

**BARFORD SHERBOURNE & WASPERTON JOINT
PARISH COUNCIL**

Minutes of the Meeting of the Joint Parish Council
held in Barford Memorial Hall on Mon 10 Oct 22

Present:	Cllr: T Merrygold (Chairman) Cllr: J T Barrott, J D Billingham, H Gadsden, J M Hawkesford, Mrs S Jarratt, Mrs L M Jones, J V Murphy, Mrs R Newsome, P B Phillips, M J Sheard,
Apologies:	Cllr: R Clay, Mrs D E Haynes, G Jackson, M J Metcalfe,

Opening

84 The meeting opened at 7:30 pm

85 No members of the public were present.

Declarations of Disclosable Interests

86 None was declared

Public Participation

87 None

Minutes of the Meeting of Council on 11 Jul 22

88 The minutes were approved as a true record. There were no matters arising.

Minutes of the Meeting of Council on 8 Aug 22

89 The minutes were approved as a true record. There were no matters arising.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee 28 Jun 22

90 The minutes were approved as a true record. There were no matters arising.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee 11 Jul 22

91 The minutes were approved as a true record. There were no matters arising.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee 8 Aug 22

92 The minutes were approved as a true record. There were no matters arising.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee 12 Sep 22

93 The minutes were approved as a true record. There were no matters arising.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee 28 Sep 22

94 The minutes were approved as a true record. There were no matters arising.

Financial Report

95 Cashbook Balances as at 30 Sep 22

- HSBC £237,853.59
- Santander £75,270.44

96 Receipts and Payments

Date	Payee	Category	Total
01 Jul 22	Pestforce	Open spaces maintenance	(80.00)
01 Jul 22	Stripe	BLIS:BSC	182.23
01 Jul 22	Barford Netball	BLIS:BSC	60.00
01 Jul 22	Countryside Services	Wasperton War Memorial	(28.00)
01 Jul 22	LTA	BLIS:BSC	(30.00)
01 Jul 22	Frank Mann Farmers	Mowing	(548.66)
01 Jul 22	Santander	Bank interest	6.19
09 Jul 22	Pestforce	Allotments	(90.00)
10 Jul 22	HMRC	Employment Expenses	(700.00)
12 Jul 22	Daughter Stu	Allotments	500.00
16 Jul 22	J T Windows	Bus shelter maintenance	(60.00)
21 Jul 22	HSBC	Bank Charges	(8.00)

23 Jul 22	Booker (JVM)	BLIS:KGF	(50.70)
25 Jul 22	Administration	Office Accommodation	(66.00)
25 Jul 22	Salaries	Employment Expenses	(885.00)
31 Jul 22	Santander	Bank interest	6.39
01 Aug 22	Countryside Services	Wasperton War Memorial	(28.00)
01 Aug 22	Stripe	BLIS:BSC	144.79
03 Aug 22	Frank Mann Farmers	Mowing	(620.66)
10 Aug 22	M&B Surfaces	BLIS:KGF	(2,658.00)
10 Aug 22	HMRC	Employment Expenses	(700.00)
11 Aug 22	J T Windows	Bus shelter maintenance	(60.00)
15 Aug 22	E.on	BLIS:KGF	(69.53)
18 Aug 22	Smith Construction	Open Spaces Maintenance	(495.00)
18 Aug 22	WALC	Training and Seminar Expenses	(36.00)
18 Aug 22	WALC	Training and Seminar Expenses	(36.00)
20 Aug 22	BYCC	Allotment water charge	(62.44)
21 Aug 22	HSBC	Bank Charges	(8.00)
22 Aug 22	PKF Littlejohn	Audit Fees	(480.00)
25 Aug 22	Administration	Office Accommodation	(66.00)
25 Aug 22	Salaries	Employment Expenses	(885.00)
01 Sep 22	Stripe	BLIS:BSC	201.86
01 Sep 22	Santander	Bank interest	6.39
02 Sep 22	Countryside Services	Wasperton War Memorial	(28.00)
08 Sep 22	D W Richards	BMH	(3,650.00)
10 Sep 22	HMRC	Employment Expenses	(700.00)
15 Sep 22	R J Smith	Allotments Hire of Land	(140.00)
15 Sep 22	D M Hadley	Allotments Hire of Land	(140.00)
20 Sep 22	WALC	Training and Seminar Expenses	36.00
21 Sep 22	HSBC	Bank Charges	(8.00)
23 Sep 22	WALC	Training and Seminar Expenses	(36.00)
24 Sep 22	J T Windows	Bus shelter maintenance	(60.00)
25 Sep 22	Administration	Office Accommodation	(66.00)
25 Sep 22	Salaries	Employment Expenses	(885.00)
28 Sep 22	WDC	Precept	28,474.00
28 Sep 22	Pestforce	Allotments	(225.00)

