

# Minutes of the Council Meeting held on Monday 6<sup>th</sup> February 2017 in the Village Hall

**Present:**

Charles Mathew	(CM)	Chairman
Matthew Judson	(MJ)	Councillor- Vice Chairman
Jose Eaton	(JE)	Councillor
Colin Wells	(CW)	Councillor
Trudi Gasser	(TG)	Parish Clerk

**In Attendance:**

Hilary Fenton	(HF)	WODC District Councillor
10 Members of the public		

MIN REF	ITEM	ACTION AGREED
<b>17/013</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	
	Graham Dixon-Brown (GDB) Councillor Joe Deane (JD) Councillor Steve Good (SG) WODC District Councillor	
<b>17/014</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CM owns property near the Leys, the Green and the School</li> <li>MJ lives near Butts Piece</li> </ul>	
<b>17/015</b>	<b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 9<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2017</b>	
	The Minutes were approved for publication.	TG to publish
	<b>Matters Arising:</b>	
	<p>16/110 – The speed gun has been purchased and utilised.</p> <p>16/097 – Eynsham Local Plan – CM confirmed that he had requested that rules on access for HGV's on the B4449 be included in the Eynsham Local Plan</p>	
<b>17/016</b>	<b>REPORTS FROM DISTRICT/COUNTY COUNCILLORS</b>	
	<b>DISTRICT:</b> HF confirmed that WODC are currently occupied by the Unitary debate.	
	<b>COUNTY:</b> <u>Nothing further</u> to report.	
<b>17/017</b>	<b>PLANNING</b>	
	<p>Current Applications: TG confirmed that no new application had been received since the previous meeting.</p> <p>Churchyard Car Park Ownership: CM reported that ownership of the Church car park is unconfirmed – a search of the Land Registry had not identified ownership.</p> <p>WODC Local Plan: CM reported that following the granting of the Planning Application for housing on the Airfield, the PC have an opportunity to present information regarding the site to the Inspector of the WODC Local Plan highlighting the risk of housing being located so close to a landfill site. CM explained that following the</p>	

MIN REF	ITEM	ACTION AGREED
	previous meeting, where it was resolved that CM should obtain costing for Environmental Resources Management (ERM) to undertake research and provide a specialist report for submission to the Inspector, a quotation in two phases (£2,000 and a further £3,000) had been received. The quotation had been circulated to Councillors via email and Councillors had responded in favour (4 votes in favour, 2 against). As this item on whether the PC should undertake the services of ERM had mistakenly not been included on the agenda (CW), a legally binding decision could not be made at this meeting but it was agreed that a further_extra ordinary PC meeting would be held to reach a decision on next Monday 13 <sup>th</sup> .	
<b>17/018</b>	<b>QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC</b>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It was resolved to close the meeting to take questions (see appendix).</li> <li>2. It was resolved to reconvene the meeting.</li> </ol>	
<b>17/019</b>	<b>ANNUAL PARISH MEETING</b>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The meeting date was agreed ó Monday 15<sup>th</sup> May at 7.30pm</li> <li>2. Suggested speakers/topics were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The School</li> <li>• Thames Valley Police</li> <li>• Festival Committee</li> <li>• Local Groups, ie Drama Group</li> <li>• Eynsham Link</li> <li>• The new Website</li> <li>• Dr Kate Scott (archaeologist)</li> <li>• Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>CW to work with TG on a list of possibilities with a view to have a final list for the March meeting.</p>	CW/TG
<b>17/020</b>	<b>VILLAGE MAINTENANCE</b>	
	<p>MJ reported that the Village Maintenance Audit had identified required work. TG to send MJ a copy of Robin Smith's contract. MJ confirmed that the next steps were to correspond with residents regarding growth and ditch clearing and issue instructions to Robin Smith.</p> <p>CM confirmed that Clive James had stated that replacement hedge plants on the Green would be planted in the coming week.</p>	TG/CM/MJ
<b>17/021</b>	<b>REPORTS FROM PARISH COUNCILLORS</b>	
CM	Nothing to Report.	
CW	<p>CW provided an update regarding the Village Hall Car Park Resurfacing: Progress was halted for a while when I was alerted to the possibility that Planning Consent might be necessary. At the January meeting I reported this and that an Enquiry had been submitted to WODC. A formal statement (copied to the Clerk for the Records) had been received confirming that this was not necessary.</p> <p>Invitations to Tender were sent to these local contractors (two others did not respond to the initial enquiry):</p>	CW

MIN REF	ITEM	ACTION AGREED
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>George Ayres (who, as reported in January, responded promptly and was very helpful in suggesting a part-tarmac solution);</li> <li>Gordon Hill, whose quotation for a part-tarmac solution was received on 31 January;</li> <li>Jonathan Stacey, who I met today.</li> </ul> <p>The better quotation is Gordon Hill's at £17,168.00 + VAT; the detailed specification is also superior.</p> <p>Next Steps Cost Sharing CW expressed a view that discussion of possible complementary cost contributions from PC and Village Hall funds could usefully begin. For planning purposes an indicative cost of £17.2k could be assumed.</p> <p>CW recommend that the Council agrees that: It will use its best endeavours to place a contract for the durable resurfacing of the Car Park as soon as practicable To further this aim it will meet with key members of the Village Hall Committee as soon as this can be arranged. ..... CW and MJ to represent PC</p> <p>CM expressed concern regarding the cost. MJ supported CW's recommendation. CM agreed in principle to proceed to discuss further with the Village Hall Committee and to seek further quotes</p> <p>It was resolved that CM &amp; MJ are to meet with the Village Hall Committee and report back to the PC.</p>	
MJ	Nothing to report	
JE	Nothing to report	
JD	Not present at the meeting	
<b>17/022</b>	<b>COMMUNICATION WITH THE PARISH</b>	
	<p>CW updated the members of Public present on the current status of the new website. He explained that the new website is much more attractive and easier to maintain.</p> <p>All supported CW in the development and agreed that CW should publish the website for comments, views and feedback.</p>	CW to progress
<b>17/023</b>	<b>FINANCIAL MATTERS</b>	
	Cheques were circulated for signature.	
<b>17/024</b>	<b>CORRESPONDENCE</b>	
	The PC had received a letter regarding the Blackditch Development where work has recently begun, asking whether the street lighting and whether any work should proceed with installation of lighting on the development. TG to reply	TG

<b>MIN REF</b>	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION AGREED</b>
	confirming that there is no street lighting the in Parish and it would not be welcomed. A letter had been received regarding publishing a map of 'difficult to find' houses on notice boards in the village, as delivery drivers were experiencing difficulties in locating some houses. TG to respond confirming that the PC would support the production of a map, but have limited time and resources.	
<b>17/025</b>	<b>OTHER BUSINESS (for information only)</b>	
	Nothing to report.	TG
	<b>NEXT MEETING</b> An Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting will be held at 7.30pm on Monday 13 <sup>th</sup> February 2017.  The next Ordinary Meeting will be at 7.30pm on Monday 6 <sup>th</sup> March 2017.	

Signed .....

Date .....

## ITEMS/ACTIONS CARRIED OVER TO NEXT MEETING:

16/094	VILLAGE MAINTENANCE/RISK ASSESSMENT
16/098	COMMUNICATION WITH THE PARISH
	Parish Council Standing Orders

## APPENDIX TO MINUTES: PUBLIC SESSION NOTES

- **It was confirmed that data regarding the testing for gas from the Landfill Site neighbouring the Airfield is publically available – it was questioned whether WODC had access to this information when deciding on the planning application?**

CM confirmed that OCC are very concerned regarding the information provided at the Planning hearing and regarding the Agenda papers from the meeting. Not only did OCC object to the application, but they also felt that the papers were badly presented. It was clarified that the WODC Planning officers relied on the expert advice in such matters.

CM also pointed out that although the information may be freely available, the PC would require the services of ERM to decipher the information accordingly.

- **It was questioned that should the building go ahead on the airfield, who would be responsible or the potential issue of gas on the site?**

CM confirmed that it is unclear who is responsible, Gladmans are currently trying to sell the site with outline planning, so responsibility cannot be confirmed.

- **It was questioned whether the Newbridge closure was still going ahead next week?**

CM reported that it was due to close originally in October 2016, but he had it delayed until after Christmas. Despite much communication it looks to be going ahead [a member of the public confirmed that road signs had been erected that evening confirming the closure].

- **It was questioned whether the PC would be submitting comments regarding the Beaumont House Orchard planning application?**

CM confirmed that comments would be submitted and he would most likely be attending to speak on behalf on the PC.

- **It was questioned whether the PC would consider changing their process to include more public participation throughout the meeting?**

CM confirmed that although he welcomed and allowed public participation at meeting, the structure of the meeting is laid down and cannot be altered. CM confirmed that meetings include a public session, during members of the public can speak.

- **It was questioned whether the PC have a view regarding Unitary?**

CM confirmed that Parish Council members can express their views as individual residents, the PC as a whole have not been asked for their view.

- **It was questioned whether the PC had made any financial contribution towards the Comet Bus Service?**

CM confirmed that the Parish Council had been invoiced £60 for past services, which has been split between Northmoor PC and Stanton Harcourt PC.

END