

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF  
THE WOODSTOCK TOWN COUNCIL  
ON TUESDAY 9<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2021 AT 7.30PM  
HELD VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCING**

**PRESENT:**

Cllr M Parkinson (Mayor)  
Cllr P Jay  
Cllr U Parkinson  
Cllr S Rasch  
Cllr T Redpath

Cllr A Grant (Deputy Mayor)  
Cllr J Cooper  
Cllr S Parnes  
Cllr E Poskitt  
Cllr P Redpath

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** C Carruthers (Clerk), CCllr I Hudspeth and 35 members of the public.

**WTC250/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:** None.

**WTC251/20 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST:**

Cllr E Poskitt            **Item 10 Planning:** Personal interest as she is a member of WODC.

Cllr J Cooper            **Item 10 Planning:** Personal interest as he is a member of WODC Planning Sub-Committee.

Cllr S Rasch            **Item 10 Planning:** Personal interest.

**WTC252/20 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION:**

Colin Carritt addressed the meeting concerning the displacement of Heavy Goods Vehicle from Burford and its impact on Woodstock.

He requested that WTC join the newly created Windrush Valley Traffic Action Group to review and take action against current trial regarding heavy goods and freight vehicles.

A hard copy of the update is available (on request via the Clerk) for anyone who would like a copy.

Mr Carritt was requested to make contact with the chairman of the A44A group - which had worked hard to obtain an advisory rerouting of lorries away from more densely populated roads - as there were other communities on the A44 also affected by the Burford displacement.

**The motion "to join the WVTAG":** Proposed E Poskitt, Seconded M Parkinson.

<b>VOTE:</b>	For:	9	Cllrs J Cooper, U Parkinson, S Parnes, E Poskitt, M Parkinson P Redpath, T Redpath, S Rasch, A Grant
	Against:	0	
	Abstaining:	1	Cllr P Jay

**RESOLVED:** Motion carried

Tony McHugh and Mandy Miller of C-POW addressed the meeting to express concern against planning application 21/00189/FUL, which is an agenda item.

A hard copy of the update is available (on request via the Clerk) for anyone who would like a copy.

**WTC253/20 TO APPROVE AND ADOPT THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:**

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 12<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2021:**

To approve the minutes: Proposed M Parkinson, Seconded T Redpath:

<b>VOTE:</b>	For:	8	Cllrs J Cooper, U Parkinson, E Poskitt, M Parkinson P Redpath, T Redpath, S Rasch, A Grant
	Against:	0	
	Abstaining:	1	Cllrs P Jay, S Parnes

**RESOLVED:** Motion carried

**MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY TOWN COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 26<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2021:**

Cllr M Parkinson put forward a special motion, seconded by A Grant,

*“for rescission of the previously approved minutes in accordance with SO11”.*

<b>VOTE:</b>	For:	7	Cllrs M Parkinson, U Parkinson, S Parnes, E Poskitt S Rasch, A Grant, P Jay.
	Against:	2	Cllrs P Redpath, J Cooper.
	Abstaining:	1	Cllr T Redpath.

**RESOLVED:** The motion was carried.

Cllr M Parkinson, seconded by A Grant proposed

*“approval the amended version of the Minutes”*

<b>VOTE:</b>	For:	7	Cllrs M Parkinson, U Parkinson, E Poskitt, P Redpath, S Rasch, A Grant, T Redpath.
	Against:	2	Cllrs P Jay, J Cooper.
	Abstaining:	1	Cllr S Parnes.

**RESOLVED:** The motion was carried.

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 9<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2021:**

Cllr M Parkinson, seconded by T Redpath

*“to resolve the minutes with the suggested amendments by Cllrs E Poskitt and A Grant.*

<b>VOTE:</b>	For:	9	Cllrs M Parkinson, U Parkinson, E Poskitt, P Redpath, S Rasch, A Grant, T Redpath, S Parnes, J Cooper
	Against:	0	

Abstaining: 1 Cllr P Jay

**RESOLVED:** The motion was carried.

**MINUTES OF THE URGENT PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 25<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2021:**

To agree the receipt of the minutes: **Approved**

**WTC254/20 REPORT FROM THE TOWN CLERK:**

i. Watermeadows update:

Martin Greatbatch spent 3 days clearing the site of tree debris. At a cost £500 per day for 4 workers plus machinery. The Clerk approached 3 companies to quote for carrying out the urgent health and safety repairs on Millstream Bank. Only one quote has been received (two other companies chased for quotes). She confirmed that her due diligence had been carried out and went ahead with the instruction for this work to be undertaken at a cost of £4165.00 (£5000.00 has been budgeted for this) as it is required as a matter of urgency. All councillors **approved** this action.

ii. Elections:

Timetable has been sent by WODC which will be circulated. The Clerk has a contact who can design an individual advert if we so wish. Nomination packs will be available from office as of 18<sup>th</sup> March and can be accepted back at Woodgreen from 29<sup>th</sup> March and the deadline for all nominations is 8<sup>th</sup> April at 4pm. Council meeting to be moved the 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday of May to accommodate possible counting delays.

**WTC255/20 COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILLORS' UPDATE:**

The monthly Parish report from Cllr I Hudspeth was received by Council, and circulated, without question or comment. Cllr P Redpath reminds Cllr I Hudspeth of the issues regarding the heavy goods vehicles as discussed earlier in the meeting. Cllr I Hudspeth confirms that this is an experimental traffic order that can be trialled for 6 to 18 months then reviewed to see if it should be implemented or withdrawn. Cllr Grant reiterated that the current level of traffic does not provide a valid indication of traffic flow as this is at a reduced level due to the pandemic. (It is a true version of the traffic recorded whenever it was recorded but cannot be considered indicative of the traffic on the A44 were there no pandemic).

Cllr A Grant also asked for confirmation over the availability of funding towards flooding prevention and repairs. Cllr I Hudspeth confirms that this should be under the remit of the Town Council. Cllr P Redpath reminded Cllr I Hudspeth that the clearance and maintenance of the grilles of the bridge are under the remit of the County Council.

The District Councillor's report was received by Council. Cllr A Grant asks the DC members if they are aware of the new flats that are being proposed. They are not, Cllr A Grant will research further. There has been no further communication about Hensington Road car park site. Cllr S Parnes asked about the outcome of the application for a pavement licence outside the King's Arms to which The Town Council had objected. Cllr Cooper responded that the matter had not yet been resolved.

**WTC256/20 COMMUNICATIONS:**

Cllr M Parkinson had circulated a report regarding possible installation of CCTV at New Road play park following a number of reported anti-social behaviour incidents. CCTV will hopefully prevent and deter the incidents occurring in the future. A consultation and advice will be obtained prior to any purchase and installation. The PC officer has given the Clerk a contact with the Witney Patrol Office to discuss options.

He proposed the following motion, seconded by Cllr A Grant:

*“Woodstock Town Council Resolves that it will invest in CCTV equipment for the New Road Playground and ensure the Police and, if appropriate, WODC are involved and consulted in the process, whilst also seeking grant funding”.*

Following a discussion Cllr E Poskitt proposed the amendment to the motion to include £explore to” as inserted.

*“Woodstock Town Council Resolves that it will explore investing in CCTV equipment for the New Road Playground and ensure the Police and, if appropriate, WODC are involved and consulted in the process, whilst also seeking grant funding”.*

**VOTE:** For: 9 Against: 1 Abstaining: 0

**RESOLVED:** The motion was carried.

Cllr M Parkinson, seconded by Cllr A Grant proposed the following motion:

*“Woodstock Town Council resolves that it will request WODC invest in installing CCTV Camera(s) in the Woodstock Open Air Pool which can be linked and monitored in the same way as the ones at New Road Play Park in a holistic approach”.*

**VOTE:** For: 10 Against: 0 Abstaining: 0

**RESOLVED:** The motion was carried.

**WTC257/20 QUESTIONS:** No questions had been received.

**WTC258/20 MOTIONS PRESENTED TO THE COUNCIL:** No motions had been presented.

**WTC259/20 PLANNING:**

To **agree** comments to be submitted to West Oxfordshire District Council in respect of the following planning applications: -

- i. APPLICATION NO: 21/00318/HHD - 36 Hill Rise Woodstock  
Erection of a single storey rear extension along with the reroofing of the existing

**RESOLVED:** No objection.

- ii. APPLICATION NO: 21/00111/FUL - Garrett House 5 Park Street Woodstock  
Refurbishment of existing office and storage outbuilding (Class use E) to include single and two storey front extension and provision of first floor outdoor amenity space with metal balustrading.

