

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF CODDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL
held on 7 January 2016 at 7:30 pm at Coddington Community Centre

Present:

Members: Cllrs Cox (Chairman), Allen, Armstrong, Carver, Gangel, Molloson, O'Donnell, Parrett, Rowden-Allen.

Clerk: Mrs Y Wellard.

In Attendance: Co. Cllr Maureen Dobson, 12 members of the public.

1. Apologies for Absence.

Apologies for absence were received from District Cllrs Payne and Lee.

2. Declarations of Interest.

There were no declarations of interest for items on the agenda.

3. Public Contribution.

Several residents voiced their objections to plans for the redevelopment of The Plough and the erection of three houses on the existing car park. A new lease of life for the pub would be welcomed, but residents of Chapel Lane did not want a car park and recycling bins adjacent to their properties, causing disturbance and noise late at night. Residents of Hall Farm objected to their loss of privacy if new houses were built on the elevated site of the existing car park. Concerns were also expressed about road safety and the loss of open space.

The applicant explained that the new car park would be constructed of soft mesh over grass which would provide a quiet surface and blend in to the surrounding area.

On a proposal by Cllr Parrett, seconded by Cllr Carver, it was agreed to bring forward discussion of item 7a on the agenda, planning application 15/02253/FUL.

Cllrs had previously received notes drafted by Cllr Molloson relating the application to criteria set out in the relevant Development Plan Policies.

Members were in full agreement with all the objections cited by residents and in Cllr Molloson's notes. Whilst some elements of the application would be acceptable to bring The Plough back to life as a village pub, it was unanimously agreed that new houses on the northern side of the C208 would be out of character in the conservation area, and could set a precedent for further ribbon development along the road.

Proposed by Cllr Parrett, seconded by Cllr O'Donnell, Cllrs voted to reject the application by a majority of 8:1 abstention. Cllr Gangel abstained from the vote, as being keen to retain a traditional style public house in the village, he was not totally opposed to the proposal.

It was agreed that Cllr Molloson's notes should form the basis of the Parish Council's response, which would also include concerns for road safety and the impact on Hall Farm residents. (A copy of the full response is attached to the minutes – appendix 1.)

Members thanked Cllr Molloson for her thorough scrutiny of the application.

11 members of the public left the meeting.

4. District and County Councillors.

- i. County Cllr Dobson reported that the committee meeting held at County Hall for discussion of the Local Minerals Plan was disappointing. It appeared that Officers had not listened to public opinion, and the Strategic Traffic Assessment used, covered only 7 years, not the lifetime of the gravel extraction. Their recommendations would now go to full Council meeting on 14 January, to agree the next stage for consultation.
- ii. Cllr Dobson would aim to provide a date for the next public meeting on footpaths, for publication in the March newsletter.
- iii. Cllr Payne reported (through the Clerk) a complaint about the unreliability of the bus service, which he would forward to Cllr Dobson.

Cllr Dobson left the meeting.

5. To receive and accept Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on 5 November 2015.

Proposed by Cllr Rowden-Allen, seconded by Cllr Carver, the minutes of the 5 November meeting were approved, and signed by the Chmn.

6. Matters Arising from the Previous Minutes.

6.7i. Cllrs reported that there was still a smell in the area around Greenfields every day. Reports on this and smoke from Greenways were being regularly submitted to Jeremy Hutchinson (NSDC). He had suggested that the smell could be linked to Greenways, but Cllrs were sure that these were two separate issues. JH had contacted the Environment Agency about the burning of waste at Greenways, but as there had been no response, it was suggested that the Clerk write directly to the Environment Agency with a copy to JH. The Clerk would also ask JH to examine STW's plan of the sewers around Greenfields and to re-visit the site.

6.7ii. The Planning Office had carried out a search on the original planning consent for 26 Newark Road but found nothing relating to the perimeter fence. James Mountain (NSDC) had visited the site and advised that as the fence was no more than 1m high, no action would be taken. The Clerk was asked to contact NottsCC Highways to report concerns over the impaired line of sight for cars leaving Old Hall Gardens.

6.9a Cllr Armstrong reported that the over-grown elder tree and rose bush next to the Community Centre was part of the school hedge, and had now been cut back.

6.9c Matt Duckworth (NCC) had written again to the homeowner asking for the laurel hedge to be cut further back.

6.9e Members asked the Clerk to write on their behalf to thank Mr Gray for supplying the Christmas tree and those who had helped to erect and decorate the tree – Chris and Adrian Parrett, Mike Cox, Janice and Andrew Barber.

7cii The field behind Old Hall Gardens had not been cleared in the two months since the Untidy Land Notice was served. Various complaints had been voiced by residents; a dead horse was seen in the field; concerns about the conditions the horses were kept in; there was evidence of rat poisoning causing concern for pet owners; cars and lorries were accessing the field via Parklands Close which is a private road. The Clerk would write to Adrian Adams,(NSDC Enforcement Officer) to arrange a site meeting, and to the owners of the field to inform them that Parklands Close is a private road. It had also been also suggested that the RSPCA be informed.

9c The Parish Council's map of TPOs covered most of the village and the Clerk would request another map to include the whole parish.

7. Planning and Consultations.

a. Planning application 15/02253/FUL – The Plough

The Parish Council's response is minuted at item 3 and in detail as appendix 1.

b. Planning Decision – Post Office Row extension

Cllrs expressed concern that the application had been resolved under delegated powers by Planning Officers, and asked the Clerk to request clarification of criteria for decision making on planning matters. The Clerk would invite Matt Lamb (NSDC) to speak to the Parish Council.

c. Consultations.

- i. NottsCC Local Minerals Plan – Cllr Dobson had reported on the meeting at County Hall held on 4 January (minute 4i), and the Parish Council would now await the next stage of the consultation.
- ii. NottsCC 2016 Spending Proposals – the public consultation on budget cuts would close on 5 February. An online questionnaire was available at www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/budget, and Cllrs would respond individually if they wished to.

8. Finance.

a) To Receive and Accept the Accounts for November/December 2015.

Proposed by Cllr Molloson, seconded by Cllr Armstrong, the November and December accounts were agreed and signed by the Chmn.

b) To Approve Expenditure at 7 January 2016.

Proposed by Cllr Molloson, seconded by Cllr Gangel, the following payments were approved

	£
Clerk's net salary (November/December)	683.52
HMRC (Clerk's PAYE)	161.12
Admin expenses October – December	62.05
Village Handyman (November/December)	177.55
Doug Lyne, mowing	786.00
DCR Electrical (Defibrillator fitting)	409.50
Willsons – Printing December CVN	395.00

Village Hall Hire April – December	129.50
Winthorpe Parish Council – trees	68.80
NSDC – election admin charges	104.99
R.S. Gray – Christmas tree	100.00
Coddington Scouts – archive storage	100.00

c) Mowing Contract

Cllrs considered three quotations which had been received. It was proposed by Cllr Armstrong, seconded by Cllr Molloson and agreed by a majority vote of 6 in favour with 3 against, to award a one year contract to Town and Country Groundworks of Kneesall, as this would provide a substantial saving over the year. Excellent references had been supplied by Edwinstowe Parish Council and Bracebridge Heath PC, and Coddington would review the contract in October 2016.

d) Allotment Fees

The allotment working group recommended an increase of 10% for the 2016 allotment fees, taking the average plot to £11p.a. The charge for water would be calculated on the 2015/2016 bill from STW. On a proposal from Cllr Armstrong, seconded by Cllr O'Donnell the recommended increase was approved. Cllr Parrett declared an interest as an allotment holder and abstained from discussions and the vote.

e) Review of 2015/16 Budget and Financial Position

Cllrs noted the figures at 31 December. There were no comments.

f) Approval of the Budget for 2016/17

Copies of the 2016/17 budget had been previously circulated. Proposed by Cllr Molloson, seconded by Cllr Rowden-Allen the budget figures were approved as detailed in appendix 2.

g) 2016/17 Precept

Proposed by Cllr Armstrong, seconded by Cllr O'Donnell the precept for the coming year was agreed at £14,259, calculated as a 2% increase on the parish share for a Band D property.

9. Administration.

a. Casual Vacancy.

Cllr Barry King had regrettably submitted his resignation to the Chairman. The Clerk would notify NSDC and post notice of the Parish Council vacancy on the noticeboards and web site for 14 days. Members asked the Clerk to send a letter of appreciation to Mr King for all the work that he had done for the Council and the community..

b. Coddington Community Centre.

i. Following discussions with Mr Andy Statham at the November PC meeting, NSDC had submitted their amendments to the Overage Deed. The revised document would be circulated to Cllrs for questions to be addressed and comments noted prior to the next meeting.

ii. Cllr Armstrong reported that the Community Centre was breaking even; Trustees were currently pursuing a bad debt through the small claims court; the accounts had been audited by Fred Reed; a new clerk would need to be recruited; one of the gutter joints was leaking at the highest level on the building, and this had been reported to NSDC.

c. Clerk's Annual Review.

Proposed by Cllr O'Donnell, seconded by Cllr Parrett it was resolved that discussion of the next two items on the agenda should be confidential. The Clerk and member of the public left the room. Cllrs discussed the annual review statement which had been compiled by the Chmn following the Clerk's annual appraisal interview. It was proposed by Cllr Rowden-Allen, seconded by Cllr Gangel and agreed, to increase the Clerk's salary to SCP 20 on the national salary scale for part-time clerks from April 2016.

The Clerk returned to the meeting.

d. Review of Handyman's Probationary Period.

This item was deemed confidential and has been minuted separately.

2125 hrs – Proposed by Cllr Armstrong, seconded by Cllr Parrett, the Council agreed an extension to the meeting beyond 2130hrs in order to complete the business on the agenda.

e. Newsletter and web site

Apart from the casual vacancy notice which Cllr Armstrong would also put on the 'Streetlife' internet site, there were no other items for publication.

f. Noticeboards.

The notice boards at the corner of Beaconsfield and at the Community Centre were in need of attention. Cllr Gangel volunteered to varnish them, and to look at repairing supports and replacing the plywood where needed.

g. Reports from Elected Representatives.

Minutes of the Newark Healthcare Consultative Group meeting held on 11th December had been previously circulated. Cllr Cox drew attention to Robert Jenrick MP's proposal that Newark Hospital should separate from the Sherwood Forest Hospital Trust and merge with the Nottingham Trust.

Proposed by Cllr Armstrong, seconded by Cllr Molloson, the Parish Council

RESOLVED to support the campaign for the separation of Newark Hospital from the Sherwood Forest Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and its integration with Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust.

10 Environment, Amenities and Services.

a. Trees.

Matt Duckworth (NCC) had advised appointing a contractor to cut off the dead branches at Page's Wood, who would then contact him to arrange a joint inspection and decision on traffic management. The Clerk was asked to contact Heartwood Treecare with this information.

b. Old Hall Gardens ACV.

An email had been received from Mr M Douglass who was concerned about the extent of subsidence on the grassed area at the junction of Old Hall Gardens and Newark Road. Cllrs were unable to explain why it was getting worse. The land does not belong to the Parish Council or to any known person, but the subsidence would be monitored. The Clerk would send this response to Mr Douglass.

c. Allotments.

There was currently one vacant allotment, but Cllr Allen advised waiting to see whether any others became available before offering this plot to the next person on the waiting list.

d. Open Spaces.

NSDC had produced a questionnaire on open space provision and need assessment. Cllr Parrett volunteered to help the Clerk complete the survey.

e. Defibrillator.

The defibrillator co-ordinator, Cllr Gangel reported that all equipment and spares were in place. He, his wife and Ian Lawson (CCC Caretaker) were carrying out regular checks and returns had been forwarded to the CHT.

f. Lorry Watch.

Cllr Gangel had negotiated the loan of a traffic gun from Cllr Keith Girling. The first requirement would be to find volunteers to take part in traffic watch and training sessions, and it was agreed to put a notice in the March CVN.

g. Matters for Immediate Note.

i. A question was raised about activities on the field next to The Homestead on Balderton Lane. The Clerk would ask the Enforcement Officer to check.

ii. It was suggested that a traffic tube count was overdue on the C208 at the Community Centre. The Clerk would submit a request to Matt Duckworth for a traffic count during term time.

iii. It appeared that horses were walking along the Millennium Garden path. Cllrs Cox and O'Donnell said that they would look at the site.

iv. Buddleia shrubs were overgrown on the A1S slip road, obscuring the road sign and view of traffic. The Clerk would contact Highways England.

v. It was suggested that the Parish Council should send out information on the next Minerals Plan consultation. Cllr Armstrong would draft a letter for approval.

vi. The Christmas decorations in the garden of The Stables on Beckingham Road could be a traffic hazard in the dark, and the grass verge had been churned up by cars pulling up to look at the lights.

11. Correspondence.

i. The Clerk reminded Members about the presentation on Devolution by Anthony May, NottsCC Chief Executive, to be held in Collingham on 18 January.

ii. NottsCC advised that a new Community Benefit Society, 'Inspire' would now be responsible for delivering library, arts, archive and cultural services in Nottinghamshire.

12. Date of Next Meeting / Items for the Agenda.

The next Parish Council Meeting would be held on Thursday 3 February 2016 in the Community Centre. The agenda to include the LGBCE's decision on Nottinghamshire County divisions, arrangements for the Annual Parish Meeting on 28 April and consideration of the revised Overage Deed for the transfer of the Community Centre.

The meeting closed at 2150hrs.

Appendix1 Planning Application No.15/02253/FUL

The Plough, Coddington – Proposed Development

Members of Coddington Parish Council have read the Design and Access Statement (DAS) submitted with the application, and studied the accompanying plans.

The Parish Council strongly objects to the proposals for the reasons set out below.

There are three elements to the application -

- 1) the restoration of the Plough Public House;
- 2) the creation of a car park, sitting-out area and recycling facility in the paddock to the west of the PH and
- 3) the erection of three dwellings on the existing car park and adjoining open fields on the northern side of the C208.

In considering the application, the Parish Council has made reference to the relevant Development Plan Policies namely:-

- Spatial Policy 3 - Rural Development (SP3).
- Core Policy 14 - The Historic Environment.
- Policy DM5 – Design.
- Policy DM9 - Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment.
- The Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide.

1) Renovation of The Plough Public House.

1.1 The Parish Council would welcome this element of the application, on the basis that a very modest increase in residential accommodation is justified to secure the future of the public house.

1.2 On a matter of clarification, it is not clear from the application plan whether the line of conifer trees along the northern boundary of the public house cartilage are proposed for retention. These trees make a major contribution to the character of the Conservation Area (CA), particularly when progressing eastwards along the C208 and they should be retained.

2) Proposed Car Park, Sitting-out Area and Recycling Facility on the Paddock to the West of the Public House.

2.1 In the ADM, this part of the application site is annotated as a Main Open Area (MOA). Such areas are defined as being *'areas of predominantly open land within settlements that play an important role in defining their form and structure'*.

2.2 In the Conservation Area Character Appraisal prepared and adopted by the District Council in 2002, this paddock is identified as an Important Open Area within the Conservation Area. This area's importance in the character and appearance of the CA has been fully recognised.

2.3 **The fourth criterion of Policy SP3** requires that new development should not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of local people. The use of this area for 16 customers' car parking, three residents' car parking spaces, a sitting-out area for customers and a recycling facility would generate a considerable amount of movement, noise and loss of privacy to the severe detriment of the inhabitants of the two dwellings which immediately abut the paddock, Chapel House and The Cottage. The noise and disturbance from traffic movements, including service vehicles delivering and collecting the recycling bins would be particularly pronounced in respect of the recycling facility which at present comprises 8 well-used bins. Furthermore, there is only one point of entry and exit to the proposed site. This would require all vehicles, including the larger service vehicles, having to turn around within the site before rejoining the C.208, thereby adding to the noise element. Privacy would be threatened and noise and disturbance created by people parking their cars, sitting outside or using the recycling facility.

2.4 **The fifth criterion of Policy SP3** requires that new development should not have a detrimental impact on the character of the location or its landscape setting. Bearing in mind the designations given to this area, see 2.1 and 2.2 above, and its location within the Conservation Area, the uses proposed could be seen to severely conflict with this criterion.

2.5 **Core Policy 14** seeks to preserve and enhance the character, appearance and setting of the District's heritage assets and historic environment. It also aims to preserve the special character of Conservation Areas, including such character identified in Conservation Character Appraisals, and to protect important open spaces identified in such Appraisals. The paddock has received such recognition, as set out in 2.1 and 2.2 above. The proposed use of this part of the application site, which lies at the heart of the oldest part of the Conservation Area, would be completely at odds with the Council's designations and would do nothing to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. Finally, it would severely detract from the setting of a listed building, All Saints' Church, a view of which is obtained across the paddock. A sea of cars and a recycling facility hardly provide a fitting setting for this heritage asset.

2.6 Criteria 3 and 4 of POLICY DM5:

The proposed uses of the paddock are in clear conflict with Criterion 3 in respect of the adverse effect on the amenities of the occupants of Chapel House and The Cottage as set out in paragraph 2.3 above. They also adversely affect the local distinctiveness and character of the area as set out at 2.4 above, and are therefore at odds with Criterion 4.

