



Minutes of the Hanborough Parish Council

41/2015

At the meeting of Hanborough Parish Council held at 7.15 pm on Tuesday 13th January 2015 in the Pavilion Greenway Room, the following were present:

Mr Mike Baggaley (Chair)	Mrs Gill Battams	Mr Peter Brittin	Mr Hugh Burton
Mr Niels Chapman	Mr Philip Earnshaw (Vice Chair)		Mr Colin James
Mr Steve Nicholls	Mr David Tee		

In attendance: Mr Adrian Edwards, Responsible Financial Officer (RFO), Mr Jon Gammage (Clerk), District Councillor Colin Dingwall and County Councillor Ian Hudspeth.

Members of the public attending: 4 members of the public were present.

195. Public participation session: Ian Hudspeth (Leader of Oxfordshire County Council) attended to answer questions relating to OCC's withdrawal of opposition to the Pye planning application. The Chairman reminded the meeting that in his withdrawal of the County Council's objection to the Pye proposed development, Geoffrey Arnold (Senior Engineer and Transport Planner) accepted the revised estimate of trip generation if this development were approved. He stated as his reason for withdrawal of the objection that "pertinently this is less than 5%, which is considered significant and less than the expected daily fluctuation". Councillors questions mainly relate to this decision and the reasons for it.

Q1: In response to a question at the recent Woodstock Town Council meeting about the origin of this 5% rule Tom Flanagan from Oxfordshire County Council stated that this "was old IHT (Institute of Highways & Transportation) guidance that was used to assess when transport assessments should be undertaken for a development. However, this guidance has since been superseded twice, first by the "Guidance on Transport Assessment" and secondly by the "Transport Evidence Bases in Plan Making" that only deals with the impact of the Local Plan, leaving transport assessments for individual developments to the discretion of the Local Planning Authority (and through consultation the Local Highway Authority). As a 'rule of thumb' the old guidance is still often quoted. Do you think therefore that it is sensible for the County Council's decision to withdraw their objection should be based on a "rule of thumb" dating back over twenty years that has since been superseded twice?

A1: Cllr Hudspeth stated that this figure is historically used and that if not used OCC would have to provide reasons which they do not believe would be substantiated in appeal.

Q2: Tom Flanagan also indicates that transport assessments for individual developments are at the discretion of the Local Planning Authority and through consultation the Local Highway Authority. Has WODC asked you to carry out such an assessment and if not does the County Council think that one might be appropriate?

A2: Cllr Hudspeth agreed to ask whether WODC had made such a request, but said OCC did not have sufficient funds for challenging every traffic assessment submitted by developers.

Q3: If we accept this 5% rule of thumb there does not appear to be any indication in the documentation seen by the PC in relation to this that individual developments must be assessed in isolation. The traffic assessments for the two proposed developments in Hanborough alone (ignoring the even more significant proposed developments in Witney and Woodstock) accept that they will increase traffic flow by 1.7% and 4%, why doesn't a 5.7% increase in traffic flow constitute a significant increase in traffic?

A3: Cllr Hudspeth stated that the two applications will be considered separately. He suggested that opposition should be based on planning policy rather than highways.

Q4: If the County Council is still insistent on assessing the developments individually, if the Church Road development is approved will the County Council reinstate its objection to the Pye proposal on the basis that the resultant increase in traffic flow would increase above 5%?

A4: Cllr Hudspeth reiterated that the two applications will be considered separately.

Q5: Does it not strike you as inconsistent that when the original Pye application was submitted the County Council objected on the basis that it felt that the traffic impact had not been properly assessed, yet when they resubmit a traffic assessment demonstrating an even more severe impact you withdraw your objection?

A5: Cllr Hudspeth was satisfied that his officers had worked through the issues and had reached a conclusion that the original issues of concern had been overcome. The applicant had demonstrated that the original objections cannot be substantiated.

Q6: At the recent Woodstock Town Council meeting, reference was made to the current discussions between Oxford City Council and the four District Councils as to how accommodate Oxford's overspill population. This could amount to tens of thousands of dwellings throughout the Oxfordshire Districts, in addition to the increased numbers required by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Do you know whether these discussions are being directed by Officers or elected members, and is OCC aware of any strategic land use proposals to accommodate this additional burden on the Districts?

A6: Cllr Hudspeth confirmed that all districts are involved in discussions about the SHMA. To date Cherwell and Vale have responded positively to the proposals, SODC is considering it and WODC are challenging the proposed numbers.

Q7: Can you please update us on the proposals for the expansion of the car park at Hanborough station, and what if any arrangements have been made for the cars already using it to park whilst this expansion takes place?

A7: Cllr Hudspeth was not aware of any specific details at the moment but agreed that some impact would be inevitable while works took place.

Some additional questions were asked from members of the public and Councillors.

Q8: Can the applicant simply split applications to bring the impact below 5%?

A8: If compliant with the law, yes. Common sense doesn't necessarily prevail.

Q9: Of 514 objections to the Pye application, 94% mentioned roads as a factor, would Officers be instructed to read these? A9: Cllr Hudspeth stated that his Officers are familiar with the roads but he would ask the question.