**RESOLVED:** No objection.

- iii. APPLICATION NO: 21/00234/HHD- 10 Rectory Lane Woodstock  
Conversion of garage into habitable space to include single storey front and rear extensions together with relocation of pedestrian access in rear boundary walling.

**RESOLVED:** Objection on the grounds that the application removes the garage and no replacement of the car parking space.

- iv. APPLICATION NO: 21/00205/S73- Merry Piece Oxford Road  
Non-compliance with conditions 2 and 3 of planning permission 19/00094/HHD to allow design alterations including reduction in building width and changes to fenestration and eaves material.

**RESOLVED:** No objection.

- v. APPLICATION NO: 21/00189/FUL - Land East of Hill Rise Woodstock  
Hybrid planning application consisting of full planning permission for the erection of 74 dwellings, 60 sqm of community space (Class E), a parking barn, means of access from the A44, associated infrastructure, open space, engineering and ancillary works; outline planning permission for up to 106 dwellings, up to 60sqm of community space (Class E), a parking barn, with associated infrastructure, open space, engineering and ancillary works.

**RESOLVED:** Objection on the following grounds:

Firstly we do not believe the following planning policies have been met:  
CO1,CO2,CO3,CO10,OS1,T1,T4,EH9,EH14,EW10.

Following on from the unmet policies, please note the below bullet points identified against this application:

- An 2019 Audit of opinion of Old Woodstock residents showed 82% opposed to the proposed development, with just 2% supporting.
- The Application diverges from the Local Plan in number of houses sought, and movement of the boundary of the Site. It must therefore be refused.
- If not refused on the above legal ground, the following are further objections to the Application, all of which show failure to comply with the Local Plan's Core Objective 1, that new developments "should be in locations which will help improve the quality of life of local communities and where the need to travel, particularly by car, can be minimised "
- The problem of safety on the A44 road through Old Woodstock : No viable solution has been proposed.
- The problem of safety on the A44 gave rise to the suggestion of pedestrian, disabled and cycle paths over the River Glyme. These are unacceptable for obvious reasons of safety, distance, and weather conditions, especially for young students.
- For the 3 development sites there will be a shortfall of 111 places at Woodstock Primary School after the proposed expansion to 2 form entry. Early years places are a significant issue, and 44 places will need to be found. Old Woodstock children would have to either walk or cycle along the hazardous A44 or go by car.
- The problem of the GP Surgery : The current patient-to-GP ratio already exceeds Government targets. The three developments in Woodstock will produce 1,752 extra patients. This will be completely unsustainable, and no "solution", other than some S.106 money, is proposed by the Applicant. OCCG states that Woodstock Surgery is not suitable for expansion.
- Parking in Woodstock is a current problem and the cars of 730 further houses will be trying to park. Old Woodstock residents use their cars more readily for small errands to Woodstock and

this development will add cars of 180 houses to those journeys and their need to park in Woodstock.

In addition to the above we would like you also note that WTC is unhappy with the increase of proposed houses in both this and the Banbury Road application increasing the Inspector's allocated numbers for Woodstock from 600 to 730 (an increase of 130 overall) -

We would like WODC to note that the Inspector thought there could be more dwellings if *"it could be convincingly demonstrated that this would not cause significant harm"*. Blenheim are claiming that the high level assessment demonstrated this but in fact that assessment was in front of the Inspector when he made the comment and there does not appear to have been any subsequent demonstration.

We also stress that WTC as owner and managers of the water meadows have resolved not to allow a pathway down to the Mill Stream to be bridged with cycle pedestrian ways across the water meadows carrying the below motion which we would like to reaffirm:

*"WTC does not want any part of the Woodstock watermeadows used to facilitate a pathway through from the new Hill Rise development and agrees that the plan submitted by Blenheim Estate for a bridge across the Mill Stream (R. Glyme) into the watermeadows and associated path/cycleways through the meadows is unacceptable.*

*The watermeadows are wild and tranquil areas to be enjoyed by all residents, and the Council cannot support any urbanisation that will detract from their beauty.*

*If Blenheim is to develop in Old Woodstock, the Council does however acknowledge that a safe access from the new development into the town centre and Woodstock schools will need to be found and suggests joining with other stakeholders to find better options using land in the ownership of Blenheim estate both within the palace walls and through the meadows behind Hill Rise, crossing the R. Glyme upstream of Owen Mumford and connecting with Green Lane – enabling linkage with the new Banbury Road/Green Lane estate and beyond.*

*All pathway works to be funded by Blenheim Estate without recourse to s106 monies.*

The above response was proposed by Cllr T Redpath, Seconded Cllr A Grant.

