

WOODCOTE PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Parish Council meeting held in the Committee Room, Village Hall, Woodcote
Wednesday 18th November 2015 commencing 7.30pm.

PRESENT

Chairman Mr. R. Peirce
Vice Chairman Mr. G. Botting
Mr. M. Smith
Mr. A. Crockett.
Mr. R. Lewin
Mrs. D. Hadaway
Mr. D. Booth
Dr. P. Sudbury
Mr. B. Williams

Parish Clerk Ms. Jenny Welham

1. To receive apologies for absence.
Mrs. S. McGurk.

2. To Receive declarations of interest.
None.

3. **Public Forum**: Opportunity for members of the public to address the Council, the public may also speak about specific items of business as they arise, with the permission of the Chairman.
Many members of the public present to speak about planning applications.

4. To approve Minutes Parish Council Meeting held on 3rd November.
Approved as a true record.

5. Matters arising from those Minutes not on the agenda elsewhere.
None.

6. Planning Applications

P15/S3434/FUL (Full Application) Minor Proposal: Erection of 5 new houses with parking and new access to Beech Lane. (2 x 2 bed, 2 x 4 bed, 1 x 5 bed units). Retention of smaller paddock for continued use for grazing.
Land north of Beech Lane Woodcote RG8 0PX.

Cllr. Smith who had visited the site and dealt with this application for the Parish Council gave an overview. There are several points that do not comply with the Woodcote NHP.
Also the site has an extensive planning history dating from 1960 to 1984, with 12 applications submitted all of which had been refused and some on appeal.

The Chairman then invited the various members of the public present to speak on this application.

Mr. M. Roberts resident of Beech Lane.

He objects to this application. Feels it is outside the NHP and therefore commercial. Does not agree that it is infill according to NHP policy and SODC Core Strategy. It would significantly change the rural nature Beech Lane, and traffic will increase on what is a narrow rural lane.

Mr. S. Fraser – resident Beech Lane.

He objects to this development, stating it does not conform to the infill policies and it also invades privacy of his property. Also to build a second service road to these properties is not in keeping with the rural character of Beech Lane.

Mr. M. Compton

He was in agreement with the previous speakers with the same objections. He also has concerns that this development could set a precedent for others in the area and the small paddock to be left at the rear of this development.

The Chairman summarised the issues with this application;

It does not meet the density policy as per SODC Core Strategy which is a strong reason for refusal.

Not showing any affordable housing not confirming to NHP or SODC Core Strategy

He agrees with the comment on the design being very bland and not in keeping with the rural character of the area.

Service Road to the development is not in character with the rural area in the AONB.

The Chairman asked Cllr. Smith to give his recommendations, he stated that we must give sound planning reasons for any objections, he stated at least nine NHP policies that the development did not conform to. A major reasons for refusal is that it is in the AONB and the Planning inspector had refused the Goats Gambol application on the opposite side of Beech Lane for this reason. Also the development will increase to be outside the village envelope. He recommends Refusal

Cllr. Botting seconded this and the Parish Council voted unanimously for Refusal.

P15/S3449/O (Outline) Minor. Proposal: Outline planning permission for demolition of existing bungalow and detached garage and replace with three 3 bedroom dwellings. Approval sought for Highways Access and Parking.

Address: Red Lane Bungalow Red Lane Woodcote RG8 0PD

The Chairman asked Cllr. Williams who had this application and had made a site visit together with 8 other Parish Councillors for his views. Cllr. Williams stated he could not find and planning reasons for strong objections to this outline application, but that as yet Highways had not made their comments.

The Chairman advised that this is for outline planning only and any drawings are illustrative only, what is presented for determination is the principle of 3 dwellings being erected on this site and the existing bungalow and double garage be demolished.

SODC Planning officer had given the pre planning details stating he felt that the site could support 3 dwellings and that 2 appear to be on the footprint of the existing bungalow. This would therefore make the third proposed dwelling infill.

He stated that the Highways access is critical but currently no comments had been received from OCC Highways. The third dwelling is currently too close to the Grade II listed cottages. However he could not see any sound planning conditions to refuse the principle of 3 dwellings on this site.

The Chairman invited the members of public present to speak on this application.

Gillian Walker – Resident of Weevil Cottage Grade II listed.

Gillian had sent a 14 page letter to SODC with her objections to this application, the PC have a copy on file. She objects stating that the positioning of the third dwelling is too close to a Grade II listed building. This area of the village has a rural nature and is not a built up area of the village. Past planning history of this areas show infill being rejected.

Mr. T. Sparks – resident Toggs Cottage Grade II listed.

He agreed with previous comments but also stated and would like to add that the site had a history of drainage problems and some flooding.

Mrs. P. Booker resident

Objected stating a third dwelling was intrusive to the listed cottages, and the access is not acceptable, however nothing as yet had been received from OCC Highways.

Mr. J. Bowden – resident Weevil Cottage

He expressed that should the third dwelling be build further down the site and therefore away from the listed buildings this would push the site outside the envelope of the village, so this would mean that a third dwelling would need to be sited closer on the site to the listed properties. He stated that some Councils do not allow outline planning close to any Grade II listed buildings.

The Chairman agreed that this was factually true, but however SODC do not have this policy in place currently.

Owner of Deans Farm House

He has concerns regarding the lane and access, but said he could not comment without the input from OCC Highways.

The Applicant and Architect were present and invited questions, no one present put questions to them.

The Chairman summarised, proposing that there were no sound planning reasons to object to the principle of three dwellings on this site application and recommended Approval, however made without any comment from OCC Highways. The Parish Council voted in agreement.

The response to SODC Planning should state that should this outline application be approved any full application needs to show careful siting of the third dwelling so it was not close to the Grade II listed properties, and that to use the full extent of the site, despite it slightly going outside building line by approximately 1 to 2 metres.

P15/S3629/HH Demolition of existing garage and erection of proposed garage. Single storey front, side and rear extensions and dropped kerb.

Address: 68 Whitehouse Road Woodcote RG8 0SA.

Cllr. Lewin had visited the site and summarised his findings. The Council recommend refusal to this application solely on the siting of the proposed garage to the front of the property. The extensions are acceptable. The Council all agreed.

P15/S3157/HH (Householder) Proposal: Erection of summer house (retrospective).

Address: 13 Hagbourne Close Woodcote RG8 0RZ

Cllr. Crockett had visited the site and spoken to the neighbours either side who were not overly impacted by the building. The garden to the rear in Birchen Close was impacted and they had objected.

He stated that the applicant had erected the building in good faith being told that it needed to be one metre from the fencing either side, now he has been advised it should be two metres. The applicant is prepared to move it so it is two metres from one of the fences.

Cllr. Crockett stated that the building is very high at 3 metres, and is overbearing, unneighbourly and intrusive to the neighbouring properties in particular the garden to the rear. If the height was reduced this would make a difference. He recommended Refusal. The Parish Council agreed.

6.1 Applications Granted by SODC:

None.

6.2 Applications Refused by SODC:

None.

6.3 Other Planning Matters

P15/S3603/PDH Projection: 2.1 metres, Height: 2.6 metres, Height to eaves: 2.6 metres

AT: 1a Corner Cottages Wayside Green Woodcote RG8 0PR

This application is under the permitted development policy and therefore is for information only, the Parish Council are not allowed to comment, only close neighbours to the property can make comments.

7.FinanceTo approve payments. To note receipts.

Date Paid	Payee Name	Reference	Amount Paid	Authorized Ref	Transaction Detail
05/11/2015	HMRC SO		£239.00	Oct tax	
18/11/2015	Westcotec Ltd	498	£149.40	Repair 30mph traffic sign	
18/11/2015	Royal British Legion	499	£50.00	Poppy Appeal	
18/11/2015	ABA Construction Ltd	500	£126.00	ARD repair to seesaw frame	
18/11/2015	K .Smallbone	501	£30.00	War Memorial Garden Nov.	
18/11/2015	Berinsfield Community Business	502	£1,183.20	October Grass cutting	
18/11/2015	Citizens Advice Bureau	503	£1,000.00	Annual Grant	
28/11/2015	A. Crockett SO		£200.00	November litter picking	
28/11/2015	Jenny Welham SO		£782.00	November Salary	

Total Payments £3,759.60

APPROVED

Noted no receipts

7.1 Quotations/Grants received for review/approval.

Fencing quotation for allotment fencing.

A further company Secure-a-field had given a quotation for palisade fencing and was less expensive than ARD.

They had also proposed a close mesh fencing that is less expensive and would not be able to be climbed.

A decision needs to be made regarding if double gates are required and also the funding. Deferred to a meeting of the Allotment Trustees to finalise before proceeding.

Blandy&Blandy had asked if the PC required searches carried out on the woodland to be gifted at the rear of the development in Long Toll. Estimated cost of £500. The PC agreed these were not necessary. Clerk to advise.

8. Budget Review FY 2016/2017 - first review of budget and forecast costs.

The Clerk had circulated the latest Budget report as of 16 November.

The Chairman advised that for the next FY2016/17 the PC would need to consider the workplace pension. Even if the current Clerk has decided to opt out, the PC need a pension scheme in place to be able to offer it should future employees required to opt in.

Contribution amounts for the PC will be 1% in the first 6 months rising to 2% for the remainder of the FY, of gross salary paid to employees. A pension provider will need to be established. Clerk recommended NEST as they are a Trust and only charge a set up and administration fee.

Section 106 funds are expected for various projects next year, these need to be considered when considering the items from the precept budget, so the incoming 106 funds are offset and it is not calculated as precept budget funds.

The Chairman also advised that the budget needs to be carefully considered when looking at the Village Hall, there seemed some miss communication regarding the PC's budget amount equalling the previous match funding and the rental that the PC used to pay. He stated that the PC are under no obligation whatsoever to pay any rental as they own the building and have agreed to take over the capital expenditure.

Cllr. Booth expressed that he felt let down by these statements and that his understanding from various meetings was that the PC would also cover certain maintenance items and they would cover the equal amount of the rental. This year the PC have budgeted £5K for the Village hall and have already spend over £4K. This area needs very clear clarification when it comes to next year's budget figures. Cllr. Botting suggested that the PC would need to be spending more on the Village Hall on an ongoing basis.

The budget forecast figures for FY2016/17 to be circulated to the PC for review and discussion at the next PC meeting 2nd December. The final precept figure has to be determined before close of business in December.

8.1 Section 106 Payments – review position so far and for next FY in line with budget.

The Outdoor Table Tennis table Sec106 funds have been agreed and received, the Chairman asked where it was suggested to be placed on the Village Green. Cllr. Booth advised that the Village Green committee had decided to place it on the corner of the green outside the Youth Club. The Chairman advised that this was a major change for the green and its structure and any such changes needed the PC to be consulted first as the VGC are acting on behalf of the PC. This matter to be discussed at the next PC meeting, Clerk to invite a member from the VGC.

The Clerk advised the Section 106 application for the Hearing Loop had been accepted by SODC and the Chairman signed the letter to be send back to them, funds will then be releases to value of £1422.

Clerk to show the incoming Sec 106 funds under each specific category on the accounting system so the amounts can be tracked against their section rather than one large figure stating Sec106. Clerk to action, and also check if there is a way to offset the incoming against the outgoing spend so they equal out, she was doubtful that the system had the capability to do this but will enquire.

There is a list of potential projects for Sec106 funds, these need to be reviewed and prioritised on a regular basis.

With new developments in the village 106 funds will be allocated by SODC if the PC do not specify their own projects under the pre determined categories.

9. Other Committee Reports

Cllr. Lewin reported on the meeting he had attended at OCC regarding their review of the budget and which areas/services would be cut to accommodate their reduced funds for next year. He advised that more and more is being expected to be done by Parish Councils. OCC have put forward ideas to help such as making a small charge for entry to the Household Waste Disposal centres to hopefully avoid closures.

Central Government will not sanction this suggestion.

He stated that the final areas for cuts are not yet announced but warned there will be issues which may mean Parish Councils covering more cost in certain areas.

Cllr. Williams had circulated an email, unfortunately there has been a series of burglaries in the village, mostly from vehicles stealing tools and related items.

Cllr. Williams is going to talk to the Neighbourhood Watch Controllers in the village. The Chairman advised it is Mrs. MacDougall for Wayside Green and she will likely know the others in the village.

10. Other Matters for the Chairman

The Chairman had attended the SODC annual Town and Parish Council meeting. The majority of the evening was taken up with Planning and the need for PC's and Town Councils to develop and have a Neighbourhood Plan. Woodcote is in a very good position already having an NHP, so is well placed.

11. Correspondence

1 letter to be referred to the next meeting.

12. To note date of the Next PC Meeting : Wednesday 2nd December.

Meeting Closed at 10.20pm

Signed.....Date.....