

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, 15 January 2026 at 4.00 pm.

PRESENT: Councillor A Freeman (Chair)
Councillor D Moore (Vice-Chair)

Councillor C Brooks, Councillor L Dales, Councillor P Harris, Councillor P Rainbow, Councillor S Saddington, Councillor M Shakeshaft, Councillor T Smith, Councillor T Wildgust, Councillor M Home and Councillor M Spors

APOLOGIES FOR Councillor S Forde, Councillor K Melton and Councillor L Tift
ABSENCE:

84 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.

85 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

Councillors L Dales and A Freeman declared an other registerable interest for any relevant items as appointed representatives on the Tent Valley Internal Drainage Board.

Councillor P Rainbow declared a non-registerable interest in Agenda Item No. 11 – Land to the North of Hawthorn Cottage, Main Street, Kirklington, Newark On Trent, as the applicant was known to her. Councillor P Rainbow took no part in the debate or vote.

86 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4 DECEMBER 2025

AGREED that the minutes from the meeting held on 4 December 2025 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Vice-Chair.

87 LAND TO THE NORTH OF 14 COTTAGE CLOSE, BLIDWORTH, NG21 0QE - 25/00785/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the proposed development of nine detached dwellings along with associated garages, access road and landscaping.

Councillor P Harris arrived during the Officers presentation and took no part in the debate or vote for this application.

A Schedule of Communication was circulated prior to the meeting which detailed correspondence received from a local resident.

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

Mr A Smith, local resident spoke in objection to the application.

Mr L Evans, the applicant spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application, and it was felt that the access and egress to this development was unsafe and although the report had indicated that flooding issues had been addressed there were still concerns regarding this. It was commented that whilst the development would enhance the area and appeared to be of good design it was not in the right place.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that contact with No. 7 Cottage Close had not taken place as flooding at that property was an existing flood problem and was not from this site.

Having left the meeting during the presentation of this application Councillor M Spoors took no part in the vote.

A vote was taken for approval and lost with 4 votes For, 5 votes Against and 1 Abstention.

AGREED Moved Councillor T Smith and Seconded Councillor D Moore (with 5 votes For, 4 votes Against and 1 Abstention) that contrary to Officer recommendation Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons:

- (i) Access and Highways issues; and
- (ii) Failure to address surface water flood issues.

In accordance with paragraph 18.5 of the Planning Protocol, as the motion was against Officer recommendation, a recorded vote was taken.

Councillor	Vote
C Brooks	Against
L Dales	Against
A Freeman	Abstention
M Home	Against
D Moore	For
P Rainbow	For
S Saddington	For
M Shakeshaft	For
T Smith	For
T Wildgust	Against

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) The proposal was particularly contentious, and the aspects being raised could only be viewed on site.

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

Ms A Smithson, local resident spoke in objection to the application.

Mr S Silcocks, the applicant spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application, and concern was raised regarding traffic onto the surrounding network. It was suggested that a dual access was required. Members also commented that there was no affordable housing on this site and the payment in lieu was not considered acceptable. It was considered that whilst planning permission was extant on the site for housing, which had been granted twenty years ago, the housing market had changed since then and affordable housing had not been part of that scheme at that time but was considered needed at present time.

A vote for approval was taken and lost with 2 votes For and 10 votes Against.

AGREED Moved Councillor A Freeman and Seconded Councillor Councillor D Moore (unanimously) that Planning Permission be refused on the grounds of safety due to the single point of access and no affordable housing on site, the payment in lieu was not acceptable.

In accordance with paragraph 18.5 of the Planning Protocol, as the motion was against Officer recommendation, a recorded vote was taken.

Councillor	Vote
C Brooks	For
L Dales	For
A Freeman	For
P Harris	For
M Home	For
D Moore	For
P Rainbow	For
S Saddington	For
M Shakeshaft	For
M Spoors	For
T Smith	For
T Wildgust	For

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the erection of an animal therapy provision including associated animal shelter and livestock fencing to grazing paddocks.

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

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

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

Members considered the application acceptable given the inappropriate sports field and the nature for the use of the site for animal therapy for children. Concern was raised that there appeared to be no provision to the wellbeing of the Alpaca's as the field was located in flood zone 3. It was suggested that if Members were minded to approve the application that a flood evacuation plan protecting the animals on site be written and submitted to the Planning Authority within six months of confirmation of planning permission.

AGREED (with 11 votes For and 1 vote Against) that:

- (a) Planning Permission be approved subject to the conditions, as contained within the report;
- (b) an additional condition providing a flood evacuation plan protecting the animals on site in the event of flooding, be submitted to the Planning Authority within six months of confirmation of planning permission; and
- (c) due to the statutory objection from Sport England, the application be referred to the Secretary of State to determine if they wish to call in the application, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Consultation)(England) Direction 2024.

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought permission in principle for construction of a minimum of 2 dwellings and a maximum of 9 dwellings.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the reason, the impact of the proposed development was difficult to visualise.

A Schedule of Communication was circulated prior to the meeting which detailed correspondence received from a member of the public, who raised concern regarding highway safety and character of the area.

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

Mr S White, a member of the public spoke against the application.

Mr N Baseley, the Agent for the applicant spoke in support of the application.

During the debate of this item, the Chair indicated that the meeting duration had expired therefore a motion was moved and seconded to continue the meeting. A motion was voted on with unanimous agreement to continue for a further hour.

Members considered the application and whilst some Members felt that the proposal was acceptable given that the site was located adjacent to the 30mph speed area of the road, and the other side of the road was also built up. Other Members felt that the proposed houses on the front were in keeping with the street scene but suggested that the development should not go beyond that as it would be out of character with Wellow. It was also commented that the development was in the open countryside.

The Senior Planning Officer advised the Committee that the proposed application did not provide any details of the proposed design therefore the Committee did not have the knowledge of what the character and design of the area would be.

AGREED (with 8 votes For and 4 votes Against) that Permission in Principle is approved, as contained within the report.

Councillor T Smith left the meeting at this point.

91 LAND AT CORKHILL LANE, NORMANTON - 25/01827/PIP

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought permission in principle for a residential development of a minimum of 2 dwellings and a maximum of 5 dwellings.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the reason, the impact of the proposed development was difficult to visualise.

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

Mr N Baseley, the Agent for the applicant spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application and felt that this development was outside of the built-up area of Normanton and would affect the views of Southwell Minster, which was steeped in years of history. Members considered this a creep of urbanisation into the open countryside and was not a suitable site for development.

AGREED (unanimously) that Permission in Principle be refused for the following reasons:

- (i) DM8; and
- (ii) Protective Views - impact of the view of the Minster.

In accordance with paragraph 18.5 of the Planning Protocol, as the motion was against Officer recommendation, a recorded vote was taken.

Councillor	Vote
C Brooks	For
L Dales	For
A Freeman	For
P Harris	For
M Home	For
D Moore	For
P Rainbow	For
S Saddington	For
M Shakeshaft	For
M Spoors	For
T Smith	For
T Wildgust	For

92 LAND ADJACENT CARTREF, CORKHILL LANE, NORMANTON - 25/01832/PIP

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought permission in principle for proposed residential development of 2 dwellings.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the reason, the impact of the proposed development was difficult to visualise.

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

Mr N Baseley, the Agent for the applicant spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application acceptable as the proposal was for two houses which would not impact on the infrastructure of the village.

AGREED (unanimously) that Permission in Principle is Approved, as contained within the report.

The Planning Committee Chair indicated that the meeting duration of an additional one hour had expired therefore a motion was moved by the Chair and agreed by Members to continue the meeting for a further hour. The Chair sought agreement from the Committee to defer agenda items 13 and 15 to the February meeting of the Planning Committee, to achieve this time deadline.

93 LAND TO THE NORTH OF HAWTHORN COTTAGE, MAIN STREET, KIRKLINGTON, NEWARK ON TRENT, NG22 8NL - 25/01823/PIP

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought permission in principle for residential development of one dwelling following demolition of existing open-fronted car port.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the reason, the impact of the proposed development was difficult to visualise.

A Schedule of Communication was circulated prior to the meeting which detailed correspondence received from Kirklington Parish Council.

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

Members considered the application acceptable and felt that the proposed development would tidy the site and requested a high-quality design.

Having declared an interest in this application Councillor P Rainbow took no part in the debate or vote.

AGREED (unanimously) that permission in principle be approved, as contained within the report.

94 NEWARK CASTLE, CASTLE GATE, NEWARK ON TRENT - 25/01917/ADV

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought vinyl advertisement attached to hoardings.

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

A Schedule of Communication was circulated prior to the meeting which detailed correspondence received from Newark Town Council, who raised no objection to the application.

Members considered the application acceptable however commented that the examples of the advertisements included in the report were not appropriate and suggested the history of the Castle to be displayed. The expiration date was also proposed to be one year instead of the end period of five years, from the date of consent.

The Director for Planning & Growth confirmed that the advertisement had been decided by the Council's design team and would be consistent with the hoarding on Stodman Street, he confirmed that this would be taken back to the design team and also confirmed that the end period of one year was acceptable.

AGREED (with 8 votes For and 3 votes Against) that:

- (a) advertisement consent is approved, subject to the conditions within the report, and the amendment of condition 01, the end period of one year; and
- (b) the design of the vinyl advertisements for the hoarding to be addressed by the design team.

95 PLANNING REFORM UPDATE

The Committee agreed that due to the time this report would be considered at the 12 February 2026 meeting of the Planning Committee.

96 NOMINATION TO THE PLANNING POLICY BOARD ONE MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE TO BE NOMINATED TO THE PLANNING POLICY BOARD TO REPLACE FORMER COUNCILLOR OLDHAM

The Committee were asked to nominate one Member of the Planning Committee to be appointed to the Planning Policy Board, to fill the vacant seat.

AGREED (unanimously) that Councillor M Home be appointed as the Planning Committee representative on the Planning Policy Board up to May 2026.

97 MIDDLEBECK - AFFORDABLE HOUSING REVIEW (S106) - 14/01978/OUTM

The Committee agreed that due to the time this report would be considered at the 12 February 2026 meeting of the Planning Committee.

98 APPEALS LODGED

AGREED that the report be noted.

99 APPEALS DETERMINED

The Committee was informed that Application No. 25/00673/AGR – Land adjacent to the Old Grain Store, Old Epperstone Road, Lowdham. Judicial review had been requested but was not taken any further by the Courts.

AGREED that the report be noted.

Meeting closed at 8.24 pm.

Chair