



OFFICIAL

Great Park Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Agenda for the Great Park Neighbourhood Association (GPNA) Committee with NCC, & the Great Park Consortium

Date: 25.03.2024

Time: 6:00 PM - 8.00 PM

Venue: Great Park Community Centre, Roseden Wy, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE13 9BD

Present	Apologies	Absences
GPNA Caitlin Smithson Donna Rawling Ian Tew Sophie Cox Jamie Robinson Paul Cross Neil Collington Consortium David Abercrombie Richard Cook Open Spaces Cheryl Cessford NCC Sue Wannop Local Councillors Ali Avei Thom Champion	Steven Mason Claire Khan NCC sent apologies via Sue	Chris Clark Chris Dawson Sam Walton

1. Welcome and Introductions

All attendees introduced themselves.

2. Consortium update to all key questions asked which were not answered in the initial meeting on 26.02.24

[Questions raised by the GPNA.26.02.24.docx](#)



OFFICIAL

Great Park
Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Why has there been a significant increase to the developer recharge costs and landscape and maintenance costs?

Response: Consortium stated that for landscape maintenance costs – there was a large increase in bins that year, 2021-2022. Consortium brought plans which show open spaces as they've changed over. Open spaces have looked into this and there was an increase in bins from 26 to 32 bins, 36 bins altogether. Local authority bins had increased too.

GPNA Chair questioned why this was the case and how many bins are local authority bins?

Response was 2 in cell G, 2 Cell I, 1 in cell 6.

36 bins ManCo, 5 Local Authority – 41 bins in total.

Consortium stated that there were increased areas of open space which equals additional bins.

Questioned over open spaces: recharge for landscape and maintenance – Plus 10 new bins were placed for the year 2021-2022.

Response: Consortium stated that – the contractor for landscaping and maintenance has increased their charges for the first time since 2012.

Resident question – how often do they test these things? How do you know they are the lowest? How often is it priced and repriced?

Response: Consortium replied that rather than doing a full tender process, one company were cheapest across the North East. They tender across the North East and are significantly cheaper than any other. No obligation to say they must retender.

Resident concerned over plants being killed by the landscape and maintenance contractor– the response was that the contractor doesn't spray plants. Resident disagreed. Picture showing this has happened has been shared with the GPNA chair.

Question over developer recharge cost – there are no recharge costs on audit of account information.

Response: Consortium representatives stated they would answer this in the next questions.

Question from chair about an increase from £73 – 103k? Why? Is the additional 30k is due to 10 bins being placed on the park?



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Response: Consortium representatives stated the increase in rates, is due to an increase in open spaces.

Director has been able to negotiate no increase in landscaping costs since 2012.

GPNA asked whether the strategic open space increased in size as the amount had increased from £46k to £81k in 2021 to 2022.

Response: There was a Measure issue, rates have increased, more open space to be dealt with. Rates have not doubled in 2021 to 2022. More open spaces.

Director explained that whole park managed by section 106 – series of different open spaces, every rate changed. Consortium representatives feel it would be beneficial for representatives to sit with UNW and will show every invoice, very detailed document from landscaper and stated they have nothing to hide. Director believes it would be very beneficial for us to look at this, GPNA agreed.

Consortium stated that Great Park has the lowest landscaping in North East. An assessment was completed today of what we get per hectare; this is better than elsewhere. Agreed that we can see the accounts.

GPNA said this would be beneficial but reiterated that they don't need to sign NDA.

Response: Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon have said they are taking legal advice on whether they are able to share without an NDA.

Residents say we have looked at service charge and what we can and can't do. We want to look at it and believe we are in our rights to do so. Not in terms of distrust but for transparency.

Response: The response was that this was to protect the contractor's rates from the tender process. Staff had taken part in a discussion about this but taking legal advice at this time.

Directors agreed it would be worthwhile if GPNA use UNW to answer questions.

Chair said this links to transparency – residents need to be reassured. NDA stops this process being transparent. If GPNA were allowed to see this, we can confirm and reassure lots of residents.

Chair - coming back to question 1 – asked about the 30k increase for 10 bins and developer forward fund increase – 73k



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Response: this is a combination of the developer forward fund, recharge costs is combination of SMR, RA, PPO and developer FFS.

