



## Sutton Courtenay Parish Council

### Minutes for the Parish Council meeting held on Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> April 2023 at the Village Hall Sutton Courtenay, commencing at 7.30pm.

Present: Councillors Rita Atkinson (chairman), Robert Dalby, Lyn Hodder, Joanna O'Callaghan, Hugo Raworth and Jason Warwick.

In attendance: Jennie Currie, Clerk; 3 members of the public.

---

#### 2023/053 Public Participation

A resident from the High Street explained that when heavy and/or fast vehicles drove over the speed bumps their house would shake and that the vibration had caused damage to their property. The properties are close to the road side and many were built in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Members would take this into consideration when discussing the weight restrictions later in the meeting and asked the Clerk to add it to a future meeting.

**Clerk**

Another resident advised that approximately 15 years ago, residents were asked whether they would like the speed bumps in the High Street to be removed. The majority of residents choose to keep the speed bumps.

A representative from the Sutton Courtenay Cricket Club explained that they plan to hold youth practice sessions this summer. The current practice nets' surface is uneven and would only be suitable for soft ball cricket so they would cut grass practice stirps elsewhere.

#### 2023/054 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from County & District Councillor Richard Webber; Councillors David Butler, Eileen Daw, Teresa Field, Father Morkos and Antony Willott.

#### 2023/055 Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

#### 2023/056 Minutes for the meetings held on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> March 2023

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> March 2023 were a true and accurate record and would be signed by the Chairman.

#### 2023/057 Allotment Tenancy agreement

**RESOLVED** that Councillors O'Callaghan and Warwick would sign the tenancy agreement for plot 8.

#### 2023/058 **RESOLVED** that item 13 Recreation Ground (Recreational Amenities working party) would be brought forward.

- 2023/059 Recreation Ground (Recreational Amenities working party)  
 (a) New cricket practice nets  
 Quotes were being gathered to build new frames and nets. Members of the Cricket Club had advised that the current surface was in poor condition. It was also noted that the current east to west alignment did not match English Cricket Board regulations. They added that there had been a recent refurbishment of facilities at Kingston Bagpuize. The Clerk would contact the Clerk to the Parish Council. **Clerk**  
 The Clerk had been contacted by two families who regularly use the Recreation Ground for cricket practice who supported the idea to replace the practise strips.  
 (b) Skate park request  
**RESOLVED** that the District Council's Active Communities Team would use the skate park on 27<sup>th</sup> July, 3<sup>rd</sup> August, 10<sup>th</sup> August and 17<sup>th</sup> August to run skate session for families.
- 2023/060 Planning applications  
 (a) Planning applications to be considered  
**RESOLVED** that the following observations would be submitted:  
 MW.0034/23 (P23/V0529/CM) Sutton Courtenay Landfill Site, Appleford – Object (see below for full objection).  
 P23/V0515/S73 Rebellion Film Studios, Milton Road, SC – No comment  
 P23/V0541/HH Laburnum, Churchmere Road, SC – No comment  
 P22/V1053/RM Phase A3 & A4 Signia Park, Didcot – No comment  
 MW.0051/23 Oday Hill Plant Site, Sutton Wick – Objection  
 The environmental report does not clear condition 6, it is not clear that the site is free of protected species.  
 MW.0052/23 Sutton Wick Plant Site, Land Adjoining Stone Hills Lane, Oday Hill, Sutton Wick – Objection  
 The application provides inadequate information regarding the tree protection of existing trees and lacks sufficient details on proposed planting. In the absence of these details the council is unable to give a view from an informed position and hence objects pending further information supplied by the applicant.  
 P23/V0700/HH 39 Barretts Way, SC – No comment  
 (b) Additional planning correspondence  
 P23/V0304/PDH 90 Milton Road, SC  
 Permitted development: Single storey rear extension. Depth - 3.90m Height - 3.70m Height to Eaves - 2.60m. Noted.  
 Members noted the decisions on previous applications  
 P23/V0109/LB The Norman Hall, 9 Church Street, SC – Granted.  
 P23/V0141/HH The Norman Hall, 9 Church Street, SC – Granted.  
 P23/V0301/HH Hulgrove Barn, Drayton Road, SC – Granted.  
 P23/V0179/FUL Pipaway Engineering Ltd, Milton Road, Drayton – Granted.  
 P23/V0194/HH Atwood House, 1 Appleford Road, SC – Granted.  
 P23/V0253/HH 15 The Green, SC – Granted.
- 2023/061 Reports  
 (a) County Councillor  
 Cllr Webber had submitted his apologies for the meeting.  
 (b) District Councillor  
 Cllr Webber had submitted his apologies for the meeting.

2023/061

Reports continued

(c) Parish Councillors

Cllr Hodder had been approached by the produce show asking if the Village Hall was available for their September 2023 event and why they had to pay for the booking. The Clerk advised that the produce show would need to contact the Village Hall Management Committee which is separate to the Parish Council. If they struggle with the cost of the event then they could apply to the Parish Council for a grant.

Cllr O' Callaghan reported that the manhole cover outside 3 Church Street has recently been overflowing with raw sewage. Cllr Raworth advised that Thames Water are aware of the problems. It is a pinch point within the network of sewers. Cllr Raworth has photographs of the area being flooded and will submit them to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Members noted that the sewer infrastructure should be considered when considering future developments.

Cllr O' Callaghan queried whether a SID pole had been missed off the list. The six poles that were originally agreed have been installed. Members had requested pole(s) on Milton Road and potentially another pole would be needed on Drayton Road.

**JO**

Cllr Atkinson asked whether Members were happy to hold the grand opening of the new equipment at the Recreation Ground in the summer holidays, she would liaise with Kompan who would organise the day.

**RA**

(c) Clerk

Defibs: Just awaiting confirmation from the owner of the Costcutter store on Bradstocks Way.

SIDs: Need to select a team of Councillors to be responsible for moving the SIDs and confirmation of an address to have them delivered to. Cllr Raworth would take delivery of the SIDs.

2023/062

Consultations

(a) Didcot LWCIP Stage A

**RESOLVED** that the following response would be submitted:

Sutton Courtenay is on Sustrans National Cycle Route 5 [NR5] between Abingdon and Didcot and is also a key node on commuting routes to Milton Park and Culham Science Centre, and to the European School, Culham via Sutton Bridge. It would therefore benefit from improved infrastructure for walking and cycling. Despite the brief consultation time, there are some important points and suggestions the Parish Council would like to raise with the Didcot LCWIP.

Currently NR5 joins the B4016 at the end of Peep-o-Day Lane (partly on a discrete road-side cycle-path) before turning right onto High Street, Sutton Courtenay. The righthand turn is on a dangerous blind bend and the shared-use High Street is busy during commuting and school hours. We would favour a new cycle-path - partially upgrading existing footpaths\* – linking the end of Peep-o-Day Lane to Milton Road, where there would be easy access to the new cycle-path into Milton Park, and to the continuation of NR5 via the Power Station cycle-path.

\*We would like to see dedicated cycle lanes rather than just painting a narrow strip at the edge of the road or a simple cycle symbol. We are also against the use of pavements as shared cycle routes, as there have been several near misses between pedestrians and cyclists.

NR5 from Frilsham Street/Hobbyhorse Lane to Didcot is an excellent piece of infrastructure although improvements would be possible. There is a short section of very poorly surfaced track from Sutton Courtenay Village Hall to the right-hand turn off Hobbyhorse Lane. At the Didcot end, the cycle-path ends on a busy roundabout, and the onward route into Didcot through the industrial estate to Basil Hill Road is tortuous and unattractive.

Sutton Bridge is a notorious pinch-point in the village. Many cyclists are wary (or impatient) of using the road here and some cycle on the pavement, causing conflicts with pedestrians. Advance stop lines for cyclists and staggering the traffic-lights to allow cyclists more time to cross the bridge safely would help.

2023/062 Consultations continued  
(b) Area weight restrictions

**RESOLVED** that the following response would be submitted:

There should be a weight limit on the B4016 from Drayton to Sutton Courtenay and over the 2 bridges to Culham. OCC should be aware that the PC have been arguing for this in relation to communications on HIF.

The roads affected are Drayton Road, Brook Steet, Church Street, Appleford Road, Abingdon Road, the 2 bridges and Tollgate Road. At the moment there is no weight limit meaning that the roads can take 44 ton trucks which they regularly do.

HGV traffic through the village is excessive and on the increase. My summary of this traffic includes the following:

1. Training HGV's from the DVLA HGV Test Centre at Culham No. 1 on the A415. This results in numerous HGV's up to and including 44 ton trucks plus lesser vehicles using this as a practice and TEST ROUTE. I think there are currently 4 different operators which use this route daily, in both directions, sometimes running a few per hour, and occasionally consecutive vehicles. Trainers includes articulated 44 ton trucks, buses, non-articulated trucks, ambulances, vehicles with trailers and vans.
2. The Recycling Waste Transfer site for the Vale and South Oxon is sited at Culham NO.1. on the A41. As a result, Biffa waste trucks use our village every weekday and Saturdays. Waste collected from all the rapidly expanding towns such as Wantage is transported through the village. Additionally, waste from Didcot reaches the transfer depot via our village as our village is quicker than the alternative which is the Wallingford bypass. Frequently waste collected from South Abingdon passes through our village avoiding Abingdon town centre. There are occasions when the walking floor trucks exit the A34 at Milton and use our village roads as access to Culham No 1 to pick up waste from the transfer site.
3. Local freight and distribution companies use our village as a route that avoids Abingdon eg Verran Freight and H&H both of which are based at Steventon.
4. Hanson vehicles to and from their site within the parish. Agricultural vehicles using the Hanson road to access the composter operation for compost collection.
5. Waste vehicles from Drayton Recycling Centre, transporting full containers to another site in Oxfordshire eg Grundon at Wallingford/Ewelme.
6. Skip trucks from Collard Recycling at Chilton transferring waste to and from Chilton to Ewelme/Wallingford.
7. Random HGV's using the route as following their Sat Navs
8. Traffic associated with the numerous construction sites in the village and neighbouring towns and villages.

The conclusion from the above summary is that the road through our village is a major thoroughfare for heavy duty traffic. It is totally inappropriate for heavy duty traffic for the following reasons:

1. The B4016 from Drayton through our village and onwards to the Thames crossing at Culham is a narrow, winding and in part undulating road.
2. It passes though the oldest parts of Drayton and Sutton Courtenay, falling within the conservation areas of both villages and lined with numerous listed buildings.
3. There are physical constraints including the listed Thames crossing, the 90 degree bend where Church Street joins Appleford Road and the curved 90 degree bend at The Triangle (the junction of Brook St, High St and Church St). All properties at the 90 degree bend are listed.
4. There is a very narrow stretch of Brook St between Chapel Lane and the bridge over Ginge Brook. At this point it is not of sufficient width to take a 44 ton truck and another vehicle coming towards it.
5. Pavement/footways along Drayton Rd and Brook St are either non-existent or of limited width. Similarly, the pavement along Appleford Rd is sub standard considering the quantity of new development at the eastern end.
6. The Triangle is a blind 3 way junction and dangerous in its own right.
7. National Cycle Network Route 5 shares Drayton Rd and Brook St and then turns right at The Triangle. This is an increasingly busy route.

In conclusion, there are numerous issues with HGV's passing through our village with resulting negative impacts on residents, a negative impact on our historic environment, major safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists, noise, air pollution and vibration and health issues for residents.

(c) Removal of marked disabled bay at 7 Barrett's Way  
Members noted the removal of the marked disabled bay.

- 2023/063     Art Trail  
 The Clerk had contacted landowners and had received positive responses, with some details to be finalised. The Clerk had obtained quotes for the desktop utilities searches and would have quotes for installation by the end of April. The working party would meet before the next Council meeting to discuss the landowner responses and quotes. Cllr Dalby would join the working party. **Art Trail WP**
- 2023/064     Coronation Celebrations  
 Members discussed ideas for a community service event to be held on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> May 2023 and decided not to progress the idea.
- 2023/065     Litter and Dog Waste - Community Litter Pick update  
 The March event had been a success and Members would organise another later in the year.
- 2023/066     Neighbourhood Plan  
 The District Council would launch its consultation for the Neighbourhood Plan on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> April 2023. As part of the consultation the draft plan would be available to view at the Village Hall by appointment.
- 2022/067     2022-23 Financial Year End  
 (a) Year end budget report  
**RESOLVED** that the year end budget report would be approved.  
 (b) Year end reserves report  
**RESOLVED** that the year end reserves report would be approved with £9,221.11 in general reserves; £5931.00 S106; £50,726.84 CIL; and a total of £92,294.87 in ear marked reserves.
- 2023/068     Finance  
 (a) SID grant agreement  
**RESOLVED** that Cllrs Dalby and Raworth would sign the County Councillor's Priority Fund grant agreement.  
 (b) Assets register  
**RESOLVED** that the asset register would be approved with assets totalling £293,436.

2023/068 Finance continued  
 (c) Receipts and Payments report

**RESOLVED** that the following payments would be authorised:

**Receipts for March 2023**

VAT 126 claim (until 28 Feb 2023)	HMRC	£27,158.34
Councillor Priority Fund for SIDs	Grant	£7,517.34
<b>Total receipts</b>		<b>£34,675.68</b>

**Direct Debits and pre agreed payments for April 2023**

none				
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>£0.00</b>

**BACS & Cheque Payments to be agreed in April 2023**

OALC	Annual Membership	S00271/2023/3	1	£598.97
Vision ICT	Emails x 13 May23 - Apr 24	16252	2	£280.80
C-Through Windows	Bus shelter Feb 2023	1658	3	£40.00
SLCC	Annual Membership	MEM243665-2	4	£184.26
SLCC	Clerk's Manual 2023	ORD508977-3	5	£52.30
HMRC	Tax and NI	Month 01	7	£393.97
R Atkinson	Litter pick refreshments	Receipts x2	9	£87.78
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>£1,638.08</b>

**Standing orders for April 2023**

J Currie	Salary - new SO	Month 01	6	£1,371.00
Oxfordshire Pension Fund	Clerk's Pension - amended	Month 01	8	£476.17
J Currie	Office Allowance	Month 01	mins	£26.00
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>£1,873.17</b>
<b>Total payments</b>				<b>£3,511.25</b>

(d) Councillors to authorise payments

**RESOLVED** that Cllrs Atkinson and Daw would authorise payments via the online banking software.

**RA & ED**

(e) Budget and Reserves report  
 Members noted the reports.

Close of meeting

It was noted that the next ordinary meeting of the Council would be held at 7.15pm, on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> May. There being no further business the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 8.58pm.

Signed.....

Dated.....

Item 2023/060 (a)

SUTTON COURTENAY PARISH COUNCIL (SCPC)

OBJECTION TO FCC APPLICATION MW.0034/23

SCPC objects to the removal of the restrictions on the hinterland, to enable waste from a wider South East/London area, to be deposited in the SC Landfill site and to delay the implementation of the Permissive Path for the following reasons.

#### HINTERLAND

Huge quantities of London's waste have already been deposited at the SC landfill site in the past. In the period 2015 -2018 alone, this totalled some 2,092,707 tonnes to Oxfordshire's waste landfill facilities, the vast bulk of which was in Sutton Courtenay (Ref. 1). This ceased when FCC lost the London contract. The GLC undertook to review its waste and recycling operations with a view to dealing with its own by reducing landfill and increasing recycling and, thus, reduce the need to transport waste with the resultant economic and environmental benefits that would accrue.

Whilst, as FCC's agent suggests, the hinterland restriction might have originated in the 2009 Legal Agreement, the 'current' restriction limiting import to the administrative areas of Oxfordshire, West Berkshire, Reading, Wokingham and Bracknell was effectively implemented after FCC lost the London contract. The suggestion that it was 14 years ago and so is out of date is disingenuous. The same issues still apply and the need for a sustainable waste management process is even more relevant today with the Government requiring greater effort in meeting its global warming reduction targets.

There were several reasons for the restriction, not least that there was a growing public concern that Sutton Courtenay was being used as London and the Southeast's waste bin, the need to husband Oxfordshire's waste capacity and that London was working towards meeting its own need. As the Oxfordshire Mineral and WasteCore Strategy 2017 (OMWCS)(Ref. 2) stated, 'Waste from West London that was being disposed under contract at Sutton Courtenay is now being managed elsewhere. The London Plan expects the London Boroughs to become net self-sufficient in managing their waste by 2025 and to cease sending recyclable or biodegradable waste to landfill at that time'. To reopen the possibility of importing waste from a Southeast/London area to Sutton Courtenay would detract from that, at an unacceptable cost to local residents.

