



# EYNSHAM PARISH COUNCIL

CLERK: SUE LEE, 19 BRADSHAW CLOSE, STEEPLE ASTON, BICESTER

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 1 APRIL 2008 at 7.30pmin the Bartholomew Room, Eynsham

**Present: Councillors** - Mr G Beach (Chairman), Mrs. L Gerrans, Ms S Osborne, Mrs. M Jones, Ms J Tinson, Mr R Andrews, Mr T Green, Dr F Wright, Mrs M Sheppard, Mr P Staley and Mrs L Pialek. County Cllr. C Mathew and District Cllr Ms F Pike and 12 members of the public – Ms J Stonham, Mr and Mrs Sheffield, Ms C Mayhew, Ms S Isaacs, Mr and Mrs A Minto, Mr B Hammersley, Mr V Goodstadt, Ms H Jordan and Mr and Mrs P Coulter.

**In Attendance:** Mrs. S Lee - Clerk

**08/46 Apologies for Absence** were received and accepted from Mr D Rossiter, Mrs V Hughes, Mrs A Beavis and District Cllr Mrs M Stevens

**08/47 Declarations of interest** – Mr Green – prejudicial interest in Finance - payment to him for Churchyard works. Mr Staley registered a personal interest in the East Eynsham development as in his previous employment with OCC he advised on access to the site.

**08/48 New Parish Councillor Vacancies** - Mr Paul Staley and Mrs Marion Sheppard signed their acceptance of office papers and were welcomed to the Parish Council.

**08/49 Kate Clemmow** – Head of Strategic Support at Cottsway Housing advised the meeting of Cottsway's plans for working with the community and answered questions regarding this.

### **08/50 Public Participation**

- The Chairman advised the meeting of Mr George Wood's death last week. He had been a long serving parish councillor and was involved in many aspects of village life and would be sadly missed.
- **East Eynsham development**
- o Mr and Mrs Sheffield — advised that they had been severely restricted by the Planning Authority when carrying out works to their property due to its location in the conservation area. They felt the same care should be taken with the proposed new development. In addition they expressed concern at the proposed use of the Bitterell as the only access to pedestrians, cyclists etc from the proposed development to the village and the increase in traffic on this small unlit footpath. He also advised that plans to build a further property on the Bitterell had been refused by WODC as they did not feel that Bitterell was wide enough for vehicular access.
- o Ms C Mayhew– concerned with regard to the possible addition of 110 houses to the village. Can the infrastructure cope with extra properties – police and other services are already stretched. In addition concern re access via the Bitterell.

- o Ms S Isaacs – reaffirmed all the comments already made as concerns.
- o Mrs M Minto – asked how the Parish Council felt about the application and the Chairman advised that their comments on the initial consultation would be forwarded to her. He pointed out that the PC had and were persevering to ensure that the consultation process was improved and agreed that the consultation to date had not been effective. The land had been identified for housing by WODC in the Local Plan and it was vital that the local community be involved in any plans that are put forward for its development and at present the consultation process is severely lacking.
- o Mr A Minto advised that he felt the PC had a duty to act as a voice of the village – Clerk would forward copy of comments on initial consultation to him for info – they have been available on website etc. He expressed great concern with regard to flooding on the site.
- o Mr B Hammersley advised that he was not opposed to development in Eynsham however he was opposed to this development as he felt the proposals were inappropriate for the site. He suggested that the Parish Council should make representations to WODC to have the site taken out of the Local Plan for development. He advised that the current consultation was out of character with the conservation area – the proposed 3 storey properties would cause a serious blight to the area, the published response to the concern re drainage was inadequate as was the response to the traffic concerns with no mention being made to peak flow traffic movements.
- o Mr V Goodstadt had forwarded his draft responses to the Parish Council – for revision following a meeting with the developer’s last week and asked for the letter to be taken as part of this record – main points listed below –
  - a) The Risk of Flooding: The consultation states that proposals have been looked on favourably by the Environment Agency. This is at odds with its stated position that it is concerned about the development of the site. The draft FRA and the EA response to it that forms the basis of the ‘*Introduction*’ diagram should be made available and the subject of public consultation.
  - b) The density of development has now been increased from 100 units to 110 units without explanation, and contrary to the statement on the diagram titled ‘*Introduction*’, which wrongly claims that the density has been reduced;
  - c) The principle set out in the draft brief that development would be under 3 storey in height has now been ignored, and therefore the statement on the diagram titled ‘*Introduction*’ that the storey height has been reduced is untrue;
  - d) The inadequate footpath arrangements have not been addressed. It is not acceptable for the occupiers of a large housing development to have to walk along public roads or private unlit rights of way;
  - e) The needs of the Orchard Close residents in terms of privacy, outlook and boundary treatment have not been met. There are still issues which need to be discussed;
  - f) The need to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area has not been addressed in the material provided. The indicative elevations do not relate to the character of the Conservation Area. The diagram titled *Introduction* states that the developers have ‘reviewed the development ideas in conjunction with the Conservation Area and sought to preserve views and promote high quality.’ No evidence is provided in support of this statement. What review was undertaken? Which views have been preserved? Where is the evidence that a high quality scheme is being promoted? As it stands this statement is no more than marketing hype. An opportunity to have a copy of this review and an explanation from whoever undertook it would be appreciated;

- g) There are still concerns about the traffic impacts, which are recognised by the developers. The draft TIA should be made available as part of the consultative process. An opportunity to have a presentation from the engineer responsible for the TIA and modelling would be welcomed;
  - h) The Landscape Strategy diagram needs more explanation before it could be agreed. It is a set of broad concepts which need more justification and explanation in terms of the boundary treatment of the south west area, the meaning of 'home zone' style planting, the treatment of water features and why the south westerly vista is given so much prominence. An opportunity to have an explanation from the Landscape Architect would be welcomed;
  - i) The intention to make a contribution to local services was noted. The original brief showed the contribution related to the impacts of the development. A review should also be undertaken of local needs and assessed against an open book accounting approach on the potential contribution to the enhancement of the village; and
  - j) The background material that supports the latest consultation documents is still missing. This should be made available and subject to consultation.
  - k) There is also one general comment to make. This second stage consultation has been even more inadequate than that in December. The timing was at very short notice, the web site was not operational well into the consultation period, the timescale for making responses has been absurdly short, the quality of the material is inadequate (in places illegible, without proper referencing and unexplained) and the developers persist in a reactive non-participatory approach.
  - l) The draft brief published in December had serious limitations in terms of errors and omissions. In particular, it did not give the appropriate priority to the statutory duty to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. These criticisms have been borne out by the latest set of drawings and therefore still remain unanswered.  
We therefore ask that the revised brief, that has been promised, be made available for consultation which is open and participatory, with the presentation of options. Until this happens no planning application should be submitted if the consultation process is to have any credibility.
- Mr Goodstadt further advised that he moved into the village aware of the proposals to develop the site and is not against the development as such but does require it to meet all the standards of the conservation area and the final plans to be the result of a proper consultation period. He pointed out that the developers state that a Green Travel plan has been drawn up but OCC are unaware of this in addition to all the points above. He stated that when the plans are presented they will show evidence of consultation however no credibility should be given to this consultation as it stands at present - the developers need to revisit the plans to ensure that they are of the high quality of design and character that befits the conservation area.
  - The public felt that the 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation was worse than the first and that all issues from the first consultation still remain and have not been addressed.
  - Ms H Jordan – expressed concern re flooding on the site and queried as to whether affordable housing would be only for the local community – she was advised that there would be approx 50% affordable housing on the site in accordance with WODC policy but as this was not a rural exception site it would be open to all potential tenants on the WODC housing register. The proposed Chilbridge site was a rural exception site with the associated stringent requirements re local connections for all tenants – Mr Green questioned this and advised that he did not think this would be the case and that there would be no control over residents.

- Several members of the public expressed concern over the statement on the consultation documents that the residents of the Bitterell would police the area – how and why?
- Mr P Coulter thanked the PC for the new fence on the playing fields. He was aware of the plans to develop the field when he moved into his property but shared the concerns above and advised that the developers were building up resentment within the community rather than working alongside them.
- Mrs A Coulter felt that the development would be good for the village but that 110 houses was over development of the site and a development more in keeping with the surrounding area and character would be beneficial.
- County Cllr C Mathew advised that he opposed all building on the site and felt that it should be taken out of the conservation area before any development was considered. He offered his total support to the community in opposing the proposals.
- District Cllr Ms F Pike – advised that Cottsway had written to all residents of Merton Close advising that the road could be used as the proposed new access to the proposed development on Chilbridge.

**08/51 Minutes of the meeting of 4 March** - Dr Wright requested that extra information be included in the minutes regarding the current issues between the village hall and Scouts – it was proposed by Mrs Gerrans and seconded by Mr Green that his additions be held as an annexe to these minutes for future record. Dr Wright abstained from the vote. The minutes were unanimously agreed as a true record of the meeting and signed and dated by the Chairman.

**08/52 Clerk's Report - circulated**

- The Clerk requested a pen portrait from all the parish councillors for the parish website and The Echo.  
**Action: All**
- OALC training – Mrs Sheppard requested a place on the How to be a Better Councillor course – Clerk will book places at end of this week so anyone else requiring a place on training course please advise ASAP.  
**Action: All**
- 2 volunteers had put their names forward to compile The Echo - details have been forwarded to Communications Cmtee for next meeting **Action: Comm Cmtee**
- Clerk will meet with Bill Butcher – TVP re defensive planting at new fence on Oxford Rd as it is being climbed over at present.

**08/53 Finance**

Mr Green left the meeting

- **To approve payment of accounts as listed on schedules -**  
Proposed by Dr Wright and seconded by Mrs Gerrans that accounts in the sum of £132,894.99 be accepted as attached – unanimously agreed and cheques signed by Mrs Gerrans and Dr Wright. Salary run cheques included in total signed by Mr Beach and Mr Rossiter on 25 March 2008.

Mr Green returned to the meeting

- **Income** – Income of £253,086.61 was advised including maturation of money market account - £113,698.44.

## 08/54 Correspondence

Name	Request	Action
Volunteer Centre	Invitation to celebration – 20 June 6-7.30pm	No takers
David Miller	Request for support for clearing Wharf Stream	Clerk has contacted EA – they will write to OCC if no response to Mr Miller and EPC letters
WODC	Planning for the future – Consultation on issues and options	For May agenda – a meeting with planners was not required. Clerk to obtain more copies of booklets – all to send comments re sites to Clerk by 21 April for consideration at planning meeting and compilation before the May meeting– <b>Action: Clerk</b>
ORCC	Calor Villages of the Year	No interest
OCC	Changes to Stagecoach services 11 and 18	Copied to Echo and Website
Local Channel	Re websites	Passed to communications committee
Fields in Trust	Public liability insurance for playing fields	Passed to PFMC for payment
Mrs West	Copies of corresp. to WODC re planning issues at 44 Mill St	Advised her issues were out of PC control as planning
Eynsham Neighbourhood Care Scheme	Update on take up - during 6 months ending 31 March 205 journeys made by volunteer drivers.	For information
Vincent Goodstadt and Cathy Stasz	East Eynsham	Passed to next agenda item
Police report	Advised meeting of incidents as reported.	
Morey Andrews	The Noise – requests for projects	All to think and advise Clerk of any ideas <b>Action: All</b>

### Correspondence for information

WODC	Decisions – cabinet and planning	Passed to Chair
ORCC	Calor Village year Report 2007	For info
OPFA	Sports Seminar	To Play Area Committee
Leader of OCC	Letter to Chairmen	Passed to Chair

**08/55 East Eynsham Development** - Discussion regarding the latest round of consultation on the proposed development – Clerk to ensure that WODC is copied in to all the comments.

In addition to advise WODC that the Parish Council do not feel that the consultation has been conducted in a professional manner which enabled the community to work alongside the developers to ensure that concerns were addressed. **Action: Clerk**

Clerk to respond to developers with following concerns –

- **Consultation** – to date it was felt that lip service had been paid to the term consultation – 2 events had taken place neither of which were notified to the village until the week before and both of which were found out by accident prior to any notification. The Parish Council had then requested information from the developers. In both cases the developers felt it was sufficient to send the Parish Council a poster – with the wrong address on the initial poster to put up in the village. It was felt that a public meeting was required to address all the concerns and enable the village to feel part of the consultation process and ensure that the developers are fully aware of all the issues around the site. The Parish Council had requested a meeting with the developers but to date none had been forthcoming. For a development of this size the consultation has been sadly lacking – successful consultation should help with the final planning application however this half hearted attempt has aggrieved the village.
- **Conservation area** –the current proposals do not enhance or preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area and there is no evidence to suggest that any work has been carried out to ensure that these requirements are met
- **Risk of Flooding** – there is no evidence to suggest that the risk of flooding on the area has been taken into account – the Environment Agency report on the site should be made available for public consultation. In addition the raising of the properties by 0.5m using topsoil from the plots will simply serve to make the area at increased risk as there will be less land above the floodplain for it to soak into. Has a survey been carried out on the suggested pipe way under the road to take any flood water away? It was felt that without valves and appropriate controls water is more likely to flow from east to west.
- **Density** – the density of properties has now increased which is contrary to the statement in the consultation indicating it had been reduced.
- **Design and Style** – the revised consultation document features 3 storey properties that are totally out of keeping with the surrounding environment. There are also concerns with regard to the quality of the development – it is in a conservation area.
- **Traffic** – there is still concern with regard to the general layout and apparent lack of work that has been carried out after the initial consultation. It is still strongly felt that the exit on to the A4449 should be a left turn only junction in order not to aggravate an already dangerous road. A Traffic assessment must be carried out and its results used to make the proposals safe for the residents and local community.
- **Footpaths** – there is great concern regarding the connection to the village. The proposed access to the village on foot or bicycle is down an unlit narrow right of way which is unsuitable. This will force the new residents on the estate into their cars and increase the traffic congestion in an already congested village. The idea of a footway along the main road for schoolchildren to use is unsafe and unviable. In addition the Parish Council have concern about the possible siting of a path across their playing fields on which there has been no individual consultation.
- **Orchard Close** – the Parish Council understand that there has now been a meeting with some of the residents and the developers following a request from the residents. The current proposals and the new height of the houses make the situation worse for these residents and their views need to be strongly taken into consideration.
- **Landscape Strategy** – this is far too brief and gives very little detail – the views from both in and out of the site need to be considered if seems apparent that the only views that are being considered at present are those in and it must be stressed that the views out are just as important.

Clerk to compile response and circulate before responding. **Action: Clerk**

### **08/56 Sports Centre**

To date the response from WODC has been that they are looking into the request by the PC to add a clause to the JUA. It was proposed by Dr Wright, seconded by Mr Green with unanimous agreement that the Clerk should advise WODC that they are preparing a case to serve a notice for arbitration on WODC, OCC, Bartholomew School and Wycombe Leisure. Cllr Mathew advised he was meeting with Hilary Biles – Cabinet member for Health, Leisure and Tourism - and would advise of outcome before any letter was sent. **Action: Clerk**

### **08/57 Churchyard**

Mr Pimm has agreed for the works on the churchyard to be carried out from his land – Clerk will meet with Mr Green to find a contractor to carry out the work. Mr Green has ascertained the water stopcock for the tap in the churchyard. Mr Green requested an assurance that the PC would not be liable if an accident occurred with the railings in the Churchyard and the Chairman confirmed that these were covered by the PCC insurance. Spoil is still being taken from the Catholic church to St Leonard's by the grave diggers – Mr Green has discussed this with the undertaker and this practice will hopefully cease. **Action: Clerk and Mr Green**

### **08/58 Highways**

List of proposed works following Paul Wilson's village walk was circulated. A request for road junction markings on Beech Rd/Hawthorn Rd and Beech Rd/Millmoor Crescent was made but it was pointed out that similar requests had recently been turned down on John Lopes Rd/Evans Rd so it was unlikely this would proceed. In addition the school yellow zigzag lines needed repainting and Dr Wright advised of a hole in Back Lane by the village hall. **Clerk** to advise Highways.

Cllr Mathew advised that the barrier for cyclists on Hawthorn Rd will be erected shortly.

White lines have appeared on Cassington Lane – **Clerk** to ask Highways why they have been put down.

### **08/59 Risk Assessment to date –**

Mrs Beavis had read and agreed the risk assessment to date – an action plan will now be compiled with the committees to ensure all Parish Council risks in the village are covered. **Action: Clerk**

### **08/60 Village Hall –**

The Scouts have forwarded a letter from their insurance company with regard to public liability insurance which was circulated. Dr Wright will feedback any comments. Dr Wright is still working with Pre school and Police re notice board and will feedback to Communications Committee.

**Action: Dr Wright**

Dr Wright expressed the concern of the village hall committee officers that they had received no support from the Parish Council with respect to the issues with the Scouts re access etc.

### **08/61 Committee meetings**

- Planning - Proposed Mrs Gerrans, seconded Mrs Jones with unanimous approval to adopt minutes and recommendations of the meeting of 10 March – meeting on 31 March cancelled as no plans.
- Communications – proposed Mr Andrews, seconded Mrs Pialek with unanimous approval to adopt minutes and recommendations of the meeting on 6 May 2008. Dr Wright advised that he was upset not to have been involved in the latest edition of the Echo – he was advised that due to the tight time schedule it was put together and approved by email and no paper copy had been circulated. Mr Green expressed his concerns with regard to the possible costs of the new website - he was advised the money had been allocated several years ago and the old website was past its sell by date and

involved a lot more work for the webmaster that was necessary and the costs suggested were the expected commercial rate.

**Dates of Next Meetings**

- Planning Committee - Monday 21 April 5.30pm
- Communication Committee – Thursday 29 April 7pm
- Annual Parish meeting – Tuesday 22 April 7.30pm – Village Hall.
- Main Meeting – Tuesday 6 May 7.30pm

The meeting closed at 9.50pm

Signed..... Date...6<sup>th</sup> May 2008.....