

NEWARK & SHERWOOD DISTRICT COUNCIL
LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE

RECORD OF HEARING HELD ON
MONDAY, 22 SEPTEMBER 2025
10:00 HOURS

MEETING HELD AT
CASTLE HOUSE, GREAT NORTH ROAD, NEWARK NG24 1BY

HEARING TO CONSIDER AN APPLICATION FOR THE GRANT OF A
PREMISE LICENCE

THE FISHING LODGE
MAYTHORNE
SOUTHWELL
NG25 0RS

SUB-COMMITTEE:
(The Panel) Councillor Sylvia Michael (Chair)
Councillor Neil Allen
Councillor David Moore

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Lisa Ingram (Legal Advisor to the Panel– NSDC)
Narelle Plowright (Senior Licensing Officer – NSDC)

Applicant:

Sarah Elliott
Pirie Scott (in support of applicant)

Objectors:

Duncan Sedgewick
Corriane Bunting
Linda Atkinson
Angela Spowage (in support of objectors)
Jane Reay (in support of objectors)

Observers

Damian Wilkins (Environmental Health & Licensing Manager – NSDC)
Tony Dennis (Licensing Enforcement Officer – NSDC)
Eleanor Woolner (Law & Information Governance Apprentice – NSDC)
Steve Carr (Licensing Officer – Nottinghamshire Police)

Prior to the commencement of the Hearing, the Legal Advisor advised of the advice she had given to the Panel. The Hearing was to be based on real evidence together with responses from the Responsible Authorities.

The Legal Advisor also stated that Pirie Scott, who was in attendance in support of the Applicant, was known to her socially through participation at a sporting club.

Presentation by the Senior Licensing Officer

The Senior Licensing Officer presented to the Panel details of the application for the grant of a Premise Licence in respect of The Fishing Lodge, Maythorne, Southwell NG25 0RS. The report before the Panel presented Members with the reason for the hearing, noting that a total of 12 relevant representations had been received, which were attached at appendices to the report. It was also reported that the Applicant had withdrawn the request for live and recorded music from the application.

Applicant's Case

The Applicant, Sarah Elliott, advised the Panel that she was a local businesswoman who had held a Premise Licence for a different premise for a period of 20 years. She had taken over the lease of The Fishing Lodge, Maythorne (formerly known as All Mine Cakes by the Lake). The premise was to be a food focus business and alcohol to be served with meals. Ms Ellis stated that she had followed all protocols and had personally met with all the Objectors at the premise, if requested. She wanted to open a restaurant and considered it would be good for the community and would be an asset to the town and would create employment. Despite the number of objections, there had also been support for the venture.

Questions to the Applicant

Duncan Sedgewick sought clarification on a number of points as follows:

When had the application had been made;
What was the length of the consultation period;
What were the opening hours at the premise;
Could people attend the premise just for a drink;
What was the number of covers;
What time was food to be served until;
How many days a week would the premise be open;
Did the Applicant consider that her communication with objectors had been sufficient.

In response to the queries, the Senior Licensing Officer confirmed that the completed application had been received on 31 July 2025 and that the consultation period lasted for 28 days. She added that Regulation 25 of the Licensing Act 2003 provided information as to the requirements for the displaying of notices.

Ms Ellis advised that the application was until 23:00 hours to provide flexibility to remain open if required. The premise was to be for a food focus business and that the number of covers was for 26 internally with 20 to 30 externally and that the intention was to serve food until 20:30 hours. The premise was to trade 5 days a week but added that she could not guarantee that it would not be more. In relation to effective communication, Ms Ellis stated that she had instigated the meeting held with objectors and that she had followed all protocols, as far as she was aware.

Councillor Allen queried as to the arrangements for sharing the car park with the fishing club. Ms Ellis confirmed she had control of the car park and that the fisherman could have use of the overspill car park at the rear.

Councillor Moore sought clarity in relation to the serving of alcohol on and off the premises; the fire safety assessment; and where Ms Ellis' existing Premise Licence was for.

In response, Ms Ellis advised that the off-sales of alcohol was for consumption on the balcony area; the fire safety assessment had been carried out by Pace Fire; and that the existing Premise Licence was for the Deli in Southwell. She added that she was also a farmer and reared her own cattle for beef and milk and intended to use this produce in the restaurant.

The Legal Advisor raised a number of queries in relation to: licenses held elsewhere; whether any enforcement actions had been taken against these; clarity on the external sales (off-sales); would parties or weddings be hosted; if an 'event' was held would tables be removed to increase capacity; management of customers driving to and from the premises; whether taxi recommendations had been considered for customers who had not driven.

In response, Ms Ellis advised that she held both a Personal and Premise Licence at the Deli in Southwell and that she had not been subject to any enforcement action. She confirmed that external sales were solely for consumption on the decked area at the premise. She also confirmed that the premise would not host events, but should someone wish to book tables for a birthday party that would be accepted but that she would not provide catering for outside events, adding that it was a food focus premises/restaurant and not an exclusive hire venue and that customers wishing to have a drink only would not be encouraged. In relation to customers driving, she stated that full signage would be installed but noted that there was a public footpath outside. The car park was large and that she believed there was existing signage advising drivers that there was a left turn only when exiting. She noted that the road to the premise was busy and that there were a number of existing businesses together with walkers who parking on the road and that it was her intention to effectively manage the premise car park.

Objectors' Case

Mr Sedgwick advised that he was speaking on behalf of residents of Maythorne who he had spoken to. He stated that Maythorne was a small hamlet and that residents had moved there for peace and tranquillity. The concern arising from the application was for the increase in traffic, albeit there was acknowledgement of the existing businesses in the vicinity. Mr. Sedgewick advised that the previous business of the All Mine Cakes by the Lake had tempered their hours to allay the concerns of the residents. He noted that the road to the premise was a single track with a speed limit of 60mph. He queried how this would be managed, noting that the track crossed over the Southwell Trail.

In referring to the 23:00 hours late opening, he noted that staff would be leaving later than that and the potential for an increase in disturbance.

Mr. Sedgewick acknowledged the business generated at the Applicant's premise in Southwell, stating that this would create an issue if it was replicated in Maythorne. He advised that it was pleasing to see that the application had been amended to remove the request for live and recorded music.

Mr. Sedgewick stated that residents' main objection was to the late-night opening and the potential for nuisance as 23:00 hours was too late and would impact on Maythorne's residents, adding that it would be better if the hours were reduced. He noted that there were other restaurants in the area that closed at 22:00 hours.

Corriane Bunting referred to the roads around the premise, noting that they were 'pitch black' with no lighting at all. She also referred to the previous business of All Mine Cakes stating that they adhered to strict rules in relation to their opening hours. The concern residents had was in relation to the hours applied for. She stated that a suggestion had been made that the restaurant be used for dining only but that this had not fitted into Ms Elliott's business plan.

Ms Bunting referred to the likely volume of cars and the noise therefrom e.g. doors slamming etc. She stated that the whole experience of living in Maythorne would be changed, especially in the evenings. She suggested that the business should be for diners only with an earlier finish time.

Questions to the Objectors

Ms Elliott advised that she was not aware of the restrictions imposed on All Mine Cakes. Mr. Sedgewick advised that they were self-imposed restrictions.

In referring to comments made about the opening hours of other business in the vicinity, Ms Elliott stated that it was not her experience that they only worked during the day and that reducing her operational hours would not work.

In response to whether the objectors thought that touring caravans did not create traffic, Mr. Sedgewick stated that they did not impact on the village, adding that they appeared to be respectful of the environment. He commented that sometimes this was not the case with hikers. He acknowledged that it was a public footpath but that it was usually well managed.

Ms Elliott queried whether the objectors thought that the car park at the premises was not sufficient. Mr. Sedgewick advised that dog walkers parked on the road for approximately 30 minutes. He agreed that the car park should be big enough but that it had been blocked on previous occasions. Residents would not wish to see that happen again, noting that if the premise was busy, it could impact on the village.

Ms Elliott sought clarity on what the objectors were seeking respite from. Mr. Sedgewick advised that it was from drivers using the village to turn their cars around in, acknowledging that this was mainly dog walkers. He stated that even with the overspill parking, there was potential for parking issues.

Councillor Moore commented that he understood the concerns with the issues of parking on the lane. He stated that the car park could easily accommodate 30 cars. Mr. Sedgewick responded that there may be fishermen also using the car park and not just those visiting the restaurant.

Councillor Moore advised that concerns with parking, lighting and speed limits on public roads were all issues for Nottinghamshire County Council and did not form part of the licensing application.

In relation to the opening hours applied for, Councillor Moore queried as to why the objectors believed it would be a problem, especially mid-week. He queried as to where the evidence was for that and not just the opinion that it would be an issue. Mr. Sedgewick confirmed that the objection was that there could be a problem.

In acknowledging that Maythorne was a small hamlet, Councillor Allen noted that there were 32 businesses operating and queried whether any of them had restrictions on their opening hours. He also sought further clarity on why the objectors felt that a closing time of 23:00 hours was unreasonable. In response, Mr. Sedgewick advised that the concern was for noise pollution, citing that the Waggon & Horses at Halam closed at 22:00 hours which lessened the impact. He added that the existing businesses were not part of the hamlet and did not impact of residents.

Councillor Michael queried when issues with traffic were envisaged. Mr. Sedgewick advised that All My Cakes had experienced some congestion during the daytime. He added that issues at night would be more so from noise. He acknowledged that the existing businesses also created noise from deliveries, but this occurred before the farm and houses in the hamlet and were much further away.

Councillor Michael queried whether any noise could be heard from the farm or the garage. Mr Sedgewick advised that work on the farm could be heard during the day but no noise could be heard from the garage. He added that deliveries to the premise would add to the potential problem.

The Legal Advisor to the Panel sought to clarify the main issue, that of late hours and the noise therefrom. Mr. Sedgewick confirmed that to be the case, noise from people leaving the premises. He added that the car park had a gravel surface which made a noise when walked or driven on and that all the potential issues needed consideration.

Summaries

Objectors

Mr. Sedgewick advised that the statements already made covered the main issues and concerns of the objectors. There was an appreciation that the application was Ms Elliotts livelihood. He added that residents were happy for the business to be there but for dining only and with reduced hours.

Applicant

Ms Elliott stated that The Fishing Lodge was to be a sustainable food led business. She considered herself to be a responsible person and that no objection had been received from the Police or Responsible Authorities to the application submitted and she had withdrawn the request for live and recorded music, resulting in 3 objections being withdrawn. She acknowledged the comments made in relation to the traffic flow and who this was created by. It was her belief that the car park was sufficient to accommodate the premise and its customers Ms Elliott stated she was proud of her sustainable farming offering customer a 'field to fork' choice. Her produce was all traceable which she considered to be important as was the protection of wildlife and its habitat. She added that she was working in conjunction with the fishermen and the farmers and that her business would support the local economy and lead to employment. It was her belief that the business would not be detrimental to the residents of Maythorne.

Decision

The Panel granted the licence as amended by the applicant (removing live and recorded music) and with the conditions as agreed with the Police.