

Notes following Minster Lovell Parish Council meeting with Phil Shaw, 10th January 2019.

1. The Council asked about changing the houses currently planned alongside Whitehall Close, and whether it would be possible to swap these with the bungalows currently planned along the Burford Road. Phil confirmed that this would not be preferable for several reasons:
 - a) The bungalows on the Burford Road side have been put there to protect the skyline from the Windrush Valley and Burford Road approach, to create a more pleasant view from this viewpoint and something that better reflects the character of Minster Lovell, rather than seeing 5-bedroom executive homes on entrance to the Village.
 - b) Bungalows on this site would actually take up a larger area than the houses that are currently planned, which would impinge further on the current residents of Whitehall Close as they would be directly garden to garden and actually this would recede the current 30m between the properties further.
 - c) There is no legitimate planning reason why these homes should be exchanged – WODC have already asked the developer to add in extra space between the new homes and existing properties in Whitehall Close; the permitted minimum privacy distance is 21m and the current homes give 30m.

However Phil is already planning to speak to the developers about the frontages of the homes alongside Whitehall Close as there is currently a random mix of open fronts and hedged front gardens. As a result, he agreed to ask the developers if it would be possible for them to move these homes further forward and closer to the road. This will also have some impact on the changes which need to take place to the road layout further to the OCC objections. Cllr. Mullins asked if the height of the 5-bed homes is larger than the 2-bed homes and Phil and the Council checked the plans and confirmed that in the case of these homes, they are the same height. Other large homes on the development are very slightly higher.

2. The Council asked about asking for the developer to install a 6ft fence between new and existing properties alongside Whitehall Close to further enhance the privacy of properties on both sides. Phil confirmed that the developer would already be keen to add this in to ensure that the new properties can be marketed with this added privacy feature, which will help to make these homes more desirable when they are being sold.
3. The Council asked about the boundary with Whitehall Close and the trees currently located along this divide. Phil confirmed that the plans currently show that the developer is conceding a small strip of land along this edge to give current residents access to and control of the trees here. This means that they will also be gaining a small section of land.
4. The Council asked about the possibility of adding in a bus stop to the main entrance of the estate to ensure that members of the public and schoolchildren are able to use public transport safely. Phil confirmed that the County Council are in control of where bus stops are currently located and he will check with them about the criteria for this. The Clerk also agreed that she will speak with OCC to ascertain the current situation. The preferred option for both WODC and the PC is that residents of the new estate will be able to walk through Ripley Avenue Amenity Area to access the bus stops on Brize Norton Road but where the

school buses currently stop needs to be confirmed. The Parish Council will discuss the possibility of a path through Ripley Avenue at the February Parish Council meeting.

5. The Council asked about the choice of plants currently planned for the estate as some of these may require further maintenance than a standard once-a-year trim. Phil confirmed that these are chosen in correlation with the Forestry Officer, and therefore may include plants such as lavender, which are better to bees etc and therefore more nature-friendly.
6. The Council asked about the distribution of affordable housing on the estate and Phil confirmed that part of the reason that these are laid out as they are is that it makes it easier for the Housing Association that take these on in terms of repairs and maintenance of the properties. It is not possible to give priority for affordable housing to existing residents of the Village specifically because of the way that the planning application has happened, however those in the Village who are able to demonstrate a local connection would be given priority against any other applicants in a similar situation from outside of the area. Affordable housing is generally considered to be renting at 80% of market value. The Housing Association involved is likely to be Cottsway Housing Association.
7. The Council asked about lack of rear access to properties, particularly those in the affordable housing section of the estate. Phil confirmed that more detailed plans actually show access to all properties through small alleyways behind the houses. This allows residents to put their bins and recycling containers back into their back gardens after collection. However Phil agreed that it does not mean that residents will chose to do this and nothing can be done to prevent them leaving these outside of the front of their properties.
8. Maintenance of the green spaces on the estate will be offered to the PC at a later date but they are under no obligation to take this on. If they don't, this will need to be carried out by a management company and therefore each of the new homes will need to pay an annual fee towards this. The benefit of taking on the maintenance of these areas is that the Council will have control over the speed that repairs happen, however the area is large and will be tricky to manage.
9. The Council and Phil discussed the possibility of a path through Ripley Avenue Amenity Area to link the two housing estates. Phil would recommend agreeing on a specific location for this as otherwise residents are likely to form their own gap between the developments and create unofficial pathways, which the Council agreed with. He also confirmed that the Council cannot expect the developer to finance an official path, as this should have been locked in at the initial planning stage when the Council objected to the entire development. The S106 monies will also not be increasing as this is also now confirmed. However he may be able to ask the developer to contribute towards the cost of a formal path if the Council can confirm where they want this to be located and how much this is likely to cost.
10. Phil already has concerns about the design and location of the foul water pump on the development and the current plans do not show the location of the main electricity

substation so he will confirm details of these with the developer and confirm with the Parish Clerk.

11. Regarding the objections from Thames Water regarding drainage, these are highly technical issues and would be dealt with directly between the developers and Thames Water. These issues are not usually enough to prevent a development from happening. The issues raised by OCC regarding the road layout will need to be addressed and confirmed before building can go ahead.
12. Parking concerns raised by OCC and the PC will be looked at and it may be that visitor parking bays will be installed into the development; however Phil and the PC agreed that these are likely to be used by existing residents rather than visitors.