

# Agenda

## Council

Date: **Wednesday 30 September 2026**

---

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 Sandra Barnes

**Deputy Mayor** Councillor Pauline Allan

|                                |                                |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Councillor Michael Adams       | Councillor Ron McCrossen       |
| Councillor Roy Allan           | Councillor Viv McCrossen       |
| Councillor Jane Allen          | Councillor Andrew Meads        |
| Councillor Stuart Bestwick     | Councillor Julie Najuk         |
| Councillor David Brocklebank   | Councillor Marje Paling        |
| Councillor John Clarke         | Councillor Michael Payne       |
| Councillor Jim Creamer         | Councillor Lynda Pearson       |
| Councillor Andrew Dunkin       | Councillor Sue Pickering       |
| Councillor Boyd Elliott        | Councillor Catherine Pope      |
| Councillor David Ellis         | Councillor Grahame Pope        |
| Councillor Rachael Ellis       | Councillor Kyle Robinson-Payne |
| 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 Alison Hunt         | Councillor Paul Wilkinson      |
| Councillor Darren Maltby       |                                |

### **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 30 September 2026 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 21 January 2026, 4 March 2026 and 10 June 2026 | 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 – To the Leader of the Council – Asked by Sebastian Soar

First, I would like to thank the Leader of the Council for being so generous with his time and for spending an hour with me earlier this month discussing this issue.

When people think about the benefits of working in the public sector, and particularly in local government, one of the things they often associate with it is a strong and inclusive employment package. In many respects, that is true. However, there is one area where policy has failed to keep pace with modern working lives and changing expectations around equality: paternity leave.

Gedling Borough Council's current paternity leave arrangements, like those of many local authorities, were developed in a policy environment that no longer reflects where we are as a society. They do not fully reflect

the progress we have made in challenging traditional gender roles, supporting greater equality between men and women, and recognising the importance of fathers being able to play a meaningful role in the earliest weeks of their child's life.

Enhanced paternity leave is a relatively low-cost policy with potentially significant benefits. It can support fathers, mothers and children at one of the most important periods in family life; give families the time and financial security they need to adjust to a new child; support maternal wellbeing and a more equal sharing of caring responsibilities; and help the Council attract and retain staff by demonstrating that it is a genuinely family-friendly employer.

With that in mind, and given that other councils have already begun to enhance their paternity leave policies, will the Council commit to reviewing its paternity leave policy as a matter of priority, with the aim of introducing six weeks of fully paid paternity leave for employees of Gedling Borough Council?

Question 2 – To the Portfolio Holder Climate Change, Parks, and Environmental Health

Hi, i'm a fourteen year old boy who lives near conway park, i was just wondering if it would be possible for a volleyball net to be put in at the tennis facilities on conway park, and for the court to be done, i know it's a big ask but i think it'd open up a lot more opportunities for people and maybe get more people interested in the sport as it is quite underrepresented.

Question 3 – To the Chair of Planning Committee.

How do I found out if a HMO grant has been agreed for the area I Live and why are the residents not consulted before applicants are agreed.

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

Question from Cllr Maltby to the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services (Operations)

How many missed bin collections has there been per ward over the past 12 months?

Question from Cllr Hughes to the Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Community Protection, Communications and Engagement

Could the Leader please tell me how much money has been spent on preparations for LGR on consultants etc; and provide an estimate of how many hours of senior officer time have been committed to preparing for the now paused Local Government Reorganisation.

Question from Cllr Ellwood to the Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Community Protection, Communications and Engagement

Concerns have been raised by local residents concerning littering near to commercial properties within Phoenix Ward. What action does the Council intend to do to address this matter?

Question from Cllr Whiting to the Chair of Planning Committee

To ask what steps Gedling Borough Council takes to ensure that planning applications are adequately enforced, especially in the construction phase of projects.

Question from Cllr Whiting to the Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Community Protection, Communications and Engagement

Following the recent decision to pause LGR will any remaining budget allocated to LGR now be reallocated to other areas?

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

There seems to be a misconception, especially on social media, that planning applications cannot be submitted for sites identified within the Gedling draft local development plan until the plan is adopted in 2028. But is it in fact correct that planning applications could be submitted at any time a developer wishes for these sites? Then any planning applications would be determined on the basis of their merits at the time of submission, and as the draft local development plan progress through the process to adoption the planning officers will afford any planning applications that come in for these sites more weight.

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

Is it correct that when deciding on the housing site allocation in the draft Gedling local development plan, the defined settlement and spatial development hierarchy was strictly adhered to, and decisions evidenced based, in other words was the total housing allocation met in this order:

- First) sites within the main built-up urban area
- Second) sites adjoining the main built-up urban area
- Third) sites at Linby around Oak House
- Fourth) sites at the key settlements of Ravenshead, Bestwood village, and Calverton
- Finally sites around the other villages within the borough?

|    |                                                                                                                                                        |           |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| a  | <b>Changes to Cabinet Member Roles and Responsibilities</b>                                                                                            | 39 - 46   |
|    | Report of the Leader of the Council                                                                                                                    |           |
| b  | <b>Budget Outturn and Budget Carry Forwards 2025/26</b>                                                                                                | 47 - 89   |
|    | Report of the Senior Leadership Team                                                                                                                   |           |
| c  | <b>Annual Treasury Activity Report 2025/26</b>                                                                                                         | 91 - 111  |
|    | Report of the Chief Finance Officer & Section 151 Officer                                                                                              |           |
| d  | <b>Amendments to the Planning Committee Rules within Section 10 the Constitution and the Scheme of Delegation with Section 19b of the Constitution</b> | 113 - 157 |
|    | Report of the Assistant Director - Development                                                                                                         |           |
| 10 | <b>Independent Remuneration Panel - Report and recommendations for Audit co-opted member and mileage rates</b>                                         | 159 - 173 |
|    | Report of the Democratic Services Manager                                                                                                              |           |
| 11 | <b>To consider comments, of which due notice has been given, under procedural rule 7.11</b>                                                            |           |
| a  | <b>Minutes of meeting Monday 20 April 2026 of Appeals and Retirements Committee</b>                                                                    | 175 - 177 |
| b  | <b>Minutes of meeting Thursday 21 May 2026 of Cabinet</b>                                                                                              | 179 - 182 |
| c  | <b>Minutes of meeting Tuesday 2 June 2026 of Environment and Licensing Committee</b>                                                                   | 183 - 184 |
| d  | <b>Minutes of meeting Wednesday 3 June 2026 of Planning Committee</b>                                                                                  | 185 - 227 |
| e  | <b>Minutes of meeting Wednesday 17 June 2026 of Appointments and Conditions of Service Committee</b>                                                   | 229 - 231 |
| f  | <b>Minutes of meeting Tuesday 23 June 2026 of Audit Committee</b>                                                                                      | 233 - 238 |
| g  | <b>Minutes of meeting Thursday 25 June 2026 of Cabinet</b>                                                                                             | 239 - 241 |
| h  | <b>Minutes of meeting Thursday 25 June 2026 of Standards Committee</b>                                                                                 | 243 - 244 |
| i  | <b>Minutes of meeting Tuesday 7 July 2026 of Environment and Licensing Committee</b>                                                                   | 245 - 248 |
| j  | <b>Minutes of meeting Wednesday 15 July 2026 of Licensing Act</b>                                                                                      | 249 - 252 |

## **Panel**

|          |                                                                                             |                  |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>k</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting Wednesday 15 July 2026 of Planning Committee</b>                      | <b>253 - 263</b> |
| <b>l</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting Thursday 16 July 2026 of Cabinet</b>                                  | <b>265 - 271</b> |
| <b>m</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting Tuesday 25 August 2026 of Joint Consultative and Safety Committee</b> | <b>273 - 276</b> |
| <b>n</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting Wednesday 9 September 2026 of Planning Committee</b>                  | <b>277 - 279</b> |
| <b>o</b> | <b>Decisions made under delegated authority</b>                                             | <b>281 - 283</b> |

## **12 To consider motions under procedural rule 7.12**

### **Motion 1**

#### **Motion: LGR cost to local taxpayers and government reimbursement**

##### **Council notes that:**

- In the face of potentially unlawful decision making, and allegations of gerrymandering, the Labour Government has announced a review of Local Government Reorganisation, with decisions in some areas withdrawn and implementation work across Nottinghamshire paused.
- Gedling Borough Council, and Councils across the country, have already spent significant amounts of taxpayers' money and officer time preparing for Local Government Reorganisation at the Labour Government's request.
- Much of this work has been undertaken because councils were working to deadlines and requirements set by the Labour Government.

##### **Council believes that:**

- Local residents should not be left to pick up the bill for a process which the Government has now chosen to pause.
- At a time when council finances are already under enormous pressure, every pound unnecessarily spent on Local Government Reorganisation is a pound which cannot be spent on improving the services our residents rely on.
- It should be democratically elected local councils, in consultation with local residents, to decide on whether or not to put forward (locally-led) proposals for restructuring

##### **Council resolves:**

- To direct the Chief Executive and Section 151 Officer to establish the full cost to this Council of Local Government Reorganisation to date.
- To direct the Leader of the Council to write to the Secretary of State and

our local Members of Parliaments making clear that:

- Local taxpayers should not be expected to pay for the Government's LGR U-turn.
- Call on the Government to reimburse this Council for all costs incurred as a direct result of the Local Government Reorganisation process.
- Call on the Government to provide clear answers about the future of Local Government Reorganisation before councils are expected to spend any more taxpayers' money on the process.
- To make clear this council's view that the Local Government Boundary Commission for England must be involved in reviewing any local government boundary, ward and council size proposals submitted to the Secretary of State by councils in due course.

**Proposed by Cllr Mike Adams**  
**Seconded by Cllr Martin Smith**

Motion 2

**Motion: Application of parking standards to houses in multiple occupation**

**This Council notes that:**

1. Gedling Borough Council's Parking Provision for Residential and Non-Residential Developments Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted in February 2022, establishes minimum parking standards for new development and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
2. The SPD states that its purpose is to ensure that new development is supported by an appropriate level of parking and provides a framework for determining and negotiating parking requirements on planning applications.
3. The SPD sets parking requirements according to factors including the type and size of residential development, the number of bedrooms and whether a site is located in an urban or rural area.
4. The SPD does not, however, expressly set out a specific parking standard for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs).
5. The Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide does set out parking standards for HMOs and sheltered accommodation but the application of this guidance is not always clearly set out in officer reports.
6. Gedling Borough is experiencing an increasing number of planning applications for HMOs, including applications involving the

conversion of existing family homes into properties accommodating multiple unrelated residents.

7. HMOs can generate significantly different parking demand from an ordinary single-household dwelling, particularly where several adults may each have their own vehicle.
8. Where insufficient on-site parking is provided, additional parking demand can be displaced onto surrounding residential streets, increasing pressure on already limited parking capacity and potentially affecting highway safety, pedestrian access and the amenity of neighbouring residents.
9. This Council's current Parking Standards SPD recognises that parking requirements should normally be met and that poorly designed or insufficient parking can create problems for road safety, pedestrians, cyclists, emergency vehicle access and the efficient flow of traffic.

**This Council believes that:**

1. Residents should not be expected to bear the consequences of inadequate parking provision arising from changes in the use of residential properties.
2. There should be a clear, consistent and transparent approach to parking provision when planning applications for HMOs are considered.
3. HMOs should not be treated as though they were ordinary single-household dwellings where the number of individual residents and bedrooms may create a materially greater demand for parking.

**This Council therefore resolves to:**

1. Ensure the application of the existing Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide as a material consideration to all planning applications for HMOs, including applications for changes of use and extensions or alterations associated with an HMO
2. Ensure that consideration of the above guide is reflected in planning reports and decisions in respect of HMOs.

**Proposed by Cllr Helen Greensmith  
Seconded by Cllr Stuart Bestwick**