

## **MINUTES COUNCIL**

**Wednesday 17 September 2025**

Councillor Kyle Robinson-Payne (Mayor)

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

Absent: Councillor Pauline Allan, Councillor Roy Allan, Councillor Sue Pickering and Councillor Alex Scroggie

### **47 THOUGHT FOR THE DAY**

Members observed a minute's silence to honour the passing of former Councillor and Alderman, Gary Gregory.

The Mayor's chaplain, Rev O'Kane, shared his thoughts on the recent civic service and how nice it was to celebrate inclusion in unity.

### **48 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Pauline Allan, Roy Allan, Scroggie and Pickering.

### **49 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor gave an update on the last few months of his mayoral year noting the wonderful events he had attended within the community. He highlighted his visits to the Daybrook Bowls Club summer fair, the LOCO Centre, the Lambley village show, Killisick fun day and a local film

screening of “My Nieces Big Fat Delhi Wedding” held at the Bonington Theatre.

Thanks were given for a recent fundraising wine tasting evening at Taste First that raised over £300. The Mayor highlighted that his recent Civic Service had also raised £450 for his chosen charity and thanked all those who attended and supported the event, making it a successful event.

**50 TO APPROVE, AS A CORRECT RECORD, THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 5 MARCH, 23 JULY AND 30 JULY 2025**

Members raised queries about the accuracy of an item on the 23 July 2025 minutes. It was noted that the minutes were not verbatim but that they would be looked into and amended as necessary.

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the above meeting, subject to any necessary amendments, be approved as a correct record.

**51 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

None.

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

None received.

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

Two questions were received from members of the public. The questions and answers were as follows:

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?

Response from Councillor Hollingsworth:

Thank you for the question. In determining the application for planning permission for the development at Top Wighay Farm the Council did have careful regard to all these matters and consulted with statutory and

other specialist consultees who provided appropriate advice. The impact of the development is mitigated through the imposition of conditions and a Section 106 legal agreement. The Section 106 agreement requires the housing developer to provide land for the construction of a primary school along with a contribution of £4.75m for its delivery. Other contributions include £802,500 toward highways including public transport provision and £436,209 toward healthcare improvements along with extensive areas of public open space within the development. In terms of drainage, detailed technical information has been provided and this has been independently assessed by technical experts at the County Council and the Environment Agency, prior to approval.

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?

Response from Councillor Hollingsworth:

Thank you for the question. The Government sets a method for calculating local housing need in order to provide a minimum number of homes. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in December 2024 and sets a minimum requirement for 631 new homes to be delivered within the borough per annum. If the Council is unable to deliver this number of homes or cannot demonstrate a housing land supply of 5 years, there will be risk of speculative development taking place in less sustainable locations within the borough.

The Council is currently progressing the Gedling Local Development Plan which will include policies and allocations for the future growth of the borough. The Council will continue to work closely with partners and key stakeholders, including Nottinghamshire County Council and the NHS, to ensure appropriate infrastructure improvements are delivered to mitigate the impact of any planned development. The Gedling Local Development Plan will be supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will use evidence to set out the type of infrastructure improvements, such as schools, highway improvements and health provision, required to support the identified growth within the borough

The Council secures infrastructure contributions through Section 106 agreements which provide mitigation for any direct impacts of a development and also through the Community Infrastructure Levy which helps fund infrastructure projects

54

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

A question was asked of the Portfolio Holder for Climate Change and Natural Habitat by Councillor Whiting, as follows:

“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?”

Response from Councillor Viv McCrossen:

Thank you for the question.

Allotments within the Borough are currently designated as Protected Open Space in the adopted Local Planning Document 2018. Any development proposals on these sites must be in accordance with Policy LPD 20 – Protection of Open Space which seeks to ensure that allotments and other open spaces are retained unless exceptions detailed in the policy can be evidenced.

There are two allotment sites in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which is used to identify and assess possible future housing sites. These are:

- G1152 - Robin Hood Carlton Allotments, Carlton
- G1136 – Leapool Allotments, Redhill

Both sites were submitted to the SHLAA in 2019 by the GBC Property Team as part of an asset review undertaken at that time. Any decision to dispose of a Council allotment would require further consultation and approval. I can however confirm that there are no current plans to dispose of either allotment for the purposes of delivering housing.

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

“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?”

Response from Councillor Clarke:

Thank you for your question.

At the current time, no substantial work has taken place to consider ways in which the events in Gaza can be commemorated in the future. The events team have a scheduled events programme which has already been agreed for the upcoming year.

Work will take place shortly to see how this can be incorporated into the 2026/27 programme of events for the year, and this will be reviewed by the senior leadership team and cascaded to members and the public once agreed.

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

“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?”

Response from Councillor Clarke:

Thank you for the question, Councillor Wheeler.

I will first respond to the Freedom of Information requests:

The Council has a statutory duty to provide information upon request in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act and the Environmental Information Regulations.

Recording the request, gathering the information, and preparing a response, takes a significant amount of time. It is not always straightforward and can involve a number of different officers across the Council.

Recently we have also experienced some of these requests taking a ‘scattergun’ approach which targets several officers and councillors. This of course, increases the effort involved and can duplicate the investigative work that we have to do.

In some cases, there is also a request for further clarification of an answer, or a review of the decision to apply an exemption to the

disclosure of information. Clearly this requires further time to be spent on each request.

The Council's Retention Policy means that Freedom of Information and Environmental Information data is only retained for 2 years plus the current year, therefore it has not been possible to provide information from the last 4 financial years.

However, during the last 2 and a half years, I can report that we have experienced 2,210 requests. Based on an estimated average of 2.5 hours to process and respond, and using the industry standard of £25 per hour, this has cost the Council around £55,000 per year in officer time.

The top 3 individuals account for 217 of these requests, around 10%. Whilst it is difficult to record all time spent on these requests, using the same average of 2.5 hours and £25 per hour, these 3 individuals have cost the Council around £5,400 per year in officer time.

I will now move onto Complaints:

The Council is committed to continually improving the quality of, and access to, the services it provides. We take a positive approach to customer feedback and encourage customers to give us their views.

The Council's Complaints Policy has a two-staged response process, whereby following an initial response a complainant can request the Council to progress the initial complaint to a stage 2 review, and this is undertaken by a senior manager.

In the last 4 financial years we have received 3,663 stage 1 complaints and 176 stage 2 complaints. Based on the same estimated average of 2.5 hours to process and respond, and costing around £25 per hour, this has cost around £60,000 per year in officer time.

The top 3 individuals account for 47 stage 1 complaints, and 9 stage 2 complaints. Whilst the degree of complexity in each complaint means it is difficult to record all time spent by officers on these requests, these complaints are generally more complicated and can take up to 10 hours to deal with by a senior officer. On this basis an estimated cost in dealing with complaints from these 3 individuals is around £4,000 per year in officer time.

Putting this into context Mr Mayor, the top 3 individuals between them submit around 7 requests for information and 1 Complaint every month.

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

"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.”

Response from Councillor Hollingsworth:

Nottinghamshire County Council are responsible for expending contributions for education in accordance with the relevant Section 106 legal agreement which define the planning area and timescale for expenditure.

For example, the Section 106 legal agreement relating to the development of 365 houses on land at Park Road, Calverton requires the primary contribution of just over £1.4m to be spent within the Calverton Primary School Planning Area and the secondary contribution of just over £1m to be spent to expand the capacity at Colonel Frank Seeley Academy. The County Council has 12 years, from the date of receipt of the final payment, to spend the contributions on projects within the specified areas.

Nottinghamshire County Council as the education authority are responsible for ensuring schools have specific capacity.

The legal agreements are a robust mechanism to ensure that education contributions are expended on expanding provision where new development is taking place.

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

“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?"

Response from Councillor D Ellis:

Pro-Environmental were given planning permission by the county council in 2022 for a change of use to plastic recycling. The business takes plastic waste and processes it into pellets for reuse. The business is regulated by the Environment Agency and operates under a permit granted by them. The Borough Council has powers under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to deal with insects from industrial premises. Where a complaint of a statutory nuisance is made by a person living within its area, the Borough Council investigates the complaint and when the council is satisfied that a statute nuisance exists or it is likely to occur or recur, it has powers to serve an obedience notice.

During the summer of 2024, complaints were received from members of the public of an increase in flies in the northwest of Calverton and environmental health officers visited a number of commercial premises in the village to try and establish a source of any fly infestations. This included the sewage treatment works, the Viola recycling plant, the vehicle breakers yard and pro-environmental recycling centre. However, no fly infestations were witnessed.

With regards to pro environmental, officers met with the site manager who demonstrated they have a fly management plan in place and a contract with a private pest control business to ensure that suitable control measures were in place. Officers checked their records, and it was clear that press pest control visits had been done at the time.

So far in 2025, there have been two complaints to the council about flies in the village with the suggestion that pro-environmental is the source,

which is a significant decrease of the more than 30 complaints received in 2024.

Officers have continued to monitor the situation, and I can confirm that the most recent visit was within the last 48 hours, and no concerns were identified. Council appreciates that fly infestations can be distressing for local people and residents should be ensured that the council takes reports of infestations seriously. Pro-Environmental has cooperated with officers and are happy to be transparent with their pest control plan. The local management on the site have confirmed that they are willing for councillors to tour the facility by appointment to get a better understanding of their operations and I am sure the officers will be happy to facilitate this.

Officers have encouraged Pro-Environmental to be transparent with their pest control plan, and local management on the site have confirmed that they are willing for Councillors to tour the facility by appointment to get a better understanding of their operations.

**55                    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  
RESOLVED**

To note the report.

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

No comments or issues were raised.

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

Councillor Meads, seconded by councillor Whiting, proposed a motion in the following terms:

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: Councillor Andy Meads

Seconder: Councillor Russell Whiting

Members debated the motion and on being put to a vote, the motion was lost.

The meeting finished at 7.13 pm

Signed by Chair:

Date: