

CONFIDENTIAL
Newton Community Partnership Board
Notes of meeting Friday 30^h January 2026 at 10am
Rushcliffe Arena

Attendees

Cllr Neil Clarke - RBC
 Cllr Roger Upton – RBC
 Leanne Ashmore – RBC
 James Abbott – Redrow
 Jen Towers – Redrow
 Alan Staley – Redrow
 Dan Sullivan – NCC
 William Lawrence - NCC
 Paul Taylor – RBC
 Ben Ryder – RBC
 James Bate – RBC
 Rachel Gaskell – RBC
 Simon Waterfield - Landowner
 Chris Quinsee – Q&A Planning
 Craig Straw – Innes England
 Emily Spedding – NPC
 Martyn Saulter - NPC

Apologies

Jan Witko – NCC

ITEM	KEY POINTS	ACTION
1. Welcome, introductions and apologies.	- Welcome to Emily Spedding of Newton Parish Council and Rachel Gaskell of RBC - Petition made by Cllr Soloman to Simon Waterfield regarding resident desire for the footbridge. Petition has run for 13 days and received 728 responses with an overwhelming theme of positive desire for a footbridge. Cllr Soloman outlined some of the positive comments from residents. Comments included themes around Newton being cut off, current need for a car and road safety concerns. Cllr Soloman presented the petition to CQ and SW. - SW outlined the financial challenges posed by the footbridge and questioned the economic case to be made for the cost/benefit analysis for the footbridge at current costs. SW explained that the financial contribution would need to be supported by further funding eg Highways and EMCCA and that SW is looking to fund other works as per the live planning applications to divorce the HGV traffic, which comes at significant cost and is considered by SW to be a greater priority. - SW shared analysis of walking time and distance between Newton and Bingham Primary school, questioning the realistic future use.	

OFFICIAL

ITEM	KEY POINTS	ACTION
	• Cllr Soloman responded with ES; questioning the decision not to build the bridge when the grant was 'in date'. Cllr Soloman finished her response by highlighting the priority for active travel over car travel. Cllr Soloman also explained that she understood the funding gap and challenges that face SW. • CQ requested a digital version of the petition from Cllr Soloman.	Cllr Soloman to provide digital copy of petition.
2. Notes and actions from meeting Sep 2025	Minutes from previous meeting agreed. Actions from previous meeting: • Cllr Soloman challenged the installation of a sign to prevent HGV access, stating it is too small and isn't visible enough. Also highlighted that barriers haven't been provided. • Redrow to review legal advice on education provision – still to be visited • CS has passed Chipmunk Way landscape maintenance issue to Bellway • Cllr Soloman has connected three separate clubs to NCCC regarding funding for new pavilion. New information shows that there are issues with the orientation, size and safety of the existing pitch designs; as well as a lack of changing facilities. JA responded by outlining that Redrow have constructed the site according to the planning consent. Cllr Soloman questioned the planning process. LA confirmed later in the meeting that the planning authority had appropriately discharged its responsibilities in this respect. • JA advised that Redrow have completed winter treatment on the square. • Redrow have solved the problem with the play park gates. Access to the cricket pitch will be available from April, though Cllr Soloman highlighted people are accessing this anyway. • MS highlighted that railings need painting	Cllr Soloman and Redrow to discuss HGV signage and barriers Redrow to review legal advice SW to arrange for railing to be painted
3.Planning Application Update	• RG that consultation on the five planning applications has begun and is feeding back consultation responses to the landowner and agents. • LA shared that no comments have been received to date to potentially trigger planning committee as it's too early in the process. MS questioned that there hadn't been any objections and LA explained the trigger for a committee determination. Cllr Soloman outlined her objections/concerns but overall is supportive of the road. • CQ and RG are in regular contact to discuss the applications and any issues they raised through the consultation process.	

OFFICIAL

ITEM	KEY POINTS	ACTION
	• Cllr Soloman wanted to place on record thanks for the extension to the consultation response. • JA mentioned an article in the Nottingham Post that was misreported and misleading which Redrow have challenged. • DS questioned CQ around the residential planning application which CQ clarified is still to be submitted, hopefully in the next few weeks.	
4.Update from Landowner	• No update as matters relate to the pending planning applications.	
5. Update from developer	Retail • JA outlined the news that an interested retail party removed their interest in having a unit at Newton due to market conditions. Redrow have re-instructed the agent to search for alternative retailers, with some tentative interest. Search is being widened to franchisees under a design and build option. • Cllr Soloman questioned retail land ownership and that the land is for sale. JA outlined that Redrow own the land but that the land is under retail use only for planning purposes. • MS questioned the price of the land. JA explained that the land is listed at guide price and previous retailers have exceeded this. Redrow have instructed the agents to inform them of any offer, regardless of value. • Cllr Clarke and Cllr Soloman sought clarity from Redrow that upon the sale of the land, any change of use from retail will need further planning process. • PT clarified that planning permission and granted use carries over to the new owner and that any proposed change of use would need to be taken through the planning process. • JA reassured that Redrow are not seeing a land buyer outside of a potential retailer. Build programme • David Wilson have been granted permission and Redrow are commencing building of the road. DW homes should follow shortly at pace. Traffic calming / signage • Give way sign as requested previously has been ordered and AS has committed to installing this in the near future • Cllr Soloman outlined issue around no white lines on Wellington Road. Cllr Soloman to contact Laura Trusler. Village Hall • JA asked PT for clarity around surplus costs to the construction of the village hall (car park, access etc). JA highlighted that the Bellway contribution could be used for the internal fit out or the extra external work. • PT committed to providing a response on condition 11 of the S106 agreement and to review variance.	Redrow installing give way sign. Cllr Soloman contacting NCC re adoption and white line work PT committed to providing a response on condition 11 of the S106 agreement and

ITEM	KEY POINTS	ACTION
	Open space and footpaths • Issues around cricket pitch and safety issues in relation the play park re-discussed. • Cllr Solomon flagged that NPC would like to engage with Redrow on water feed. JA highlighted that the water supply to cricket pitch has been paid for already. • JB highlighted that the ball strike assessment form Sport England relating to the cricket pitch was wider reaching than residential concerns and included open spaces. • LA explained that safety issues could be mitigated dependent on level of use (professional or recreational) of the cricket area and that the cricket pitch still has planning conditions to be discharged by Redrow before it can be used. • Cllr Solomon outlined that changing facilities were included in the original design and plan for village hall but were lost due to growing costs. • MS highlighted that discussions are needed with Redrow and landowner/agents to potentially re-purpose the cricket land if it is not fit for purpose. LA highlighted its original use could have been recreational and consideration should be given to the expected use of the pitch. • SW suggested moving the potential cricket pitch/club to other land under his ownership and reiterated his support to the creation of a cricket facility/club.	to review variance/legal framework.
6. NCC update	Kirkhill Junction Improvements • DS outlined that the Kirk Hill junction upgrades will commence in September 2026 as part of the larger A614 developments but is still partly reliant on funding from the developer. • JB set out, and WL confirmed, that as the school is no longer being sought on the site (due to changes at NCC and Central Government level relating to support for half form entry schools), that the extension of an existing school is cheaper than provision of a new one. Therefore, NCC have requested if the differences in costs could be used to contribute towards the Kirk Hill improvements. Redrow are reviewing this request (and as minutes above have sought legal advice on the matter). If acceptable to Redrow then a DoV to the S106 would be required to regularise this. The funding was explained as being specifically to provide additional capacity for pupils, initially planning as through a new school but now likely through extensions of existing schools • MS asked when costings for the junctions becomes an issue. DS explained that would be dependent on RBC's possible necessity for a cost/benefit analysis. • Cllr Clarke agreeing in principle to the access road • DS outlined that East Bridgford road will be closed for around 12 months to enable the Kirk Hill development works from September 2026. • AS asked what the improvements to the junction will be. DS explained that the junction needs to be expanded with extra lanes and run offs.	

OFFICIAL

ITEM	KEY POINTS	ACTION
	School land • Cllr Solomon questioned the likelihood of reallocating school money to the development of the road network. WL outlined his view that this is achievable. • ES questioned why the Newton school finance has been redirected to Bingham Primary School. Cllr Clarke explained that Bingham school was built under a separate budget and the Newton budget is still to be allocated. ES followed up by asking if there is a trigger for the development of the school given that the new Bingham school isn't in catchment for Newton families. • Cllr Solomon revisited education payments and questioned where the first payment of £93k has been spent. Cllr Clarke and JB explained that the education contributions are being held by RBC and haven't been allocated or spent. • LA explained that the finances for S106 work in a way that payments are collected as varying triggers are hit. • MS highlighted concerns that various amenities included in the S106 are not being delivered. LA responded explaining that funds are held until triggers are met and funds requested by the provider to pay for the infrastructure. • LA reiterated that S106 figures are publicly available and explained that S106 build out periods are over long periods of time and sometimes changes to the original plans are required, but variations need to be agreed between all parties of the S106. • MS highlighted concerns over lack of consultation with NPC re allocation of school funding. LA expanded to explain that the Newton CPB group had discussed this issue at length at previous meetings. • JB clarified that the school funding can only be used to provide pupil places. JB explained this could be done by new school builds or expanding existing schools. JB explained that school funding can be spent up to the amount detailed in the S106. If there is underspend, the surplus is returned the developer. In the event of overspend, this needs to be found elsewhere. JB also reassured that the idea of spending school money on highways is not possible in the context of the legal framework within the S106, which is why a deed of variation would be required if the developer supported diverting the funds and signed by all original parties. • Cllr Solomon thanked JB for clarification of the school funding position and NCC agreed with the summary of JB.	
Parish and Ward Councillors	• MS requested that other parties respond promptly to emails from NPC. • Cllr Upton raised the village hall and start of its development. JA clarified that the plan is to commence the build by the trigger date in June 2026.	
Next meeting	Date TBC	