



*Castle House
Great North Road
Newark
NG24 1BY*

Tel: 01636 650000
www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk

Monday, 13 October 2025

Chair: Councillor L Tift
Vice-Chair: Councillor R Jackson

To all Members of the Council:

MEETING: Full Council

DATE: Tuesday, 21 October 2025 at 6.00 pm

**VENUE: Civic Suite, Castle House, Great North Road,
Newark, NG24 1BY**

**You are hereby requested to attend the above Meeting to be held at the time/place
and on the date mentioned above for the purpose of transacting the
business on the Agenda as overleaf.**

If you have any queries please contact Nigel Hill on Tel: 01636 655243 Email: nigel.hill@newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk.

AGENDA

Page Nos.

- | | | |
|----|---|--------|
| 1. | Notification to those present that the meeting will be recorded and streamed online | |
| 2. | Apologies for absence | |
| 3. | Declarations of Interest by Members and Officers | |
| 4. | Minutes from the meeting held on 15 July 2025 | 6 - 15 |
| 5. | Communications which the Chairman, Leader, Chief Executive or Portfolio Holders may wish to lay before the Council | |
| 6. | In accordance with Rule No. 3.1 to receive the presentation or the debating of any Petitions from Members of the Council (if any) | |
| 7. | Questions from Members of the Public and Council | |

In accordance with Rule No. 3.3.2 the following questions have been submitted to the Council from a member of the public, Laurence Goff:

Empty Properties – Why did it take so long?

“For many years Newark and Sherwood has had empty buildings not being protected, empty properties, often commercial buildings.

Work is set to take place to transform the historic 300-year-old Ollerton Hall that has stood vacant for 50 years. It now has planning permission to turn them into apartments. The Robin Hood Hotel in Newark, a landmark building, stood derelict for over two decades after its closure in 1999 before being transformed into a Travelodge hotel.

The Lilley and Stone School, Newark has stood empty for 9 years; Woods Court former care home is empty; the Oaks and Little Oaks Care Home, 172 London Road, Balderton, Newark is also standing empty. The Corner Exchange, Newark stood empty for years which is now a night club, located in the town Centre.

The question is why they did not have someone to live in to safeguard the properties in the first place? It would be good to setup a Guardianship to safeguard our properties across the District.

An empty property guardianship offers the best solution where an individual lives in and protects vacant properties, at a lower cost than traditional renting, while the property owner benefits from security and reduced risks. Guardians secure the property, preventing issues like squatters, anti-social behaviour and vandalism, and often enjoy more affordable, flexible living arrangements. Not only do property owners

benefit from having their vacant buildings protected, but guardians pay lower rent than market rates in exchange for maintaining the property and ensuring its security.”

In accordance with Rule No. 3.3.3 the following question has been submitted to the Council from Councillor Peter Harris:

“The Leader is our representative to the East Midlands Combined Authority Mayor. What influence does the East Midlands Mayor have at the Government for improving rail services in our area?”

In accordance with Rule No. 3.3.3 the following question has been submitted to the Council from Councillor John Lee:

“During the last election, the Independents for Newark & District set out a number of manifesto commitments. Residents reasonably expect clarity on whether those commitments are being delivered within the current term.

For example:

1. Housing and Green Space – The Council’s Housing Allocation Scheme consultation (Sept 2024) confirmed that demand for homes continues to outstrip supply. In addition, 142 homes were approved on Lowfield Lane, Balderton, land that residents had previously understood would be protected. ([Newark Advertiser, 2024]).
2. Climate Change – The Council has reported a 26% reduction in carbon emissions from its own buildings and operations ([Newark Advertiser, Sept 2025]), but there is no published timetable showing how the wider district will move towards the pledged 2035 net zero target.
3. Health and Wellbeing – While community events have been delivered, there is no published evidence demonstrating improvements in life expectancy or reduced health inequalities.
4. Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour – Nottinghamshire Police figures show shoplifting increased by 21% and burglary by 9% in 2024 compared to the previous year. Overall crime stood at 6,834 incidents per 100,000 people in the year to Sept 2023. ([Notts Police, Jan 2025]; [Varbes, 2023])

Given these published figures, will the Deputy Leader confirm when each of these manifesto pledges will be fully met, or whether she accepts that they will not be met within the lifetime of this administration”.

8. Appointment of the Council's Monitoring Officer
9. Appointment of Independent Remuneration Panel
10. Treasury Management Outturn Report 2024/25
11. Winthorpe and Langford Neighbourhood Plan Referendum

12. Outcome of Standards Complaints Hearing Panel

13. Notices of Motion (if any)

In accordance with the Rule No. 3.4.3, the following motions are to be considered:

Motion 1 - Consideration of the introduction of Article 4 Directions within urban areas of Newark and Sherwood (Under the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015)

Motion 2 – Marie Curie Campaign for a Council Tax Exemption for Terminally Ill

14. Minutes for Noting

- (a) Cabinet - 8 July 2025
- (b) Cabinet - 15 July 2025
- (c) Cabinet - 9 September 2025
- (d) Policy and Performance Improvement Committee - 1 September 2025
- (e) Policy & Performance Improvement Committee - 6 October 2025
- (f) Planning Committee - 21 July 2025
- (g) Planning Committee - 7 August 2025
- (h) Planning Committee - 4 September 2025
- (i) Planning Committee - 2 October 2025
- (j) Governance, General Purposes & LGR Committee - 11 September 2025
- (k) Executive Shareholder Committee - 8 July 2025
- (l) Executive Shareholder - 9 September 2025

15. Exclusion of the Press and Public

To consider resolving that, under section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

Note – Fire Alarm Evacuation

In the event of an alarm sounding please evacuate the building using the nearest fire exit in the

Civic Suite. You should assemble at the designated fire assembly point located in the rear car park and remain there until the Fire Service arrive and advise it is safe to return into the building

Report to: Meeting of the Full Council: 21 October 2025

Relevant Portfolio Holder: Councillor Paul Peacock, Strategy, Performance & Finance

Director Lead: John Robinson, Chief Executive

Report Summary	
Report Title	Appointment of the Council's Monitoring Officer
Purpose of Report	This report proposes the appointment of Francesca Whyley as the Council's Monitoring Officer and the Director – Resources and Section 151 Officer, Sanjiv Kohli as Senior Responsible Officer (Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA))
Recommendations	That Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) approves the appointment of Francesca Whyley as the Council's Monitoring Officer with immediate effect; b) approves the appointment of Sanjiv Kohli as Senior Responsible Officer (RIPA) with immediate effect; and c) subject to (a) give delegated authority to the Monitoring Officer to make minor consequential amendments to the constitution given references to the Assistant Director - Legal & Democratic Services.
Reason for Recommendation	Under Section 5 of the Local Government & Housing Act 1989, the Council has a duty to appoint a Monitoring Officer. Part 4.41 Covert Surveillance and Property Interference Code of Practice (Accessible) provides that it is best practise for a Council to appoint a Senior Responsible Officer (RIPA) and that individual to be a member of the Senior Leadership Team.

1.0 Background and Proposal

- 1.1 The appointment of a Monitoring Officer is a matter reserved for Full Council. The Monitoring Officer has a number of statutory duties and responsibilities relating to the Council's constitution and the arrangements for effective governance. These duties include:
- 1.1.1 To report on matters believed to be, or likely to be, illegal or amount to maladministration
 - 1.1.2 To be responsible for matters relating to the conduct of councillors and officers
 - 1.1.3 To be responsible for the operation of the Council's constitution

- 1.2 As Members will be aware, Sue Bearman, Assistant Director - Legal & Democratic Services and the Council's Monitoring Officer, has recently left the Council for alternative employment. Under normal circumstances, the post would be filled on a like for like basis with the continued attachment of the designation of Monitoring Officer.
- 1.3 However, under Local Government Re-organisation, all of the options proposed will reduce the number of Councils to two and consequently, going forward only two Monitoring Officers would be required. To mitigate the risk of recruiting a new employee and placing them in a potential redundancy situation with the associated costs involved, the Chief Executive has reached out to a number of neighbouring authorities to explore the appetite to share their current post of Monitoring Officer.
- 1.4 Gedling Borough Council has provided legal services support to Newark & Sherwood over a number of years and their Monitoring Officer, Francesca Whyley, is someone who is known to Newark & Sherwood colleagues and is highly respected. Francesca is a qualified solicitor and considered to have the appropriate skills, experience and values required.
- 1.5 Agreement has been reached with Gedling Borough Council to share the Monitoring Officer services of Francesca Whyley, with Newark & Sherwood receiving support two days a week.
- 1.6 The Council's two Principal Legal Officers have also recently been designated as Deputy Monitoring Officers, which provides them with a valuable development opportunity, and they have been working alongside the Business Manager - Elections & Democratic Services who is also a Deputy Monitoring Officer. It is proposed that this arrangement will continue following the appointment of Francesca Whyley. Once appointed, Francesca Whyley will be invited to designate these three posts as Deputy Monitoring Officers to support her work with the Council.
- 1.7 Short-term locum support has also been sourced to ensure continuity of service, and to sustain the current level of resource commitment to Code of Conduct issues.
- 1.8 Following the appointment of Francesca Whyley as Monitoring Officer, minor amendments will need to be made to the Constitution to reflect such changes, specifically given there will be a transfer of relevant functions delegated to the Assistant Director - Legal & Democratic Services given that post will no longer be in existence.
- 1.9 In addition, the Assistant Director - Legal & Democratic Services held the role of the Senior Responsible Officer (RIPA). It is therefore proposed that this role be allocated to the Director – Resources as the most appropriate member of the Council's Senior Leadership Team.

3.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations, officers have considered the following implications: Data Protection; Digital & Cyber Security; Equality & Diversity; Financial; Human Resources; Human Rights; Legal; Safeguarding & Sustainability and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

Financial Implications FIN25-26/8332

- 3.1 The cost of the arrangements referred to above will met be met from existing salary budgets, namely the vacant post of Assistant Director, Legal and Democratic Services.

Legal Implications LEG2526/3876

- 3.2 Under Section 5 of the Local Government & Housing Act 1989, the Council has a duty to appoint a Monitoring Officer.
- 3.3 In addition, Section 5(1)(b) Local Government and Housing Act 1989 provides that sufficient staff and resource be provided to perform the Monitoring Officer role and duties effectively.
- 3.4 Part 4.41 Covert Surveillance and Property Interference Code of Practice (Accessible) provides that it is best practise for a Council to appoint a Senior Responsible Officer (RIPA) and that individual is to be a member of the Senior Leadership Team.

Human Resources Implications

- 3.5 The services of the proposed appointee are being sought through an SLA with Gedling Borough Council, and no employment relationship will be created with the appointee.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

None

Report to: Meeting of the Full Council: 21 October 2025

Relevant Portfolio Holder: Councillor Paul Peacock, Strategy, Performance & Finance

Director Lead: Sue Bearman, Assistant Director Legal & Democratic Services

Lead Officer: Nigel Hill – Business Manager Elections & Democratic Services and Deputy Monitoring Officer, Ext. 5243

Report Summary	
Report Title	Appointment of Independent Remuneration Panel
Purpose of Report	To convene an Independent Remuneration Panel to consider Members Special Responsibility Allowances given the recent changes in Committees.
Recommendations	That Council: a) approves the convening of the Independent Remuneration Panel as set out in the report to undertake a full review of the Special Responsibility Allowances; and b) approve a cost envelope of £4,500 for the purposes of the review.
Reason for Recommendation	To bring the current Scheme of Members Allowances in line with the current Committees following the recent changes.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 At its last meeting held on 15 July 2025, Full Council approved the Terms of Reference and made appointments to the two new committees, the Audit & Accounts Committee and Governance, General Purposes & Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) Committee.
- 1.2 At this same meeting, appointments were made to the new Licensing Committee for which Terms of Reference were approved on 20 May with the Committee taking effect as from 15 July 2025.
- 1.3 These new Committees replaced the former General Purposes and Audit & Governance Committees.
- 1.4 Given these changes, the Full Council considered arrangements for the convening of an Independent Remuneration Panel and agreed to reconvene the same Panel who last undertook a review of Special Responsibility Allowances. The resolution of the Full Council was to convene the same Panel to undertake a full review of Special Responsibility Allowances within a cost envelope of £2,200.

- 1.5 Further to the Council resolution, the previous panel were approached to carry out the review. The Council's two Independent Persons confirmed their availability to assist, but unfortunately the previous Chair of the Panel was unable to undertake the review. Therefore, an alternate Chair has been sought which requires the approval of the Council.

2.0 Proposal/Options Considered

- 2.1 Following various enquiries and recommendations as to potential Chairs, an approach was made to Mr Declan Hall. Mr Hall acts as a 'remuneration consultant' and has a wealth of experience of Independent Remuneration Panels having conducted circa 20 reviews in the last 18 months for a whole range of authorities including Ashfield District Council and the East Midlands Combined Authority.
- 2.2 Mr Hall has indicated his availability for the Panel to consider Special Responsibility Allowances which reflected the resolution of the Full Council.
- 2.3 Given information provided by Mr Hall, it is anticipated that a review of Special Responsibility Allowances would take around 3- 5 days. Approximate costs for Mr Hall services are £550 per day plus any expenses.
- 2.4 With the support of the two other Panel Members, as Chair Mr Hall would undertake the relevant benchmarking and research and would produce the final report following various interviews with stakeholders and relevant parties.
- 2.5 Given the estimate of time required, costs for the proposed Chair would be up to £3,000 for a full review of Special Responsibility Allowances. An appropriate payment for the two Independent Persons as the other panel members would also need to be made and it is suggested that dependent on the scope of the review these be made at £750.
- 2.6 Based on the approximations above the Council will need to consider a cost envelope of £4,500 to support the full review of the Special Responsibility Allowances.

3.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations, officers have considered the following implications: Data Protection; Digital & Cyber Security; Equality & Diversity; Financial; Human Resources; Human Rights; Legal; Safeguarding & Sustainability and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

Financial Implications (FIN25-26/2029)

- 3.1 The £4,500 can be financed by the Corporate Contingency budget in year.

Legal Implications (LEG2526/7873)

- 3.2 The process for determining and setting Members' Allowances for local authorities is set out in the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003. These Regulations set out the range of allowances that can be paid to Councillors (with particular reference to special responsibilities) and the requirement to have an Independent Remuneration Panel to make recommendations to the Council regarding Members' Allowances.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

The current Councillors' Allowance Scheme is published - <https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/your-council/your-council/councillors-and-committees/councillor-allowances/>



Report to: Full Council – 21 October 2025

Relevant Committee Chair: Councillor Sylvia Michael, Audit & Accounts Committee

Director Lead: Sanjiv Kohli, Deputy Chief Executive, Director - Resources & S151 Officer

Lead Officer: Nick Wilson, Business Manager – Financial Services

Report Summary	
Report Title	Treasury Management Outturn Report 2024/25
Purpose of Report	To update Members on the Treasury Management activity and confirm that the Council complied with its Prudential Indicators for 2024/24.
Recommendations	<p>That Council note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) the Treasury Management Outturn report following consideration by the Audit and Governance Committee on 2 July 2025; andb) that in 2024/25 the Council complied with its Prudential Indicators which were approved by Full Council on 7 March 2024.
Reason for Recommendation	To allow Members to consider the Treasury Outturn position.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 In January 2010 the Council formally adopted the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management which requires that the Council receives regular reports on its treasury management activities including, as a minimum, an annual strategy and plan in advance of the year, a mid-year review and an annual report after its close.
- 1.2 The Council delegates responsibility for the implementation and regular monitoring of its treasury management policies and practices to the Audit & Accounts Committee and for the execution and administration of treasury management decisions to the Section 151 Officer, who will act in accordance with the Council's policies and practices.
- 1.3 At their meeting held on 2 July 2025, the Audit and Governance Committee considered the Treasury Management Outturn report for 2024/25. A copy of the report and appendix considered by the Committee is attached at Appendix 1.

2.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations, officers have considered the following implications: Data Protection, Digital and Cyber Security, Equality and Diversity, Financial, Human Resources, Human Rights, Legal, Safeguarding and Sustainability and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

None



Report to: Audit & Governance Committee - 2 July 2025

Director or Business Manager Lead: Sanjiv Kohli Deputy Chief Executive / Director – Resources and Section 151 Officer

Lead Officer: Andrew Snape, Assistant Business Manager Financial Services on ext 5331

Report Summary	
Report Title	Treasury Management Outturn Report 2024/25
Purpose of Report	To give Members the opportunity to review the Annual Treasury Outturn report, which will be presented to Council on 21 October 2025.
Recommendations	That the Treasury Outturn position for 2024/25 be considered.
Reason for Recommendation	To allow Members to consider the Treasury Outturn position.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 In January 2010 the Council formally adopted the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management which requires that the Council receives regular reports on its treasury management activities including, as a minimum, an annual strategy and plan in advance of the year, a mid-year review and an annual report after its close.
- 1.2 The Council delegates responsibility for the implementation and regular monitoring of its treasury management policies and practices to the Audit & Governance Committee and for the execution and administration of treasury management decisions to the Section 151 Officer, who will act in accordance with the Council's policies and practices.
- 1.3 The Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2024/25 was approved by Full Council on 7 March 2024, and the Outturn report is the last report for the financial year, as required by the Code. It has been prepared based on the draft final accounts, which appear elsewhere on the agenda. If there are significant changes resulting from the audit of the accounts, they will be reported at the next meeting of this Committee.

2.0 Summary of Treasury Balances as at 31 March 2025

- 2.1 Below is a summary of the Council's borrowing position as at 31 March 2025. Further detail can be found in appendix A at section 4.

Balance on 01/04/2024 £m		Balance on 31/03/2025 £m
85.463	Total Borrowings	109.798
4.864	Total Other Long Term Liabilities	4.738
90.327	Total External Debt	114.536

- 2.2 Below is a summary of the Councils investment position as at 31 March 2025. Further detail can be found in appendix A at section 5.

Balance on 01/04/2024 £m		Balance on 31/03/2025 £m
21.910	Total Short Term Investments	36.528
12.500	Total Long Term Investments	12.500
34.410	Total Investments	49.028

- 2.3 There have been no breaches of the approved prudential indicators during 2024/25. Further information can be found at section 6 of appendix A.

3.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations, officers have considered the following implications: Data Protection; Digital & Cyber Security; Equality & Diversity; Financial; Human Resources; Human Rights; Legal; Safeguarding & Sustainability and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

Legal Implications LEG2526/7251

- 3.1 The Audit & Governance Committee is the appropriate body to consider the content of this report.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Nil.

ANNUAL TREASURY REPORT 2024/25**1. Background**

- 1.1 This Council is required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 to produce an annual treasury management review of activities and the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2024/25. This report meets the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management, (the Code), and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities, (the Prudential Code).
- 1.2 Treasury management is defined as: 'The management of the local authority's investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks.'
- 1.3 Overall responsibility for treasury management remains with the Council. No treasury management activity is without risk; the effective identification and management of risk are integral to the Council's treasury management strategy.

2.0 Economic Background**UK Economy**

- 2.1 UK inflation has proved somewhat stubborn throughout 2024/25. Having started the financial year at 2.3% y/y (April), the CPI measure of inflation briefly dipped to 1.7% y/y in September before picking up pace again in the latter months. The latest data shows CPI rising by 2.8% y/y (February), but there is a strong likelihood that figure will increase to at least 3.5% by the Autumn of 2025.
- 2.2 Against that backdrop, and the continued lack of progress in ending the Russian invasion of Ukraine, as well as the potentially negative implications for global growth as a consequence of the implementation of US tariff policies by US President Trump in April 2025, Bank Rate reductions have been limited. Bank Rate currently stands at 4.5%, despite the Office for Budget Responsibility reducing its 2025 GDP forecast for the UK economy to only 1% (previously 2% in October).
- 2.3 Moreover, borrowing has becoming increasingly expensive in 2024/25. Gilt yields rose significantly in the wake of the Chancellor's Autumn Statement, and the loosening of fiscal policy, and have remained elevated ever since, as dampened growth expectations and the minimal budget contingency (<£10bn) have stoked market fears that increased levels of borrowing will need to be funded during 2025.
- 2.4 The table below provides a snapshot of the conundrum facing central banks: inflation pressures remain, labour markets are still relatively tight by historical comparisons, and central banks are also having to react to a fundamental re-ordering of economic and defence policies by the US administration.

