

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, 12 February 2026 at 4.00 pm.

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

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

APOLOGIES FOR        Councillor P Harris and Councillor T Smith  
ABSENCE:

100    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.

101    DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

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

102    MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 15 JANUARY 2026

AGREED                that the minutes from the meeting held on 15 January 2026 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

103    LAND WEST OF ALLENBY ROAD, SOUTHWELL - 25/01879/OUTM

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought outline planning with all matters reserved except for access to Allenby Road, for up to seventy dwellings, including affordable housing, highway works, public open space, children's play space, landscaping, drainage and all other associated works, including infrastructure.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the reason that 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.

A Schedule of Communication was circulated prior to the meeting which detailed correspondence received from the Senior Planning Officer, which sought amendment to conditions 02, 09, 19, 22 and 25 following discussions with the agent.

Members considered the presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, which

included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

Mr R Lewis, representing Southwell Civic Society spoke in objection to the application.

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

Members considered the application, and the Local Ward Member commented that this site had been put forward under the call for sites in 2012 and was deemed unacceptable. The call for sites at that time had produced seven to eight other sites, two of which were still to be developed. Southwell was up to capacity with new housing. This was a gateway site in the open countryside and was a step nearer to Southwell joining with Halam, which was considered creep of urbanisation. The schools and doctor's surgeries were also reaching capacity. The additional traffic would also aggravate the already congested roads. A concern was raised regarding surface water flooding on the road further down from the site due to the land levels. A Member commented that Southwell had been allocated its share of new developments and was over stocked with housing. However, Members recognised that other areas in the District have seen a greater share of new housing. The Chair commented that the landscape had changed through development and the need to consider the impact on the landscape and character of Southwell should be undertaken. A deferral was proposed and seconded to obtain a professional opinion regarding the character and impact on the landscape and the impact of this proposed development on Southwell's distinctive landscape.

AGREED (with 10 votes For, 1 vote Against and 1 Abstention) that the application be deferred pending a professional landscape survey.

104 LAND AT 50A MAIN STREET, LOWDHAM, NG14 7BE - 25/01298/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the proposed erection of two dwellings.

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
- (iii) 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 two neighbours and the Agent.

The Senior Planning Officer also proposed a minor modification to Condition 02 to amend the plans to omit the ground source heat pump from the parking area, if the Planning Committee was minded to approve the application.

Members considered the presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, which

included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

Mr R Wood, local resident spoke in objection to the application.

Mr L Wiltshire, representing Lowdham Parish Council spoke in objection to the application.

Mr D Wainwright, the applicant spoke in support of the application.

Councillor T Wendels, Local Ward Member for Lowdham spoke in objection to the application.

Members considered the application, and it was commented that the proposed two storey properties would be overbearing on the street scene. Other Members commented that the proposed development was for two small, two bed room semi-detached properties and not family homes. The premises below the proposed site were commercial dwellings with customers visiting via car all day, it was felt that the access/egress could not be argued for the small amount of additional traffic that would be generated from the two properties. The visibility would also be improved by the removal of part of the wall, should the committee be minded to approve the application. A Member commented that the report indicated the shortfall of provision for two-bedroom houses in Lowdham, which would meet the small identified need. Concern was raised regarding the site increasing the chance of flooding due to the removal of the grassed area. It was suggested that the flood alleviation plan would be in place in the next year and it was unlikely that the proposed houses would be built in that timescale, it was therefore considered minimal risk. A Member commented that this scheme would allow two local residents to remain in the village and prevent the loss of young local people leaving the village.

In answer to a Member question regarding the Highway objection, it was confirmed that there would not be a loss of commercial space in the car park. Car parking proposed was in line with SPDs and guidance. There would be some improvement with visibility with the removal of part of the wall. The turning area had been satisfied, from a highway safety point of view and was adequate in terms of the planning application. There was still an objection regarding pedestrian highway splays, however given that there was not a significant intensification of use the recommendation was approval.

