



## MINSTER LOVELL PARISH COUNCIL

www.minsterlovell-pc.gov.uk

Parish Clerk: Alexandra Molton

111 Walker Drive, Faringdon SN7 7FY

Email [info@minsterlovell-pc.gov.uk](mailto:info@minsterlovell-pc.gov.uk)

Tel: 07712 705865

### MINUTES OF THE EXTRA PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 7<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2019 AT ST KENELM'S HALL AT 7.30pm.

**Present:** Cllr. Haley (Chair), Cllr. Jones, Cllr. Williams, Cllr. Bicker, Cllr. King, Cllr. Alderman, Alexandra Molton (Parish Clerk).

1. Cllr. Haley welcomed Councillors and Parishioners to the January Extra Parish Council Meeting.

**Apologies for absence:** Cllr. Stowell.

**Parishioners and visitors present:** Twenty six.

#### 2. **Declarations of Interest in agenda items.**

Cllr. Bicker declared an interest as a resident adjacent to the new development.

#### 3. **Parishioner's Public Participation**

None at this point in the meeting.

#### 4. **To review planning applications, decisions, appeals and enforcements\***

Cllr. King proposed taking item 4b) at this point in the agenda to allow residents to leave after the discussion if they would like to; Cllr. Williams seconded this and all Councillors agreed.

##### **a) Discuss and finalise the Council's response to the plans for planning application 18/03473/RES; Land West of Minster Lovell, South of Burford Road, Minster Lovell: Residential development of up to 126 dwellings, together with a new vehicular access onto Burford Road (B4047), footpath links, areas of public open space and landscaping.**

Cllr. Haley described how Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) has lodged an objection to the current plans which have addressed technical aspects of the scheme which need to be rectified. The main issues covered by OCC are parking, drainage, flooding, street layout and access to the site. The Council agreed to strongly support these comments made by OCC. Cllr. Haley also reiterated that the number of houses -126 – has already received planning permission so this aspect is not now up for debate.

Cllr. Haley summarised the feedback about the plans from the open morning on Saturday 5<sup>th</sup> January, which had been provided to Councillors by the Clerk in advance of the meeting:

##### 1. **Traffic/parking**

Villagers were concerned about the lack of parking available on the site which would lead to on-road parking; cars cutting through Werrisc Drive and additional traffic in the Village.

##### 2. **Bungalows along the boundary with Whitehall Close**

Residents had been given the assurance that those homes along the boundary with Whitehall Close would be bungalows to ensure the impact on existing residents here would be less imposing. This is not the case in the current plans. Villagers questioned whether the houses currently planned alongside Whitehall Close could be 'swapped' with the bungalows to the north of the site, bordering the Burford Road, or the whole site layout amended.

##### 3. **More affordable houses in the scheme**

Parishioners felt that the scheme should incorporate more affordable housing, particularly for local residents. The development currently has 40% affordable housing provision compared to similar schemes and is generally considered reasonable.

##### 4. **No extra amenities on the site, particularly for children**

OCC and the school have not expressed any concerns about the children coming into the area being able to get a space in the current primary school in the Village. OCC had previously not challenged the development, as it would help the school to grow. The school has not commented that they are unable to take any more children. It was noted that there are no other play parks or equivalent, on the proposed site.

#### 5. **Lack of bungalows/housing for over 60's**

This was brought up as part of parishioners' analysis of the bungalows on the site and may be something that the Council want to consider in their response.

#### 6. **Access path through Ripley Avenue**

Cllr. Haley proposed that the Council should not comment on this at this time as this is something to be looked at once the plans for the development are finalised. Any access path would need to meet technical specifications so it is not as simple as asking the developer to incorporate this into the existing plans.

#### 7. **Lack of access behind homes/rubbish and recycling bins outside the front of properties**

There are several homes on the scheme, particularly the terraced affordable homes proposed in the centre of the scheme, which do not currently have access to the back of the property. This has resulted in concerns about bins and recycling containers being left at the front of properties, and potentially rubbish from these being left in the street. This is unsightly and a health hazard.

#### 8. **Maintenance of the plants which are being proposed for the estate/trees being placed in inappropriate places**

Several of the plants proposed for the scheme are 'flowers' rather than shrubs, which means they will require additional attention, particularly in the warmer weather. This could lead to additional maintenance costs for the Council and could affect the attractiveness of the scheme if these are not appropriately maintained. There are also trees planned in for junctions on the estate, which could block sightlines for driving and effect access to natural light for current Whitehall Close residents.

#### 9. **Location of foul water pump**

Residents of Whitehall Close felt that the foul water pump proposed in the current plan was located unnecessarily close to their properties and were concerned about the potential for noise pollution in addition to foul water flooding into their properties should this facility fail.

Cllr. Haley highlighted that there is large green space at the bottom of the development where the original new Village hall was proposed to be sited and the Council could consider asking the developer to use this space in the main part of the scheme to space the dwellings out better.

Cllr. King has received a comment about the green space on the Western edge of the development, which is located at the end of the gardens. A resident suggested that the whole scheme could be moved a few metres to put this additional space between Whitehall Close and the new development to increase the space between the existing and new developments.

Cllr. Williams had some comment about the design of the affordable and rental housing, which is placed mainly all together on the development and she was concerned that this could pose future problems. Cllr. Bicker asked Cllr. Mullins and Cllr. Walker to provide some insight into what 'affordable housing' actually means and both responded to say that there are a number of purchasing schemes which claim to be 'affordable'. Broadly speaking it means homes which available to purchase in a more flexible way, to allow home buyers to get onto the property ladder in places where they would not otherwise be able to afford to buy a home. There was some question over whether Cottsway Housing Association would be taking on all of the rented and affordable housing properties on the development. Cllr. Mullins confirmed that this was in the original paperwork and so this was likely. Cllr. Hill suggested some of these schemes are restricted to only local residents although another resident of the Village suggested that this was not usually possible.

Cllr. King referred to the objections raised by OCC and their comment that this was an initial plan and would be reframed following comments and consultation. Thames Water has also raised a number of key issues regarding flooding, drainage and overloading the current system with waste water, which will need to be addressed prior to building commencing. It is therefore likely that new plans will be provided for the Parish Council's analysis following this consultation.

Cllr. Williams felt that the key issue which the Council needed to raise was to protect the current residents of Whitehall Close from impingement of privacy and negative impact from the building of the new development. Cllr. King referred to the Planning Statement from the developer which described how the new scheme would not impeach upon the living standards of existing residents in the Village.

#### **ACTION: Clerk to refer to this document in the Council's final response.**

Questions were raised regarding potential vehicular use of Wenrisc Drive. The Council would need to be clear on the plans for this and the effect this could have upon residents in this area.

A resident from Whitehall Close asked about the planned new footpath, which runs alongside his property. The Council note to discuss this footpath and its location at a later date.

Cllr. Jones summarised the main issues from feedback on the plans into the following headings:

**2019/02**

1. **Access:** A bus stop needs to be included on the scheme, preferably double width, to allow residents of the scheme to safely travel on school and public buses. All properties on the site need to have rear access. There are also concerns about access to and from the site by residents. The location of the development also means that a speed restriction will need to be imposed further outside of the Village boundary. Cllr. Walker confirmed that he is already working on addressing this as part of the Speedwatch scheme.
2. **Boundary:** This relates to the type of housing in the scheme, such as the houses along the boundary with Whitehall Close, the configuration of the affordable housing properties and definition of the boundary with Whitehall Close, in the form of a fence or similar to clearly delineate boundaries and improve privacy.
3. **Housing types:** This includes putting the correct homes in the right places on the site and ensuring that the houses on offer meet the needs of the local housing market.
4. **On-site configuration:** This includes the road layout, and collection of refuse and recycling on the estate, as well as storage of bins.
5. **On-going Parish Council liability:** This relates to the trees, bushes, and grass cutting on the development. The Council have previously confirmed that it will not take on any further liability for grounds maintenance in the Village.

Cllr. Haley asked the Council to decide on its response to the plans. Cllr. Jones proposed that the Parish Council strongly object to the plans; seconded by Cllr. Alderman and agreed by all Councillors except Cllr. Bicker who abstained from the vote due to the close proximity of her home to the new development. Councillors discussed the structure of the letter to be sent to West Oxfordshire District Council (WODC). Cllr. Haley asked for the first section of the letter to contain corrections to the background information to the Village which was provided in paperwork from the developer but was factually incorrect. Cllr. Haley has already provided this to the Clerk.

The Council agreed that the boundary line with Whitehall Close is the priority for the Council and all of the issues tied up with this, including how the new homes affect current residents, how the two developments will be divided and access through this area for residents.

Cllr. Haley reiterated that residents can lodge their responses either with West Oxfordshire District Council (WODC) directly or through the Council. Cllr. Williams offered to take letters from villagers to the WODC officers in Witney, provided they are delivered to her home by 12.30pm on Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> January. Cllr. Haley also asked the Clerk to ensure that a draft letter is available on the website as soon as possible for residents to see and comment upon, ready for submission on Thursday. Cllr. Haley asked for District Councillors to support the plans, both in their work with Officers and if a situation arises where a vote on the plans is called for; both Councillors agreed to this.

Clerk to arrange a meeting directly with Phil Shaw and available Councillors to go through the plans in further detail.

**ACTION: Clerk to contact Phil as soon as possible to arrange this.**

Cllr. Haley provided residents with the opportunity to leave the meeting following discussion of the main agenda item. Eight residents remained.

**b) Receive and discuss planning application 18/03602/HHD: 145 Brize Norton Road Minster Lovell Witney; Alterations and changes to layout to include erection of extensions, provision of first floor bedrooms and bathrooms and self contained ancillary living accommodation at ground floor. Construction of red brick chimneys and replacement conservatory. Alterations to detached garage building to create first floor art studio.**

After discussion, the Council agreed that the development is out of character with the Village – in particular in the sizes, scale and mass of the frontage and the timber frame conservatory. It also demonstrates over-development and the scale of the extension is inappropriate for the Village. Additionally it would set an unwanted precedent for similar development in the Village if the application was approved.

Cllr. King proposed to lodge a strong objection to the planning application on the above basis; seconded by Cllr. Williams and carried by four votes to two. Cllr. Jones asked the Clerk to confirm if the building shown on the plans behind the house is a new building or conversion of an existing structure.

**ACTION: Clerk to contact WODC to confirm details about the structure in the garden.**

**c) Planning application by Mikael Armstrong on behalf of Brize Norton Gun Club**

Cllr. Walker has been asked if this needs to go to Committee as it may involve a change to the opening times of the gun club. Cllr. Bicker confirmed that they definitely use only clay pigeon shooting and is closed during the pheasant shooting season. Cllr. Haley proposed lodging no objection to the plans, Cllr. Jones seconded this and all Councillors voted in favour of this except Cllr. Bicker who abstained as her husband is a member of the Club. The Council confirmed that they would want clarification that the opening days and times of the Club will not change following the work.

**ACTION: Clerk to check with OCC whether the Gun Club is likely to change their opening times as a result of the application being granted.**

**6. Discuss proposed increase to Council Tax to cover operational Policing.**

This had been circulated to Councillors in advance of the meeting. Thames Valley Police have opened a consultation on increasing the 'Police' element of Council Tax in the region to provide extra financial support to the Police force. Cllr. Stowell emailed his comments to the Clerk and Councillors before the meeting and proposed that the Council should support this increase. Councillors agreed with Cllr. Stowell. The Council also suggested it would be interesting to receive more details about what the money being raised will be spent upon.

**7. 'Around the Village' - matters not covered by other agenda items that need addressing or noting.**

Cllr. Bicker raised the issue of vehicles still being parked on the entrance to Wychwood Close.

**ACTION: Clerk to write to Mr Williams and copy in Cllr. Walker as the land is owned by OCC. Cllr. Walker suggested he could provide financial support to erect small bollards here to prevent this occurring again. Clerk and Cllr. Walker to liaise.**

Cllr. Alderman raised the issue of the state of Crawley Lane following the road works: he will bring photos to the next meeting to show the damage caused.

Cllr. Haley confirmed that the bin collections in the Village are still an issue and several residents now have broken bins. Cllr. Mullins confirmed that he will report this back to WODC.

Cllr. King asked that the quality of the recent laurel cutting in Ripley Avenue be added to the next agenda.

**ACTION: Clerk to add this to the January Parish Council meeting agenda.**

The Council considered the recent consultation by WODC of an increase in Council tax of £5 per household to help protect frontline services. The Council agreed that this was acceptable.

Mrs Holloway provided an interim dog fouling report. Several deposits were left in various locations around the Village over the Christmas period. She has suggested that the grass verge opposite the Spar Shop may be a suitable location for the new dog bin.

**ACTION: Councillors to check this area and discuss this possibility at the next meeting.**

The meeting closed at 9.15pm.

Signed.....

Cllr. David Haley, Chairman