	UK	Eurozone	US
Bank Rate	4.50%	2.5%	4.25%-4.5%
GDP	0.1%q/q Q4 (1.1%y/y)	+0.1%q/q Q4 (0.7%y/y)	2.4% Q4 Annualised
Inflation	2.8%y/y (Feb)	2.3%y/y (Feb)	2.8%y/y (Feb)
Unemployment Rate	4.4% (Jan)	6.2% (Jan)	4.1% (Feb)

- 2.5 The Bank of England sprung no surprises in their March meeting, leaving Bank Rate unchanged at 4.5% by a vote of 8-1, but suggesting further reductions would be gradual. The Bank of England was always going to continue its cut-hold-cut-hold pattern by leaving interest rates at 4.50% but, in the opposite of what happened at the February meeting, the vote was more hawkish than expected. This suggested that as inflation rises later in the year, the Bank cuts rates even slower, but the initial impact of President Trump's tariff policies in April 2025 on the financial markets underpin our view that the Bank will eventually reduce rates to 3.50%.
- 2.6 Having said that, the Bank still thinks inflation will rise from 2.8% in February to 3¾% in Q3. And while in February it said "inflation is expected to fall back thereafter to around the 2% target", this time it just said it would "fall back thereafter". That may be a sign that the Bank is getting a bit more worried about the "persistence in domestic wages and prices, including from second-round effects". Accordingly, although we expect a series of rate cuts over the next year or so, that does not contradict the Bank taking "a gradual and careful" approach to cutting rates, but a tepid economy will probably reduce inflation further ahead and prompt the Bank to cut at regular intervals.
- 2.7 From a fiscal perspective, the increase in businesses' national insurance and national minimum wage costs from April 2025 is likely to prove a headwind, although in the near-term the Government's efforts to provide 300,000 new homes in each year of the current Parliament is likely to ensure building industry employees are well remunerated, as will the clamp-down on immigration and the generally high levels of sickness amongst the British workforce. Currently wages continue to increase at a rate close to 6% y/y. The MPC would prefer a more sustainable level of c3.5%.
- 2.8 As for equity markets, the FTSE 100 has recently fallen back to 7,700 having hit an all-time intra-day high 8,908 as recently as 3rd March. The £ has also endured a topsy-turvy time, hitting a peak of \$1.34 before dropping to \$1.22 in January and then reaching \$1.27 in early April 2025.

USA Economy

- 2.9 Despite the markets willing the FOMC to repeat the rate cut medicine of 2024 (100 basis points in total), the Fed Chair, Jay Powell, has suggested that the Fed. Funds Rate will remain anchored at 4.25%-4.5% until inflation is under control, and/or the economy looks like it may head into recession as a consequence of President Trump's tariff policies.
- 2.10 Inflation is close to 3% and annualised growth for Q4 2024 was 2.4%. With unemployment just above 4%, and tax cuts in the pipeline, the FOMC is unlikely to be in a hurry to cut rates, at least for now.

EZ Economy

- 2.11 The Eurozone economy has struggled throughout 2024 and is flat lining at present, although there is the promise of substantial expenditure on German defence/infrastructure over the coming years, which would see a fiscal loosening. France has struggled against a difficult political backdrop, but with a large budget deficit it is difficult to see any turn-around in economic hopes in the near-term.
- 2.12 With GDP currently below 1% in the Euro-zone, the ECB is likely to continue to cut rates, although the headline inflation rate is still above 2% (2.3% February 2025). Currently at 2.5%, a further reduction in the Deposit Rate to at least 2% is highly likely.

3.0 Local Context

- 3.1 During 2024/25, the Council maintained an under-borrowed position. This meant that the capital borrowing need, (the Capital Financing Requirement), was not fully funded with loan debt as cash supporting the Council's reserves, balances and cash flow was used as an interim measure. This strategy was prudent as although near-term investment rates were equal to, and sometimes higher than, long-term borrowing costs, the latter are expected to fall back through 2025/26 as inflation concerns are dampened.
- 3.2 A cost of carry remained during the year on any new long-term borrowing that was not immediately used to finance capital expenditure, as it would have caused a temporary increase in cash balances; this would have incurred a revenue cost – the difference between (higher) borrowing costs and (lower) investment returns.
- 3.3 The policy of avoiding new borrowing by running down spare cash balances, has served well over the last few years. However, this was kept under review to avoid incurring higher borrowing costs in the future when this authority may not be able to avoid new borrowing to finance capital expenditure and/or the refinancing of maturing debt.
- 3.4 The Council's Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) at 31 March 2025 was £146.614m, while usable reserves and working capital which are the underlying resources available for investment were £67.764m.
- 3.5 The Council has an increasing CFR over the next 2 years of £40.1m, due to the borrowing requirement of £49.9m (GF £19.8m / HRA £30.1m) for financing the capital programme over the forecast period. The CFR reduces when Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) are made and the repayment of debt, over the forecast period there are loans due for repayment with a combined total value of £9.788m.

4.0 Borrowing Strategy

4.1 Borrowing Activity in 2024/25

	Balance 1/4/24 £m	New Borrowing £m	Debt Maturing £m	Balance 31/3/25 £m
CFR	135.658			146.614
Short Term Borrowing	7.065	4.220	-3.847	7.438
Long Term Borrowing	78.397	27.000	-3.037	102.360
Total Borrowing	85.463	31.220	-6.884	109.798
Other Liabilities – Finance Lease Liability	4.864	0.000	-0.126	4.738
Total External Debt	90.327	31.220	-7.010	114.536
Increase/(Decrease) in Borrowing £000				24.209

- 4.2 The Council's chief objective when borrowing has been to strike an appropriately low risk balance between securing low interest costs and achieving cost certainty over the period for which funds are required, with flexibility to renegotiate loans should the Authority's long-term plans change being a secondary objective.
- 4.3 The Council has an increasing CFR due to the capital programme and an estimated borrowing requirement as determined by the Liability Benchmark, which also takes into account usable reserves and working capital. Having considered the appropriate duration and structure of the Council's borrowing need based on realistic projections, it was decided not to take any long term borrowing due to the high interest rates.
- 4.4 **LOBOs:** The Council holds £3.5m of LOBO (Lender's Option Borrower's Option) loans where the lender has the option to propose an increase in the interest rate at set dates, following which the Council has the option to either accept the new rate or to repay the loan at no additional cost. All of the £3.5m of LOBOS had options during the year, none of which were exercised by the lender.
- 4.5 **Debt Rescheduling:** The premium charge for early repayment of PWLB debt remained relatively expensive for the loans in the Council's portfolio and therefore unattractive for debt rescheduling activity. No rescheduling activity was undertaken as a consequence.

5.0 Investment Activity

- 5.1 The Council's investment policy is governed by DLUHC investment guidance, which has been implemented in the annual investment strategy approved by the Council on 7 March 2024. The policy sets out the approach for choosing investment counterparties and is based on credit ratings provided by the three main credit rating agencies, supplemented by additional market data, (such as rating outlooks, credit default swaps, bank share prices etc.). During 2024/25 the Council's investment balances have ranged between £29.8m and £60.7m.