2.7 **Policy DM9** reiterates the requirements of Core Policy 14 (paragraph 2.5 above).

3) Erection of Two Semi-detached Dwellings and One Detached Dwelling on Land to the Northern Side of the C208:

3.1 All of the application site lies within the Coddington Conservation Area as adopted on 11 September 2006.

3.2 **Criterion 1, SP3** requires that new development should be within the built-up areas of villages. The applicants maintain that this part of the application site lies within the built-up area of Coddington, but this is clearly not the case. The existing public house car park and the fields to its north form part of the open setting of the village, creating its form and structure. There is no frontage development on the northern side of the C208 from the crossing of the A1 in the west to the junction with Main Street in the east and therefore no intrusion into this rural setting. The role of this part of the application site was originally recognised on the adopted Local Plan of 1999, where the application land lies outside of the village envelope and is defined as 'Open Countryside'. There have been several approaches over subsequent years with regard to developing the land in question, and all have been rejected on the basis of its countryside designation. The District Council will have records of these approaches and applications.

3.3 **Criterion 3 of Policy SP3** requires that new housing should only be permitted where it helps to meet identified proven local need. The applicant makes lengthy submissions on this matter, very similar to those made in support of a recent application (15/01038/FUL) which was determined in the Autumn of 2015. As far as the Parish Council is aware, circumstances in relation to local housing need have not changed since that date when the District Council concluded that no robust evidence was provided of local need and that there was a requirement for a housing need survey specific to Coddington. No such survey has been produced by the applicant to support these proposals and therefore this application must fail to meet this specific criterion. There is no substantive evidence of a proven local need to justify the permitting of this proposed housing.

3.4 **Criterion 5 of Policy SP3** requires that new development should not have a detrimental impact on the character of the location or its landscape setting. The erection of three houses, extending outwards from beyond the clearly defined edge of the built-up area, and totally unrelated to it in form or character, would be incongruous and a damaging visual intrusion into the open setting of the village. Such development would in effect constitute 'ribbon development', a feature completely out of character with this part of the village. In this context, it is relevant to note that the land immediately to the west of this part of the application site is owned by the applicants. Whilst every application must be treated on its merits, approval of this application could make it difficult for the LPA to resist further development of the adjoining open land.

3.5 Paragraph 4.28 which follows Policy SP3, defines the main built-up area of the village as being where most of the housing and community facilities are focussed. This part of the application site is totally divorced from the main housing and community elements of the village. There is therefore total consistency on the part of the District Council in identifying this part of the application site as lying within the open countryside.

3.6 **Core Policy 14** requires the continued preservation and enhancement of the special character, appearance and setting of the District's Conservation Areas. This inappropriate extension of what are, in effect, three suburban-type properties into the open countryside setting of the village, contrary to the established form of the village, would do immeasurable damage to the character, appearance and setting of the Coddington Conservation Area.

3.7 The applicants argue that the existing car park is not an attractive feature in the Conservation Area and that it would be improved by the proposed development. The surface and usage of the car park does not diminish its contribution to the open setting of the village. The recycling facility is well managed by the District Council and any debris and rubbish around the perimeter is largely due to lack of maintenance. The car park is no different from a farm yard facility which lies in the open countryside but which does not justify development. Furthermore, this part of the application site also includes the open fields to the north of the car park thus increasing and exacerbating the adverse impact the development would have on the open countryside setting of the village.

3.8 Policy DM5, Criterion 4:

This Policy relates to the design of proposed developments. However well designed the development might be, and the design of these dwellings is at best inoffensive, their location is unacceptable and their provision in terms of need unnecessary.

3.9 **Policy DM9** reiterates the requirements of Core Policy 14.

4) Observations on the Planning Application.

4.1 National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG):

The applicants refer to the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPG and maintain that the Development Plans predate and are overridden by this Guidance, particularly in relation to housing development. This is not the case as Policy DM12 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD (ADMDDP) clearly states the presumption in favour of sustainable development. What is of equal importance is that the NPPG emphasises the importance of good design which is particularly relevant in relation to this application.

4.2 **The Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide** is addressed by the applicants at pages 45 and 46 of the DAS. The Parish Council does not accept their assertion that the proposed development would not adversely affect the character and setting of the Conservation Area. Whilst welcoming the restoration of the public house, the Parish Council disagrees with the applicants' comments in relation to heritage benefits, and their comments relating to the proposed design.

