Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2026

by S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/25/3369949
207 London Road, Balderton, Newark, NG24 3HB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Kedleston Group Ltd against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
- The application reference is 25/00126/FUL.
- The development proposed is change of use of existing family dwellinghouse (Class C3) into children's care home (Class C2).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers, particularly in respect of the adequacy of off-street parking arrangements.

Reasons

3. The appeal site contains a five-bedroom detached house with hardstanding to its front and side, accessed via separate vehicular and pedestrian gates to the B6326 London Road. This is a busy road with pedestrian refuges and wide footways, both of which contain cycle paths, albeit the markings are worn. A narrow access road runs over a footway crossover and down the side of the site to five or six houses and there are two other side roads with footways opposite the site.

4. The speed limit is 30mph and there is no parking restriction outside the site, but parking is prohibited at any time on the opposite side of the road. A few vehicles were parked on the footway nearby when I visited at around 11am on a weekday morning in term time and the side road opposite was heavily parked.

5. Bus stops are about 100m and 200m away, serving Newark town centre twice an hour and Nottingham hourly, both stopping within walking distance of the more central but less busy of the town's two railway stations. The cycle path runs to the town centre and to the other station, both about a 10-minute cycle away.

6. The appellant states that the proposed care home would be staffed by 18 part-time carers, who would rotate in shifts of four at a time. The Transport Note states that shifts would cycle through the day and night. However, the example rota provided with the appeal shows only 11 staff, a two-hour weekday overlap and no staff in attendance during the night. No further consistent detail is provided on how the proposed use is likely to be operated in practice.

7. Consequently, I am inclined to agree with the County Council's highway officer that the proposal would result in increased parking demand with several staff on site at the same time during shift changes, possibly coinciding with visitors. Whilst bus stops are nearby, services are unlikely to be available for staff finishing late shifts, so that, overall, the parking standard for care homes recommended by the County Council's highway officer is likely to be appropriate.

8. Even if I were to accept that two cars could be parked alongside the house, this would still only provide four spaces, two less than required. Whilst I accept that on-street parking is likely to be available in the area surveyed, the nature of the use proposed and the characteristics of this section of London Road (for example, its speed limit, carriageway and footway widths) are such that people would tend to park as near as possible to the site on the footway.

9. Whilst tandem or on-street parking may accommodate surplus demand, these are likely to result in reversing into, or obstruction of, the highway. Both would increase risk to cyclists and pedestrians, decrease the safety and ease of use of the cycle path and footway or reduce visibility from the adjacent access road.

10. Either scenario would increase danger for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers using the road and would therefore be contrary to Spatial Policy 7 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy Development Plan Document and DM5 of the Newark and Sherwood Allocation and Development Management Development Plan Document, which require safe, convenient and attractive access, appropriate and effective parking provision and safe cycle and footpath networks.

Other Matters

11. Whilst there may be a need for accommodation for looked after children in the area, I have no evidence, for example, from the County Council's Children's Social Care Sufficiency Strategy, of the scale of that need. In the circumstances, the need does not outweigh the harm I have found in relation to highway safety.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would harm the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers and would conflict with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR