

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF CODDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL
HELD ON 4 JULY 2013 AT 7.30 PM AT CODDINGTON COMMUNITY CENTRE**

Present:

Members: Cllr O'Donnell (Chairman), Cllrs Allen, Bell, Carver, Cox, Elliott, King, Molloson, Parrett

CC & DC: Cllr Maureen Dobson

Clerk: Mrs Y Wellard

Public: 8 residents of the Parish attended

1. **Apologies for Absence.** Cllr Armstrong (holiday).
2. **Declarations of Interest.** There were no declarations of interest in items on the agenda.
3. **Public Contribution.**
 - a. Mr Mick Lord gave a verbal apology to CCllr Maureen Dobson for remarks he had made at the Local Improvement Scheme meeting on 24 June when he said that nothing had been achieved in the village in 20 years. Mr Lord wished to put on record that he retracted this statement and he acknowledged that Cllr Vincent Dobson and Cllr Maureen Dobson had both put a lot of work into achieving improvements for Coddington. However, he was still very concerned about the problems on Brownlow's Hill and Main Street caused by school traffic and insufficient parking for staff, who were forced to park on the road all day.
Cllr Dobson thanked Mr Lord for his apology, and outlined her suggestion for acquiring additional land for school parking which she was discussing with the Director of Education.
 - b. Mrs Lisa Cobb spoke on behalf of residents objecting to plans for an extension to the house and garage at 12 Bryans Close. The main concerns were on-street parking and the additional traffic generated by a business being run from the property. As there was no pavement in the Close, these would be safety issues, and would change the appearance of the area. (*Residents' notes attached to the minutes*). The applicant, Mr Highfield, advised that the application to move the boundary fence had been withdrawn. He stated that his wife's business activities were for only for a few hours a week, but did confirm that promotional parties at the house had been advertised.
4. **Public Contribution – County and District Councillor.**
 - a. Cllr Dobson asked to be supplied with the numbers of the street lights which could be switched off as part of the energy saving drive.
 - b. Colin Walker, Director of Growth, would be invited to attend a meeting with Parish Councillors from Coddington and Winthorpe to discuss their concerns about the lack of transparency in granting permission for tree works. **The Clerk** was asked to book the Coddington Community Centre for a meeting in September.
 - c. The Coddington gateway signage was in the process of being evaluated for implementation during 2014/2015. However, Cllr Dobson warned that LIS funding would be cut next year as NCC has to find another round of savings.
 - d. Cllr Dobson had passed on the Parish Council's comments to Andy Warrington, that for repairs to last, pot holes should be filled before roads were surfaced dressed.

- e. The Chmn and Clerk reported that the new web site for N&SDC Planning Department was more difficult to negotiate and there appeared to be no way to access old records of planning applications.

5. **To receive and accept:**

a. **Minutes of the Ordinary Parish Council Meeting of 6 June 2013**

The Clerk highlighted an amendment to the draft minutes: para 8b to read 'Cllr Armstrong tabled a copy of the accounts for the Community Centre which clearly showed a loss *during* the first four years.' Proposed by Cllr Parrett and seconded by Cllr Cox, the amended minutes were approved and signed by the Chmn.

b. **Accounts for June 2013.**

Proposed by Cllr Parrett, seconded by Cllr King, the June accounts were approved and signed by the Chmn. Councillors were reminded that the Clerk's salary was paid net of tax, and there would be additional payments to HMRC of £64 per month.

6. **Matters arising from the Minutes.**

There were no matters arising from the previous meeting.

7. **Finance.**

a. **To approve expenditure as at 4 July 2013:**

	£
Scout Hall Archives (half yearly payment)	100.00
Owen Wilby – Scout Hall renovations (from Scout funds held)	1,750.00
Notts Wildlife Trust Annual Subscription	33.00
Bruce Richmond – April / May / June	144.40
Mike Elliott – Internal Audit	130.00
Clerk's Salary - June	256.00
Cllr L Cox, Stationery	12.00
MCR Joinery (installation of benches)	75.00
J.R. Designs – Queen's Jubilee Plaque	60.00*

Following a proposal by Cllr Molloson, seconded by Cllr Parrett, the above bills were approved for payment.

*Cllr Parrett advised that after paying for the plaque, there would be £104 left in the Jubilee Fund which was to be given to the school for a commemorative tree.

b. **Internal Auditor's Report**

The Clerk drew attention to the following points in the auditor's report:

- 1) Minutes of the Annual Parish Council Meeting should be presented for approval at the next Ordinary meeting
- 2) The Annual meeting of the Council should not include the word 'general', nor should it appear in the Standing Orders.
- 3) There is no VAT payable as the Parish Council is not registered (a separate email received from Mr Elliott explained that the Parish Council should register for VAT if there is regular business income over £1,000 p.a.)
- 4) Bank statements should be addressed to the Council c/o the Clerk
- 5) Two Councillors should initial invoices for expenditure when payments are authorised.

In answer to the Clerk's questions about the payment of VAT on income, Mr Elliott had advised that it was not necessary for the Parish Council to register for VAT unless income from business activities was in excess of £1,000 p.a. (*copy of email attached*)

8. **Administration.**

- a. **Footpaths.** In regard to progress on the diversion of Footpath 4, Cllr Allen reported that he had heard nothing more about the proposed footbridge over the dyke. **The Clerk** was asked to email a reminder to Stephen Tipping at NCC.
- b. **Coddington Community Association.** Minutes of the CCA meeting held on 23 May 2013 had been previously circulated. Cllr Cox reported that the Liaison Group meeting had discussed finances, fund raising events and solar panels. Cllr Carver requested that a written report on the Liaison Group meetings be made available.
- c. **Village website.** The Chmn's introductory page for the Parish Council's section of the web site was almost complete. It was suggested that street maps of the village would be a useful addition to the web site; **the Clerk** to investigate copyright regulations.
- d. **Defibrillation Unit.** A third person had volunteered to train in the use of the defibrillation unit, and it was hoped that all three could be scheduled for the November training session.
- e. **Local Improvement Scheme.** Following the LIS meeting on 24 June, a draft village plan had been compiled and circulated to Councillors. However, CCllr Dobson had warned that with further NCC cuts on the horizon, alternative funding sources should be investigated. **Cllr Cox** would write a short piece for the CVN inviting volunteers to join a village walkabout, to highlight areas which may be in need of attention.
- f. **Tree preservation.** The Chmn had responded to Mr Colin Walker's email on the notification of tree works, expressing the Parish Council's concerns over the lack of information and accountability surrounding applications and decisions for such works.
- g. **Pages' Wood.** Councillors expressed their appreciation for the hard work done by Coddington Scout Group in clearing the paths through the wood.
- h. **Best Kept Village Competition.** Cllr Parrett informed the meeting that Coddington had been placed in the top 4 villages in Section A of the competition, and was through to the second round of judging which was due to take place between 1 - 19 July. Cllr Dobson said she would put in a request for litter picking to be done as soon as possible.
- i. **Local Government Boundary Review.** Councillors who had visited the Boundary Commission's web site said that they had found very little information and nothing that they could comment on. **Cllr Dobson** said that she would try to find out more about the proposed changes.
- j. **1914 Centenary Commemoration.** It was suggested that the Parish Council approach the Coddington History Group to work with them in researching the background of the 9 First World War servicemen whose names are on the church memorial, with a view to publishing a booklet on the men and their families, and to holding a special church service on the centenary anniversary of the declaration of war on 4 August 1914.

9. **Planning.**

a. **Planning application 13/00703/FUL – 12 Bryans Close**

Further to the detailed discussions at the start of the meeting, Councillors voted unanimously by a show of hands, to reject the application for a single storey and garage extension. The main objections cited were parking, pedestrian safety, and questions over the use of the premises for business activities. (*Full response to N&SDC attached to the minutes*)

b. **Decisions:**

1) 13/00549/FUL – Mobile home, Woodlands Livery, Beckingham Road
Plans to site a six berth caravan had been refused by the District Council as unnecessary development for sustaining the business in its current form.

2) 13/00523/FUL – Car parking space, 7a Beckingham Road.
The plans had been approved by the District Council.

10. **Environment, Transport and Services.**

a. **Grit Bins.** Proposals for grit bins to be considered at the next meeting. **The Chmn and Cllr Parrett** to look at possible sites for the bins to enable **the Clerk** to obtain more precise information from NCC.

b. **Reduced Street Lighting.** **The Chmn and Cllr Cox** to obtain the pole numbers of the lamps which could be turned off, and inform Cllr Dobson.

