

GREAT COXWELL PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Great Coxwell Parish Council held
In the Parish Reading Room on Monday 13th March 2017 at 7:30pm**

Present Annabelle Zinovieff (Chair), Steve McNally, Richard May, Jacqui Russell, Ian Mason (RFO), Jo King (Parish Clerk). C/Cllr Judith Heathcoat
Members of public (3)

1. Apologies Lauren Gale D/Cllr Elaine Ware D/Cllr Simon Howell

2. Declaration of Interest - None

3. Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on Monday 7th January 2017
were signed as an accurate record

4. Planning Applications

P16/V2751/DIS Fernham Fields, southwestern part of site, 89 houses.

Discharge of conditions 8 - Green Travels Plans, 9 - Landscaping Scheme, 11 - drainage details, **13 - Sustainable drainage scheme**, 14 - construction traffic management plan, 16 - tree protection, 18 - refuse storage, 19 - contamination - further surveys and 20 - contamination - nickel survey on application ref.

P13/V0139/O Outline planning application for residential development of up to 200 houses, public open space, associated infrastructure and new access. Still under review

P17/V0043/DIS Fernham Fields 111 houses Still under review

P17/V0180/RM The Steeds Parish Council sent response, encouragingly some of the statutory responses are echoing our concerns regarding landscaping and height of buildings.

P16/V0727/O - GCO Chowle Farm Estate. Transport amendment.

Parish Council returned response to new entrance plans via e-mail

P16/V0775/O Land south of Highworth Road, 200 houses.

Awaiting

P16/V1285/FUL - Badbury Hill

Awaiting

P16/V2644/RM - Fernham Gate

Approved

P17/V0498/HH Southview

Plans were looked at meeting and discussed. Voted 4/4 no objections

Parish Clerk to respond

PC0200

5a. Thames Water/Faringdon Town and Great Coxwell Meeting

Representatives from Thames Water, Faringdon Town, Great Coxwell (Annabelle Zinovieff) and C/Cllr Heathcoat attended a site meeting at Fernham Fields then meeting at the Reading Room afterwards. The aim of the meeting was to address concerns about the cumulative impact on both Great Coxwell and Faringdon of all the developments especially Fernham Fields and The Steeds regarding the extra pressure on the surface water and sewage. An agreed list of queries and questions were agreed by all parties.

5b. Mark Bostock Drainage Engineer meeting.

Richard May and Parish Clerk met with Mr Bostock for a site visit of Great Coxwell and surrounding area in relation to mapping out the surface water/drainage system of Great Coxwell. The recent applications from the Steeds and Fernham Fields will rely on discharge their surface water into the ditches on Coxwell Road. The ditches around Great Coxwell haven't been maintained and the concern is they won't be able to cope. A map clearly showing all the ditches have been produced and problem areas highlighted. The Parish Council hope to work together to resolve some of these issues. This plan has also been sent to Peter Brampton (Planning Officer) so he can use it in talks with the developers.

6. County Councillors' Report C/Cllr Heathcoat sent her County Councillors report prior to meeting. C/Cllr Heathcoat informed Parish Councillors of the more significant issues. Placed on noticeboard.

7. District Councillors' Report D/Cllr Ware and Howell sent their District Councillors report prior to meeting. D/Cllr Howell commented on the Vale Plans progress. Placed on noticeboard.

8. Rural and urban grass cutting contract.

- a. Ben Gristwood instructed to carry out the cuts.
- b. Contact with OCC for funds to carry out cuts was discussed and voted on, 4/4 agreed to sign contract. Contract signed within meeting. Clerk to send.
- c. RM to check risk assessment regarding the cutting of verges.

9. Park

B Gristwood has carried out the agreed work.

There was a discrepancy in a payment to Playdale, this has been sorted immediately

There are no clear guidelines when maintenance or cutting is carried out on Park. Action: - JR to inquire about suitable guideline for the Park.

10. Footpath Report – Parish Path Warden

I have (notionally) divided the parish into three sectors:

- 1/ North of Highworth Road
- 2/ South of Highworth Road, but North of Church
- 3/ South of Church.

I have surveyed all the paths in the northernmost section. The only issues to report are that bridleway 1 which crosses a ploughed field has not been restored after ploughing and part of the right of way is not extant. The way-marking for bridleway 3 in front of Badbury Hill House is unclear and could be improved. The middle section is mostly done. Footpath 21 also crosses a ploughed field and is not extant. The stiles on footpath 13 are higher than recommended by the guidance, but I suspect that there would be little value in raising this as an issue with OCC and the Ramblers Assoc. The bridge at the village end of this footpath is narrow and has no handrail. We have already flagged this up with the OCC but no action has been taken yet. I will follow this up with the Council and the Ramblers Assoc. Footpath 17 is the steep cobble section leading up to the church. I've been up it recently. Although there is some moss on the stones, the footing was firm. I suspect that it could be slippery in the wet and/or frost, but am concerned that if we raise this as an issue it might lead to replacement by concrete steps and a steel handrail. I've still got most of the southern section to inspect, although there are few paths in this sector of the parish. I will report all the issues discovered to the relevant parties. I hope to have completed my exploration by the summer and will report again.

11. Finance

1. Cheques and payments to be agreed

PCExp09/16	09/03/17Weebly website fee	48.65
PCExp10/16	09/03/17RFO Honorarium	417.2
PCExp11/16	09/03/17RFO Expenses	40
PCExp12/16	09/03/17Clerk Honorarium	417.2
PCExp13/16	09/03/17Clerk Expenses	40
PkExp18/16	11/02/17Playdale	350
PkExp19/16	07/03/17OPFA	40

2. Income and expenditure worksheets – circulated prior to meeting Approved

3. For discussion

a. Review of financial regulations and risk assessment – circulated prior to meeting.

Initial discussion, agreed Richard May and Ian Mason would review.

b. Review effectiveness of internal audit.

Signed by Annabelle Zinovieff

Internal audit June, external audit July.

c. OALC membership

Discussion resulted in not renewing membership for now.

d. Precept

Precept was agreed and signed on 5th December

Please find relevant finance meetings attached for information.

Action ANZ to put in newsletter and PG to put relevant documents on Great Coxwell Website

12. Public question time

The state of Budgens carpark was raised

13. Matters arising from minutes

a. Village fete – 16th July

14. Neighbourhood Watch (NAG)

15. Great Coxwell Website

a. Annual review

Peter Gale has submitted the annual review to the Parish Council

b. Resignation

Peter Gale has handed in his resignation, the Parish Council thank him for all the effort and time he's put into making the website a really good tool for the village and Parish Council. Action put advert for role in newsletter.

16. Any other business

17. Correspondence

a. Water supply in Puddleduck Lane

Residents of Puddleduck Lane have still an ongoing problem of regular letters advising them that their water will be turned off for a period

b. NT have installed gate at Great Barn

18. Date of next meeting 8th May 2017

Distribution: All Parish Councillors, C/Cllr, D/Cllr, PCSO, Notice Board

Joanne King, Clerk to Great Coxwell Parish Council

pc_gtcoxwell@hotmail.co.uk

GREAT COXWELL PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council Budget-Setting Meeting held in the Parish Reading Room Monday 5th September 2016.