*Councillor S Saddington having entered the meeting during the Officer presentation took no part in the debate or vote.*

AGREED (with 7 votes For and 5 votes Against) that Planning Permission be approved, subject to:

- (i) the conditions contained within the report, subject to the amendment of Condition 02 to amend the plans regarding the removal of the ground source heat pump from the parking area; and
- (ii) the signing of a Unilateral Undertaking to secure the dwellings as self-build.

105 LINCOLN ROAD PLAYING FIELD, LINCOLN ROAD, NEWARK ON TRENT - 25/00679/S73M

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the removal of Condition 5 (Replacement Road Network) and to amend the wording of Condition 6 (Stopping-Up Order), 12 (Bus Route Parking) and 16 (PROW Diversion) attached to planning permission 22/01528/RMAM.

Members considered the presentation from the Senior Planning Officer, which included plans of the proposed development. The officer explained that the application relates to the regeneration scheme known as Yorke Drive, Newark, where consent was granted under 22/01528/RMAM for the construction of 207 dwellings, with new sports pitches and pavilion building.

Members were advised that the principle of development is established under the original application, which remains extant. Officers explained that the proposed revisions to the wording of each of the conditions, and the removal of condition 5, would assist the delivery of the scheme. It was not felt that the amendments would impact on the character of the area, neighbouring amenity, highways safety or flood risk. As such, it was recommended that the section 73 application be approved.

Members considered the application acceptable.

AGREED (with 12 votes For and 1 Abstention) that the removal of Condition 5 (Replacement Road Network) and to amend the wording of Condition 6 (Stopping-Up Order), 12 (Bus Route Parking) and 16 (PROW Diversion) attached to planning permission 22/01528/RMAM, be approved.

106 HOLLY HOUSE, 5 EAST LANE, EDWINSTOWE, NG21 9QN - 25/02047/HOUSE

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the retention of a garage as constructed.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the reason that 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.

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

Mrs C Watson, the applicant spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application, and it was commented that the works already undertaken were over-bearing in a conservation area and should not be allowed. Other Members commented that whilst the roof line was too high, certain other changes including the brick work, which could be changed or rendered, windows including the window on the gable could be made. Negotiations between the applicant and Officers could make the building more palatable. It was further

commented that the applicant did also comply with the Enforcement Team when asked to stop works.

*Councillor M Spoors having left the meeting during the Officer presentation took no part in the vote.*

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

AGREED Moved Councillor A Freeman and Seconded Councillor K Melton (with 10 votes For and 2 votes Against) that contrary to Officer recommendation Planning Permission be approved, subject to conditions including securing appropriate changes to the materials and brickwork including the black timberwork and amending the window on the gable, to be delegated to the Business Manager – Planning Development, in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair and Vice-Chair.

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

| <b>Councillor</b> | <b>Vote</b> |
|-------------------|-------------|
| C Brooks          | Against     |
| L Dales           | For         |
| S Forde           | For         |
| A Freeman         | For         |
| M Home            | For         |
| K Melton          | For         |
| D Moore           | For         |
| P Rainbow         | For         |
| S Saddington      | For         |
| M Shakeshaft      | For         |
| L Tift            | Against     |
| T Wildgust        | For         |

107 LAND AT RADLEY ROAD, HALAM - 25/01853/PIP

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

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the reason that 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.

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

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

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

Members considered the application, and the Local Ward Member commented that nothing had changed from the 2018 appeal decision, this proposed development was still in the open countryside and was not sustainable. Other Members commented that the development would be built between two existing properties, becoming part of the development itself and considered the proposal acceptable.

AGREED (with 8 votes For and 5 votes Against) that Planning in Principle be approved.

*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.*

108 LAND OFF SWINDERBY ROAD, SOUTH SCARLE - 25/01914/PIP

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

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

Mr D Clarke, local resident and representing South Scarle Parish Meeting spoke in objection to the application.

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

Members considered the application, and the Ward Member commented that this proposed development was in the open countryside and outside of the village envelope. The bus service provided was not functional for work/school travel. The current street scene was old farm buildings. The current land use was 3B agricultural land and was not infill in the village envelope. There were six properties currently up for sale, with a need for bungalows. There were no affordable houses within the village. A Member commented that there was a good train service 31 minute's walk from the village. Other Members commented that there were no street lighting and pavement around this location. The site may also be liable to flooding due to the land level differences.

