Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on Monday 5th February 2018 in the Village Hall

Present:	Charles Mathew	(CM)	Chairman
	Matthew Judson	(MJ)	Councillor - Vice Chairman
	Jose Eaton	(JE)	Councillor
	Joe Deane	(JD)	Councillor
	Colin Wells	(CW)	Councillor
	Trudi Gasser	(TG)	Parish Clerk
In Attendance:	Hilary Fenton Jane Eagle 14 Members of the p	(HF) oublic	WODC District Councillor Village Hall Committee Chair

MIN REF	ITEM		
18/012	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE		
	Steve Good (SG) WODC District Councillor		
	Graham Dixon-Brown (GDB) Councillor		
18/013	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST		
	 CM owns property near the Leys, the Green and the School 		
18/014	APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 8 th JANUARY 2018		
	CW requested an amendment to 18/008:		
	"Councillors were concerned to learn that sometimes the fire alarm was turned off to		
	avoid false alarms. It was agreed that CW would convey this concern to the VH		
	Committee and report what the Committee had agreed to do to allay this concern"		
	It was agreed to amend the minutes accordingly.		
	The Minutes were approved for publication once the change had been made.		
	<i>Matters Arising:</i> 18⁄007 – Maintenance MJ confirmed that Kompan had agreed to replace the playground posts. MJ to arrange installation.		
	18/003 – Sheehans CM confirmed that no further reaction to the decision and an Appeal is probable.		
	18⁄008 – Village Hall Fire Alarm It was confirmed that the Village Hall Committee are currently reviewing the hire		
	agreement of the Village Hall to highlight that the alarm should not be disabled by any hirers.		
18/015	REPORTS FROM DISTRICT/COUNTY COUNCILLORS		
	DISTRICT:		
	HF reported that the Inspector has just about finished reviewing the Local Plan and the		
	number of houses in the plan has been lowered.		

MIN REF	ITEM	
	COUNTY:	
	CM reported that OCC would be discussing in Council the budget in the coming week;	
	council tax is proposed to increase by 5.99%.	
	CM confirmed that he is campaigning against the proposed plans for the A40 and	
	supporting an alternative blue sky solution to solve its traffic problems	
	(tram/train/Wuppertal option/other), thereby removing travellers from the road by	
	offering an alternative means of accessing Oxford.	
18/016	PLANNING	
	Current Applications:	
	APPLICATION NO: 17/04147/HHD / APPLICATION NO: 17/04148/LBC	
	LOCATION: Leena Cottage 28 - 29 Main Road, Stanton Harcourt	
	PROPOSAL: General refurbishment works and alterations including converting the	
	Existing garage/storeroom to a kitchen, raising the living room roof and adding an en	
	Suite bathroom, replacing and enlarging windows and adding skylights. See comments in Appendix B	
	APPLICATION NO: 17/03906/FUL	
	LOCATION: The Old Stores New Road Sutton	
	PROPOSAL: Erection of replacement dwelling and relocation of access.	
	See comments in Appendix B	
	APPLICATION NO: 18/00256/HHD	
	PROPOSAL: Alterations to the existing roof to include raising the eaves and changing the	
	roof pitch. Replacement of single dormer to front with three individual dormers and	
	further rear dormer. Erection of single storey front extension.	
	LOCATION: Willowmead Sutton Lane Sutton	
	Application received and circulated for comment. Comments due to Clerk prior to the	
	next meeting.	
18/017	QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC	
	1. It was resolved to close the meeting to take questions (see appendix).	
	2. It was resolved to reconvene the meeting.	
18/018	MAINTENANCE	
	MJ confirmed that he had spoken with Mick Hill. Mick confirmed that he is happy to	
	continue working and had offered to cut the grass on both sides of the water courses	
	between the two waster course crossings/bridges on the Leys. It was agreed that this	
	should be actioned. Thanks were expressed to Mick Hill and his helper for the work	
	recently carried out in the Churchyard.	
18/019	VILLAGE HALL CAR PARK	
	Much discussion took pace regarding the Village Hall Car Park. CM explained as the	
	legal agreement for the Butt's Piece section 106 had not yet been completed by OCC.	
	Whilst the PC had acknowledged at the January meeting that something needed to be	
	done and agreed the way forward. Clearly it would be in no one's (PC or Village Hall	

MIN REF	ITEM
	Committee's) best interest to spend large amounts of PC money whilst the S106 has been agreed, but not yet been made legal, as part of the Butts Piece residential development.
	CM confirmed that Smiths had in the meantime been approached to donate gravel from their 'Community Fund' to make a start on the temporary solution. CM proposed that TG seek 3 quotations for remedial work MJ seconded, all were in favour.
	MJ said he would like to propose that "As the Parish Council own it, we seek immediate permanent work and seek alternative use for S106 funding and provide the funding through the precept." CW seconded the proposal.
	A vote was taken and the motion carried.
	The vote was met with spontaneous applause from the public present.
	TG asked for the proposal to be repeated for the record. MJ said as suggested by CW for the nature of the works to follow the 'National Trust' specification. CM said in his opinion the S106 money could not be used for any other project. This was met with disagreement from CW, JD & MJ. MJ however agreed to remove the mention of S106 and proposed the following motion:
	"The Parish Council funds an immediate permanent solution to the car park by borrowing money and repaying it by raising the precept." JD seconded the motion.
	A vote was taken and the motion carried.
	Resolved: the PC voted 3 in favour (MJ, JD, CW) and 2 against (CM, JE).
	It was resolved that the /TG obtain quotes on a like for like basis with a view to proceeding as fast as possible.
	It was agreed to continue with the temporary fix, as the permanent work would take time. TG to pursue the gravel donation, with a view to having gravel delivered by the end of next week.
18/020	DOG FOULING
	TG confirmed that WODC had been contacted regarding the overflowing dog waste bins, WODC replied:
	The bins are emptied weekly but due the Winter Period snow etc. they may have been emptied out of sync. However this should be all back to normal now.
	TG requested that WODC monitor the bins for the next 6 weeks to confirm which bins are used more frequently to enable the PC to consider repositioning bins if necessary.
	Further correspondence had been received from the Environmental Regulatory Officer that no complaints had been received regarding specific areas in Stanton Harcourt – an

MIN REF	ITEM		
	article to be published in Village Voice asking for problems to be reported to TG which		
	can be relayed.		
18⁄021	ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PC & ANNUAL PARISH MEETING		
	The dates of the meetings were set:		
	14 th May: Annual Meeting of the Parish Council, followed immediately by an Ordinary		
	Meeting.		
	21 st May: Annual Parish Meeting		
	CM asked for suggestions for speakers to be relayed to TG.		
18/022	REPORTS FROM PARISH COUNCILLORS		
JD	Nothing to report		
CW	Nothing to report		
MJ	Nothing to report		
JE	Nothing to report.		
СМ	Litter Pick: The date of the litter pick was decided, 17 th & 18 th March at 10am. CM to organise 17 th , MJ to organise 18 th – TG to publicise.		
	Concern was raised regarding the human faeces on the haul road at the end of		
	Blackditch – CM to contact OCC, Highways, WODC and Oasis.		
	It was suggested that the school could be contacted to see if children could be involved.		
18/023	FINANCIAL MATTERS		
	Cheques were circulated for signature.		
18/024	CORRESPONDENCE		
	Nothing to report.		
18⁄025	OTHER BUSINESS (for information only)		
	NEXT MEETING		
	The next Ordinary Meeting – Monday 5 th March 2018.		

Signed

Date

APPENDIX A TO MINUTES: PUBLIC SESSION NOTES

Village Hall Car Park

There was a discussion regarding the state of the car park and the potential danger of its present state. Many members of the public expressed a view that something had to be done immediately. It was questioned what was being done about it.

Lively discussions over responsibility for the Car Park repairs took place and a clear direction was given that action should proceed soonest See 18/019

Discussion about the legal ownership of the Car Park took place (post – proof had now been found that the Car Park is owned by the Parish Council and this is confirmed by Land Registry documents)

APPENDIX B TO MINUTES: PLANNING APPLICATION COMMENTS

APPLICATION NO: 17/04147/HHD / APPLICATION NO: 17/04148/LBC

LOCATION: Leena Cottage 28 - 29 Main Road, Stanton Harcourt PROPOSAL: General refurbishment works and alterations including converting the Existing garage/storeroom to a kitchen, raising the living room roof and adding an en Suite bathroom, replacing and enlarging windows and adding skylights.

The Parish Council have reviewed the above reference application.

Whilst we have no objections, we would like to point out that the existing car space is already insufficient but not affected by refurbishment and concern where the builders are going to park as the property in located on a dangerous corner and no room nearby. In addition deliveries by lorries should be outside school arrival or departure times please.

APPLICATION NO: 17/03906/FUL

LOCATION: The Old Stores New Road Sutton PROPOSAL: Erection of replacement dwelling and relocation of access.

The Parish Council have reviewed the above reference application. Whilst we have no objections we would request the following:

1. The building is in keeping and suitable for the conservation zone.

2. The Contractors must not park on New Road whilst the work is carried out, as this would be considered dangerous.

APPENDIX C TO MINUTES: Email from Steve Tuck with comments/amendments to the Minutes

Steve Tuck <steve.tuck@mail.com> To:Trudi Gasser 21 Feb at 01:04

Dear Trudi,

From speaking to Keith Butler at WODC today (Tuesday) I understand that the law states that the minutes of a Parish Council Meeting should be approved at the next meeting - regardless of the type of meeting (ordinary or emergency). As that means that you will be reviewing the minutes at the meeting on Wednesday 21st February, I would like to provide the following feedback.

1. During the Public Discussion, I raised the question of whether that part of the meeting would be minuted. CM stated that it would, absolutely, but the appendix to the minutes is a totally inadequate record, in my view. Here are my notes on the discussion, taken from an audio recording; sections in quotes are verbatim:

CM: "There is no doubt at all that as part of the Butt's Piece development, the car park will be tarmacked. The question is, and always has been, reasonably, is when? I understand that, I have made several phone calls in the last few weeks to Steven Sensecall, but he hasn't returned any of them to me, so I interpret that to mean that the 106 agreement has not yet been signed – and until that is signed then the actual planning permission is not live, so we don't know what the plan is."

CM: "We are well aware, and have been well aware and there have been discussions between ourselves and the village hall committee as to the state of the car park. The responsibility for car park is the village hall committee. We have said time and time againõ "

This was met by disagreement from members of the public present and other PC members.

CW: "Thatos your view, itos not the rest of us."

JD: "Charles, legally liability goes with ownership and maintenance goes with liability, so if we own it, we qe liable to ensure it is maintained."

A member of the public asked why he has to pay money to the PC to access his property via the car park, if the PC are not going to maintain it.

CM: "Hold on, I dong actually agree with you. It as simple as that. You know, I hear what you say and I disagree with what you say."

CM: "Weqre in a position where, the Village Hall Committee is far more able its responsibilities than the Parish Council."

VHC 1: "Can I say something to counteract that, Charles?"

- CM: "Youd have your opportunity."
- JD: "I think that is this bit, Charles!"

There was disagreement within the PC members and the Clerk about what had actually been agreed as actions in the January ordinary meeting.

CM acknowledged that there is no timescale for getting any S106 payment from the Butts Piece development. It was pointed out by a member of the public that nobody had bought the land for development yet and it could be years away.

A temporary repair involving the use of quick-drying cement and gravel was discussed. CM accused CW and JD of failing to fulfil what they had promised to do at the last PC meeting. MJ, CW & JD stated their disagreement with CMc view.

ST pointed out that at the 2017 Annual Parish Meeting, CM had reported that the Village Hall Car Park was a ‰erious challenge+facing the village.

ST stated that the car park issue had been reported in the November 2016 PC Meeting and the minutes stated that proposals had been received to split the cost with the Village Hall Committee, but a proposal to do the work was rejected on the basis that three quotes were required. ST asked if three quotes had been received.

ST also pointed out that this was before the prospect of the Butts Piece development had arisen and in his view, the development has nothing at all to do with fixing the car park. St said that his understanding was that the public discussion would not be minuted. CM assured him that it would be.

ST asked the PC if it would vote on whether they believe that car park maintenance is the responsibility of the PC, because there seemed to be a difference of opinion within the PC members. CM stated that he didnot think a vote would settle the question. A member of the public explained that itos the nature of a democracy.

A member of the public stated that he and been told by a previous PC Chair that maintenance of the car park became the responsibility of the PC when they purchased the land.

CM stated that the Clerk had contacted people on the day of the meeting and TG explained that she had asked Smiths if they would donate some gravel and that a decision was expected early the following week. If that was not possible, they would look at purchasing gravel with a view to having it delivered the weekend of 17/18 February.

A member of the public said there was no point in using more of the existing surface treatment as it does not last. CM agreed. Discussion was then had on methods of improving the car park.

CM said that it was over to the Village Hall Committee. VHC members present asked why as it is the responsibility of the PC. CM asked if the PC should start charging the VHC for people using the car park. A VHC member said ‰ thatœ what you want to do to the village, itœ fine . it is a village facility owned by the Parish Council.+ CM said that the VHC did not wish to pay for its share of the cost. The VHC member stated that, before Butts Piece, it had been agreed to split the cost with £13,000 from the VHC and £13,000 from the PC. She pointed out that the VHC money is fund-raised by a very small committee, whereas the PC could borrow the money or raise the precept. She asked if the PC could borrow the money in expectation of the S106 money. CM said that S106 money cannot be used for something that has already happened.

CM said that he has an understanding that is not reciprocated by the public or the VHC. He said we do not wish to spend a lot of money now, if we have the prospect within a reasonable period (and I say a reasonable period) we can get it done free. And it is part of a 106 for Butts Piece . full stop.

ST asked when CM had become aware of the inclusion in the S106. CM said that he had introduced it to WODC and had arranged for it to be part of the deal. JD stated that he had not seen a written record of the agreement, but that the PC could borrow money and raise the precept to pay it back. CM said that was possible.

CW responded to ST¢ earlier question about obtaining quotes. He said that four quotes had been obtained, but CM did not allow him to finish his statement. CM said what CW was saying was known to the PC and was irrelevant. Members of the public asked that CW be allowed to continue.

CW explained that 3 of the 4 quotes obtained were for variations on a scheme to deliver a surface that was tarmac on the wearing surfaces and Oxford Shingle (not dug gravel as at present) in the parking bays. He said that a full tarmac surface would require planning permission and more drainage.

CM said the quotes were not progressed at the time because they were not like-for-like. CW said that they all resulted from the same specification.

CM said that the PC had received a letter from the VHC offering to pay for materials if the PC provided labour for a temporary solution. A VHC member confirmed that to be the case in relation to filling the potholes. CM agreed that the intention was not to redress the whole car park as a complete solution may be available within a year. He then said he didn**q** know how long it (the S106 payment) would be, but there was

no point in spending money now if we would be able to redo the whole car park within the next year to eighteen months.

JD asked if they should discuss other options, including increasing the precept, if there was no progress this year. CM said he thought they would have to. He said he thought there was complete agreement that the current situation was unsatisfactory.

A member of the public asked who claims for damage caused by the car park should be addressed to and gave the example of a lady whose car received a puncture from driving through one of the potholes. The question was not answered.

CM said the temporary solution would consist of filling the potholes with a cement mix and top dressing the car park with gravel (hopefully provided free of charge). JD undertook to attempt to fill the potholes.

2. Item 18/019 on the Minutes - Village Hall Car Park

This contains a statement beginning with the word "Clearly ..." this is an opinion from one member of the PC, not a verbatim statement from the meeting and does not reflect the consensus of the PC.

Neither are the motions proposed and voted on recorded accurately. This is taken from a transcript of the recording:

CM asked for agreement that the PC i) continues discussion with Smiths regarding Gravel and ii) they would contact the three companies that had previously quoted and ask them for their immediate solution given that there is likely to be money available to tarmac in the future, but we need a solution now for the present situation. That should be reported back to the Parish Council.

CM said that if the gravel arrived in the meantime, it would be spread, in order to improve the current situation and provide some temporary improvement.

CM asked to amend the proposal to include an invitation to a contractor, whose name he would provide, who specialises in this type of groundwork. CM said he was very happy to accept the amendment . he said it the invitation should go to the three original and any other thought appropriate. CM said the PC would discuss the outcome with the VHC and proceed to get something done in reasonably short order. He said he was loathed to put a date on it, but would be upset if it was not done by the end of February and they should aim for that.

JD questioned if this would cost in the order of £2-3,000. CM said it should be discussed with the VHC, whatever the amount.

CW said his misgiving was that the gravel might be more expensive than the VHC had budgeted for. TG said they were working on the basis that the gravel would be donated. CM said that was the basis, but could not be relied on. He said the PC had a local charitable community fund and they had asked it to come out and was awaiting their reply.

MJ asked CM to summarise his proposal so it could be voted on.

CM said that he was suggesting that we proceed with our discussions with Smiths over the gravel; that we get the three people who had already quoted (and any other appropriate) to come ASAP to view the situation and make proposals for temporary work in order to bring this into a state where it will for the immediate foreseeable future, overcome the present problem, with a view to the car park being tarmacked through 106 from Butts Piece in the future.+

MJ said he would second the proposal if the S106 statement was removed. That was agreed, so the final proposal voted on read:

"We proceed with our discussions with Smiths over the gravel; that we get the three people who had already quoted (and any other appropriate) to come ASAP to view the situation and make proposals for temporary work in order to bring this into a state where it will for the immediate foreseeable future, overcome the present problem."

A vote was taken and the motion carried.

MJ said he would like to propose that "As the Parish Council own it, we seek immediate permanent work and seek alternative use for S106 funding and provide the funding through the precept." CW seconded the proposal.

A vote was taken and the motion carried.

The vote was met with spontaneous applause from the public present.

TG asked for the proposal to be repeated for the record. MJ said as suggested by CW for the nature of the works to follow the Alational Trustospecification. CM said in his opinion the S106 money could not be used for any other project. This was met with disagreement from CW, JD & MJ. MJ however agreed to remove the mention of S106 and proposed the following motion:

"The Parish Council funds an immediate permanent solution to the car park by borrowing money and repaying it by raising the precept." JD seconded the motion.

A vote was taken and the motion carried.

I would be grateful if you could circulate these notes to the members of the PC to aid their review of the minutes before they are signed.

Kind regards,

Steve Tuck