

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SHIPLAKE PARISH COUNCIL HELD IN SHIPLAKE
MEMORIAL HALL ON MONDAY NOVEMBER 12th AT 7.45 PM.**

- 1. PRESENT** Mr Taylor (Chairman) Mr R Head , Mr D Pheasant, Miss A Manning, Dr S Mann, Mr R Curtis, Mr F Maroudas, Mr G Davies and Mr C Penrose , Mr D Bartholomew(OCC)Mr P Harrison (DC)in addition there were three members of the public present
- 2. DECLARATIONS OF GIFTS & INTEREST.** Councillors were given the opportunity to declare any gifts or interest in any item on the Agenda. None declared.
- 3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SHIPLAKE PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON MONDAY OCTOBER 1st 2018** were approved on a motion proposed by Mr R Curtis and seconded by Mr D Pheasant.
- 4. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**
 1. Planning enforcement response to Chelford House. Letter received from Corey Webster
 2. Update on Neighbourhood Plan see below item 71/19.2
 3. Shiplake Landing Green CCTV Mr F Maroudas Mr Maroudas asked Mr Bartholomew whether Basmore had private road status. Mr Bartholomew to follow up
 4. Centenary Commemorative Sapling update Clerk informed Council that new supplies were due in and would be delivered to County Hall for collection.
 5. Shiplake Parish Council award ceremony 14th November 2018.No Councillors are available to attend
 6. Planning and Financial Working Parties terms of reference. Clerk. Council agreed for the groups to review their terms of reference and report back
- 5. POLICE MATTERS.**
 1. The following is a link which shows incidents/crimes that have happened in the Henley/Shiplake area. <https://www.police.uk/thames-valley/N379/crime/>. One incident recorded during Halloween

6. O.C.C. Cllr D Bartholomew

REPORT TO SHIPLAKE PARISH COUNCIL NOVEMBER 2018

GENERAL OCC REPORT

1.IN ALL TYPES OF WEATHER OCC CREWS ARE OUT REPAIRING THE ROADS

Earlier this year OCC put an extra £10m into fixing the roads

This has already resulted in £1.6m worth of surface dressing with around 33km of roads being surfaced. Work is also under way on a £700,000 programme of surfacing sealing projects around the county. As well as the extra cash which is going into some larger projects, the county council has also increased the amount of relatively small-scale work it does to put right local roads that are suffering from potholes, cracks and worn out tarmac. The number of completed defect repairs between January and September this year is 35,127.

2.SALTING, GRITTING AND SNOW CLEARANCE

. Precautionary salting (sometimes called

'gritting') helps achieve this aim. OCC usually salts between 2 November and 5 April. Live

updates can be found here: [https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/roads-andtransport/](https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/roads-andtransport/street-maintenance-z/salting-and-snow-clearance)

[street-maintenance-z/salting-and-snow-clearance](https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/roads-andtransport/street-maintenance-z/salting-and-snow-clearance) Details about how community

groups can request salt bins can be found here: <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/roadsand-transport/street-maintenance-z/salt-and-grit-bins>

3.COUNCIL TO INVEST IN TECHNOLOGY TO IMPROVE & REDUCE RUNNING COSTS

Plans to completely overhaul the county council were given the go-ahead by the county council's Cabinet on 16 October. They agreed a major investment in digital technology to improve customer service and reduce council running costs. The redesigned council will enable residents to report faults or book appointments online, freeing up staff time to help to service users who cannot go online or have complex care needs. Staff will be given the tools they need to do a better job and spend more time on delivering services to residents. Outdated ICT systems make it hard to join up services and will be replaced, with admin tasks automated to save money and make the council run more smoothly. The changes will support the county council's long-term vision of 'thriving communities for everyone in Oxfordshire'. The redesign is

also needed to secure the council's long-term financial stability as demand for services continues to rise – particularly for children and adult social care.

4. OCC TRADING STANDARDS & POLICE CONDUCT OPERATION ROGUE TRADER

Rogue traders and aggressive doorstep sellers were targeted during October by OCC Trading Standards as part of ongoing work to protect residents and business people. Working in collaboration with Thames Valley Police, Operation Rogue Trader aims to stop rogue business practices and raise awareness of the dangers linked to hiring cold-callers. Fourteen Trading Standards staff and around 30 police travelled around the county when 67 traders were approached and checked; ten warning letters were issued; five waste offenders were fined by district councils; and an overloaded vehicle was investigated along with seven doorstep crime offences and two police offences. In Henley four traders were checked; three warning letters were issued to traders for not providing 'cancellation rights' to residents; and there were three offences for carrying waste without a licence. In Witney 11 traders were checked; and two warning letters issued to traders for not providing 'cancellation rights' to residents. Those who suspect someone of being a rogue trader, or find themselves accosted by uninvited doorstep sellers should contact the Citizens Advice Consumer Helpline on 03454 040506.

5. BOOST FOR A 'FULL FIBRE' FUTURE IN OXFORDSHIRE

Hundreds of businesses and homes across Oxfordshire are set to benefit from faster internet connections, following the launch of the UK Government's nationwide Gigabit Broadband Voucher Scheme (GBVS). The £67m investment is in addition to the £200m allocated to the Local Full Fibre Networks (LFFN) programme, and will provide future-proof full fibre connections for businesses and the residential communities around them. It follows a successful pilot scheme launched in four areas around the country late last year, which has already seen nearly 1,000 vouchers used up to date. ThinkBroadband statistics show that 8% of homes and businesses in Oxfordshire already have a full fibre internet connection. Superfast broadband reaches almost 97% of premises, and even-quicker ultrafast broadband covers 51.3% of the county. The vouchers, worth up to £3,000 for a SME and £500 for a resident, provide a one-off contribution to subsidise the installation cost of gigabit-capable infrastructure. In addition to providing a boost to the 95% of the UK that can already get superfast speeds (24Mbps or faster), the vouchers could also help those not yet able to do so, helping to narrow the diminishing digital divide even further. The scheme launched at the end of March 2018 and will run until March 2021 or until all available funding has been allocated. For more information visit <https://gigabitvoucher.culture.gov.uk/>.

6. CARERS CAN SHOW BADGE FOR A FREE JAB

Flu season is coming and the army of front-line carers across Oxfordshire are being urged to make having a free jab a key priority. More than 8,500 staff employed in residential care, nursing homes or with registered domiciliary care providers, who are directly involved in the care of vulnerable people are entitled to a free flu jab. Keeping this valuable workforce fit and well is essential to easing winter pressures across the county's health and social care system. Being immunised not only reduces the chances of carers themselves and their families becoming unwell, it also means that the health of the most vulnerable people in Oxfordshire's communities is not compromised. The flu is not the same as getting a cold. It can seriously affect an individual's health and the risks of developing complications are greater for people within the 'at-risk' groups – for example the over 65s and those with medical conditions like heart, lung and kidney diseases, diabetes, asthma and multiple sclerosis. Healthy individuals usually recover within two to seven days, but for some influenza can lead to a stay in hospital, permanent disability or even death. All workers across the NHS will get flu jabs – meaning the immunisation of the whole health and social care workforce will make the system more resilient. As well as workers in social care settings, anyone who receives a carers allowance, or is the main carer for an elderly or disabled person, is eligible for a free vaccination; all they have to do is present their ID badge to a pharmacist or GP surgery.

SPECIFIC REPORT FOR SHIPLAKE

7. IMPROVING SAFETY ON A4155

Recent traffic surveys have shown that the average vehicle speed on the A4155 between Tower House and Mill Lane is 40mph. It is my view that the safety of road users would be improved if the speed limit was changed to 40mph to reflect the reality of the situation as there are no feasible measures to bring the average vehicle speed down. The current 30mph limit lulls local people into a false sense of security, while those unfamiliar with the area often tailgate vehicles in front or attempt dangerous overtaking manoeuvres. Before progressing this matter. I seek the views of the parish council.

8. MILL ROAD SURFACE DRESSING

I emailed the clerk on 10 October and asked him to advise parish councillors that this work has been postponed in view of the development work at Lashbrook Mead.

9. REPAIRS TO VERGE AT MEMORIAL AVENUE

Shortly after OCC completed the works, BT/Openreach turned up and undertook further works in the same place, disrupting all the new plantings/soil and filling the ditch with debris. I was advised by email on 01 November that remedial works had nearly been completed, but I drove past and was unsure the remedial work had even been started, let alone completed. In case I had missed something, I asked Cllr Head to check and he concurred with my view. I have referred the matter back to officers.

10. SIGNAGE AT SHIPLAKE PRIMARY FIXMYSTREET 764229

I am advised by officers that the necessary materials are now in stock and that the practical team are looking to undertake the works on Wednesday or Thursday of this week (14th /15th November).

11. ROAD SAFETY SIGNAGE

Progress on this matter had been delayed because of email address issues, which have now been resolved. Please advise if further input is required from me.

12. P18/S3210/O: RETIREMENT VILLAGE

OCC is objecting on Highways grounds. I have circulated the report to the PC Planning Group.

13. P18/S0951/O: 40 DWELLINGS AT FORMER WYEVALE GARDEN CENTRE

I attended the planning committee meeting on Wednesday 26th September in Didcot to speak against the proposal, but the decision was deferred pending a site visit and reappraisal of the applicant's viability report. I have not been notified of the new date.

14. CAVERSHAM QUARRY

The liaison group met on Thursday 18th October. Key points from the meeting are:

- 52,000 tonnes of sand/gravel have been extracted to date
- The internal road for backfill leading from the A4155 to the weighbridge has been constructed, as has the weighbridge itself
- Construction of the junction on the A4155 to the internal road has now commenced and will take around eight weeks
- Backfilling will commence in January
- Test drilling for a potential new site adjacent to Shiplake College is currently taking place (this is in response to the OCC call for potential future sites some ten years ahead)

15. TOWN AND PARISH LIAISON EVENT THURSDAY 17TH JANUARY 2019

As part of the Thriving Communities vision, OCC wants to move away from the traditional top-down service design and delivery and talk to people to help shape plans and hear local voices. To support this, there will be a town and parish liaison event on Thursday 17th January 2019 at Sonning Common Village Hall starting at 2pm and ending at 5pm. The event will start with a short presentation followed by round table discussions. Please register for the event at townparishevents@oxfordshire.gov.uk. All Councillors welcome .Dr S Mann available to attend

8. HIGHWAY MATTERS . Mr R Head reported on suggested highway works that could be implemented with costs shared between OCC/SPC County Councillor Priority Fund

- 1) Suggested highway works that could be implemented with cost shared between Oxfordshire County Council and Shiplake Parish Council. Renew white lining to the following junctions
I. Mill Road / Station Road
II. Mill Road /Mill Lane

III. Mill Lane /A 4155

- 2) Plowden Way - weeding pavement
- 3) War memorial surround - clear silt etc along kerbing and weeding pavement along A4155 plus verge
- 4) Clean directions signs on A4155
- 5) Remove small tree on field boundary that obscures vision to the right when exiting Memorial Avenue onto the A4155 .
- 6) Mr C Penrose also suggested that consideration should be given to improving the Parish's footpaths. In Winter they become very muddy and laying the most basic material scalplings across these areas would be much appreciated by the many residents and pupils/staff that use the footpaths:
 - I. Orchard Close-Reading Road
 - II. Badgers Walk

9. S.O.D.C. Cllr. P Harrison District Councillor's Report November 2018

1. RENEWABLE ENERGY WORKSHOP FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS

District councillors and neighbourhood planning groups are invited to attend our Renewable Energy Workshop on Wednesday 21 November.

The event, run in association with the Centre for Sustainable Energy (CSE), will be a fantastic opportunity to discover how neighbourhood plans could take advantage of renewable energy and address the issues of climate change. It will focus on:

- identifying potential renewable energy resources in the neighbourhood
- expressing support for specific forms of renewable energy
- identifying suitable sites
- promoting a more sustainable future

The workshop is being held in our offices at 135 Eastern Avenue between 1pm and 4.30pm.

We expect this event to be popular, so are working on a first come, first served basis. Anyone wishing to attend should register online before 5pm on Wednesday 14 November.

2. HOUSING LAND SUPPLY BRIEFING NOTE

The Secretary of State has confirmed that we only need to show a three-year supply of land for housing, rather than five, until the completion of the Joint Statutory Spatial Plan.

3. BUSINESS AWARDS LAUNCH

Our Economic Development Team would like to invite you to attend the launch of the first-ever South and Vale Business Awards on 31 October at Cornerstone.

The launch and networking event takes place 9am-11am and will explain how you can nominate successful businesses in our region for one or more of the seven award categories.

You can register to attend and find out more information on the awards on the SO Business websites. Nominations will continue to be accepted into the new year and the awards ceremony is set to take place at Williams F1 on 15 March.

For more information on the work the team do to help businesses in our districts email Economic Development or call 01235 422213.

4. GIGABIT SCHEME

Let your local businesses and residents know that they can apply for the government's gigabit scheme that supports communities to achieve a better broadband connection.

The scheme is designed for small and medium businesses to access up to £3,000 worth of vouchers to upgrade their internet connection.

Groups of residents can also apply for a voucher of up to £500 for each domestic connection - as long as a local business is involved in the scheme and is the main beneficiary.

Businesses and residents can check their eligibility via gigabitvoucher.culture.gov.uk/

5. COUNCILLOR COMMUNITY GRANTS

Like last year each councillor can give grants up to a maximum of £5,000. This need to be submitted before 17th December. Grants from a minimum of £250 up to the maximum of £5,000 can be requested.

Because we have 2 councillors, we have a total of £10,000 to be spent between the 5 parishes which make up this ward. So far this year we haven't had any requests for our ward.

We have simplified the process of application and unlike last year grants can be shared between councillors if both agree.

Last year we lost out on £5,000 in grants as we could not transfer grants from one council to another. Council suggested that the Memorial Hall should apply as the trustees were looking for support to replace the panels at the rear of the stage ACTION : Miss A Manning and chairman of MH

6. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY**

Last week I signed off the Community Infrastructure Levy after it completed its consultation process. The breakdown is follows: -

Initial Spending

Towns or Parishes with a neighbourhood plan	25%
Towns or Parishes without a neighbourhood plan	15%
Admin and Support	5%
- Planning Dept	2.5%
- Development & Regeneration	2.5%

Remainer

Oxfordshire County Council (transport & education)	50%
Oxfordshire Clinical Commission Group	20%
SODC Sports & Leisure	20%
Infrastructure & Biodiversity	5%
Public Art/Public Realm	5%

CIL funding can only be given to the Town or Parish where the development takes place.

CIL does not replace S106 agreements. S106 agreements will be used for most strategic sites but CIL will be used for all the other developments.

We've been collecting CIL money since 1st April 2016 and this will be the first time we've started to distribute the money. We will review the allocation after 1 year and depending on the feedback we can adjust the scheme then.

Councillor Harrison was asked to clarify wider CIL money from Thames Farm was to be allocated to Henley and Harpsden neighbourhood plan and not for the village within which the properties are being built. Mr. T Taylor requested a statement to that effect.

7. **FREE PARKING IN THE RUN UP TO CHRISTMAS**

As with previous years the SODC run carparks in Henley will be free on Tuesday on the run up to Christmas starting on the 4th December.

10. OPEN FORUM The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.02pm to allow input from members of the public present. Mr Stewart expressed concerns and asked Council's views on the planning developments at Kingsley House. Dr S Mann responded. The open forum was closed at 8.11pm and the meeting resumed.

11. SPECIAL REPORTS-PLANNING. Letter received from Thames Farm Architects requesting a meeting to discuss site development plans. Council agreed and requested Clerk to set up a convenient date Councillors to include Mr R Curtis, Dr S Mann, Mr D Pheasant and Mr R Head. ACTION : Clerk

12. PLANNING report and recommendations from Planning Working Party:

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDED RESPONSES SINCE 1st OCTOBER 2018.

1. P18/S3409/HH. Single story rear extension (replacement of conservatory with garden room). Berwin House Crowsley Road RG9 3LD. Applicant: Mr Roger Smith. Comments by 17/11/18.

RECOMMEND NO OBJECTION.

2. P18/S3210/O. Outline application for the development of land to the east of Reading Road to consist of an extra care development of up to 65 units comprising of apartments and cottages (Use Class 2); associated communal facilities; provision of vehicular and cycle parking together with all necessary internal roads and footpaths; provision of open space and associated landscape works; and ancillary works and structures. Land to the east of Reading Road lower Shiplake RG9 4BG. Applicant: Retirement Villages Group. Comments by 24 October (2 November). **RECOMMEND STRONG OBJECTION.**

Response to application P18/S3210/O

Shiplake Parish Council is strongly opposed to this application and recommend refusal on the basis of location, not compliant with SODC housing policy, and unsustainability. The reasons given by the planning officer for refusal of the previous application still apply.

2.1. Location. The site is outside the built-up area of Lower Shiplake and in open countryside in the gap separating Lower Shiplake and Shiplake Cross. The proposal would have an unacceptable urbanising effect and detract from the character and appearance of the site. The proposed complex pedestrian access structure would significantly further detract from the rural, sylvan approach to the village with the loss of trees and extensive work proposed to elevate the walkway. The walking distance to the village would be too far for elderly residents and probably too far for workers who might wish to travel by train. The location therefore fails the test of sustainability. Furthermore, as the proposed dwellings have no immediate access to the villages this would result in isolation of the residents which has been shown to be detrimental to the mental health of the aging population. The proposed facilities do not replace integration with a mixed community which helps to delay the onset of dementia. Access to the proposed development is onto a busy A road with the approach obscured by a curve and hill. The applicant has acknowledged extensive non-compliance with the speed limit and the proposed traffic calming would be both ineffective and inappropriate.

2.2 SODC Housing Policy is for provision of an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes that meet the needs of the district. This proposal meets neither the needs of the village nor the district. There is currently over provision of retirement accommodation in the Henley, Harpsden, Shiplake area with another large project being currently built. Housing assessment by SODC and Shiplake parish demonstrates the need for smaller, more affordable housing to ensure the long-term viability of the village.

2.3. This proposal would not contribute to the local economy by supporting growth, innovation, and productivity. Any workers in the proposed development would have to travel to work adding to the areas traffic and pollution problems. It would cause further deterioration in the villages demographics which have shown a continuing increase in the percentage of elderly residents. The results of the Neighbourhood Plan survey showed none of the residents over 65 who are planning to move in the next 10 years wish to move to retirement village type dwellings; the desire is very much for smaller dwellings within the built-up area of the village.

2.4. Oxfordshire CCG has raised concerns about being able to provide the addition services that would be needed. This is of particular concern considering the age of potential residents and the stress already on services for over 65 age group.

2.5. We also question the financial viability of the proposal due to the overprovision of such accommodation in the area. Indeed, the parent company is having difficulty selling similar dwellings that are close to the centre of Henley.

3. P18/S2951/HH. Addition of rear dormer over staircase & smaller dormers to the front (amended plans received 16 October 2018 showing alterations to the windows on the rear dormer, reduced in size for the staircase window and two smaller windows for the bathroom. The windows are shown to be fitted with obscure glazing and fixed shut with the exception of a top fan openable for bathroom windows). The Knoll Crowsley Road lower Shiplake RG9 3JT. Applicant: Matthew Marchant. Comments by 31 October 2018. **RECOMMEND: NO OBJECTIONS** but to take into account previous concerns for traffic management.

4. P18/S3354/FUL. Erection of 1.5 storey detached 5-bedroom dwelling with detached double garage. Land adjacent to Kingsley House Crowsley Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3LU. Applicant: Mr Ian McKean. Comments by 2 November 2018. **RECOMMENDATION TO SODC BY FULL PARISH COUNCIL IS NO OBJECTIONS** but to take into account recommendations and comply with the advice from the various surveys including tree, environmental and wildlife.

This was a difficult decision as the PC has previously strenuously opposed any development on this site and as considered outside the village curtilage. Because of this and that there was a split decision on the planning working group advice was sought from NALC who advised garnering views of the whole Parish Council by email as an extraordinary PC meeting would be difficult if not impossible to arrange.

The factors influencing the decision were:

- Full review of objections to previous applications since 1965.
- Recent changes in NPPF and local planning policy relating to infill in small villages. This was thoroughly discussed with the relevant planning officer with review of current local and national government guidance on these issues.
- The need for consistency in decisions by the Parish Council. The Parish Council offered no objection to the development of the two houses off Mill Lane. These make the argument for the site being infill very strong.
- Kingsley House is now apartments instead of a single residence.
- The residents' comments and views were taken into account.

On considering material planning considerations that are normally taken into account in the determination of applications and the above, objection to this application was deemed futile by the majority of all parish council members (one opposed, one willing to go with majority decision).

See appendix 1 for comments from Councillors

The planning recommendations were then approved on a motion proposed by Mr T Taylor and seconded by Mr D Pheasant

PLANNING DECISIONS

1. P18/S3104/HH

Saffrons Station Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3JP

Construction of kitchen extension

12 September 2018

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED

2. P18/S3085/HH

Coolhurst Mill Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3LW

Proposed garden room extension and ancillary works

11 September 2018

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED

3. P18/S2699/HH

Chestnut House Station Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3JS

Extension and alteration with a replacement garage

15 August 2018

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED

4. P18/S2437/FUL

Land to the West of Ridgeways New Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3LA

Development of two large family dwellings, with associated landscaping (as amended to re-position Plot 2).

1 August 2018

REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

5. P18/S1046/FUL

Land at Sheephouse Farm Reading Road Henley-On-Thames RG9 4HF
 Proposed construction of energy centre plant building and enclosure in connection with new watch making and administrative building approved by application P17/S1888/FUL.
 29 March 2018

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

6. P18/S2405/HH

Little Purbeck Bolney Road Lower Shiplake RG9 3NS

Erection of two-storey side extension with link to existing dwelling. New double garage with store. (Amended plans received 1 October 2018 showing the first-floor window on the east elevation of the garage removed).

13 July 2018

PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED

13. FINANCIAL MATTERS.

1. The following payments require approval :

R V Hudson – salary October	62.18	102721	351.78
R V Hudson – expenses, office allowance. October	63.18	102722	129.75
Inland Revenue – clerk’s tax October	64.18	BACS	234.52
Robin Head (Grasscutting)	65.18	102723	75.00
Staples (Office expenses)	66.18	102724	79.32
SODC(Dog Bin Servicing)	67.18	102725	13.09
Shiplake Court Ltd (playground maintenance)	68.18	102728	155.00
Broadband	69.18	DD	39.00

The month accounts were approved on a motion proposed Mr T Taylor and seconded by Mr R Curtis

2. The FWP did not meet so there was no opportunity to discuss comments from auditors report off line .The Clerk has discussed the issues with OALC and their advice is for Shiplake Parish Council to review its terms of reference /working practices of the two working parties as discussed in item 4.6

3.The following grant requests were reviewed and if appropriate approved

- 1) Royal British Legion(Grant) approved £350.00(2017-18) Provisional Budget £350
- 2) Citizens Advice Bureau(Grant) approved £250.00(2017-18) Provisional Budget £250
- 3)J Tabor Be Free Young Carers (Grant) not approved nothing in budget
- 4) Shiplake Memorial Hall sum tbc committed already this year £1609 Provisional Budget £3000 see item 8.5 .Council agreed to consider making up any shortfall if Councillor Community grant did not cover full project
- 5)The Rosemary Club approved £650.00(2017-18)Provisional Budget £650

Items 1,2,and 5 were approved on a motion proposed by Mr G Davies and seconded by Mr F Maroudas

13. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION.

69/19 RECREATION GROUNDS/OPFA

- 1. Badgers Walk -.Detailed review of RoSPA reports for Badgers Walk and Memorial Hall , no urgent issues clerk has enquired from Association of Playground Contractors to get quote to repair wet pour under slide
- 2. Memorial Hall. Mr G Davies to report on the condition of the equipment and the general condition of the playground.

70/19 FOOTPATHS

71/19 SHIPLAKE – DEVELOPMENT OF FACILITIES.

1.Privacy Statement, GDPR legislation and Neighbourhood Plan Council was discussed no action at this stage

2. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN UPDATE - NOVEMBER 2018

See Appendix 2

72/19 ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

73/19 CHILTERN SOCIETY/CPRE/AONB

AONB update .Mr R Head reported .

- 1) More information requested on national parks available by Sue Biggs Chairman of Kidmore End PC and member of Chilterns Conservation Board
- 2) Map showing the complete AONB to be produced by David Woodward, Chairman of Eye & Dunsden Parish Council
- 3) Meeting with John Howell MP, Sue Biggs to report back and Liz ransome to produce a draft letter to John Howell and then to set up a meeting in the spring for a public forum .
- 4) Latest Chiltern /Conservation Board /Society newsletters circulated by email
- 5) Latest CPRE newsletter circulated by email

74/19 S.O.D.C. /OCC

75/19 O.A.L.C. /O.R.C.C.

1. Latest 2018 OALC update circulated by email

76/19 MEMORIAL HALL. Miss A Manning reported that at a meeting of the Hall trustees the Hall will be registered under CIO shortly

77/19 DEFRA & OTHER GOVERNMENT CORRESPONDENCE

78/19 TOWNLANDS & OXFORDSHIRE PCT.

14 CORRESPONDENCE Email from SOHA in response to Clerks query re use of resident's lounge for community meetings

Dear Roger,

Thank you for your email about the residents' lounge that is under development in Shiplake.

We are always happy to work with local communities in looking at the use of residents' lounges. Our residents retain primary control of their lounges and pay towards their upkeep as part of their service charges.

However, where a significant number of Soha residents support the use of the lounge by local groups then we are happy to look at arrangements. We would have to consider safety, security and safeguarding but groups such as lunch clubs are often successfully run in Soha lounges.

Once the residents start to move into their new homes then we will be in a position to consider any requests from local groups.

Thanks, and best wishes,

Jude McCaffrey | Head of Housing | T: 01235 515900 / 0800 014 15 45 (freephone)

15. ITEMS OF INTEREST OR FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION.

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting at 10.57pm

R.V. Hudson.

Clerk to the Council

26/11/2018

APPENDIX 1

On Wed, Oct 17, 2018 at 6:08 PM, <smann@shiplakepc.com> wrote:

Dear all,

I would appreciate your thoughts on this application. I have had a discussion with Paul Lucas regarding whether it can be considered infill. Under current infill policy based on the updated NPPF and local planning policy, CSR1 means it can be considered infill. The GDB is irrelevant as the NP is not made. There is a good deal of information including preapplication advice on the website.

Thanks,

Susan

On Wed, Oct 17, 2018 at 10:07 PM, fmaroudas <fmaroudas@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hi Susan

I think we need to think this through very carefully. Development on this site has always been refused in the past on the basis that it is outside the curtilage of the village. This position was supported in appeal by the inspector. My present view is that we should recommend refusal on this basis.

Kind regards

Fred

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

----- Original message -----

From: Mr R Curtis <rcurtis@shiplake.org.uk>

Date: 17/10/2018 18:13 (GMT+00:00)

To: Sue Mann <smann@shiplakepc.com>

Subject: Re: P18/S3354/FUL Kingsley response by 2 November

Dear Sue,

I looked at this application thoroughly at the weekend when Roger sent it through.

I can see no reason for objection.

Kind regards

Richard

Best wishes

Richard

Richard Curtis

From: fmaroudas@shiplakepc.com <fmaroudas@shiplakepc.com>

Sent: 18 October 2018 14:08

To: smann@shiplakepc.com; 'Mr R Curtis' <rcurtis@shiplake.org.uk>; 'fmaroudas' <fmaroudas@yahoo.com>

Subject: RE: P18/S3354/FUL Kingsley response by 2 November

Dear all

This continues seriously to trouble me.

We are due to publish the draft NDP within a matter of days. The NDP proposes the establishment of a development boundary; and further proposes that development of new dwellings, including infill, is not permitted outside the development boundary. The boundary itself has been based explicitly on previous decisions that this specific site was outside the curtilage of Lower Shiplake.

I do not see how we can publish a draft NDP which proposes the prohibition of infill development outside the curtilage of the village; and in the very same week approve just such a development.

26/11/2018

Page 10 of 16

Sorry to be contrary.
Fred

From: smann@shiplakepc.com <smann@shiplakepc.com>
Sent: 18 October 2018 12:21
To: 'Mr R Curtis' <rcurtis@shiplake.org.uk>; 'fmaroudas' <fmaroudas@yahoo.com>
Subject: RE: P18/S3354/FUL Kingsley response by 2 November

Dear Richard (all)

Indeed, that development is part of the reason the current proposal would be considered infill and previous judgements don't necessarily apply anymore. The question of the curtilage regarding this site is now arguable from a planning policy point of view. I can't see a valid argument that would let us win this one if we objected, so suggest we recommend no objection but with compliance with restrictions from forestry and ecology reports

Kind regards

Susan

From: Tudor <tudorhtaylor@hotmail.com>

Sent: 18 October 2018 19:59

To: smann@shiplakepc.com

Subject: Re: P18/S3354/FUL Kingsley response by 2 November

Hi Susan

This is really difficult and I'm at a distance as you know - I can see the validity of both sets of arguments. I think we will not convince the PO particularly as it's Paul Lucas but Fred's argument might persuade the Planning Committee and on that basis I'm for refusing.

Happy to go with PC majority though.

R

Tudor

Sent from my iPhone

On 18 Oct 2018, at 08:45, "smann@shiplakepc.com" <smann@shiplakepc.com> wrote:

Dear Fred and all,

This does not effect the NP. If the NP were made we would have some grounds to object, but it isn't.

As the application for the two houses on Mill Road was unopposed by the PC and has been approved AND there is new guidance on infill, etc it makes grounds for objection difficult. The site is now surrounded on 3 sides and is small enough to be infill. .

If the majority of the PC want to recommend refusal we will have to do that as it's a democratic decision, but with little chance of convincing the planning officer. That is why I have given you the results of the discussion with Paul Lucas. It would be a futile battle when we need to put most of our energies into the Wyevale and retirement village battles.

Let's see what the others say. We can certainly say we are disappointed at the relaxation of defining what is or isn't infill after historically defending the site.

Best regards

Susan

From: Mr R Curtis <rcurtis@shiplake.org.uk>

Sent: 18 October 2018 05:08

To: fmaroudas <fmaroudas@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: P18/S3354/FUL Kingsley response by 2 November

Dear Fred,

With all due respect, we raised no objection to the development of two houses on Mill Road just to the East of Kingsley House, which one could argue was outside the curtilage of the village too.

Personally, I would struggle with that argument.

Kind regards

Richard

Richard Curtis

----- Original message -----

From: David Pheasant <david@davidpheasant.com>

Date: 19/10/2018 17:10 (GMT+00:00)

To: smann@shiplakepc.com

Subject: Re: Planning applicationP18/S3354/FUL

Susan

Sorry not to have been able to respond before now. Yes, a difficult one given past position on applications re this site. Given recent changes in Planning guidelines, history of the site and related buildings with flats created, the status of our NP and our recent decision not to object to the 2 houses at Kingsley Gate leads me to conclude that 'no Objection' should be our response.

Rgds

David

Sent from my iPhone

From: Gregg Davies <gdavies@shiplakepc.com>

Sent: 19 October 2018 17:34

To: smann@shiplakepc.com

Subject: RE: Planning applicationP18/S3354/FUL

Dear Susan

I concur with David. No objection

On 19 Oct 2018, at 13:59, <smann@shiplakepc.com> <smann@shiplakepc.com> wrote:

Dear all,

You are not on the Planning working group, but we have a split decision on the recommendations for this proposal. I would be most grateful for your views. Sorry but it is urgent as the recommendation needs to be in by 24 October.

We have historically since 1967 recommended refusal of development on the site as it is outside the village curtilage and landscape value.

The proposal is likely to be recommended for approval by the planning officer. The proposal is partly based on the site being infill.

There is mention of the GDB for the NP, but this is irrelevant as the NP is not made and if it was this proposal would not be appropriate due to its size.

What is relevant is that there are new National and local guidelines as to what constitutes infill. According to this, as the site is bounded by dwellings on 3 sides and on the edges of the built-up area, it can be considered infill.

The 2 houses currently being constructed off Mill Lane make up the eastern boundary of the site. The Parish Council did not object to these dwellings.

All this plus other factors have been taken into account by the planning officer. You can see pre-submission advice, reports, and the plans on the SODC planning application website.

The two points of view by the working group are:

1. The PC has historically resisted applications for development on this site and should continue to do so on the basis of village curtilage and landscape value. It is felt we could make a good argument at committee by 2 members.

2. Although we have historically resisted development on this site, with the changes in definition of infill and the change in the adjoining sites meaning this site is bounded on three sides on the edge of the built-up settlement, we would have difficulty justifying recommending refusal. This is particularly in view of the no objection to the adjoining development on the east ,i.e., the 2 houses off Mill Road. It is felt that this would be futile effort under current conditions.

You can find full details of the application at Southoxon.gov.uk/planning. Then enter the application number or follow the link on Rogers email about the application.

Please give me your views ASAP.

Kind regards

Susan

From: smann@shiplakepc.com <smann@shiplakepc.com>

Sent: 19 October 2018 17:10

To: 'Chris Penrose' <cpenrose@shiplakepc.com>

Subject: RE: Planning applicationP18/S3354/FUL

Dear Chris,

Thank you for your prompt reply. I am collating the replies in an effort to make sure there are not a lot of crossed emails. Everyones views are in the public domain.

You are correct in your assumptions, well done. GDB by the way means Guide Development Boundary and is important in what type of development can be done where.

Outside the village curtilage is outside the built up area and yes, its previously been felt the area was important because of its history and landscape. Back in 1995 there was a Judicial review about the whole Kingsley House estate, that has pretty much been superceded by changes in legislation and circumstances.

As for the trees, they already have tree protection orders on them and there would be conditions put on any development about their retention and preservation.

If you want any explanations of terms etc, please feel free to ask. I've not been on the Parish Council very long but have been involved with the Neighbourhood Plan for 18 months. You will get taken through a lot of things but it can still be a bit confusing, especially when planning policy Nationally and locally keeps changing!

Kind regards

Susan

From: Chris Penrose <cpenrose@shiplakepc.com>

Sent: 19 October 2018 16:08

To: smann@shiplakepc.com

Subject: RE: Planning applicationP18/S3354/FUL

Dear Susan,

I have responded only to you in line with your request.

I'm afraid I did not fully understand some terms:

1. 'GDB' and I could find no reference to it in the planning application materials. I'm guessing it is something about helping to reach required minimum NP build targets.
2. *We have historically since 1967 recommended refusal of development on the site as it is out side the village curtilage and landscape value*. I'm guessing this is something about the land and house should remain all together as this is of some (historic) value to the village?

However, given the material in your note and reviewing the application in isolation I am in camp 2. [*Although we have historically resisted development on this site, with the changes in definition of infill and the change in the adjoining sites meaning this site is bounded on three sides on the edge of the built up settlement, we would have difficulty justifying recommending refusal. This is particularly in view of the no objection to the adjoining development on the east ,i.e., the 2 houses off Mill Road. It is felt that this would be futile effort under current conditions*']

My reasoning:

1. Consistency: I think this is in line with other infill decisions such as in the land at Shiplake Grange at Shiplake Cross made in the last few years which would likewise could have claimed to be important and of historical value to the village. They were approved and built.
2. The changed infill definition and the village's preference for infill type development.
3. The plan: The area here is bound by high trees and the proposed building is a modest height. This should restrict the impact it has on surrounding properties and village sightlines

Idea:

Is it perhaps appropriate to request Tree Preservation Orders on trees of value, not just protection of them in the building phase? Is this something we could recommend to offset any loss of village sight lines?

Chris

From: fmaroudas <fmaroudas@yahoo.com>

Sent: 20 October 2018 13:02

To: David Pheasant <david@davidhpheasant.com>; smann@shiplakepc.com

Subject: Re: Planning applicationP18/S3354/FUL

I wonder whether I might propose a compromise? This application clearly raises important issues. It seems to me that they would benefit from a face to face discussion, which we haven't had either at PWG or PC. May I suggest that at this stage we put in an objection, which we can always withdraw if we wish following a full discussion at the November PC?