A vote was taken for approval and lost with 4 votes For, 8 votes Against and 1 Abstention.

AGREED Moved Councillor L Dales and Seconded Councillor D Moore (with 8 votes For, 3 votes Against and 2 Abstentions) that contrary to Officer recommendation Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons:

- (i) Unsustainable – Policy SP1; and
- (ii) Open Countryside – Policy DM8.

The wording for refusal to be delegated to the Business Manager – Planning Development, in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair and Vice-Chair.

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

| <b>Councillor</b> | <b>Vote</b> |
|-------------------|-------------|
| C Brooks          | Against     |
| L Dales           | For         |
| S Forde           | Abstention  |
| A Freeman         | For         |
| M Home            | For         |
| K Melton          | Abstention  |
| D Moore           | For         |
| P Rainbow         | For         |
| S Saddington      | For         |
| M Shakeshaft      | Against     |
| M Spors           | For         |
| L Tift            | For         |
| T Wildgust        | Against     |

The Chair in agreement with Members of the Planning Committee changed the order of business on the agenda and brought Agenda Item No. 13 – Land to the Rear of 59 Beacon Hill, Newark (25/02147/PIP) as the next item of business. This decision was taken as there were three speakers for that application and time factors. There were no speakers thereafter and the agenda resumed its stated order.

109 LAND TO THE REAR OF 59 BEACON HILL ROAD, NEWARK ON TRENT, NG24 2JH - 25/02147/PIP

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought permission in principle for construction of between one (minimum) and two (maximum) dwellings.

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

- (ii) 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
- (iii) 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.

*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.*

Mr S Mawson, local resident spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor L Geary, representing Newark Town Council spoke in objection of the application.

Mr J Foot, Agent spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application and compared this application with the neighbouring plot which had been granted planning permission for development on appeal. Members felt that there were significant differences with this development, the plot size was much narrower and there were no outbuildings in situ. Members felt that the gardens should remain as gardens as approval would set a precedent for further development in the gardens along Beacon Hill, which was considered as overwhelming the area, invasion of privacy for the neighbouring properties and land grab.

A vote was taken for approval and lost with 12 votes Against and 1 Abstention.

AGREED Moved Councillor A Freeman and Seconded Councillor D Moore (with 12 votes For and 1 Abstention) that contrary to Officer recommendation Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons:

- (i) Backland development;
- (ii) Incongruous form in conflict with DM5;
- (iii) Over intensification; and
- (iv) Out of Character for the area.

The wording for refusal to be delegated to the Business Manager – Planning Development, in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair and Vice-Chair.

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

| <b>Councillor</b> | <b>Vote</b> |
|-------------------|-------------|
| C Brooks          | Abstention  |
| L Dales           | For         |
| S Forde           | For         |
| A Freeman         | For         |
| M Home            | For         |
| K Melton          | For         |
| D Moore           | For         |
| P Rainbow         | For         |
| S Saddington      | For         |
| M Shakeshaft      | For         |
| M Spors           | For         |
| L Tift            | For         |
| T Wildgust        | For         |

110 LAND ADJACENT THE BRUSHES, RETFORD ROAD, WALESBY - 25/01974/PIP

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

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

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

Members considered the application, and it was felt that the proposed development was in a sustainable location and on a main road, it was therefore considered acceptable.

AGREED (with 12 votes For and 1 vote Against) that the Permission in Principle be approved.

111 FIELD REFERENCE NUMBER 7919, CAUNTON ROAD, HOCKERTON - 25/01918/PIP

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought permission in principle for residential development for a minimum of two and up to four dwellings.

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

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

Members considered the application acceptable.

AGREED (with 8 votes For, 3 votes Against and 2 Abstentions) that Permission in Principle be approved.

112 LAND OFF SAND LANE, SPALFORD - 25/02146/PIP

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

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
- (iii) 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 the following: Ms Quibell (former owner of site); Spalford Parish Meeting; and Mrs Cassells.

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

Members considered the application, and it was commented that Spalford was an unsustainable location as it was a hamlet, with no services other than an on-demand bus service. The proposed development would be surrounded by flood zone 2 & 3. In terms of need, five dwellings and two barn conversions had recently been approved. This was considered a development too far. The Planning Officer confirmed regarding a Member comment that the trees had already been felled on site, the trees were not protected and the owner had been permitted to remove them. Members raised concern that the removal of the trees would only exacerbate the flooding problem. The Senior Planning Officer advised in answer to a Member question that the access to the North which was viewed at the site visit, would not be allowed as it was outside the redline on the application plan. Access would be allowed through flood zone 2, which would need a sequential test, which had been undertaken by the applicant and deemed acceptable. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the previous application had been refused at appeal on the grounds of the sequential test.

A vote was taken for approval and lost with 1 vote For and 12 Votes Against.

AGREED                      Moved Councillor L Dales and Seconded Councillor D Moore (with 12 votes For, 1 vote Against) that contrary to Officer recommendation Permission in Principle be refused for the following reasons:

- (v) Policy SP3 & DM12;
- (vi) Surrounded by flood zone 2 & 3;
- (vii) Unsustainable location; and
- (viii) Out of character with the area.

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

| <b>Councillor</b> | <b>Vote</b> |
|-------------------|-------------|
| C Brooks          | For         |
| L Dales           | For         |
| S Forde           | For         |
| A Freeman         | For         |
| M Home            | For         |
| K Melton          | For         |
| D Moore           | For         |
| P Rainbow         | For         |
| S Saddington      | For         |
| M Shakeshaft      | For         |
| M Spoors          | For         |
| L Tift            | For         |
| T Wildgust        | Against     |

*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.*

113 PLANNING REFORM UPDATE

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning and Growth, which provided an update on the latest planning reforms.

*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.*

On the 16 December 2026, the government launched a consultation on a new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and a suite of planning reforms. The deadline for responses was 10 March 2026.

The Planning and Infrastructure Bill received Royal Assent on the 18 December 2026. The new Act was central to the government's Plan for Change. Further consultation and regulations for this new legislation was planned for early 2026.

In addition, the government was also seeking views on reforming the role of statutory consultees in the planning system. This consultation would last for eight weeks from 18 November 2025 to 13 January 2026.

Prior to Christmas 2025 the Government also published a written ministerial statement on the new plan-making system. The new system would be based on the legislative changes set out in the Levelling-Up and Regeneration Act 2023, and accompanying the statement was a guidance on creating a Local Plan using the new system including proposed regulatory requirements. One element of the announcements that would have significant implications was that Supplementary Planning Documents would no longer be able to be adopted after 30 June 2026. The implications of those changes would be considered by Planning Policy Board in January and Cabinet in February 2026.

The Chair encouraged Members to submit any questions to the Business Manager – Planning Development, the Director of Planning and Growth or the Planning Policy Board.

AGREED that:

- (a) the contents of the report be noted;
- (b) the Council's response on planning reform consultations given the urgency involved with meeting the consultation deadline be delegated to the Director for Planning & Growth in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair and Vice-Chair; and
- (c) the presentation of all other reforms via the Planning Policy Board and Cabinet be endorsed.

114 MIDDLEBECK - AFFORDABLE HOUSING REVIEW (S106)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, regarding the Affordable Housing Review (S106) at Middlebeck. Members were informed of the outcome of the review of the first S106 affordable housing review.

The Senior Planning Officer informed the Committee that there was a correction to the report to show the residual affordable housing figures for the site required was 15 and not 17. The corrections to the table as contained within the report was amended in the Schedule of Communication.

AGREED that the report be noted.

115 APPEALS LODGED

AGREED that the report be noted.

116 APPEALS DETERMINED

It was noted that several appeal decisions had been issued by PINS sometime after the original decision was made. Officers explained that this was due to a technical problem with the email being used by PINS. This had now been resolved.

AGREED that the report be noted.

Meeting closed at 9.16 pm.

Chair