

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF
THE WOODSTOCK TOWN COUNCIL
HELD AT 7.30 PM ON TUESDAY 06th JANUARY 2015
IN THE COMMUNITY CENTRE, WOODSTOCK**

PRESENT:

Cllr J Cooper (Mayor)
Cllr B Yoxall
Cllr T Wray
Cllr Mrs E Jay
Cllr S Parnes

Cllr M Robertson (Deputy Mayor)
Cllr Mrs E Stokes
Cllr C Carritt (from agenda item 5)
Cllr P Jay

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Approximately 60 members of the public, Mr H Mellor, Kemp and Kemp, Cllr M Gibbard, Cherwell District Council, and County Cllr I Hudspeth (from Agenda Item 4 (iii) Public Debate).

WTC/195/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs L Maybury, S Rasch and E Poskitt. Cllr C Carritt had also sent his apologies noting that he hoped to join the meeting later.

WTC/196/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:

Cllr J Cooper declared a general interest in agenda items 4, To Consider WTC'S Response to Planning Application 14/02004/HYBRID: Land South of Perdiswell Farm, Shipton Road, Shipton on Cherwell. Outline as he is a Member of West Oxfordshire District Council.

WTC/197/14 QUESTIONS: There were no questions submitted under Standing Order No 8.

WTC/198/14 TO CONSIDER WTC'S RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION

14/02004/HYBRID: LAND SOUTH OF PERDISWELL FARM, SHIPTON ROAD, SHIPTON ON CHERWELL. OUTLINE. Up to 1500 dwellings, including affordable housing and up to a 150 unit care village (C2) with associated publicly accessible ancillary facilities; site for a new primary school; up to 930sqm of retail space; up to 7,500sqm locally led employment (B1/B2/B8) including link and ride; site for a football association step 5 football facility with publicly accessible ancillary facilities; public open space, associated infrastructure, engineering and ancillary works, (all matters reserved except for means of access to the development); and Full Planning:- development of Phase 1 at the south western corner of the site for the erection of 29 residential dwellings (29 or the 1500 described above) with associated open space, parking and landscaping; with vehicular access provided from Upper Campsfield Road (A4095), Shipton Road and Oxford Road (A44).

The Council agreed to take agenda item 5 before item 4(i).

WTC/199/14 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING GROUP MEETING 30.12.14

Cllr B Yoxall explained the background to the Neighbourhood Planning Working Group. He said that it would consider the basis for a WTC objection to the Woodstock East proposal. Cllr Yoxall listed the provisional objections listed in the minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Working Group that was held on 30th December 2014 and notified the meeting that WTC had resolved the following "The Council reaffirms its policy towards the proposed development in East Woodstock. It opposes the developers' plans in their present form and calls upon the Neighbourhood Plan Working group to convene with all possible speed to formulate proposals both for resisting the proposed development in East Woodstock

and for guiding the future development of the town in the best interests of its residents and to report promptly. It appoints Councillor Yoxall as an additional member of the group. It considers that the Town partnership is an organisation independent of the town council which does not speak for or on behalf of the town council.”

He noted that the WTC commissioned Glanville Traffic Survey was not yet complete due to delays in the availability of the transport parts of planning application 14/02004/HYBRID but said that it was hoped that it would be available soon.

**WTC/200/14 TO CONSIDER WTC’S RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION
14/02004/HYBRID: LAND SOUTH OF PERDISWELLFARM, SHIPTON ROAD,
SHIPTON ON CHERWELL. OUTLINE.**

Cllr J Cooper declared a general interest.

(i) Report from Huw Mellor, Kemp and Kemp

Mr Mellor provided a factual overview of the current position. Mr Mellor, Kemp and Kemp, provided an overview of the current situation noting the following:

a. General Points

- 1) This is an unusual; hybrid application as it crosses two administrative boundaries i.e. District Councils (DC’s) with a clear split between the two districts. 1300 of the houses (85%) come under Cherwell District Council (CDC) and 200 (15%) under West Oxfordshire District Council (WODC). The split application could be treated separately if there is an appeal - both DC’s do have to approve it.
- 2) The two DC’s are working together when processing the application. CDC is leading on this planning application but both DC’s could consider their respective parts separately if they wished to do so.
- 3) None of the planning officers involved from either DC have come out in support of this planning application at the pre-application stage as far as can be seen.
- 4) The response date to the application has not yet been lodged but may be 21 days which would be by the end of January 2015.
- 5) The application is due to be determined by 10th March but could be determined at a later date if all parties agree to a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA).
- 6) WTC should submit its response by 10th March 2015.

b) Local Plans and Land Supply

- 1) As neither DC has an up to date Local Plan in place insofar as it relates to housing provision so they are vulnerable to developers.
- 2) It is difficult for either DC to prove that they have a 5 year land supply.
- 3) The City of Oxford claims that it cannot meet its housing targets so pressure is currently on the four DC’s in Oxfordshire to take more houses. The number of additional houses per district has yet to be agreed.
- 4) The main arguments should therefore not be based upon 5 year land supply considerations although this is an important consideration.

c) Planning Issues

- 1) 10 years ago an independent Planning Inspector turned down a proposal in the then emerging WODC Local Plan for 200 houses on this site.
- 2) There are no significant planning differences between the proposal that was rejected 10 years ago and this one but this point is largely overlooked in the new application
- 3) One party to the current planning application objected to the proposal of 10 years ago but this is not mentioned in the current documentation.

- 4) This application will potentially have a negative effect on the adjacent Green Belt and this is a material consideration that needs noting.
- 5) The proposed supermarket and other shops are likely to have a negative impact on the town centre.
- 6) This development may have landscape and visual harm
- 7) This development may cause ecological damage.
- 8) The scale and magnitude will have a negative effect on the setting of the to the World Heritage site.
- 9) The transport report commissioned by WTC from Glanville Consultants will be important when determining issues that may be used to resist this development.

(ii) **Public Debate**

Residents asked various questions to Mr Mellor – these are summarised in Appendix A attached:

The Council then

RESOLVED to resume the Council meeting to consider its response to the planning application 14/02004/HYBRID. Discussion followed.

Cllr C Carritt joined the meeting at this point

County Cllr I Hudspeth confirmed that:

- 1 OCC will only look at the technical issues associated with transport and highways matters.
- 2 The Glanville consultant's report should form the basis of a response to counter developer's claims about the proposed Link and Ride scheme and the A40/A34 link road.
- 3 The 5% traffic rule applies to layout and junction capacity.

ACTION: *Cllr I Hudspeth will confirm the source and status of the 5% rule that is applied to traffic changes and confirm whether this is statutory or guidance.*

Cllr M Gibbard, CDC District Councillor for Begbroke and Yarnton who is the CDC Lead Member for Planning was present at this meeting. He noted that:

1. CDC does not need this development in order to meet its land supply requirements. **The CDC Local Plan has identified sufficient housing elsewhere in the district and therefore this site is not needed.**
2. CDC currently has a 3.6 year housing supply and 4.5 years' worth of permissions in place.
3. The current problem is due to a lack of building on the approved sites and the developers cannot be made to do so.

The time frame for the WTC response was discussed.

RESOLVED That the Town Clerk will ask both WODC and CDC for an extension in time for the WTC planning response.

ACTIONS:

1. *The Town Clerk will ask both DC's for an extension in time for the WTC planning response.*
2. *A letter should be sent to UNESCO and/or EH expressing WTC's concerns.*

Cllr P Jay proposed, Cllr E Stokes seconded the motion and the Council

RESOLVED (unanimous) that the Council reaffirms its decisions of 23rd December 2014 and calls upon the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group, having clarified the probable time table for determination of this application by the two District Councils, to bring forward specific proposals for the Councils response with all due speed.

WTC/201/14 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED that in view of the commercial 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).

WTC/202/14 ADDITIONAL TREE WORK AT THE WATER MEADOWS

The Council received and considered a quote for additional tree work at the Woodstock Water Meadows. It was recommended that this work be done whilst the tree contractors were on site. Cllr C Carritt proposed, Cllr Mrs E Jay seconded the motion and the Council

RESOLVED that WTC approves the extra tree work totalling £2,540.00 at the Water Meadows.

The meeting closed at 9.32pm

Signed Date

Various residents asked questions which Mr Mellor answered as follows.

a) General

- (i) The impact upon the World Heritage Site is an important objection as the effects of this new application will be worse, due to the increased scale, than that of the application that was refused 10 years ago.
- (ii) English Heritage (EH) is a statutory consultee. CDC will ask for its opinion about the impact on the World Heritage site so Mr Mellor recommended that WTC write and outline its concerns to EH.
- (iii) The Mayor noted that the World heritage status is reviewed periodically and he has asked WODC to write to UNESCO in Paris to make them aware of the application.
- (iv) The safety of the development in light of its vicinity to the Oxford Airport is something to consider.

b) Local Plans and Land Supply

- (i) The four other DC's have a duty to co-operate with Oxford City Council to meet its shortfall. The numbers are unclear but the 4 DC's may be asked to take between 14,000 and 21,800 between now and 2031. It was noted that a duty to co-operate is not a duty to agree.
- (ii) The adopted planning policies of the two DC's have not changed as neither currently has an approved Local Plan in housing supply terms. What has changed is the government's top down approach to a 5 year rolling land supply through until 2031 in Oxon's case.
- (iii) Although the SHMA is important it cannot be relied upon as the key reason for objecting but should be treated as one grounds on which to do so. This is because of the current uncertainty surrounding the SHMA figures. WODC has proposed a figure of the current SHMA plus 5%. The developer is arguing that the figure should be the current WODC SHMA plus 20%. If WODC's figures are approved an appeal is likely therefore the land supply figures should not be relied upon.
- (iv) The developers will probably claim that housing supply needs over-ride all other planning considerations but this is not correct. There are other material considerations that are equally as important.
- (v) The developers may claim that WODC Planning Policy H7 is not currently relevant to this planning application and can be set aside as WODC will have difficulty proving a 5 Year Land Supply.

c) Planning Issues

- (i) It does not matter if one DC rejects the planning application as this will only affect their part of it.
- (ii) Planning objections must be about the content of this planning application.
- (iii) A key objection should be to the scale and magnitude of the current planning application.
- (iv) Sustainability is an important consideration.
- (v) There appears to be nothing about a possible new health centre or to explain how the existing facility would cope with an additional 1500 families.
- (vi) The proposals include a new Primary School but it is not clear how the Marlborough secondary school would cope with the additional pupils coming through the system. The Marlborough school does not only service Woodstock children but also has pupils from the surrounding area. The effects on these need to be considered as do the knock-on effects on other schools.
- (vii) The OCC traffic survey was undertaken on 15th July 2014.
- (viii) The Mayor said that WTC will put the Glanville traffic survey on the WTC web site after it has been received.
- (ix) The National Planning Policy Framework talks about demonstrable harm. Although the issues relating to schools and a health centre may be able to be addressed it will

be more difficult to offset the associated traffic and roads problems especially as the 1500 houses will probably have 2 cars each.

- (x) The potential effects on the A44 should also be considered as many of the new residents will have to commute due to the limited number of jobs available in the local area.
- (xi) Nothing can be done about developers making a profit, assessing whether or not this profit is 'fair', or offsetting subsequent claims from a developer that the provision of affordable housing makes a development unviable.
- (xii) The additional application for 29 houses will have different timescales and run separately from the all-encompassing hybrid application, although they may be phase 1 of the development.

ENDS