

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, 4 June 2026 at 4.00 pm.

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

Councillor N Allen, Councillor A Brazier, Councillor L Dales, Councillor S Forde, Councillor M Home, Councillor P Rainbow, Councillor S Saddington, Councillor M Shakeshaft, Councillor L Tift and Councillor T Wildgust

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor C Brooks, Councillor K Melton and Councillor M Spoors

1 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.

Further to the changes to the Planning Committee membership, the Chair thanked Councillor P Harris and Councillor T Smith for their work and commitment to the Planning Committee and welcomed Councillor A Brazier and Councillor N Allen to the Planning Committee.

2 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 Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board.

Councillor A Brazier declared an other registerable interest regarding Agenda Item 6 – Land at Rufford Avenue, Ollerton – 25/01999/FULM, as she was a Member of Ollerton and Boughton Town Council and took no part in the debate or vote.

Councillor D Moore declared an other registrable interest regarding Agenda Item 9 – First Floor, The Buttermarket, Middle Gate, Newark – 26/00477/LBC, as he was a Member of Newark Town Council.

The Director of Planning & Growth declared an other registrable interest on Agenda Item No. 6 – Land at Rufford Avenue, Ollerton – 25/01999/FULM, as he was acting on behalf of the applicant and developer and left the room when the application was considered.

3 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7 MAY 2026

AGREED that the minutes from the meeting held on 7 May 2026 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought a proposed residential development.

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.

Members considered the presentation from the Principal Planning 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 a correction to the Committee Report from the Planning Case Officer.

Mr M Peet, objector, spoke against the application.

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

Members considered the application and it was commented that the housing mix was excellent including the affordable housing on this allocated site and that existing bungalows would not be overlooked. The buffer zone was good but needed to be correctly managed. The development however was over intensive, would put a strain on the services within Rainworth including doctors, dentists and schools who were already stretched to capacity. It was commented on that although the site formed part of an allocated site, the quantum proposed was too high and a considerable uplift to original allocation number. It was noted that six plots did not meet parking standards and it was a step back having on-road parking for those six properties. It was commented on that the access roads were inadequate and weren't built for this level of development. It was felt that a number of plots should be removed from the plan to provide adequate space for car parking, which would also alleviate pressure onto the access roads. The foul sewage system was also raised as a current problem. Concern was raised regarding the lack of access to open land North and North-West of the development and whether that was public open land.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that six properties did not meet the parking standards as they had a tandem parking arrangement, although each plot had three car parking spaces and had designated on-street parking within the plan. It was confirmed that the on-street parking would not hinder large and refuse vehicles, which had been agreed with NCC Highways. The Committee was advised that if the layout was reconfigured that could have an impact on the open-space and landscaping, a balance which would need to be taken on board. NCC Highways had also undertaken an evening assessment regarding the junction with Nightjar Way and were satisfied with the movements at that junction. The developer had also engaged with Severn Trent water who had confirmed that there was capacity in the system to cope with this development. The Section 106 process could address the Management Company or Council management arrangements for public open space. It was further

confirmed that comments from the NHS had confirmed that improvements were required and the money from this development would be invested in either of the two existing facilities. It was confirmed that the land to the North of the site was public open space. The developer had informed the Council that they had tried to engage with Rainworth Parish Council to provide access to the land to the north of the site, which had not been resolved.

AGREED (unanimously) that the application be deferred to the 2 July 2026 Planning Committee in order for further discussion to take place with the developer regarding the six plots that do not have adequate car parking and the access to the open land to the north.

5 LAND AT RUFFORD AVENUE, OLLERTON - 25/01999/FULM

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the demolition of the Forest Centre 111 Forest Road, the Former Lloyds TSB Bank Forest Road and the Town Hall, Sherwood Drive, and the erection of a mixed use proposed development including: a cinema/ leisure use/ café building; retail (Class E(a)), customer service/office facilities (class E(c)) and ancillary/shared areas; commercial office units (Class E(c)); and associated infrastructure; landscaping; public realm areas; and the erection of three dwellings with access and parking.

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 Principal Planning Officer, which included photographs and plans of the proposed development. The recommendation contained within the report was also amended from a “unilateral undertakings” to “Planning Obligation” if the Planning Committee were minded to approve the application.

Ms E Buchanan, the Applicant spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application and commented that this was of good design and a fantastic scheme. It was commented that permeable surface should be used for the driveways and may provide increased moveability on the driveways for parallel parking. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that there was a hard and soft landscaping condition, permeable surfacing could be considered under that condition. Parking provision for users of the development was discussed and the agreement with Tesco for use of the carpark was clarified by the Principal Planning Officer, along with clarification that employee and Town Council spaces would be provided in the Council owned car park at the top of Sherwood Drive.

It was confirmed that increased CCTV would be provided around the site and that secure cycle parking would be provided for employees in the rear gated area and public cycle parking would be to the front of the development in the open area, which should be a deterrent for any potential theft.