Management Accounts

97 The JPC took note of the Management Accounts at Annex A

Funding Offers

98 Funding Offer" is the term used by WDC for the distribution of s106 monies. The allocation is provisional; the grant must be used for the purpose specified and within a defined time. This presents the possibility of the long-term liability of returning any unspent part of the grant. The JPC should remain alert to this.

99 The Clerk had been at pains to submit the record of expenditure in a simple but unambiguous way. The response from WDC to the first submission of W/15/0747, which also asked how frequently WDC requires an update, was:

Hi James,
This is very comprehensive, thank-you. I have attached this information to the project notes.
Moving forward, I would be satisfied to receive just 2 reports a year, or even one if it is a smaller project. If everything can be consolidated as you have done here, which is easy to read/understand that would be great.
When you are ready please do forward W/17/0440.
Kind regards,
Helen

Offer	Balance	Expiry	Purpose
W/15/0747	£11,556	30 Nov 24	Barford Playing Field Project
W/17/0440	£127,677	31 Jan 27	Open space in Barford

Disbursement of s106 Funds

100 Allotment Footpath & KGF Bench Bases

Cllr Sheard reported:

ALLOTMENT PATH AND KING GEORGE'S PLAYING FIELD Report to Meeting 10 October 2022

Contract Value £49,936.55 plus VAT:
Allotment Path £40,893.12 plus VAT
KGF works £9043.43 plus VAT

Commencement Date: 3/10/22
Contract duration: a maximum of 6 weeks

Variations:

Fence posts and rails including wire fencing has been upgraded, approx. additional cost approx. £1300 (to be remeasured on completion)

Allotment path:

Footpath has been closed except for allotment holders.
Existing condition video has been taken by MJS
Progress is satisfactory, the existing fencing has been removed from site, the path edging kerbs are approximately 90% completed and the fence posts are concreted in, approx. 95% completed.
The new vehicle and personnel gates at the Dugard end are installed.
MJS has met with the school and the nursery to advise them of the Works.
Setting out of the 'Di Hadley' gate relocation, and the allotment gate at the KGF end have been agreed with the contractor

KGF bench bases:

The base positions have been set out and agreed with the contractor

102 Gymnasium Equipment.

Cllr Murphy confirmed that this matter is being investigated, three schemes had been proposed but the costs appear considerable at some £30-40k. They would be considered by the s.106 group and brought to a future JPC

103 Outstanding

- KGF Signage
- Repairs to Barford Village Green Wall

Emergency Planning

104 The Emergency Planning Committee met on 7 Sep 22 and considered the generic plan. It will meet again and continue to draft its Terms of Reference to be brought to the JPC at the November meeting for adoption.

20 is Plenty

105 The Chairman briefed the meeting on his discussions with Jo Edwards of WCC Highways Department. The traffic statistics they have for Barford currently show that the mean traffic speed along Church Street/High Street is below the 24mph level required for a reduction to a 20 mph limit and Highways would support a proposal from the JPC to make this 20mph. The statistics show that the mean speed for Bridge Street and Wellesbourne Road is above 24mph and Highways would not support a proposal for these two roads.

106 She does not believe there is a need for further traffic surveys, the cost for each being about £500.

- 107 Installation costs would be £8k-£10k, possibly less if they could be included with other 20mph proposals. Cllr Jan Matecki agreed to have further discussions with Jo Edwards to see if Bridge Street and at least part of Wellesbourne Road (from Canon Price Road to the mini roundabout) could be included. He also indicated that he would be prepared to put some of his Delegated Budget towards covering the costs.
- 108 The question was raised about how much consultation needs to be done with the residents. The Chairman is to check.
- 109 Speedwatch. Although Speedwatch is not really needed to help the case for 20 mph, it was still deemed to be a good idea in principle to help reduce the overall traffic speed and raise awareness. From previous items in Village Voices the JPC believes there are possibly 10-12 people willing to volunteer to help with it which is enough to make it viable. The Chairman is to pursue.