5) Conclusions.

5.1 There is no identified proven local need for new housing development in Coddington. The Parish Council accepts, as an exception to this criterion, the modest additional housing provision within the Public House is justified to secure the renovation of that property.

The application is therefore contrary to Policy SP3.

5.2 The provision of car parking, sitting-out areas and a recycling facility on the paddock to the west of the Public House would cause severe harm in terms of noise, disturbance and loss of privacy to the amenities of nearby residents.

The application is therefore contrary to Policies SP3 and DM5.

5.3 The provision of car parking, sitting-out areas and a recycling facility would adversely affect the character and form of the Conservation Area, result in the loss of an 'Important Open Area' and a 'Main Open Area' as defined in the Council's own Documents and would adversely affect the setting of a listed building, the Church.

The application is therefore contrary to Policies SP3, Core Policy 14 and DM9.

5.4 As well as being contrary to Policy SP3 in terms of housing need, the erection of three dwellings on the northern side of the C208 would do demonstrable harm to the character and setting of the Conservation Area and the structure and form of the village, contrary to the requirements of the Civic Amenities Act and the provision of the Development Plans.

The application is therefore contrary to Policies SP3, Core Policy 14, DM5 and DM9.

5.5 Coddington Parish Council fully supports all the objections which have been submitted by local residents, including additional points raised concerning loss of privacy for residents of Hall Farm and unsafe access to the proposed car park on a bend in the road. The Parish Council cannot overstate its concerns about highway safety and access to the proposed car park. On the C208 there is persistent flouting of both the 40 mph speed limit and the 7.5 tonne weight restriction. The latest Notts CC tube-count figures (westbound) show 20% of vehicles exceeding the speed limit by at least 10% at 1800 hrs, rising steadily to 40% of vehicles by 2300 hrs. Overweight vehicles use the C208 day and night, and especially during the hours of darkness, with a notable spike during evenings all year round.

5.6 The Parish Council is keen to see The Plough Public House renovated. However, the level of development proposed, its conflict with the adopted policies of the Development Plan and its harmful effects on the amenities of nearby residents and on the character of the Conservation Area, render this application unacceptable and too high a price to pay to achieve that objective. The Parish Council therefore urges refusal of the application. In the event of a refusal, the Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to meet with the applicants and other interested parties to attempt to find a more compatible solution to the future of The Plough.

Appendix 2 2016/17 Budget

ADMINISTRATION				
INSURANCE			215.00	
SUBSCRIPTIONS/FEES			310.00	
TRAINING			100.00	£50 book
STORAGE			200.00	
ROOM HIRE			200.00	
AUDIT			260.00	
CLERK'S GROSS SALARY			4752.00	SCP 20
HANDYMAN			1750.00	7.20 per hr
ELECTION COSTS			350.00	
CVN			1700.00	
POSTAGE & STATIONERY			60.00	
PRINTING			150.00	
WEB SITE			150.00	
KEYS/SUNDRIES			0.00	
NOTICEBOARDS			200.00	repairs
TOTAL			10397.00	
ENVIRONMENT				
SALT			0.00	
DOG/LITTER BINS			330.00	new litter bin
GRASS VERGES			3170.00	
MILLENNIUM GARDEN			220.00	
PAGE'S WOOD HEDGE			150.00	
TREE WORK			500.00	
TOTAL			4370.00	
ALLOTMENTS				
LEASE			110.00	
STW			80.00	
GRASS/HEDGE CUTTING			60.00	
TOTAL			250.00	
COMMUNITY CENTRE				
MAINTENANCE&REPAIRS			2500.00	
INSURANCE			1000.00	
GRASS CUTTING			290.00	
HEDGE CUTTING			180.00	
TOTAL			3970.00	
GRANTS & DONATIONS			700.00	
SUNDRIES				
CHMN'S ALLOWANCE			50.00	
DEFIBRILATOR MAINTENANCE			150.00	
CHRISTMAS			150.00	

2016-17	
INCOME	
Precept	14259.00
NSDC supp	190
Precept supp	1306
VAT	1200
Allotments	320
CVN	700
NCC Grass	2032
Comm. Centre	1100
TOTAL	21,107.00

CONTINGENCY			1000.00		
			1350.00		
TOTAL EXPENDITURE			21,037.00		