	Balance 1/4/24 £m	New Investments £m	Investments Redeemed £m	Balance 31/3/25 £m
Short Term Investments	21.910	190.205	-175.587	36.528
Long Term Investments	12.500	0.000	0.000	12.500
Total Investments	34.410	190.205	-175.587	49.028
Increase/(Decrease) in Investments £000				14.618

5.2 Security of capital remained the Council's main objective. This was maintained by following the Council's counterparty policy as set out in its Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2024/25.

5.3 Counterparty credit quality is assessed and monitored by Link the Council's treasury advisors, with reference to credit ratings; credit default swap prices, financial statements, information on potential government support and reports in the quality financial press. Link provide recommendations for suitable counterparties and maximum investment periods.

6.0 Compliance with Prudential Indicators

6.1 The Council has complied with its Prudential Indicators for 2024/25, which were set on 7 March 2024 as part of the Council's Treasury Management Strategy Statement.

6.2 **Interest Rate Exposure:** These indicators allow the Council to manage the extent to which it is exposed to changes in interest rates for both borrowing and investments. The upper limit for variable rate exposure allows for the use of variable rate debt to offset exposure to changes in short-term rates on our portfolio of investments.

	Approved Limit for 2024/25 %	Maximum during 2024/25 £m
<u>Fixed Rate</u>		
Borrowing	100%	99.38%
Investments	75%	16.32%
<i>Compliance with Limit</i>		Yes
<u>Variable Rate</u>		
Borrowing	20%	0.62%
Investments	100%	83.68%
<i>Compliance with Limit</i>		Yes

6.3 **Maturity Structure of Fixed Rate Borrowing.** This indicator is to limit large concentrations of fixed rate debt and control the Council's exposure to refinancing risk.

	Upper Limit %	Fixed Rate Borrowing 31/03/25 £m	Fixed Rate Borrowing 31/3/25 %	Compliance?
Under 12 months	15%	15.938	14.52%	Yes
12 months to 2 years	15%	3.000	2.73%	Yes
2 years to 5 years	30%	16.059	14.63%	Yes
5 years to 10 years	100%	23.936	21.80%	Yes
10 years and above	100%	50.865	46.33%	Yes

- 6.4 **Principal Sums Invested for over 364 Days.** The purpose of this indicator is to control the Council's exposure to the risk of incurring losses by seeking early repayment of its investments.

Price Risk Indicator	Limit 2024/25	Actual 31/03/25	Compliance?
Limit on principal invested beyond year end	£15m	£12.5m	Yes

- 6.5 **Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary for External Debt.** The Local Government Act 2003 requires the Council to set an Affordable Borrowing Limit, irrespective of their indebted status. This is a statutory limit which should not be breached. The Operational Boundary is based on the same estimates as the Authorised Limit but reflects the most likely, prudent but not worst case scenario without the additional headroom included within the Authorised Limit. The s151 Officer confirms that there were no breaches to the Authorised Limit and the Operational Boundary during 2024/25.

	Approved Operational Boundary 2024/25 £m	Authorised Limit 2024/25 £m	Actual External Debt 31/03/25 £m
Borrowing – incl Finance Leases	161.972	166.972	114.536
Other Long Term Liabilities	2.000	2.000	0.000
Total	163.972	168.972	114.536

- 6.6 In compliance with the requirements of the CIPFA Code of Practice this report provides members with a summary of the treasury management activity during 2024/25. A prudent approach has been taken in relation to investment activity with priority being given to security and liquidity over yield.
- 6.7 The Council also confirms that during 2024/25 it complied with its Treasury Management Policy Statement and Treasury Management Practices.

Report to: Meeting of the Full Council: 21 October 2025

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Claire Penny, Sustainable Economic Development

Director Lead: Matt Lamb, Planning & Growth

Lead Officer: Matthew Norton, Business Manager – Planning Policy & Infrastructure

Report Summary	
Report Title	Winthorpe with Langford Neighbourhood Plan Referendum
Purpose of Report	To seek the Council's approval to call the referendum for the Winthorpe with Langford Neighbourhood Plan.
Recommendations	That Council: a) note the report; and b) authorise the Chief Executive, acting as Returning Officer, to arrange the referendum for the Winthorpe with Langford Neighbourhood Plan.
Reason for Recommendation	To allow the Winthorpe with Langford Neighbourhood Plan to proceed to Referendum.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Following its Examination, the Independent Examiner has concluded that the Winthorpe with Langford Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other relevant regulatory requirements. It has therefore been recommended that the Plan proceed onto referendum.
- 1.2 Neighbourhood Plans are required to meet the Basic Conditions set out at paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as well as a range of other regulatory requirements. It is through their Examination by an Independent Examiner that final conclusions are drawn over whether this is the case. Where a Plan is successful at Examination then it is able to proceed onto Referendum, with eligible persons being able to vote over whether it should be brought into force.
- 1.3 The Winthorpe with Langford Neighbourhood Area was designated on 26 February 2021, with the first stage of public consultation being carried out in various phases between 5 June 2023 and 16 September 2023. Submission of a Draft Neighbourhood Plan to the District Council occurred in December 2024 with public consultation occurring between 8 January 2025 and 19 February 2025. The Plan was submitted for Examination in May 2025. Subject to the recommended modifications being accepted, the Examiner has concluded that the Plan should proceed onto referendum. Confirmation has been provided by the Parish Council that they are content with the recommended modifications.

2.0 Proposal/Options Considered

- 2.1 Approval is therefore sought for the referendum to be arranged for the Winthorpe with Langford Neighbourhood Plan as soon as practical. Prior to this date the referendum will be subject to a minimum, six-week publicity period. To support the referendum an Information Statement and the Notice of Referendum will be published and polling cards will be sent to all electors.
- 2.2 It is the District Council's responsibility to prepare a version of the Neighbourhood Plan incorporating any modifications from the Examiner, and it will be this version which goes to referendum. The Plan to be put referendum and its associated Examination report will be published on the District Council's website in advance of the Notice of Referendum being issued.

3.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations, officers have considered the following implications: Data Protection; Digital & Cyber Security; Equality & Diversity; Financial; Human Resources; Human Rights; Legal; Safeguarding & Sustainability and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

Financial Implications

- 3.1 The District Council will be responsible for paying for the referendums, but funds will be provided by central Government to cover the cost of this exercise.

Legal Implications - LEG2526/5358

- 3.2 This is a matter reserved to Full Council under the Council's Constitution.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Submission Winthorpe with Langford Neighbourhood Plan
Winthorpe with Langford Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report

Available at:

<https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/winthorpewithlangfordneighbourhoodplan/>

Report to: Meeting of the Full Council: 21 October 2025

Committee Chair: Councillor Rhona Holloway, Governance, General Purposes and LGR Committee

Director Lead: Sue Bearman, Assistant Director Legal & Democratic Services, Monitoring Officer

Officer Lead: Bryony Norman, Principal Legal Officer & Deputy Monitoring Officer and Lisa Ingram, Principal Legal Officer & Deputy Monitoring Officer.