Q10: Councillors challenged the modelling used by Pye which resulted in a prediction of just below the 5% threshold.

A10: Cllr Hudspeth stated that this would have been supported by evidence.

Councillors asked that this evidence is shared with the PC.

Q11: Would OCC be willing to commission an independent traffic assessment as evidence to be used on all planning applications affecting the A4095?

A12: Cllr Hudspeth stated that it is unlikely that a global opposition could be made on this basis and noted that improvements to the A40 would have a positive impact.

The Chairman thanked Cllr Hudspeth for attending and he left the meeting.

196. To receive apologies for absence: Received from Mr Christopher Ball and Mrs Vicky Field.

197. To sign, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 9th December 2014

RESOLVED: That minutes of the meeting of 9th December 2014, copies of which had been circulated, be approved and signed as a correct record.

198. To sign, as a correct record, the minutes of the EGM held on 22nd December 2014

Cllr James asked for the draft minutes to be amended to show that Council resolved to commission an assessment of the traffic assessment submitted by Pye. The clerk agreed and the minutes were changed accordingly.

RESOLVED: That minutes of the EGM of 22nd December 2014, copies of which had been circulated, be approved and signed as a correct record.

199. To receive declarations of pecuniary interest from councillors relating to agenda items: None received.

200. Matters of report arising from the previous minutes

200.1. (172.3) Registering The Pit as a Community Asset: The clerk confirmed that the completed an application form had been submitted.

200.2. (172.4) Tennis court lighting: The clerk reported that he is meeting the contractor this week to progress this.

200.3. (173.1.2) George and Dragon Pub: The brewery has confirmed that it is seeking a new landlord and councillors reported that they had heard rumours as to who this might be.

200.4. (175.1) WW1 Commemoration Project: Cllr Burton reported that our grant application had been successful.

200.5. (185) Salt Bin: No response to request.

Action: Clerk to chase response.

200.6. (145) Parish Web Site: Cllr Battams reported that Stephen Braybrooke-Tucker has given 1 months notice that he will no longer update the site. Councillors thanked Stephen for providing many years of reliable service.

Action: Chairman to contact a possible candidate to take this on.

201. Report from Planning and Environment Working Group

201.1. Group report including an update on Hanborough Action Group activities Niels Chapman

HAG have prepared analysis of all responses to the consultation and are considering how to best present these.

Cllr Chapman reported that HPC continues to resist the two large housing developments proposed by Corpus Christi College and Pye Homes, off Church Road and to the south of the A4095 respectively. Council wants the former to be smaller and consider the latter to be wholly inappropriate. At the time of the meeting, neither had offered reductions of more than a few dwellings. Corpus offered 1.8 hectares of land that could be used for recreation or “educational purposes” (including pre-school and/or school buildings), but councillors have many concerns about the impact this would have, especially in respect of traffic volume and safety.

Pye is expected to offer a solution to avoid overcrowding our doctors’ surgery; perhaps a new building on their south of the A4095 site? However, it is hard to see what Pye or anyone else could do to mitigate the effect of the greatly increased volume of traffic that would flow, or rather crawl, from their proposed development. Oxfordshire’s Highways engineers first objected to Pye’s proposals, but they have since withdrawn their objection; so, HPC commissioned an independent traffic assessment to ensure that WODC’s planning committee is aware that outstanding problems have not gone away.

201.2. Applications received, WODC decisions, pending (circulated at the meeting)

201.2.1. Applications received, PC response pending:

15/00016/HHD Goatley House, Church Road, Church Hanborough
Alterations and erection of single storey extension.

201.2.2. Applications received and PC response made

14/01717/HHD Thresher Barn 6 Millwood Farm Barns Abelwood Road Long Hanborough Witney Oxfordshire OX29 8RB
14/01718/LBC Erection of single storey side extension, alterations and increase in height of boundary wall
No Comments Made.

14/01929/FUL The Courtyard Hotel Main Road Long Hanborough Witney Oxfordshire OX29 8LA
Conversion of hotel to create six holiday lets
No Comments Made.

14/02048/HHD Annexe Mill Farm Lower Road Long Hanborough Oxfordshire
14/02111/LBC Loft conversion to include three front dormer windows and insertion of new sitting room window.
No Comments Made.

14/01939/FUL Land at Myrtle Farm, Main Road, Long Hanborough
Removal of existing redundant farm buildings and the erection of 9 dwellings and ancillary development.
While Hanborough Parish Council is in favour of relatively small-scale developments on brown field sites, it has concerns about this development's reliance on vehicles exiting and entering from the busy A4095 near a junction and a congested mini roundabout. The Parish Council also has concerns about traffic crossing the pavement at a point where pedestrians and cyclists might not expect it. The PC would have no objection, if an alternative exit could be found for all 9 houses rather than just 2 of them

14/02305/HHD 34 Church Road, Long Hanborough
Erection of two storey front extension.
No Comments Made.

14/02412/HHD 61 Millwood End, Long Hanborough
Erection of replacement garage.
No Comments Made.

201.2.3. Planning application decisions notified by WODC:

14/01557/HHD Malt House 18 Millwood End Long Hanborough Witney Oxfordshire OX29 8BX
14/01558/LBC Malt House 18 Millwood End Long Hanborough Witney Oxfordshire OX29 8BX
Grant Subject to Conditions.
14/01564/HHD 21 Church Road Long Hanborough Witney Oxfordshire OX29 8JE
Grant Subject to Conditions.
14/01923/S73 19 Pinsley Road Long Hanborough Witney Oxfordshire OX29 8JQ
Grant Subject to Conditions.

201.2.4. Planning applications pending decision

LP.0010/14 OCC: Minerals and waste consultation.
14/1102/P/OP Land to east of Church Road Long Hanborough.
14/1234/P/OP Land south of Witney Road Long Hanborough.
14/01717/HHD Thresher Barn 6 Millwood Farm Barns Abelwood Road Long Hanborough Witney Oxfordshire OX29 8RB
14/01718/LBC Thresher Barn 6 Millwood Farm Barns Abelwood Road Long Hanborough Witney Oxfordshire OX29 8RB
14/01929/FUL The Courtyard Hotel Main Road Long Hanborough Witney Oxfordshire OX29 8LA
14/02048/HHD Annexe Mill Farm Lower Road Long Hanborough Oxfordshire
14/02111/LBC Annexe Mill Farm Lower Road Long Hanborough Oxfordshire
14/01939/FUL Land at Myrtle Farm, Main Road, Long Hanborough
14/02305/HHD 34 Church Road, Long Hanborough

202. Report from Community and Leisure Working Group: Deferred to February due to late running of the meeting.

203. Report from Parish Projects Working Group: Deferred to February due to late running of the meeting.

204. Report from Business Working Group: Deferred to February due to late running of the meeting.

205. Financial Matters:

205.1. The monthly financial summary was circulated at the meeting and reviewed.

205.2. To approve the monthly payment schedule of accounts from 10/12/2014 to 13/01/2015

RESOLVED: To make payment of the following Schedule of Accounts.

Receipts:

05/12/2014	Cooperative Interest	Interest	0.26
09/01/2015	Banbury Memorials	Cemetery Fees	130.00
09/01/2015	Greens Funeral Services	Cemetery Fees	280.00

Payments:

13/01/2015	103140, 103141, 103142	Staff Salary & Expenses	
13/01/2015	103137	Thames Water	Water Rates 4.25
13/01/2015	103138	WODC	Waste Collection 97.50
13/01/2015	103139	Lucy Tritton	Maintenance of Planters 77.51
13/01/2015	103143	Oxfordshire County Council	Pension Fund 346.35

206. To receive a report on the effectiveness of the current working groups

Discussions had been held and Cllr Earnshaw will circulate a report.

207. To consider the SWA offer of £730 towards costs to replace the damaged Pavilion changing room floor

The clerk reported that to date we have only received one of the three quotes we require. Councillors **agreed** to defer this item until all quotes are received.

208. To consider if parish council wishes to contribute towards costs to replace the Pavilion changing room floor

Councillors **agreed** to defer this item until all quotes are received.

209. To consider quotes to replace the Pavilion changing room floor

Councillors **agreed** to defer this item until all quotes are received.

210. To consider quote for installation of a new bin and related emptying costs in Hurdeswell

WODC have quoted £345 for a new bin including installation. The emptying costs are quoted at £6 per week. As this seems higher than other costs for emptying in the parish, it was **agreed** to seek clarification on current costs.

Action: RFO to contact WODC for clarification.

211. To discuss the recommended maintenance regime for the new multi sports ground

Councillors agreed that the facility should be properly maintained subject to costs.

Action: RFO to obtain costs from the contractor.

212. To consider requesting a 3hr parking limit in the Riely Close car park

Councillors **agreed** to defer this for 6 months until building works in the area are completed.

213. To review salary scale for clerk & RFO against the National Agreement on Salaries and Conditions of Service

Councillors **agreed** that this should be considered by the Parish Business Group.

214. Reports from Community Groups & Organisations

214.1. HPFA: PC Representative: Steve Nicholls

Cllr Nicholls reported that a recent Bingo evening held at the Pavilion had been a success and that HPFA planned to do more of these fund raising events. He also reported on really positive feedback on the new multi sports facility.

214.2 Dementia Friendly: Cllr Chapman reported that they are hoping that dementia awareness can be considered at the building design stage by the architects.

215. Report of Clerk

215.1. The Post Office will be closed for improvements between 31st January at 12:30 and 2nd February at 13:00. When it reopens it will benefit from longer opening hours.

215.2. Councillors **agreed** to support Freeland Parish Councils efforts to lobby for improvements to mobile coverage in the two parishes.

215.3. The clerk circulated AgeUK temperature gauges for distribution through local groups.

216. Report of County and District Councillors

Cllr Dingwall reported that there is to be a Local Plan workshop for members in February.

217. Miscellaneous items from Members: None

The meeting was closed at 9:30pm. The next meeting will be held on Tuesday 10th February in The Greenway Room.

The Chairman. 10th February 2015