

Extraordinary Meeting of Woodstock Town Council
Assembly Room, Town Hall
27th September 2022 at 6.30pm

Present: Cllr Elizabeth Poskitt (Mayor, in the Chair)
Cllr Linda Addis
Cllr Kate Begley
Cllr John Bleakley
Cllr Ann Grant
Cllr Jo Lamb (Deputy Mayor)
Cllr Meg Manson
Cllr Sharone Parnes
Cllr James Spencer-Churchill

The meeting began with a one minute silence to memory of the late Queen Elizabeth II

The Mayor also recorded that Mrs Barbara Pix, past Lady Mayoress (when Mrs Vaughan) had died. The Mayor thanked Cllr Grant for representing the Town Council at the funeral as the Mayor was away at the time.

Cllr Poskitt also welcomed Cllr Addis to her first meeting of the Council and hoped she would find working for the Council interesting and enjoyable.

ETC 9/22/1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies had been received from Cllrs Bailey, Mathew Parkinson and Ulli Parkinson.

ETC 9/22/2 Declarations of Interests

Cllr Poskitt expressed a general interest in Item 4 as a Member of WODC and Chair of Development Control Committee and Uplands Planning sub-committee.

ETC 9/22/3 Public Speaking and Question Time

A resident spoke about the application (retrospective) for land adjacent to 34 Bear Close 22/02014/FUL explaining that one of the buildings was an upturned and reduced in size body of a furniture van which was used for storage. The other building was a shed with windows, flat roofed and single storey used as a studio. As the owner of the land, the speaker, had not been aware that these minor elements would be subject to planning approval but made the application when WODC became aware of 'development' on the site. She had discussed the development with residents in the neighbouring properties. She requested WTC to support the application.

In answer to a question, the speaker said she had no objection to a condition being suggested that the uses of the site remain as at present, namely an artist's studio and storage space.

ETC 9/22/4 Planning & Licensing

a. 22/02014/FUL Land Adjacent to 34 Bear Close Woodstock.

Construction of two detached buildings comprising of an artist studio and ancillary storage space. (Retrospective). After discussion relating to the use of the site it was

unanimously agreed that Council had no objection to the application provided it was conditioned that the use of the site remained as at present.

b. 22/02076/HHD 50 Banbury Road Woodstock Oxfordshire

This application had already been determined by WODC (refusal) so was not discussed here

c. 22/02311/HHD 11 Rosamund Drive Woodstock Oxfordshire

Single storey rear extension and alterations. No objections.

d. 22/02168/HHD 10 Glovers Close Woodstock Oxfordshire

Single and two storey flat roof extensions to front and single and two storey bay windows to rear. Cllrs felt this was a somewhat extensive development for the size of the present dwelling but, in view of other development in the area, did not feel they had grounds to object.

e. 22/02307/OUT Land South of 2 & 3 Cadogan Park, Woodstock

Outline application with some matters reserved for residential development of 2 detached houses and associated ancillary works including provision of access.

Objections on the grounds of :

Concerns over access to A44 when there were several other entrances on the short strip of road from Cadogan Park to Park View and a zebra crossing and tow bus stops opposite one another. Rush hour – and other times – already produced a steady stream of traffic which it was often difficult and awkward for cars to join along this stretch of the A44

A further exit on to this part of the A44 would probably require the removal of trees thus threatening the green corridor as one approaches the main gate to the Palace. Whilst there were entrances already on that side of the road (as mentioned above), this proposed development was where the WHS listed Park wall in close proximity to the A44 unlike further south.

The buildings appear to be on the site of a filled in pond.....how would that affect the structures?

The buildings could have an adverse shading effect on neighbouring gardens especially Treetops just north of the site.

Cllr Poskitt was requested to ask officers to bring the matter to Uplands planning sub-committee if Officers were mindful of approving the outline development.

f. 22/02509/HHD 11 Shipton Road Woodstock Oxfordshire

Construction of single storey rear extension, enclosure of rear covered area, conversion of existing integral garage into games room and installation of rear dormer window to bedroom above.

No objection

g. 21/00189/FUL Land East Of Hill Rise Woodstock

Hybrid planning application consisting of full planning permission for 48 dwellings, 57 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 132 dwellings, up to 57 sqm of community space (Class E), a parking barn, with associated infrastructure, open space, engineering and ancillary works (amended).

Strong objection.

Strong objection

The comments previously made in relation to our objection still apply. It was disappointing that the number of homes proposed remained well above that suggested as acceptable for that site.

WTC has major concerns about the inadequacy of the local sewage system to cope with the new homes already being built in Woodstock and this proposed development would only add to the problems.

The medical facilities in terms of surgery accommodation remain a major reason for objection and is a view also supported by OCCG.

There was concern over the loss of the football pitch at the top of Rosamund Drive.

The revised application was awaiting further updated reports from several consultees some of whom had not been happy with previous versions of the development proposal.

h. 21/00217/OUT Land North Of Banbury Road Woodstock

Outline planning application with all matters reserved except for means of access for up to 235 dwellings with community space and car barns together with associated works (Amended).

Strong objection.

As with 21/00189/FUL, WTCs repeats the points it made in its previous submissions.

Although the number of proposed homes has been reduced, it still remains above that deemed acceptable to the Inspector of the WODC Local Plan.

There was considerable concern about the effect of the development on the setting of Hensington Farmhouse, one of the listed buildings for which the Inspector of the Local Plan felt the homes in the development should be confined to the eastern end of the site.

Dwellings near the Hensington Farmhouse should be reduced in height and only single or one and a half storey homes.

There remain concerns about traffic and pedestrians along Banbury Road towards the centre of town as there is no proper footpath along the whole length of the road on either side of the road and there is nowhere where footpaths exist on both sides of the road.

The inadequacy of the doctors' surgery accommodation remains a strong reason to object to the development. OCCG continues to object to the development on grounds of the surgery accommodation being grossly inadequate

9/22/5 Other planning matters

Appeal ref: APP/D33125/C22/33041

LPA Appeal ref: 22/00018/APPE

Brothertons of Woodstock Limited

Unauthorised siting of two awnings on the front elevation of 1 High Street
Woodstock

(This application was discussed immediately after 22/02014/FUL in view of the number of residents attending the meeting to listen to Council's views on this appeal).

In answer to a question, Cllr Poskitt explained that she and Cllr Lamb had been drawing up a response to send to the Appeal Inspector when the formal request for a response

came to Council so they delayed the response for the matter to be discussed in Council and draw up a response to the formal request for comment.

Council strongly supports the appeal against the decision to force removal of the awnings.

There had been a petition drawn up by and signed by over 150 residents in support of the appeal against removal of the awnings.

WTC commented that there were other buildings within the town centre with awnings and these were no more obvious than those awnings.

Council rejected the WODC officers' view that the awnings were obtrusive, conflicted with policies protecting the conservation area and affected the enhanced setting of listed buildings. They were shallow awnings and were not considered to deface the façade of the building.

In WTC's view, the awnings were not garish but rather the opposite in their discrete soft brown colour. They were associated with attractive creeping plants on the building. They enhanced hospitality by providing some shade for those eating outside and had been introduced to encourage customers when pandemic only allowed out of doors hospitality. In an era of Climate Change and increasingly hot sunny summers, the awnings provide a significant protection to customers. Indeed, WTC feels the awnings enhance the street scene.

The meeting closed at 7.20pm