Report Summary	
Report Title	Outcome of Standards Complaints Hearing Panel
Purpose of Report	To update Full Council of the outcome of the Code of Conduct Hearing held on 10 October 2025
Recommendations	That Members note the contents of the report
Reason for Recommendations	<p>All councils are required to have a local Councillor Code of Conduct to promote and maintain high standards of conduct by its Councillors. The Council's Code of Conduct is designed to protect the democratic role of Councillors, encourage good conduct and safeguard the public's trust in local government. It is based on the principles of selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership ("The Nolan Principles").</p> <p>The Council's Community Plan includes our 'Purpose and Values' to make it clear what it is we are here to do and how it will go about it – as public servants we place great emphasis on adopting a public sector ethos and seek to embody this in how we interact with residents and each other. This includes a commitment to being professional and trustworthy.</p>

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Four complaints were raised in relation to the conduct of Councillor John Lee which the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Council's Independent Person, decided warranted further investigation.
- 1.2 East Midlands Councils were commissioned in March 2025 to undertake the independent investigation. The investigation was paused for a period between mid-April and mid-May 2025 due to the County Council elections, in relation to which Councillor Lee and two of the witnesses were also candidates. East Midlands Councils produced their final report on 26 August 2025. The investigation found evidence of breach in relation to two complaints: -

- 1.2.1 Complaint Number 20241126: This complaint was made by Councillor Mike Pringle and relates to Councillor Lee's alleged conduct at a meeting of the Council's Policy & Performance Improvement Committee which took place on the evening of 25 November 2024.

The investigation concluded that Councillor Lee failed to treat two Councillors with respect and did not lead by example in a way that secures public confidence in the role of a councillor - and that as a result Councillor Lee's conduct brought the Council into disrepute.

- 1.2.2 Complaint Number 20250205: This complaint was made by Councillor Forde but also supported by the Chief Executive and relates to a 'Facebook' post published by Councillor Lee on 29 January 2025 detailing the alleged poor performance of the Council, the substance of which was repeated by Councillor Lee at a meeting of Balderton Parish Council on the same day. The investigation concluded that the information posted was entirely fictitious and therefore calculated to unfairly damage the reputation of the Council.

Accordingly, it was concluded that Councillor Lee brought the Council into disrepute through first publishing fictional information, then failing remove that information when advised to so by the Monitoring Officer, and further by repeating verbally it at a meeting of Balderton Parish Council.

- 1.3 The investigation found no evidence of breach in relation to two of the complaints. Considering this the Monitoring Officer decided to take no further action in relation to those complaints.

- 1.4 A draft of the investigation report was sent to Councillor Lee for comment on the 28 July 2025. It was made clear in the covering email that, consistent with the Council's procedure for Code of Conduct investigations, the draft report and the investigation itself should remain strictly confidential. Subsequently, the investigators were sent copies of an email written by Councillor Lee to four parish councils on the 29 July 2025 clearly referencing aspects of the draft investigation report and a Facebook post by Councillor Lee (made on or around the 29 July 2025 and subsequently removed) which does similar.

In their final report, the investigators concluded that this amounted to a further breach of the Code of Conduct by Councillor Lee; breach of confidentiality.

- 1.5 Following receipt of the final report, the Monitoring Officer, in line with the Council's Arrangements for dealing with Complaints, considered the report and was satisfied the investigation had been conducted properly. In relation to the findings of breach, the Monitoring Officer concluded, after consultation with the Independent Person, that there was evidence of a failure to comply with the Code of Conduct and that the matter should be referred to a Standards Complaint Hearing Panel. It was not considered appropriate to resolve by local informal resolution, although it was acknowledged that Councillor Lee had offered apologies and to attend Code of Conduct training. This was due to the belated nature of these actions.

- 1.6 In line with the Council's arrangements, the matter progressed to a hearing. A Standards Complaint Hearing Panel was convened on 10 October 2025 formed of Councillor Rainbow (Chair), Councillor Brazier and Councillor Shakeshaft.

2.0 Summary

- 2.1 The Panel considered the information in the report and presented at the hearing and retired to determine whether there has been a breach of the District Council's Code of Conduct by Councillor Lee.

- 2.2 Councillor Lee's legal advisor confirmed prior to the publication of this report that Councillor Lee would not be attending the hearing and would not be represented at the hearing. Instead, written submissions were submitted on 29 September 2025. Councillor Lee nor his legal advisor attended the hearing.

- 2.3 The outcome of the hearing was as follows:

2.3.1 Complaint Number 20241126:

The Panel found that there had not been a breach of the Code of Conduct in Councillor Lee's behaviour in reference to Councillor Hall.

The Panel found that there had been a breach of the Code of conduct in Councillor Lee's behaviour towards Councillor Pringle but that his conduct did not reach the threshold to bring his Office or the Council into disrepute.

2.3.2 Complaint Number 20250205:

The Panel found that there had been a breach of the Code of Conduct in the social media post about the performance of the Council, the information contained within the post was incorrect and this information was further supported at a meeting of Balderton Parish Council and Councillor Lee refused to remove the post on request of the Monitoring Officer. This information unfairly damaged the reputation of the Council and brought the Council into disrepute.

2.3.3 Further complaint:

The Panel found that there had been a breach of the Code of Conduct by breaching confidentiality when he shared parts of the confidential draft investigation report online and by email to four Parish Councils.

2.4 Sanctions:

2.4.1 The Panel imposed the following sanctions:

- The Panel determined that Councillor Lee should attend training in relation to the Code of Conduct which should include training on the use of social media and confidentiality.
- The Panel determined that their findings should be reported to Council.

2.5 A copy of the decision notice is attached as an **Appendix** to the report.

3.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations, officers have considered the following implications: Data Protection; Digital & Cyber Security; Equality & Diversity; Financial; Human Resources; Human Rights; Legal; Safeguarding & Sustainability and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

Legal Implications - LEG2526/7289

- 3.1 Code of Conduct complaints must be dealt with in accordance with the Council's Approved Arrangements for Dealing with Complaints made under s.28 (6) Localism Act 2011. This is being reported to Members at Full Council at the request of the Panel Members.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Standards Complaints Hearing Panel – 10 October 2025 Agenda and Hearing Recording
<https://democracy.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=316&MId=1224>

Decision Notice: Breach of Newark & Sherwood District Council Code of Conduct

Complaint

On 10 October 2025, the Standards Complaints Hearing Panel (“the Panel”) sat at Newark & Sherwood District Council to determine three complaints regarding alleged breaches of the Newark & Sherwood District Council Member Code of Conduct (“the Code”) by District Councillor John Lee (“the Subject Member”).

The complaint had been referred for investigation by the Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Independent Person. In March 2025 independent investigators were appointed from East Midlands Councils (“the Investigator”). The investigation concluded that the Subject Member had breached the following paragraphs of the Code:

7.

1. Respect

As a Councillor you should

- 1.1 treat other councillors and members of the public with respect.

4. Confidentiality and Access to Information

As a Councillor you should:

4.1 not disclose information:

- a) given to you in confidence by anyone
- b) acquired by you which you believe, or ought reasonably to be aware, is of a confidential nature, unless:
 - i. you have received the consent of the person authorised to give it;
 - ii. you are required by law to do so;
 - iii. the disclosure is made to a third party for the purpose of obtaining professional legal advice provided that the third party agrees not to disclose the information to any other person; or
 - iv. the disclosure is:
 - reasonable and in the public interest; and
 - made in good faith and in compliance with the reasonable requirements of the local authority; and
 - you have consulted the Monitoring Officer prior to its release.

5. Disrepute

As a Councillor you should:

- 4.2 not bring your role or the local authority into disrepute.

Having considered the Investigator’s report and consulting with the Independent Person, the Monitoring Officer referred the matter for a local hearing. It was not considered appropriate to resolve by local resolution, although it was acknowledged that the Subject Member had offered apologies and to attend training, it was considered to be a belated offer.

The Panel, sitting on 10 October considered the following information:

- Report of the Monitoring officer
- Council's Arrangements for dealing with Code of Conduct Complaints
- Code of Conduct
- Hearing Procedure
- Investigator's report
- Schedule of Evidence
- Representations from the Subject Member's representative
- Local Government Association's Guidance on the Code of Conduct

During the hearing, the Panel heard from the following:

- Andrew Pritchard and Samantha Maher – the Investigators

The Complainant did not attend the hearing.

The Panel were advised by Francesca Whyley (legal officer) and heard the views of the Independent Person.

Full details of the complaints were set out in the agenda papers, in summary, the complainants alleged:

- 1) *On 25 November 2024 at a meeting of the Council's Policy & Performance Improvement Committee (PPIC) the Subject Member demonstrated a lack of respect to Councillor's Hall (not present at the Committee) and Pringle (Chair of the Committee) and in so doing, did not lead by example in a way which secured public confidence in the role of a councillor – and that as a result the Subject Member's conduct brought the Council into disrepute.*
- 2) *The Subject Member posted comments on the Johnno Lee facebook page on 29 January 2025 which he referenced at a meeting of Balderton Parish Council also on 29 January. The comments set out 10 specific service failures of Newark & Sherwood District Council which the Subject Member indicated were quoted from the Q2 Performance Report 2024/25. The Subject Member then clarified to the Monitoring Officer that the comments came from an LGA Corporate Peer Challenge report then that they came from both reports. It was alleged that the comments were not in fact taken from either report and were not factually correct. The posting and referencing of the comments by the Subject Member on 29 January 2025 therefore brought the Council into disrepute.*
- 3) *A draft copy of the investigation report was shared with the Subject member on 28 July 2025 inviting his comments. The Subject Member was advised the report was strictly confidential in line with the Council's procedure for dealing with investigations. Subsequently an email was sent by the Subject Member to four parish Councillors on 29 July referencing aspects of the draft investigation report and a facebook post the same day made by the Subject Member, also referenced the same comments. This is alleged to be a breach of confidence.*

Decision

In accordance with Sections 28 (6) and (7) of the Localism Act 2011, having carefully considered the allegation in accordance with the Council's Arrangements for Dealing with Complaints about breach of the Code of Conduct, having considered all the information before them and in consultation with the Independent Person, the Panel determined that the Subject Member had breached paragraphs 1, 4 and 5 of the Code. In that he had showed disrespect towards Councillor Pringle on 25 November 2025, he had, by posting comments on 29 January 2025 and reiterating those comments at a parish meeting brought the Council into disrepute and finally that the Subject Member had, by disclosing information from the draft investigation report on 29 July 2025 breached confidentiality.

The Panel did not find that the Subject Member had shown disrespect towards Councillor Hall on 25 November 2025, nor did they find that his actions on 25 November brought his role or the Council into disrepute.

Reasons for Decision

Section 27(2) of the Localism Act 2011 requires all relevant authorities to "adopt a code dealing with the conduct that is expected of members and co-opted members of the authority when they are acting in that capacity."

Newark & Sherwood District Council has adopted such a Code of Conduct which reflects this and states:

- 4.3 This Code of Conduct applies to you when you are acting in your capacity as a councillor which may include when your actions give the impression to a reasonable member of the public with knowledge of all the facts that you are acting as a councillor.

The Panel accepted that on 25 November 2024 when the Subject Member spoke at the PPIC he was acting as a Councillor, and the Code was engaged.

The Panel determined that the posts on 29 January 2025 on the Johnno Lee facebook page, related to Council activities and as such the Code was engaged. The Panel were aware that some of the content of the facebook page may be handled by administrators but ultimately the page was in the Subject Member's name, and he was ultimately responsible for the postings. Similarly, when on 29 January 2025 he attended a meeting of the Balderton Parish Council, the Subject Member was attending in his capacity as a District Councillor, and the Code was engaged.

Finally, when the Subject Member received the draft investigation report, it specifically related to his role as a Councillor, he then contacted parish councillors and posted on his facebook page about that report which directly related to his role as a Councillor. The Code was therefore engaged.

The Panel considered the matter extremely carefully and came to the following conclusions:

In relation to alleged disrespect towards Councillor Hall at the meeting on 25 November 2024 the Panel considered all the information provided and the representations of the Subject Member Councillor Lee and watched the video footage of the meeting in the retiring room. On balance, whilst the Panel felt the quoting of Councillor Hall's post to be unnecessary, and politically motivated, it did not find on balance that the threshold for disrespect towards Councillor Hall was met.

In relation to alleged disrespect shown towards Councillor Pringle, the Chair of PPIC, on 25 November 2024, the Panel considered all the information and watched the video a number of times. The Panel considered the Subject Member's Article 10 right to freedom of expression and his right to robustly express his views in a political forum. On balance, however, the Panel found that the Subject Member's behaviour towards the Chair, Councillor Pringle did cross the threshold for disrespect.

The Chair of the Committee exercised his discretion in allowing the Subject Member to speak at the Committee as he was not a committee member. Once speaking Councillor Lee was overly assertive in his views, took the opportunity to make lengthy statements when asked by the Chair to state his question and walked out of the meeting mid discussion, still addressing the room as he left which was unprofessional and petulant. The Panel considered carefully whether the threshold for disrespect had been reached. On balance, the Panel determined that the Subject Member, in his behaviour specifically toward the Chair demonstrated disrespect. His actions and demeanour towards the Chair were rude, especially as the Chair had shown goodwill in allowing him to speak. PPIC is not a decision-making body but a scrutiny committee as such the Subject Member's conduct was unnecessary and disrespectful to the Chair.

The Panel considered whether the Subject Member's conduct at the meeting brought his office or the Council into disrepute. Whilst the Panel have determined that disrespect was shown towards Councillor Pringle as the Chair, the Panel did not find, on balance, that this brought the Subject Member's office or the Council into disrepute as it did not undermine necessarily the public's confidence in the Subject Member to undertake his role. It was however not the standard of behaviour the Panel would expect from Councillors.

