

CONFIDENTIAL
Newton Community Partnership Board
Notes of meeting Friday 10th July 2026 at 10am
Rushcliffe Arena

Attendees

Cllr Neil Clarke - RBC
 Cllr Roger Upton – RBC
 Cllr Debbie Soloman - RBC
 James Abbott – Redrow
 Jen Towers – Redrow
 Dan Sullivan – NCC
 Paul Taylor – RBC
 James Bate - RBC
 Sara Ebeid – RBC
 Martyn Saultter – NPC
 Emily Spedding – NPC

Apologies

William Lawrence – NCC
 Craig Straw – Innes England
 Jan Witko – NCC
 Alan Staley – Redrow
 Ben Ryder – RBC
 Simon Waterfield – Landowner
 Chris Quinsee – Q&Q Planning
 Leanne Ashmore – RBC
 Rachel Gaskell – RBC

ITEM	KEY POINTS	ACTION
1. Welcome, introductions and apologies.	RBC officers confirmed Leanne Ashmore has now left RBC – as a voting member of the board it was agreed that it is the post (Director) not the person that sits on the board (as was the case with Parish representatives) and therefore her replacement Lorna Vertigan (who will join RBC in September, taking over Leanne's previous role) will join the board as a direct replacement. The Board confirmed that they accept Lorna as Leanne's direct replacement. Redrow also confirmed Alan Staley has left the organisation and Jen Towers will take over his responsibilities. The Board agreed to this change.	
2. Notes and actions from meeting Jan 2026 	Item 1 Cllr Solomon: Residents have responded to the petition and are very supportive of the bridge, with over 700 respondents. Redrow: requested copy of questionnaire – cannot be provided due to GDPR, but copy of question(s) posed can be- Cllr Clarke: Raised the issue (of bridge) with the Mayor in connection with 'kickstart' funding to query whether they can contribute funding so the matter	Cllr Soloman to provide copy of questionnaire

ITEM	KEY POINTS	ACTION
	can be resolved quickly. No commitment has been made, and a further meeting is required to establish a business case. It is currently 50/50 and unclear whether the funding be provided to assist the project to progress.	question(s) to Redrow.
	Item 2 JA: Questions were raised around the barriers due to tracking. Redrow is carrying out work to ensure a bus can track through the area, not just lorries. Cllr Solomon: Believes the plan should have been deliverable. JA has asked for a completion date, but Redrow has declined to provide one. Confirmation that the existence of a planning permission for the barriers does not require they be installed.	
	Item 3 A query was raised as to whether the education provision funding could be diverted elsewhere. Redrow confirmed they had a legal opinion that it could be redirected. JB clarified that rather than building a new school, the funding will be used to expand an existing school. Not all the funding is therefore needed (as extending an existing school is cheaper than building a new school) so question was whether the “left over” monies can be reallocated to off-site highway works as the costs of these had grown. Overall Redrow would be no worse off financially. Another issue is that the County Council has highway projects to extend the junction, and costs have increased compared to a year ago. The discussion confirmed that figures have been agreed for both education and highway contributions. A question was raised as to whether the ratios could be adjusted. Cllr Solomon: The money can be reallocated, but it cannot be assigned to anything that has not already been identified. Any changes are subject to a variation being agreed by Planning. PC: Asked whether the funding would go to Bingham or East Bridgford, raising concerns about children being unable to travel safely to school in Bingham via public transport. JB: Funding may support other schools. Discussions are ongoing with the County Council about expanding a different school from the one identified within the development. The intention is to direct children to Newton from East Bridgford while expanding provision in Bingham. MS: Funding can be used for highways, but education remains the priority. JB: Now that the position is clearer, discussions from a year ago highlighted that landowners (Nottingham Newton LLP) were unwilling to proceed without being able to also discuss other changes they wished to make, but no specifics on what these other matters would be. PC: Queried why no representative from the education authority was present and why they were not advocating for education funding instead of highway projects. Chair (RU) clarified they were invited but have not attended. Redrow: Confirmed that the school expansion will be in Bingham. PC: Stated that a bridge or bus route is needed to allow children to travel safely to school (esp if more housing is approved at the site). Action: Contact Lawrence at the County Council regarding the above.	
	Item 4	

OFFICIAL

ITEM	KEY POINTS	ACTION
	The railings have not yet been painted. The contractor required further clarification and the matter remains pending. Action: SW to confirm details to contractor so railings can be painted.	
	Item 5 The give-way sign has not yet been installed. Redrow advised it should be installed within a week and a contractor was already engaged to do so.	
	Item 6 There is insufficient space for the white line to be added. The automatic speed sign in Wellington Avenue is not working and has been reported (by Cllr Clarke).	
	Item 7 PT: There has been dialogue between the contractors and the Parish Council and Redrow re the details of Condition 11. Redrow: Work has been undertaken to prevent the planning permission from lapsing and Redrow have been securing quotes for the hall. The Parish Council is requested to provide input on the design specification before work can continue, at present some information has been provided but this is insufficient to allow Redrow to seek quotes at this time rather than a specification. This helps Redrow but a more detailed specification will be required. Redrow confirmed that RBC had queried whether funding from the Bellway pot could contribute to the works. The Bellway pot could contribute to the works, thus allowing funding to be maximised. Current plans are to use the Bellway funding towards the building costs thus allowing funding to be maximised from both the Bellway and Redrow contributions. PT: The aim is to ensure current funds cover all costs and avoid the need for escalation. All parties are aligned in wanting all available funding to be used for the village hall. PC: Raised the issue of the 350th occupancy trigger (confirmed as 450). Redrow: The design work was only instructed last week. They do not yet have a contract, surveyor's report, or completed design specification. Cllr Clarke: From a commercial perspective, questioned whether it is in Redrow's interest to support the village hall, as community facilities may help attract buyers. Redrow: Expressed confusion about speculation regarding whether the hall will be built, given that they have already committed to it. JB: Redrow is currently obtaining quotes. If a developer develops a reputation for seeking quotes on projects they do not intend to complete, it would be damaging. The fact that Redrow is obtaining quotes is a positive indication that they intend to deliver the project, and to do so on a much shorter timescale than 450 occupations. Cllr Clarke: Has witnessed many years of discussions regarding the village hall design. It appears to be getting smaller over time, and there is concern that residents are receiving little benefit, with no significant progress having been made. Action: Redrow to provide an update and confirm the next steps. JB: Can circulate the requested information. PC: Expressed concern that there is greater focus on other construction projects while little progress has been made on the village hall and believes they are being misled.	

ITEM	KEY POINTS	ACTION
	Cllr Solomon: Acknowledged significant local frustration and stated there is a need to be more visible in progressing the project and improving communication. Cllr Solomon: Clarified that affordable housing is different from social housing. JB: Clarified that the trigger point for the transfer of the completed village hall is 450 occupations. Action: Paul Taylor to reconfirm the position to ensure there is a clear audit trail. Action: James Bate to circulate the amalgamated Section 106 information in respect of the bridge and community hall.	
3.Planning Application Update	PT: Six planning applications have been submitted and allocated to a planning officer (Rachel Gaskell). The sixth housing application was submitted later, causing some delay. All applications remain under consideration. A meeting with Stonebond (housing provider) is scheduled next week. Mr Cullen has indicated that the planning applications should be ready for consideration at September committee. Amendments are expected and will be reviewed together, followed by a further round of consultation. Highways officers will also need to assess all six applications. Updates will be provided on any delays as the applications progress through technical consultation.	
	Village Hall Redrow has submitted a Certificates of Lawfulness, seeking confirmation that work on the village hall has officially commenced. This is a legal determination, if granted it means that the permission will not expire.	
	Road Adoption Redrow is progressing additional roads, but discussions with Newton NLOP are required too and on-going. Cllr Solomon: Requested a list of roads to be adopted or repaired. Redrow confirmed that it is their intention for all the roads to be adopted, but the sequencing of which roads are adopted when is not yet fully known Action: Redrow to provide a list of roads proposed for adoption and repair. Cllr Solomon expressed concern that issues she has raised may not be determined by the Planning Committee- due to changes to the committee process at a national level. The updated NPPF may be released over the summer. Officer's advised on the timing for changes to committee, and the committee cycle (2nd Thursday of every month).	
	Cricket Pitch Interest in managing the cricket pitch has been limited due to its layout and orientation. A representative linked to Trent Bridge Cricket Ground has expressed interest and is arranging a site visit. Concerns remain regarding the lack of changing facilities, drainage, and the risk of cricket balls reaching the nearby play area. Protective netting may be required.	

ITEM	KEY POINTS	ACTION
	Interested parties have indicated they would fence off the cricket square, limiting public access. Cllr Solomon: Asked what would happen if no long-term operator could be found. There was concern that the land could eventually be sold for housing, which would be detrimental to the community. There was support for fencing from a safety perspective. Cllr Clarke: Raised concerns about drainage and queried whether the facility was intended to be a private club or a public pitch. Further discussions are required with the landowner, Nottingham Newton LLP. Action: Redrow to discuss the opportunity with the interested party and gauge commitment. It was noted that parts of the 6 new proposal lies within the Green Belt and any future changes to provide a new cricket pitch with facilities elsewhere (outside of the allocated site within the local plan) would require a Green Belt assessment.	
	Traffic Calming / Signage No update provided.	
	Retail Provision The interested retail provider has withdrawn interest from occupying the proposed retail unit. The site is being marketed to alternative operators, with interest from other parties received. Redrow has advised on its preferred operator from the two interested parties. Other operators suggested by the Parish (and others) have either declined or not responded to expressions of interest to occupy the retail unit.	
	Open Space and Footpaths Cllr Solomon: Asked whether material could be added to raise a low section of pathway near the play area. Redrow: Will review the issue with the developer after a period of significant rainfall. Action: Redrow to review the pathway and consider any remedial works. PC: Confirmed that the land transfer for the memorial statue has been completed.	
4.Update from Landowner	None as landowner and representatives not in attendance	
5. Update from developer	Build programme Traffic calming / signage Village Hall Open space and footpaths	

OFFICIAL

ITEM	KEY POINTS	ACTION
	Issues on the agenda already largely covered in discussions.	
6. NCC update	(NCC): NCC's comments on each application are available online. There has been no change to the timetable for the Kirk Hill Junction improvements, which are currently expected to be completed by the end of February. Cllr Solomon: Expressed concern that road closures could increase traffic congestion and requested that the situation be monitored. NCC: Confirmed that traffic will need to be diverted during the works. Cllr Upton: Advised that the proposed new road (to the hangars) will be considered as part of one of the six planning applications. Cllr Clarke: Asked whether there was any update on East Bridgford Road not being built to a standard suitable for larger vehicles. (NCC): Acknowledged the issue but advised that further assessment is required before any determination can be made. Potential road improvements could be costly and need detailed evaluation.	
	School Land No update provided as NCC Education not in attendance.	
	The Bridge NCC: Continues to recommend that the pedestrian/cycle bridge is delivered. Cllr Clarke: Stated that expectations need to be managed, as discussions with the Mayor are still ongoing (re possible additional funding). It was also noted that an application relating to roadworks and drainage (at Bingham on the employment site on the opposite side of the A46) was determined in early June and may support future progress (of the bridge).	
Parish and Ward Councillors	No additional information raised.	
Next meeting	Date TBC – Sept/Oct – Action for BR	