GPNA residents spoke about additional open space – how much has been taken over?

Response: Consortium representatives/Open Spaces states that they have brought plans along which show this and they have calculated open space down to the square metre.

Representatives from consortium state these are more detailed than any other management company. Provided a plan of adoption, a plan of bins, plans of open space which they don't have to do. Will issue to GPNA once checked as they are currently drafts.

Plan in place showing what is being adopted in 2024.

3. Significant changes to accounts sheet within 30 days for income and expenditure not adding up inline with audit of account information in January 2023? Why when an average of £22000 is spent on UNW for account audits?

Question 2 is one they are struggling with as a consortium. Bottom line is that it is the UNW role, Rachel had suggested they don't do what they should do. Consortium explained prices were tended in 2014. Audits, accounts, invoices on service charge records, can all be interrogated, thinks UNW would be happy to do that with GPNA.

Chair asked about discrepancies between spreadsheets. Rachel launching investigation as to why money didn't tally up with one another. Chair didn't get full response. Local resident put into spreadsheet and worked out it didn't add up, those figures changed. Expenditure was 63-64k and once sent back they had all reverted to what it was before. This raised alarm bells for residents. Rachael said it was a concern.

Response: Consortium understands this but is not sure of the impact as people make mistakes.

Chair asked why this was the case?

Response: Consortium stated that the UNW are happy to answer the questions for us. As the staff members here were not at the previous meeting, they do not know details, and suggested it was an estimated service charge.

Chair said no it was actual, information provided from audit of account information which was on the website. Chair state there was possibly some audit of account information still on website which doesn't match. These figures aren't adding up.

Response: Representatives from the consortium said as they are not an accountant, this information is submitted to companies' house, nothing was challenged. They have appointed



OFFICIAL

Great Park
Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

the UNW and agree their information is correct. Consortium happy to get UNW into a meeting to prove why this is factually incorrect.

Question from GPNA – have they been audited?

Response: The answer was that they did a level of audit, not sure on the exact level. However, it was the level of audit required for this kind of company. States this on the first statement. It would cost more money if there was a more detailed audit than this.

Question from GPNA over audit thresholds – the response was that this is based on turnover and type of company. Lawyers have checked.

Response: Consortium checked documents and it was an FRS102 section 1a- small entities.

The companies don't require statutory audits. Residents do see 'audit of accounts' mentioned a lot but they are audited with what is needed for this level of business.

3. Service charge income for each cell (Including commercial centre funding) does not match income with what has been inputted on companies house? Can you explain this please? E.g Cell G creditors 2022 = £124,515 vs Cell G income = £103,610 Cell G debtors 2022 = £55,590 vs Cell G expenditure = £103,608

Response: Consortium read out official statement from UNW - the income charge from the residents matches the accounts. Looking at the full account information every invoice is coded to every area and split out.

Companies house isn't an appropriate measure. Even though it's the funds of the audit account for particular cells – it won't match companies' house information. UNW Looking at creditors and debtors. The representative from the consortium is a planner and director, not accountant and UNW have offered to meet with GPNA.

Chair stated, it doesn't make sense for someone like me who is not an accountant. That the income and expenditure doesn't match creditors and debtors. Accruals wouldn't meet with the account information.

Response: Consortium stated that at this level we are getting into detail – UNW best placed to answer.

4. How is each house charged?

Response: The Service charge is calculated on the square footage around the size of properties, the strategic open spaces in that cell, transferred to the management company.



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

A Gosford type house for example would be charged differently in each cell. The director was concerned over Gosford in cell F being charged more than another Gosford in Cell F. This has been checked by and may be in error, residents should speak to Open Spaces if this is the case.

5. What is the Management Fee and what does this pay for?

Response: The response was that this is site accommodation costs, running the cost of an office, phone, broadband, posting of documents.

Chair question; so £10,537 - how many offices are on GP at the moment?

Response: The Management company had rented an office in Esh Plaza. This is now closed. Moved to managing agent, contract out for all services.

Chair questioned what would reduction be for 23-34 now that this office has closed?

Response: DA couldn't say but stated it would be cheaper. The management fee for 2023-2024 usually 50-70 per plot of Managing agent cost. Open Spaces clarified that this will not impact until 2024 but we should see the difference in the 2024 estimate.

6. How many staff did GPMC employ over these three years and why the substantial increase in 2021 and again in 2022, when only R Kadansky was available? Who was the other part time member of staff?

Response: There was a part time admin assistant, Rachel was full time. The part time admin was working more hours than part time. This was a significant cost – hence the reason to move to managing agent. Part time admin complimented on her service by NCC representative and consortium representatives.

7. What RA/Audit/Reviews took place in 2022?

IDM do audits and reviews. E.g. Suds ponds, if the council asks for a report, they do a check on their invoices. Consortium showed example of invoice, splits down every rate and every measure for what they do. Chair asked if we can see that and it is part of the service charge. No response from the consortium.

8. What does the PPO Liability insurance cover?

Response: It is public liability insurance. Average is 6.5k but up to around 9k. The increase is due to land increase. Increased from £3k to £4k to £5k – in line with what?

Question over what the insurance company uses to calculate insurance charge.

Response was that it was open space, suds draining, play parks – etc.



OFFICIAL

Great Park Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

GPNA representative stated the increase is a lot in public liability, 25% increase, 6.2% is usual. Concerned this is a significant increase and was wondering if it has been tendered.

Consortium response that an insurance broker does all of TW and Persimmon insurance. A claim from previous year in play park could have affected this. They also had more detailed questions this year from insurance broker.

GPNA resident asked why it isn't named public liability – PPO is not appropriately named.

Response: Consortium agreed.

9. What is the forward funding cost?

Response: this is forward funding and bank costs for payments, process cheques, sage pay has a charge, it can be seen on service charge records.

GPNA resident stated it was unusual to name it forward funding – isn't this meant to be funding that is spent in future years?

Response: Consortium agreed.

10. Can you confirm what land is strategic open space and local open space and when it was handed over?

Response: Consortium stated they sat and looked at plans and reviewed them fully. The plans on the website are incorrect, a drafting error, will leave the new ones with us. They intend to do a plan of all open spaces, lighter green for local, dark green strategic, to highlight the difference between the two. Haven't put cell boundaries on there yet. Have shown footpaths there in pink. So they can show what the service charge covers for what paths. Not yet added a plan for streetlights which every service charge links to.

Chair –we were under the impression that all of the lights were covered by developers.

Response: Consortium says this was also incorrect in previous minutes – streetlights on strategic routes, e.g. East Village are now transferred to the ManCo. Ones in pink are ManCo on the plans.

10. Why the substantial increase for strategic open space in 2022?

Response: Parking bays – there is not £100,000 for parking bays. This covers roads and sewage, clarified that it was with paths included. Parking bays are under developer's remit. No roads have TP1, they could have charged service charges for maintenance of roads and decided not to do that. Consortium stated that charging us for this would be the wrong thing to



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

do. They also stated they could charge for gritting but they don't. Plans will hopefully show this more clearly.

Question from a resident – does that path across East moor show as complete?

Response was that it is only adopted where it is topped off. Left white where not paying for it. New section under A1 topped off so is adopted. The light brown areas on the plan is what they are proposing to adopt to the ManCo in 2024. Additional cost contributed for a landscape architect. Hence when the charge goes up - you can see where this is as the land that has been adopted is a significant area of land. Street lights, ones in pink are Manco, other ones go to developers.

Vice chair brought up streetlights – what is the latest? Mentioned issues in September, but nothing is being done. If the survey has been done it's clearly not incorporated all lights, as we still have the same lights out at the end of March?

Response: Consortium taking responsibility for this. Wanting to find a contractor to do what they need to do. Struggling with this as parts are obsolete. Have given a contractor the purchase order – just waiting for them to deliver.

Vice chair questioned that if they haven't managed to source the parts...How long do we give them? Reported someone breaking leg and in hospital, big contributor was that the lights were out, at some point will you change tact?

Response: the consortium stated that lots of parts are on order. However, they agree, they want a contractor doing the job, and do have some problems with how this is going currently. There is a national framework agreement for contractors as in service level agreement.

