

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, 7 May 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 P Harris, Councillor M Home, Councillor K Melton, Councillor P Rainbow, Councillor S Saddington, Councillor M Shakeshaft, Councillor M Spoors and Councillor T Wildgust

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor N Allen, Councillor K Smith and Councillor S Michael

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor T Smith and Councillor L Tift

140 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.

141 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.

Councillor D Moore declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest regarding Agenda Item 8 – Land to the East of Hockerton Road, Upton – 26/00382/PIP, as he was known to one of the speakers.

Councillor S Saddington declared a Personal Interest regarding Agenda Item 6 – Land at Foxholes Farm, Bathley Lane, North Muskham – 22/01983/FULM, as she represents that Ward and is known to her constituents.

142 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9 APRIL 2026

AGREED that the minutes from the meeting held on 9 April 2026 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

143 REVIEW OF THE PROTOCOL FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE PLANNING COMMITTEE SCHEME OF DELEGATION TO OFFICERS

The Committee considered the report of the Director for Planning & Growth regarding the review of the Protocol for Planning Committee and the Planning Committee scheme of Delegation to Officers.

It was proposed that a comprehensive review of the Protocol and the Scheme be deferred until such a time that the Planning Regulations had been published. That would save any abortive work and allow for the full review of both the Protocol and the Scheme alongside the changes to the Council's constitution which aligned with the requirements of the Regulations.

Throughout the year, Officers kept the Scheme and Protocol under review, noting any issues that may arise that did not require immediate action for full review with Members on an annual basis. Officers had reviewed the Protocol and Scheme and were content that there were no changes required to either document.

AGREED that:

- (a) no changes are currently required to the Protocol for Planning Committee or the Planning Scheme of Delegation: and
- (b) there will be a review of the Protocol and Scheme alongside any required updates to the Council's constitution following the publication of The Town and Country Planning (Discharge of Local Planning Authority Functions) (England) Regulations 2026.

144 LAND AT FOXHOLES FARM, BATHLEY LANE, NORTH MUSKHAM (22/01983/FULM)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the construction of a Solar farm with associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the following reasons: 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. There were specific site factors and/or significant policy or precedent implications that needed to be carefully addressed; and the proposal was particularly contentious, and the aspects being raised could only be viewed on site.

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

A schedule of communication had been circulated prior to the meeting in accordance with the Planning Committee Protocol, to all Members which included two additional public comments of objection.

Mr P William, objector, spoke against the application.

Councillor L Johnson, representing Norwell Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Mr C Calvert, the Agent spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application and the Chair commented that the site visit undertaken that morning was extremely useful. Members had walked to the brow of the hill which clearly showed the impact of this solar farm, which was contained in the Officer report. The local Ward Member commented that the fields would be covered

in solar panels having an adverse effect and the loss of good agricultural land when solar panels could be located on roof tops. They would have an impact on the heritage of the village and the surrounding area. The onset of large vehicles as a consequence of the proposal would have a huge impact on the residents who liked to walk, cycle and horse ride. The widening of the road was also considered of no benefit to the local residents and out of character for the area. The solar panels would be a block on the landscape for forty years and they would be hard to dispose in the future. This proposal would cause harm and have an impact on the Norwell conservation area and heritage assets within it such as the church and windmill tower.

Other Members commented on the cumulative impact from other solar farms in the area and felt that there was no community benefit from this development in spite of the impact it would have on local residents. This application site would have an impact on more heritage assets than another local proposal near Kelham which only impacted on one. Members commented on the proposed screening of the site including 4m fencing and hedges being ineffective and an erosion of the local setting. Due to the elevations of the site, it would be impossible to screen the proposal from the village and would mean a fundamental change to Norwell. 90% of the village was considered in a Conservation Area and this application would change the village of Norwell for forty years. Concerns were raised on the impact of the scheme on the identified listed buildings and Conservation Area. The application was considered inappropriate for a development of this nature.

A vote was taken and lost for approval with 0 votes For and 13 votes Against.

AGREED Moved Councillor A Freeman and Seconded Councillor L Dales (unanimously) that contrary to Officer recommendation Planning Permission be Refused, for the following reason:

- (i) Adverse impact on the setting of the Listed Building's, notably Grade I Church and windmill and major adverse impact on the Conservation Area etc outweighed the benefits.

The wording 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.

Councillor	Vote
C Brooks	For
L Dales	For
S Forde	For
A Freeman	For
P Harris	For
M Home	For
K Melton	For
D Moore	For
P Rainbow	For

S Saddington	For
M Shakeshaft	For
M Spoors	For
T Wildgust	For

145 LAND TO REAR OF MILL LANE, CAUNTON (25/01952/FUL)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the erection of four bungalows.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the following reasons: 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. There were specific site factors and/or significant policy or precedent implications that needed to be carefully addressed; the impact of the proposed development was difficult to visualise.

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

Ms K Veitch, objector, spoke against the application.

Councillor S Routledge, representing Caunton Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Mr G Machin, the Agent spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application, and the local Ward Member informed the Committee that during the last two major storms the village had flooded, the main street had become a river as the Beck had overflowed, and 39 houses and gardens were flooded. It was commented that the village drains, and sewage system were inadequate. The soakaways and the soil being clay were not sufficient in absorbing the excess water. Concern was also raised regarding this being in the Conservation Area and the footpath running through the site was considered dangerous for pedestrians.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the drainage agreement was referred to as a Section 106 Drainage Agreement which was different to the usual s106 Agreement to secure planning obligations. All new developments would be required to enter into a drainage agreement with Severn Trent.

Other Members commented that the proposed site would be damaging to the ecology outside of the boundary. There would be a loss of high-grade agricultural land and a similar application had been previously dismissed at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate.

A vote was taken and lost for approval with 2 votes For and 11 votes Against.

AGREED Moved Councillor M Spoors and Seconded Councillor S Saddington (with 11 votes For and 2 votes Against) that contrary to Officer recommendation Planning Permission be Refused for the following

reasons:

- (i) Unsustainable location contrary to DM8,
- (ii) The development would be in the open countryside contrary to policy,
- (iii) Back land development,
- (iv) Concerns regarding surface water run-off,
- (v) adverse impact on setting of Conservation Area

The wording 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.

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

146 LAND TO THE EAST OF HOCKERTON ROAD, UPTON (26/00382/PIP)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the permission in principle for proposed residential development of a minimum of 1 dwelling and a maximum of 5 dwellings.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the following reasons: 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; and the proposal was particularly contentious, and the aspects being raised could only be viewed on site.

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

Mr M Trueman, objector, spoke against the application.

Ms R Holloway, Parish Clerk, representing Upton Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Mr G Machin, the Agent spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application, and it was felt that this was infill due to the adjacent cricket pavilion, but in the open countryside. Five properties would not be in keeping with the rest of the village and the site was considered out of the village. The location was incongruous with the village of Upton and would cause harm to the character of the Conservation Area, noting the fields surrounding the village made a special contribution to the Conservation Area. It was also considered an unsustainable location.

Other Members commented that the proposal continued the line of the village and was book ended and allowed the village to grow, which was a natural progression.

A vote was taken and lost for approval with 6 votes For and 7 votes Against.

AGREED Moved Councillor K Melton and Seconded Councillor P Harris (with 7 votes For and 6 vote Against) that contrary to Officer recommendation Permission in Principle be Refused for the following reasons:

- (i) Concerns about location and sustainability (DM8);
- (ii) impact on the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area, noting importance of historic fields in this part of the Conservation Area.

The wording to be delegated to the Business Manager – Planning Development in consultation with the Planning 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.

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

Councillor P Harris left the meeting at this point.

The Planning Committee 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.

147 LAND ADJACENT APPLE COTTAGE, BILSTHORPE ROAD, EAKRING (26/00377/PIP)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought permission in principle for proposed residential development of a minimum of 1 dwelling and a maximum of 4.

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the following 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 Business Manager – Planning Development, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development.

Mr G Machin, the Agent spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application, and it was commented that Apple Cottage was an attractive period building at the entrance to the village, the technical submission needed to be carefully designed to form an enhanced approach to the village. There were no concerns raised regarding the position and quantum. The Business Manager - Planning Development confirmed the Agent was present at the meeting and would be listening to Member comments and agreed that there was a slight incline to the site. He also commented that the setting of the Conservation Area was a powerful policy in the NPPF, any technical submission needed to be carefully addressed with the Poplar trees taken into consideration and perhaps a soft and sensitive proposal fitting into the landscape.

AGREED (with 10 votes For and 2 votes Against) that Permission in Principle be approved.

148 LAND SOUTH-EAST OF CAUNTON ROAD, HOCKERTON NG25 0LP (26/00448/PIP)

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

A site visit had taken place prior to the commencement of the Planning Committee for Members, for the following reasons: 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. There were specific site factors and/or significant policy or precedent implications that needed to be carefully addressed; the impact of the proposed development was difficult to visualise.

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

Mr G Machin, the Agent spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application, and concern was raised regarding the already approved permission in principle on a piece of land to the south of this site, it was commented that if that development did not take place this site could be left in isolation. The cumulative impact and scale of village of 59 houses was also commented upon.

AGREED (with 7 votes For, 4 votes Against and 1 Abstention) that Permission in Principle be approved.

149 FOREST CENTRE INDOOR MARKET AND FORMER LLOYDS BANK, FOREST ROAD, OLLERTON (26/00235/ADV)

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought four hoardings to existing windows.

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

Members considered the application acceptable, although concern was raised regarding the use of Foamex as that product was suggested to be hard to dispose after its usage and a more sustainable material was preferred. The Business Manager Planning Development informed the Committee that those comments would be fed back to the Design Team.

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 half an hour.

AGREED (unanimously) that:

- (a) Advert Consent be approved, subject to the conditions contained within the report; and
- (b) the comments regarding the use of Foamex be fed back to the Design Team.

150 ANNUAL REPORT DETAILING THE EXEMPT REPORTS CONSIDERED BY PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Executive which detailed the exempt business considered by the Committee for the period 6 June 2025 to date.

AGREED (unanimously) that the report considered at the 2 October 2025 Planning Committee, during exempt business, entitled: Land North of Main Road, Kelham – 23/01837/FULM. The information would now be open.

151 APPEALS LODGED

AGREED that the report be noted.

152 APPEALS DETERMINED

AGREED that the report be noted.

Meeting closed at 8.05 pm.

Chair