

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
COUNCIL**

THURSDAY, 18 SEPTEMBER 2025

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Rushcliffe Arena,
Rugby Road, West Bridgford
and live streamed on Rushcliffe Borough Council's YouTube channel

PRESENT:

Councillors J Cottee (Chair), R Butler (Vice-Chair), M Barney, J Billin, T Birch, R Bird, A Brennan, A Brown, S Calvert, J Chaplain, K Chewings, N Clarke, T Combella, S Dellar, A Edyvean, S Ellis, G Fletcher, M Gaunt, E Georgiou, P Gowland, C Grocock, R Inglis, R Mallender, S Mallender, D Mason, P Matthews, H Om, H Parekh, A Phillips, L Plant, D Polenta, N Regan, D Simms, D Soloman, C Thomas, R Upton, J Walker, R Walker, L Way, T Wells, G Wheeler, J Wheeler and G Williams

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

D Banks	Director of Neighbourhoods
R Clack	Deputy Monitoring Officer
A Hill	Chief Executive
E Richardson	Democratic Services Officer
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager
S Whittaker	Head of Finance

APOLOGIES:

Councillor D Virdi

24 Declarations of Interest

Councillor R Walker stated that having considered his obligations under the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of Item 10b: Notices of Motion – Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs), he advised that he owned or was involved in the ownership of investment property, including some HMOs, which included some properties in Rushcliffe, as disclosed in his Register of Interests. He advised that he was also a partner in a business involved in the letting and management of property, including some HMOs, although he confirmed that currently the business did not manage any HMOs in Rushcliffe. Accordingly, he concluded that he did not have a disclosable pecuniary interest in the item, and the motion, when considered in the context of its specific detail, was not directly related to his financial interests. He was sure that his involvement in property ownership and management did not affect his capacity to objectively assess the motion or compromise his impartiality on the matter, so he would therefore take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

25 Minutes of the Meeting held on 17 July 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 17 July 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

26 Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor informed Council that he had been keeping busy, attending numerous events over the summer, all of which he had thoroughly enjoyed, and he thanked Councillors for sponsoring his wife, who had recently completed the Great North Run and would be taking part in the Robin Hood Half Marathon for his charity.

27 Leader's Announcements

The Leader advised that he had recently written to both local MPs requesting that they lobbied the Government, on Rushcliffe's behalf to ensure that the Council received the best possible Fairer Funding. He was pleased to announce that following refurbishment, both Keyworth Leisure Centre and the Sir Julian Cahn Pavilion had recently reopened. The Leader referred to the ongoing roll out of the new recycling bins for glass, which would continue.

28 Chief Executive's Announcements

There were no Chief Executive's announcements.

29 Citizens' Questions

No citizens' questions were received for this meeting.

30 Rushcliffe Sport and Tourism Charter

The Leader and Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough-wide Leadership, Councillor Clarke MBE presented the report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth detailing the Rushcliffe Sport and Tourism Charter.

The Leader stated that it was hoped that this Charter would promote tourism and the visitor economy, by encouraging visitors attending sporting events to stay for longer and enjoy the Borough. He advised that high level talks had taken place with various local clubs, and whilst Nottingham Forest's name was not currently included, the club was involved and fully supportive and the Leader was confident that the club's name would be added to the Charter over the next few months.

Councillor Brennan seconded the recommendation and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Polenta referred to the importance of grass roots sports and felt that investing in sport was investing in healthier lives, with sport crossing social divides. She agreed that sporting events helped to boost the local economy, with tourism linked to that building resilience and strengthening communities. It was important to create partnership working, to ensure that everyone could be involved.

Councillor S Mallender stated that whilst supporting the Charter, she was concerned that there was no reference in it to local residents, nor any

commitment to promote active travel and public transport, to improve the parking problems faced by residents, especially when Nottingham Forest was playing. She stated that assurances had previously been given that the club would liaise with local residents; however, that had yet to happen and whilst wanting to encourage sport and bring people to Rushcliffe, it was important that local residents were not forgotten.

Councillor Plant reiterated those comments, and whilst acknowledging the huge contribution that the club made, the impact on residents and local infrastructure due to the lack of parking could not be ignored and some meaningful dialogue was required.

Councillor Gowland also agreed with comments made and stated that it was very hard to engage with Nottingham Forest, land was available for parking and local residents should be listened to.

Councillor Grocock agreed that tourism was a very important growth area for the Borough and referred to the Strategy's importance to the East Midland Combined Authority (EMCCA). He felt that there was a "broadbrush" interpretation when considering the visitor economy for the EMCCA region, which simplified it into the City and rural Derbyshire. Councillor Grocock acknowledged the many rural areas in Rushcliffe, and the important role that they could play, which would mean interpreting sport on its broadest level. He felt that it was important to align sport with its broader role and questioned how the Charter and Strategy would fall within the broader interpretation of economic growth and how tourism businesses would be supported.

Councillor Chaplain struggled to think how community groups would deliver visitor-focused services and asked which groups the Charter was referring to. She also questioned the statement that there would be investment in sport-led regeneration, when the report stated that no financial implications had been identified, and sought clarification on that.

Whilst sharing concerns regarding traffic, Councillor Matthews felt that this was a separate issues already being addressed, the report was about encouraging visitors to extend their stay in Rushcliffe, and boosting the local economy, and if they could be encouraged to use public transport that would be even better.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Brennan referred to the Council's Economic Growth Strategy, which had tourism as a key priority, as did EMCCA. She agreed that EMCCA's focus was on larger strategic areas, and it was therefore important that Rushcliffe had its own platform. She advised that whilst everyone was aware of the positive economic influences sport could have, sport importantly also helped to foster a sense of place and civic pride. Councillor Brennan stated that whilst she was not diminishing the concerns already raised about transport, from a strategic and economic level, this represented a fantastic opportunity, with Rushcliffe fortunate to have such fantastic sporting venues, and she welcomed the Council's continued commitment to develop new initiatives.

The Leader stated that Rushcliffe was the home of sport, with assets to be built upon and advised that the Charter was the start of the process, with more

sports becoming involved over time. He acknowledged the comments raised regarding local residents' concerns, and whilst those would not be ignored, they were dealt with as part of the planning process. The Charter was focused on promoting visitors to come and watch sport and stay in the Borough. The Leader agreed that it was important to collaborate with EMCCA, although work should not be duplicated and this Charter specifically identified Rushcliffe, with fresh ideas about engagement and taking action. The Leader advised that community groups had been referenced to ensure that everyone was included, and he confirmed that sports clubs would be contributing financially, with the Council acting as the facilitator. He concluded by asking for suggestions going forward of venues and places that visitors might wish to visit.

It was RESOLVED that the adoption of the draft Rushcliffe: Together in Sport Charter be approved, with final amendments delegated to the Director – Development and Economic Growth.

31 **Councillors' Learning and Development Policy 2026-2029**

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Wellbeing, ICT and Member Development, Councillor J Wheeler presented the report of the Director – Finance and Corporate Services detailing the Councillors' Learning and Development Policy for 2026-2029.

Councillor Wheeler referred to the important decisions Councillors made and the need to have appropriate training to make those informed decision, hence the considerable time and resources given to develop and deliver a training programme. The Policy set out this approach, including the important role played by the Member Development Group (MDG), which had reviewed this Policy. Councillor Wheeler stated that some Councillors had asked for additional support with e-learning and confirmed that drop-in sessions were being arranged and he encouraged all Councillors to take up as many training opportunities as they could.

Councillor Matthews seconded the recommendation and referred the right to speak.

Councillor Plant agreed that it was appropriate that Councillors received appropriate training, questioned why some mandatory training had not been completed within 12 months of taking office, as required in the Policy, and felt that it would have been helpful for Councillors to have received more regular updates on training requirements. Councillor Plant referred to the revised Policy and a requirement that an annual training report be taken to the Standards Committee and was concerned that potentially Councillors could be named if they had failed to complete mandatory training. She felt that this was unnecessary, as there could be extenuating reasons and that should be taken into account. Councillor Plant also suggested that Councillors should submit ideas to broaden the programme.

Councillor Way supported Councillor Plant and asked for more frequent and structured MDG meetings, to ensure consistency and to allow the Policy to be implemented and delivered. Regular meetings would allow training completion rates to be monitored and concerns addressed, and she questioned when and

how Councillor feedback on training had been used to improve it. Councillor Way suggested that all mandatory training sessions should be held at least twice, at different times of the day, and where possible remote access and recording sessions should be available. Councillor Way was concerned that responsibility was being given to the Chair of Standards Committee to name individual Councillors, asked for safeguards to be put in place, and advised that she had been reassured by officers that naming individual Councillors would be a final step. However, to ensure that this did not happen, she proposed the following amendment, to provide an additional layer of protection and to ensure that a unilateral decision could not be made:

It is RECOMMENDED that Council adopts the 2026-2029 Councillors' Learning and Development Policy subject to the following change in wording of section 11 of the Policy:

"If necessary, the Chair of Standards Committee will write to individuals with mandatory training remaining undone more than 12 months after becoming a Councillor. Should this situation persist, then the Chair of Standards Committee, in conjunction with the Monitoring Officer, reserves the right to identify individual Councillors not meeting the required standard."

Councillor Billin seconded the amendment to the recommendation and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Wheeler confirmed that he accepted the amendment, which then became part of the substantive motion. He also reassured Councillors that naming a Councillor would be a final step and very unlikely to ever happen.

Councillor R Mallender referred to previous discussions at MDG regarding training completion rates, noted that some Councillors had difficulties using e-learning and agreed that there should be at least two sessions for each mandatory course. He was also concerned about naming Councillors at Standards Committee.

Councillor Chewings reiterated the importance of training and that more work was needed to improve uptake. He referred to the mandatory sessions listed and was concerned that many of the face to face sessions had only been run once, and more work was required to make them more open and inclusive, perhaps recording sessions, and running them more than once. Councillor Chewings was concerned that there appeared to be inconsistencies regarding whether some courses were mandatory or not and asked for an update on that and requested that mandatory sessions, which had only been held once be repeated.

Councillor Polenta agreed with previous comments that it was unhelpful to use punitive measures and referred to the importance of training not just as Councillors but as members of the community. Training allowed Councillors to grow and develop and be accountable, with diversity and accessibility at the forefront and ensuring that local government was for all.

As a regular member of the MDG, Councillor Birch stated that at each meeting he had raised concerns regarding the lack of remote training offered to those

who could not attend in person, and given the generally high attendance at committee meetings, he felt that the current system discriminated against some Councillors, and more inclusivity was required. He felt that sessions should be recorded, to allow Councillors to view and complete them later and more could be done to support Councillors who worked.

Councillor Gowland agreed that Councillors were very busy and suggested that going forward alternative ways to provide training should be considered.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Matthews confirmed that the MDG had agreed that a report would be submitted to the Standards Committee and advised that some of the mandatory sessions were only mandatory for members of specific committees. He advised that the MDG had discussed having online sessions and repeating face to face sessions and he hoped that the Individual Learning Records had helped Councillors identify what training they needed to do and help officers to provide support. Councillor Matthews confirmed that a safeguard had been added that any Councillor who had still to complete mandatory training would be given a reminder before any report was taken to Standards Committee. He was pleased to report a 100% completion for GDPR training and overall, Rushcliffe's training completions compared favourably to the majority of other councils.

Councillor Wheeler reiterated that the Council was required to demonstrate that it had processes in place to ensure that the Council was not being put at risk; however, he was confident that naming a Councillor would never be required. He stated that previously MDG meetings were more ad-hoc; however, it had been recognised that more frequent meetings were required, and that would be actioned, with Individual Learning Records also regularly sent to Councillors. Councillor Wheeler agreed that Councillors should be encouraged to attend sessions, and alternative ways to deliver training would be investigated.