Whilst the introduction of the hinterland was also to prevent 'waste being transported to the site over long distances' in line with the 'proximity principle', it was also to protect the amenity of the local communities after the extensive and noisy imports from London and, indeed, to avoid providing a disincentive to self-sufficiency in wider areas. Those concerns still apply and serve a useful purpose and the Applicant's suggestion that they do not is most misleading.

As important, the Applicant also fails to even attempt to prove that there is a requirement to restart imports of waste from the wider Southeast/London area, in order to fulfil its requirement to cease operations by the end of 2030. That is anyway still possible, 'as necessary', under Waste Policy W6, but there must be proof that it is necessary.

As of 2018, the Sutton Courtenay Landfill site had 3,889,805m<sup>3</sup> of void space left on the site. Waste material imports are restricted to 600,000 tonnes and FCC has not asked to increase that. Given the end date for cessation of waste landfilling by 31 Dec 2030, the available void should have been filled by then, without going outside the hinterland. Even taking account of the lower import levels recently, using the 2021 figure of 260,000 tonnes as an average over the 12 years from 2019-2030, reducing the identified void space by well over 3,000,000m<sup>3</sup> any need for extra imports would be limited.

If there is a need for waste from outside the hinterland to fill the void by 2030 then the applicant should have quantified that and the timescale envisaged. In this and, indeed, other respects, the submission is particularly deficient and inadequate.

Even then a recommencement of imports from a wider Southeast/London area could only realistically be undertaken by rail. Any attempt to move waste by road would be counter to Oxfordshire County Council and the Vale of White Horse DC policies of reducing traffic and pollution.

Rail imports of construction materials for Hanson and Forterra to the site are already severely affecting the amenity of the residents in Appleford and Sutton Courtenay. Moreover, Hanson has already applied for an extension of working hours due to the difficulties of the rail network being able to facilitate the number of trains its needs, in the current work time restrictions. That application is being robustly opposed.

Any increase in rail traffic by FCC would face the same network issues. In addition, the impact of the proposed HIF road, also being robustly opposed, needs to be considered. SCPC believes the cumulative impact of adding FCC rail traffic to Hanson and Forterra traffic, not to mention the HIF traffic, would create excessive noise pollution in Appleford, Sutton Courtenay and the Didcot northern developments. Another important reason why the SCPC considers this submission to be totally unacceptable.

Using the possibility to chase London's contracts to its commercial advantage, without proof of and quantifying the need, is yet another example of FCC misusing the planning process; something the SCPC has come to expect of the Applicants and its modus operandi over the years. It follows its regular Sect 73 and S106 applications to avoid fulfilling the conditions of planning permissions, which are exemplified by its failures in meeting restoration deadlines and the establishment of long overdue permissive paths.

SCPC considers that is not acceptable and urges the Planning Committee to reject the application. Finally, the applicant makes play of its success at the Milton Keynes appeal. That site, however, still had a void of 10 million m<sup>3</sup>, some three times larger than the Sutton Courtenay site void as of 2018. That is not an acceptable comparator and is aimed at raising undue concern in the Planning Committee about the risks of an appeal. The PC does not consider the Milton Keynes site to constitute a reasonable precedent that could be used in this case for several reasons/material considerations, including traffic and harm to local infrastructure, harm to local residential amenities and harm to local environmental matters by way of continuing pollution – air, soil, light, land and water.

#### DELAY TO THE PERMISSIVE PATH.

At a first glance, the logic of the FCC request seems understandable. However, the permissive path was included in the 2008 application with an annotation that it should be 'put in progressively.' It should, therefore, have been completed some time ago and allowance made for it in Hanson's expansion of the concreting batching facility. This highlights 1. the ongoing saga of the permissive paths, 2. FCC's failure in implementing the agreed footpaths plan and to maintain the boundaries of existing public rights of way and 3. of OCC's continuing inability to enforce planning permissions/conditions.

The Planning Committee is asked to reject the application and insist that FCC meets its long overdue obligation to activate the agreed permissive paths and to ensure its activities and adjacent ditches and vegetation are not allowed to impede the rights of residents to enjoy the public rights of way across its site.

References:

1. OMWCS 217 Para 2.14 and Table 1
2. OMWCS Note 46