

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF CODDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL
HELD on 5 DECEMBER 2013 at 7.00 pm in THE VILLAGE HALL

Present:

Members: Cllrs Allen, Armstrong, Carver, Cox, King, Molloson, Parrett.

Clerk: Mrs Wellard

Public: 13 residents of the Parish attended

1. **Apologies for Absence.**

Cllr O'Donnell (bereavement), Cllr Elliott (unwell), Cllr Bell (holiday). The meeting was chaired by Cllr Cox.

2. **Declarations of Interest.**

Cllr Allen declared an interest in the Minerals Local Plan consultation.

3. **Public Contribution.**

Mr Dan Howard was elected as spokesman for residents opposing the application to erect two houses on land adjacent to 4 Yew Tree Way. Mr Howard referred to the correspondence already submitted to the Planning Authority (copies previously circulated to Members), highlighting residents' concerns and the protection of trees now in place. Other primary concerns included the location of 2 soak-aways on the site, the lack of space for additional parking and manoeuvring of vehicles, and the impact on neighbours' privacy. He added that there had been no communication with the residents of Yew Tree Way, the plans were not in keeping with existing properties and would set a precedent for further development and removal of trees.

4. **Planning Applications.**

a) **13/01623/FUL: Erection of two houses on land adjacent to 4 Yew Tree Way**

Each of the Councillors indicated their support for the concerns expressed by the residents. Cllr Molloson drew attention to the Core Strategy's principle that any development should reflect local need, of which there was none proven. Other concerns included the loss of mature woodland, deviation from the original design principles of well spaced houses planned around the dominant woodland, a lack of space for additional vehicles, incompatible materials and design, and precedents for further development and loss of woodland.

It was therefore proposed by Cllr Carver, seconded by Cllr Armstrong and unanimously agreed that the planning application be rejected.

Members of the public left the meeting.

b) **13/01636/FUL: Erection of detached dwelling on land adjacent to 3 Drove Lane**

This was a resubmission of plans originally rejected in 2012. Cllr Molloson's report, previously circulated to Members, stated that this was not an area allocated for development, and should be refused as being contrary to national and local development policies. Cllr Molloson's proposal to reject the application was seconded by Cllr Armstrong and agreed by a majority vote of 6:1 in favour.

Cllr Allen had no objection to a single dwelling which he thought would tidy up the area and he therefore opposed the resolution.

5. Consultations.

a) Local Minerals Plan

Cllr Allen, having declared an interest, withdrew from the meeting

A draft submission compiled by Cllr Molloson and Cllr O'Donnell, which had been previously circulated, was broadly agreed. Cllr Armstrong suggested there should be clarification of the recommendation that no work be permitted on site during evenings and weekends by the addition of 'including all site access, HGV transport, machinery and pumping' (para 16g).

The final report to be completed by **Cllr O'Donnell** and circulated prior to submission.

Cllr Allen returned to the meeting

b) Electoral Boundary Review

Cllr O'Donnell was still in the process of completing the draft response on behalf of the Parish Council. His proposal that Coddington should be included in the Beacon Ward rather than the Balderton North Ward was agreed by Members because of the close community links with the Beacon Heights area. **Cllr O'Donnell** to circulate his final report for the Council's approval, prior to submission by 6 January.

Councillors proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman for all the work he had done in preparing the response on their behalf.

6. Matters of immediate note.

a) Application to extend licensing hours at Newark Showground

Proposed amendments to the original application had been circulated to Members following a meeting with the CEO of Newark Showground which Cllr Cox had attended. Cllrs were not satisfied by the amendments, as the proposed changes would be on a voluntary basis only, with no guarantees. Concerns were also expressed that the new agreement would allow for additional noise from all the buildings on site, including those close to the road and livestock.

It was proposed by Cllr Molloson, seconded by Cllr King that the Parish Council's objections should stand, and that a revised application setting out the new proposals should be submitted before further consideration. The proposal was agreed by a majority of 6; Cllr Allen abstained from the vote.

- b) Cllr Parrett reported a trail of mud from Mr Martin Hanbury's field on the C208 along the cycle path which would be slippery and dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. The Clerk was to report this to NCC.

13. **Matters for next agenda.** None

14. **Next CPC Meeting.** The next Parish Council meeting to be held on 9 January 2014 at 7.30pm at Coddington Community Centre.

The meeting closed at 8:00pm.

Attachments:

1. The PC's response to planning application 13/01623/FUL
2. The PC's response to planning application 13/01636/FUL

**1. Planning Application 13/01623/FUL
Erection of two houses on land adjacent to 4 Yew Tree Way, Coddington.**

At a meeting of the Coddington Parish Council on 5 December 2013, Councillors voted unanimously to reject the above application. The main reasons for opposing the plans are:

1. The Core Strategy states that any development in Coddington should be for local need. There is no proven need, and there is already a surplus of three bedroom houses in the area.
2. Impact on trees and the loss of mature woodland. A recent preservation order provides full protection for the trees on this site.
3. Inadequate parking space and room for manoeuvring vehicles at this end of the road would cause congestion and inconvenience to other residents.
4. The original plans rejected more intensive development on this site – the scheme was for 4 bedroom houses with large gardens designed around the dominant woodland.
5. The design and proposed building materials are not in keeping with other properties on Yew Tree Way.
6. The division of gardens for further development and loss of woodland would set precedents contrary to the original design for the area.

2. Planning Application Ref.13/01636/FUL – Land at 3 Drove Lane, Coddington

1. This is a resubmission of the previously refused planning application Ref.12/01319/FUL relating to land at 3 Drove Lane, Coddington. The only difference between the two applications is the design of the proposed dwelling.
2. It is Coddington Parish Council's submission that there is nothing in the present application which overcomes the conflict with national and local planning policy identified by the Newark and Sherwood District Council in relation to the previous application. This conflict is clearly set out in the Reasons for Refusal relating to that application which can be summarised as follows:-
3. a) There is no proven need for the dwelling and the application site is not within the built-up area of the village. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, and Spatial Policies 2 and 3 of the Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy DPD 2011.
b) The proposed pastiche, cottage-style design of the dwelling is of unremarkable quality and the site is in an area deemed important to the open countryside setting of the Conservation Area in the Coddington Conservation Area Appraisal 2002. The application is therefore contrary to Core Policy 14 of the Core Strategy.
c) The Application site is part of a much wider area which contributes to the rural setting of the village and of the Conservation Area. The proposed development would harm these important attributes and would be contrary to the Coddington Conservation Area Appraisal 2002, and Core Strategy Policies 14 and SP3.
d) These Reasons for Refusal relating to the previous application apply equally to the present application and are reinforced by Policies DM8 and DM9 of the Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD adopted by the District Council in July 2013.
4. On the basis of the above submissions and in the interests of consistency, this planning application should be refused.