11. **Allotments and Open Spaces.**

a. Cllr Allen reported that the Allotment Working Group had held a site meeting and found that although it was possible to mow the paths, plot boundaries needed to be straightened up to make the task easier. One allotment was not being used, and **Cllr Allen** would contact the tenant.

b. The rubbish had been removed from the site by Cllr Allen, and the bath moved out of the way, but a further email from Mr Elliott had made it clear that allotment holders would prefer the bath to be removed. **Cllr Allen** said that he would resolve the matter.

There was a proposal by Cllr Cox, seconded by Cllr Parrett and agreed, that the meeting be extended by 5 minutes in order to complete the agenda.

12. **Miscellaneous correspondence.**

The Clerk drew attention to the following items:

- A NALC training event – “Responding to Major Planning Applications – Increasing the Effectiveness of your Response” – to be held at Oxtou Village Hall on Wednesday 25 September. **The Chmn and Cllr Cox** said that they would attend. **The Clerk** was asked to forward details of the event to them.
- Standards Training at Kelham Hall, Monday 9 September. **The Clerk** to attend.
- Road works on the A1 between 22 and 26 July – details had been previously circulated by email.
- Resurfacing work on Balderton Lane and Brownlow’s Hill from 22 July to 24 August

12. **Other reports.**

Cllr Parrett reported that safety railings at the C208 school crossing patrol had been damaged during the roadworks. **Cllr Dobson** noted the report.

13. **Matters of immediate note.**

Councillors noted holiday dates

14. **Matters for next agenda.** No proposals were put forward.
15. **Next CPC Meeting.** The next Parish Council meeting would be held at 7.30pm, 5 September 2013, at Coddington Community Centre.

The meeting closed at 2135 hrs.

Lynsey Tomlin
Planning Department
Newark and Sherwood District Council
Kelham Hall

5 July 2013

Dear Ms Tomlin,

Planning Application 13/00703/FUL – 12 Bryans Close, Coddington

At the Coddington Parish Council meeting on 4 July, Councillors voted unanimously to reject the above application for a single storey and garage extension.

The Parish Council's objections are:

1. Parking. The extension would leave only a single parking space on the drive, which is inadequate for a four bedroom house, and in particular at this address, where business clients visit the house. The applicant has confirmed to the Council that promotional parties are held at the property, and this would inevitably result in on-street parking, possibly for several cars at a time.
2. Safety. Bryans Close has no footpath and the additional traffic generated by business activities and the on-street parking would create safety concerns, especially as children use the road to access the footpath at the end of the Close.
3. Use of Premises. Having been given details of advertising for the business and the plans for promotional parties, the Parish Council questions whether the business can still be classed as 'de minimus' and therefore should be subject to additional planning consent. It appears that the business activities would be excessive for that neighbourhood.
4. Proximity to Neighbouring Property. The proposed extension comes right up to the edge of the property and as well as impacting adversely on the adjoining neighbours' privacy and outlook, would leave no access for maintenance.
5. Character of the Neighbourhood. The Parish Council understands that the application to move the boundary fence has been withdrawn. However the fence has been repositioned in the past, and this, together with extra cars parked on the road, alters the open plan character of the area which was the intention of the developers and which makes the area attractive to residents. The provision of open spaces was one of the original conditions on the development and neighbouring home owners have a right to expect this to be maintained.

At the meeting, there was strong representation by residents opposed to the plans, and I attach a copy of their notes to highlight further points which have been put forward.

Yours sincerely,

RESIDENTS' NOTES RE 12 BRYANS CLOSE

To members of the Parish Council,

We are here in relation to planning application 13/00703/FUL and we wish to convey our OBJECTION to the proposals. As the owners are already aware, moving the fence is not acceptable under the covenants of the property and this matter is being taken up separately by our Solicitor.

With regards the application and the planning process, we would like to summarise our objections on the following grounds:

1. It impacts upon the safety of residents and visitors; both drivers and pedestrians.
2. It dramatically changes the open aspect of the street.
3. It reduces the car parking (the property also has a business attached to it) to just one space.
4. The proposed extension appears to be at least partly designed to develop and grow the business and increased business will result in more traffic.
5. Previous applications of the same nature have been rejected (reference 08/00526/FUL and 08/01718/FUL).
6. Lack of privacy afforded to the properties adjacent and opposite the proposed fence boundary change.
7. Permission to access the neighbouring property to build and thereafter maintain the proposed extension has not been sought or granted. The proposed extension also appears infringe the legal boundary with the neighbouring property.
8. The restrictive covenants that are placed on the property clearly state that moving the fence is not allowed.

To give further detail on the above:

1. The safety of all residents and visitors onto the street is paramount. By moving the fence, this will reduce visibility and create an obstruction for all drivers on the cul- de- sac. Children do play on the street, as would be expected on a cul-de-sac on a family estate close to excellent primary schools. People tend to use the road as opposed to the grassed verge, particularly those with walking sticks, pushchairs as well as children with bikes and scooters - at least one of which describes every resident on the street. It is not possible to use the grass verge as these are unsuitable terrain and therefore by the nature of the street, people will always be walking / cycling / scooting on the road.
2. One large reason for many purchasing homes on the close was the pleasing, open aspect of the cul-de-sac. If this application is approved, and the fence moved, it dramatically changes the current open aspect and the existing street scene. It would also set a precedent for other owners which in turn will affect the aspect of the whole estate in a detrimental way. Its current open plan aspect is one enjoyed by many and creates for a better social aspect to the neighbourhood and its residents.
3. Parking on the cul-de-sac has always been a problem even with the two spaces all dwellings currently have. The proposed scheme reduces parking at the property to just one space which is not suitable for a large, 4 bedroom detached family property (also see note 4 below).
4. The current owner runs a business from the property which is open at least five evenings a week and is advertised through Facebook as having on-street parking. The proposed extension appears to create additional space for the owner's Beauty Salon and as there is no off-street parking it is inevitable that traffic volumes will continue to increase and exacerbate the existing problem (I have several photos showing the existing parking problem outside 12 Bryans Close should these be required).
5. Applications in 2008 from another address on the same estate (08/00526/FUL & 08/01719/FUL) were rejected due to reasons 1 and 2 stated above. There may be other applications we are not aware of.
6. The proposed changes to the boundary fence would increase visibility of No. 12's rear garden from the upstairs windows of surrounding properties.
7. The proposed extension will be adjacent to the border of No. 14 Bryans Close and from the plans it appears that the fascia and guttering will in fact overhang the boundary line. Furthermore, we don't believe the proposed extension can be built and thereafter maintained without access to the property of No. 14. The applicants have not requested any such access or a change to the property deeds of No. 14 that would grant them and future occupier's access.
8. There are restrictive covenants placed on the property that the buyer is "not to erect any walls, fences or other structures nor allow any hedges to grow on the property between any building on the property and the estate roads" The applicants are aware of this restriction as the previous owners made it very clear to them. The applicants have ignored these covenants in the past as they have already moved their fence 12ft from the fence line in existence when they bought the property. At the time of this boundary fence move some residents discussed the "restrictive covenants" and their concerns about the safety implications of this change but the applicants made it very clear that they were not interested in any covenants or the resident's

concerns. I have enclosed a copy of No. 12's deeds and an aerial shot of the house with its original boundary fence and have marked on it where the fence is currently placed and where they want to move it to. Our objections all fall within Policy DD1 and DD4 as the fence causes an obstruction to the visibility of drivers and pedestrians, and the intrusive feature and loss of a green buffer the fence will create is detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene.

Based upon the facts given above, as well as objections from 10 residents (copies of their objections can be obtained if needed) we hope you will appreciate the strength of feeling amongst the residents of Bryans Close and would therefore strongly recommend the objection to this planning application.

Yours faithfully

Residents of Bryans Close

From: elliottnews@btconnect.com
To: coddingtonpc@hotmail.com
Subject: RE: Coddington Parish Council Audit
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 2013 11:24:47 +0100

Morning

Yes advertising in a newsletter is a business activity and, as such, the Council would normally be required to register for VAT. However, if **all** the income from **all** business activities is **less than £1000**, then HMRC will not enforce registration.

If registered, you would need to look at all other charges such as letting sports fields and halls.

regards

Mike Elliott, Elliott News Service

19/21 Main Street. Keyworth, Nottingham NG12 5AA

Tel: 0115 937 6506

Email: elliottnews@btconnect.com