

NEWARK AND SHERWOOD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of **Planning Committee** held in the Civic Suite, Castle House, Great North Road, Newark, NG24 1BY on Thursday, 13 November 2025 at 4.00 pm.

PRESENT: Councillor A Freeman (Chair)

Councillor C Brooks, Councillor L Dales, Councillor S Forde, Councillor P Harris, Councillor K Melton, Councillor P Rainbow, Councillor S Saddington, Councillor M Shakeshaft, Councillor L Tift and Councillor T Wildgust

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor N Allen

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor D Moore (Vice-Chair) and Councillor T Smith

61 NOTIFICATION TO THOSE PRESENT THAT THE MEETING WILL BE RECORDED AND STREAMED ONLINE

The Chair informed the Committee that the Council was undertaking an audio recording of the meeting and that it was being live streamed.

62 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

Councillors L Dales, A Freeman and K Melton declared an other registrable interest for any relevant items, as they were appointed representatives on the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board.

Councillor M Shakeshaft declared he was pre-determined regarding application No. 24/01338/FUL – Former Winner City Cantonese Restaurant, White Post, Farnsfield, as he was the Chair of Planning Committee for Farnsfield Parish Council where this item had been discussed and voted on. He would leave the meeting for the duration of that item.

63 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 2 OCTOBER 2025

AGREED that the minutes from the meeting held on 2 October 2025 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

64 LAND TO THE SOUTH EAST OF BULLPIT ROAD, BALDERTON, NEWARK ON TRENT, NG24 3NA - 25/00805/FULM

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the change of use of land to a traveller site including ancillary hardstanding.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the following reasons:

- (i) There were particular site factors which were significant in terms of the weight attached to them relative to other factors if they would be difficult to assess in the absence of a site inspection;
- (ii) There were specific site factors and/or significant policy or precedent implications that needed to be carefully addressed; and
- (iii) The proposal was particularly contentious, and the aspects being raised could only be viewed on site.

Councillor J Hall, Balderton Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Mrs A Simmonds, the Agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor J Lee, Local Ward Member, spoke against the application.

Members considered the presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development. Members were also informed of an error in the wording of Informative No. 5, which should read “Bullpit Road” and not Great North Road, which would be amended should the Planning Committee be minded to approve the application.

Members considered the application and it was commented that some of the objections raised were valid but that some within the report were unacceptable and not well phrased. The noise objection was considered hard to accept given the high-speed railway line running parallel to the site, which was loud. Members commented on the need for traveller sites although concern was raised regarding the close proximity to the railway line, especially with children playing and that the site was in the open countryside. The Highways objection, although technical also raised concern for Members. It was suggested that a footpath be included on the roadside to connect the site with the footpath at the railway crossing. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that this could be achieved through a Grampian condition. Members further commented that this was not an allocated site and did erode the open break between Newark and Balderton and there was no landscaping as included on the plan.

A Member sought clarification as to whether this application was consistent with the procedure for other applications and whether the application would have been treated differently if not retrospective. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the application would have been treated the same. Members debated the requirements of Bio-diversity net gain (BNG) and that given that the application was retrospective that did not have to be considered. Members raised their concerns regarding this rule and felt that the application therefore had not been treated the same. It was considered that this would encourage further retrospective applications coming forward as this would be a loophole for applicants. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that legislation stated that retrospective applications do not have to provide BNG as the mandatory condition for BNG was a pre-commencement one.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed in response to Members questions that the correct consultation process had been undertaken. The Highways, technical problems had been addressed through condition. The cumulative impact for the three sites

was, Chestnut Lodge – 19 pitches, Winthorpe – 16 pitches and Appleby – 16 pitches, these were considered small sites given the small number of pitches. In terms of waste disposal, four plots shared a septic tank, the remaining six plots had their own septic tanks. The Highways objection maintained that the visibility splays did fall short, however Highways recent comments were that although the splays had been drawn short, the correct visibility could be achieved. The lack of footpath could be achieved through a Grampian condition and soft landscaping could also be conditioned.

The Planning Committee Chair commented that the site was surround by tall fencing, there was therefore no risk to children wondering onto the railway line, as raised as a concern in the debate.

A vote was taken and lost to defer the application, with 3 votes For and 7 votes Against.

AGREED (with 6 votes For and 5 votes Against) that Planning Permission be approved subject to the conditions, as contained within the report and additional conditions including Grampian condition for a footpath and sensitive landscaping, the wording of the additional conditions to be delegated to the Business Manager – Planning Development.

A recorded vote was moved and seconded as follows:

Councillor	Vote
C Brooks	For
L Dales	Against
S Forde	Against
A Freeman	For
P Harris	For
K Melton	For
P Rainbow	For
S Saddington	Against
M Shakeshaft	Against
L Tift	Against
T Wildgust	For

Councillor M Shakeshaft declared he was pre-determined and left the meeting for the duration of the following item, including the discussion and vote.

65 FORMER WINNER CITY CANTONESE RESTAURANT, WHITE POST, FARNSFIELD, NG22 8JD - 24/01338/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the demolition of the existing building and structures and construction of two Drive-Thru units (Class E/Sui Generis Hot Food Takeaway) with cycle and car parking, alterations to vehicular access, refuse storage, landscaping, and associated works.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for

Members, for the following reasons:

- (i) There were particular site factors which were significant in terms of the weight attached to them relative to other factors if they would be difficult to assess in the absence of a site inspection;
- (ii) There were specific site factors and/or significant policy or precedent implications that needed to be carefully addressed; and
- (iii) The proposal was particularly contentious, and the aspects being raised could only be viewed on site.

Mr Blakey, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

Members considered the application and expressed concern regarding the amount of rubbish this proposal may generate, as customers may not discard their used takeaway rubbish correctly, littering hedge rows and neighbouring villages. The proposed buildings were considered in keeping with their brands but were uninspiring in design. Concerns were raised regarding the traffic using the busy A614 which would further increase traffic problems in this locality. The right hand turn out of the premises car park also presented concern to a majority of Members. Members debated the officer clarifications from the Highway Authority, noting concern that restricting a right hand turn might cause stacking problems at the roundabout.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that there would be a parking management plan and travel plan secured by condition, which could include a restriction of the time spent in the car park.

AGREED (with 9 votes For and 1 vote Against) that Planning Permission be approved subject to the conditions contained within the report and a s106 agreement.

Councillor M Shakeshaft returned to the meeting at this point.

66 LAND AT MANOR FARM, SAND LANE, SPALFORD, NEWARK ON TRENT, NG23 7HF - 25/00222/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the demolition of existing agricultural buildings. Erection of 5 new dwellings, detached garages, associated surfacing and boundary treatments.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the following reasons:

- (i) There were particular site factors which were significant in terms of the weight attached to them relative to other factors if they would be difficult to assess in the absence of a site inspection; and

- (ii) There were specific site factors and/or significant policy or precedent implications that needed to be carefully addressed.

Mr J McArthur, Spalford Parish Meeting Chair, spoke against the application.

Members considered the presentation from the Business Manager – Planning Development, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development

The Planning Committee Chair indicated that the meeting duration had expired therefore a motion was moved by the Chair and agreed by Members to continue the meeting for a further hour.

Members considered the application, and the Ward Member commented that she would have preferred the original scheme, which had more affordable homes, as they would be more in keeping with the site. Some Members felt that the new builds would be a better solution than barn conversions, providing better insulated and quality houses and would improve what was currently in situ. Other Members considered the proposal as a housing development and out of character. Some weight was given to the legitimate class Q fallback and titled balance, despite concerns about the scale of new houses and impact on the hamlet.

AGREED (with 7 votes For and 3 votes Against) that Planning Permission be approved subject to the conditions contained within the report.

Councillor Mrs Saddington left the meeting during the presentation of this item.

67 LAND AT WILLOW HALL FARM MANSFIELD ROAD EDINGLEY NG22 8BQ - 25/01492/PIP

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought in principle a residential development of one dwelling.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the following reasons:

- (i) There were particular site factors which were significant in terms of the weight attached to them relative to other factors if they would be difficult to assess in the absence of a site inspection; and
- (ii) There were specific site factors and/or significant policy or precedent implications that needed to be carefully addressed.

Mr A Northcote, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the presentation from the Business Manager – Planning Development, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development. The report included commentary on the principle of development, site constraints (including flood risk, ecology and open countryside location) and the legal process for determining Permission in Principle.

Members considered the application acceptable as the planning in principle was for one residential dwelling which would be set back from the road but not isolated from

the village. Members debated the Local Plan position in regard to countryside policies, alongside the specific site factors and the previous appeal decision. One Member remained concerned about the impact on countryside. The importance of securing a good quality design at technical submission stage was indicated.

AGREED (with 9 votes For and 1 vote Against) that Planning Permission in principle be approved.

68 KENNELS FARM, MAY LODGE DRIVE, RUFFORD - 25/00961/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought a residential redevelopment of a former poultry complex comprising the construction of 1no. dwelling and ancillary accommodation.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the following reasons:

- (i) There were particular site factors which were significant in terms of the weight attached to them relative to other factors if they would be difficult to assess in the absence of a site inspection; and
- (ii) There were specific site factors and/or significant policy or precedent implications that needed to be carefully addressed.

Mr Baseley, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the presentation from the Planning Officer, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

Members discussed the location of the site, the fallback position and the merits of the design scheme. Members considered this an exceptional development.

AGREED (unanimously) that Planning Permission be approved subject to the conditions contained within the report.

Councillor T Wildgust left the meeting during the Officers presentation.

The Planning Committee Chair indicated that the meeting duration of an additional hour had expired therefore a motion was moved by the Chair and agreed by Members to continue the meeting for a further hour.

69 APPEALS LODGED

AGREED that the report be noted.

70 APPEALS DETERMINED

Members were informed that the Planning Inspectorate had dismissed the Weston appeal and that the Flaggs Farm, Caunton appeal had been allowed by the Planning Inspectorate, this was a Planning Committee overturn. Feedback on the recent solar Inquiry was also discussed.

AGREED that the report be noted.

71 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE REPORT

The Committee considered the report of the Director for Planning & Growth relating to the performance of the Planning Development Business Unit over the three-month period July to September 2025 (Quarter 2). Performance had continued to be met and exceeded, despite challenges within and without the organisation.

The Planning Department undertook a range of activities including the processing of planning applications and associated appeals, planning enforcement, conservation and listed building advice, tree applications, pre-application advice as well as other service areas including land charges, street naming and numbering and management of the building control service for the Council. The report related to the planning functions of the service area.

The Planning Committee Chair thanked the Business Manager – Planning Development and the Development Control team for their work.

AGREED that the report be noted.

72 QUARTERLY PLANNING ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY UPDATE REPORT

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development updating Members as to the activity and performance of the planning enforcement function over the fourth quarter of the current financial year.

The report provided Members with examples of cases that had been resolved, both through negotiation and via the service of notices and provided detailed and explanations of notices that had been issued during the period covered 1 July 2025 – 30 September 2025.

The Planning Committee Chair expressed his thanks to the Enforcement Team for their commitment and hard work.

AGREED that the contents of the report and the ongoing work of the planning enforcement team be noted.

Meeting closed at 8.35 pm.

Chair