King George's Field

- 110 Cllr Murphy reported on the "arson attack" in July along with the response of police, insurers and contractors and the slow progress to repair and re-opening. Councillors considered if other steps can be taken to minimize risk of repeat events.

Crossings and Other Highways Work from WCC

- 111 WCC Highways had completed the fence replacement along the A429 and Barford Exchange. An excellent job; concrete posts and stronger fencing than before and some of the white H marking although not all. The Chairman will chase Graham Stanley for the remainder of the works.

BYCC

- 112 Following further consultation with the community the BYCC trustees are now considering either a staged approach or a complete review of the project. Cllr Murphy explained that the switch to a modular design reduces the cost from £1.2m to £600k, a figure which brings the project within the realms of achievability. The BYCC group would move towards a final decision as more information becomes available.

Land Around Barford House (LABH)

- 113 In response to the email exchange (*Pages 8-10*) which followed RHG's withdrawal of interest in LABH, notice had been received of further interest from the agent indicating that new developers/operators are interested in discussing the prospects for a care facility on the site and a date has been set for 18th October when representatives of the landowner, the developers and LABHWP would discuss the possibilities prior to any further commitment. The LABHWP stressed that its recent communication laid out red lines for any consideration of development on this sensitive site and welcomed the interest being expressed, particularly the intention of access "through the wall" on Wellesbourne Road. Progress to be reported at next JPC

Notwithstanding his professional relationship with Barford House, Cllr Hawkesford was invited to remain in the meeting as a source of information but without involvement in the deliberations.

Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (CPR) Training

- 114 Cllr Gadsden had organized a training session for eight people which had been very successful, so much so that another is intended.

External Auditor Report and Certificate 2021/22

- 115 The JPC took note.

Village Green Wildflower Proposal

- 116 A proposal by Bar Zero was considered by the JPC:

Summary

Bar Zero requests that the JPC, in view of the need to protect and increase biodiversity

- agree that in principle there can be some naturalisation of some of the verges, by altering the cutting regime

- Agree that some areas, to be mutually defined, can be planted with wildflowers under the management of Bar Zero who will be responsible for restitution if needed and for ongoing maintenance.
- Appoint a JPC representative to liaise with Bar Zero.

As an initial project we seek consent

- to plant wildflowers along the top of the village green wall that borders Church Street for a minimum of three summers (2023-2025 incl.)
- We also request that the JPC consider reducing the cutting frequency of the perimeter of the green and around the base of the trees to allow the grass and flowers naturally in the ground to grow. This should not be cut until September, once any naturally occurring flowers have set seed.

Background

Protecting and increasing biodiversity is an important part of the challenge to tackle climate change and the consequent impact on plant and insect species. Wildflowers, plants and fungi are the life support of all our wildlife. Further, wildflower areas store more 30% more carbon than a grass area (source: Plantlife.org).

We all have a role to play in this. Here in Barford, Wasperton and Sherbourne we have an opportunity to create a colourful display, to protect native species, attract butterflies and other insects and to be taking visible action.

117 The request was granted in principle, subject to provision of a detailed plan and confirmation of the term of the agreement and responsibility for maintenance and mowing.

Closure

118 The meeting closed at 9:00pm

Management Accounts as at 30 Sep 22

Executive Summary

Opening balance 1 Apr 22	282,536	
Excess of Income over Expenditure 2021-22	4,151	
Closing balance 31 Mar 23	286,688	
Designated Funds		
Barford Leisure Improvement Scheme:		
Barford Sports Club	7,901	Self funding. Money banked with JPC
King George's Field	29,145	Residue of start-up funding & s106 grants
Sinking Fund	35,000	Funded from Precept; for long-term capital needs
Barford Funding Offer	129,272	s106
Barford Memorial Hall	1,761	Current balance owned by BMH
Barford Telephone Kiosk	200	Barford Heritage Group bond for future costs
Barford War Memorial	470	Raised by public subscription
Election Expenses	3,000	JPC policy to reserve this early in the election cycle
Neighbourhood Watch	100	Current Balance
Provision for new mower	1,600	Purchase approved by JPC
Public Access Defibrillation	185	Current balance (donated)
Section 106	3,140	Reserved for specific projects
Barford Youth & Community Centre	20,000	Promissory note; payable on completion.
Key Man Insurance (self-funded)	15,613	75% of Clerk's Salary, ERNI and Office Costs
Total Designated Funds	247,387	
SUMMARY	Cr	Dr
Closing Balance 31 Mar 23	286,688	
Designated Funds		247,387
Totals	286,688	247,387
Discretionary Reserve	39,301	

Budget

	Budget 22-23	Forecast Outturn
RECEIPTS		
Allotments Rents	1,350	1,307
Bank Interest	10	80
BLIS:BSC	2,000	2,000
Grants	0	0
Precept (WDC)	56,948	56,948
s106	0	0
VAT	2,500	2,884
Wayleave	5	5
TOTAL RECEIPTS	62,813	63,225
PAYMENTS		
Allotments Hire of Land	560	560
Allotments Maintenance	360	500
Allotments Water Supply	200	200
Audit Fees	526	680
Bank Charges	0	96
BLIS:BSC	0	200
BLIS:KGF	0	9,000
BLIS:SF	5,000	0
BMH	0	3,650
Bus Shelters Maintenance	585	700
Chairman's Allowance	527	527
Employment Expenses	20,044	20,000
Grants: Churchyard Maintenance	1,500	1,500
Grants: Community Centres	5,246	4,200
Insurance	2,474	2,983
KGF Funding Offer	0	0
Newsletter	2,480	2,614
Office Accommodation	817	817
Open Spaces Maintenance	5,000	9,000
Postage	20	20
Printing and Stationery	20	20
Rectory Paddock	500	500
Section 137	25	25
Subs: Information Commissioner	40	40
Subs: SLCC	192	192
Subs: WALC	680	661
Training and Seminar Expenses	100	200
Travel Expenses	20	80
War Memorial Wasperton	108	108
TOTAL PAYMENTS	53,074	59,073
Difference:	9,739	4,151

LABH EMAIL EXCHANGE

From: James Hawkesford <jmh@hawkesford.co.uk>

Sent: 12 August 2022 12:07

To: John Murphy <jvmurphy@talktalk.net>; Roger Clay <roger.oakframe@btinternet.com>; Michael Sheard <mikesheard6@gmail.com>; tmerrygold@btinternet.com

Subject: Land Around Barford House

Gents

Just to update you as to what is going on in respect to my clients land.

The Option with Restful Homes has lapsed and in light of the issues with them they do not have the appetite to take this forward further.

I had been in negotiations with another provider called Opus who are a specialised care firm, the management team sold out to Bupa some years ago. They were keen to put a scheme forward and had proposed in the first instance to submit an application for a hole in the wall and they would have walked away if they were turned down. I think you would have been very impressed as to what they were proposing.

In doing their due diligence their planning team from Avison Young have advised them to walk away in the following email:

In short, this site has a number of policy hurdles to overcome in order for a scheme to be supported and in our view, given previous decisions reached by inspectors on the site, a planning application would likely be refused. If an appeal were to be progressed, we would consider prospects to be materially below 50%. I think this would remain the case for the smallest scheme that you could viably propose.

In reaching this conclusion we have noted the policy considerations set out in the proforma and as discussed yesterday. We have also tracked down the appeal decisions relating to the previous two residential schemes on the site and reviewed the decisions of the inspectors.

Applications were submitted in 2011 and then 2013 for residential development on the site, both were refused and the decisions appealed. The appeals were both determined by way of inquiry in 2013 and 2014. The first application was for 58 dwellings and a public park and the second was for 50 dwellings and open space, in addition to partial demolition of 86m of the boundary wall. Both appeals were dismissed and copies of the appeal decisions and site layout plans are attached.

In both instances, a main issue of consideration was the impact of development on the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the Grade II* listed building. Some of the key conclusions reached by the Inspectors were:

- The boundary wall forms part of the Grade II* listing and removal of 14m to form an access would result in a severe loss of the sense of seclusion of the former estate grounds and the exclusivity of the setting of Barford House. It would also jeopardise the distinctive character of the setting of Barford House and the removal of part of the wall would cause substantial harm to the significance of Barford House as an outstanding heritage asset.
- The loss of the former estate grounds would be particularly damaging to the unique character of the village.
- The site formed part of an estate surrounding Barford House and served not only recreational and functional purposes but also provided enclosed exclusive space and thus the status appropriate to a regency mansion. It is therefore considered that the surrounding estate lands provide a designed secluded setting for the house and that the particular character of the setting contributes strongly to the special interest and significance of Barford House.
- The boundary wall on Wellesbourne Road is the most complete surviving example of an estate wall within the village and makes a significant contribution to the distinctive character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- The site is in a very sensitive location, subject to three layers of protection – as the setting of an important listed building; as a significant part of the CA; and as a park and garden of key local interest (the latter being a designation in the previous Local Plan but which also appears to continue to be the case, although there is no plan defining the boundary of protected parks in the current plan, it simply refers to Barford House).
- The land surrounding Barford House, including that with the Wellesbourne Road frontage are most sensitive to change and of particular importance.

- The development of the site would not preserve the secluded setting of the house and it would cause extensive damage to its setting which would seriously undermine the distinctive character of Barford House, causing substantial harm to its significance.

The key parts of the appeal decisions can be viewed at the following paras: W_11_1533 appeal, paras 6-12 and 22; W_13_1465 Appeal, paras 17-33 and 44.

It is worth noting that both appeals were determined prior to the neighbourhood plan being 'made', which now adds a further policy layer which is Local Green Space. The national planning practice guidance states "Designating a green area as Local Green Space would give it protection consistent with that in respect of Green Belt". This is therefore a further considerable policy hurdle to overcome and the way the neighbourhood plan policy is drafted is to put a blanket restriction against any development. It does not set out exceptions where some types of development could be supported.

The above lead us to conclude that prospects on this site would be very low

The bold text is what has led them to walk away completely as the neighbourhood plan has effectively sterilised the site for any development, with this in place I am going to be unable to convince a proper provider to look at making any kind of application.

Is the JPC prepared to help in getting the wording of the plan changed so that there is an exception made for a care home / care village use on the site?

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Kind Regards

James M Hawkesford MRICS FNAEA FNAVA

To James Hawkesford

Dear James,

Thank you for the update received recently.

We have convened and held a meeting of the **Land Around Barford House Working Party (LABHWP)** to consider your message and this is our formal response.

We were, of course, disappointed to hear that, after five years working together, RHG had terminated their interest in this project, however given their seeming reluctance latterly to respond promptly and actively engage with us we are perhaps not totally surprised. Regardless, we wish them well in their future endeavours.

We were very interested to hear that you had already found another developer/operator interested in the site and particularly impressed that they were willing to consider an access through the Barford House Land wall. We understand their advisers' interpretations of the chances of success but are cheered that they understand that the concept still has a significant chance of getting approval.

We were less cheered with the interpretation of the **Barford Neighbourhood Development Plan (BNDP) Policy B10 Protection and enhancement of Local Green Spaces**, as they seem to have overlooked para. 5.54 which would allow development "*in very special circumstances*".

It is our interpretation that provision of a facility which meets **BNDP Policy B3** could very well be such a very special circumstance.

That section of BNDP in particular was written very carefully specifically to allow consideration of such a situation if, and only if, an appropriate and acceptable scheme were to come forward, when we would expect the JPC and the community to support such a proposal, through whatever planning challenge was presented.

It is our contention that Barford has the enthusiasm for such a scheme, and many of the persuasive skills to help drive such a scheme forward, and that a suitable developer should have significant confidence that, with Barford's help, they will have better than average chance of achieving the required permissions.

Whilst recognising the very significant site-specific issues we believe the real challenge is identifying a developer/operator willing and able to offer the full range of facilities and scale which we require. For clarity, we would remind you that we are looking for a facility which will cover downsizing homes, sheltered accommodation, with care home and significant dementia care, including EMI Residential – all with age and/or disability restrictions on tenure, and some local connection prioritisation.

It is NOT the JPC's intention to open the BNDP any wider for fear of undesirable/predatory developer activity.

We are unfamiliar with Opus and or their connection with BUPA beyond brief online searches, however if they still have some interest in this site and the concept detailed briefly above, then we would be pleased to meet with them, and/or other potential investors, to share our enthusiasm and

vision for this site.

We hope that this is helpful and clarifies the JPC position regarding this site and we look forward to further fruitful working with you and suitable developers.

We are happy for the content of this email to be shared with your various colleagues and are happy to engage in dialogue as needed.

Yours sincerely,

John Murphy

Chair – LABHWP

01926 624421

07710 033444