**VOTE:** For: 10 Against: 0 Abstaining: 0

**RESOLVED:** The motion was carried.

**WTC260/20 REPORT OF THE RESPONSIBLE FINANCIAL OFFICER – FEBRUARY 2021:**

- i. To receive the list of payments for February 2021 (enclosed): Recommendation That the Council **RESOLVED** that the list of payments totalling £12,850.60 made in the month of February 2021 be received and approved.
- ii. Bank Reconciliation Statement (enclosed)  
To receive and **APPROVE** the bank reconciliation statements for February 2021
- iii. Summary and Detailed Income & Expenditure Statements (enclosed).  
To receive and **CONSIDER** the summary and detailed income & expenditure statements for February 2021
- iv. List of Regular payments made by Direct Debit and Standing orders (enclosed)

To receive and **APPROVE** the regular payments made by DD and S/O

- v. To receive the Internal Auditor's Interim report (enclosed)  
To receive and **NOTE** the Interim report from the Internal Auditor and note the recommendations
- vi. Investment Policy and Interest review (enclosed)  
To receive and **APPROVE** the Council Investment Policy for 2020-21 and note the Interest received

Cllr P Jay proposed, seconded by M Parkinson that the council APPROVES points i-vi above.

**VOTE:** For: 10 Against: 0 Abstaining: 0

**WTC261/20 TO REVIEW AND APPROVE A CONTRACTOR FROM INVITED TENDERS FOR THE TREE WORKS:**

Three companies had responded to the invitation to tender for carrying out works to the high and medium risk trees identified on the tree survey.

	Company A	Company B	Company C
<b>Medium Priority Works</b>	£ 5,960	£ 7,470	£ 5,500
<b>High Priority Works</b>	£ 5,910	£ 7,175	£ 6,500
<b>Both Medium &amp; High Priority Works</b>	£ 11,870	£ 15,895	£ 12,000

Cllr T Redpath proposed appointing Company C on the basis that once the high risk tree works had been completed all ongoing works should be classed as medium therefore company C's charges are the lowest.

She also proposed a supplementary motion that once a company had been approved they remain the designated contractor for one year or until the next annual tree survey is carried out.

Cllr P Jay reminded the council that there is an agreement in place with the residents living along the Old Woodstock Line, that any works along the OWL will be consulted on beforehand letting them know what and where.

Proposed Cllr T Redpath, Seconded Cllr P Redpath

*"To approve company C as a contractor"*

**VOTE:** For: 10 Against: 0 Abstaining: 0

**RESOLVED:** The motion was carried.

**WTC262/20 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT:**

An introduction for a Community Development Worker had been put forward at a meeting attended by the Steering Group and District Councillors. Cllr T Redpath prepared and had circulated the report to all council members. This is a joint project with Blenheim and the Woodstock community, funded by Blenheim with a Steering Committee attended by local Councillors. Cllr S Parnes believes that the time is inappropriate due to the 'downtime' of the council during the election period.

Cllr J Cooper thanked Cllr T Redpath for taking the notes from this meeting and reporting back.

Cllr J Cooper was also disappointed by the examples that were given for other schemes (i.e., Bicester and Upper Heyford).

Cllr M Parkinson proposed Seconded Cllr P Redpath that

*"WTC proceed and agree to a Steering Committee"*

**VOTE:** For: 10 Against: 0 Abstaining: 0

**RESOLVED:** The motion was carried.

**WTC263/20 WTC PROPERTY PORTFOLIO:**

Cllr A Grant circulated a property report, and highlighted the below from that report.

- i. Park Street: No confirmed moving date given but when received, a new tenant will be sought.
- ii. Town Hall toilets: Listed building consent has not yet been obtained.
- iii. Suite Two lease: This has now been signed.
- iv. Community Centre car park: Resurfacing is not yet confirmed.

The meeting closed at 9:31pm

Chair:

Date: