



Civic Centre,  
Arnot Hill Park,  
Arnold,  
Nottinghamshire,  
NG5 6LU

# Agenda

## Council

Date: **Wednesday 17 September 2025**

---

Time: **6.00 pm**

---

Place: **Council Chamber**

---

For any further information please contact:

**Democratic Services**

[committees@gedling.gov.uk](mailto:committees@gedling.gov.uk)

0115 901 3844

---

# Council

## Membership

**Mayor** Councillor Kyle Robinson-Payne

**Deputy Mayor** Councillor Sandra Barnes

Councillor Michael Adams	Councillor Alison Hunt
Councillor Pauline Allan	Councillor Darren Maltby
Councillor Roy Allan	Councillor Ron McCrossen
Councillor Jane Allen	Councillor Viv McCrossen
Councillor Stuart Bestwick	Councillor Andrew Meads
Councillor David Brocklebank	Councillor Julie Najuk
Councillor John Clarke	Councillor Marje Paling
Councillor Jim Creamer	Councillor Michael Payne
Councillor Andrew Dunkin	Councillor Lynda Pearson
Councillor Boyd Elliott	Councillor Sue Pickering
Councillor David Ellis	Councillor Catherine Pope
Councillor Rachael Ellis	Councillor Grahame Pope
Councillor Roxanne Ellis	Councillor Alex Scroggie
Councillor Andrew Ellwood	Councillor Martin Smith
Councillor Paul Feeney	Councillor Sam Smith
Councillor Kathryn Fox	Councillor Ruth Strong
Councillor Helen Greensmith	Councillor Clive Towsey-Hinton
Councillor Jenny Hollingsworth	Councillor Henry Wheeler
Councillor Paul Hughes	Councillor Russell Whiting
	Councillor Paul Wilkinson

### **WEBCASTING NOTICE**

Please note that this meeting will be live streamed on the Council's YouTube channel and via the website ([www.gedling.gov.uk](http://www.gedling.gov.uk)). At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being broadcast.

You should be aware that the Council is a Data Controller under the Data Protection Act. Data collected during this webcast will be retained in accordance with the Council's published policy.

For more information about how your personal data is collected and used please view our privacy notice <https://www.gedling.gov.uk/elections-privacy/>

## SUMMONS

A meeting of the Borough Council will be held on Wednesday 17 September 2025 at 6.00 pm to transact the business as set out below.



**Mike Hill**  
Chief Executive

## AGENDA

Page

- 1 Thought for the day
- 2 Apologies for absence
- 3 Mayor's announcements
- 4 To approve, as a correct record, the minutes of the meetings held on 5 March, 23 July and 30 July 2025 5 - 37
- 5 Declaration of interests
- 6 To deal with any petitions received under procedural rule 7.8
- 7 To answer questions asked by the public under procedural rule 7.7

Question 1 - Question to the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Economy and Growth – asked by Joan Sharp

Have you considered the effect of the Wighay housing development on the inadequate healthcare, road networks, secondary schools and flooding issues in Hucknall which due to the location of the development will mean residents living in the houses will be reliant on the already inadequate infrastructure currently in place?

Question 2 – Question to the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Economy and Growth – asked by Jodie-Ana Van Alten

Given the rapid pace of development being permitted across the borough, how does the council justify continuing to approve large-scale projects when the supporting infrastructure—such as roads, healthcare, schools,

and public transport—is already stretched to its limits and, in many cases, operating at or beyond capacity. This situation appears increasingly unsustainable for both existing and new residents. Can you outline the council's strategic agenda to ensure that infrastructure investment keeps pace with development and that essential services are not pushed to the brink?

**8 To answer questions asked by Members of the Council under procedural rule 7.9**

Question from Cllr Whiting to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth and Economy

Following recent media reports about the increased number of allotment sites being developed into housing, can Cabinet reassure us that Gedling Borough has no allotment sites in future housing plans and will not entertain any planning application to develop allotment sites in future?

Question from Cllr Whiting to the Leader of the Council

Following the passing of a motion in July 2024 by Full Council on the current situation in Gaza, which committed Council to "Consider ways in which the events can be remembered in the future", can the Leader of the Council update us on what, if any, progress has been made on this?

Question from Cllr Wheeler to the Leader of the Council

The Freedom of Information Act and the Council's complaints system are an essential and legitimate part of democracy and governance, and both officers and Members respect these requests and respond to them appropriately.

However, I am aware that there are a small number of individuals who appear to target the Council, and submit frequent requests for information or make regular complaints, perhaps not always with the best of intentions.

Can the Leader tell me how much time has been spent by officers and estimated cost in gathering information in response to Freedom of Information requests and complaints from the top 3 correspondents over the last 4 financial years?

Question from Cllr Meads to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth and Economy

At the present time the county council is holding onto about £5million in section 106 money for school improvements from housing developments in Calverton, with the potential for much more to be handed over to them before LGR has taken place.

The county council has sat on some of this money for four years, and only around 10% of it has to be spent on specific Calverton schools under the terms of the various section 106 agreements. Buyers of the new homes in Calverton rightly expected that part of their purchase price included money for new school improvements within the village.

Since Reform have been in control at the county council projects have been put on hold. The same situation must exist across the borough.

Is there any pressure this council can put on the county council to ensure they spend the money now on our schools and before LGR takes place, rather than on schools that would remain in the new county authority if Gedling were put in with the new city based authority? I am aware it is the county council education department that draughts these 106 agreements but wonder if there any mechanism this council can use to ensure the future 106 money stays local, within our area.

#### Question from Cllr Meads to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection

Over the last few summers the north west corner of Calverton has been blighted by a huge number of small flies. This unwanted phenomenon means that residents can no longer have their doors or windows open, which is making life really uncomfortable, especially during the long hot summers. Some residents have paid for bi-fold doors they can not use at all.

The huge increase in flies coincided with the opening of a plastic recycling business. This business did not come before the Gedling BC planning department, but rather through the county council.

The late Lorraine Brown headed up a campaign to try and stop this recycling business coming to Calverton, with the unanimous support of the 15 parish councillors at the time, including the two Gedling BC independent councillors, but she was unsuccessful. I am aware that environmental health officers have been out to the business and visited residents a number of times over the last few years.

Could the council confirm the latest information they have on this, and to meet with me to see how we can look at eliminating this problem for the sake of the residents, and if it turns out not be the fault of the recycling business, to clear their name?

## **9 Reports and recommendations of the Executive or a Committee (procedural rule 7.10)**

### **a Prudential Code Indicator Monitoring 2025/26 and Treasury Activity Report for the Period April 2025 to July 2025**

- 10 To consider comments, of which due notice has been given, under procedural rule 7.11**
- |          |  |                |
|----------|--|----------------|
| <b>a</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting Tuesday 8 July 2025 of Environment and Licensing Committee</b>   | <b>55 - 57</b> |
| <b>b</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting Thursday 10 July 2025 of Cabinet</b>                             | <b>59 - 62</b> |
| <b>c</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting Wednesday 16 July 2025 of Planning Committee</b>                 | <b>63 - 69</b> |
| <b>d</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting Monday 21 July 2025 of Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>       | <b>71 - 74</b> |
| <b>e</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting Wednesday 30 July 2025 of Cabinet</b>                            | <b>75 - 76</b> |
| <b>f</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting Tuesday 5 August 2025 of Environment and Licensing Committee</b> | <b>77 - 78</b> |
| <b>g</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting Wednesday 3 September 2025 of Planning Committee</b>             | <b>79 - 80</b> |
| <b>h</b> | <b>Decisions made under delegated authority</b>  | <b>81 - 82</b> |
- 11 To consider motions under procedural rule 7.12**

The Council forms a Local Development Plan Working Group to support the Portfolio Holder - Sustainable Growth and Economy and the Director for Place to explore the reasonable alternatives for delivering the spatial strategy for Gedling Borough for the period up to 2043 and beyond arising from the required growth in housing, employment, services and infrastructure that the Borough needs to accommodate.

This shall include consideration of the option for delivering growth through new settlements. The conclusions and recommendations of the Local Development Plan Working Group shall be taken into consideration by Officers, Cabinet and Council when formulating and agreeing the Regulation 19 Pre-submission version of the Gedling Local Development Plan (or the equivalent stage under any future change of legislation)

Proposer: Cllr Andy Meads  
Seconder: Cllr Russell Whiting

## MINUTES COUNCIL

**Wednesday 5 March 2025**

Councillor Ron McCrossen (Mayor)

Present: Councillor Kyle Robinson-Payne Councillor Helen Greensmith  
Councillor Michael Adams Councillor Jenny Hollingsworth  
Councillor Roy Allan Councillor Paul Hughes  
Councillor Sandra Barnes Councillor Alison Hunt  
Councillor Stuart Bestwick Councillor Darren Maltby  
Councillor David Brocklebank Councillor Julie Najuk  
Councillor John Clarke Councillor Lynda Pearson  
Councillor Jim Creamer Councillor Sue Pickering  
Councillor Andrew Dunkin Councillor Catherine Pope  
Councillor Boyd Elliott Councillor Alex Scroggie  
Councillor David Ellis Councillor Sam Smith  
Councillor Rachael Ellis Councillor Ruth Strong  
Councillor Roxanne Ellis Councillor Clive Towsey-Hinton  
Councillor Andrew Ellwood Councillor Henry Wheeler  
Councillor Paul Feeney Councillor Russell Whiting  
Councillor Kathryn Fox Councillor Paul Wilkinson

Absent: Councillor Lorraine Brown, Councillor Viv McCrossen,  
Councillor Marje Paling, Councillor Michael Payne,  
Councillor Grahame Pope, Councillor Martin Smith,  
Councillor Jane Walker and Michelle Welsh

### **61 THOUGHT FOR THE DAY**

The Mayors' Chaplain could not attend the meeting so no thought for the day was heard.

### **62 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brown, V McCrossen, Paling, Payne, G Pope, M Smith, Walker and Welsh

### **63 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

None received

### **64 TO CONSIDER, AND IF APPROVED, ADOPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF CABINET DATED 13 FEBRUARY 2025 AND SET THE COUNCIL TAX FOR THE YEAR ENDING 31 MARCH 2026**

A proposition was moved by Councillor Clarke and seconded by Councillor Hollingsworth in the following terms:

1. In accordance with the recommendations of Cabinet on 13 February 2025, that the Prudential and Treasury Indicators and Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) 2025/26, which includes the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement, the Borrowing Strategy, and the Annual Investment Strategy, set out at pages 5 to 34 of the Council agenda, be approved.
2. In accordance with the recommendations of Cabinet on 13 February 2025, that the Capital Programme and Capital Investment Strategy 2025/26 to 2029/30 set out at pages 89 to 98 of the Council agenda, be approved.
3. In accordance with the recommendation of Cabinet on 13 February 2025, that the financial threshold above which decisions will be regarded as Key Decisions be set at £0.5 million for 2025/26, and that the detailed budget for 2025/26 included at pages 127 to 156 of the Council agenda be approved.
4. That the sum of £56,300 be taken from General Fund Balances in 2025/26 to support future General Fund revenue expenditure.
5. That it be noted that the Portfolio holder for Corporate Resources and Performance and Leader of the Council determined on 19 December 2024 (D1572), the following amounts for the year 2025/26 in accordance with regulations made under section 31(B) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
  - (a) 39,664.26 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, as its council tax base for the year. **(The Council Tax base for the whole district)**

(b)

<u>Part of the Council's Area</u>	<u>Tax Base</u>
Bestwood Village	732.75
Burton Joyce	1,564.06
Calverton	2,555.11
Colwick	897.78
Lambley	505.61
Linby	403.53
Newstead	368.39
Papplewick	271.19
Ravenshead	2,805.64
St Albans	945.66
Stoke Bardolph	463.75
Woodborough	935.89



being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amounts of its council tax base for the year for dwellings in/ those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate. **(The Council Tax base for each parish)**

6. That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2025/26 in accordance with sections 31A, 31B and 34 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (the Act):
- (a) £48,232,280 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in section 31A(2) of the Act. **(Effectively gross expenditure including parish precepts, and transfers to reserves)**
  - (b) £39,536,110 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in section 31A(3) of the Act. **(Effectively gross income and transfers from reserves)**
  - (c) £8,696,170 being the amount by which the aggregate at 6(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 6(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 31A(4) of the Act, as its Council Tax Requirement for the year. **(Expenditure less income)**
  - (d) £219.24 being the amount at 6(c) above, divided by the amount at 5(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year. **(The overall average amount of Council Tax per Band D property, including parish precepts)**
  - (e) £981,413 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in section 34(1) of the Act. **(Total of parish precepts)**. For information, the amount in respect of each parish is as follows:

<u>Part of the Council's Area</u>	<u>Parish Precept</u>
Bestwood Village	20,000
Burton Joyce	247,799
Calverton	294,634
Colwick	30,700
Lambley	25,151
Linby	29,532
Newstead	22,449
Papplewick	23,288
Ravenshead	170,055
St Albans	28,720
Stoke Bardolph	2,500
Woodborough	86,585

- (f) £194.50 being the amount at 6(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 6(e) above by the amount

at 5(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates. **(Gedling's own element of the Council Tax for a Band D dwelling).**

(g)

<b><u>Part of the Council's Area</u></b>	<b><u>£</u></b>
Bestwood Village	221.79
Burton Joyce	352.93
Calverton	309.81
Colwick	228.70
Lambley	244.24
Linby	267.68
Newstead	255.44
Papplewick	280.37
Ravenshead	255.11
St Albans	224.87
Stoke Bardolph	199.89
Woodborough	287.02

being the amounts given by adding the amount at 6(f) above to the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above, divided in each case by the amount at 5(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate. **(The combined district and parish amount of Council Tax for a Band D dwelling)**

(h)

<b><u>Part of the Council's Area</u></b>	<b><u>Valuation Bands</u></b>							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Bestwood Village	147.86	172.51	197.15	221.79	271.07	320.36	369.65	443.58
Burton Joyce	235.29	274.50	313.72	352.93	431.36	509.78	588.22	705.86
Calverton	206.54	240.97	275.39	309.81	378.65	447.50	516.35	619.62
Colwick	152.47	177.88	203.29	228.70	279.52	330.34	381.17	457.40
Lambley	162.83	189.97	217.10	244.24	298.51	352.79	407.07	488.48
Linby	178.46	208.20	237.94	267.68	327.16	386.64	446.14	535.36
Newstead	170.30	198.68	227.06	255.44	312.20	368.96	425.74	510.88
Papplewick	186.92	218.07	249.22	280.37	342.67	404.97	467.29	560.74
Ravenshead	170.08	198.42	226.77	255.11	311.80	368.49	425.19	510.22
St Albans	149.92	174.90	199.89	224.87	274.84	324.81	374.79	449.74
Stoke Bardolph	133.26	155.47	177.68	199.89	244.31	288.73	333.15	399.78
Woodborough	191.35	223.24	255.13	287.02	350.80	414.58	478.37	574.04
All other parts of the Council's area	129.67	151.28	172.89	194.50	237.72	280.94	324.17	389.00

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 6(f) and 6(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in

section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands. **(The combined district and parish amount of Council Tax for each band of dwelling).**

**7. That it be noted that for the year 2025/26, Nottinghamshire County Council, the Office of the Nottinghamshire Police & Crime Commissioner and the Combined Fire & Rescue Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Precepting Authority:	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Notts County Council	1,263.03	1,473.53	1,684.04	1,894.54	2,315.55	2,736.56	3,157.57	3,789.08
Notts Police & Crime Commissioner	197.40	230.30	263.20	296.10	361.90	427.70	493.50	592.20
Combined Fire & Rescue Authority	64.81	75.61	86.41	97.21	118.81	140.41	162.02	194.42

**8. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 6(h) and 7 above, the Council, in accordance with section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts of council tax for the year 2025/26 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below: (The total amount of Council Tax for each band of dwelling)**

**Part of the Council's Area**

	<u>Valuation Bands</u>							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Bestwood Village	1,673.10	1,951.95	2,230.80	2,509.64	3,067.33	3,625.03	4,182.74	5,019.28
Burton Joyce	1,760.53	2,053.94	2,347.37	2,640.78	3,227.62	3,814.45	4,401.31	5,281.56
Calverton	1,731.78	2,020.41	2,309.04	2,597.66	3,174.91	3,752.17	4,329.44	5,195.32
Colwick	1,677.71	1,957.32	2,236.94	2,516.55	3,075.78	3,635.01	4,194.26	5,033.10
Lambley	1,688.07	1,969.41	2,250.75	2,532.09	3,094.77	3,657.46	4,220.16	5,064.18
Linby	1,703.70	1,987.64	2,271.59	2,555.53	3,123.42	3,691.31	4,259.23	5,111.06
Newstead	1,695.54	1,978.12	2,260.71	2,543.29	3,108.46	3,673.63	4,238.83	5,086.58
Papplewick	1,712.16	1,997.51	2,282.87	2,568.22	3,138.93	3,709.64	4,280.38	5,136.44
Ravenshead	1,695.32	1,977.86	2,260.42	2,542.96	3,108.06	3,673.16	4,238.28	5,085.92
St Albans	1,675.16	1,954.34	2,233.54	2,512.72	3,071.10	3,629.48	4,187.88	5,025.44
Stoke Bardolph	1,658.50	1,934.91	2,211.33	2,487.74	3,040.57	3,593.40	4,146.24	4,975.48
Woodborough	1,716.59	2,002.68	2,288.78	2,574.87	3,147.06	3,719.25	4,291.46	5,149.74
All other parts of the Council's area	1,654.91	1,930.72	2,206.54	2,482.35	3,033.98	3,585.61	4,137.26	4,964.70

An amendment was moved by Councillor Adams and seconded by Councillor S Smith on the following terms:

That the Council has the following objections and proposals to the estimates submitted by Cabinet, and it requires the Cabinet to reconsider those estimates in the light of these objections and proposals, and report back to Council within five working days after the day of this meeting.

#### **Revenue Budget Proposed Amendment**

Revert to Diesel rather than HVO as a fuel source *	(£8,000)
Fuel savings due to budget calculated prior to a reduction in fuel prices identified**	(£18,000)
Deletion of four Portfolio Holders	(£34,000)
Removal of Deputy Mayor's Special Responsibility Allowance	(£2,100)
Removal of Policy Advisors	(£4,200)
Removal of Contacts Magazine to online only publication	(£37,000)
Purchase of a New Small Street Sweeper this would result in an increase in the revenue budget to cover the cost of borrowing and associated running costs	£24,000
One additional driver for the above	£38,000
Provision of one free hour parking at Gedling Country Park ***	£41,300

The following caveats apply:

\*On the assumption that the differential in fuel prices between Diesel and HVO do not alter significantly during 2025/26.

\*\*Based on current fuel prices which can be volatile; therefore, this proposal is on the assumption that fuel prices do not increase significantly during 2025/26.

\*\*\*Offering an hour free parking may have a more significant impact on the income that is already included in the budget and the MTFP, if the majority of visitors only stay for an hour or less, this could result in insufficient income being unavailable to maintain the park and the car park, potentially placing additional pressure onto the revenue budget to be funded elsewhere or requiring additional efficiencies within the service area to be identified. This is an untested assumption which could have a more significant budget impact than stated above.

#### **Note:**

The Local Government Act 2003 requires that the Council's Chief Financial Officer, in the case of Gedling that is The Chief Finance and S151 Officer, provide advice to the Council on the adequacy of financial reserves, and the robustness of the estimates. These comments can be found below:

## **THE ROBUSTNESS OF THE ESTIMATES AND THE ADEQUACY OF THE GENERAL FUND BALANCES**

*The annual budget and the medium-term plan are based on a range of assumptions, detailed to Cabinet on 13 February, and these have enabled estimates of current and future spending to be modelled. The Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) is presented against the backdrop of major and unprecedented uncertainty, primarily due to the continuing deferral of local government finance reforms inflationary increases, significant increase in demand for services, post-Brexit supply and labour shortages. The Council has an established process for assessing the financial risk factors inherent in any business activity, and the financial risk register recognises the increasing risks to financial sustainability in the medium term arising from the increased costs and uncertain funding levels.*

*The Council has a strong track record of meeting demands within the approved budget, together with a good reputation for the robustness of its financial planning, which will continue, however, it is important to note the structural deficit that remains within the MTFP which will require the development of further plans for budget efficiencies/savings and it should be expected that there will need to be some contraction of service delivery/performance if efficiency plans do not proceed in line with expectations.*

*The annual budget for 2025/26 and the subsequent years of the MTFP leave the Council with a level of balances broadly in line with the minimum required from 2027/28 onwards. Whilst existing management approaches should enable the Council to deliver the efficiency required in the medium to long term, further changes to the way that services are delivered will be required if the Council is to fully achieve its ambitions and achieve a sustainable financial position.*

*The Council will continue to implement the approved efficiency plans and to develop new budget reduction proposals in order to balance the MTFP which, if implemented, will mean that the financial outlook remains fair, and that the 2025/26 estimates, and beyond, are robust. Members are reminded that risk levels in the MTFP are increasing as a result of ongoing uncertainties surrounding the local government finance settlement and in the absence of funding increases, from 2027/28 additional budget reductions will be required and whilst some have been identified they are not currently backed by an agreed action plan. Despite this, risks are currently still at acceptable levels as there is a sufficient lead in time for developing detailed plans in the coming year.*

*An assessment of reserves and balances has been carried out and I am satisfied that the financial position as presented is robust, and that reserves and balances are adequate in the short to medium term. However, pressures on both capital and revenue budgets are substantial and the MTFP shows continued reliance on the use of General Fund balances to support expenditure levels, as reported to Cabinet on 13 February 2025.*

*The Council has in the past successfully managed such pressures, and therefore I consider that, given the information available at the time, the*

*level of general reserves are adequate for the purpose of setting the 2025/26 Council Tax.*

A proposed motion to briefly adjourn the meeting to allow members to consider the amendment put before them. The motion was supported, and the Mayor declared it carried.

The meeting adjourned at 6:27pm.

The meeting resumed at 6:37pm.

Following debate, in accordance with standing orders the amendment was put to a named vote. The Mayor declared the amendment not carried.

Members debated the original motion, the main budget vote.

Upon the Mayor putting the original proposition of the meeting, and in accordance with standing orders, the original proposition was put to a named vote. The Mayor declared the motion carried.

**RESOLVED that:**

1. In accordance with the recommendations of Cabinet on 13 February 2025, that the Prudential and Treasury Indicators and Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) 2025/26, which includes the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement, the Borrowing Strategy, and the Annual Investment Strategy, set out at pages 5 to 34 of the Council agenda, be approved.
2. In accordance with the recommendations of Cabinet on 13 February 2025, that the Capital Programme and Capital Investment Strategy 2025/26 to 2029/30 set out at pages 89 to 98 of the Council agenda, be approved.
3. In accordance with the recommendation of Cabinet on 13 February 2025, that the financial threshold above which decisions will be regarded as Key Decisions be set at £0.5 million for 2025/26, and that the detailed budget for 2025/26 included at pages 127 to 156 of the Council agenda be approved.
4. That the sum of £56,300 be taken from General Fund Balances in 2025/26 to support future General Fund revenue expenditure.
5. That it be noted that the Portfolio holder for Corporate Resources and Performance and Leader of the Council determined on 19 December 2024 (D1572), the following amounts for the year 2025/26 in accordance with regulations made under section 31(B) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
  - (a) 39,664.26 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations

2012, as its council tax base for the year. **(The Council Tax base for the whole district)**

(b)

<u>Part of the Council's Area</u>	<u>Tax Base</u>
Bestwood Village	732.75
Burton Joyce	1,564.06
Calverton	2,555.11
Colwick	897.78
Lambley	505.61
Linby	403.53
Newstead	368.39
Papplewick	271.19
Ravenshead	2,805.64
St Albans	945.66
Stoke Bardolph	463.75
Woodborough	935.89

being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amounts of its council tax base for the year for dwellings in/ those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate. **(The Council Tax base for each parish)**

6. That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2025/26 in accordance with sections 31A, 31B and 34 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (the Act):

- (a) £48,232,280 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in section 31A(2) of the Act. **(Effectively gross expenditure including parish precepts, and transfers to reserves)**
- (b) £39,536,110 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in section 31A(3) of the Act. **(Effectively gross income and transfers from reserves)**
- (c) £8,696,170 being the amount by which the aggregate at 6(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 6(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 31A(4) of the Act, as its Council Tax Requirement for the year. **(Expenditure less income)**
- (d) £219.24 being the amount at 6(c) above, divided by the amount at 5(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year. **(The overall average amount of Council Tax per Band D property, including parish precepts)**
- (e) £981,413 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in section 34(1) of the Act. **(Total of parish**

**precepts).** For information, the amount in respect of each parish is as follows:

<u>Part of the Council's Area</u>	<u>Parish Precept</u>
Bestwood Village	20,000
Burton Joyce	247,799
Calverton	294,634
Colwick	30,700
Lambley	25,151
Linby	29,532
Newstead	22,449
Papplewick	23,288
Ravenshead	170,055
St Albans	28,720
Stoke Bardolph	2,500
Woodborough	86,585

- (f) £194.50 being the amount at 6(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 6(e) above by the amount at 5(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates. **(Gedling's own element of the Council Tax for a Band D dwelling).**

- (g)

<u>Part of the Council's Area</u>	<u>£</u>
Bestwood Village	221.79
Burton Joyce	352.93
Calverton	309.81
Colwick	228.70
Lambley	244.24
Linby	267.68
Newstead	255.44
Papplewick	280.37
Ravenshead	255.11
St Albans	224.87
Stoke Bardolph	199.89
Woodborough	287.02

being the amounts given by adding the amount at 6(f) above to the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above, divided in each case by the amount at 5(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate. **(The combined district and parish amount of Council Tax for a Band D dwelling)**

- (h)



**Part of the Council's Area****Valuation Bands**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Bestwood Village	147.86	172.51	197.15	221.79	271.07	320.36	369.65	443.58
Burton Joyce	235.29	274.50	313.72	352.93	431.36	509.78	588.22	705.86
Calverton	206.54	240.97	275.39	309.81	378.65	447.50	516.35	619.62
Colwick	152.47	177.88	203.29	228.70	279.52	330.34	381.17	457.40
Lambley	162.83	189.97	217.10	244.24	298.51	352.79	407.07	488.48
Linby	178.46	208.20	237.94	267.68	327.16	386.64	446.14	535.36
Newstead	170.30	198.68	227.06	255.44	312.20	368.96	425.74	510.88
Papplewick	186.92	218.07	249.22	280.37	342.67	404.97	467.29	560.74
Ravenshead	170.08	198.42	226.77	255.11	311.80	368.49	425.19	510.22
St Albans	149.92	174.90	199.89	224.87	274.84	324.81	374.79	449.74
Stoke Bardolph	133.26	155.47	177.68	199.89	244.31	288.73	333.15	399.78
Woodborough	191.35	223.24	255.13	287.02	350.80	414.58	478.37	574.04
All other parts of the Council's area	129.67	151.28	172.89	194.50	237.72	280.94	324.17	389.00

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 6(f) and 6(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands. **(The combined district and parish amount of Council Tax for each band of dwelling).**

***7. That it be noted that for the year 2025/26, Nottinghamshire County Council, the Office of the Nottinghamshire Police & Crime Commissioner and the Combined Fire & Rescue Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:***

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
<b>Precepting Authority:</b>								
Notts County Council	1,263.03	1,473.53	1,684.04	1,894.54	2,315.55	2,736.56	3,157.57	3,789.08
Notts Police & Crime Commissioner	197.40	230.30	263.20	296.10	361.90	427.70	493.50	592.20
Combined Fire & Rescue Authority	64.81	75.61	86.41	97.21	118.81	140.41	162.02	194.42

***8. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 6(h) and 7 above, the Council, in accordance with section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts of council tax for the year***

**2025/26 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:  
(The total amount of Council Tax for each band of dwelling)**

<u>Part of the Council's Area</u>	<u>Valuation Bands</u>							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Bestwood Village	1,673.10	1,951.95	2,230.80	2,509.64	3,067.33	3,625.03	4,182.74	5,019.28
Burton Joyce	1,760.53	2,053.94	2,347.37	2,640.78	3,227.62	3,814.45	4,401.31	5,281.56
Calverton	1,731.78	2,020.41	2,309.04	2,597.66	3,174.91	3,752.17	4,329.44	5,195.32
Colwick	1,677.71	1,957.32	2,236.94	2,516.55	3,075.78	3,635.01	4,194.26	5,033.10
Lambley	1,688.07	1,969.41	2,250.75	2,532.09	3,094.77	3,657.46	4,220.16	5,064.18
Linby	1,703.70	1,987.64	2,271.59	2,555.53	3,123.42	3,691.31	4,259.23	5,111.06
Newstead	1,695.54	1,978.12	2,260.71	2,543.29	3,108.46	3,673.63	4,238.83	5,086.58
Papplewick	1,712.16	1,997.51	2,282.87	2,568.22	3,138.93	3,709.64	4,280.38	5,136.44
Ravenshead	1,695.32	1,977.86	2,260.42	2,542.96	3,108.06	3,673.16	4,238.28	5,085.92
St Albans	1,675.16	1,954.34	2,233.54	2,512.72	3,071.10	3,629.48	4,187.88	5,025.44
Stoke Bardolph	1,658.50	1,934.91	2,211.33	2,487.74	3,040.57	3,593.40	4,146.24	4,975.48
Woodborough	1,716.59	2,002.68	2,288.78	2,574.87	3,147.06	3,719.25	4,291.46	5,149.74
All other parts of the Council's area	1,654.91	1,930.72	2,206.54	2,482.35	3,033.98	3,585.61	4,137.26	4,964.70

**65                    IMPLICATIONS OF THE REVISED NPPF FOR LOCAL PLAN  
PREPARATION AND APPROVAL OF REVISED LOCAL  
DEVELOPMENT SCHEME**

**RESOLVED that:**

- i. Council notes the summary of changes to the NPPF arising from the publication of the revised NPPF on 12th December 2024; and
- ii. Council approves withdrawal from the preparation of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan and to commence the preparation of the Gedling Local Development Plan which will cover strategic and non-strategic matters; and
- iii. Council approves the revised Local Development Scheme (LDS)

**66                    NON-ATTENDANCE BY A COUNCILLOR FOR SIX MONTHS**

**RESOLVED that:**

Council accepts serious illness as the reason for non-attendance of Councillor Brown to avoid forfeiture of office.

The meeting finished at 20:43

Signed by Chair:  
Date:

## **MINUTES COUNCIL**

**Wednesday 23 July 2025**

Councillor Kyle Robinson-Payne (Mayor)

Present: Councillor Sandra Barnes Councillor Helen Greensmith  
Councillor Michael Adams Councillor Paul Hughes  
Councillor Pauline Allan Councillor Alison Hunt  
Councillor Roy Allan Councillor Darren Maltby  
Councillor Stuart Bestwick Councillor Andrew Meads  
Councillor David Brocklebank Councillor Julie Najuk  
Councillor John Clarke Councillor Marje Paling  
Councillor Jim Creamer Councillor Sue Pickering  
Councillor Andrew Dunkin Councillor Alex Scroggie  
Councillor Boyd Elliott Councillor Martin Smith  
Councillor David Ellis Councillor Sam Smith  
Councillor Rachael Ellis Councillor Ruth Strong  
Councillor Roxanne Ellis Councillor Jane Walker  
Councillor Andrew Ellwood Councillor Russell Whiting  
Councillor Kathryn Fox Councillor Paul Wilkinson

Absent: Councillor Paul Feeney, Councillor Jenny Hollingsworth,  
Councillor Ron McCrossen, Councillor Viv McCrossen, Councillor  
Michael Payne, Councillor Lynda Pearson, Councillor Catherine  
Pope, Councillor Grahame Pope, Councillor Clive Towsey-Hinton  
and Councillor Henry Wheeler

In attendance M Hill, F Whyley, M Avery, N Osei, E McGinlay and C Goodall

### **27 THOUGHT FOR THE DAY**

Members observed a minute's silence to commemorate the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Srebrenica genocide.

The Mayor's chaplain then read an extract from the letter of St Paul to the Romans, which centred the idea of loving those around us.

### **28 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Feeney, Hollingsworth, Ron McCrossen, Viv McCrossen, Payne, Pearson, Catherine Pope, Grahame Pope, Towsey-Hinton and Wheeler.

### **29 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor welcomed Councillor Meads to the council and congratulated him on his recent win in the Calverton ward by-election.

The Mayor spoke about the recent community events he had attended across the borough and highlighted a few – noting his particular pleasure to have attended the recent unveiling of the Queen Elizabeth II memorial in Gedling Country Park and the Arnold Summer Fair hosted at Arnot Hill Park.

**30 TO APPROVE, AS A CORRECT RECORD, THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4 JUNE 2025**

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the above meeting, having been circulated, be approved as a correct record.

**31 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Clarke declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6, noting he was a CAMRA (campaign for real ale) member.

**32 TO DEAL WITH ANY PETITIONS RECEIVED UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE 7.8**

The Mayor welcomed the petitioners to present the petition to the council, which had been signed by 272 residents of the borough and related to changes to the Horse and Groom Public House in Linby.

After the petition had been presented, the Mayor confirmed that it had been accepted, the requested action being as follows:

*‘That Gedling Borough Council give full consideration to the petition and ensure that any planning or licensing applications related to the Horse and Groom are subject to rigorous scrutiny, with particular attention to conservation, amenity and community impact.*

*Should no planning application be in place or submitted prior to the clearly planned refurbishment the local community understand are due to commence in mid-august 2025, the Council will deploy all measures available to protect the Horse and Groom Pub to prevent any further alterations by the owner until both the Council, any other interested stakeholders and local residents are sighted and consulted on the proposed changes and correct permissions are sought. These actions are time critical.”*

As the petition had been accepted, that became the motion which was deemed to have been seconded.

It was noted that since the publication of the report, there had been some further background information that Members should be aware of.

The detail of this was as follows:

*'Since the publication of the Report, the Council's Planning and Conservation officer visited the Horse & Groom with Members of the Parish Council on 21<sup>st</sup> July following a request from the parish for the building to be listed and for the Council to serve a Building Preservation Notice.*

*A building preservation notice is a form of temporary listing and protects a building for up to 6 months. In this 6 month period, Historic England would assess the building and submit a report to the Secretary of State to consider whether to list the building formally.*

*Prior to serving a Building Preservation Notice the local authority must consult with Historic England.*

*During the visit on 21<sup>st</sup> July, the Planning and Conservation Officer observed that the building clearly had a historic core but has been substantially altered in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Due to the alterations, the building is, in their professional opinion, unlikely to be considered worthy of listing, however, the building has a notable 1930s phase, which includes bar fixtures and fittings which both the Council and CAMRA a Pub Heritage Group can identify historic interest in.*

*The Council are now engaging directly with Historic England in order to establish whether the building may merit listing and building preservation notice served.'*

Members debated the motion and on being put to a vote, it was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED that:**

Council have debated and accepted the petition actions.

**33**

**TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ASKED BY THE PUBLIC UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE 7.7**

Four questions were received from members of the public and two of the questioners were in attendance to ask their questions. The questions and answers were as follows:

- 1) Question to the Leader of the Council – Read by Mike Hill on behalf of Tahir Butt

NG5 area is one of the Biggest in Nottinghamshire. So, we believe the Arnold should also get the Tram link to town. Tram would help people of Arnold from all ages, connected areas and will also increase businesses opportunities means more jobs. What is your thought about this?

Response from Councillor Clarke:

Thank you for your question.

This Council has always supported the extension of the tram into Gedling, but unfortunately it is not within our control to do so.

The tram system is owned by Nottingham City Council and is operated and maintained by Nottingham Trams Ltd. In March of this year there was an announcement that the new East Midlands Mayor has provided £300,000 to commission a study into extending the NET network, with one option to extend into Gedling.

We very much support this, but realistically this could take many more years before we see anything on the ground. I will add that I am part of the NET board, as is Cllr Hollingsworth, and neither of us have been notified of the meetings that have taken place despite several requests to do so. I have also challenged this at county hall, as a county councillor, to try get and get us there as we know this would be a tremendous support to the people of Gedling and would boost our local economy.

2) Question to the Portfolio Holder for Health, Lifestyles and Wellbeing  
– Asked by John Allen

Why are you considering spending vast sums of ratepayers' money moving leisure facilities to The Richard Herod Centre when it's such a difficult place to get to from Arnold by Public Transport?

Response from Councillor Clarke:

Our Leisure Strategy, the Strategic Outcomes Planning Model, has recommended the Council should consider two new sites when planning its leisure provision for years to come. This has been based on an analysis of current site age and maintenance liabilities, the performance of existing sites, and local population and market analysis. The Cabinet has agreed to consider feasibility work for both a new site in Carlton and a new site in Arnold.

The current priority for investment is a new Carlton site at the Richard Herrod Centre. This is based on the following:

- the current Carlton Forum Leisure Centre is 55 years old and has the more significant building maintenance challenges,
- we do not own Carlton Forum so investment in that site is restricted,
- the high community need in Carlton reflected in the high usage of the current Carlton Forum site.

Carlton Forum is our biggest leisure centre site supporting the wellbeing of residents across the wider area. In 2024/25 it had:

- over 550,000 visits, almost half the footfall across all our sites,
- 2,500 individual DNA members registered,
- almost 2,000 children on the swim scheme,
- income was £1.8m.

The risk of potential closure due to the age of the building would have a significant impact on Council finances, and the health and wellbeing of thousands of residents, so we have made the decision to prioritise our plans for developing new provision in the Carlton area.

As we consider our plans for a new Carlton site, we will use the development as an opportunity to advocate for better public transport options from across the Borough to the site. This will involve promoting the need for improved transport to the south of the Borough with our partners such as the East Midlands Combined County Authority Mayor.

We are still developing longer-term plans for leisure provision in Arnold through the Ambition Arnold regeneration programme. And of course, our sites at Arnold Leisure Centre and Redhill Leisure Centre remain open to the public.

### 3) Question to the Leader of the Council – Read by Mike Hill on behalf of Ronald Maddison

Why does Gedling council constantly only consider what is good for Arnold and the other areas under the councils' umbrella are the poor neighbours?

#### Response from Councillor Clarke:

Thank you for your question.

This Council is proud of all towns and villages within the Gedling boundary. The Council provides a wide array of services that impact on daily life for all its residents. These include waste management, street cleaning, planning, environmental protection, licensing, parks and open spaces, and so much more.

In terms of major investment, the Council does what it can to invest in the borough. Recent examples include:

- Calverton, where we have spent £1.5 million to provide further business start-up units at Hill Crest Business Park.
- Carlton, where plans have been launched to provide a new multi-million-pound leisure and wellbeing facility.
- Lambley Lane changing room and pitch renovation.
- Conway Road Tennis Court refurbishment.
- Play area investment across the borough.
- the Shared Prosperity Fund, where £2.8 million has been spent widely across the borough, including a £100,000 contribution to

Calverton Miners Welfare to facilitate the construction of a new 3G pitch.

- Shared Prosperity Funding has also provided targeted expenditure in the parished areas of Bestwood, Burton Joyce, Colwick, Newstead, Ravenshead, and St Albans, on top of borough-wide grants to support Local Business and further investment in People and Skills.
- A Government grant award of £20 million for the Greater Carlton Plan for Neighbourhoods which will be spent in the southern area of the borough over the next 10 years.
- All of this builds on the success of our award-winning Gedling Country Park which we are immensely proud of as a Council.

So, in answer to your question, I believe that this Council tries its best to support all areas of the borough equally.

4) Question to the Portfolio Holder for Health, Lifestyles and Wellbeing  
– Asked by Jim Vernon

In light of the significant public concern, packed community protest meetings, and growing confusion surrounding the future of the Richard Herrod Centre site, the public require information on the following concerns:

1. Discussions or decisions which may have, or have not taken place – formally or informally – about ending or not renewing the Richard Herrod Bowling Club's lease
2. Steps the Council has taken to honour its own transparency commitments during the Max Associates consultation and any emerging redevelopment plans
3. Whether the Council is prepared to pause any decisions relating to the site or the bowling club until full public scrutiny, including site-specific proposals and leaseholder impacts, have been debated openly

The bowling club is a well-established community institution, run by volunteers, with deep roots in the borough. Many residents – including vulnerable pensioners – are now fearful they are being pushed out to make way for something they have never been properly consulted on.

Will the Council finally acknowledge this and commit to a fair, inclusive process before taking any irrevocable steps — or must concerned residents now begin preparing a formal call for an official investigation into the consultation process and treatment of leaseholders?

Response from Councillor Clarke:

Thank you for your question.

As regards what discussions have taken place:



The Council has been in dialogue with Gedling Indoor Bowls Club Committee for the past year and the lease arrangements have been discussed. The Bowls Club's current lease with the Council runs until 26 April 2026. A request from the Bowls Club Committee has been made to the Council for a new lease beyond April 2026, however the Club has been informed that this is currently not possible, while the Council considers its pre-construction feasibility planning for a new leisure and wellbeing facility on the Richard Herrod site.

Plans are being developed, and this will include a business case for the new development. This work should be completed by January 2026. It is imperative that a robust business case is established before Cabinet makes a decision to proceed with the development. Should that business case be agreed early next year, construction preparation work could commence on site from Spring 2026.

Therefore, the Council cannot currently commit to a lease beyond April 2026.

It is acknowledged that this may cause uncertainty for the Bowls Club and its members. The Council is committed to give clarity to the Bowls Club on the future direction of the site as early as it can do, during 2025. After which it will continue to work alongside the Bowls Club to consider future options.

As regards the consultation:

Max Associates are consultants that compiled the Council's Strategic Outcomes Planning Model during 2023, and the findings of this work was reported publicly to Cabinet in November 2023 and July 2024.

Consultation informed this work, which comprised of a public survey with over 600 responses, as well as 27 stakeholder consultations and 4 specific focus groups. There was additional engagement with local stakeholders, partners, sports clubs and National Governing Bodies for Sport. Both Gedling Indoor Bowls Club and England Indoor Bowls Association were consulted at that time and their feedback considered by the consultants.

The consultants recommended as part of the Strategy that the Council should consult further with Gedling Indoor Bowls Club to discuss a possible reduction in number of rinks at Richard Herrod Centre from 6 to 3.

In July 2024 Cabinet agreed to undertake pre-construction feasibility planning for a new Carlton Leisure and Community Wellbeing Centre and consult further with the public and stakeholders regarding its leisure transformation plans.

Since April 2025, the Council has been working with consultants Alliance Leisure to move forward with its feasibility planning. The Council does

not have the internal expertise or capacity to undertake this work alone. This involves:

- Reviewing the Strategic Outcomes Planning Model to ensure its evidence base is up to date - Max Associates will again be undertaking this.
- Public survey to which over 1,500 responses have been received.
- 20 separate stakeholder and community meetings seeking the views of local people and partners on a new leisure and wellbeing facility at Richard Herrod Centre.
- This has included two consultation meetings specifically for members of Gedling Indoor Bowls Club in June, at which attendees made it clear their preference was 6 rinks not 3.
- Consulting with National Governing Bodies for Sport and other strategic partners.

The insight gathered by both the Strategy review and the widespread community and stakeholder engagement would be used to inform a revised proposed layout for the new centre. It is expected that Cabinet will consider these plans in the Autumn.

As regards the bowls club:

The Council recognises the role Gedling Indoor Bowls Club has played over many years and the work it continues to do to offer indoor bowls to its users. This recognition has been influential in the support the Council has offered the Bowls Club since the Covid-19 pandemic.

This has included Covid-19 business support and re-start grants totalling £34,600 and Cabinet decisions agreeing to offer a significantly reduced rent to support the Club's finances during 2021 to 2024. This follows requests during that time from the Bowls Club for additional support to help manage their finances. The Club also benefits from 100% business case relief, agreed by the Council.

As part of the current consultation process, 2 focus groups were organised by the Council at Richard Herrod Centre specifically for Gedling Indoor Bowls Club members to attend on 23 June.

Over 200 people attended the 2 focus groups at which the context and proposals for the feasibility work planned for a new site were presented and an opportunity given for participants to share their thoughts, ideas and concerns with the Council about what facilities a new centre at Richard Herrod centre site might have.

The notes were recorded by Council officers and the Bowls Club Committee has also submitted to the Council a list of questions and comments raised at the focus groups, and afterwards, by its members and supporters. This feedback will be considered as we move forward with our proposals, alongside our wider engagement across the

community. The Council continues to meet regularly with the Bowls Club Committee and will share proposals with them as they are developed further. The Council is also engaging with England Indoor Bowls Association to understand the future business case for indoor bowls in Gedling.

34

**TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ASKED BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE 7.9**

A question was asked of the Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth and Economy by Councillor M Smith, as follows:

“Members have been repeatedly told in this chamber that there is a housing crisis in this country. This, along with all the problems that the country and the world are facing have previously been blamed on the Conservative government. However, Gedling Borough Council has the means to assist with alleviating some of the housing problems within the Borough, by using S106 contributions from housebuilders.

£560,567 was allocated by the developer of the Strata Homes site in Linby nine years ago, application 2014/0959. This money needs spending by 2026, otherwise the money will be returned to the developer. Whilst I am aware that officers know there is a time limit on this money, why has this not been spent before and used to alleviate some of the acute housing needs faced by those in this Borough? We either have a housing crisis, or we don't. This council's own website shows that in total there is £1,451,019 in the pot for affordable housing.

Officers have informed me that they are working on delivering affordable housing on sites in Netherfield and are looking to acquire properties for the same purpose. Those who purchased their home in Linby, nine years ago, would prefer to have seen this money spent locally to them, and certainly by now. Why the nine year delay and still nothing to show for the S106 contribution?”

Response from Councillor R Allan:

The council's new local plan will meet government housing targets, delivering more homes, including affordable ones, faster.

When approving planning applications, the council requires developers to provide affordable housing on site. Only in rare cases where on site provision isn't possible does the council negotiate a financial contribution instead following its affordable housing supplementary planning document.

The strata homes section 106 agreement allows funds to be spent boroughwide. The delay in using strata homes contribution is because the council doesn't manage its own housing stock. While developers have paid sums instead of providing affordable homes, buying and

managing just a few properties isn't practical or affordable without knowing future contributions.

With more funds now available, the council is exploring options to buy properties across the borough for social housing as allowed by section 106 agreements. This aligns with the upcoming housing strategy which will be consulted on after approval by the portfolio holder. All contributions will be spent by their deadlines. Thank you.

A question was asked of the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services (operations) by Councillor Bestwick, as follows:

“What is the current number of pavement sweepers deployable across the Borough, are they all currently operational and does the Cabinet Member feel certain this will be adequate during the autumn?”

Response from Councillor Paling:

At the current time the Council has 4 mechanical sweepers as part of the Council fleet. There are 2 large sweepers for roads, and 2 smaller sweepers for pavements. All four are operational at the current time. The two smaller sweepers have recently been procured as part of the fleet replacement programme, and as such there should be less maintenance issues and off-road time with these vehicles this year. In terms of vehicles, we have better, maybe not adequate, but better capacity for leaf drop season.

However, we need to note that all schedules are subject to change, especially in emergency situations such as flooding where the street care team's response is about deploying sandbags, clearing drainage grids and post event cleanups, which was an area of strength in the recent BDO internal audit report presented to the audit committee on the 24th of June. I'm sorry that we can't do both, but hopefully we will not have the same flooding this year and our vehicles may be adequate for leaf drop.

In addition to the new vehicles, the new Assistant Director of Environment (Operations) joined the Council this week. As part of the roll out of the Council's new in-cab/hand-held software system for frontline services, work is being undertaken in the Autumn to review street cleansing rounds and ensure they are accurately mapped as part of the implementation of the system which should improve efficiency of street cleansing. The system will enable us to identify and monitor hot spot areas which will need greater maintenance including heavy leaf fall areas to ensure adequate maintenance. This programme of work will be ongoing through the Autumn.

Finally, whilst we have the vehicles and equipment to deliver street cleansing, we need to ensure officer capacity so that all vehicles can be utilised appropriately. We have separated Street Care from Parks; to

instead combine with our Waste team so we can ensure effective management across the two areas with stronger focus on absence management, use of agency and performance.

A question was asked of the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection by Councillor Maltby, as follows:

“In a bid to help reduce ASB, CCTV was promised to be installed in Muirfield Park, Bestwood, but then installation plans were cancelled. Can you advise why and how we can work together and with the residents to get it installed?”

Response from Councillor D Ellis:

I assume that Councillor Maltby has read the annual CCTV monitoring report that cabinet considered on the 10th of July. But just to remind members, CCTV is regulated by the surveillance commissioner through the national statutory code of practice and locally is developed in compliance with the council's policy which was adopted in March 2020. This policy is designed to ensure that council's operation of CCTV in all its forms complies with the law and the principles of good governance.

As part of this, the policy requires that any operational changes to the systems are approved by the senior responsible officer. This includes any additional CCTV cameras or removal of cameras. These decisions should be evidence-based and balance the needs of crime prevention and detection with amongst others; the protection of freedoms act 2012. CCTV is one of a range of approaches to crime and social behaviour and surveillance needs to be considered in that wider context.

A surveillance camera was initially proposed by the council for Muirfield Recreation Ground in May 2022. At that time, the number and type of instances on the site indicated that one may be justified and relevant permissions were sought. However, there are a number of technical complexities with this proposed installation which delayed work on it and during this time officers observed a reduction in the number of reported incidents. As a result of these changed circumstances, the project was deferred.

It was kept on the agenda and the incidents of crime, both on and around recreation ground, were regularly reviewed. These reviews concluded that installing a camera would be disproportionate and not in line with the Protection of Freedom Act 2012 and its associated codes of practice.

This code of practice places a duty on systems owners to ensure that when cameras are deployed, officers carefully consider the balance between carrying out surveillance and safeguarding individual privacy and rights. And as such, officers were satisfied that that a camera would not be justified.

Officers also consulted with the local police inspector in April 2024, March 2025, and recently in July 2025 on the need for a camera. On all occasions, the local police agreed with the council officers that, taken into consideration the nature and incidents, that a permanent CCTV camera would be seen as an unreasonable and disproportionate intervention. The site will however be kept under review.

As members and residents would expect Mr Mayor you can be assured that the local labour member for Bestwood St Alban's ward actively engages with local residents and the parish council and very much ensures I'm personally aware of local concerns that come to her attention. The message has to be that the decision to introduce a new CCTV camera has to be evidence-based and that at present the evidence is not sufficient just to justify it. Residents should ensure that any antisocial behaviour, crimes, or similar incidents they're aware of are reported to provide the evidence base.

A question was asked of the Portfolio Holder for Lifestyles, Health and Wellbeing by Councillor Walker, as follows:

“Can the Cabinet Member for Public Health assure me that Calverton Leisure Centre will remain open under Labour's 'Leisure Transformation' plans?”

Response from Councillor Clarke:

As part of the leisure transformation programme, we will be looking at the ongoing business case for all our leisure sites, and this includes those governed under joint use agreements at Carlton Academy, Redhill Academy and Colonel Frank Seeley Academy. These are sites the Council does not own, so our ability to ensure ongoing maintenance and options for future development are very limited as a result.

All our sites are ageing in their nature, so ensuring a sustainable model for future delivery to safeguard leisure services across the borough for years to come is essential. We are therefore updating our Strategic Outcomes Planning Model Strategy with the most up to date community, financial, market and business data to understand the future business case for each of our leisure sites as we plan for the future. Once this review is complete, we will consider options for future provision, balancing business and community need.

At this stage Calverton Leisure Centre remains open for business as usual, and Council has agreed the operational budget to do this for 2025/26. Any future change to joint use agreements with Nottinghamshire County Council and Redhill Academy Trust will require consultation with the public.

A question was asked of the Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth and Economy by Councillor Adams, as follows:

“Can the cabinet member for Sustainable Growth and Economy please direct us to the planning application number, decision notice or if not available, the authoriser for the June 4<sup>th</sup> raising of the Pride Progress flag at Gedling Borough Council?”

Response from Councillor Robinson-Payne:

To answer your question Councillor Adams, the application number is 2025/0458, which I now believe has been approved by Gedling Borough Council.

A supplementary question was asked by Councillor Adams to ascertain whether the Cabinet member would confirm if they would be referring themselves to standards following a breach of planning regulations.

Response from Councillor Robinson-Payne:

As mayor, I made it clear at annual council in May that the theme of my year would be inclusivity. That means making a conscious effort to represent all the people who live in our borough, not just those who share our own personal views, but everyone. It includes standing up for residents who are too often marginalized or made to feel unwelcome, including members of the LGBTQ plus community.

Flying the Progress Pride flag at the Civic Centre was a deliberate and symbolic act as part of that commitment. The progress pride flag is an evolution of the original rainbow flag designed specifically to better reflect the full diversity of the LGBTQ plus community including trans people and people of colour and to acknowledge the ongoing struggle for equality. It ensures that all members of the community are recognized and included.

As someone who's been on the receiving end of homophobia throughout my life, and yes, even now while serving as your mayor of this borough, I can tell you that visible support from those in positions of responsibility matters. It sends a powerful message of solidarity and reassurance, especially to those who may not always feel safe or accepted. That said, I do recognize the technical requirement for planning permission to fly certain flags. To that end, I asked our officers to put in place the necessary permissions to fly the progress pride flag in future years.

This is about more than what's on a flag pole. It's about who we are as a community. One that chooses kindness, inclusion, and respect for all. That's a message I will always be proud to stand behind as the mayor of Gedling borough and an ordinary citizen just like everyone else. Thank you.

A question was asked of the Portfolio Holder for Environment Services (Operations) by Councillor S Smith, as follows:

“Fly-tipping on Catts Lane, Stoke Bardolph, is a far too regular occurrence. Will the Cabinet Member finally commit her department to working alongside Cllr Adams, the Parish Council and me in ensuring Gedling Borough Council fund and install CCTV on Catts Lane to prosecute and deter those fly-tipping at this hotspot?”

Response from Councillor D Ellis:

Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'll answer this question as it relates more to my portfolio.

Councillor Smith will remember our previous discussions about this problem. We all recognize that fly tipping is a particular problem on the Stoke Lane/Cats Lane area of Stoke Bardolph and something which residents are rightly concerned about.

However, that doesn't mean that CCTV is the answer or is appropriate. I'm advised that a fixed camera would have a limited coverage and is unlikely to view specific areas where offenses occur. Such a camera would need to be visible and consequently risk displacing officers to monitor nearby locations and a single fixed camera will be of limited value. The topography of the area also means that the transmission pathways will be a challenge and incur additional cost.

The council responds to reports of fly tipping in the area and, as well as removing them, monitors the level and type of incident. Officers consider that the incidence of fly tipping in the area does not meet the test of significant harm, vulnerability or community impact that would warrant this level of intervention. Most CCTV cameras across the borough have multiple functions such as detecting antisocial behaviour and crime, whereas a camera in this location would serve a single environmental purpose which further reduces the justification for an installation.

Following years of austerity and cut to our resources, we are no longer able to sustain the neighbourhood warden service. With the larger budget that was there previously, the council was able to be more active, including using mobile covert cameras. This was used extensively around Cats Lane with a significant number of fixed penalty notices being issued. We are currently in the process of commissioning a private provider to act as enforcement partners on environmental crime, including fly tipping. Residents can be assured that the area is a known hotspot and will be on the agenda for enforcement activity in the future. Thank you.

A question was asked of the Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth and Economy by Councillor Whiting, as follows:



“The Public Space Protection Order aimed at anti-social car cruisers has improved the situation over the past two years, but there are still incidents of car meets and breaches of the Order. Will Gedling support the extension of the PSPO and ensure that everything is in place before the current Order expires in 2026?”

Response by Councillor D Ellis:

Thank you, Mr Mayor. Members will recall that the council introduced a PSPO to address nuisance from vehicles and people engaged in car cruising activities. The order was made after consideration of the evidence and consultation and lasts for 3 years until the 22nd of June 2026. There is scope within the order for an extension of a further three years if the circumstances at the time justify it.

Both the police and officers from the team believe that the PSPO has been an effective tool in combating the problem of car related ASB, although there are still incidents reported. Consequently, officers from the council's public protection and legal teams have already met to discuss the extension to PSPO and begun the review process and will report to cabinet in the coming months with proposals relating to the extension. Thank you.

A question was asked of the Leader of the Council by Councillor Whiting, as follows:

“Is Gedling Borough Council currently using Artificial Intelligence for any functions of the Council, and what plans are there to use AI in the future?”

Response by Councillor Clarke:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is currently utilised in a limited capacity within Gedling Borough Council. The primary application of AI thus far has been in assisting with content creation for officers, such as summarising meetings and generating documents. It is important to note that AI is not used for any decision-making processes, and no personally identifiable or sensitive information is exposed to AI tools.

The council are currently working on an AI policy that is underpinned by guiding principles to ensure officers are using tools appropriately and compliantly.

Looking ahead, the Council intends to harness AI's potential to enhance efficiency and customer service where appropriate. Some anticipated applications include:

- Optimising Customer Access channels
- Summarising large amounts of data
- Document and content creation
- Automating repetitive tasks

- Monitoring trends to provide meaningful data for decision-making
- Research applications

As software suppliers integrate AI functionalities into their products, the Council will evaluate these enhancements on a case-by-case basis. This evaluation will be conducted by the Business and Technical Design Authority board to ensure any AI adoption aligns with the Council's strategic goals and complies with our governance.

While the Council recognises the significant opportunities presented by AI, the safety and security of our data remain our top priorities. Any implementation of AI will be carefully considered to uphold these principles.

A question was asked of the Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth and Economy by Councillors Meads, as follows:

“The CIL public consultation was conducted in February this year, when will we be presented with the results and why has it taken so long?”

Response from Councillor R Allan:

Thank you. A report with feedback and recommendations for updating the community infrastructure levy project list will be reviewed by the cabinet member later this year as planned in the consultation documents. Officers are targeting the September meeting, and the forward plan has been updated to reflect this.

35

## **REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE OR A COMMITTEE (PROCEDURAL RULE 7.10)**

### **(a) ANNUAL TREASURY ACTIVITY REPORT 2024/25**

#### **RESOLVED that:**

Members approve the Annual Treasury Activity Report for 2024/25, as required by the regulations.

### **(b) BUDGET OUTTURN AND BUDGET CARRY FORWARDS 2024/25**

#### **RESOLVED that:**

Members approve:

- i. The overall method of financing of the 2024/25 capital expenditure; and
- ii. The determination of the minimum revenue provision for the repayment of debt

**(c) EXTERNAL AUDIT FEES FOR THE 2024/25 STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS**

**RESOLVED that:**

Members:

- i. Approve the additional budget required of £88,549 for the 2024/25 External Audit Scale fees; and
- ii. Note the grants received from MHCLG in response to the Redmond review and rebuilding assurance

**36 UPDATING PARKS AND OPEN SPACES BYELAWS**

**RESOLVED that:**

Council:

- i. Notes the content of the Regulatory Assessment at Appendix 4 and the Consultation Report at Appendix 5; and
- ii. Approves the publishing of the statement of regulatory assessment at Appendix 6 in line with the 2016 Regulations; and
- iii. Delegates authority to the Director of Operations to make any minor amendments to any documents prior to advertising; and
- iv. Approves that the proposed Scheme be sent to the SoS for approval with the supporting documentation in line with the 2016 Regulations; and
- v. Authorises officers to undertake the necessary publication requirements (publication for a period of at least 28 days) in line with the 2016 Regulations should approval be granted by the SoS

**37 CHANGES TO POLITICAL BALANCE AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**RESOLVED that:**

The following changes to representation on committees, be approved:

- i. Remove Councillor Elliot from Environment & Licensing Committee
- ii. Remove Councillor Elliott from Licensing Act Committee
- iii. Add Councillor Meads to Environment & Licensing Committee
- iv. Add Councillor Meads to Licensing Act Panel
- v. Add Councillors Whiting and Meads to Standards Committee
- vi. Remove Councillor Catherine Pope from Joint Consultative & Safety Committee
- vii. Add Councillor Elliott to Joint Consultative & Safety Committee
- ix. Remove Councillor Elliott from Standards Committee
- x. Add Councillor Adams to Standards Committee

- xi. Remove Councillor Adams from Appeals & Retirement Committee
- xii. Add Councillor Maltby to Appeals & Retirement Committee

**38 APPOINTMENT TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

**RESOLVED that:**

The updated appointment of representatives to Outside Bodies be approved.

**39 NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE TO POLICY ADVISORS**

**RESOLVED that:**

The changes to Policy Holders be noted.

**40 TO CONSIDER COMMENTS, OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN, UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE 7.11**

No comments or issued were raised.

**41 TO CONSIDER MOTIONS UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE 7.12**

None.

The meeting finished at 7.47 pm

Signed by Chair:  
Date:

## **MINUTES COUNCIL**

**Wednesday 30 July 2025**

Councillor Kyle Robinson-Payne (Mayor)

Present:

Councillor Sandra Barnes	Councillor Viv McCrossen
Councillor Michael Adams	Councillor Andrew Meads
Councillor Roy Allan	Councillor Marje Paling
Councillor Stuart Bestwick	Councillor Michael Payne
Councillor David Brocklebank	Councillor Lynda Pearson
Councillor John Clarke	Councillor Sue Pickering
Councillor Jim Creamer	Councillor Catherine Pope
Councillor Andrew Dunkin	Councillor Grahame Pope
Councillor Boyd Elliott	Councillor Alex Scroggie
Councillor David Ellis	Councillor Martin Smith
Councillor Rachael Ellis	Councillor Sam Smith
Councillor Andrew Ellwood	Councillor Ruth Strong
Councillor Kathryn Fox	Councillor Clive Towsey-Hinton
Councillor Helen Greensmith	Councillor Jane Walker
Councillor Paul Hughes	Councillor Henry Wheeler
Councillor Alison Hunt	Councillor Russell Whiting
Councillor Darren Maltby	Councillor Paul Wilkinson
Councillor Ron McCrossen	

Absent: Councillor Pauline Allan, Councillor Roxanne Ellis, Councillor Paul Feeney, Councillor Jenny Hollingsworth and Councillor Julie Najuk

### **1 THOUGHT FOR THE DAY**

The Mayor's Chaplain, Father Philipp Ziomek, addressed council and gave a reading from Sir Thomas More's book, Utopia. The message surrounded thoughts about trying to make as little wrong as possible in the world.

### **2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Pauline Allan, Councillor Roxanne Ellis, Councillor Paul Feeney, Councillor Jenny Hollingsworth and Councillor Julie Najuk.

### **3 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor addressed the council and gave a short speech. He expressed his pleasure to have recently attended Coppice Lodge Care Home for their Annual Summer Fair and gave thanks to the people who organised the event for the community to enjoy.

He was also pleased to have attended Nottingham Pride in his official capacity as mayor, thanking Nottingham Front Runners and Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service and congratulated the organisers for creating a safe and inclusive event for everyone.

He also noted that he attended Springwater Golf Club in Calverton for their Gedling Borough Challenge and thanked club captain Brad Fields for the warm welcome and for raising a generous donation to the Mayor's charity, The Motor Neuron Disease Association and Motor Neuron Disease Association Nottingham.

#### **4 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

None.

#### **5 LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION IN NOTTINGHAM AND NOTTINGHAMSHIRE**

Consideration was given to a report of the Chief Executive which had been circulated prior to the meeting, to provide full Council with an update on the Government's requirement for Local Government Reorganisation, including the work undertaken to determine which option to develop as a final proposal for submission in November 2025.

Councillor Brocklebank joined the meeting.

An amendment to the original recommendation was proposed by Councillor Whiting and seconded by Councillor Meads. The amendment added the following to the original proposal:

- f. Calls upon the Secretary of State to make provision for the public to have the final say on any proposals through a Nottinghamshire wide referendum prior to implementation.

An adjournment of 10 minutes was proposed, seconded and agreed by members to allow them time to review the amendment.

On returning to the meeting, a recorded vote on the amendment was proposed and seconded. On being put to vote, the amendment was lost.

Members debated the original recommendations and gave their views on the best way forward with Local Government Reorganisation.

Councillor Paling left the meeting.

A recorded vote on the original proposal was proposed and seconded. On being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

**RESOLVED to recommend that Cabinet:**

- a. Considers the options appraisal and summary document provided by Price Waterhouse Cooper (PWC) (Appendices 4 and 5).
- b. Develop Option 1e as set out in the Appendices, as this Council's preferred option for submission as a final proposal to Government by 28 November 2025.
- c. Further considers other viable options (should they be developed) that stop any part of the current Gedling Borough being merged with an expanded City area.
- d. Supports a countywide approach to engagement activities during the period August to September 2025 tailored for different stakeholder groups across Gedling and Nottinghamshire.
- e. Supports continued collaborative working with other local authorities across Nottingham and Nottinghamshire with a view to developing a final proposal for Local Government Reorganisation.

The meeting finished at Time Not Specified

Signed by Chair:  
Date:

This page is intentionally left blank





## Report to Cabinet

**Subject:** Prudential Code Indicator Monitoring 2025/26 and Treasury Activity Report for the Period April 2025 to July 2025

**Date:** 4 September 2025

**Author:** Principal Finance Business Partner

### Wards Affected

Borough wide

### Purpose

To inform Members of the performance monitoring of the 2025/26 Prudential Code Indicators, and to advise Members of the Treasury activity as required by the Treasury Management Strategy.

### Key Decision

This is **not** a key decision.

### Recommendation(s)

#### Cabinet are recommended to:

1. Note the report, together with the Treasury Activity Report 2025/26 for Period 4 at Appendix 1, and the Prudential and Treasury Indicator Monitoring 2025/26 for the period April to July 2025, at Appendix 2.
2. Approve the changes to Prudential Indicators detailed at paragraph 2.7 to align with the latest revenue and capital budgets being reported to members as part of the Budget Monitoring and Virement Report for the period April 2025 to July 2025.

## **1 Background**

- 1.1 The Council is required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 to report on its Prudential Code indicators and treasury activity. This report meets the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management (the Code) and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (the Prudential Code).
- 1.2 For 2025/26 the minimum reporting requirements are that the Full Council should receive the following reports:
- An annual Treasury Strategy in advance of the year (the TMSS, considered by Cabinet on 13 February 2025 and subsequently approved by Full Council on 5 March 2025);
  - A mid-year treasury update report;
  - An annual review following the end of the year describing the activity compared to the Strategy.

In 2024/25 reporting to Cabinet & Full Council was carried out in three four monthly periods (April 2024 to July 2024. August 2024 to November 2024 and December 2024 to March 2025) this was on a trial basis to assess the resource benefits of only providing three periods of monitoring, allowing officers more time to address concerns and consider remedial action. This proved to be successful and will be continued in 2025/26.

Whilst this was a reduction in the number of reports being presented it should be noted that this still exceeds the minimum requirements.

- 1.3 The regulatory environment places responsibility on Members for the review and scrutiny of treasury management policy and activities. This report provides details of the position at 31 July 2025 and highlights compliance with the Council's policies.

## **2 Proposal**

### **2.1 Economic Update - headlines**

#### **Economic Activity & GDP**

- Real GDP fell 0.3% in April, the first decline since October 2024 and largest since October 2023.
- Likely due to unwinding of Q1 boosts from net exports and investment; exports to the US dropped 31%.
- Services output fell 0.4%, offsetting March's gain; manufacturing down 0.9% month on month.
- GDP likely flatlined in Q2, with subdued overseas demand and higher domestic costs from April's tax hikes.

- Bank of England forecasts 0.8% growth for 2025.

### **Inflation & Monetary Policy**

- Core CPI eased from 3.8% to 3.5% in May; headline CPI fell slightly to 3.4%.
- Services inflation dropped from 5.4% to 4.7%, expected to fall to 3.0% by year end.
- Bank of England cut interest rates to 4.25% in May, with a further cut to 4% in August.
- CPI may stay above 3.0% longer due to energy and food price risks; peak expected at 3.8% in September.

### **Labour Market & Wages**

- Employment fell by 109,000 in May, largest non-pandemic drop on record; total fall since October's Chancellor budget is 276,000.
- Job vacancies declined, signalling a weakening labour market.
- Wage growth softened: average earnings growth (excl. bonuses) fell to 5.2%; PAYE median earnings dropped to 5.8% year on year.

### **Retail & Consumer Sentiment**

- Retail sales volumes fell 2.7% in May, reversing April's weather-driven boost.
- Consumer confidence rose slightly (GfK index from -20 to -18), suggesting a modest retail recovery ahead.

### **Public Finances**

- Public sector borrowing in May was £17.7bn, slightly above forecast but £2.9bn below forecast for April/May combined.
- Debt interest payments were £1.1bn below forecast, but rising gilt yields may reverse this trend.
- Chancellor may need to raise £13bn to maintain fiscal headroom, implying likely tax increases.

## **2.2 Interest rate forecast**

Our Treasury Management advisors, MUFG, provided their quarterly forecast of interest rates. These are shown in the table below. PWLB rates in the table are based on the Certainty Rate which include a 0.2% reduction on the standard rates. The current bank rate is 4.0% which is earlier than forecast. However, the current trend of the rates is suggesting a further reduction to 3.75% or 3.50% in 2025/26. Any movement below a 4.0% Bank Rate will, nonetheless, be very much dependent on inflation data releases in the coming months.

Interest Rate Forecasts								
Bank Rate	Sep-25	Dec-25	Mar-26	Jun-26	Sep-26	Dec-26	Mar-27	Jun-27
MUFG CM	4.25%	4.00%	3.75%	3.75%	3.75%	3.50%	3.50%	3.50%
Cap Econ	4.00%	3.75%	3.50%	3.25%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
5Y PWLB RATE								
MUFG CM	4.80%	4.70%	4.60%	4.50%	4.40%	4.40%	4.30%	4.20%
Cap Econ	4.60%	4.30%	4.30%	4.20%	4.10%	4.10%	4.10%	4.10%
10Y PWLB RATE								
MUFG CM	5.10%	5.00%	4.90%	4.80%	4.70%	4.70%	4.60%	4.50%
Cap Econ	5.30%	5.10%	4.90%	4.80%	4.70%	4.60%	4.60%	4.60%
25Y PWLB RATE								
MUFG CM	5.60%	5.50%	5.40%	5.30%	5.20%	5.10%	5.00%	5.00%
Cap Econ	5.90%	5.40%	5.30%	5.10%	5.00%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%
50Y PWLB RATE								
MUFG CM	5.30%	5.20%	5.10%	5.00%	4.90%	4.80%	4.70%	4.70%
Cap Econ	5.60%	5.30%	5.10%	5.00%	4.80%	4.70%	4.70%	4.70%

## 2.3 Treasury Management Strategy

The Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) for 2025/26, which includes the Annual Investment Strategy, was approved by Council on 5 March 2025, and sets out the Council's investment priorities as:

- Security of capital;
- Liquidity;
- Yield.

Whilst the Council will always seek to obtain the optimum return (yield) on its investments, this will at all times be commensurate with proper levels of security and liquidity. In the current economic climate it is considered appropriate either to keep investments short term to cover cash flow needs, or to extend the period up to 12 months with highly rated financial institutions, selected by the use of the MUFG creditworthiness methodology (see below) which includes consideration of sovereign ratings.

Investment counterparty limits for 2025/26 are generally **£3m** per individual counterparty, however a higher limit of **£4m** per Money Market Fund is considered prudent since such funds are already by definition highly diversified investment vehicles. There is no limit on Investment with the Debt Management Office (DMO) since this represents lending to central government. The Chief Financial Officer has delegated authority to vary these limits as appropriate, and then to report any change to Cabinet as part of the next report.

Members are advised that no new variations have been made during period 1 to 4 of 2025/26.

Limits with investment counterparties have not exceeded the prevailing levels approved by the CFO during the period 1 April to 31 July 2025.

Credit ratings advice is taken from MUFG and the Chief Financial Officer has adopted the MUFG credit rating methodology for the selection of investment counterparties. This employs a sophisticated modelling approach utilising credit ratings from all three of the main rating agencies to give a suggested maximum

duration for investments. Accordingly it does not place undue reliance on any one agency's ratings.

The methodology subsequently applies an “overlay” to take account of positive and negative credit watches and/or credit outlook information, which may increase or decrease the suggested duration of investments. It then applies a second overlay based on the credit default swap spreads for institutions, the monitoring of which has been shown to give an early warning of likely changes in credit ratings. It also incorporates sovereign ratings to ensure selection of counterparties from only the most creditworthy countries. The current Treasury Strategy permits the use of any UK counterparties subject to their individual credit ratings under the MUFG methodology. It also permits the use of counterparties from other countries with a minimum sovereign rating of AA minus. For information, the UK currently has a rating of AA minus.

The MUFG modelling approach combines all the various factors in a weighted scoring system and results in a series of colour coded bands which indicate the creditworthiness of counterparties. The colour bandings are as follows:

- Yellow 5 years (UK Government debt or its equivalent)
- Dark pink 5 years for Ultra Short Dated Bond Funds (credit score 1.25)
- Light pink 5 years for Ultra Short Dated Bond Funds (credit score 1.50)
- Purple 2 years
- Blue 1 year (nationalised or semi nationalised UK banks only)
- Orange 1 year
- Red 6 months
- Green 100 days
- No colour not to be used

Significant downgrades by the Ratings agencies have not materialised since the beginning of the Covid-19 crisis in March 2020. Where changes were made these were generally limited to “outlooks”. However, as economies re-opened some instances of previous reductions were reversed.

Credit ratings are monitored weekly and the Council is also alerted to interim changes by its use of the MUFG creditworthiness service, however ratings under the methodology, including sovereign ratings, will not necessarily be the sole determinant of the quality of an institution. Other information sources used will include the financial press, share price and other such information pertaining to the banking sector in order to establish the most robust scrutiny process on the suitability of potential investment counterparties.

**The ultimate decision on what is prudent and manageable for the Council will be taken by the Chief Financial Officer under the approved scheme of delegation.**

## 2.4 Treasury Activity during Period 1 to 4 of 2025/26

The Treasury Activity Report for the period ended 31 July 2025 is attached at Appendix 1, in accordance with the Treasury Management Strategy.

Members will note that investment interest of £224,958 was generated from MMF activity, term deposits with banks and building societies, and the property fund, during the period from 1 April to 31 July 2025. This represents an overall equated rate for the Council of 4.33% which is marginally higher than the compounded Sterling Overnight Index Average (SONIA) rate, which averaged 4.26%.

During the period from 1 April to 31 July 2025, significant use was made of the Council's three Money Market Funds (MMFs). These are AAA rated investment vehicles which allow the pooling of many billions of pounds into highly diversified funds, thus reducing risk. The current rates of return on these funds are around 4% which remain generally higher than overnight treasury deposit rates, and slightly higher than the rate obtainable from the Debt Management Office (DMO).

The Council made an investment of £1m in the CCLA Local Authority Property Fund (LAPF) on 1 December 2017. The LAPF is a local government investment scheme approved by the Treasury under the Trustee Investments Act 1961 (section 11). Dividends are treated as revenue income and have in previous years averaged around 4%.

The fund increased slightly by £1,406 between 1 April 2025 and 30 June 2025. A dividend of £9,983 was also received in the first quarter of the year.

This investment allows the Council to introduce a property element into its investment portfolio without the risks associated with the direct purchase of assets. It should be noted however that the capital value is **not** guaranteed and can fall as well as rise. The certificated value of the investment at 30 June 2025 was £895,412 which was lower than the original investment of £1m, this represents a £104,588 loss. However, this investment is regarded as a long-term commitment and fluctuations should be expected. A recent meeting with the CCLA suggested that the investment is expected to increase over the course of the next few years and dividends continue to be received of approximately £40k per annum.

Interest rates are still favourable, however they have started to fall due to the reductions in the bank rate. As loans mature every effort is made to replace them at favourable rates. As regards investments, security and liquidity will always be the overriding factors in the Council's treasury management. As stated in 2.2 above, MUFG currently forecast that the Bank Rate will fall to 3.75% by March 2026.

At the start of 2025/26 the Bank of England base rate stood at 4.50%, this was then reduced by The Monetary Policy Committee (MPC) on 8 May 2025 to

4.25%, with a further reduction down to 4.00% on the 7 August 2025. This has had a negative impact on investment interest received by the Council on 31 July 2025, however, currently, the budget estimate of £1.1m for 2025/26 remains achievable, if required a revised calculation of interest will be included in the August to November 2025 Treasury report.

## 2.5 New borrowing

At 31 July 2025 no new borrowing had been undertaken.

Advice will be taken from MUFG with regard to the amount and timing of any additional borrowing, and should conditions become advantageous, some borrowing in advance of need will also be considered by the Chief Financial Officer. The Council's Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) represents its underlying need to borrow to finance capital investment. Due to favourable interest rates, borrowing in advance of need is sometimes desirable, with the result that the CFR can differ to the actual borrowing planned in the year.

Councils may not borrow in advance of need purely to profit from the investment of the extra sums borrowed. However, prudent early borrowing for a demonstrable service objective is permitted. Serious consideration must be given to the cost of carrying any additional borrowing during the period prior to it being required for the financing of capital expenditure since this places a further burden on the General Fund.

## 2.6 Debt rescheduling

When the current day PWLB rate for the same term is higher than that being paid on an existing loan there is the potential for a discount to be receivable if the loan is repaid prematurely.

However, debt rescheduling opportunities are limited in the current economic climate, and due to the structure of PWLB interest rates. Advice in this regard will continue to be taken from MUFG. No debt rescheduling has been undertaken during the period from 1 April to 31 July 2025.

## 2.7 Compliance with Prudential and treasury indicators

It is a statutory duty for the Council to determine and keep under review the affordable borrowing limit. The Council's approved Prudential and Treasury Indicators (affordability limits) are included in the Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) approved by Full Council on 5 March 2025.

During the financial year to date the Council has at all times operated within the majority treasury limits and Prudential Indicators set out in the Council's TMSS, and in compliance with the Council's Treasury Management Practices. The Prudential and Treasury Indicators as at 31 July 2025 are shown at Appendix 2.

The Prudential Indicator relating to Capital Expenditure has been exceeded due to the carry forward of budget from 2024/25 which was approved by members as part of the Budget Outturn and Budget Carry Forwards 2024/25 report. The changes in the Capital Programme for 2025/26 are being reported to members via the Budget Monitoring and Virement Report for the period April 2025 to July 2025, it is proposed that this indicator is increased from £6,413,400 to £10,159,800.

The Prudential Indicator relating to the ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream is currently at 2.30% which is under the approved indicator of 3.85% due to a decrease in the original budget of the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP), the change in the MRP budget is being reported to members as part of the Budget Monitoring and Virement Report for the period April 2025 to July 2025.

All other treasury limits and Prudential Indicators have been achieved for the period April to July 2025

A) Prudential Indicators:

These indicators are based on estimates of expected outcomes, and are key indicators of “affordability”. They are monitored on a regular basis, and Appendix 2 compares the approved indicators with the projected outturn for 2025/26, and shows variances on the indicators, as described below:

a. Capital Expenditure

The latest projected outturn shows that total capital expenditure is expected to be £10,159,800. This differs to the approved indicator of £6,413,400 due to the inclusion of approved carry-forward requests from 2024/25 and variations on the current year’s capital programme.

b. Capital Financing Requirement (CFR)

The CFR represents the historic outstanding capital expenditure which has not yet been paid for from capital or revenue resources, and is essentially a measure of the Council’s underlying borrowing need. The CFR does not increase indefinitely since the minimum revenue provision (MRP) is a statutory annual revenue charge for the economic consumption of capital assets.

At 31 July the projected closing CFR for 2025/26 is £21,052,378. This differs slightly to the approved indicator of £21,226,000.

c. Gearing ratio

The concept of “gearing” compares the total underlying borrowing need (the CFR) to the Council’s total fixed assets and the gearing ratio can provide an early



indication where debt levels are rising relative to long term assets held.

The projected gearing ratio at 31 July 2025 is 45%, which is in line with the approved indicator and is broadly comparable with the average gearing ratio for councils of a similar size.

d. Ratio of financing costs to net revenue stream

This indicator identifies the trend in the cost of borrowing net of investment income against the net revenue stream. Financing costs represent the element of the Council's budget to which it is committed even before providing any services.

The projected outturn of 2.30% for service-related expenditure is lower than the approved indicator of 3.85% due to reduced Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) costs for 2025/26.

e. Maximum gross debt

The Council must ensure that its gross debt does not, except in the short term, exceed the opening capital financing requirement, plus estimates of any additional CFR for 2025/26 and the following two financial years. This allows flexibility for early borrowing for future years, but ensures that borrowing is not undertaken for revenue purposes. The Council's gross debt at 31 July 2025 was £10.812m, which was within the approved indicator.

g. Ratio of internal borrowing to CFR

The Council is currently maintaining an "internal borrowing" position, i.e. the underlying borrowing need (CFR) has not yet been fully funded with loan debt as cash supporting the Council's reserves and balances is being used as a temporary measure.

The current projected outturn for internal borrowing is 49%, which is higher than the approved indicator of 45%. This is due to not taking expecting to take out any additional long-term borrowing for the Vehicle Replacement Programme and the Temporary Accommodation scheme which are expected to be funded from internal borrowing. Although the rate is currently projected at 49% we know this will reduce during the year due to slippage in the capital programme. It is proposed that this indicator is temporarily increased to 50%, whilst advice will be sought from our Treasury Management advisors about the optimal time to undertake new borrowing. Cashflow and liquidity will be monitored closely, and an update will be provided in the period 8 report.

B) Treasury Management Indicators:

These indicators are based on limits, beyond which activities should not pass

without management action. They include two key indicators of affordability and four key indicators of prudence.

Affordability:

a. Operational boundary for external debt

This is the limit which external debt is not “normally” expected to exceed. In most cases, this would be a similar figure to the CFR, but it may be lower or higher depending on the levels of actual debt, and must allow for unusual cash flow movements.

b. Authorised limit for external debt

This limit represents a control on the “maximum” level of borrowing. It is the statutory limit determined under s3 (1) of the Local Government Act 2003 and represents the limit beyond which external debt is prohibited. The Authorised Limit must be set, and revised if necessary, by Full Council. It reflects a level of external debt which, while not desirable, could be afforded in the short term, but is not sustainable in the longer term. The Government retains an option to control either the total of all councils’ plans, or those of a specific council, although this power has not yet been exercised.

Prudence:

c. Upper limits for the maturity structure of borrowing

These are set to reduce the Council’s exposure to large fixed rate sums falling due for refinancing.

d. Maximum new principal sums to be invested during 2025/26 for periods in excess of one year (365 days)

All such investments are classified as “non-specified”. This indicator is subject to the overall limit for non-specified investments set out in the TMSS, and to the overall limit per counterparty.

e. Interest rate exposure

The latest Treasury Management Code requires a statement in the TMSS explaining how interest rate exposure is managed and monitored by the Council, and this is repeated below:

*The Council has a general preference for fixed rate borrowing in order to minimise uncertainty and ensure stability in the charge to revenue, however it is acknowledged that in certain circumstances, some variable rate borrowing may be prudent, for*

*example if interest rates are expected to fall. The Council's investments are generally for cashflow purposes and accordingly a mix of fixed and variable rates will be used to maximise flexibility and liquidity. Interest rate exposure will be managed and monitored on a daily basis by the Chief Financial Officer.*

Local indicators for the proportions of fixed and variable rate loans, have been retained by the Council for information purposes.

Appendix 2 shows the actual position as at 31 July 2025, and demonstrates that all activities are contained within the currently approved limits.

### **3 Risk Management**

The CIPFA Prudential Code and Treasury Management Code (both updated in 2021) have placed greater importance on risk management. Where a local authority changes its risk appetite (for example, moving surplus cash into or out of certain types of investment funds or other investment instruments) then this change in risk appetite should be brought to Members attention in treasury management update reports.

There have been no changes in risk appetite and there are no other significant treasury management issues that have arisen since approval of the TMSS on 5 March 2025 that need to be brought to the attention of Members.

There are a number of risks inherent within any treasury management strategy, the most significant risks include:

- Reporting is not compliant with statutory guidelines.
- Investment and borrowing activity is outside the approved TM framework.
- Long term borrowing is taken at rates that are not advantageous.
- Investment of principal sums with insecure counterparties.
- Investment returns are volatile and may not meet budgeted amounts.
- Borrowing is not affordable.

These risks are mitigated by the controls included in the TMSS and are detailed at section 2.3 - Treasury Management Strategy above.

### **4 Alternative Options**

An alternative option is to fail to present a Prudential Code Indicator Monitoring and Treasury Activity Report, however this would contravene the requirement of the Council's Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS).

### **5 Financial Implications**

No specific financial implications are attributable to this report.

## **6 Legal Implications**

There are no legal implications arising from this report.

## **7 Equalities Implications**

There are no equalities implications arising from this report.

## **8 Carbon Reduction/Environmental Sustainability Implications**

There are no carbon reduction/environmental sustainability implications arising from this report.

## **9 Appendices**

1. Treasury Activity Report 2025/26 for Period 1 to 4 (31 July 2025).
2. Prudential and Treasury Indicator Monitoring 2025/26 for Period 1 to 4 (31 July 2025).

## **10 Background Papers**

None identified.

## **11 Reasons for Recommendation**

To comply with the requirements of the Council's Treasury Management Strategy Statement.

### **Statutory Officer approval:**

**Approved by:** Chief Financial Officer  
**Date:** 26 August 2025

**Approved by:** Monitoring Officer  
**Date:** 26 August 2025

**TREASURY ACTIVITY REPORT 2025/26****For Period ended 31 July 2025**

	<b>Position @ 1 April 2025</b>	<b>Loans Made During Apr - July</b>	<b>Loans Repaid During Apr - July</b>	<b>Position @ 31 July 2025</b>
	£	£	£	£
<b>Long Term Borrowing</b>				
PWLB	10,811,577	0	0	10,811,577
<b>Total Long Term Borrowing</b>	10,811,577	0	0	10,811,577
<b>Temporary Borrowing</b>				
Local Authorities	0	0	0	0
Central Government	0	0	0	0
Banks & Other Institutions	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Temporary Borrowing</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL BORROWING</b>	<b>10,811,577</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10,811,577</b>
<b>Long Term Investment</b>				
CCLA LAPF Property Fund	(1,000,000)	0	0	(1,000,000)
<b>Total Long Term Investment</b>	(1,000,000)	0	0	(1,000,000)
<b>Short Term Investment</b>				
Aberdeen MMF	(3,690,000)	(6,410,000)	6,100,000	(4,000,000)
Bank of Scotland	0	0	0	0
Barclays	0	0	0	0
Blackrock MMF	(1,000,000)	(11,720,000)	8,720,000	(4,000,000)
CCLA PSDF (MMF)	(3,000,000)	0	0	(3,000,000)
Close Brothers	(3,000,000)	0	0	(3,000,000)
Debt Management Office	(2,520,000)	(34,560,000)	21,130,000	(15,950,000)
Goldman Sachs	(3,000,000)	(480,000)	3,480,000	0
HSBC Treasury	0	0	0	0
Local Authorities & Other	0	0	0	0
Nationwide	(2,000,000)	(4,460,000)	4,460,000	(2,000,000)
Santander	0			0
<b>Total Short Term Investment</b>	<b>(18,210,000)</b>	<b>(57,630,000)</b>	<b>43,890,000</b>	<b>(31,950,000)</b>
<b>TOTAL INVESTMENT (See below)</b>	<b>(19,210,000)</b>	<b>(57,630,000)</b>	<b>43,890,000</b>	<b>(32,950,000)</b>
<b>NET BORROWING / (INVESTMENT)</b>	<b>(8,398,423)</b>	<b>(57,630,000)</b>	<b>43,890,000</b>	<b>(22,138,423)</b>

**Temporary Borrowing & Investment Statistics at 31 July 2025****Investment:**

Fixed Rate Investment	(10,520,000)	(39,500,000)	29,070,000	(20,950,000)
Variable Rate Investment	(8,690,000)	(18,130,000)	14,820,000	(12,000,000)
<b>TOTAL INVESTMENT</b>	<b>(19,210,000)</b>	<b>(57,630,000)</b>	<b>43,890,000</b>	<b>(32,950,000)</b>

Proportion of Fixed Rate Investment	63.58%
Proportion of Variable Rate Investment	36.42%
Temporary Investment Interest Receivable	£ 224,958
Equated Temporary Investment	£ 5,198,542
Weighted Average Interest Rate Received (Interest Receivable / Equated Investment)	4.33%
Compounded SONIA (3 month backward looking)	4.26%

**Borrowing:**

Temporary Borrowing Interest Payable	£ -
Equated Temporary Borrowing	£ -
Weighted Average Interest Rate Paid (Interest Payable / Equated Borrowing)	n/a

This page is intentionally left blank

**A) Prudential Indicators**

Affordability:

i)	Capital Expenditure	£ 6,413,400	£ 10,159,800
ii)	Capital Financing Requirement	£ 21,226,000	£ 21,052,378
iii)	Gearing (CFR to Long Term Assets)	43%	45%
iv)	Ratio of Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream-Services	2.21%	2.30%
v)	Maximum Gross Debt	£ 21,226,000	£ 10,811,577
vi)	Ratio of Internal Borrowing to CFR	45%	49%

**B) Treasury Management Indicators**

Affordability:

i)	Operational Boundary for External Debt:		
	Borrowing	£ 22,000,000	£ 10,811,577
	Other Long Term Liabilities	£ 1,500,000	£ -
	Total Operational Boundary	£ 23,500,000	£ 10,811,577
ii)	Authorised Limit for External Debt:		
	Borrowing	£ 23,000,000	£ 10,811,577
	Other Long Term Liabilities	£ 1,500,000	£ -
	Total Authorised Limit	£ 24,500,000	£ 10,811,577

Prudence:

iii)	Investment Treasury Indicator and limit:		
	Max. NEW principal sums invested in 2025/26 for periods OVER 365 days (ie. non-specified investments), subject to maximum non specified per counterparty of £3m AND to the prevailing overall counterparty limit, AND to the TOTAL non specified limit of £5m.	£ 3,000,000	£ 3,000,000
iv)	Upper & Lower limits for the maturity structure of outstanding Borrowing during 2025/26		
	Under 1 Year	40%	0%
	1 Year to 2 Years	40%	0%
	2 Years to 5 Years	50%	0%
	5 Years to 10 Years	50%	6%
	Over 10 Years	100%	94%

This page is intentionally left blank



## **MINUTES ENVIRONMENT AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday 8 July 2025**

Councillor Alison Hunt (Chair)

Present: Councillor Marje Paling Councillor Sue Pickering  
Councillor Rachael Ellis Councillor Alex Scroggie  
Councillor Roxanne Ellis Councillor Martin Smith  
Councillor Paul Hughes Councillor Paul Wilkinson  
Councillor Julie Najuk

Absent: Councillor Boyd Elliott and Councillor Clive Towsey-Hinton

Officers in Attendance: L Chaplin, B Cox, B Hopewell, A Hutchinson and K Nealon

### **8 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS.**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Towsey-Hinton. Councillor Hughes attended as substitute.

### **9 TO APPROVE, AS A CORRECT RECORD, THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10 JUNE 2025.**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the above meeting, having been circulated, be approved as a correct record.

### **10 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.**

None.

### **11 BOROUGH WIDE SMOKE CONTROL AREA DECLARATION**

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Place, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting, advising Members of the outcome of consultation regarding the revocation of all existing post 1980 smoke control orders. The report also sought to update members on the confirmation from the Secretary of State regarding the revocation of all existing pre 1980 smoke control orders and for the post 1980 revocation order and the borough wide smoke control area orders to be made.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- 1) Agree to make an Order (Appendix II) revoking all existing post 1980 smoke control orders to come into operation on the 1 February 2026.
- 2) Agree to make an Order (Appendix III) creating a Boroughwide Smoke Control Order to come into operation on the 1 February 2026.
- 3) Note the confirmation from the Secretary of State regarding the revocation of the pre 1980 smoke control orders with the order (Appendix I) to come into operation on the 1 February 2026.

**12 ANY OTHER ITEM WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT.**

None.

**13 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC.**

**RESOLVED:**

That, the Members being satisfied that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information that under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the ensuing reports on the grounds that the report involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

**14 APPLICATION FOR A THREE YEAR JOINT HACKNEY CARRIAGE/PRIVATE HIRE DRIVERS LICENCE - AA**

Consideration was given to a report of the Corporate Director of Place, which had been circulated prior to the meeting, regarding an application for a three year joint Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver's Licence for AA.

AA attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

In making the decision the Committee applied the Council's approved Policy and Guidelines.

**RESOLVED:**

To refuse AA's application for a Joint Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver's Licence.

AA was advised of the right of appeal against the decision of the Committee.

**15 APPLICATION FOR A THREE-YEAR JOINT HACKNEY CARRIAGE/PRIVATE HIRE DRIVERS LICENCE - MA**

Consideration was given to a report of the Corporate Director of Place, which had been circulated prior to the meeting, regarding an application for a three year joint Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver's Licence for MA.

MA attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

In making the decision the Committee applied the Council's approved Policy and Guidelines.

**RESOLVED:**

To refuse MA's application for a Joint Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver's Licence.

MA was advised of the right of appeal against the decision of the Committee.

The meeting finished at 6.15 pm

Signed by Chair:  
Date:

This page is intentionally left blank

## **MINUTES CABINET**

**Thursday 10 July 2025**

Councillor John Clarke (Chair)

Councillor David Ellis  
Councillor Kathryn Fox  
Councillor Viv McCrossen

Councillor Marje Paling  
Councillor Lynda Pearson  
Councillor Henry Wheeler

Absent: Councillor Jenny Hollingsworth

Officers in Attendance: M Hill, F Whyley, M Avery, K Lindley, L Chaplin,  
J Gray, SDuhra, L Widdowson and L Squires

### **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hollingsworth.

### **2 TO APPROVE, AS A CORRECT RECORD, THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 05/06/2025**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the above meeting, having been circulated, be approved as a correct record.

### **3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

None.

### **4 FORWARD PLAN**

Consideration was given to a report of the Democratic Services Manager, which had been circulated prior to the meeting, detailing the Executive's draft Forward Plan for the next six month period.

#### **RESOLVED:**

To note the report.

### **5 UPDATE ON THE CARBON MANAGEMENT STRATEGY ACTIONS 2025/6**

Consideration was given to a report of the Climate Change Officer, which had been circulated prior to the meeting, to seek approval for an updated carbon management action plan to be delivered in 2025/26.

**RESOLVED:**

THAT:

- 1) Members approve the updated Carbon Management Action Plan, with revised actions set out in Appendix 1.

**6**

**ANNUAL PLAN**

The Deputy Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer introduced a report which had been circulated prior to the meeting, to seek Cabinet agreement to the publication of the Gedling Plan Annual Report for 2024/25.

**RESOLVED:**

THAT Cabinet:

- 1) Approve the Gedling Plan Annual Report 2024/25 for publication internally and externally as described within the report.

**7**

**ANNUAL CCTV REPORT**

Consideration was given to a report of the Legal Services Manager which was circulated prior to the meeting, to update members on work undertaken and planned, to ensure good governance and compliance with the law in respect of the Council's surveillance systems.

**RESOLVED:**

THAT Cabinet:

- 1) Notes the work that has been undertaken and continues to be done to ensure lawful compliance and good governance and efficacy in the operation and use of the Council's surveillance systems.

**8**

**COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) NON- PARISH FUNDING – CONSULTATION RESPONSE AND FUNDING DECISION 24/25**

Consideration was given to a report of the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 Monitoring Officer which was circulated prior to the meeting, to note the representations and comments received in relation to the CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood Public Consultation, and approve the awarding of CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood Funding and the retention of unsuccessful projects on the Local Infrastructure Schedule, in accordance with the officer recommendations.

**RESOLVED:**

THAT Cabinet approves:

- 1) Award LIS2 – Gedling Youth & Community Hub Regeneration Project up to £75,000 CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood Funding.
- 2) Award LIS5 – Ambition Arnold Front Street Public Realm up to £220,000 CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood Funding.
- 3) Award LIS6 – The Revitalisation and Improvement of Sports Pavilions up to £236,600 CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood Funding.
- 4) Award LIS7 – Gedling Scout Group HQ Refurbishment up to £11,750 CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood Funding.
- 5) Retain LIS3 – Lambley Village Cricket Club on the Local Infrastructure Schedule for reconsideration as part of next year's CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood Funding awards.
- 6) Retain LIS4 – Mapperley All Stars (MAS) Community Hub on the Local Infrastructure Schedule for reconsideration as part of next year's CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood Funding awards.
- 7) Remove LIS1 – Cinder Path Extension from the Local Infrastructure Schedule.

## **9 CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY**

The Director of Transformation introduced a report, which had been circulated prior to the meeting to seek Cabinet approval to adopt a new, Council-wide Consultation and Engagement Strategy.

### **RESOLVED:**

THAT:

- 1) The Consultation and Engagement Strategy is adopted.
- 2) The Director of Transformation is authorised to publish the document.
- 3) Following approval, a toolkit and training is developed for managers across the Council.

## **10 GEDLING LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION**

The Planning Policy Manager introduced a report which had been circulated prior to the meeting, to seek approval to go out for consultation on the Gedling Local Development Plan Issues and Options Document and the separate Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.

**RESOLVED:**

THAT:

1) That Cabinet considers and agrees that the Gedling Local Development Plan Issues and Options Document (Appendix 1) and separate Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (Appendix 2) be published for a six-week period of consultation.

2) That Cabinet authorises the Director of Place in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder to approve any drafting or minor editing changes and update the documents where necessary prior to them being published for consultation.

**11**

**ANY OTHER ITEMS THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

None.

The meeting finished at 2.57 pm

Signed by Chair:  
Date:



## **MINUTES PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday 16 July 2025**

Councillor Roy Allan (Chair)

In Attendance:	Councillor Paul Wilkinson	Councillor Julie Najuk
	Councillor Pauline Allan	Councillor Lynda Pearson
	Councillor David Ellis	Councillor Catherine Pope
	Councillor Rachael Ellis	Councillor Grahame Pope
	Councillor Andrew Ellwood	Councillor Jane Walker
	Councillor Helen Greensmith	Councillor Henry Wheeler
	Councillor Darren Maltby	Councillor Russell Whiting

Absent: Councillor Stuart Bestwick, Councillor Sam Smith and Councillor Ruth Strong

Officers in Attendance: J Krawczyk, C Turton, S Fayaz, H Stylianou and C Goodall

### **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS.**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bestwick, Smith and Strong. Councillors Rachael Ellis and Maltby attended as substitutes.

### **2 TO APPROVE, AS A CORRECT RECORD, THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23 APRIL 2025**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the above meeting, having been circulated, be approved as a correct record.

### **3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

The Chair declared a collective non-pecuniary interest on behalf of all members of the committee in item 5 on the agenda, as Gedling Borough Council were the applicant and the owned the land.

### **4 APPLICATION 2025/0274 - WOODBOROUGH GARDEN CENTRE, LOWDHAM LANE, WOODBOROUGH**

Erection of 2 Canopies to the north facade of the Garden Centre.

David Lazenby, Property and Concessions Director of British Gardens Centres (The Applicant), spoke in support of the application.

The Assistant Director of Development informed the committee that since the publication of the agenda, a letter had been received from County Councillor Stoll, who considered that the benefits of the proposal would outweigh the negligible impact upon the Green Belt and was therefore in support of the application.

He then went on to introduce the report and concluded that as the proposal was considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt, which was not justified by any very special circumstances, it was therefore recommended that planning permission be refused for the reason detailed within the report.

The officer recommendation to refuse planning permission was not carried.

The Chair proposed an adjournment for five minutes, which was duly seconded.

*The meeting was adjourned at 18:26.*

*The meeting resumed at 18:31.*

The Chair proposed a further adjournment, which was duly seconded.

*The meeting was adjourned at 18:37.*

*The meeting resumed at 18:39.*

The Chair proposed a motion, which was duly seconded, for members to debate the very special circumstances as a reason to grant planning permission, contrary to officer recommendation.

Following debate, the committee felt the development did not meet all the criteria set out within paragraph 155 of the NPPF and was therefore inappropriate development.

However, they felt that the economic benefits of the development, namely the ability of the business to compete with online retailers, providing a better environment for customers and securing the viability of the business for the future, were very special circumstances which outweighed the potential harm to the Green Belt.

It was therefore agreed that the reasons as set out above, were the proposed reasons to grant planning permission.

The Assistant Director of Development introduced the following proposed conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall commence before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. This permission shall be read in accordance with the application form and following list of approved drawings received by the Local Planning Authority:

A-PL-200 (P02) – Site Location Plan  
A-PL-210 (P02) – Proposed Site Plan  
A-PL-211 (P02) – Proposed Floor Plan  
A-PL-212 (P02) – Proposed Roof Plan  
A-PL-213 (P02) – Proposed Elevations

The Chair then moved a motion, which was duly seconded, to grant planning permission based on the very special circumstances discussed in the previous motion and including the proposed conditions as set out above by the Assistant Director of Development, which was carried.

It was therefore

**RESOLVED:**

To Grant Planning Permission subject to the following conditions:

**Conditions**

1. The development hereby permitted shall commence before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. This permission shall be read in accordance with the application form and following list of approved drawings received by the Local Planning Authority:  
A-PL-200 (P02) – Site Location Plan  
A-PL-210 (P02) – Proposed Site Plan  
A-PL-211 (P02) – Proposed Floor Plan  
A-PL-212 (P02) – Proposed Roof Plan  
A-PL-213 (P02) – Proposed Elevations

**Reasons**

1. To comply with the requirements of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
2. For the avoidance of doubt.

5

**APPLICATION 2025/0458 - GEDLING BOROUGH COUNCIL, CIVIC CENTRE, ARNOT HILL PARK, ARNOLD**

Display of one of the following flags on a flagpole: Pride Flag, Progress Flag, Windrush Flag, VE Day Flag, D-Day Flag (including any future versions).

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report.

**RESOLVED:**

TO GRANT ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT subject to the following conditions:

**Conditions**

- 1 The consent shall be read in accordance with the following submitted documents:
  - Application form, received by the Local Planning Authority 27<sup>th</sup> June 2025
  - Site Location Plan, received by the Local Planning Authority 18<sup>th</sup> June 2025
  - Elevation Plan - VE Day flag, received by the Local Planning Authority 1<sup>st</sup> July 2025
  - Elevation Plan - D-Day Flag, received by the Local Planning Authority 1<sup>st</sup> July 2025
  - Elevation Plan – Progress Flag, received by the Local Planning Authority 9<sup>th</sup> June 2025
  - Elevation Plan – Progress and Intersex Flag, received by the Local Planning Authority 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2025
  - Elevation Plan – Pride Flag, received by the Local Planning Authority 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2025
  - Elevation Plan – Windrush Flag, received by the Local Planning Authority 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2025
- 2 No advertisement is to be displayed without the permission of the owner of the site or any other person with an interest in the site entitled to grant permission.

- 3 No advertisement shall be sited or displayed so as to— (a) endanger persons using any highway, railway, waterway, dock, harbour or aerodrome (civil or military);(b) obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of, any traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air; or;(c) hinder the operation of any device used for the purpose of security or surveillance or for measuring the speed of any vehicle.
- 4 Any advertisement displayed, and any site used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a condition that does not impair the visual amenity of the site.
- 5 Any structure or hoarding erected or used principally for the purpose of displaying advertisements shall be maintained in a condition that does not endanger the public.
- 6 Where an advertisement is required to be removed under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) Regulations, the site shall be left in a condition that does not endanger the public or impair visual amenity.

### **Reasons**

- 1 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to define the terms of this consent.
- 2 Reason: In accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.
- 3 Reason: In accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.
- 4 Reason: In accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.
- 5 Reason: In accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.
- 6 Reason: In accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

## **6 APPEAL SUMMARY REF: APP/N3020/D/25/3360775 – 9 BIRCHWOOD DRIVE, RAVENSHEAD**

Erection of a two-storey front extension and dormer window. Erection of an attached garage with dormer window. Dropped kerb to provide access to new garage.

**RESOLVED:**

To note the information.

**7 APPEAL SUMMARY REF: APP/N3020/D/25/3361530 - 149B MAIN STREET, WOODBOROUGH**

Loft conversion with dormer roof to the rear and raise ridge line of dwelling. Conversion of garage to ancillary domestic accommodation and skylights to the garage.

**RESOLVED:**

To note the information.

**8 APPEAL SUMMARY REF:APP/N3020/W/24/3354066 - ERNEHALE LODGE NURSING HOME, 82A FURLONG STREET, ARNOLD**

Change of Use from Nursing Home to 19 No. Dwellings with rear, side and roof extensions and facade alterations.

**RESOLVED:**

To note the information.

**9 FUTURE PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**RESOLVED:**

To note the information.

**10 PLANNING DELEGATION PANEL ACTION SHEETS**

**RESOLVED:**

To note the information.

**11 ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT.**

None.

The meeting finished at 7.01 pm

Signed by Chair:  
Date:

This page is intentionally left blank



## **MINUTES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Monday 21 July 2025**

Councillor Catherine Pope (Chair)

Councillor David Brocklebank	Councillor Rachael Ellis
Councillor Michael Adams	Councillor Darren Maltby
Councillor Pauline Allan	Councillor Grahame Pope
Councillor Roy Allan	Councillor Sam Smith
Councillor Jim Creamer	Councillor Russell Whiting
Councillor Andrew Dunkin	

Apologies for absence: Councillor Ron McCrossen

Officers in Attendance: F Whyley, E McGinlay and L Squires

### **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS.**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor McCrossen.

### **2 TO APPROVE, AS A CORRECT RECORD, THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10 MARCH 2025.**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the above meeting, having been circulated, be approved as a correct record.

### **3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.**

None.

### **4 PROCUREMENT POLICY UPDATE.**

The Deputy Chief Executive introduced a report, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting, updating members on the progress of the Procurement project and the new Procurement Strategy.

Members queried whether the new procurement plan had given any special consideration towards the upcoming Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) when devising the procurement strategy to avoid long-term entanglements.

The Deputy Chief Executive explained that some work had taken place to assess the current contracts and that consideration was being given to future contracts to avoid entanglements following the LGR.

Members asked whether a timeframe had been put in place on the social value report.

The Deputy Chief Executive informed Members that they expected a draft report to be in place towards the end of the summer.

Members requested a future update on spend and savings from efficiencies achieved following the implementation of the new procurement policy.

**RESOLVED to:**

Note the report.

**5 RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE Q3 24/25.**

The Deputy Chief Executive introduced a report, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting, updating Members on the current level of assurance which could be provided against each corporate risk.

**RESOLVED:**

To note the current risk level and actions identified within the Corporate Risk Register.

**6 RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE Q4 24/25.**

The Deputy Chief Executive introduced a report, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting, updating Members on the current level of assurance which could be provided against each corporate risk.

**RESOLVED:**

To note the current risk level and actions identified within the Corporate Risk Register.

**7 GEDLING PLAN Q4 2024/25 PERFORMANCE AND ANNUAL REPORT.**

The Deputy Chief Executive introduced a report, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting, informing Members in summary of the position against Improvement Actions and Performance Indicators in the 2024/25 Gedling Plan at the end of quarter 4 and the year end.

Members queried whether the upcoming report on fly tipping could also include some information on bin collection performance.

The Deputy Chief Executive agreed to include some information on bin collection performance in the fly tipping report.

Members queried whether Trade Waste bin collections were also using the new in-cab 'Whitespace' system.

Members noted that Whitespace systems for Trade Waste would take place during phase two of the system's rollout.

**RESOLVED:**

To note the progress against Improvement Actions and Performance Indicators for quarter 4 and the full year of 2024/25 Gedling Plan.

**8 SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME.**

Consideration was given to a report of the Democratic Services Manager, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting, updating Members on the Scrutiny Work Programme.

Members expressed an interest in receiving an update on the progress and implementation of the LGR.

It was agreed that a report would be brought to Committee in 2026.

Members queried whether an update from the Carlton Town Board could be brought to a future meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

It was agreed that a report on the Carlton Town Board would be brought to the next meeting in September.

Members queried whether a report on the Council's plans regarding the use of AI and IT transformation could be brought to a future meeting.

It was agreed that a report would be brought to the September meeting.

Members noted that reports on fly tipping and waste management would be coming to the next meeting and suggested inviting the Portfolio Holder for Operations to attend.

**RESOLVED:**

To note the report.

**9 ANY OTHER ITEM WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT.**

None.

The meeting finished at 6.05 pm

Signed by Chair:  
Date:

**MINUTES  
CABINET  
Wednesday 30 July 2025**

Councillor John Clarke (Chair)

Present:       Councillor David Ellis                               Councillor Lynda Pearson  
                  Councillor Kathryn Fox                           Councillor Henry Wheeler  
                  Councillor Viv McCrossen

Absent:         Councillor Jenny Hollingsworth and Councillor Marje Paling

Officers in     M Hill, F Whyley, T Adams, M Avery, N Osei, E McGinlay, L  
Attendance:    Squires

**12           APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hollingsworth and Councillor Paling.

**13           TO APPROVE, AS A CORRECT RECORD, THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10.07.25.**

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the above meeting, having been circulated, be approved as a correct record.

**14           DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.**

None

**15           UPDATE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION**

A report of the Chief Executive was circulated prior to the meeting for Cabinet to consider the outcome of the Full Council debate on Local Government Reorganisation and resolve the Council's position on which option to develop as a final proposal(s) for submission to Government in November 2025.

**RESOLVED:**

THAT CABINET:

a. Considered the options appraisal and summary document provided by Price Waterhouse Cooper (PWC) (Appendices 4 and 5 to the Full Council report).

b. Develop Option 1e as this Council's preferred option for submission as a final proposal to Government by 28 November 2025.

c. Further considers other viable options (should they be developed) that stop any part of the current Gedling Borough being merged with an expanded City area.

d. Supports a countywide approach to engagement activities during the period August to September 2025 tailored for different stakeholder groups across Gedling and Nottinghamshire.

e. Supports continued collaborative working with other local authorities across Nottingham and Nottinghamshire with a view to developing a final proposal for Local Government Reorganisation.

**16**

**ANY OTHER ITEMS THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT.**

None.

The meeting finished at 8:05 pm

Signed by Chair:  
Date:

## **MINUTES ENVIRONMENT AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday 5 August 2025**

Councillor Alison Hunt (Chair)

Present: Councillor Marje Paling Councillor Sue Pickering  
Councillor Rachael Ellis Councillor Martin Smith  
Councillor Roxanne Ellis Councillor Clive Towsey-Hinton  
Councillor Andrew Meads Councillor Paul Wilkinson  
Councillor Julie Najuk

Absent: Councillor Alex Scroggie

Officers in Attendance: C Allcock, J Goodall, B Hopewell, K Nealon and R Towlson

### **16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS.**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Scroggie.

### **17 TO APPROVE, AS A CORRECT RECORD, THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8 JULY 2025.**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the above meeting, having been circulated, be approved as a correct record.

### **18 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.**

None.

### **19 PROPOSED TAXI LICENSING FEES FOR 2025/26**

The Community Protection Manager introduced a report, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting, seeking approval of the proposed vehicle licensing for 2025/26 as shown at appendix 1 to the report, subject to advertisement requirements being satisfied.

#### **RESOLVED:**

To approve the fees for the taxi driver, operators and vehicle licences as detailed inat Appendix 1 for 2025/26 for advertisement in accordance with the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, such fees to automatically come into force on 1 October 2025 if no objections are received within the statutory period. If any objections are received

within the statutory period, they would be referred back to Committee for consideration in accordance with the legislation.

**20 ANY OTHER ITEM WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT.**

None.

**21 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC.**

**RESOLVED:**

That, the Members being satisfied that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information that under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the ensuing reports on the grounds that the report involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

**22 CHANGE OF CIRCUMSTANCES OF JOINT HACKNEY CARRIAGE & PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE DRIVERS LICENCE SA**

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Place, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting, regarding a change of circumstances following information received about the holder of a Joint Hackney Carriage/ Private Hire Driver's Licence.

**RESOLVED:**

To defer the decision until the next available committee.

The meeting finished at 4.35 pm

Signed by Chair:  
Date:



## **MINUTES PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday 3 September 2025**

Councillor Roy Allan (Chair)

In Attendance:	Councillor Paul Wilkinson	Councillor Catherine Pope
	Councillor Pauline Allan	Councillor Grahame Pope
	Councillor David Ellis	Councillor Sam Smith
	Councillor Andrew Ellwood	Councillor Ruth Strong
	Councillor Helen Greensmith	Councillor Jane Walker
	Councillor Darren Maltby	Councillor Henry Wheeler
	Councillor Julie Najuk	Councillor Russell Whiting
	Councillor Lynda Pearson	

Absent: Councillor Stuart Bestwick

Officers in Attendance: J Krawczyk, N Bryan, S Fayaz and C Goodall

### **12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS.**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Bestwick. Councillor Maltby attended as substitute.

### **13 TO APPROVE, AS A CORRECT RECORD, THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16 JULY 2025**

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the above meeting, having been circulated, be approved as a correct record.

### **14 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

None.

### **15 POSITION STATEMENT ON GREY BELT - GEDLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

The Assistant Director - Development introduced a report of the Planning Policy Manager, asking members to note the Position Statement on Grey Belt.

**RESOLVED:**

To note the Gedling Borough Council Position Statement on Grey Belt attached at Appendix 1.

**16 FUTURE APPLICATIONS**

**RESOLVED:**

To note the information.

**17 PLANNING DELEGATION PANEL ACTION SHEETS**

**RESOLVED:**

To note the information.

**18 ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT.**

None.

The meeting finished at 6.14 pm

Signed by Chair:  
Date:

**Decisions made under delegated authority**

<b>Business (click to view decision)</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>Was decision made under urgency provisions?</b>
Advertisement of Disposal of Land Parcel at the Northern Portion of Killisick Lane	Approval to advertise the notice of the Council's intention to dispose of the small parcel of land at Killisick Lane and shown on the plan at Appendix 2, in accordance with s.123 (2A) of the Local Government Act 1972	D1648	30/07/2025	Leader of the Council	No
Council Employees Wearing Body Cameras	Approval to allow officers in the Council's employees to use Body Worn Video Cameras whilst working across the Borough.	D1651	01/09/2025	Leader of the Council	No
Increasing fixed penalty notice (FPN) charge levels for littering under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 from £65 to £150	Approval to raise the Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) for littering in Gedling Borough from £65 to £150, in line with powers under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.	D1658	16/08/2025	Portfolio Holder for Public Protection	No
Response to Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government on the Fair Funding Review 2.0	Approval for of Gedling Borough Council's response to the government's funding reform consultation: the Fair Funding Review 2.0.	D1667	15/08/2025	Leader of the Council	No
Warm Homes Local Grant 2025 to 2028	Approval to enter a partnership arrangement with Nottinghamshire County Council. This partnership will allow Nottinghamshire County Council to manage and	D1661	08/08/2025	Portfolio Holder for Public Protection	No

	administer the Warm Homes Local Grant 2025 to 2028 on behalf of Gedling Borough Council.				
National Non-Domestic Rates - Discretionary Relief Application - Nottinghamshire Royal Society for the Blind	Approval for discretionary charitable relief under Section 47 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988.	D1650	29/07/2025	Leader of the Council	No
Response to Government Technical Consultation – Reform of Planning Committees	Approval for endorsement of Gedling Borough Council's proposed response contained in Appendix 1 to the Government consultation on proposed reforms to Planning Committees. The consultation response is required to be submitted by 23rd July 2025	D1656	25/07/2025	Leader of the Council	No
Approval of Gedling UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) Health and Wellbeing, Physical Activity Grant Fund 2025/26	Approval to launch and administer the Gedling UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) 'Health and Wellbeing, Physical Activity' Grant Fund	D1649	15/07/2025	Portfolio Holder for Lifestyles, Health and Wellbeing	No