

**KIRTLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held in the Village Hall on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> June 2016**

Present: Miss S van Loen, Dr H Macbeth, Mr D R Pratt (Chairman), Mrs R M Powles (Clerk),  
D Richardson, Cllr Barry Wood (Cherwell District Council, until Item 4)  
In attendance: Stuart Jenkins, W Twiddy (John D Wood & Co, 8 p.m. - 8.20 p.m.), E King (from 8  
p.m.)  
Apologies: R Sadler, S Tylor

**Agenda Item**

**Action**

Cllr Pratt welcomed Cllr Barry Wood to the meeting and congratulated him on his recent election to the newly created Fringford & Heyfords ward. Cllr Pratt also welcomed Stuart Jenkins who was considering standing as Councillor by co-option and was therefore attending as an observer.

Cllr Pratt proposed that a matter for discussion under Item 8 (Planning) be brought forward for immediate discussion, namely the Parish Council's policy with regard to engagement with representatives of development proposals, and it was agreed to do this. Cllr Pratt noted that previously the Council had declined requests from developers or their agents to discuss proposals, and had acted consistently in this regard. Cllr Macbeth proposed that the policy should change and the Parish Council should meet developers, and thus engage in a more positive way with potential future development in the parish. The proposal was agreed unanimously.

Cllr Macbeth noted that following the dismissal of the second Gladman appeal (proposal for 75 houses on land at Corner Farm) on 12<sup>th</sup> May, the Parish Council's views on future development needed to be clear and this tied in with the immediate requirements of the Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan (MCNP). She suggested that the Council should be mindful of the arguments it used in fighting the two Gladman proposals, and that the work of the MCNP forum was progressing. One decision of the MCNP was that all villages should consider the boundaries of future expansion, being rather similar to the old concept of "village envelope". She noted that throughout recent discussions the Council and the District Council had continued to stress the importance of the historic north-south linear layout of the central village settlement, and this should be relevant to such boundaries. There was clear evidence of the significance of the old Woodstock Way as a western boundary because of the historic agricultural field pattern west of it. It was suggested that the Council should continue to insist that there should be no new development to its west. The historic Park lay to the east but the current Conservation Area extended beyond the historic Park as shown on the 1875 map and so the Conservation Area should be reconsidered. Another view of the MCNP was that it was important for village settlements to be separated by rural land and not to merge, and so, for example, there should be no development southwards towards Bletchington. The MCNP proposal was that outside the village boundaries sporadic development should be opposed although the construction of the occasional home need not be precluded. She asked the Council for its comments so that she could report to the next MCNP Housing Working Group meeting.

Cllr Pratt agreed that there should be no development westward over agricultural land.

Cllr Macbeth proposed that the western boundary be the route of the old Woodstock Way, to the east the original historic sections of the Park, to the north Akeman Street and to the south the 30 mph sign on the Bletchington Road. The proposal was agreed unanimously.

Cllr Macbeth referred also to recent requests from the MCNP Housing group for member parishes to consider sites or conditions for sites; it had been suggested, for example, a maximum of 20 houses in any site. The District Council had stated at the appeal hearing in July 2015 for the first Gladman proposal (for 95 homes) that a fair share for Kirtlington as a Category A village would be about 17 new homes. She noted also the Council's recent concerns, expressed consistently at both Gladman appeals, related to limitations on village infrastructure that made Kirtlington's "Category A status" inappropriate, in particular that the school was at capacity with no space to expand, the small size of the village shop with no space to expand and the serious and frequent problems in the sewerage system. She suggested that the

Council bear in mind its responses to recent development proposals when considering any future applications.

Mr Twiddy and Mr King entered the meeting room at 8 p.m. Cllr Pratt invited Mr Twiddy to speak.

Mr Twiddy as representative of the Budgett family confirmed that the Jersey Cottages site was still available, and that the position of the Parish Council was noted and other views including those of parishioners were also recognized. Further surveys had been carried out since the original application (summer 2015). Cllr Pratt asked if new plans had been drawn up. Mr Twiddy said that to date this had not been done, in order to limit costs. Cllr Pratt said that in addition to its planning comments made at the time, the Council had wanted to ensure villagers had priority in terms of occupancy. Mr Twiddy said he thought that might be difficult to achieve but that a wish could be expressed. Cllr Macbeth mentioned that at Heyford Park Dorchester Group had achieved permission that 100% of its social housing be available in the first instance to local families.

Mr Twiddy said he was seeking the Council's views and Cllr Macbeth referred him to the points in the Council's formal planning response to the previous application, as these points remained significant. Cllr Pratt asked if the phased build-out requested by the Council in those comments was a possibility. Cllr Macbeth said the Council had been opposed to the construction of thirty new homes because of continuing concern about the infrastructure limitations mentioned above and considered a much lower figure more appropriate for the village. On the one matter of sewerage, Mr Twiddy suggested he could approach Thames Water, as a parishioner, in order to find out whether new pipework could be installed by a method called "pipe busting". He said he would ask the site promoter, Mr Dunn, to address the Council's points and send responses to the Clerk. Mr Twiddy left the meeting at 8.20 p.m.

WT /  
MD

Cllr Pratt referred Councillors back to the agenda and the normal business of the meeting resumed.

1. Minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2016

The minutes were signed as a correct record.

2. Matters arising from the minutes

Speed indicator on the Heyford Road: Cllr Richardson had established that the manufacturer was Solargen. Solargen could send an employee to check the indicator at a cost of £180. Cllr Richardson thought the problem might be a faulty battery, and he hoped to test it and see if a replacement could be found on the open market. If the problem was more complicated it might be necessary to replace the unit.

DR

Defibrillator: Cllr Richardson reported he had met Mrs Shackleton and Dr Grimshaw, and fundraising was under way. Cllr Macbeth said Mrs Shackleton had asked if the Council could record its agreement to a grant application; the Council confirmed its agreement. Cllr Richardson said a practical matter to be resolved was which body "owned" the equipment, for the longer term care and maintenance. It was agreed that the Parish Council should be that body.

LEADER (EU Funding scheme) event, Tackley, 12<sup>th</sup> May: Cllr Pratt had attended but the Council's projects did not fit the criteria.

3. Declarations of interest

None.

Cllr Wood left the meeting at 8.30 p.m.

4. Reports

Bus subsidies, provision of the 25a/25 service: At the Annual Parish Meeting Cllr Pratt had been able to confirm the 25A service would continue. A new timetable would start on 24<sup>th</sup> July, which would still be hourly but might have changes in actual times. The late evening service on Fridays and Saturdays would be cancelled as would the 25 service.

<p>5. <u>Village Greens</u></p> <p>Landscaping to front elevation of the Coach House, South Green and at the side entrance to Manor House: Cllr Pratt had written to Mr Roskelly as agreed at the last meeting. Mr Roskelly had declined the offer of a license but had advised the new owners were “relatively indifferent” as to the future of the low-level walls, and had copied this response to his two Estate Agents. Cllr Pratt had therefore written to request the removal of the walls and raised grass feature at the foot of the Coach House and had also copied this request to the Estate Agents.</p> <p>Resurfacing of South Green tracks: Cllr Pratt proposed that a circular letter should be sent by the end of the month to residents of South Green, requesting voluntary contributions to the cost of this work. The letter should include reference to the installation and cost of the new bollards. The proposal was agreed. Cllr Pratt would thank the two contractors for their quotations.</p> <p>6. <u>Village Hall, Sports Field and surrounds</u></p> <p><u>(i) Village Hall</u></p> <p>Cllr Pratt had attended the May meeting. The new timber framed windows were warping and the Committee was investigating what action could be taken under the guarantee. The Committee had approached the Parish Council to advise it might wish to change the soffits and fascias to UPVC; the Council’s planning committee had replied it did not think planning permission would be needed but had asked to be consulted on the replacement material before a final decision.</p> <p><u>(ii) Sports Field</u></p> <p>It had been suggested that the path round the pitches be made clearer; Mr Clifford had suggested a few paving stones to identify the route. Cllr Macbeth said it was a possible future project for the Community Service team.</p> <p>Graveyard extension: Cllr Sadler and the Clerk had met Mrs Mowat and Mr Summerfield to discuss the process, which might take about two years, this being the time taken for the first extension in 1992 - 94. The Clerk would contact Cherwell DC for pre-application advice, and it might be necessary to request a further letter from the landowners stating specifically that the land was a gift to the Church.</p> <p>Mr Harrison had passed on to the Council a request from the Parochial Church Council that he mow additional areas in the Churchyard. It was agreed that as 70% of his time was spent on the Churchyard already the Parish Council would not agree to the request.</p> <p><u>(iii) Pond:</u></p> <p>KWACS had written to request permission for a thorough clearing out of the pond by landscape contractors, and hoped to apply for a grant. It was agreed there was no objection to the clearing out and that the Council could be the formal signatory to the grant application if KWACS wished.</p> <p><u>(iv) Play Area</u></p> <p>The new play bark had been delivered and the formal opening of the new Climbing Frame would be on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> June. Cllr van Loen had asked Mrs Nicholson to cut the ribbon.</p>	<p>DP</p> <p>RP</p>
<p>7. <u>Village Fete, Saturday 25<sup>th</sup> June</u></p> <p>The Clerk would circulate a request to Council members for time shifts at the Council’s stand. Flyers advertising the MCNP would be distributed before the Fete; the questionnaire-leaflet would be available at the Council’s Fete stand for visitors to complete.</p> <p>8. <u>Planning</u></p> <p>(i) Gladman application 14/02139/OUT, Public Hearing held on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> February: the Appeal was dismissed on 12<sup>th</sup> May. The applicant had until 23<sup>rd</sup> June to apply for a Judicial Review.</p>	

- (ii) Future development in the parish: see above, before Item 1.
- (iii) MCNP Forum meetings and working groups: Cllr Macbeth referred to the latest minutes. Work had been done on the amenities lists and the evidence lists, for example bus services.
- (iv) Monthly application schedule: Cllr van Loen said she would like more information on the dimensions of the proposed two-storey garage and studio at Stoke House (16/00918/F) and would liaise with the other members of the planning committee.

9. Correspondence

The Clerk referred to the recent NALC recommendations on the circulation of Local Authority emails; Council members should bear in mind that if they did not want an email published, it should not be sent.

Oxfordshire CC and Cherwell DC disagreement about the future structure of local authorities for Oxfordshire: a workshop would be held in Bicester on 21<sup>st</sup> June. No Council member was able to attend.

10. Finance

Annual Return to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016: The Clerk and Cllr Sadler had met to discuss the Accounting Statement and the Clerk presented the statement to the Council. The Council approved the Annual governance statement 2015 – 2016 (Section 1) and the Accounting statements 2015 - 2016 (Section 2). Mr Steve Rice had kindly agreed to carry out the internal audit.

Annual Parish Meeting: Cllr Sadler had asked for parishioners’ views on whether the Precept should be increased. Mr Clifford had written in favour of an increase and had asked if the Council could submit an article to the next edition of the Village News.

Barclays Bank had confirmed the changes to the mandate, thus the Clerk was now a signatory (in her maiden name of R M Bone), in addition to Cllrs Pratt and van Loen.

Council insurance: Zurich had provided full details with their quotation but Aon had not, and Cllrs Pratt and Sadler had approved the appointment of Zurich for a three-year Long Term agreement, to provide cover from 1<sup>st</sup> June 2016. Neither company allowed payment by Direct Debit. Payment of the Zurich premium for the first year of £812.70 was approved.

Monthly schedule of payments and receipts: the new payments were approved.

11. AOB

Cllr Macbeth said the Community Service team had had to cancel their scheduled visit on one Sunday, but would be working in the Churchyard and Allotments, possibly for the next four or five Sundays.

Cllr Pratt said Mrs Hawkesworth had mentioned a poisonous plant found in the Gravel Pit field and had asked if the Council could have it removed.

Cllr Pratt queried why Cridland Estate Agent boards advertising the Fete had been put up at Lamb Ale, which was several weeks in advance. He suggested this was too long in advance.

Cllr Pratt invited Mr King to speak. Mr King said he would be grateful to be able to present his proposals for the Ryefurlong site to the Council at its next meeting. Cllr Pratt said he would be welcome to do so.

Signed ***D R Pratt*** Chairman

Date ***12.7.2016***

Formatted: Font: Britannic Bold, 14 pt, Italic

Formatted: Font: Britannic Bold