In relation to the second complaint, the Panel considered the information before them and the posts and public comments made by the Subject Member about the performance of the Council on 29 January 2025. The Panel considered the Subject Member's Article 10 rights and his right to provide comments on matters of public interest such as the performance of the Council, however they determined that where negative comments are made publicly and expressed as fact, this will undoubtedly have an impact on the reputation of the Council and reflect badly on the ability of the Council to effectively perform its functions, which will impact the public's confidence in the organisation.

The Panel determined that whilst it is acceptable for Councillors to comment on performance, the comments made by the Subject Member which he claimed were referenced from the Performance Report for Q2 2024/25 and the Peer Review Performance Report have been considered and there is no correlation to the comments the Subject

Member made and the content of the reports. As such, the Panel found that the comments posted by the Subject Member were unfounded, had no factual basis and as such the posting of the comments brought the Authority into disrepute. The Panel felt that as the owner of the facebook page the Subject Member had overall responsibility to ensure accuracy of what was reported, and he continued to claim that the comments were from within the two reports previously mentioned which was not the case. Even when advised to remove the posts due to inaccuracy by the Monitoring Officer, the Subject Member did not remove them.

Finally, in relation to the third complaint in respect of confidentiality, the Panel considered the email to parish councillors and the post on facebook made by the Subject Member on 29 July 2025 in which he referenced the content of the draft Code of Conduct Investigation report. The Panel considered the guidance in relation to confidentiality. Investigations into the Code of Conduct are kept confidential at the investigation stage, the Subject Member, Councillor Lee was aware of that from the cover email he received in relation to the report and the Council's own arrangements for dealing with complaints. The Subject Member has referenced the reports in public, and he should not have done so as he was aware the information was confidential. The Panel therefore found that the Subject Member had breached the code of conduct by failing to maintain confidentiality.

Sanctions

Having determined that the Code had been breached by the Subject Member, the Panel sought representations from the Investigating Officer in relation to sanctions that the Panel may impose. The Panel also sought the views of the Independent Person.

The Panel considered the sanctions available to them under the Council's Arrangements for dealing with Code of Conduct Complaints. The Panel recognised that there had been efforts by the Subject Member to apologise to Councillor Pringle and took this into account as mitigation when considering appropriate sanctions.

The Panel also recognised that it had been some time since the Subject Member had attended training in relation to the Code of Conduct and that his actions demonstrated a lack of understanding in relation to the appropriate use of social media.

The Panel imposed the following sanctions:

- The Panel determined that the Subject Member should attend training in relation to the Code of Conduct which should include training on the use of social media and confidentiality.
- The Panel determined that their findings should be reported to Council.

Please note, there is no right of appeal against a decision of the Hearing Panel. If the Complainant feels the Council have failed to deal with the complaint properly, he/she may complain to the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman PO Box 4771, Coventry, CV4 0EH.

NOTICE OF MOTION FOR FULL COUNCIL

See [Part D of the Council's Constitution – Council Procedure Rules](#) – for the rules on motions

Title of Motion:	To request that officers explore the feasibility and implications of the introduction of Article 4 Directions within urban areas of Newark and Sherwood (Under the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015)
Date of Council meeting:	21 October 2025
Proposer of Motion: (Name, and signature if hard copy submitted)	Councillor John Lee
Seconder of Motion: (Name, and signature if hard copy submitted)	Councillor Matthew Spoors

Background/supporting information (maximum 300 words):

Article 4 Directions remove the national permitted development rights in a specific area of a town or district. Generally, they are intended to protect unacceptable impacts of unchecked development that will adversely affect local amenity or the well-being of the area. Most recently councils in cities such as Bristol, Nottingham and York, have used these powers to manage and regulate growth of housing developments which may have left residents vulnerable to the impacts of over-concentration of certain housing types that would have reduced housing affordability, for residents, students and minority groups. The measures also took into consideration issues such as parking pressures, and increased waste.

These measures have protected community cohesion and allowed strong integration and cooperation between the different ethnic and socio-economic groups that have been welcomed into these areas. They have proven to be effective, lawful, and necessary in ensuring local housing remains accessible and affordable while giving councils greater control over planning decisions.

Whilst Newark and Sherwood has had few issues to date with an over-supply of any one type of housing, as the expansion of our housing stock increases and the demographics of our communities alters, we should be mindful of allowing this council the opportunity to robustly regulate our housing stock to ensure that it is appropriate for current residents as well as welcoming to those that join our communities.

By exploring the options now, we will be better prepared for future change.

Motion to be proposed (active section):

This Council therefore resolves to:

- Establish a working group through the Policy Performance & Improvement Committee to assess the current and future impact of the permitted development allowing change of use from a dwelling house (C3) to a House of Multiple Occupation (C4) at all conurbations across our district.
- The working group should consider the impact of HMOs on our communities including (but not limited to) housing affordability, community balance, infrastructure and planning enforcement.
- The working group should present through the Policy Performance & Improvement Committee to Cabinet recommendations regarding the principles of issuing Article 4 Directions.

d) Subject to any view of Cabinet any Article 4 Directions be referred to the Planning Committee for progression.

Date and time received:

(for completion by Democratic Services)

24 September 2025 - 18:59

NOTICE OF MOTION FOR FULL COUNCIL

See [Part D of the Council's Constitution – Council Procedure Rules](#) – for the rules on motions

Title of Motion:	Marie Curie Campaign for a Council Tax Exemption for the Terminally Ill
Date of Council meeting:	21 October 2025
Proposer of Motion: (Name, and signature if hard copy submitted)	Councillor Jean Hall
Seconder of Motion: (Name, and signature if hard copy submitted)	Councillor Paul Peacock
Background/supporting information (maximum 300 words):	
<p>Newark & Sherwood District Council notes the research undertaken by Marie Curie Cancer Care into the cost of living and the additional financial burden faced by those with a terminal illness. Newark & Sherwood District Council believes that people at the end of life should be able to focus on what really matters, but as life is often more expensive when you live with a terminal diagnosis, too many people are spending their final days, weeks and months struggling to make ends meet.</p>	
Motion to be proposed (active section):	
<p>Newark & Sherwood District Council therefore resolves to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Support the Marie Curie campaign for a Council Tax Exemption for the Terminally Ill.b) Congratulate Manchester City Council on becoming the first council to implement such a scheme for their local residents.c) Establish a PPIC working group to consider the development of an appropriate policy for Council Tax Exemption for those with a terminal illness, or a partner or family member within the same household, as part of the local tax reduction scheme. PPIC to make recommendations to Cabinet to adopt a formal policy if appropriate.d) Write to other Nottinghamshire Local Authorities to ask that they support the Marie Curie campaign for a Council Tax Exemption for the terminally ill.	
Date and time received: (for completion by Democratic Services)	25 September 2025 - 12:39