

**Minutes of the Meeting of Fringford Parish Council, held on  
Monday 20 April 2015, in the Chinnery Room of Fringford Village Hall at 7.45pm**

**Present:** John Fargin (Chairman), Les Harris, Jan Macijewski, David McCullagh,  
John Reader  
**In attendance:** 17 members of the public, (14 of whom attended until 8.30pm), Cllr Barry  
Wood, Jane Olds (Parish Clerk)  
**Apologies:** Mick Cowland, Adrian Thwaites

**1. Apologies**

The Councillors **RESOLVED** to accept Mick Cowland's and Adrian Thwaites' apologies.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

Jan Macijewski declared an interest in the planning applications reference 15/00485/F and 15/00486/F. The Councillors **RESOLVED** that Mr Macijewski may take part in the discussion.

**3. Public Participation**

17 members of the public attended the meeting.

The Councillors **RESOLVED** to bring forward items 9a, Speed Checks; 9b, War Memorial and 12a, i and ii Planning applications, to the beginning of the meeting in order that the members of the public could give their views.

**Speed checks (item 9a)**

The Chairman asked the members of the public their views on speeding and where they thought the most appropriate place might be to install the speed monitoring devices.

Following discussion and input from members of the public, the Councillors **RESOLVED** to agree to paying £100 each for two monitoring devices which would monitor speed in both directions; one on the Stratton Audley Road as vehicles enter the village and one on Main Street near the telephone box.

The Clerk would arrange installation.

**War Memorial (item 9b)**

The Clerk had received 16 comments from villagers about the relocation of the War Memorial. 14 villagers were in favour of keeping it where it is. Two villagers wanted the War Memorial moved, but no alternative site was suggested. The Church had also been contacted and preferred the current position.

A number of the villagers raised the point that the War Memorial had been paid for by public subscription in the 1920s and that those involved at the time had chosen to put it in the churchyard. The general consensus was that it should be left where it is as it is both a grave and a memorial, but that it would be good to be able to make that area of the churchyard more prominent and accessible with a new path.

The Councillors **RESOLVED** to agree to leave the War Memorial in its current position.

The Chairman had returned the paperwork to the National Heritage Lottery Fund for the grant funding and is awaiting final confirmation. This grant funding is to help towards the straightening, cleaning and re-lettering of the War Memorial, but also to contribute towards the History project in the new Chinnery Room and the production of First World War village trail leaflets. There is now adequate funding for the project to be completed.

There was also the suggestion that a memorial plaque might be installed on the new part of the village hall when it is completed.

The Clerk has updated the contractors Underwood and Weston.

**Planning Applications (item 12a, i and ii)**

- i. 15/00485/F, Mr and Mrs Ward, Former Rosemary, Main Street; Variation of Conditions 1 and 2 of 13/00718/F - Plot 1 only (to retain house with an altered façade/side elevation) - No changes to Plot 2

The applicants were invited to comment on the application but declined to do so. A number of villagers expressed their views about the development in general.

The Chairman introduced, at the request of a Parishioner, that an image from Google Earth showing the original cottage be taken into consideration. This image was distributed at the meeting but it was felt that it did not give an accurate view because of the angle and scale. (It was confirmed that the image had been considered thoroughly in relation to earlier applications.)

The general consensus was that the Planning Inspector had, in allowing an earlier appeal, specified certain changes to part of the front of Plot 1 which have not yet been undertaken. Cherwell District Council is not able to enforce the Planning Inspector's recommendations because the two new applications being considered at this meeting had been made.

Concern was raised by members of the public that the Planning Inspector's ruling had been ignored. It was agreed that there was very little difference between the current application and a previous application (reference 14/00817/F) which had been refused by CDC apart from the fact that the number of bedrooms had increased from three to four in plot 2 which is a change.

Mr Fargin brought the discussion to a close. Following consideration, the Councillors **RESOLVED** to agree to object to the application on the grounds that the application had not substantially changed from the previous application which the Parish Council had already objected to and that CDC had refused. Namely that:

- the application to all intents and purposes had been refused by Committee in July 2014;
- the application does not remedy the fundamental problem that the houses were built 1.2 metres too far forward of the approved position and the proposed plans do not conform to the Planning Inspector's recommendation that the whole of the first floor be set back by 1.1 metres;
- as proposed the forward projection of the dwellings still negatively affects the street scene;

- the minimal alterations to the dwellings will not sufficiently reduce the overbearing impact on Kohanka or the listed building – the Forge - opposite.

It was agreed to also append the response to CDC with the relevant sections of the Planning Officer's Report to the Planning Committee of 10 July 2014

- ii. 15/00486/F, Mr and Mrs Ward, Former Rosemary, Main Street; Removal of Conditions 1 and 2 of 13/00718/F (retain Plot 1 building "as built" with first floor side window to be removed) - Plot 1 only

It was noted that this application was to retain Plot 1 of the development with the minor amendment of a blocked up side window. No changes to Plot 2 were proposed.

The applicants were invited to comment on the application but declined to do so. A number of villagers expressed their views about the development in general, and in particular commented that this application did not meet the requirements of the Planning Inspector or overcome the problems highlighted in the objections from the Parish Council in respect of application 15/00485/F, which claimed that only three bedrooms existed.

Following further discussion the Councillors **RESOLVED** to agree to object to the application on the grounds referred to in the previous application. Concern was raised that it would regularise the development which would not remedy the problems highlighted in earlier planning application refusals, would not meet the requirements of the Planning Inspector and would not overcome the following issues:

- the application does not remedy the fundamental problem that the houses were built 1.2 metres too far forward of the approved position and the proposed plans do not conform to the Planning Inspector's recommendation that the whole of the first floor be set back by 1.1 metres;
- as proposed, the forward projection of the dwellings still negatively affects the street scene;
- the minimal alterations to the dwellings will not sufficiently reduce the overbearing impact on Kohanka or the listed building – the Forge – opposite.

It was agreed that the Parish Council should ask CDC to refer both of the above applications to the Planning Committee.

### **Village Pump**

Comment was made that the restoration of the pump has been well done.

No further questions or comments were raised and 14 members of the public left at 8.30pm.

#### **4. Minutes of the Meeting held on 16 March 2015**

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes be accepted as a true record and were signed by the Chairman of the meeting.

#### **5. Update on progress from the Minutes**

##### **a. Emergency Planning**

The Councillors agreed to adding Emergency Planning to the next agenda

**b. Village Website**

The new website is progressing.

**c. Caravan on the Green**

This has now found a new home and been moved.

**6. Report from District and County Councillors**

Councillor Wood reported that the Local Plan had been submitted, but that no announcement would be made while the Government was in Purdah, so CDC is likely to hear after the General Election on 7 May. The response will be one of three:

1. that all is well and that CDC can proceed to adopt;
2. that it is not acceptable and will need to be started again;
3. that it is almost right and with some amendments it will be ready for adoption.

If the response is the third option there will need to be a further period of consultation which will delay adoption. However, after ten years of work it is hoped that it will be ready for adoption very soon.

Once the Plan has been adopted, the Local Plan Part 2 will be triggered which will, among other things, decide where in the Category A villages to put 750 houses. Work has already started on this and it will impact on Fringford as a Category A village, but the village will have the ability to be consulted on.

Cllr Wood also raised the issue of finance of CDC. Whilst it is not possible to know what plans the new Government will have for local government, it is fairly likely that the financial position will be poor. With this in mind, CDC has been creating a joint management structure with South Northants District Council for some time to cut costs and is now also starting to work with Stratford.

**7. Finance**

**a. To receive the financial report for the year end**

As at 31 March the Accounts stood at:

Co-op Current Account	£2,874.56
Co-op Savings Account	£18,841.09

There were four outstanding cheques totalling £855.13. The Clerk provided the Councillors with printouts of the bank accounts and summary.

The Clerk had transferred over to the 15/16 budget, the budget to cover the OALC Subscription invoice of £133.07 which was anticipated last year but didn't arrive in time.

The Clerk reported that last year's budget was underspent by £41. She had revised the budget to take account of the additions such as the subscriptions, the pump and the Village Voice donations and had produced a finalised budget for the year.

The Clerk had completed the VAT reclaim (a total of £1,300.18) and included in this the OALC Subscription.

The Clerk had completed the Final Submission of the year to HMRC via the RTI Tools software.

**b. To receive the monthly financial report**

As at 14 April the Accounts stood at:

Co-op Current Account	£2,600.25
Co-op Savings Account	£18,850.12

There were two outstanding cheques totalling £630.78.

The Current Account has received a total of £210 in donations to the Village Voice and £0.29 in interest

The Savings Account has received £9.03 in interest.

The Clerk had received a letter on 30 March from CDC informing the Parish that the dog bin emptying charges were to rise from £1.27 per bin to £1.40 per bin from 1 April. The Clerk had requested much more notice in future so that budgets could be set accordingly. The budget for this is likely to now be £30 under.

The Standing Order of £110.25 to pay the Clerk for the period of 1 to 31 March cleared on 1 April.

The Clerk confirmed that while the Village Hall project was under way she would maintain the current account at a level of £5,000 to make it easier to pay larger sums. She would therefore make a transfer of £2,000 to top up the account.

**c. To receive the Statement of Accounts**

The Clerk had prepared the draft Statement of Accounts which the Councillors **RESOLVED** to agree.

**d. To update the Asset Register**

The Councillors **RESOLVED** to add the Village Pump to the Asset Register.

**e. To complete the External Audit Accounting Statements**

The Clerk provided the Councillors with the figures which they **RESOLVED** to agree. The Chairman signed the form.

**f. To complete the External Audit Annual Governance Statement**

The Councillors **RESOLVED** to agree to all the Governance questions and the Chairman signed the form.

**g. To consider the Insurance Renewal**

The Councillors **RESOLVED** to agree to the insurance renewal, but asked the Clerk to look into the possibility of insuring the Village Pump.

**h. To consider invoices for payment**

The Councillors **RESOLVED** to approve the following invoices for payment:

<b>Cheque no:</b>	<b>Payee and reason</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Amount</b>
400078	OALC for Subscription	Subscriptions	£133.07
400079	Zurich Municipal for Insurance Renewal	Insurance	£398.44
400080	John Fargin for CLP Questionnaire winners	CLP	£85.00

**8. Parish Remuneration**

The Councillors considered the report of CDC’s Parish Remuneration Committee which had been circulated and publicised on the noticeboard. The Councillors **RESOLVED** to agree not to accept any allowances for Councillors except the mileage allowance.

**9. Parish Matters**

**a. Speed Checks**

This was discussed during public participation.

**b. War Memorial**

This was discussed during public participation.

**c. Village Pump**

The Clerk was pleased to report that the work had been finished and the scaffolding removed.

**d. Crosslands tree**

David McCullagh would send the Clerk details of tree surgeons to obtain quotations.

**e. Magna Carta ‘LiberTeas’ Day Sunday 14 June**

The Councillors considered the project to celebrate 800 years of the Magna Carta but declined to take part.

**10. Community Led Plans**

Mr Fargin reported that the questionnaire feedback meeting on 28 March was a great success with more than 40 villagers attending. The Chairman of the CLP Group would bring the final analysis to a Parish Council meeting. There were a number of key issues which had been raised in the questionnaire which can be achieved, but it was recommended waiting until the full analysis of the data had been completed.

The Spring Fayre would be going ahead on 16 May. The Clerk would arrange the insurance.

Mr Fargin asked whether Councillors would be prepared to take part in the Parish Council ‘Human Fruit Machine’ attraction at the Spring Fayre. If there were not enough participants, the Church might be able to be use it instead.

## 11. Village Hall Extension

### a. To receive a progress report

Mr Fargin reported that the architect had not been as quick to supply the contracts as expected. A new timber frame supplier has been sourced and the quotation accepted.

As soon as the contracts are signed, the builder will be able to order the timber frame and commence the project.

## 12. Planning Applications

### a. To consider all recent Applications received from Cherwell District Council detailed below or on the District Council website up to the date of the meeting

- i. 15/00485/F, Mr and Mrs Ward, Former Rosemary, Main Street; Variation of Conditions 1 and 2 of 13/00718/F - Plot 1 only (to retain house with an altered façade/side elevation) - No changes to Plot 2
- ii. 15/00486/F, Mr and Mrs Ward, Former Rosemary, Main Street; Removal of Conditions 1 and 2 of 13/00718/F (retain Plot 1 building "as built" with first floor side window to be removed) - Plot 1 only

The two applications were discussed during Public Participation.

### b. To note Notices of Decision

- i. 14/01953/F, Glebe Lakes Caravan Park, Erection of a permanent Warden's dwelling – re-submission of 14/00698/F; refusal of permission for development
- ii. 14/01530/F, Mr Christophe Surdiacourt, Puratos Innovation Centre, Fringford Mill, Single storey extension with glazed link; permission for development (omitted from a previous meeting)
- iii. 14/00918/F, Mr and Mrs Ward, Plot 2, Rosemary, Main Street, Garden Shed; permission for development on appeal.

Following a query about why the Puratos notice and the Rosemary Shed appeal had not been noted on the Minutes, the Clerk reported that she notes the decisions when she receives the paper copy from Cherwell District Council. The Puratos notice had simply been missed. However, despite chasing, the Clerk had still not received formal notification about the planning appeal regarding the shed at Rosemary, but had noted it from the Planning Portal.

## 13. Cherwell Local Plan

The Councillors considered the note from the Planning Department about the term 'minor development' and noted its contents.

## 14. Correspondence Received

The Councillors noted the correspondence received and discussed where necessary.

- a. **A villager** –re footpath from Rectory Lane to Bancroft field. The villager queried the land ownership of the footpath believing it was public land, which it is not, but this now been resolved.
- b. **Bicester Rural Children's Centre** – Ofsted Inspection
- c. **Young's Tree Services**
- d. **OCC Highways** – due to restructuring there is now a new Highways Steward.
- e. **John Mayo** – re Stratton Audley exchange accepting orders for fibre broadband
- f. **OCC** – re celebrating 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of VE Day (8 May) with a beacon
- g. **A villager** – re the caravan on the Green which has now been sorted

- h. **OALC** – March Members’ update
- i. **A Villager** – re over grown ditch between Fringford Cottage and Folly Fields. This has been reported to OCC Highways and the Clerk was due to meet with a representative shortly.
- j. **A Villager** – re the Green being used as a race track. The Clerk advised the villager to call the Rural Policing team, either on 999 if it is antisocial behaviour because of drink or drugs, or alternatively on 101
- k. **OALC** – re War Memorials.
- l. **A villager** – re parking round the Village Green

**15. Reports from meetings**

No meetings had been attended.

**16. Items for information or next Agenda only**

- a. **Agenda Items** – the Clerk requested that all items for the next agenda should be submitted by Thursday 7 May
- b. **Bicester Village using Bicester Heritage Airfield as parking.** The Clerk had received a number of complaints from villagers in the area about the traffic problems over the Easter weekend and had raised the issue with CDC. A Planning Enforcement Officer has investigated and the gateway (opposite Thompson Drive in Caversfield) is an existing entrance so there is no breach of planning control currently. However, Highways has been made aware of the issue in case there is increased use of the gateway. The use by Bicester Village is temporary until the new park and ride south of Bicester has been completed.
- c. **No cold calling zones.** The Clerk had found out that the ‘no cold calling zones’ is run by OCC Trading Standards. The Clerk will talk to the Chairman of Finmere Parish Council to find out more about their project.
- d. **Bonfire and Firework night**  
Following concern about the traffic management issues at last year’s bonfire, Mr McCullagh asked the Councillors to consider the Village Hall Committee’s proposal to cancel this year’s display. The Clerk would add it to the next agenda.

**16. Date of next meeting**

The Councillors **RESOLVED** to agree the date of Monday 18 May 2015 which will take place after the Annual Parish Meeting which commences at 7.45pm.

The meeting closed at 9.30pm

Signed ..... Dated .....