

CABINET – 14 JULY 2026

RESPONSES TO MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

1. Councillor Chris Naylor

This question was withdrawn.

2. Councillor Dawn Husemann

Does the Cabinet accept that demolition for redevelopment would be contrary to government policy and the Councils 'net zero by 2030' target?

RESPONSE:

The carbon impact of any scheme can only be assessed once actual proposals come forward and their whole-life carbon is known — and the recommendation today is to move to marketing, not to decide demolition. Continued vacancy also carries its own environmental cost. The prospectus will invite proposals for interested parties to set out their approach to carbon and wider environmental impact.

3. Councillor Brendan Mallon

Will a financial comparison be made between the 2-track approach recommended by T&F i.e. **either** pursuing a sale **or** securing a JV partner in order to enable members to make an informed decision, and will a financial appraisal be made to compare the receipt from an immediate sale with the cost of replacing the 'unfit for purpose' Guildhall by Joint Venture?

RESPONSE:

The Draft MTFP has just been published which shows that it is estimated more EFS borrowing will be required for the next few years.

The Council does not have the resources to participate in a joint venture as an investing partner. To do so would require even more additional borrowing at a time when the Council is already reliant on Exceptional Financial Support, which would run directly counter to its recovery strategy. The Council does however, welcome joint venture proposals from partners able to bring their own funding, and the marketing process is designed to invite exactly that.