

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, 2 July 2026 at 4.00 pm.

PRESENT: Councillor D Moore (Chair for the duration of the meeting)

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

ALSO IN
ATTENDANCE: Councillor K Smith

APOLOGIES FOR
ABSENCE: Councillor A Freeman (Chair), Councillor A Brazier, Councillor C Brooks and Councillor M Spoors

14 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.

15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

Councillors L Dales 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 and Councillor S Saddington declared Personal interests regarding Agenda Item No. 7 – Land Adjacent The Elms, Cotham Lane, Hawton – 26/00545/PIP, Councillor D Moore was known to an objector whom his wife had been to a cookery lesson with and lived across the road from the application site. Councillor S Saddington was known to the applicant.

Councillor S Forde declared an other registerable interest regarding Agenda Item No. 5 – Land at London Road, Balderton – 26/00473/FUL, as he was a resident of Balderton and resides quarter of a mile from the application site.

The Director of Planning & Growth declared an other registerable interest on Agenda Item No. 9 – 32 Stodman Street, Newark – 26/00541/S73M, as he was acting on behalf of the applicant and developer and left the room when the application was considered.

16 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4 JUNE 2026

AGREED that the minutes from the meeting held on 4 June 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 construction and operation of a micro energy storage project.

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

Members considered the presentation from the 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 comments from Balderton Parish Council.

Mr J Hague, objector, spoke against the application.

Councillor J Buxton, representing Balderton Parish Council spoke against the application.

Ms P Rees, applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor J Hall, Local Ward Member, spoke against the application.

Members considered the application, and it was commented that there had not been any evaluation of the visual impact that this would cause. It was commented that this land was a green gateway and was a designated open space. Balderton had a short fall of over 200 acres of open space. The proposed units would equate to two, twenty-foot shipping containers which would be intrusive in size. The fire risks as mentioned by the objectors had not been considered in the Planning Officers report. It was commented that the Fire and Rescue Service had said that the developer should engage early when any fire started as the fire would emit toxic gas and the fire would not be extinguished using water. Fire safety needed to be much higher in priority as it was close to residential homes and the road. Tonal noise was considered worse for humans, and it was felt that the noise from this had not been taken into consideration. Given the hot summer temperatures being experienced the fans would be running faster, with local residents having their windows open and experiencing noise pollution. Members referred to the National Chief Fire document and commented that the proposal did fall under those guidelines for commercial industrial regulations. The guidelines also recommended a 25-30 metre distance from residential homes; the report had detailed 27-metres, which had been sited closer than the originally proposed 30-metres. The gardens to the residential homes were used by the homeowner and there would be no warning should the battery storage units caught fire. It was commented that an 800 kilowatt system would charge four vehicles, or keep the 4,000 homes in Balderton in power for 30 minutes. It was considered that this was not the correct location given the risk to the residents in that vicinity. Other Members commented that the containers were opposite a busy supermarket, bus stop and busy main road and considered this a fire safety hazard, emitting toxic gases. Members commented upon the battery storage site at Rainworth, which had been located at the old Rufford Colliery storage site, concerns had been raised regarding that site which was tucked away from residential

development. That site had caught fire and concerns had been raised from the Wildlife Trust regarding the wildlife habitation impact from the toxic fumes emitted.

A vote was taken, and the application was unanimously refused.

AGREED moved by Councillor S Forde and seconded by Councillor M Shakeshaft (unanimously) that contrary to Officer recommendation Planning Permission be refused, for the reasons: visual impact and safety.

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
L Dales	For
S Forde	For
M Home	For
K Melton	For
D Moore	For
P Rainbow	For
S Saddington	For
M Shakeshaft	For
L Tift	For
T Wildgust	For

18 LAND OFF KESTREL RISE, RAINWORTH - 25/00197/FULM

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

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 comments from Rainworth Parish Council.

The application was previously presented to the 4 June 2026 Planning Committee due to a call-in request by Councillor Thompson on the grounds of conflict with the masterplan, an over-intensive form of development out of keeping with the surrounding built form, insufficient parking spaces, highways concerns regarding access and the impact upon wildlife and ecology.

The decision was deferred from the 4 July 2026 Planning Committee for two reasons:

- Incorporating a footpath connection to the open space to the north of the site

- Seeing if anything could be done to improve the parking situation for 6 of the plots

As such, an addendum report had been prepared following the deferral to address those two points.

Mr M Peet, objector, spoke against the application.

Councillor C Penny, representing Rainworth Parish Council, spoke against the application.

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

Councillor T Thompson, Local Ward Member, spoke against the application.

Members considered the application, and it was commented that there should not be a compromise regarding car parking on a new build estate. The bus service did not have good transfer links; it was therefore deemed necessary to have a car to access surrounding areas. This would therefore be a large development with a lot of vehicular movement which was considered unacceptable. It was commented that the on street car-parking arrangements may cause aggravation for refuse vehicles, HGV's and emergency service vehicles. Members felt that this scheme was not acceptable and acknowledged that by removing some plots may have an impact on the affordable homes provided.

AGREED (with 5 votes For, 5 votes Against and 1 Abstention, and the Planning Committee Chair using his casting vote For approval) that Planning Permission be approved, subject to the updated conditions originally detailed in the report as contained in Appendix A of the report and as updated in paragraph 14 of the report, and subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement.

19 LAND ADJACENT THE ELMS, COTHAM LANE, HAWTON NG24 3RL - 26/00545/PIP

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought an application for permission in principle for a residential development of a minimum of 3 dwellings and maximum of 6 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.

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

Members considered the application, and it was commented that Hawton was a small village and any development needed to be small and sympathetic. The second stage should deliver a good quality development. There was a bus service to the village which helped the village to be integrated. The development would help Hawton to grow and survive. The quantum, location and access were considered acceptable. Concern was raised regarding the bank of trees and whether some trees would be lost

when the driveway was constructed. Access onto the site was also raised although the development across from the site was considered more dangerous due to the road corner. The lack of footpaths into the village was also commented upon but could be addressed at the next phase.

AGREED (unanimously) that Permission in Principle be approved.

20 14 MARKET PLACE, NEWARK ON TRENT, NG24 1DU - 26/00648/FUL

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought to vary the use from class E to classes E and F – ground floor only.

Members considered the presentation from the Principal 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 the conditions contained within the report.

21 32 STODMAN STREET, NEWARK ON TRENT, NG24 1AW - 26/00541/S73M

The Committee considered the report of the Business Manager – Planning Development, which sought the variation of condition 18 attached to planning permission 21/00699/FULM to vary the opening times of the ground floor units.

Members considered the presentation from the Principal 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 the conditions contained within the report.

22 LAND ADJACENT CHURCH VIEW FARM, SWINDERBY ROAD, SOUTH SCARLE, NG23 7JW - 26/00643/FUL

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

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

Mr C Almond, objector, spoke against the application.

Mr J Williams, Applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Mr D Duffield, representing South Scarle Parish Meeting, spoke against the application.

Members considered the application and it was commented that amendments had

been made to the previous application which had been refused, although the application was in an unsustainable village, residents would still need a car and the site was outside the village envelope and was in the open countryside. The titled balance had been taken into consideration, and it was felt that the application would not outweigh the damage that it would cause. It was considered that bungalows would have less impact on the edge of the village, although it was acknowledged that the roof line had been lowered on the application. It was considered an over-intensive development. Other Members considered the revised design acceptable and so close to the village, therefore not intrusive into the open countryside. It was noted by the Principal Planning Officer that Councillor Dales had requested that if the application was approved that an additional condition was included to restrict construction times, and that this had been agreed with the applicant and would be included in the recommendation.

AGREED (with 6 votes For, 4 votes Against and 1 Abstention) that:

- (a) Planning Permission be approved subject to the conditions contained within the report;
- (b) an additional condition to restrict construction times to:
 - 8am – 6pm – Monday -Friday
 - 8am – 2pm - Saturday
 - Sunday no construction, including Bank Holidays, additional condition to be worded by the Business Manager Planning Development; and
- (c) a Unilateral Undertaking to secure self-build exemption for BNG

23 APPEALS LODGED

The Principal Planning Officer informed the Planning Committee that applications 25/02031/FUL and 24/00024/ENFB were both written representations and not Hearings as stated in the report.

AGREED that the report be noted.

24 APPEALS DETERMINED

AGREED that the report be noted.

25 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

That, under section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 3 and 5 of part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

26 LAND ADJOINING CHESTNUT FARM, CORKHILL LANE, NORMANTON, NOTTS NG25 0PR

The Planning Committee considered the exempt report regarding land adjoining Chestnut Farm, Corkhill Lane, Normanton, Notts, NG25 0PR. This information was noted and Officers advised that Members would be kept updated on all aspects of the claim for Judicial Review.

(Summary provided in accordance with Section 100C(2) of the Local Government Act 1972).

27 LAND TO EAST OF MOORHOUSE ROAD, EGMANTON

The Planning Committee considered the exempt report regarding land at east of Moorhouse Road, Egmanton. This information was noted and Officers advised that Members would be kept updated on all aspects of the claim for Judicial Review.

(Summary provided in accordance with Section 100C(2) of the Local Government Act 1972).

Meeting closed at 6.44 pm.

Chair