

RAMSDEN PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of extraordinary meeting held on Wed 6th February 2008 at 8.00pm in St James' Church

Members Present: Mr Clive Cowen (CC), Mrs Holly Deans (HD) (Chairman), Mrs Sally Miller (SM), Mr Tony Shuker (TS) and Mrs Sarah Wiggins (SW)

Others Present: Cllr Simon Hoare (SH), the Clerk and 18 parishioners

Item	Subject	Action
101.	Apologies None.	
102.	Public Participation SH updated on the current planning situation, he and Mr Dick Williamson (DW) having met with the Planning Officer (Phil Shaw) the previous day. Responses in the Application regarding flood risk related to work undertaken prior to July 2007. They were true at the time, but a new Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was now needed. Cottsway had been advised of the technical situation on the water issues and had been asked to make further submissions. SH had requested that the Application be decided by the Planning Committee. The earliest possible date would be 17 th March. This would allow time for questions, comments and extra work by Cottsway, but further submissions should be made as soon as possible. Mr Steve MacLennan (SMac) asked if the Engineer would see the plans. Response: Yes. Flood risk issues were being dealt with seriously by Phil Shaw. It was very important for both applicants and planners to show that the proposed development would not add to existing problems. Mr John Biggs asked about awaiting the findings of the WODC survey in the summer. Response: The flood survey would not be planning document. PPS 25 on development and flooding issues was relevant and a new FRA would relate to this. Miss Liz Pearce asked about extra run-off with the increase in building. Response: If soft ground is replaced by hard standing, run-off increases. The FRA would establish if this was likely to cause a problem. There were a number of possible engineering solutions, such as the use of tanks. A solution that was financially viable for 5 buildings would be needed if risks were identified. DW made representations on points relating to flooding, the rural exemption site, the adequacy of the sewer, the effect on the conservation area, shared ownership, environmental impact, the absence of a Sec. 106 agreement, the contract with the vendor and the maintenance of the area between the site and the cemetery. SMac made representations about the diameter and adequacy of the sewer for the number of dwellings. He also raised safety issues with the speed of traffic on Akeman Street. Response: The sewer issues needed to be raised with the Planning Office. Oxfordshire Highways had assessed the site and had not raised any objections in regard to pedestrian safety or junction splays. There was a lack of clarity on 5.15. Mrs Gill Ford asked about the ownership of the rest of the field. Response: No change of ownership, but a new gated access would be made. Clarification over maintenance of that area might be desirable.	
103.	To consider the Kemp and Kemp Dec 2007 Design, Planning and Access Statement relating to Planning Application 08/0036/P/FP (Proposed Erection of 5 affordable dwellings. Formation of new vehicular & pedestrian access and associated parking)	

The document had been circulated with the Agenda and was reviewed. A number of points were identified where comment or clarification would be appropriate.

3.1 Local need – the PC agreed that this had been demonstrated.

3.2 Shared ownership - The lack of an initial demand did not mean that such a demand would not exist in the future. The Parish Council wanted the part buy/part rent option to remain open.

4.16 (and 9.9 to 9.14) Sustainability – The PC was keen that proposals on low carbon/alternative technologies should be fulfilled.

5.15 Parking - Some consideration to parking space for visitors would be requested. Junction - Clarification of the comment about tightening the radii on the junction was needed.

5.22 The area between the site and the cemetery - the PC wished to ask about ownership and maintenance.

9.5 The adequacy of the sewer. The Parish Council would seek clarification from the Planning Office and an assurance that the required standard would be met.

9.3 Archaeology. A planning condition to be requested securing a watching brief .

Storm water drainage and flood risk. The Parish Council would reiterate its earlier comments. An up-to-date Flood Risk Assessment and if necessary a solution to the flooding problem to the point of engineering satisfaction would seem essential in order to comply with Policy H2. **Clerk**

Parishioners were reminded of the contact details for making their own submissions to the Planning Office. It was commented that some pages were missing from the WODC website.

The meeting closed at 9.08pm

Signed:

Chairman

Date: