

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF CODDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL
held on 1 February 2018 at 7:30 pm at Coddington Community Centre

Present:

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

Clerk: Mrs Y Wellard.

In Attendance: Co. Cllr Dobson, Dist Cllr Lee, 4 members of the public.

1. Apologies for Absence.

Apologies for absence were received from Dist Cllr Payne.

2. Declarations of Interest.

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Public Contribution.

Mr Kennett reported his concerns about the condition of an oak tree at the junction of Lancaster Road and Beaconsfield Drive, directly behind his garden. Much of the tree is diseased, which he reported to NSDC in April 2015. Despite several visits by NSDC contractors, the problem has not been solved, and he feared that the tree was unsafe. Contractors were due to visit the site again on 6 February to cut back the tree, and **Cllrs Cox and Rowden-Allen** said they would also be present. Mr Kennett had been given conflicting information on, whether the tree was subject to a preservation order. Cllr Molloson suggested that NSDC again be approached to provide a definitive map of TPOs. Cllrs also felt that it would be advisable to remind NSDC officers about the historic significance of the former park land of the area.

It was agreed to bring forward agenda item 7a for the benefit of members of the public who had come to listen to the Parish Council's views on the Thorpe Close planning application.

4. Planning Application 17/02294/FUL.

Newark & Sherwood Homes – demolition of Thorpe Close and Parkes Close garages and the development of 4 bungalows.

Cllrs were concerned that with the application scheduled for the Planning Committee meeting on 6 February, there was insufficient time for the Parish Council's views to be included in the report to Members and that if submitted as a late item, Committee Members would not have time to absorb the information. There was also a question on the validity of a planning application to NSDC which named NSDC as the applicant. It was proposed by Cllr Molloson, seconded by Cllr Gangel and agreed that the **Clerk** should request a deferment of a decision on the application to allow time for all views to be represented.

Cllrs were unanimous in their support of the concerns expressed by residents at the extra-ordinary meeting on 25 January, particularly relating to on-street parking and the threat to the future of the estate's bus service.

By a show of hands, Cllrs voted unanimously to reject the proposals. The draft response prepared by Cllr Molloson, detailing reasons for the Parish Council's objections, was agreed for submission. (*Appendix 1*), with a request that if the District Council was minded to approve the application, there should be immediate provision of secure fencing to properties and alternative parking provided close by.

It was agreed that the **Chmn** would attend the planning meeting on 6 February to represent the Parish Council and request a postponement to allow more detailed consideration prior to the decision.

5. District and County Councillors.

Cllr Lee commented on a report in the local press that laundry facilities at Wellgreen were to be withdrawn, stating that this was still under consultation and no action had been taken.

Parking enforcers had been monitoring the restricted areas around the school. There may be some pupils who do require transport directly to the school gate and photographs of cars stopping on the double yellow lines should not be posted on the internet.

Cllr Dobson advised that there had been no response yet from the Rights of Way Officer, Neil Lewis on the final agreement of permissive footpaths at Beaconfield. If it was not available in time for the March newsletter, the information could initially be posted on the Parish Council's Facebook page.

Cllr Dobson expressed her regret that the Headteacher, Mrs Caputa would be leaving Coddington School at the end of the term.

The Chmn enquired whether Coddington could benefit from the Government's announcement of extra money for repairing potholes. Cllr Dobson said that the money would be thinly spread over four years, but she would forward information on any roads that Cllrs felt were eligible for repair to Mike Keeling.

Cllr Lee and 3 members of the public left the meeting.

6. **Approval of Minutes of the January 2018 Parish Council Meetings.**

Proposed as correct by Cllr Rowden-Allen, seconded by Cllr Armstrong, the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 4 January 2018 were agreed.

The minutes of the extra-ordinary meeting held on 25 January 2018 were proposed as correct by Cllr Gangel, seconded by Cllr Parrett and approved.

7. **Matters Arising from the Minutes.**

4 January 2018

3. The Clerk was asked to remind **Dist Cllr Lee** to provide information on the occupancies of the Thorpe Close garages.

6/6. Andrew Clifford had suggested a location for the Jubilee Oak on the edge of Page's Wood, and that children and parents may like to be involved in planting it. **Cllr Parrett** will contact Mr Clifford to make arrangements.

6/9f. Cllr Allen reported that he was not aware of very much interest from residents in having a bench on Parkes Close. It was suggested that if the broken bench on the C208 was repairable, it could be used at Page's Wood.

7di. Cllr Armstrong reported on his attendance at the Amended Core Strategy hearing, which had mostly focused on SP3. It appeared that neighbourhood plans and design statements would be incorporated by NSDC only if they were in agreement with its policy. There had been no discussion on need.

7diii. The retrospective planning application for 24 Post Office Row did not appear to have been submitted. The **Clerk** will ask the Enforcement Officer for an update.

10. Cllrs Cox, Parrett and Gangel attended the DARE graduation presentation and commented on the excellent presentation and how important the programme is for children.

8. **Planning and Consultations.**

a. Newark & Sherwood Homes – demolition of garages, erection of 4 bungalows.

This item was dealt with at the beginning of the meeting and minuted as item 4 above.

b. Highlander House, Stapleford Lane – single storey extension and porch.

There were no objections to the plans.

c. Notts County Council – removal of temporary classroom, construction of 2 permanent classrooms.

The Parish Council supported the plans.

d. Post Office Ltd. – temporary closure of Coddington Post Office.

Letters from the retiring postmaster and from Post Office Ltd had been previously circulated. Cllrs were very keen to maintain the post office service for the village and suggested that subject to the agreement of the owners, perhaps a temporary postmaster could operate at least part time from the existing premises. There were concerns about security if alternative premises in the village were used for pensions etc. The **Clerk** would submit the Council's comments to Post Office Ltd.

9. **Finance.**

a. To receive and accept accounts for January 2018.

Proposed by Cllr Rowden-Allen, seconded by Cllr Allen, the cash book entries for January were approved and signed by the Chmn.

b. Approval of Expenditure at 1 February 2018.

The following payments were tabled for approval:

Clerk's salary, January	384.28
Handyman's salary, January	172.50
NALC 2018 subscription	252.34
NALC - appraisal training	25.00
Unipar Services Ltd – radar equipment	987.60
Community Heartbeat Trust - servicing	151.20

Proposed by Cllr Parrett, seconded by Cllr Armstrong, the payments were approved.

10. Administration.

a. Coddington Community Centre.

- i) The minutes of the Trustees' meeting had been previously circulated. There were no questions.
- ii) The Clerk reported that the laminated Community Centre sign mounted on the fence had been purchased from County Signs at a cost of £60. It was proposed by Cllr Rowden-Allen, seconded by Cllr Armstrong and agreed that the Clerk purchase a similar sign to be mounted over the existing NSDC wooden sign at the Community Centre entrance.
- iii) It was suggested that the hedge at the back of the Centre should be trimmed. The Clerk would enquire about ownership of the hedge.
- iv) A liaison meeting between the Parish Council Chmn and Clerk, and the Community Centre Chmn was arranged for 21 February.

b. 2018 Mowing Contract.

Cllrs considered quotations from Ulyett Landscapes Ltd and from D. Lyne for the 2018 mowing season.

It was proposed by Cllr Parrett and seconded by Cllr Rowden-Allen to award a contract for 8 cuts to Doug Lyne because of his local knowledge and previous experience of the Parish Council's requirements. The proposal was agreed by a majority of 7 in favour to 3 against.

c. Allotments.

The Allotment Group would be measuring and recording the size of each plot in the next month. The Clerk would obtain confirmation from the holder of 5c that he wished to reduce the length of his plot and that the holder of 5b would take up the extra ground. Cllr Hedge suggested meeting with as many of the allotment holders as possible to explain why measurements were being taken.

d. Litter bins.

- i) The handyman's report on the excessive amount of litter in the C208 lay-by had been circulated to Cllrs and forwarded to Matt Adey, NSDC Waste Management.
- ii) Matt Adey had suggested that the problem of dog waste in the litter bin within the children's play area at Thorpe Oaks could be solved by providing another dog bin close by as an alternative. It was proposed by Cllr Armstrong seconded by Cllr Parrett and agreed that the Clerk order a new dog bin and post for the Thorpe Oaks playing field.

e. Roads and Traffic.

- i) Traffic problems on Brownlow's Hill / Main Street had significantly increased, particularly at Post Office Row, due to the number of parked cars and the increased volume of traffic cutting through to Balderton. It was suggested that it was time to reconsider a one-way traffic system, and Cllr Dobson said that she would make enquiries.
- ii) Cllrs had looked at Highways England's consultation on road network priorities but decided against commenting as the report did not provide an opportunity to raise local issues.
- iii) It was reported that a stream of water was flowing down Main Street from the churchyard, and was possibly another underground leak. Cllr Dobson said that she would report it.

f. Data Protection.

Cllr Armstrong had set up a dedicated Parish Council email address for himself which the Clerk had tested for access. Cllrs agreed that they would each have a separate email address for parish business in order to comply with the new data protection rules. Cllr Armstrong would set these up and provide instructions for Cllrs from 7pm on 1 March, prior to the Parish Council meeting.

g. Annual Parish Meeting.

The date of the Annual Parish Meeting was confirmed as 12 April at 7:30pm in the Village Hall. There would not be a speaker; Parishioners would be invited to take part in an open discussion. The Annual Parish Council meeting was confirmed as 3 May at 7:00pm in the Village Hall.

h. Review of Emergency Plan.

As this had not been looked at for some time, the Clerk would circulate copies of the emergency plan for discussion at the next meeting and adoption at the Annual Parish Council meeting.

i. Reports from Representatives.

- i) The Newark Healthcare Consultative Group report had been previously circulated, including information about the new Urgent Treatment Centre.

- ii) Facebook continued to be popular and a useful medium for passing on information. A concern had been raised on Facebook about moles damaging the grass verges. It was suggested that Cllr Rowden-Allen forward this to VIA EM.

11. Correspondence.

- NALC training sessions for Cllrs to be held during 2018 would be covering planning and finance.
- Cllr Bernard Allen and his wife had been nominated by NALC to receive an invitation to the Buckingham Palace Garden Party in recognition of 35 years' service on the Parish Council.

12. Matters of Immediate Note and the Next Agenda.

Cllr Parrett said that she had 10 packets of wild flower seeds to donate to the village.

13. Date of the Next Meeting.

The next Parish Council meeting will be held on Thursday 1 March 2018 at 7:30pm in the Community Centre.

Cllrs are invited to attend at 7pm for an introduction to using their new email addresses.

The meeting closed at 9:30 pm.

Appendix 1 -

Coddington Parish Council **objects** to planning application No.17/02294/FUL on the following grounds:

1. Statutory Planning Policy:

No reference is made in the Application to statutory planning policy, i.e. the Core Strategy. The only basis for the application is a letter from the Chief Executive of Newark and Sherwood Homes to '*a clear and demonstrable need for housing*'. This was amplified by Councillor Lee as being the requirement for 3000 additional dwellings to meet the 5 year supply for the District as a whole. The application does not address the requirements of Policy SP3 of the Core Strategy which requires that the Applicant demonstrate an '*identified, proven, local need*'. Policy SP3 in the Amended Core Strategy reiterates this requirement with the added condition that the development be shown to support local facilities. The application fails to comply with statutory planning policy, relying on a generalisation which may or may not have implications for Coddington.

2. Site Specific Objections:

Bearing in mind the number of 'affordable' dwellings already built or granted planning permission and yet to be built in Coddington, the Parish Council questions whether a need for any further housing of this nature in the village is required. It also questions whether this village location with very limited public transport and diminishing facilities, (the post office closes on 31 January 2018), is the right place to provide further housing for people who will need access to work and everyday facilities. Just because the site is in the applicant's ownership and even if it were to be demonstrated that there is an identified, proven local need for housing in Coddington, it is considered that this site is unsuitable for such development for a number of planning reasons.

2a) Loss of Garaging for Existing Residents:

Referring to Policy SP3, Bullet Point 4, '*Impact*', requires that any development should not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of local people, nor have an undue impact on local infrastructure. It is difficult to conceive of a proposal which would have a more adverse impact on local residents. It would deprive the residents, many of them elderly, of secure, garaging in a village with a very limited bus service, a car is an essential not a luxury. This is emphasised by the recent closure of Coddington Post Office, due to ill health, not lack of support. Anyone working unsocial hours, such as nurses, are similarly adversely affected. Loss of garaging in an urban area may be an inconvenience, but with frequent public transport and facilities, often

within walking distance, it does not have the very severe impact as in a village community. It is ironic that the application proposes the provision of off-street parking for the new dwellings whilst depriving existing residents of their long cherished garaging.

2b) Adverse Impact on Local Infrastructure:

A direct result of the loss of the garages would be a marked increase in on-street parking. Such parking is a considerable problem on this estate leading to the recent provision of double yellow lines at road junctions. Whilst this has improved the situation to an extent, problems due to constricted road width are still experienced. The problem would only be exacerbated by throwing more vehicles onto the carriageways raising concerns about access for emergency vehicles and possibly the bus where improvements have only recently been achieved. Presumably in recognition of these problems, a suggestion has been made to residents that they provide dropped kerbs to allow them to drive their vehicles onto their front gardens. Apart from the very detrimental effect this would have on what is a well maintained and attractive estate, why should existing residents be required to sacrifice their gardens and their living environment to facilitate an inappropriate and over-intensive proposal? The Parish Council **objects** to the application on the basis of its adverse effect on the infrastructure and the amenities of local residents, contrary to Bullet Point 4 of Policy SP3.

2c) Over Intensive and Inappropriate Development:

Because of the constricted nature of the site the proposed dwellings have grossly inadequate private open space, particularly the two proposed to the rear of numbers 9 and 11 Parkes Close. All of the proposed dwellings would suffer from a lack of privacy due to overlooking by the two-storey dwellings on Parkes Close. The existing properties on both sides of the site will suffer a loss of privacy and security which they presently enjoy due to the substantial boundary definitions provided by the existing garages. This is a classic example of over-intensive development and is clearly in conflict with Policies DM5 and 6 of the District Council's own Allocations and Development Management DPD which require the protection of privacy and the provision of an adequate standard of amenity.

2d) Disturbance and Potential Danger to Existing Residents during Construction:

The constricted and confined character of the site means that there would be very high levels of disturbance and pollution of the environment from dust for existing residents during clearance of the site and the construction of the new properties. This is an unacceptable price to pay by existing residents for what is an opportunist proposal which would result in a very severe diminution of the living environment for an extended period. Concern must also be expressed about potential danger to existing residents from the movement of construction vehicles. Both site entrances run between the gardens of existing dwellings, some with open frontages. The danger to children and the elderly is obvious.

2e) There is a history of inadequate surface water drainage and consequential flooding in the whole of the area surrounding and including the Application site. This recurrent problem appears not to be raised in the Applicant's Agents' desktop supporting statement. Attempts have been made to resolve these problems in the past but to little avail. The proposed development could only increase this problem unless substantial investment was to be forthcoming for its resolution.

3. Conclusions:

The Coddington Parish Council **objects** to the application on the grounds set out above. It is worthy of note that at a special meeting called on 25 January 2018 by the Parish Council to ascertain residents views, 29 members of the public attended and voted unanimously to oppose the application. The views of the villagers are reflected in the Parish Council's objections.