The Consortium stated that they may need to change contractors, however the previous contractor fitted wrong parts. They are trying to get Cell I adopted but, council wants the lights changed.

GPNA resident stated that a councillor in different place, posted on social media that a streetlight was out in another area of Newcastle, reported to NCC one day, replaced within 3 days. Vice chair reiterated that this is a health and safety issue, responsibility falls to Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon, they need to sort this out. Residents would love to see a joint statement to say this is the issue we have – we aren't happy but we are doing something about it and being delayed because of XYZ.

Response from the consortium states that street lighting contractor has been paid, but not delivering.



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Chair mentioned that the working list was always useful. For residents to see that you are having difficulties getting parts – allowing people to know those facts would reassure residents and reduce the number of emails.

Another GPNA member asking about how to report that; does the managing agent have service charge funds. Is the service charge accessible for them to crack on and fix what they need to fix? If there is 3 different people to report to – it is a mess. Simpler if it goes to the managing agent, they say Taylor Wimpey are responsible and send out. Residents are irritated as they send emails and reports in but when they get nothing back it is frustrating. GPNA residents stated the need for this to be the way of reporting to be correct. Agreed that yes there is an element of taking more time to do a schedule/work list, even if it isn't the answer they want; the consortium can then manage expectations.

Response: Managing agent says they are taking some time to sort this out.

GPNA resident stated it has got to go through one entity as it is best. People will criticise – as someone reports streetlight last Autumn and nothing has happened in March, no updates, no communication, it promotes bad feeling.

Response: Consortium representative thinks work schedule is doubling up. If residents go to the managing agent and not wanting to be criticised by going to one place rather than separate developers.

Requirements from the new home ombudsman, comes in to one point and sent to Persimmon or Taylor Wimpey. Man Co happy to take the residents requests.

GPNA reiterated that we would like a work schedule.

Consortium stated it was an animal and too much work.

GPNA residents agree that this is being missed.

Response: Open spaces stated that everything is being logged – it is the contractor not complying.

Again consortium stated that doing a spreadsheet is not helpful. It is logged behind the website.

GPNA residents view; I report something nothing happens and repeat. Black hole, no accountability and nobody takes any responsibility for that.



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Response: Open spaces has KPI's to address. Residents to go to management agent, if it is a developer issue it goes to Taylor Wimpey or Persimmon customer services.

Resident disagrees nothing comes back. *Open Spaces did check the log the following day for this particular resident and found a chain of emails and there was a reply.

Response: Open spaces explained that a complaint comes through – then the developer is told.

GPNA questioned what happens with the complaint, do developers come to ManCo and say it has been fixed? Who is holding developers accountable from Managing company? Or chasing it up?

Response: Consortium representative, says developer would speak to the customer. Open Spaces will also be told by the developer. The email response back to the customer should state this isn't our responsibility, we have forwarded to Taylor Wimpey, Persimmon or local authority. Gave an example of residents who have spoken to GPNA with concerns thinking we could solve it, if they get a response email then it provides clarity and would improve relationships.

Sue gave example of what she does as part of NCC.

Chair asked them to review communication as this is an issue.

Response: Open spaces stated that this should be better now they are managing the inbox.

Response: Consortium isn't happy with lampposts/lighting. Need to review with the head of customer services from Persimmon, Taylor Wimpey and Open Spaces to set out the process and ensure everyone is on the same page.

Consortium agreed they will take away actions on street lighting and set out what they are doing in terms of customer service directors will meet and will set up these things.

Consortium stated that spending time doing this will increase costs.

GPNA responded but if we work on this now it will improve everything. Less chaser emails and get things resolved quickly.

Discussion around number of days to resolve an issue – specific number of days to complete tasks. 56 days max for new quality code. Manco, Taylor Wimpey or Persimmon, consortium, new homes quality code covers this. Persimmon started this from the 5th March – any reservation now falls into the new homes quality code.

Question whether we can show on plans different colours for Taylor Wimpey?



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Response: Consortium said they can't do different colours for Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon – as the streets are complex.

Question over which developer is responsible for what.

Response: Taylor Wimpey customer goes to Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon goes to Persimmon. Some are joint.

Chair has been out on Great Park and looked at newer areas, spoke to resident who was saying there is an argument going on between Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon over who is responsible for a pothole. If you could split this on a map, then it could alleviate these concerns. Clear communication lines to follow.

Response: Consortium reiterated that the bottom line is Taylor Wimpey to Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon customer to Persimmon.

Chair – but who is responsible? You have just said that there are some which are a joint responsibility?

Response: Consortium has appointed a new project manager for Great Park management. This individual will be employed by the consortium to respond to joint issues. If Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon disagree on a responsibility then the project manager will sort it.

GPNA resident asked about the new manager, will they take over historical areas of Great Park?

Response was yes they will be taking it to adoption.

Resident questioned: Will he or she will have responsibility to produce a plan to deal with areas that have been left by developers 'completed' e.g. paths, roads, parks?

Response was yes they deal with the infrastructure.

Chair agrees that this will be a huge step up. If you've got an issue with paths, lights etc send to project manager and not clog up the ManCo. Massively improves communication, no crossed lines.

Consortium doesn't want this person to deal with making a spreadsheet.



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Resident states that there'll be lots of emails, if your new manager can do a job list – this path will be topped in whenever, it will take away email traffic.

Response: Consortium agrees. They can share with us what can be done in the next 6 months and things than might be done but affected by planning.

GPNA agree and would like this information shared. This will help residents. GPNA resident states that if this job list is shared then it has to be adhered to and if not explain why, as we have had years of saying things are going to happen and no one explains why it isn't done. No timescales given and gave examples of Roseden being left without the top layer for 10 years. Resident grateful for the plan but have to stick to it but need to explain why to manage expectations for residents.

Response: Consortium states that things are planned but planning may hinder and wants to share presentations.

Chair thinks a public meeting to promote transparency would be fantastic.

Response: Consortium feels that after 30 years in the role, for public engagement a resident meeting would not be beneficial. Would like to do drop ins, and share information with us as GPNA and us to disseminate.

Resident suggested video of consortium representatives to be posted online. Consortium will have a think about this.

Chair suggested a monthly or 2 monthly newsletters. Chair explained that the Great park website being used more effectively now to share information which was a huge positive. Posters sent by Sue and other information posted has a really positive impact. Could the website or newsletter say the top 3 things/issues – what we have done to address this, what we have got problems with. Resident stated that it isn't the big issues/infrastructure that we have problems with, it is smaller things.

Response: Consortium suggested that the new project manager could do a drop in with support initially, and now that we have one group on the park, communication can improve with GPNA and a presentation can be shared with us monthly.

Resident suggested that underneath the concerns button on website, clear information stating this one is responsible for roads, this one is the button to click for bins etc. Before emails are sent to the wrong place. Direct the residents to the right place. Cut down on traffic and hours spent forwarding emails etc.



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Response: Consortium and NCC agreed they liked the meet the team nights – so the voices of residents who wouldn't speak up at meetings would be heard.

Vice chair agrees and thinks a human touch might be better.

13. Can you confirm what land is strategic local open space and differentiate this on the previous map in another colour?

Agreed that this question had been answered by the plans developed by the consortium and open spaces.

14. Can the parks be addressed for SEND residents?

Response: In previous years, there was an accessibility forum. For example, not always just SEND needs as parks that don't have level access, 2014/2015 set up an action group.

Residents are in the process of setting up a group and meeting. 5 or 6 residents expressed that they were keen to join.

Response: Consortium states that improving the park will impact service charge.

GPNA stated that most residents don't mind paying as long as it is justifiable.

Response: Head teachers from Brunton and Havannah have sent information to parents to join SEND groups after Sue got in touch about setting this up.

Consortium stated that we need to manage expectations as there might be an issues changing planning permission. As these are current parks which are delivered as planned.

Chair expressed that we can do quick wins, e.g. particular equipment or improve accessibility route. Can be promoted on the website, with photographs of all working together.

Response: Consortium hoping council will fund SEND areas.

Chair stated £5k a year for play parks so I want to see them in the best way possible.

Response: Local councillor mentioned that there is currently a Thomas Bewick expansion planning application in. The consultation about upgrading elements of Brunton First to have a campus here. May be opportunities for funding, however it is a long way to go.

15. Residents are paying for the upkeep of the play parks – should it be the case that only residents can use them?

Response: Consortium states this is not possible, legal obligation that it is public open space.



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Chair questioned if it is public open space, why is it classed as private estate and why are local residents and not the wider public paying for them?

Response was that it is not a private estate and there are lots of different typologies. There needs to be free access to the public at all times.

Question over residents being charged council tax and it does not provide anything other than bins and does not fix pot holes or lights as in other areas. If it is public open space and it is not a private new build estate, why does it need adopting in the first place?

Chair questioned about the service charge in Taylor Wimpey – point of sale, said it was just for grass cutting.

Response: Consortium says they are often criticised for mis selling but there is a checklist for each customer at reservation which includes this.

Chair stated that at his point of sale this checklist does not appear to have been run through with him or the other 80% of 500 residents who responded to the GPNA survey.

Chair questioned why he and other residents were recommended to use solicitors by Taylor Wimpey, this is a concern.

Response: Consortium reiterated that this is not a private estate but it is open space.

Chair said his property was sold as freehold and this means he owns the land, so why is there a covenant that my freehold can be reversed to leasehold and he can be contacted by the mortgage company and have his property taken off him if it is freehold?

Response: Consortium states that you bought a freehold property, it is freehold and you have signed the contract.

Chair agreed and said they were not negating this fact but questioned why there is a rent charge alongside the service charge as it is a freehold property?

Residents are worried about the morals of what a freehold actually is. As I was somebody who was concerned that I was reporting things and they were not getting resolved. Despite the fact that I was paying a small insignificant fund each year, it was like putting my car in for its MOT and then it not getting fixed and getting it back. So I made a stand. This is just me personally to not pay that charge for two or three years until I had adequate responses. Then was threatened by Womble and Dickinson for lack of payment, charged, an additional £180. More than the



OFFICIAL

Great Park Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

amount owed the year then WBD contacted by my mortgage company stating that they are looking to repossess my home over £400, which I paid immediately, it's strong-arming, it's immoral, and it's wrong. I'm not saying that as the chair of the GPNA. I'm saying that as a resident, that this practice is totally and utterly unbelievably immoral.

Chair stated that the service charge sets out that we pay this and you need to deliver x,y, z but you aren't delivering x, y, z.

Response from consortium was that this is clearly detailed on the contract which you need to sign.

Chair agreed but then was upset that this money isn't spent on doing X, Y, Z.

Response – We are getting on to individual cases here but it is absolutely right that a management company on Great Park collects on outstanding debts. The management company made a decision to chase legally outstanding debt for services that have been provided.

£2k charged to sell E for roads where is this being spent?

Consortium responded that it is clearly shown on draft plans. Not just road cleansing but also cleansing of the paths.

Consortium stated around 57% residents have paid service charge for this year to date.

Resident says people feel aggrieved about paying the service charge and not receiving a service. E.g £49,820. For Litter picking, bins.

Consortium thinks there should be less bins on the park. Prices have increased.

GPNA resident agrees that the rubbish can be taken home.

Consortium researched costs for emptying bins after previous meeting. council minimum is £1500 per bin and council not at capacity to do it.

Councillors to clarify where they got the £800 figure from previously, this was from a works request put in by Dinnington to get a bin installed.

NCC and others present stated that it is the ongoing costs for emptying which costs more money.



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

GPNA resident – people are annoyed by service charges, people assume everything they're putting in, see that I am paying service charge but not hearing anything. Bound to be complaints up the line for service charge.

Residents are angry they're paying full council tax alongside service charge.

Councillor stated that in terms of local services in adopted area compared to here, 5% of council tax is used for bins etc.. The vast majority is spent on adult and social care.

Great Park residents are aware that people in Jesmond are in same council tax bands in some cases.

Resident states that the tax issue, see level of action on other adopted estates and this is why residents have an issue with service charge.

Consortium explained that people don't understand they are distinctly separate charges and that even some residents here tonight don't understand it. They continued that they are the only ManCo in the UK that have subsidised and continue to subsidise. Contracts are robust in terms of directors of consortium and Manco.

GPNA resident states if lights fixed in next few months – there will be less complaints about service charge. Deal with practicalities, residents look at the consortium as one entity and all residents can't be expected to educate themselves on legal packs etc.

Lack of communication came up again as an issue.

£200,000+ between 2021 and 2022, how has that been required? If that was a one off for 2022. Where is the cap on the service charge? How much income would be generated for the Manco each year once Great Park is fully finished?

Response: Directors wouldn't know as they are still designing final cell. The maximum service charge is £500.

Asked if UNW could sort this. GPNA told that UNW don't know this. Chair asked for clarification. Chair asked exactly what the generated income would be for Great Park for current completed cells, and what the price cap would be.

Response: Consortium questioned as to why this information is needed.



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Chair asked this as wanted to know what the total income generated would be as residents need the transparency and would be able to challenge further if work was still not being completed to a good standard.

Response: Consortium doesn't see benefit in this question for residents.

Chair concerned that the maps don't look that much different for a £200,000 service charge increase.

Chair says we just want accountability.

GPNA resident asked whether £200,000 is actually what has been spent. UNW state they don't check they're right or whether they've done the work.

Response: Directors stated that all money is spent on Great Park. Great Park is cheapest per hectare in comparison to any other site in the North East. Service charges are less than elsewhere.

Chair stated that calculating this is something that will be fantastic to look at because again, if we're looking at the fact that 2022 has a jump with 200 thousand pounds, from the previous year, I think residents would like to know how much income they management company would be receiving on a yearly basis to fix the issues, across the parts that they are concerned about.

Response: Consortium agreed that they are trying to address this with the new maps.

Residents supported this and say they are happy to pay but just want some accountability.

Response: Consortium are concerned that the credibility of individuals is being questioned. Every bit of money that is spent in those accounts is spent on the managed areas of Newcastle, Great Park. Consortium has a comparison of other management companies in the North East to show that ours is the cheapest per hectare of any. What you get in terms of, community centre, community play areas, vast amount of open space, ecology areas drainage is bigger than anywhere else, and your service charges are letters per hectare.

GPNA strongly disagrees that credibility is being called into question, just that if it's so straightforward in terms of knowing that everything is being spent on Great Park, why can financial questions not be answered by directors and why do we now need to meet solely with UNW?

Questioned over community centre – commercial, has broken the cap.



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Response: Consortium stated that commercial still gets charged for community facilities. The service charge impacted by loss of Sage who signed a TP1 and Sage. Avant homes have taken over Sage. The consortium had originally successfully negotiated with SAGE who paid the service charge. Community centre part of park wide services and now at their limit, communities fund would only ever show £100,000 from now on.

Chair clarified that the community centre charge to all residents therefore will not go up on the audit information.

Response: no the charge will not go up for this.

Chair stated that if the Sage paid the service charge via there TP1 and Advent homes had now signed the TP1 then this should no longer be an issue as Advent had taken over Sage's service charge therefor it should not be impacted by the loss of Sage.

Residents were told that the more people paying in cell then we would pay less. However, the charges seem to be increasing.

Response: Consortium explains that there will be a reservation checklist which should cover this. They will take on board these issues of misinformation on point of sale.

All agreed at this point we were running out of time to answer all questions.

17 Cell G (Greenside) was charged £17139 for bins – yet only has 4 bins? £4284 a bin for a year? Please explain this.

Response: Cell G, Greenside bins, all bins are in strategic open space – these are their fair representations of strategic open space.

Chair compared costs for bins from all cells. Calculated on square footage by cell is one way of doing it. Greenside is surrounded by open spaces but doesn't have as many bins as other cells without as much open space as this fair?

Response: Consortium completed a survey for their plan and the Consortium managed the Community Centre, it was set up in a way that it can be managed by residents once developers leave. There is a section 106 in place for a certain period of time. Perpetuity, service charges fund the community centre for residents.

A question whether Newcastle council could take over the community centre?



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

This was a no as consortium are legally obligated between Taylor Wimpey and council to fund this.

Resident stated that this not an agreement between residents.

If 2800 homes are paying service charge. Approx £40 a year for residents to contribute to community centre.

Residents not obligated to pay but TP1 says there are things we can charge for, if we choose to including bins.

Consortium reiterated that they don't subsidise any other management company.

Chair asked why they don't do it with other Management companies and estates? GPNA Resident questioned why this is just us, and if it works here – why isn't it done elsewhere.

Response: Consortium did this due to issues around sage, tried to do the right thing for this development. Director stood up to the board to make this case and it is subsequently subsidised by the developer.

Chair asking what we would be charged when the developers leave?

Response: Director thinks with number of properties that the cap will still stand at £500. Section 106 is in perpetuity.

Chair asked when the subsidy finishes – what is the impact on the service charge and house prices?

Response: Consortium stated that this is the best market area for Newcastle in terms of house prices and their £500 cap is for 600 acres of open space.

GPNA residents are concerned that other residents aren't aware of the significant subsidy that only exists here but not in any other place across the country. What happens when a developer leaves? How is the estate going to be sustainable without the subsidy that enables it to be currently? Resident states he has seen invoices and doesn't match. Landscaping and maintenance contractors have also been charging for planting grass and plants and this is not for maintaining land?

Response: Director disagrees.



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Rosedon Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

Question about the section 38 road agreement, the chair sent a FOI to NCC and found that the section 38 is not in place. Has this agreement been found?

Response: Director confirmed and can send this along to us tomorrow.

Chair asked is this for all roads?

Response: No section 38 road agreement is in place all roads such as Rosedon way.

A query by GPNA over s178 road agreements are these in place?

Response: consortium stated that you don't need s178 to alter existing highway. This is to create new highways.

Meeting closed 8.16pm, chair thanked David for attending and answering questions up to Q23. Really happy that it has brought some clarity and transparency to members.

Happy to meet again and amend agenda jointly.

Consortium would like to show plans on screen and display, and clarify. New manager won't be in post but could come along. Consortium wants the opportunity to share information as to why they can't put bollards down etc.

Chair reiterated that they are grateful for answers to questions so far for residents.

Consortium happy to meet monthly as is GPNA. The director will finish their presentation and circulate to GPNA.

Permission and Taylor Wimpey will organise meeting of some members of GPNA with UNW.

Chair again thanked them for the time.

Draft documents left by the consortium that all present agreed would not be shared as they are currently in draft but would be at a later date once confirmed as accurate by the Consortium.

Next steps following the meeting will be sent to all by the GPNA chair. Next meeting to take place in April or early May.

8. Next steps discussed in meeting notes as follows:



OFFICIAL

Great Park

Neighbourhood Association

Great Park Community Centre
Roseden Way
Great Park
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE13 9BD

Email: secretary@gpna.uk

1. UNW to meet with GPNA to answer questions regarding the significant discrepancies between the income and expenditure figures that do not match the creditors and debtors. Consortium to provide contact details to the GPNA
2. Consortium to provide a plan showing the open space broken down to the square metre with finalised plans of adoption, bins and open/local space to the GPNA.
4. GPNA to look at these plans and provide comments.
5. Consortium to update the website with the corrected information on the area of space under the A1.
6. Consortium to review the service charge to see if any other houses across Cells are being charged incorrectly.
7. The consortium will look into the resident's concern that the landscape maintenance contractor is killing plants.
8. The consortium will determine if a legal obligation exists to withhold invoices detailing costs from residents if they do not sign an Non disclosure agreement
9. Consortium to show every invoice to GPNA representatives once an NDA agreement has been shown to not be required.
10. Consortium, Manco and developers to improve resident concerns reporting by providing clear guidance to residents on their reporting page on who to contact regarding areas of the estate, e.g. paths / potholes to developers and open/local space to the ManCo.

Remaining agenda items to be covered at this time: see below.

3. Great Park – Park & Ride information following FOI received – GPNA / NCC
4. Updates from NCC regarding adoption with the consortium – GPNA / NCC
5. Updates from the Consortium regarding ongoing infrastructure delivery and proposed developments alongside Town Centre update.
6. Managing agent tender process & Management Company Comparison sites
7. Any Other Business (AOB)