

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 Thorpe 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.