

BARFORD SHERBOURNE & WASPERTON JOINT PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Joint Parish Council held at Barford Memorial Hall
on Mon 11 Jan 16

Present:	Cllr J V Murphy,(Chairman) Mrs W Barlow, R Clay, H Gadsden, J M Hawkesford, Mrs A Gordon, T Merrygold, Mrs R Newsome, M J Metcalfe, A B Rhead, N F J Thurley, Mrs K E Thomson, J T Wright
In Attendance:	Cllr: L Caborn (WCC)

Opening

143 The meeting opened at 7:30 pm

144 No members of the public were present.

Appointments and Resignations

145 The JPC took note of the resignation of P A P Morris.

Composition of Planning Committee

146 Both Cllr Mrs Thomson and A B Rhead volunteered to fill the vacancy on the Planning Committee created by the resignation of P A P Morris. Cllr Rhead was appointed in order to benefit from his experience as a former chairman of the WDC Planning Committee.

Coopted Member for Barford

147 The Chairman reported success in recruiting a new member for Barford to fill one of the three remaining vacancies on the JPC. His details will be circulated in advance of the February meeting.

Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

148 Both Cllr Mrs Barlow and Rhead declared a personal interest in the item on the Public Access Defibrillator

Public Participation

149 There was none.

Minutes of the Meeting of Council 9 Nov 15

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

Matters Arising

151 Barford Leisure Improvement Scheme (BLIS). The hope expressed at the November meeting that the project would be complete by the end of December has been dashed by the continuous inclement weather turning parts of the site into a quagmire. Nevertheless everything is ready for that event as soon as it lifts. The costs are currently £10k below budget.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee 9 Nov 15

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

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee 7 Dec 15

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

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee 21 Dec 15

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

Cash Book Balances as at 31 Dec 15

155 The JPC took note of the following cash balances

- HSBC £ 8,248.17
- Santander £51,098.20

Receipts and Payments

156 The JPC endorsed the following:

Date	Payee/er	Category	Total
2 Nov 15	Santander	Bank Interest	38.43
2 Nov 15	Barford Village Shop	Grant: BMH	200.00
4 Nov 15	T F Jackson	BLIS	(234.00)
4 Nov 15	HMRC	VAT	4,505.08
5 Nov 15	WDC	Grant: BLIS	55,000.00
7 Nov 15	Sean Kinsey	BLIS	(1,600.00)
10 Nov 15	HMRC	Employment Expenses	(621.29)
14 Nov 15	MFM Services	Mowing Charges	(525.00)
17 Nov 15	T F Jackson	BLIS	(9,661.20)
23 Nov 15	HMRC	VAT	11,301.60
28 Nov 15	Miracle Design & Play Ltd	BLIS	(4,446.00)
28 Nov 15	Miracle Design & Play Ltd	BLIS	(48,000.00)
29 Nov 15	Administration	Postage	(24.50)
29 Nov 15	Administration	Travel Expenses	(27.43)
30 Nov 15	Salaries	Employment Expenses	(797.64)
30 Nov 15	Administration	Office Accommodation	(59.42)
30 Nov 15	SLCC	Subs: SLCC	(167.00)
1 Dec 15	Santander	Bank Interest	37.21
2 Dec 15	Streetmaster	BLIS	(7,941.60)
2 Dec 15	Streetmaster	BLIS	(9,964.80)
7 Dec 15	Came & Company	Insurance	(33.54)
8 Dec 15	T F Jackson	BLIS	(9,661.20)
9 Dec 15	WDC	Grant: BLIS	55,000.00
10 Dec 15	Smith Construction	BLIS	(85,457.16)
10 Dec 15	HMRC	Employment Expenses	(621.29)
24 Dec 15	HMRC	VAT	26,007.26
24 Dec 15	WTP	Training and Seminar Expenses	(60.00)
30 Dec 15	Salaries	Employment Expenses	(797.64)
30 Dec 15	Administration	Office Accommodation	(59.42)
30 Dec 15	Smith Construction	BLIS	(26,412.20)
31 Dec 15	D M Hadley	Allotments Hire of Land	(125.00)
31 Dec 15	R J Smith	Allotments Hire of Land	(125.00)

Management Accounts as at 31 Dec 15

157 The management accounts at Annex A are prepared on a Business As Usual basis, that is to say excluding the income, expenditure and VAT for BLIS in this financial year so as to avoid their distorting effects upon the report.

158 The JPC took note.

159 The BLIS Ledger is at Annex B

Budget and Precept 2016-17

160 The JPC adopted the budget at Annex C and set the precept at £42,787.

Warwickshire Police Precept

161 Recently the JPC received a circular which started: "Warwickshire Police and Crime Commissioner Ron Ball wants to hear your views as he considers setting the police budget for 2016/17. He is asking all members of the public if they are willing to contribute around a penny a day extra in order to maintain frontline policing levels."

162 The JPC ruled it was not a matter with which it should concern itself and declined to respond.

Rectory Paddock

- 163 During the early stages of developing the King George's Field (KGF) scheme the WP was in contact with the Coventry Diocese to see if the paddock could be included in the scheme. At the time the Diocese were unable to commit to the scheme and the current scheme was evolved. Since that time there has been some limited informal contact between WP members, the Barford St Peter's School and the Diocese largely centring on parking and school access issues – pupils and staff accessing the school and also access from the school to KGF. . The Diocese have now indicated a willingness to consider granting a lease on the paddock for use for “community parking purposes in connection with the school, church and KGF”. Fine details have yet to be discussed however the availability of this paddock for community use would be very valuable in supporting the school (staff parking and pedestrian access via the allotment path), the King George's Field (teams and matches), St Peter's Church (weddings, funerals and other events). It is currently envisaged that access to parking would be by arrangement rather than full open public access.
- 164 The detail terms of the lease are currently being decided by the Diocese however they have indicated that there would be an initial legal cost of £500 and an annual rent of £500.
- 165 There would be some costs of putting the paddock into use including provision of pedestrian gates, some stoning of the parking area and some general maintenance which could be largely undertaken on a self-help basis (and/or incorporated within the KGF scheme if contractors remain on site) and mowing which would be occasional and added to the current contract. There would however be various material costs.
- 166 Barford St Peter's School has no budget allowance available for this project.
- 167 Barford Community Charity is keen to support this project and has agreed to fund the £500 legal fees.
- 168 The JPC was invited:
- to agree to entering into a lease on this paddock.
 - to agree to fund the £500 pa rent on an on-going basis, subject to final lease terms
 - to allocate an amount of £1,000 from the JPC Discretionary Reserve towards putting the paddock in order for parking and pedestrian access to the school.
- 169 The JPC gave careful consideration to the request but ruled that there were too many uncertainties to allow it to commit to signing the lease at this time. It would reconsider the matter when heads of terms for the lease were made available.

Public Access Defibrillator

- 170 The Barford First Responders Group disbanded earlier this year and the Group has some modest funds still in its account.
- 171 The Group asked the JPC to take on the maintenance of the public access defibrillator (PAD), situated at the shop and it would like to give the JPC all of its existing funds (c£400.00) to assist in the JPC's then commitment.
- 172 Having been informed that the known costs were:
- Battery replacement every five years £160
 - Pads replacement every three years £99
- the JPC agreed to the transfer of ownership
- 173 Yet to be decided is the inspection regime.

Warwickshire County Council Minerals Plan

- 174 A Working Party tasked with the formulation of the JPC's response to the consultation exercise was convened and submitted its report to WDC, a copy of which is at Annex D for the record.

Any Other Business

- 175 Warwick District Council New Local Plan. In clarification of the minute of the November meeting which read:
“The Warwick District New Local Plan, originally failed by the Inspector, has been given a new lease of life by having its status amended to “Suspended until May 2016”. In the interim WDC will reexamine every

possible site in the District in order to meet the demand to accommodate the overflow of housing demand from Coventry. The WDC Executive will consider its findings in early-January prior to further public consultation”

Cllr Caborn said the date had now been set as 27 Jan 16.

- 176 Junction 15 M40. Cllr Wright drew attention to the very poor quality of road marking on the roundabout at this junction and considered they created a traffic hazard. The Clerk subsequently drew this matter to the attention of the Highways Agency (Ref: 609 of 14 Jan 16) and Chris White MP.

Closure

- 177 There being no other business the meeting closed at 8:45pm.

Date of Next Meeting

- 178 The next meeting of the JPC is on Mon 8 Feb 16 at 7:30 pm in Sherbourne Village Hall

MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS AS AT 31 DEC 15

	Budget 2015-16	YTD	Outturn	Diff
RECEIPTS				
Allotments Rents	985		985	0
Bank Interest	50	293	360	310
Concurrent Services Contribution (WDC)	2,410	2,410	2,410	
Council Tax Reduction Scheme	2,563	2,563	2,563	
Grant: BMH		200	200	200
Grant: Notice Board		673	673	673
Precept (WDC)	41,243	41,243	41,243	
VAT Refund	1,600	1,912	1,912	312
Wayleave	5	5	5	
TOTAL RECEIPTS	48,855	49,299	50,351	1,495
PAYMENTS				
Allotments Hire of Land	500	250	500	
Allotments Maintenance	150			150
Allotments Water Charges	160	75	200	(40)
Audit Fees	325	445	445	(120)
Bank Charge	20			20
Barford Leisure Improvement Scheme	15,000			15,000
Barford Parish Directory		36	44	(44)
Bus Shelters Maintenance	525	315	525	
Chairman's Allowance	468		468	
Employment Expenses	17,000	12,823	17,000	
Grants: Churchyard Maintenance	1,323		1,323	
Grants: Village Halls	4,081		4,081	
Insurance	834	832	832	3
Mowing Charges	3,545	3,252	3,252	293
Notice Boards	200	807	807	807
Office Accommodation	713	535	713	
Open Spaces Maintenance	500	209	300	200
Postage	80	113	140	(60)
Printing and Stationery	300	187	300	
Rural Footway Lighting	910	906	906	4
Section 137	20		20	
Subs: Information Commissioner	35		35	
Subs: SLCC	171	167	167	4
Subs: WALC	501	501	501	
Training and Seminar Expenses	300	60	100	200
Travel Expenses	300	185	300	
Venue Hire	170	120	170	
War Memorial Barford		65	65	(65)
War Memorial Wasperton	100	100	100	
TOTAL PAYMENTS	48,231	21,984	33,294	
NET TOTALS	624		17,057	

Executive Summary		
Opening Balance 1 Apr 15	64,993	
Add Excess Income over Expenditure	17,057	
Closing Balance 31 Mar 16	82,050	
Designated Funds		
Barford Leisure Improvement Scheme	31,933	Balance 1 Apr 15
Barford Memorial Hall	4,151	Current balance
Barford Neighbourhood Development Plan	587	Current balance
Barford Parish Directory (CVS)	37	Current balance
Barford Telephone Kiosk	200	Bond deposited by Barford Heritage Group for future costs
Election Expenses (reserve from 2015)	2,000	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
Rural Footway Lighting 2017	906	Phased payment
Rural Footway Lighting 2018	906	Phased payment
War Memorial Barford	470	Raised by public subscription. Unavailable for any other purpose
WDC New Local Plan	1,300	Contingency for challenge
Total Designated Funds	44,190	
Total Reserve	37,859	Closing balance 31 Mar 16 less Designated Funds
Risk Management Reserve	13,285	75% of Clerk's costs
Discretionary Reserve	24,575	Unallocated reserve

BLIS LEDGER AS AT 31 DEC 15

Date	PV/RV	Payee	Debit	Credit	VAT	Balance	Memo
6 Jan 14		JPC		5,000.00		5,000.00	Grant
1 Mar 14	PV077	On Centre Surveys	594.00		99.00	4,505.00	Survey
1 Apr 14		JPC		10,000.00		14,505.00	Budget
18 May 14	PV012	David Robotham Ltd	570.00		95.00	14,030.00	Architects
15 Oct 14	RV009	WDC		3,000.00		17,030.00	Grant
9 Dec 14	PV068	WDC	97.50			16,932.50	Planning
1 Apr 15		JPC		15,000.00		31,932.50	Budget
13 Apr 15	RV001	WDC		500.00		32,432.50	Grant
1 May 15	PV004	David Robotham	300.00		50.00	32,182.50	Architects
8 Jun 15	RV004	BCC		52,000.00		84,182.50	Donation
8 Jun 15	RV005	BCC		2,589.34		86,771.84	Donation
8 Jun 15	RV006	Barford WI		600.00		87,371.84	Donation
12 Jun 15	PV016	Colin Bunce	100.00			87,271.84	PR
11 Jul 15	PV022	ICON	82.50		13.75	87,203.09	Signage
22 Jul 15	PV026	Fields in Trust	50.00			87,153.09	Subscription
26 Jul 15	PV029	RPrint	278.00			86,875.09	Printing
26 Jul 15	PV030	M Griffin	11.00			86,864.09	Post
28 Jul 15	RV008	Barford School Trust		25,000.00		111,864.09	Grant
3 Aug 15	RV007	BCC		21,022.51		132,886.60	Grant
19 Aug 15	PV034	BCC	5,375.00			127,511.60	Refund
10 Sep 15	PV037	Miracle Design & Play	24,000.00		4,000.00	107,511.60	20% deposit
10 Sep 15	PV038	Miracle Design & Play	2,223.14		370.52	105,658.98	20% deposit
19 Sep 15	PV040	WDC	97.00			105,561.98	Planning
21 Sep 15	BS	BCC		14,441.48		120,003.46	Donation
24 Sep 15	PV043	Colin Bunce	100.00			119,903.46	PR
3 Oct 15	PV046	RPrint	65.00			119,838.46	Printing
3 Oct 15	PV047	RPrint	66.00			119,772.46	Printing
12 Oct 15	RV012	R A Scott		25.00		119,797.46	Misc sales
13 Oct 15	PV050	RPrint	177.00			119,620.46	Printing
13 Oct 15	RV014	BCC		2,900.00		122,520.46	Grant
22 Oct 15	PV052	Smith Construction	67,628.41		11,271.40	66,163.45	Contractor
4 Nov 15	PV055	T F Jackson	234.00		39.00	65,968.45	Site Visit
5 Nov 15	RV016	WDC		55,000.00		120,968.45	Grant
7 Nov 15	PV056	Sean Kinsey	1,600.00			119,368.45	Website
16 Nov 15	PV058	T F Jackson	9,661.20		1,610.20	111,317.45	Accommodation
28 Nov 15	PV059	Miracle Design & Play	4,446.00		741.00	107,612.45	Fencing
28 Nov 15	PV060	Miracle Design & Play	48,000.00		8,000.00	67,612.45	Playground
2 Dec 15	PV064	Streetmaster	7,941.60		1,323.60	60,994.45	Equipment
2 Dec 15	PV065	Streetmaster	9,964.80		1,660.80	52,690.45	Equipment
8 Dec 15	PV058	T F Jackson	9,661.20		1,610.20	44,639.45	Accommodation
10 Dec 15	RV018	WDC		55,000.00		99,639.45	Grant
10 Dec 15	PV066	Smith Construction	85,457.16		14,242.86	28,425.15	Contractor
30 Dec 15	PV070	Smith Construction	26,412.20		4,402.03	6,414.98	Contractor

BUDGET 2016-17

	Actual 2014-15	Budget 2015-16	Forecast Outturn 2015-16	Budget 2016-17
RECEIPTS				
Allotments Rents	1,956	985	985	993
Bank Interest	106	50	360	100
Concurrent Services Contribution (WDC)	2,470	2,410	2,410	2,290
Council Tax Reduction Scheme	2,012	2,563	2,563	1,415
Grant: BMH			200	
Grant: Notice Board			673	
Grants/Donations	9,993			
Precept (WDC)	40,170	41,243	41,243	42,787
VAT	410	1,600	2,000	1,000
Wayleave	5	5	5	5
TOTAL RECEIPTS	57,122	48,855	50,439	48,590
PAYMENTS				
Allotments Hire of Land	500	500	500	500
Allotments Maintenance		150		150
Allotments Water Charges	160	160	200	160
Audit Fees	325	325	445	445
Bank Charges	20	20		
Barford Leisure Improvement Scheme	1,270	15,000		2,000
Barford Memorial Hall	578			
Barford Neighbourhood Development Plan	8,160			
Barford Parish Directory			44	
Bus Shelters Maintenance	420	525	525	525
Chairman's Allowance	458	468	468	472
Employment Expenses	16,240	17,000	17,000	17,170
Grants: Churchyard Maintenance	1,296	1,323	1,323	1,334
Grants: Village Halls	2,850	4,081	4,081	4,114
Insurance	816	834	832	1,000
Mowing Charges	3,236	3,545	3,252	3,777
Notice Boards		200	807	
Office Accommodation	696	713	713	719
Open Spaces Maintenance	248	500	300	300
Postage	163	80	140	140
Printing and Stationery	300	300	300	300
Rural Footway Lighting	10,406	910	906	906
Section 137	20	20	20	20
Sherbourne Village Hall	2,675			
Subs: Information Commissioner	35	35	35	35
Subs: SLCC	167	171	167	170
Subs: WALC	492	501	501	505
Training and Seminar Expenses	40	300	100	200
Travel Expenses	259	300	300	300
Venue Hire	168	170	170	170
War Memorial Barford			65	
War Memorial Wasperton	100	100	100	100
TOTAL PAYMENTS	52,097	48,231	33,295	35,511
NET TOTALS	5,025	624	17,144	13,079

Minerals – Preferred Options November 2015 – JPC Submission

Question 1

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Spatial Portrait

Is there any other information or data which you would like to be included in the Spatial Portrait? If so please set out what you would like to see included.

It would be really useful to have a map provided showing the agricultural land quality - especially the "best and most versatile land" so that it was clear which land was being proposed for mineral extraction and consequential loss from agricultural use. Please add such a map.

There is no mention of the "Tourist Profile" of the areas under consideration. Mineral extraction in "open-aspect" locations on major tourist route and important town approaches can be very damaging to the local economy. Please add a tourist evaluation of some sort to the system.

Question 2

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Key Issues - Other Issues?

Do you agree with the Key issues and are there any other issues you would like to see included in the Minerals Plan?

The Key Issues as presented totally neglect the importance of agricultural land. Please add a Key Issue which serves to recognise and preserve the "best and most versatile agricultural land" rather than allowing its loss for inappropriate mineral extraction.

The Key Issues also fail to address the very significant Health risks associated with proximity to residential and business properties. Please add a Key Issue relating to "Health Safeguarding"

Question 3 – no comment

Question 4

Objectives of the Warwickshire Minerals Plan

6.8 The Government's objectives for mineral planning (as required in Section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) provide the framework for the Warwickshire Mineral Plan objectives.

6.9 The following section identifies the key objectives that will guide the Warwickshire Minerals Plan. These objectives have been derived from the national objectives from knowledge based on minerals planning in the local area and from feedback based on two sets of consultation carried out from 2006-2007.

6.10 The objectives produced previously within the plan process and following the Revised Spatial Options consultation, have now been developed further. The objectives have been scrutinised twice and refined following stakeholder comments. Having assessed the national mineral objectives and taken in to account these consultation comments, we have prepared a revised set of objectives to help achieve the Spatial Vision. These are as follows:

-
- i. To secure a steady and adequate supply of aggregates and other minerals required to support sustainable economic growth at the national, sub-regional and local level.
 - ii. To help deliver sustainable mineral development by promoting the prudent use and safeguarding of Warwickshire's mineral resources and help prevent sterilisation of land from non mineral development.
 - iii. To promote the use of recycled and/or secondary materials and promote waste minimisation to reduce the overall demand for primary mineral extraction for construction aggregates.
 - iv. To protect, conserve and enhance the natural and historic environment and avoid, reduce or mitigate potential adverse effects associated with mineral developments.
 - v. To have full regard for the concerns and interests of local communities and protect them from unacceptable environmental adverse impacts resulting from mineral developments;
 - vi. To minimise the impact of the movement of bulk materials by road on local communities and where possible encourage the use of alternative modes of transport.
 - vii. To ensure mineral sites are restored to a high standard once extraction has ceased and ensure that each site is restored to the most beneficial use(s).
 - viii. To promote the use of locally extracted materials to encourage local distinctiveness and reduce transportation distances.
 - ix. To reduce the effect of mineral development on the causes of climate change.

- x. To ensure the best quality agricultural land is protected or replaced to its former quality.

Question 4

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Objectives

Do you agree with the Minerals Plan Objectives and would you like to see any changes to their wording?

Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council agrees with these objectives and would wish Objective x. "protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land" in particular to be given significant priority and fully respected throughout the consultation.

Question 5

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Spatial Strategy

Do you agree with the Spatial Strategy set out the Key Diagram in Figure 1.6 and can you set out your reasons for this?

We presume that this question really refers to Diagram 1.7, rather than 1.6, however, regardless we cannot agree with the Spatial Strategy as proposed. Sites 4 (Wasperton) and 5 (Glebe Farm) should not be included as they are inappropriate for the following reasons:

- Both sites are sited on "best and most versatile land"
- Neither site can (economically) be restored to the same land quality after extraction
- Both sites are located in close proximity to settlements with very significant numbers of dwellings and residents impacted
- The prevailing SW wind will present noise and pollution hazards to health of residents and workers
- Both are situated on a major single carriageway road carrying c. 20,000 vehicles per day with an already heavy HGV element
- Both are located in exposed open aspect positions, fully visible from all aspects.

Questions 6,7,8 – no comments

Question 8a

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Land at Wasperton

Do you have any comments on the allocation of land at Wasperton?

This site at Wasperton Farm is totally inappropriate:

- Site is "best and most versatile agricultural land" - grades 2 and 3a, enhanced with irrigation to equivalent to grade 1
- This site cannot and will not be restored to its original land quality - there is evidence of such at previous sites on the A429 near Wasperton where S&G extraction has been left as low lying, marshy unproductive low quality farmland not worthy of cultivation
- The site is located in one of the most exposed "open aspects" of all the sites in the consultation - consider the views from Wasperton Hill Farm or Public Footpath W101, in addition from tourist route A429 - NB: Open aspect has been quoted as a significant reason in many of the sites otherwise rejected from consideration.
- The proposed stand-off of only 100m in the face of the prevailing SW wind is totally inadequate to safeguard the health of residents in Barford from the damaging effects of dust, and noise.
- The A429 is a very busy (20,000vpd) single carriageway major road with a high proportion of HGV traffic routing to Wellesbourne Distribution Park, and beyond. Laden 20 tonne, eight-wheel lorries as favoured by aggregate companies will not be able to manoeuvre into the traffic safely without major disruptions to traffic flow. It should be noted that the importance of maintaining and/or improving the traffic flows on the A429 was a major consideration when sourcing funding for and the design of the Barford Bypass - it would be quite inappropriate to significantly disrupt those cost benefits by such an inappropriate mineral extraction scheme.
- The suggestion of advance tree planting is welcome but also brings concerns. The use of conifers as happened when Warwick Castle Park was included in the previous Minerals Plan, whilst moderately effective over a relatively short period of time, is alien to the area and would not be encouraged under any other circumstances. The use of native deciduous trees which would be aesthetically more acceptable would be inherently slow growing and would fail to

achieve the intended effect in time to shield any extraction within the plan period. Additionally tree loss in the autumn would render them ineffective for significant parts of the year.

- Protected species surveys need to be included in the allocation requirements/conditions.
- An Environment Management Plan should be proposed.
- A Health Impact Assessment is essential before consideration of this site for land allocation.

Question 9

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Glebe Farm, Wasperton

Do you have any comments on the allocation of Glebe Farm, ?

This is totally inappropriate:

- The site is actually only ever marginally viable - and then only in conjunction with proposed site 4 - and is totally non-viable if any consideration is given to the blight and damage caused to neighbouring properties and businesses.
- The Policy relating to this site must include advance tree planting, protected species surveys, an environmental management plan and a Health Impact Assessment before it can be considered to go forward.
- This site cannot be restored to its original land quality - there is evidence of such at previous sites on the A429 near Wasperton where S&G extraction has been left as low lying, marshy unproductive low quality farmland not worthy of cultivation. Please cross-refer to Objective "x" which would not support this site.
- The site is located in one of the most exposed "open aspects" of all the sites in the consultation - consider the views from Wasperton Hill Farm or Public Footpath W101, in addition from tourist route A429 - NB: Open aspect has been quoted as a significant reason in many of the sites otherwise rejected from consideration. Public Footpath W101a pass straight through the middle of this allocation.
- The proposed stand off of only 100m in the face of the prevailing SW wind is totally inadequate to safeguard the health of residents in Barford from the damaging effects of dust, and noise.
- The A429 is a very busy (20,000vpd) single carriageway major road with a high proportion of HGV traffic routing to Wellesbourne Distribution Park, and beyond. Laden 20 tonne, eight-wheel lorries as favoured by aggregate companies will not be able to manoeuvre into the traffic safely without major disruptions to traffic flow. It should be noted that the importance of maintaining and/or improving the traffic flows on the A429 was a major consideration when sourcing funding for and the design of the Barford bypass - it would be quite inappropriate to significantly disrupt those cost benefits by such an inappropriate mineral extraction scheme. It should be noted that there is a considerable history of accidents already on this stretch of road, between Thelsford Brook and the Barford Bypass, stretching back over many years.
- The site is actually only ever marginally viable - and then only in conjunction with proposed site 4 - and is totally non-viable if any consideration is given to the blight and damage caused to neighbouring properties and businesses.
- The Policy relating to this site must include advance tree planting, protected species surveys, an environmental management plan and a Health Impact Assessment before it can be considered to go forward.

Questions 10-16 – no comments

Question 17

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Secondary and Recycled Aggregates

Do you agree with Policy MCS4 and do you have any further comments on the policy wording and justification?

Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council support and encourage the use of secondary and recycled aggregates and suggest that it should be actively promoted along with the use of alternative materials or if necessary aggregates from alternative sources or locations - specific consideration should be given to recovery of aggregate from sea shores where it has usually arisen from unavoidable erosion.

Question 18

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Safeguarding of Minerals

Do you agree with Policy MCS5 and do you have any further comments on the policy wording and justification?

Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council support the concept of Mineral Safeguarding provided it runs alongside proper implementation of Pre-extraction from sites undergoing other development, rather than the lip-service which has applied to the latter in the past allowing vast swathes of minerals to be sterilised in perpetuity (eg SW Warwick sites where only token excavations were undertaken)

Questions 19-24 no comments

Question 25

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Natural and built environment

Do you agree with Policy DM1 and do you agree with the Policy Wording?

Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council would hope that these considerations are given due weight in all cases.

Question 26

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Health, Economic and Amenity Impacts

Do you agree with Policy DM2 and do you agree with the Policy Wording?

DM2 as proposed is unacceptable. It contains no objective, qualitative or quantitative criteria for its implementation and is ultimately "meaningless". Put simply it will provide livings for planners and lawyers arguing about what is and isn't reasonable, unavoidable and acceptable. Please set some standards!

Question 27 – no comments

Question 28

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Public Rights of Way and Recreational Highways

Do you agree with Policy DM4 and do you agree with the Policy Wording?

The JPC considers DM4 to have little value - There is absolutely no protection for PROWs or for the public who would use them.

Question 29

Flood Risk and Water Quality

Do you agree with Policy DM5 and do you agree with the Policy

Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council strongly supports DM5 and would hope to see it fully implemented. There should be extra concerns - and permissions/allocations should be refused - where proposals are close to rivers and where contamination by "pumping" is inevitable.

Question 30 – no comment

Question 31

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Reinstatement, reclamation, restoration and aftercare

Do you agree with Policy DM7 and do you agree with the Policy Wording?

DM7 as written is far too weak - it will be an operators' charter to avoid their responsibility. It should be re-written with a presumption of reinstatement to (1) original physical levels, (2) original agricultural quality (3) in a phased manner to avoid vast swathes of neglect which becomes reliant on usually ineffective enforcement actions usually - and we have plenty of examples including Smiths Concrete site at Barford and gravel workings on west of A429 at Wasperton.

Question 32 – no comment

Question 33

Policy DM 9

'Whole Life' Approach to Mineral Developments

All mineral proposals shall be prepared and implemented using a 'Whole Life' approach to planning, construction, operation, reinstatement and restoration.

Justification

Mineral developments must address issues such as effects on the climate (carbon emissions), operational effects on the environment and resource efficiency; people who live in proximity to the facility and who will be affected by its operation; and sustainable supply chain – both suppliers and customers. This is known as 'Whole Life' approach.

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

'Whole Life' Approach to Mineral Developments

Do you agree with Policy DM9 and do you agree with the Policy Wording?

DM9 as written is vague and fails to detail what is actually meant by "Whole Life". Hopefully it means that when assessing all proposals full account will be taken of both short and long term impacts and implications of proposals and it would be good to have extra and specific reference here to health implications for nearby residents, workers and mineral industry operatives. Please include the term "Whole Life" approach in the Glossary submitted within the documentation.

Question 34

Implementation and Monitoring

Implementation

10.1 As the Minerals Planning Authority, Warwickshire County Council will play a leading role in implementing the policies of this Minerals Plan in a variety of ways. This will include:

- Determining planning applications in accordance with the Development Plan, government policy and guidance and other material considerations;
- Attaching conditions to planning permissions where appropriate;
- Seeking planning obligations or legal agreements with developers where necessary;
- Enforcing breaches of planning control where necessary;
- Encouraging co-operation and dialogue between the minerals industry and the communities by facilitating consultation and participating in liaison meetings;
- Consulting and engaging a wide range of stakeholders including other County Council departments, District and Borough Councils, Parish Councils, adjoining Minerals Planning Authorities, the West Midlands Aggregate Working Party, the Environment Agency, Natural England, English Heritage, the Health and Safety Executive, DEFRA, the Highways Agency and other interest groups;
- Working collaboratively with the minerals industry issuing advice, guidance or supplementary policy documents where required.

10.2 Monitoring

10.2 Warwickshire County Council has a legal duty to monitor policy implementation as part of its Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). The table below provides a proposed monitoring framework to assess the implementation of the policies by establishing performance indicators, targets and possible sources of information. On reviewing policy implementation on an annual basis (as a minimum), it will allow the Council to gather information to shape future policy formulation and decision making, to examine the effectiveness of its policies and, where necessary, to identify policy changes or interventions.

Question 34

- [Add Comments](#)
- View Comments (0)

Implementation and Monitoring

Do you agree with the methodology for implementation and monitoring in the county and do you have any further comments?

The section on Implementation and monitoring is vague and generic and does not inspire confidence that the interests of impacted communities will be best protected.

Bullet points 1-4 need to be undertaken with rigour so that operators understand site allocation and planning conditions and it is clear that they must stand by their obligations, even when that turns out to be difficult, inconvenient or expensive. History tells us MPAs impose weak conditions and that operators disregard many of their obligations and wriggle out of conditions to escape with low cost, low quality reinstatements that blight our area FOR EVER!

Bullet points 5 and six offer consultation and dialogue to local communities and their representatives, but bullet 7 offers collaboration with the mineral industry.