It was RESOLVED that the Councillors' Learning and Development Policy 2026-2029 be adopted, subject to the following change in wording of section 11 of the Policy:

"If necessary, the Chair of Standards Committee will write to individuals with mandatory training remaining undone more than 12 months after becoming a Councillor. Should this situation persist, then the Chair of Standards Committee, in conjunction with the Monitoring Officer, reserves the right to identify individual Councillors not meeting the required standard."

32 **Notices of Motion**

The following notice of motion was proposed by Councillor Upton and seconded by Councillor Mason

"We propose that this Council writes to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government and calls on the Government to:

1. abolish mandatory housing targets for District and Borough Councils;
2. safeguard Greenbelt and Greenfield land against future development,

where an area has met its house building obligations in the last five years; and

3. create a new approach of identifying brownfield land and city centre sites for housing development and produce targets for them regardless of the current Local Government boundaries.”

In moving the motion, Councillor Upton stated that the Conservative Group was passionate about managing housing development, with a proven record, having built more homes in Rushcliffe in the last 10 years than anywhere else in the County. Whilst acknowledging the national housing shortage, he advised that Rushcliffe had already met its obligations, had a draft Local Development Plan in place up to 2041 and therefore did not need a centralised, mandatory target imposed. Over the last 10 years, 13,000 new homes had been allocated for Rushcliffe, with 6,000 of those accepted under the Duty to Cooperate, to meet the needs of Nottingham City Council. The Government’s mandatory targets for 2024, outlined 4,000 further new homes for Rushcliffe, whilst the City had been given a lower target and Councillor Upton questioned if that was fair. He was concerned that planning reforms could potentially give more power to developers and felt that any Councillor who believed in local democracy and protecting the Greenbelt should support the motion.

Councillor Mason seconded the motion and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Calvert stated that because the Council failed to build enough homes in the previous decade, it had been given a higher target 10 years ago to make up the shortfall. He referred to the collaborative working to produce the revised Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (GNSP), which contained targets up to 2041, and questioned why those agreed targets should be abandoned, and the Plan put into jeopardy. He felt that it was premature to consider the current LGR process as a valid reason for abandoning the existing policy and that focusing on the identification of brownfield and city centre sites had little strategic merit.

Councillor Thomas felt that the actions in the motion were insufficient, suggested that all Councillors should be involved in responding to Government planning consultations, and that she would be more interested in a proactive motion that looked at what Rushcliffe could do if it was forced to accept more housing. Councillor Thomas questioned how the Council could accelerate the build out of existing strategic sites, identify more sites, and identify gaps which could be filled. She proposed the following amendment, to include two actions that the Council could take itself, which was seconded by Councillor Way, who reserved the right to speak:

In addition, the Council will take action as follows:

- a. that the Council will set up an initial cross-party briefing/brainstorming session for all Councillors and relevant officers before the end of the year to understand and quantify the likely pressures resulting from Government housing policies and to identify and assess options to ensure Rushcliffe meets any revised targets and provides an adequate supply of the right sort of housing in the right places to meet the (actual) housing

needs of our residents; and

- b. the Local Development Forum will include an item at least every six months to actively review housing completions and strategies for meeting the housing targets.

Councillor Upton stated that he did not accept the amendment, as he felt that issues raised had already been covered by the draft Local Development Plan, and that there would not be enough completions to merit six monthly updates, as updates could be provided anytime.

In supporting the amendment, Councillor R Mallender felt that it would be good to have roundtable discussions and Councillor Birch agreed that this was a positive amendment, improving democracy and adding more discussion.

In seconding the amendment, Councillor Way stated that it provided a more proactive approach, looking at ways to ensure that Rushcliffe met its housing targets whilst suiting residents' differing needs and involving more Councillors would gain wider views.

Councillor Thomas stated that the GNSP would be of no use if the Council's housing supply dropped below five years and the Council needed to take action and be proactive.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was defeated.

The debate continued on the substantive motion.

Councillor Soloman referred to the significant number of homes built in the Borough over the past 10 years, including the 6,000 homes imposed on Rushcliffe to cover the City's shortfall, whilst the City continued to build thousands of student flats. As housing targets had now returned, Rushcliffe was being asked to build 4,000 homes, whilst the City's targets were reducing and she also questioned if that was fair. Councillor Soloman stated that it was important to build the right homes, in the right place, with appropriate services and Rushcliffe was well placed to do this, using its own good judgement.

Councillor J Wheeler referred to the importance of having a five year housing supply to stop speculative applications being put forward, which had happened in the past and this motion was asking the Government to abolish those targets and to look more carefully where housing should be built, including the city centre, which benefitted from good infrastructure.

Councillor J Walker was disappointed that the motion offered no positive solutions to ongoing housing problems, with many unable to afford to live in the Borough.

Councillor Chewings questioned the timing of the motion, as housing targets had periodically been removed and then reinstated by various governments, with similar targets. He stated that due to the Council's previous failure to have a Local Plan, mass development had taken place in areas such as East Leake, with work now underway on the GNSP, which he acknowledged was guided by

national targets. He agreed that it was important to talk about how the Council should deal with housing, as he felt that the current set up was incorrect, although he advised that he could not support the motion, as it contradicted itself.

The Leader disagreed that Rushcliffe had been given higher targets to make up for previous shortfalls, rather that it had been forced to take 6,000 homes to meet the City's allocation. He stated that Rushcliffe was not saying no to further housing, it wanted to identify housing that was needed, as people wanted to live in the Borough. The Leader stated that the City had no vision, it simply built student accommodation, which generated no Council Tax, which added to its financial difficulties. The motion had been put forward as Rushcliffe wanted to have control of its own area, including its own targets.

Whilst agreeing that the motion was inconsistent, Councillor Birch advised that he would be voting for it, as he felt that power should be held locally. He stated that reference to student housing was disingenuous, as this could not be compared with family homes. Councillor Birch accepted that under the Duty to Cooperate, Rushcliffe had no choice but to accept the 6,000 homes but he also mentioned the £15m New Homes Bonus that the Council had benefitted from and stated that Rushcliffe had received a large allocation due to its affluence.

Councillor Gowland stated that young people struggled to remain in the Borough as it was too expensive and they lived in the City instead. She advised that many local residents in the City were pleased that student accommodation had been built, to free up family homes and she questioned where students were supposed to live. Councillor Gowland stated that considerable housing had been built in the City, and that city dwellers wanted green space too.

Councillor Chaplain stated that Rushcliffe's housing targets were higher as it had expensive housing and the number one reason for affordable uplift was fairness.

Councillor Gaunt stated that student accommodation was being built to free up family homes and advised that as student numbers continued to increase, it was better to build accommodation in the City. He expressed concern that since 2010, in the East Midlands, the average medium rental had doubled, affordable housing in Rushcliffe was desperately needed, and whilst agreeing that local control was important, targets had to come from the Government to ensure affordability and equitable distribution.

Councillor Way questioned what right Rushcliffe had to decide what should be built in the City and agreed that it was important to look at the Borough's own housing needs and questioned why the amendment had been voted down.

Councillor Simms advised that Councillors were elected to represent residents in Rushcliffe and referred to the significant housing already built to fulfil housing targets and stated that this motion was attempting to ensure that people worked proactively together for local residents.

Councillor Polenta stated that the Government had prioritised house building on Brownfield sites, which offered a practical and sustainable solution, although not all sites were suitable for development and had evolved into vital green spaces, including the development at Broadmarsh. Whilst acknowledging the importance of the Greenbelt, that did not mean that it should never be considered for housing, due to ongoing housing need. Some Greenbelt land had become inaccessible, with little public benefit, and when land was released there was a responsibility to restore it and make it more accessible, whilst allowing appropriate development and it was important that all voices were heard to arrive at more consensual outcomes.

In seconding the motion, Councillor Mason stated that she represented Tollerton, where nearly 4,000 homes were planned and referred to the huge pressure on the village and agreed that local councils understood local issues more than the Government. She questioned the fairness of the City having lower housing targets than Rushcliffe, when there were many Brownfield areas that could be developed.

Councillor Upton felt that this issue centered around localism and he agreed that there was a risk that Rushcliffe would be forced to take more housing; however, a draft Plan was in place. He confirmed that all sites in that Plan had around 30% affordable housing, with social housing the responsibility of housing associations across the Borough. The draft Plan had a surplus, in case Rushcliffe had to take more houses and whilst sharing concerns regarding the Council's five year housing supply, Councillor Upton was confident that the Council would keep that supply. He reiterated that Rushcliffe had taken a lot of housing from the City, and that it was a very desirable place to live; however, a reasonable compromise was required, which this motion sought and he requested that a recorded vote be taken, which was agreed by four Councillors.

In accordance with Standing Order Paragraph 4.23, a recorded vote was taken for this item as follows:

FOR: Councillors M Barney, T Birch, R Bird, A Brennan, A Brown, R Butler, N Clarke, T Combellack, J Cottee, S Dellar, A Edyvean, S Ellis, E Georgiou, R Inglis, D Mason, P Matthews, H Om, H Parekh, A Phillips, N Regan, D Simms, D Soloman, R Upton, R Walker, L Way, T Wells, G Wheeler, J Wheeler, and G Williams

AGAINST: Councillors S Calvert, J Chaplain, K Chewings, G Fletcher, M Gaunt P Gowland, C Grocock, R Mallender, S Mallender L Plant, D Polenta and J Walker

ABSTENSIONS: Councillors Billin and Thomas

It was proposed by the Leader and seconded by Councillor Upton and **RESOLVED** by Councillors that the meeting be extended and would finish no later than 10.30pm.

The following notice of motion was proposed by Councillor Inglis and seconded by Councillor Thomas.

“This Council therefore resolves to:

1. Investigate and collate an evidence base to look at whether there is a case for introducing an Article 4 Direction across Rushcliffe, to enable this Council to assess proposals for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) on a case-by-case basis through the planning process. This will allow local residents and Councillors to be consulted and consider the impacts of such proposals.
2. Bring a formal report to Cabinet by the end of February 2026, to enable it to consider the evidence (subject to it being available and the completion of public consultation) and, if justified, recommend that a Direction be made.”

In moving the motion, Councillor Inglis referred to the two categories of HMOs, ‘large’ and ‘small’. For small HMOs, automatic permitted development rights allowed properties, usually family homes to be converted and he felt that the impact on local communities needed to be investigated as the Council had a duty to look after both residents and occupants of HMOs. Whilst data was available for large HMOs, there was none for the smaller ones, which did not need to be registered. An Article 4 Direction would ensure that the Council was able to consider and control the impact on local areas before any development was authorised. He advised that as of 2023, 85 other councils were managing their HMOs with an Article 4 Direction in place.

The Council should ensure that a sufficient supply of HMOs was maintained throughout, rather than just specific areas, which would allow the Council to control to its own narrative, rather than allowing the current system to continue, which could make it vulnerable, especially with neighbouring areas having such Directions already in place. This would also fulfil an important responsibility that the Council had been entrusted with, to represent residents and to continue to generate and maintain a balanced community, with a mix of family and shared housing, to cater for everyone. Councillor Inglis stated that it was important to take sufficient time to gather and collate the relevant evidence, as it had to be robust and substantive to allow Rushcliffe to apply for an Article 4 Direction. It could take years from a submission to any implementation, so evidence had to be gathered prior to an application being made for any chance of success. He felt that the proposed time period would allow officers to complete the task internally and it should encompass all types of HMOs. It was important that the Council stayed focused that the Article 4 Direction was about planning permission for the building, rather than residents’ living conditions, which fell under the Council’s licencing regulations.

