

# Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council

Meeting of the council held at West Kidlington School on  
Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> June 2023 at 7pm

*Meeting commenced at 7pm*

**Councillors present:** Cllr Merlin Smith, Cllr Carol Matheson, Cllr Suzanne Wilson-Higgins, Cllr Clive Stayt, Cllr Nick Duval, Cllr Nigel Simpson

**To receive and accept apologies of absence from:** Cllr Suzanne McIvor, Cllr Ian Middleton,

**Other attendees:** The clerk, representative from Savills – Rob Linnell

**23/305 Declarations of interest:** None

**23/306 Public Participation:** Savills gave an update on the planning PR6a at the meeting. All files are available on Cherwell DC planning.

**23/307 To confirm the minutes of the previous council meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2023.**

The minutes of the meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2023 were approved with no matters arising.

**23/308 Update on progress from the minutes held on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2023 and Matters Arising.**

Microsoft 365 in progress and moving email across in June.

## 23/309 Reports

Cllr Simpson:

Conservatives still in control at CDC.

Cllr Simpson working on sport and recreational committee for CDC. Looking to turn Stratfield Brake into making a profit.

OCC – no update at the moment.

Policing – looking to get more PCSOs etc for policing locally. Very understaffed at the moment.

O UFC proposal and engagement meeting – invites came after the meeting, so no councillors attended.

Bramley Close park – part way through installation of the new pocket park should be completed very soon.

## 23/310 Financial Matters

(23/310.01) It was **RESOLVED** to approve the payments as detailed in the clerk's report (detailed below). Payments are made via cheque and include post-dated statutory payments for July 2023.

ICO - Data protection act - mandatory	£ 35.00 £	Direct Debit	Annual direct debit ICO ZB090439
Ady Podbery grounds Cherwell District Council	123.00 £ 2,909.20 £	102691 102692	inv 4667 - grounds / litter Multiple invoices - 20010956, 20010957, 20010958, 20010903 - parish election charges for uncontested election, SB mgmt fee april, may, June
Clerk Payroll	confidential £	102693	July post dated
RFO payroll Oxfordshire County Council Pension Fund	confidential £ confidential £	102694 102695	July post dated July post dated
HMRC PAYE	confidential	102696	July post dated

	£		
Clerk expenses	69.95	102697	Reimbursement for office and home office allowance
West Kidlington	£		
Friends	58.00	102698	June meeting room hire

There is also one direct debit payment which will come out in June – detail above.

Finance committee receive copies of the invoices to review ahead of the meeting.

£confidential relates to payroll figures – these figures are shared with councillors.

## **23/311 Planning**

### ***Development site: PR6a – CDC planning reference 23/01233/OUT***

Council looked at the designs (available on CDC planning site). Acknowledgement that housing number has increased – developer reason is because the plot fits this, so it makes efficient use of the land.

Councillors noted that some of the flats in the design could be up to 18m high. This is significantly different to other properties in the area.

The reason Savill's have put the corners at 18 metres (note that is typically six stories not five) is due to the post Grenfell Tower legislation The buildings Safety Act 2022. Here is a link: <https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3021>

If CDC for "up to 18 metres" the developer can in fact have up to six stories legally and avoid all the over 18 metres requirements of the new Buildings Safety Act. The submitted plan states five stories but also states 18 metres which actually means two different things.

Pipal barns may be demolished. This will change the character of the area. It is commented that these could be utilised / kept and re-utilised. The council was not aware this was planned until now.

Concern that all properties will have a maintenance levy (in addition to council tax charges) to manage the estate maintenance (verges etc) and parks. A management company will look after these areas. The council strongly objects to this plan, it is unreasonable to people purchasing properties to have this levy (it should be within council tax so one charge that is managed and scrutinised not profiteered by management companies). In addition, other people would use the areas (not just residents) so essentially residents would be paying for services for other people.

### ***Objection – Councillors RESOLVED to object on the following reasons:***

**Buildings:** Object to Increase in numbers and height of buildings. There is a significant height with little outdoor space for flats (out of character, not good for health and wellbeing). Some of the flats in the design could be up to 18m high. This is significantly different to other properties in the area and too high.

**Management levy:** strongly objected against. Concern that all properties will have a maintenance levy (in addition to council tax charges) to manage the estate maintenance (verges etc) and parks. A management company will look after these areas. The council strongly objects to this plan, it is unreasonable to expect people purchasing properties to have this levy and will lead to confusion (it should be within council tax so one charge that is managed and scrutinised not profiteered by management companies, by putting through council tax it would also be capped). In addition, other people would use the areas (not just residents) so essentially residents would be paying for services for other people which is not a fair measure. Standards of maintenance could be ambiguous, and residents would be confused about who they can speak to when issues.

**Recreation:** Object lack of information - needs something more definitive on recreational spaces (define what they are), 5 pocket parks detailed – we asked for 1 or 2 larger play areas because pocket parks are inefficient and do not cater for all ages of children as too small. Also, there is no hardstanding play areas considered – nothing for netball etc. There seems to be no recreational consideration, all on assumption its going elsewhere but that is not submitted to planning so not guaranteed. It is a strong concern.

**Demolition plan:** Object to Pipal barns being demolished is objected on, historic significance – not listed but of significance to the area.

**Council office provision:** Object that there is no designated council office (requested from the start) – this could be situated in Pipal barns -re-utilise for council office and council hub rather than demolish them. This is different need from community centre / village hall – we requested separate premises. The council hub could also be used for pop up services (bank, library, citizens advice too as well as council business, staff) but managed for council.

**Community hub:** objection on this area, no clarity on what's going there, we do not expect fast food outlets (what limitations will be there?). Definition of public space (use by public, open area, rented buildings, lease buildings, retail units. Nothing for local 'farmers markets' etc? There does not seem to be any specific provision for drama / arts / theatre groups? Big lack of detail.

**Parking:** Objection – lack of provision. Where are these people going to park, where are cycle bays going to be? Are the kerb heights and road widths going to allow roadside parking? Parking enforcement would also need to be clarified. Parking provision for flats is not enough at all. No electric charge points provided, and they need larger spaces. Needs consideration on who will monitor parking and manage electric parking spaces.

**Education:** Objection - Need guarantee that money for local special education need provision / funding is allocated. No provision for 0-5 (nursery), locally nurseries are closing. Provision / space (not community centre) needs to be available for this.

**Youth Facility:** No provision for youths (teenagers). The community hub has potential to become anti-social as a result. We object on the basis there is no provision – it needs to have a defined space in the plan as high demand for it.

### ***Oxford United Football Club***

Councillors visited the exhibitions which were also open to the public, councillors did interact with the public who attended. There is still a lack of detail from OUFC, not enough information for informed decision making. It was acknowledged that OUFC were happy to answer questions. Speaking to some of the residents at these exhibitions most residents seem to have concerns about traffic and parking surrounding the stadium. If this does happen then to alleviate issues of traffic on match days councillors suggest ALL local park and ride (Eynsham, Thame, Peartree, Oxford etc) would need to be open to people and should include free buses into Kidlington to increase trade to Kidlington but less traffic. There will also need to be traffic schemes for match days only (at no charge to residents).

Noise concern was also raised up and people were interested in what local job opportunities there would be. One of the noise concerns was people (drinking etc.). It is not clear but potential that any pubs would be within the ground and managed.

We continue to wait for further detail, we expect more detail September onwards now. This goes to cabinet in September. We do wait for more information and continue to monitor; we will publish links to documents as they are published. We understand some documents were submitted to OCC on 5<sup>th</sup> June, but they have not been released to us yet.

The council would like to gather more information to enable us to provide more facts about the plans

and what they want to offer residents. This will enable us to inform to residents and help the council and residents make an informed decision on the stance toward the proposed stadium. A meeting will be arranged with stakeholders to work on getting this information. Following that we will look to share information with residents.

### **23/312 Parish Matters**

Name board on north end of Bicester Road / Islip obscured. OCC reduced to one a year cut so the parish will manage this.

Water Eaton Lane sign still needs replacing – street signage. OCC slow.

We would like to know what students think about the OUFC site. Cllr Simpson to help us to arrange discussion with the two schools in the parish. Feedback box in schools etc.

### **23/314 To allocate and discuss councillor roles and responsibilities**

These are lead responsibility groups for areas to be involved in and collective convey and represent council view (not individual) and to gather representative information for the parish council and residents.

*It is imperative that councillors declare interest in meetings when involved in any discussions if they have any conflicts.*

Four parishes meeting, Traffic Advisory and Kidlington Environment group – Chair or Vice Chair will attend these.

Chair and / or Vice Chair are automatically involved in all of these groups.

**Community Safety and Policing:** Nigel Simpson

**Education and Schools:** Nigel Simpson

**Environmental:** Ian Middleton, Clive Stayt, Suzanne Wilson-Higgins

**Finance:** Merlin Smith, Carol Matheson, Suzanne Wilson-Higgins, Clive Stayt

**OUFC:** Nick Duval, Clive Stayt, Nigel Simpson, Suzanne Wilson-Higgins

**Stratfield Brake:** Nick Duval, Clive Stayt, Nigel Simpson, Suzanne Wilson-Higgins

**Planning (excluding Stratfield Brake & OUFC):** Carol Matheson, Nigel Simpson, Merlin Smith, Suzanne Wilson-Higgins, Suzanne Mclvor

**Highways & Public transport:** Suzanne Mclvor, Ian Middleton, Merlin Smith, Suzanne Wilson-Higgins

**Recreation spaces including play areas:** Nick Duval, Clive Stayt

**Airport Liaison:** Clive Stayt, Nigel Simpson

All decision making is made at full council meetings and reports from meetings attended should be provided for meetings and public information.

### **23/315 Items for information and next agenda only**

Plan to share feedback from schools on OUFC in the July meeting.

### **23/316 Date of the next full council meeting – 4<sup>th</sup> July 2023- 7pm West Kidlington School**

*Meeting ends 9.15pm*