible as it would have resulted in missing the mandated rollout deadline by a significant amount of time.

Do not introduce the weekly food waste collection service – this option was not feasible as the change had been mandated through the Environment Act 2021.

Reasons for the decision

These recommendations enabled the Council to meet the requirements to provide a weekly food waste collection service to the residents of South Kesteven within the mandated timescale. It would ensure the Council did not face penalties from DEFRA or reputational damage for non-delivery of the service.

Members of the public would receive more information on the mandated service as part of a rolling programme of communications. Full Council would consider these recommendations at their meeting on 18 September 2025, and if carried, Environment OSC would further scrutinise the policy as the Council worked towards implementing mandatory food waste collection.

The following points were highlighted during debate:

- Weekly food waste collections were mandated by DEFRA and the Council could not opt in or out.
- The Council was not using ratepayer funds for this service.
- As South Kesteven District Council (SKDC) did not currently offer food waste collections (although had run a trial in previous years), there was a proportion of 'new burden' funding allocated to the Council by the government.
- In reality, the government calculation of the cost of the service to SKDC was not adequate. In 2026/2027 there may not be enough funding for the deployment of the food waste collection service; however the government have assured SKDC that spending would be replaced through the 'funding formula'.
- The level of ongoing funding from the government was not yet known. SKDC would have to keep delivering the service whether or not the budget sent from government was ample or sufficient. This information was requested in good time from government to allow for SKDC to financially plan for the service.
- SKDC were purchasing twelve vehicles rather than nine. In calculating what resources SKDC would require, DEFRA had used an incorrect number of households for the district. The correct number was ten vehicles; the additional two vehicles were spares that could be used when others were being maintained or repaired.
- The Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste and officers were confident of recruiting the 30-35 operatives required for the service. Recruitment was likely to start in November 2025, for a service that commenced in April 2026.

35. Aslackby Conservation Area Appraisal

Purpose of report

In accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Council was required to review its Conservation Areas from time to time and to prepare and publish any proposals for the preservation and enhancement of any parts of the District that were designated as a Conservation Area. This report considered whether the Council should designate the Aslackby Conservation Area and adopt the Aslackby Conservation Area Appraisal.

Decision

That Cabinet:

- 1. Recommends to Full Council the formal designation of the Aslackby Conservation Area boundary as shown in Appendix A to this report.**
- 2. Recommends to Full Council the adoption of the Aslackby Conservation Area Appraisal, as part of the Development Plan evidence base and as a material planning consideration.**
- 3. Recommends that Full Council delegates the decision making to the Assistant Director of Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning to make minor changes, typographical corrections or non-material amendments to the Aslackby Conservation Area Appraisal and associated documents prior to formal publication and to undertake the necessary statutory actions to implement agreed recommendations.**

Alternative options considered and rejected

An alternative option was not to expand the Conservation Area; however this may have resulted in a failure to preserve or enhance the historic interest and character of the village and the conservation area as identified in the appraisal. Conservation Areas were defined as “designated” heritage assets in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for the purposes of local plan making and development management. Designated heritage assets were afforded considerably more protection both in planning policy but also in legislation than non-designated heritage assets.

Reasons for the decision

Section 69(2) of the 1990 Act required Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to determine which parts of their area possess special architectural or historic interest and to designate them Conservation Areas. As the designation of a Conservation Area Appraisal was a requirement as noted in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, it was recommended to approve the updated documents to provide an up-to-date assessment and strategies for the preservation of the Conservation Area. The adoption of the Appraisal and Management Plan

would allow for the positive management of development whilst safeguarding historic character and appearance.

It was acknowledged that historically, Conservation Area boundaries have often been drawn too tightly, omitting areas now considered of special interest, especially green spaces and open space, boundary treatment or smaller outbuildings. The appraisal and proposed extension have taken this into account, considering not just the built heritage, but also the wider streetscape and the impact open space has on the appreciation of the village.

If adopted by Full Council, the Conservation Area would become an additional planning consideration for planning applications. There was a guidance document designed to help with planning matters within Conservation areas, and this document would be updated. There was often confusion about the measures that residents could take within such an area; e.g. would they have to replace uPVC windows with a wooden window. In this example, residents might be encouraged to do this, but it was not mandated.

The Aslackby Conservation Area was originally designated in 1991.

36. Ropsley Conservation Area Appraisal

Purpose of report

In accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Council was required to review its Conservation Areas from time to time and to prepare and publish any proposals for the preservation and enhancement of any parts of the District that were designated as a Conservation Area. This report considered whether the Council should designate the Ropsley Conservation Area and adopt the Ropsley Conservation Area Appraisal.

Decision

That Cabinet:

- 1. Recommend to Full Council the formal designation of the Ropsley Conservation Area boundary as shown in Appendix A to this report.**
- 2. Recommend to Full Council the adoption of the Ropsley Conservation Area Appraisal, as part of the Development Plan evidence base and as a material planning consideration.**
- 3. Recommend that Full Council delegates the decision making to the Assistant Director of Planning to make minor changes, typographical corrections or non-material amendments to the Ropsley Conservation Area Appraisal and associated documents prior to formal publication and to undertake the necessary statutory actions to implement agreed recommendations.**

Alternative options considered and rejected

An alternative option was not to expand the Conservation Area; however this may have resulted in a failure to preserve or enhance the historic interest and character of the village and the conservation area as identified in the appraisal. Conservation Areas were defined as “designated” heritage assets in the NPPF for the purposes of local plan making and development management. Designated heritage assets were afforded considerably more protection both in planning policy but also in legislation than non-designated heritage assets.

Reasons for the decision

Section 69(2) of the 1990 Act required local planning authorities (LPAs) to determine which parts of their area possessed special architectural or historic interest and to designate them conservation areas. As the provision of a Conservation Area Appraisal was a requirement as noted in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, it was recommended to approve the updated documents to provide an up-to-date assessment and strategies for the preservation of the conservation area. The adoption of the Appraisal and Management Plan would allow for the positive management of development whilst safeguarding historic character and appearance.

It was acknowledged that historically, conservation area boundaries have often been drawn too tightly, omitting areas now considered of special interests, especially green spaces and open space, boundary treatment or smaller outbuildings. The appraisal and proposed extension have taken this into account, considering not just the built heritage, but also the wider streetscape and the impact open space has on the appreciation of the village.

If adopted by Full Council, the Conservation Area would become an additional planning consideration for planning applications. There was a guidance document designed to help with planning matters within Conservation areas, and this document would be updated. There was often confusion about the measures that residents could take within such an area; e.g. would they have to replace uPVC windows with a wooden window. In this example, residents might be encouraged to do this, but it was not mandated.

The Ropsley Conservation Area was originally designated in 1981.

37. Contract Award Report for Reactive Repairs Works to Council Properties

Purpose of report

To seek approval to enter into a contract with two contractors, for the provision of reactive repairs to properties owned by SKDC.

Decision

That Cabinet approve the award of contracts to Foster Property Maintenance Limited and Lukeman Electrical Services Limited to carry out reactive repairs

to dwellings that are owned by South Kesteven District Council with an annual value of up to £2.2M, split between both contractors for a period of 3 years with the option to extend for up to 2 years.

Alternative options considered and rejected

Cabinet could have chosen not to procure new contractors to deliver reactive repairs or procure just one contractor instead of two as outlined in this report. If Cabinet did not procure new contractors, it would have risked using incumbent contractors who were out of contract and have not been appointed in accordance with an approved procurement route.

The option of procuring just one contractor was considered but was discounted to ensure there was adequate resilience to meet the fluctuating demand of a reactive repairs service and ensure that Cabinet did not risk placing all works with one contractor.

Reasons for the decision

There was a need for improvement to the Council's repairs service and procuring new compliant contractors with increased capacity would ensure that improvements could be made to the service provided to residents.

The preferred bidders and all unsuccessful bidders would be notified of the outcome simultaneously. Subject to the satisfactory return of due diligence, and no legal challenge being received, the contract would be executed at the conclusion of any standstill period.

The overall score for Fosters was 80.55%; Lukeman scored 75%.

There had been an aspiration for some time to create a framework whereby the Council could contact local suppliers. Where there was a need to sub-contract, Cabinet asked that local suppliers be considered.

Tenant satisfaction for repairs would be managed through a system called 'Rant and Rave'. A survey was sent to residents on completion of repairs to ensure they were satisfied. Satisfaction rates were reported back to Committees through the Key Performance Indicators reports.

38. Contract Award for Wellington Way New Build Scheme (11 units)

Purpose of report

Proposals for a new build social housing development of eleven units at Wellington Way, Market Deeping with a recommendation that the construction contract be awarded to Lindum Group Limited.

Decision

That Cabinet:

- 1. Approve the outcome of the tender process and appoint Lindum Group Limited as the preferred contractor for the construction of the housing development at Wellington Way, Market Deeping.**
- 2. Delegates to the Deputy Chief Executive and Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, to enter a contract with Lindum Group Limited to build eleven units at a cost of £1,926,000.**

Alternative options considered and rejected

Waiting to commence the scheme or not building the development were discounted as options due to the high levels of housing needs in the area.

Reasons for the decision

There was a housing need for the Council to develop the site therefore the decision was for the contract to be awarded so that works could commence in Autumn 2025.

The procurement process was in accordance with the Council's Contract and Procurement Procedure Rules, the Procurement Act 2023 and the Public Contract Regulations 2015. It was an incredibly competitive tender with nine bids received.

The eleven units would be made up of a mix of property types; 2 x 1-bedroom apartments, 4 x 2-bedroom apartments and 5 x 2-bedroom houses. The Scheme was due to be 'handed over' in September 2026. There would be adequate car parking, and the Scout Hut on the former RAF Langtoft base would be protected.

39. Local Government Outcomes Framework

Purpose of report

To inform Cabinet of the government's draft Local Government Outcomes Framework (LGOF) and ask them to approve Council's proposed response to the consultation.

Decision

That Cabinet approve the LGOF consultation response for submission to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG).

Alternative options considered and rejected

The Council were not required to respond to the LGOF consultation. However, in not doing so, the Council would miss an opportunity to influence the development of a key MHCLG workstream.

Reasons for the decision

The LGOF was a key part of MHCLG's programme to rewire the relationship between central and local government. The consultation was an opportunity for the Council to influence the development of this workstream.

On 3 July 2025 the MCHLG announced a LGOF, a new approach to outcome based accountability. It included 15 outcomes that government expected to work on with local authorities, underpinned by outcome measures drawing from existing data sources. 86 draft metrics were published for sector feedback.

The consultation response welcomed the positioning of the LGOF as a steering mechanism. Assurances had been given from government that the LGOF would not set targets or create league tables.

It had been highlighted that SKDC's current Corporate Plan already demonstrated high alignment with policy areas. Service planning would be adjusted to encourage service leaders to approach policy management in a holistic manner.

Post Local Government Reorganisation (LGR), it was suggested that MHCLG the Office for National Statistics (ONS) and other bodies continue to capture data on old district footprints.

Sector feedback will be reviewed and the final LGOF would be published alongside the Local Government Funding Settlement in December 2025. LGOF would go live in April 2026.

The Appendix to the report contained metrics where we SKDC had disagreed with MHCLG on measures used for local government activity. These areas of disagreement included:

- Percentage of planning application decided on time (dwellings – priority outcome 2)
- whether people feel that they can influence local decisions (priority outcome 11)
- fly tipping enforcement actions (priority outcome 11)

The following points were highlighted during debate:

- Disagreement arose on the fly tipping metric as enforcement of fly tipping depended on evidence. If the Council did not have evidence, it could not take action; it was a difficult area to take action on as gaining evidence was tough. However, where there was the opportunity to go to court, it was taken by SKDC.
- A completely new ministerial team had very recently been appointed at MHCLG. It would be interesting to see what their views on the LGOF were.
- The NHS had very recently published its oversight framework for 2025/2026 in the form of league tables. The government does not intend to use LGOF statistics to compile league tables.

40. Contract Award for Radon Remedial Works

Purpose of report

To seek approval to enter into a contract with The Radon Consultants Ltd for the provision of carrying out Radon remediation and maintenance works to council owned dwellings for South Kesteven District Council.

Decision

That Cabinet approve the award of a contract to The Radon Consultants Ltd for the provision of Radon remediation and maintenance works at Council owned dwellings with an annual value of up to £500k for a period of 2 years with an option to extend annually for up to 2 years.

Alternative options considered and rejected

Consideration had been given to the option of carrying out the works “in-house”, but due to the specialist nature of the installation work and subsequent re-testing to ensure Radon levels have been reduced, this was not a viable option.

It was not advisable to avoid carrying out the work as this could lead to further issues.

Reasons for the decision

Radon remediation and maintenance work was an essential part of ensuring the safety of residents. Radon was a naturally occurring radioactive gas that could affect properties of all types if suitable measures were not put in place. Although South Lincolnshire was classed as a low-risk area in comparison to other areas of the country action still needed to be taken to mitigate the risks that Radon gas may pose to residents.

This contract ensured that a variety of appropriate measures, where required, would be installed and maintained to reduce the risks that Radon posed within the Council's housing stock, following an initial Radon survey which would ascertain the level of Radon in properties.

The procurement opportunity was tendered via the National Housing Consortium (NHC) Residential Property and Asset Management Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) under Category 1: Radon Gas (Testing, Remediation, Servicing). Following publication of the opportunity four Expressions of Interest were received which resulted in two Tender Submissions. It should be noted The Radon Consultants Ltd joined the DPS after the initial Expressions of Interest was conducted; they were fully vetted by the North Housing Consortium so were eligible to submit a tender for the contract.

The Radon Consultants Ltd. had given the best tender submission for the price and quality of the contract. This decision ensured that the Council had a compliant contract in place.

41. Annual Complaint Performance and Service Improvement Report 2024/25

Purpose of report

To present Cabinet with the 2024/25 Annual Complaint Performance and Service Improvement Report and self-assessment against the Housing Ombudsman Complaint Handling Code which the Council was required to publish and submit to the Housing Ombudsman.

Decision

Cabinet noted the report and were encouraged to provide any further feedback prior to the submission deadline of 30 September 2025.

Alternative options considered and rejected

To not present the report and self-assessment to Cabinet for their feedback but the Council would then not meet the Housing Ombudsman's requirement that the information was considered by the governing body.

Reasons for the decision

To provide Cabinet with the opportunity to provide feedback on the 2024/25 Annual Complaint Performance and Service Improvement Report and self-assessment against the Housing Ombudsman Complaint Handling Code prior to submission to the Housing Ombudsman.

It was difficult to obtain historical data about complaints. There were no 'root causes' going beyond the previous 2 years.

The report also included summary information from the Housing Ombudsman Landlord Performance report, including a reduced number of housing complaints, and a reduction in time taken to respond to housing complaints.

Since September 2024 all stage 1 housing complaints had been responded to on time, as had all stage 2 complaints.

All recommendations from ombudsman have been actioned, which included amendments to the Council's Feedback Policy. The Cabinet Member for Housing held monthly meetings with officers in housing to see where further improvements could be made in responding to complaints.

42. Cabinet Forward Plan

There would be an additional meeting held in November to consider a recommendation from Full Council on LGR.

Members were reminded that the start time for Cabinet from October onwards would be 4pm.

The Forward Plan was noted.

43. Open Questions from Councillors

Question One – Councillor Ian Selby to the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture

Councillor Selby asked for an update on potential accessibility issues at the SK Stadium that he had raised at Cabinet in July.

Councillor Paul Stokes and the Deputy Chief Executive were undertaking an update on equality access on council buildings; it was anticipated this would identify and address any shortcomings at the stadium.

Question Two – Councillor Elvis Stooke to the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, HR and Economic Development

Councillor Stooke asked whether footfall from the proposed designer outlet in Grantham (due in 2026) would be directed into Grantham town centre. Could the outlet have a detrimental impact on local businesses in Grantham?

The Leader of the Council extended a warm welcome to the new Economic Development manager Simon Jackson, as he would be involved with issues related to the outlet.

The brands which were likely to be sold in the outlet shops would not ordinarily be found in the town centre, which had a different retail offering. It was possible that shuttle buses could be provided to and from the town centre for shopping, retail, food and culture.

The Section 106 agreement for the development contained further information.

Question Three – Councillor Tim Harrison to the Cabinet Member for Housing

Councillor Harrison asked for an update on the apartments on St. Peter's Hill.

The Director: Housing and Project outlined the compartmentation works currently taking place on the flats. Once completed, the voids team would have to make good any damage found through these compartmentation works, which may require remediation such as painting. The letting process would take place following the completion of these works. More accurate timescales could be provided outside of the meeting.

Question Four – Councillor Ian Selby to the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, HR and Economic Development

Councillor Selby asked whether it was possible to create a 'South Kesteven Day'.

Councillor Baxter noted the idea and would mention it to the Chairman of the Culture and Leisure OSC.

The meeting closed at 3:33pm.