PRESENT: Councillors: Mrs A Zinovieff, Mr S McNally, Mrs L Gale, Mr R May, Mrs J Russell;
RFO: Mr I Mason (Chair and Minutes Sec)

1. Purpose of meeting

To agree a process and format for short (1 year) and medium (2-5 year) term financial planning to enable:

- reasoned defensible decisions regarding the setting of the annual Precept rate
- strategic planning of the extent and timing of future capital expenditure
- strategic accrual of ring-fenced funds for anticipated capital expenditure
- more effective targeting of fund-raising activities
- indication and facilitation of grant application opportunities

2. Background

- Identification of need for a more strategic approach to maintenance of park and reading room
- Acknowledgement that some park equipment has or is reaching the point where replacement is needed
- Additional expenditure anticipated for cutting grass on footpaths

3. Approach

Expenditure to be divided into: 'OpEx' – expenditure solely related to fulfilling the statutory duties of the Council; and 'CapEx' – expenditure on new projects, replacement of large one-off items and large maintenance costs. Some expenditure may fall into grey areas between the two. After discussion, it was agreed that longer-term expenditure which might attract grant-funding be deemed CapEx whilst all other, shorter-term expenditure can be regarded as OpEx.

It is likely that the OpEx budget will be reasonably future-proof during the medium-term.

Cap Ex will be more demand-led and variable. Since May 2016 Councillors have assigned areas of responsibility. It was agreed that each Councillor would identify and where possible quantify likely costs in their area of responsibility.

ACTION: RFO to draw up draft OpEx budget based on performance from April 2015 to date for discussion by 9th September '16

ACTION: Councillors to identify categories and where possible extend and timing of CapEx items for RFO by end of September '16 (we didn't agree this deadline, but is that OK for everyone?)

4. Further issues for consideration:

Should the park be self-funding (as it was initially set up to be), or can it be crossed – funded from the PC/Precept?

Should monies raised by the monthly teas be hypothecated for more high-profile (i.e. CapEx) projects and not for routine maintenance?

These are policy decisions for the Councillors

5. Next steps

Precept is to be set in early January 2017. We receive a letter from the VWHDC in mid-November asking us for the agreed the Precept figure for the year. Therefore a 1 year (2016-7) budget incorporating OpEx and CapEx items must be set and agreed by the PC at one of the PC meetings before the calendar year end. A longer timeline for setting a medium-term budget is acceptable and no deadline was set at the meeting for this. (However, I think we also should get this done by end of 2016).

Precept: Extra-ordinary meeting of Gt Coxwell Parish Council held on 5th December 2016

PRESENT: Councillors: Mrs A Zinovieff, Mr S McNally, Mrs L Gale, Mr R May,
RFO: Mr I Mason (Chair and Minutes Sec)

The RFO reported that:

- The precept figure will be in the range £5k-£8.9k
- This is based on three figures derived from the two-budget spread-sheets recently sent to you all:
- 1/ In the first spread-sheet, I used a notional figure of £5k for the precept as it seemed to be a reasonable inflation-linked hike from the current year's figure (£4635). This would cost £31.85 per band D household.
- 2/ As you will recall, according to my predictions, this would have led to a c. £3.6k reduction in our reserves by the end of the financial year 2017-8. So, adding the deficit (£3.9k) to the notional (£5k) precept leads to a figure of £8.9k. (Or £56.70 per band D household)
- 3/ The second spread-sheet was based on OpEx only and assumes no income aside from the precept. My prediction is that we need £7225 just to meet these costs. (=£46 per D household).
- Clearly the decision is for the Councillors - my role is simply to provide advice.
- In my view, basing the precept on the OpEx is logical, defensible and future-proof (it will result in much less navel-gazing next year if we have an agreed formula for making the decision next time and thereafter).
- It has the disadvantage that it will add to quite a big hike to the average householder's bill for the first year. You may feel that this would be difficult to implement and defend to parishioners - and, if that were your decision, then I wouldn't try to persuade you away from that position.

I suggest that you might all like to look carefully at the OpEx budget and identify any errors/overestimates. If we do go down the OpEx route, then we need to ensure that the OpEx budget is as accurate as we can make.

After discussion, it was decided that the principle for setting the precept would be to cover all our operational costs. Capital costs are to be covered by grants, fundraising, and carry forward money. Accordingly, the Precept was set at £7225. The PC Chair and RFO signed the Precept Form