From: smann@shiplakepc.com <smann@shiplakepc.com>

Sent: 21 October 2018 18:02

To: 'fmaroudas' <fmaroudas@yahoo.com>; 'David Pheasant' <david@davidhpheasant.com>

Subject: RE: Planning applicationP18/S3354/FUL

Dear Fred,

Like you I initially felt an objection was appropriate, but I have spent a lot of time investigating everything relating to this application, including reason for the decisions on previous applications all the way back to 1967 and the recent changes to planning policy nationally and locally. Once I had done that it was clear to me that I personally felt we could not defend a recommendation for refusal. I also recognise that every member of the parish council has the right to express their views and Have that counted.

I understand how you feel on this, but we have taken the views of the whole PC. Everyone has had an opportunity to look at the application and hear the results of the conversation with Paul Lucas as to his reasons about this being infill. I have looked at the planning references he gave me about changes in designation of infill. The site does meet the criteria. CSR1 is quite different to the previous guidance on infill.

In the past, you have stressed consistency in our recommendations and I agree that is important. It would be difficult to justify objecting to this one and not the previous application for the two houses at Kingsley Gate. I have sought guidance about what to do in this circumstance where the planning working group cannot agree, and the response is due before the next meeting. I have followed guidance by having the whole parish council give their views electronically. As long as everyone has access to the application (and they do) email is deemed sufficient.

The response is due by midday Wednesday. To try to have an extraordinary Parish Council meeting would be difficult and, in my view, unnecessary as per above. Sending a response which is the opposite to the majority view would be perverse.

In any case, once it was clear that the majority of the members of parish council recommended no objection, I posted the response as no objection to be sure it arrived on time. Even if it wasn't already posted I would not have been happy to send a recommendation opposite to the majority view.

Sorry you are so unhappy about the decision not to object to this application, but it is the majority view.

Regards, Susan

From: smann@shiplakepc.com <smann@shiplakepc.com>

Sent: 22 October 2018 18:27

To: 'Chris Penrose' <cpenrose@shiplakepc.com>

Subject: RE: Planning applicationP18/S3354/FUL

Hi Chris,

26/11//2018

That's fine. Either way the emails are open to everyone if needed.

All the best,

Susan

From: Chris Penrose <cpenrose@shiplakepc.com>

Sent: 22 October 2018 11:40

To: smann@shiplakepc.com

Subject: RE: Planning applicationP18/S3354/FUL

Hi Susan,

Thanks for this.

I see everyone 'replies to all'. I'll do that in future.

Chris

APPENDIX 2

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN UPDATE – NOVEMBER 2018

- 1. Draft Pre-consultation Document: Following reported meeting with SODC on 04/09/2018 and Susan Mann’s responses to SODC’s specific requests, two subsequent meetings have taken place with SODC with the objective of finalisation of text regarding planning policies (02/10/2018) and matters related to site selection process (17/10/2018). The summary of the actions arising from these meetings is outlined below. The most immediate outcome was the decision to defer the pre-consultation phase of the plan, which it had been hoped would start on 22/10/2018. This will necessarily result in a delay to all subsequent aspects of the project. The principle reasons for the delays relate to the impact of new NPPF and Neighbourhood Planning legislation, coupled with SODC’s increased experience of neighbourhood plan outcomes, not least in respect of the ‘robustness’ of plans when objections to a plan’s proposals are raised.**
 - 2. Planning Policies (02/10/2018): Revisions to planning policies are largely cosmetic, including elements of layout and text considered to be of an ancillary support nature or unnecessary/redundant and therefore moved or deleted. Some ‘policies’ e.g. ‘Protection and Enhancement of Community Asset’ and ‘Highway Safety and Sustainability’ are better referenced as ‘Aspirations’ rather than as policies. It was agreed that SODC provide proposed new text for certain policies and any other suggested elements, consistent with new NPPF guidelines. The changes are expected by w.e.17/11/2018.**
 - 3. Site Selection Process (17/10/2018): Whilst recognising the professionalism with which the site selection process was undertaken by the Steering Group, SODC feel this aspect of neighbourhood plans needs to be as robust as possible, again reflecting recent experience of objections to plans and the increased requirement for specialist expertise. Whilst there is frustration that this will extend the period prior to the pre-consultation process, available members the SG met on 17/10/2018 and 18/10/2018 to discuss possible options and voted 5-0* in favour of seeking the services of AECOM to undertake a supplementary site selection evaluation, based on their established methodology. This approach will ensure our plan is as robust as possible in challenging predatory developer applications inconsistent with our proposed plan. (NOTE: This option is based the services of AECOM being available through the government’s Locality funding programme.)**
 - 4. NP Evidence Base, GDPA and Privacy/Confidentiality & Project Plan: Meetings to be arranged as required to progress and monitor this phase of the NP.**
 - 5. As stated previously, if agreed draft plan changes do not impact current SEA, approve it as final version for submission with Pre-consultation document.**
 - 6. Once pre-consultation draft agreed initiate AECOM ‘health check’.**
 - 7. Retirement Village Planning Application: As changes in the new application for this site are not significantly different to the prior application, from a landscape perspective, the landscape assessment prepared for this site produced by the retained consultant for the NP, has been submitted as an objection to the application on behalf of the SG.**
- There are currently 7 members of the NP Steering Group**

David Pheasant –12/11/2018