

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRA ORDINARY MEETING OF
THE WOODSTOCK TOWN COUNCIL
ON TUESDAY 25th JULY 2017
At 7.30pm
IN THE TOWN HALL, WOODSTOCK.**

PRESENT:

Cllr. Mrs T Redpath (Mayor)

Cllr. F Collingwood

Cllr. U Parkinson

Cllr. E Poskitt

Cllr. E Stokes

Cllr. A Grant (Deputy Mayor)

Cllr. J Cooper

Cllr. S Parnes

Cllr. P Redpath

Cllr B Yoxall

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Four members of the public

WTC80/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Cllrs P Jay & S Rasch

WTC81/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Cllr E Poskitt – Item 7 | pecuniary due to residing at 11 Hedge End and also a member of WODC Uplands Planning Sub-Committee |
| Cllr J Cooper – Item 7 | member WODC Councillor |
| Cllr B Yoxall – Item 8 | he is personally known to former tenant of 8 Park Street & tenant of 6 Park Street |

WTC82/17 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION:

Dennis Allen a local resident appealed for WTC to improve their social media communication on facebook and issue a statement which would stop incorrect assumptions being made in relation to the empty shop unit 2 Market Street. He also raised the issue relating to the lack of action resulting from the parking survey conducted some time ago. Parking within the town is getting worse and the signage for the free car park off Hensington Road is not sufficient. People visiting the town on non-essential business have driven around the town and left when unable to find a parking space.

- 1) It was agreed The Mayor would issue a written statement on behalf of Woodstock Town Council (to be uploaded onto WTC website & emailed to Dennis Allen for him feed back into the 'We Love Woodstock' facebook page) regarding the current situation with 2 Market Street and the difficulty faced by WTC in relation to tenant/lease details that can be shared with the public due to tenant confidentiality.

- 2) Cllr Cooper agreed to pursue issue of the parking survey and lack of action at a meeting he is attending at West Oxfordshire District Council tomorrow (Wednesday 26th July) and update Dennis Allen accordingly

WTC83/17 COMMUNICATIONS:

The Mayor advised that after many months of advertising with no interest an application has been received for the post of Deputy Caretaker. The applicant appears suitable and Councillors agreed that the Town Clerk and Deputy Mayor would interview the applicant as soon as possible.

The Mayor confirmed that this Extra Ordinary meeting is being held to receive an update from the professional planning advisor and formulate a response to both the Cherwell & West Oxfordshire District Council development plans and deal with urgent business that cannot wait until the September. She expressed her disappointment that the meeting has been used to submit non urgent items of business and if Councillors were in agreement these items be deferred to the next meeting.

Cllr Parnes expressed that the Standing Orders state the entitlement to submit requests for agenda items to be added if received in good time.

WTC84/17 QUESTIONS:

There were no questions.

WTC85/17 CHERWELL PARTIAL PLAN LOCAL REVIEW (OXFORD UNMET NEED)

West Oxon Local Plan Examination in Public (EIP)

Richard Anstis had been brought in to act as consultant to Woodstock Town Council due to the previous consultancy of Kemp & Kemp being purchased by the adviser to the developer.

Due to his late appointment, he had been given extra time to submit a response.

He reported on his attendance at two days of the Local Plan Examination hearing the previous week - the first being discussion on the three areas of Woodstock in the plan – behind Hill Rise, north of Banbury Road, and south east of Woodstock. WTC had registered strong objections to these sites.

The previous day had focused on the Eynsham Garden Village proposal. The questions asked by the Inspector for Eynsham and the Woodstock sites had indicated possible substantial grounds for the Inspector to throw out the plan, though he doubted this would happen.

During the Thursday discussion the Inspector narrowed the terms of the day indicating that he was thinking that the numbers in the plan were non-viable.

The submitted Local Plan supports a 5.1 year housing supply, which if confirmed as non-valid could mean a 20 % buffer increase in numbers to conform with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The backlog of delivery increased year on year meaning if the plan was again thrown out, there would be no chance to fulfil the delivery requirements.

The Inspector was therefore under significant pressure not to throw out the plan, though the many developers speaking at the hearing wanted the plan to be thrown out to enable them to promote other applications.

Woodstock therefore found itself with surprising developer “friends” who put forward such good cases against the Woodstock sites that Richard had not needed to say much.

The final day concentrated on the big picture of whether the supply was viable. If one site was not delivered, the plan would fail to deliver. The low numbers lead Richard to believe the inspector would require the maximum additional 20%.

It meant between 900 and 2100 additional houses to be allocated in the plan. To put in context, if the Woodstock sites were removed, the numbers would be replaced elsewhere together with the additional quotas.

There were only two accepted formulas to deliver the buffer. The first was the Sedgefield plan which piled all the additional percentage into the Plan’s first 5 years. For WODC to adopt this route would mean 1400-2100 houses over the Plan period.

The second option is the Liverpool method as preferred by WODC. It apportions additional numbers over the term of the Plan allowing for a testing of the allocations. This would mean an additional 900 houses. It was the decision of the Inspector which route to follow.

Richard advised that in either case the chances of the Woodstock sites not being accepted were slim.

He was asked whether there was opportunity for Oxford City to be forced to find a greater number of houses when their Plan was examined. It was unlikely that there would be more than a few hundred if this were the case.

Local authorities were not doing a proper job in the preparation of plans due to the delivery pressures. For this reason, he thought the Inspector would require the new requested assessments to be “bolted on” to the existing Plan rather than starting again.

He stressed the Local Plan being thrown out would be bad for Woodstock meaning no planning restrictions. A rewritten Plan would probably target Woodstock with more sites.

He was asked if there was a case for a Judicial Review of the draft permission for the land to

the East of Woodstock, and thought that a letter registering an intention for review should be sent. Richard would prepare such a letter at the Council's request.

It was also noted that there were considerable infrastructure concerns relating to the Plan.

Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review Consultation

The meeting turned to the current consultation on the Cherwell Plan review for the Oxford Unmet Need. Cherwell had to allocate a further 4,400 homes and had a proposal for land adjoining Woodstock for 410 houses plus other facilities.

The draft permission given by the West Oxon District Council for 300 homes adjoining in the proposed site gave a linkage to the proposal.

Richard was asked to draft a consultation response and the meeting was to consider matters to be included in that response.

Several points were raised including how clean water was to be delivered to all sites and on location of the Roman Villa.

There was also concern that the newly designated Green Belt land was to be used as a Park & Ride, and on the lack of comment relating to the appearance and materials of what would be a high-profile site.

Richard was asked for recommendations on what should be included as a response; and he suggested it was best to concentrate on fundamental issues rather than a scatter gun approach. He thought the substantive issues were the effect on the World Heritage Site and on the highway infrastructure.

He understood that there could be budgetary issues but his recommendation would be for the Town Council to appoint its own heritage assessor and highways consultant. The estimated cost would be between £2-4K each.

RESOLVED:

- 1) To commit £8-10K to the appointment of Heritage Assessor and Highways Consultant and for Planning Consultant Consultation response.
- 2) To leaflet drop the Town explaining the situation and requesting donations towards costs.
- 3) Richard Anstis to prepare draft consultation response to be circulated to members for comment before consultation deadline of end of August.
- 4) Richard Anstis to urgently prepare a letter of intent of Judicial Review for submission to West Oxon District Council regarding the granting of draft approval for 300 homes on land to the south east of Woodstock without a heritage assessment of the effect on the World Heritage Site.

WTC86/17 PLANNING

- a) Ref: APPLICATION NO:17/01565/FUL Blenheim Palace, Blenheim Park, Woodstock
Alterations to provide hard standing to parking area.

Cllr Cooper proposed and Cllr P Redpath seconded that WTC object to the application under section BE11 which protects landscapes from inappropriate development.

A named vote was requested.

For: Cllrs Cooper, Poskitt, Collingwood, Stokes, Yoxall, T Redpath, Grant & P Redpath
Against: Cllr Parnes
Abstained: Cllr Parkinson

The motion was carried

- b) Ref: APPLICATION NO: 17/02255/HHD 3 Vanbrugh Close, Woodstock
Insertion of front and rear dormers.

Agreed WTC has no objection to this application

- c) Ref: APPLICATION NO: 17/02096/HHD 4 Meadow Walk Woodstock
Erection of replacement front entrance porch and alterations to fenestration in front elevation.

Agreed WTC has no objection to this application

WTC87/17 PROPERTY MATTERS (non-confidential)

The Mayor acknowledged the need to be cautious when going into confidential session as WTC is being criticised for its lack of transparency.

She then read out the statement she had prepared prior to the meeting and requested approval from Councillors that it was acceptable. Cllr Stokes requested a sentence to be added confirming that WTC were not losing any revenue on the empty unit. All councillors agreed for the statement to be issued.

All Councillors voted in agreement that the other property matters will be dealt with in confidential session as relate to individual tenants.

WTC88/17 MOTIONS PRESENTED TO THE COUNCIL:

The following motion was proposed by Cllr S Parnes:

Noting the instances of requests to record named votes in the current and previous municipal year, as freely accessible in publicly available and online Minutes, Woodstock Town Council (WTC) rejects District Councillor Julian Cooper's statement about WTC at the West Oxfordshire District Council (WODC) June 21st meeting,

wherein he publicly asserted Woodstock Council had been inundated with requests for recorded votes which were time consuming and detrimental to the efficient conduct of the Council's business, and will Notify the WODC Chairman of the same.

This motion was not seconded and no discussion therefore held.

The following motion was proposed by Cllr S Parnes:

Woodstock Town Council (WTC) acknowledges the transparency value in every Members' right to request the recording of named votes, as per the Standing Orders of this Council and being a common feature in the Standing Orders of other Councils.

This motion was not seconded and no discussion therefore held.

The following motion was proposed by Cllr S Parnes:

Woodstock Town Council (WTC) resolves that where any member requests it immediately after the vote is taken, their vote will be recorded in the minutes to show whether they voted for or against the question or whether they abstained from voting. WTC shall make any necessary amendments to its Standing Orders for clarity.

This motion was not seconded and no discussion therefore held.

Cllr Parnes left the meeting at this point (8.45pm)

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

It was then proposed and resolved that in view of the nature of the business to be transacted the public and press be temporarily excluded from the meeting (Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 s.1).

WTC88/17 PROPERTY MATTERS

The report from CMfP, Cllr A Grant was received and the following action agreed:-

6 Market Street - Council agreed (For: 7 Against: 1 Abstained: 1) to contact Carter Jonas to clarify action taken by them to date and to authorise their recommended course of action to conclude the situation that they have flagged up.

2 Market Street - Council to request from Carter Jonas clarification of whether the potential new tenant is to be a butcher or deli. The council has concerns about the outstanding repairs requiring completion under the current lease which will need to be resolved in the negotiations of any assignment of lease.

8 Park Street - The council agreed (For: 8 Abstained: 1) that the debt should be pursued and formal action taken via small claims court.

It was also agreed that all Councillors would be welcome to attend the September meeting with Carter Jonas.

The meeting finished at 21.30hrs