Councillor Thomas seconded the motion and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Polenta proposed the following amendment to ensure a commitment was made to raising living standards for occupiers of HMOs. The principle to strive for was decent, affordable housing for all, in diverse neighbourhoods, where everyone had a chance to shape their future. Currently HMOs provided

the only affordable accommodation for younger people and those on low income, and it was therefore important to raise standards. She felt that where HMOs were approved, the Council should be proactive to provide appropriate services and hold landlords to account, to bring neighbourhoods together.

This Council therefore resolves to:

1. Investigate and collate the evidence base required to determine whether there is a case for introducing an Article 4 Direction across Rushcliffe, which would enable this Council to assess proposals for HMOs on a case-by-case basis through the planning process. This will allow local residents and Councillors to be consulted and consider the impacts of such proposals and the quality of housing proposed.
2. Bring a formal report to Cabinet by the end of February 2026, to enable it to consider the evidence collected (subject to it being available and the completion of public consultation) and, if justified, recommend that a Direction be made.

Councillor Gowland seconded the amendment to the motion and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Inglis confirmed that he accepted the amendment, which then became part of the substantive motion.

Councillor Chewings raised a point of order and proposed that the motion be put to the vote, which was seconded by Councillor Gaunt and agreed by Councillors.

On being put to the vote, the substantive motion was carried.

33 Questions from Councillors

Question from Councillor Chewings to Councillor Inglis.

“Public concern remains regarding the land on Tollerton Park Estate, fuelled by ongoing media reporting and the activities of campaign groups, and residents deserve clear, unambiguous answers to questions of safety.

Could Councillor Inglis tell us what action has been taken to help residents and support them in getting definitive answers to their questions regarding the safety of the land where they grow vegetables, and what further action can be taken by this Council to help residents get the answers they require.”

Councillor Inglis advised that as stated in his response to Mr Gaff’s question at the Council meeting on 17 July 2025, the Council had undertaken considerable work to respond to concerns raised by Park Home residents. He acknowledged that many residents might not have been living on site when the Council carried out an investigative survey in 2008, with the report available on the Council’s website. He reiterated that the report had concluded that the site did not meet the statutory definition of contaminated land, with a reassessment in 2017, when further development took place, which came to the same

conclusion. The Council was not aware of any circumstances in the intervening period, which would change that conclusion.

However, given the technical nature of the report and recent concerns expressed by residents, Councillor Inglis confirmed that the Council had written a letter and briefing note, which had been hand delivered to residents on 7 July, and had been widely welcomed by many residents and ward members for the Council and County Council, who had been working hard on their residents' behalf. The accompanying letter also included good practice information on ensuring the safety of fruit and vegetables for human consumption given that it was not within the Council's role or remit to give any further assurance. Key elements of the briefing note were also available on a Council FAQ website, which demonstrated the Council's desire to ensure that all local residents were appropriately updated. This commitment was also evident when the Council met and updated the Rushcliffe MP on 23 July. Councillor Inglis stated that the Council continued to work with other relevant regulatory agencies and would add further information to its FAQ site when it became available.

The Mayor asked Councillor Chewings if he had a supplementary question.

Councillor Chewings referred to the question raised by Mr Gaff and to Councillor Inglis' response at the Council meeting; however he felt that the letter, response, and briefing note had not answered Mr Gaff's specific questions, and he asked Councillor Inglis if he agreed that the failure to address those clear questions undermined residents' confidence.

Councillor Inglis reiterated that the Council was not in a position to give that advice, and it would be unwise to give categorical assurances when there were so many variables. It was not within the Council's role or remit to make a decision on homegrown produce, rather it could provide advice and guidance based on the 2008 investigation and available information.

The meeting closed at 10.18 pm.

CHAIR