AGREED (with 10 votes For and 1 Abstention) that Planning Permission be approved, subject to the amendment regarding Planning Obligation.

6 THE GRANGE, KIRKLINGTON ROAD, HOCKERTON, NEWARK ON TRENT, NG25 0PJ - 25/01982/OUT

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought outline planning for a residential development, all matters reserved except access.

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.

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

Mr P Wade, objector, spoke against the application.

Ms S Clark, the Agent spoke in support of the application.

Members considered the application, and concern was raised regarding the cumulative impact of this site and including other sites that had recently been granted planning permission in this area. The site was in the open countryside and considered perhaps one house too many for this field, although the development did not front the road. The bus service was considered non-existent and concerns were raised about reference to the church as an amenity when it was actually used as a jewellery workshop. Whilst there was a footpath along the road into Hockerton, it was considered not safe due to the high and fast volume of traffic travelling along the A617. It was commented that this application had been considered in the past and had been refused on appeal. Other Members felt that the proposed development sat well on the proposed site, which was removed from the main road and would not detract when driving into Hockerton. It was also felt that it was a good use of scrubland. It was commented that plot 3 however looked like it had been shoehorned in and the plan would be improved if this plot was removed.

AGREED (with 9 votes For and 2 votes Against) that Planning Permission be approved, subject to the conditions contained in the report.

7 LAND ADJACENT ORCHARD COTTAGE, KIRKLINGTON ROAD, HOCKERTON, NG25 0PJ - 26/00468/PIP

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

A schedule of communication had been circulated prior to the meeting in accordance with the Planning Committee Protocol, to all Members which included consultation response received from Newark and Sherwood District Council Conservation Team.

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

Members considered the application and concerns were raised regarding the proposed development being in the open countryside, the cumulative impact this development would have on this part of Hockerton and that it was not in-keeping with the ribbon pattern. Concerns regarding safety were raised as there was no pavement on this side of a busy road and the site would need another access onto the A617. The loss of good quality agricultural land was also taken into consideration. It was commented that part of the site jutted out which was incongruous and taking the site right up to the edge of the public footpath. Location and quantum of development were considered to be the key issues, with Members feeling that too many were proposed and that this would be too intensive in this location and impact the character of the settlement.

A vote for approval was taken and lost with 4 votes For and 7 votes Against.

Councillor S Saddington arrived during the debate of this item and took no part in the vote.

AGREED Moved Councillor L Dales and Seconded Councillor P Rainbow (with 7 votes For and 4 votes Against) that contrary to Officer recommendation Permission in Principle be Refused, for the reason: DM5 location and quantum, DM8 open countryside and highway concerns – inappropriate location of access.

The wording for the reason 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.

Councillor	Vote
N Allen	For
A Brazier	For
L Dales	For
S Forde	Against
A Freeman	Against

M Home	For
D Moore	For
P Rainbow	For
M Shakeshaft	Against
L Tift	For
T Wildgust	Against

The Chair indicated that the meeting duration had exceeded three hours, a motion was moved and seconded to continue the meeting with unanimous agreement for a further hour.

8 FIRST FLOOR, THE BUTTERMARKE, MIDDLE GATE, NEWARK ON TRENT, NG24 1BF - 26/00477/LBC

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the creation of an internal office and storage spaces to first floor mezzanine.

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

Members considered the application acceptable and found no harm to the special character and appearance of the listed building subject to the proposed conditions.

AGREED (unanimously) that Planning be approved, subject to conditions.

9 93 MICKLEDALE LANE, BILSTHORPE, NG22 8RF - 26/00005/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the installation of a dropped kerb and driveway.

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

Members considered the application acceptable.

AGREED (unanimously) that Planning Permission be approved, subject to conditions outlined in the report.

10 NOMINATIONS TO THE PLANNING POLICY BOARD FOUR MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE TO BE NOMINATED TO THE PLANNING POLICY BOARD.

The Committee were asked to nominate four Members of the Planning Committee to sit on the Planning Policy Board.

AGREED (unanimously) that Councillors A Freeman (Chair), D Moore (Vice-Chair), M Home and K Melton be appointed as the Planning Committee representatives on the Planning Policy Board for 2026/27.

11 APPEALS LODGED

AGREED that the report be noted.

12 APPEALS DETERMINED

AGREED that the report be noted.

13 QUARTERLY PLANNING ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY UPDATE REPORT

The Committee considered the report of the Senior Planner (Enforcement) – 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 January 2026 to 31 March 2026.

The report was broken down into Schedule A to D. Schedule A outlined the enforcement activity for Q4 in terms of numbers of cases received, the reasons for cases being closed and response times. Schedule B included a small number of examples of where formal planning enforcement action had been taken (such as a notice being issued) in the quarter. Schedule C provided examples of cases where officers had managed to resolve the breaches through dialogue and negotiation during the quarter; and Schedule D provided examples of Notices having been complied with. The examples within the report showed considerable success that had been achieved by the enforcement team.

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 7.44 pm.

Chair