

BARFORD SHERBOURNE AND WASPERTON JOINT PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Mon 16 Jun 14 in Wasperton Village Hall

Present: Cllr J V Murphy, (Chairman)
Cllr: Mrs W Barlow, R Clay, J M Hawkesford, T Merrygold*, Mrs R Newsome,
J T Wright

Apologies: Cllr Mrs A Gordon, N F J Thurley

*Vice Cllr A Gordon

Opening

- 27 The meeting opened at 7:30pm.
- 28 Seven member of the public were present.
- 29 Apologies were noted.

Declaration of Disclosable Interests

- 30 None was declared

Public Participation

- 31 The seven members of the public raised objection to W/14/0693 as follows:
- Mr R Scott (representing the views of Barford Residents' Association) declared that WDC's statistical analysis was flawed and had given rise to a demand for housing above the real level.
 - Mr D Charles argued that the WDC Plan had not been created in accordance with the Government's rules.
 - Mr R Taylor-Watts drew attention to the deleterious effect of the loss of light.
 - Mr M Mitchell warned of the loss of trees and natural habitat for local fauna.
 - Mr M Long expressed concern over the loss of privacy and residential amenity.
 - Mrs D Johnson worried about the adverse effects on her dwelling of the nearest large house to it in the development.
 - Mrs C Long had grave reservations about the ability of Barford Village School to accommodate the additional numbers of pupils this development would create.

Planning Applications

- 32 **Application No: W/14/0693**
- Description: Full planning application for the erection of 60 dwellings including associated car parking and garages, formation of a new access from Wellesbourne Road, public open space, balancing pond, landscaping, associated earthworks, demolition of No. 22 Wellesbourne Road, associated highways works, relocation of the decommissioned BT telephone box on Wellesbourne Road and other ancillary and enabling works.
- Address: Land to the west of 22 Wellesbourne Road, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8EL
- Applicant: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
- JPC Decision: **Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council COMMENTS** on this planning application for FULL PLANNING PERMISSION, with demolition, for 60 dwellings with associated parking, public open spaces along with the of 22 Wellesbourne Road and relocation of the decommissioned BT Telephone box.

The Council comments:

1 – The JPC reluctantly accepts that Barford is likely to be expected to take a significant number of houses and following liaison work with WDC the identified sites were agreed as those most suited and least harmful to accept extra housing over the emerging Local Plan period to 2029. The site in this application is one of those identified sites.

2 - The National Planning Policy Framework states at paragraph 54 that in

rural areas local planning authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing. The 2009 Housing Needs Survey commissioned by the JPC and Warwickshire Rural Community Council concluded that there was a need for 11 affordable new homes within the three parishes. The JPC has recently completed a further survey through Warwickshire Rural Housing Association/Warwickshire Rural Community Council and whilst the final report has not yet been received the indications are that the total identified need totals 15 units with a mix of affordable and market homes within that number.

In the opinion of the Joint Parish Council it is considered that the proposed development is far greater than the local housing needs, especially with relation to the Affordable Home provision and the principle of development is therefore contrary to a purist interpretation of NPPF, paragraph 54.

Whilst the JPC recognises the applicant's attempt to broaden the Affordable Housing need to the whole WDC area, presumably in response to emerging New Local Plan numbers the JPC believes that it is quite inappropriate to direct surplus Affordable Housing to a rural village, however sustainable it may be deemed, where there will inevitably be a greater dependence on car transport.

Concerning the mix of market homes indicated in this proposal the JPC notes that despite the Statement of Community Involvement the applicant's proposed mix of market house sizes remains adrift of that clearly demonstrated in the latest Housing Needs Surveys and the information provided at every stage of consultation so far. Furthermore we note that the proposed 50:30:20 mix, whilst meeting earlier standards, does not meet the tenure requirements published in the Draft Local Plan – April 2014.

The recent publication of mid-2012 ONS figures must now cast doubt over the overall WDC housing needs and it is well known that significant credible challenges to the overall numbers have been made and that these are being reviewed, which must cast some doubt over the final district wide requirements and the numbers destined for Growth Villages such as Barford.

3 – Policy DP2 of the Warwick District Local Plan 1996-2011 states (inter alia) that development will not be permitted which has an adverse impact on the amenity of nearby uses and residents.

The proposal includes the creation of a vehicular and pedestrian access through the site of the current number 22 Wellesbourne Road with the inclusion of a chicane device to slow or stop vehicles on entry to the site. The numbers of vehicle movements and the proximity to adjacent dwellings, notably number 20 Wellesbourne Road will result in loss of amenity through loss of privacy and noise nuisance.

The proposal could therefore considered to be unneighbourly and contrary to Policy DP2

4 – The proposal is contrary to **Barford Village Design Statement** (VDS) despite the applicant's attempts to use it in its favour. The VDS clearly states that it is inappropriate for large scale developments to be repeated and cites previous such developments taking up to 40 years to be properly integrated into the village. Meanwhile the village is still struggling adjust to the recent Taylor Woodrow development of a similar number of homes at Bremridge Close on the old Oldham's Transport site.

The VDS also refers to valuable views and open spaces and specifically refers to the rural charm of small fields and paddocks off Westham Lane and this site, now stripped of most of its Sherbourne Nursery business buildings is now a significant constituent part.

5 – The proposal is contrary to **Barford Parish Plan** which, in its Conservation section, expressed a clear democratic wish that land enclosed by the Barford Bypass should not be developed for residential use.

6 – The drainage, both foul and surface, in Barford has long been problematic. Many dwellings the length of Wellesbourne Road suffer repeated problems which Severn Trent seems powerless to resolve

permanently, despite its assurances that the system can easily accommodate a further 60 (or even 70!) dwellings on this site.

The applicant's proposals to raise significant areas of the site to facilitate adequate fall, east for foul sewage and west for surface water will permanently change the topography of the site and render the whole development more prominent in its setting. Developer assurances that this increase in level of the site has been minimised are not convincing.

7 – The application causes significant transport and traffic concerns. Wellesbourne Road is already a busy and often congested road. The extra vehicle movements generated by the proposal, seemingly unrealistically underestimated by the applicant, will significantly add to this congestion. More remotely the traffic on Church Street/High Street is heavy at busy times as are the two junctions onto the A429 Barford Bypass. Increased traffic numbers in all these locations will constitute a significant compromise of safety standards.

8 – The JPC is concerned over the loss of important trees and the associated impact on wildlife in this area. The site is currently open and undeveloped and is a refuge for a wide range of species all of which contribute to the general environment and wellbeing of our parish. This site should be developed in a more sympathetic manner with adequate spacing away from existing properties (particularly the proposed number 60 behind 20 Wellesbourne Rd and the proximity of garages to Hemmings Mill properties) and with the inclusion of significant enhancing plantings of partly mature trees and not simple token provision of small saplings which will take decades to provide the essential environmental benefits.

9 – The JPC has received significant representation from residents concerned over the loss of sunlight which will result from this application. Typically houses on Wellesbourne Road, many of which were specifically designed to take maximum enjoyment from the light, currently enjoy sunlight until the sun sets on the distant horizon. Building this development will curtail that sunlight several hours earlier and as such could be deemed to impact the amenity of those residents and hence contrary to Warwick Local Plan Policy DP2.

Whilst the JPC recognises that existing residents may not have a right to views or indeed direct sunlight, views into and out of the village are a significant feature fully recognised in the Barford VDS and some of these views which are across or through existing properties will be lost forever if this development proceeds in its current form. The developers' token gesture of a view of Sherbourne Church across the site is not sufficient to satisfy our concerns in this matter.

Similarly we are concerned that views of the edge of the village across this site will be changed forever, from a soft, green rural edge to something much harder and man-made. Every effort should be made to allow the edge of this development to merge with the surrounding rural landscape.

10 – The nature and design of many of the houses along Wellesbourne Road is such that development as proposed will significantly compromise the privacy and enjoyment of existing residences which may contravene DP2.

11- Demolition of the Old Police House is undesirable due to the impact on the street scene, in the Barford Conservation Area, and the loss of a building with some significant social history. This point was made strongly when the previous outline permission was refused, however we accept that this may be the only access route for this site. We are pleased that the proposed substitution of a "strange, thin, sideways" dwelling has now been removed from the application.

12- We find the styles/designs of houses proposed to be of a standard/generic type which offer little to respect the Barford Conservation Area or Barford's sense of place. NPPF directs developers to address these issues in all such cases and we hope that previous assurances to provide a range of individuality more in keeping with a rural village setting will be

fulfilled in a substantial rather than simply token manner.

13 – We have significant concerns over the impact that this development will have on our infrastructure – not least Barford School which could expect 20 or more children from such a proposal – and would expect suitable s.106/CIL contributions to highways (in particular to Barford Bypass junction improvements), open spaces and public transport to minimise the impact on existing residents. In particular we draw attention to pre-application discussions where the JPC has clearly indicated that it would prefer open space contributions towards the Barford King George V Playing Field scheme rather than on-site installations.

14 – We note that the Draft Local Plan proposes phasing of larger sites in Growth Villages – limiting phases to 50 units per 5 year period - and suggest that such a condition must be applied to this site even if determined before adoption of the Local Plan.

- 33 **Application No:** **W/14/0706**
Description: Outline application for the erection of six detached houses with all matters reserved
Address: Land south of Westham Lane, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8DP
Applicant: Warwick United Charities
JPC Decision: Objection: the site lies outside the village envelope.
- 34 **Application No:** **W/14/0709**
Description: Raising of roof by 1.8 metres with insertion of three front dormer windows and front porch to create first floor living accommodation.
Address: 15b Wellesbourne Road, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8EL
Applicant: Mr Richards
JPC Decision: No objection, but the JPC laments the loss of another small house through this conversion.
- 35 **Application No:** **W/14/0769**
Description: Erection of a single storey rear extension after demolition of existing extension
Address: 18 High Street, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8BU
Applicant: Ms Jeffrey
JPC Decision: No objection.
- 36 **Application No:** **W/14/0770 LB**
Description: Erection of a single storey rear extension after demolition of existing extension
Address: 18 High Street, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8BU
Applicant: Ms Jeffrey
JPC Decision: No objection.

Notifications

- 37 **Application No:** **W/14/0361**
Description: Partial demolition of approximately 86m of structurally unstable and unrepairable wall circa 2m high to below line of damaged bricks and erection of safety hoarding together with necessary temporary works plus storage of undamaged bricks
Address: Wellesbourne Road, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8EL
Applicant: Mr Hopkins
JPC Decision: Comments:
 - There is uncertainty whether the wall is listed
 - The surveyor's report is regarded as inadequate
 - There is a strong body of opinion amongst Barford residents that demolition is too brutal a solution (depriving the village of an emblematic structure) and that its dismantling and rebuilding should be the aim.
 - It is understood that an independent survey has been commissioned. When that becomes available the JPC would welcome the opportunity to comment on the proposals further

WDC Decision: REFUSED

- 38 **Application No:** **W/14/0447**
Description: Erection of a single storey rear extension; two storey front extension and first floor front extension. Installation of external render, replacement windows and erection of 1.2 metre high front fence and gates.

Address: 8 Carter Drive, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8ET
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Dennis
JPC Decision: No objection.
WDC Decision: GRANTED
- 39 **Application No:** **W/14/0546**
Description: Erection of a single storey extension to steel clad agricultural building to provide additional office accommodation.

Address: Bradshaw Farm, Wellesbourne Road, Wasperton, Warwick, CV35 8EB
Applicant: J A Growers Ltd
JPC Decision: No objection
WDC Decision GRANTED

WDC Local Plan

- 40 The Planning Committee had been mandated by the JPC in plenary session to respond to WDC's draft of the New Local Plan. The approved version is at Annex A.

Closure

- 41 There being no further business the meeting closed at 8:50pm.

Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council

The Council (JPC) wishes to respond to the WDC Local Plan – Publication Draft April 2014 as follows:

The JPC challenges the SOUNDNESS of the Draft Plan on the following issues –

1 - Housing Numbers and Level of Growth

The JPC has always considered the proposed housing numbers to be in excess of realistically assessed requirements.

The first round of consultation – “Options for Growth” showed a clear residents’ preference for lower levels of growth accepting any allied limitations to infrastructure improvements.

Whilst the JPC accepts that there is a current and ongoing need for more homes in the WDC area we have never believed that there should be such an extreme “growth agenda” to impose such enormous numbers. Specifically, given the current very low unemployment in our area we contend that the actual need for new employment provision is actually very low and any higher provision must inevitably draw in inward migration and hence produce further housing pressures.

We welcome the mid-2012 ONS figures which show much lower growth predictions for the WDC area (along with the rest of Warwickshire) .

We believe that the current Draft New Local Plan based on the previous significantly higher figures is therefore **UNSOUND**.

Clearly the situation must be reviewed and we believe that the major options are:-

- (i) A total review of proposed numbers and their allocation across the district
- (ii) Retain the current land allocations and implement them in a much more imaginative way, by for example:
 - (a) a pro rata reduction in numbers thereon creating a better, lower density environment for all
 - (b) Incorporating Gypsy & Traveller provision within the Strategic Urban Extension sites – see JPC submission G&T Preferred Options and ref meetings with Ms Tracey Darke (Head Planning), Dave Barber (Head Development) and Ms Lorna Coldicott (G&T Lead Officer)
 - (c) Retaining areas of “Reserve Land” for use to meet provision shortfalls or if unused to kick-start the next Local Plan period.
 - (d) Reduce the numbers currently imposed on Growth Villages in recognition that whilst Growth Villages are the most sustainable settlements in the rural areas they are not as sustainable as the urban areas and their extensions and with particular reference to the obligatory 40% Affordable Homes provision can be considerably less

well suited due to their relatively remote locations and inherent car-dependency.

2 – Greenbelt Issues

The JPC is disappointed that WDC have not seized the opportunity to re-evaluate the Greenbelt within its area in a realistic and imaginative manner.

An aggressive “growth agenda” in a district of c.80% Greenbelt, with a near sacrosanct approach to Greenbelt puts unrealistic and unsustainable pressure on the remaining non-Greenbelt area, south of Warwick and Leamington, and renders this Draft Local Plan UNSOUND.

Given that we are/are likely to be expected to accept overflow from Coventry (See 2012 ONS figures) it would be most appropriate to look at some Coventry “urban extension” into WDC Greenbelt as a priority and not to expect to re-locate such overflow to the south of Warwick and Leamington.

Similarly imaginative use of pockets of relaxation immediately adjacent to other settlements could dramatically improve capacity and relieve some of the pressure currently focussed on the area south of Warwick and Leamington.

Removal of Greenbelt status to facilitate the Gateway project (Sub Regional Employment Allocation DS16) shows that it can be done where there is a political will so why not extend the concept to accommodate some of the housing need and a significant proportion of the G&T provision.

3 – Gypsy & Traveller Issues

The JPC was surprised that the otherwise extensive GLOSSARY provided no references of definitions relating to Gypsy and Traveller matters.

As discussed under the above two sections and in extensive discussion with Tracey Darke, Dave Barber and Lorna Coldicott (22 May 2014) the JPC believes the Draft Local Plan and the G&T Preferred Options fail to address adequately the best interests of both the settled community and the G&T community.

The JPC considers that imposing G&T Permanent Sites on mature and settled communities and a parallel failure to incorporate them into the larger strategic sites is fatally flawed and neglectful, rendering this Draft Local Plan UNSOUND.

Furthermore the reluctance to address the Greenbelt in any imaginative way concentrates the G&T impact into an unrealistically small part of the WDC disregarding both existing residents’ and G&T community wishes.

G&T provision should be properly planned, from scratch, on the strategic urban extension sites and the gateway area and only located elsewhere
When there is explicit community and landowner support.

4 – Specialist Housing for Older People

The JPC welcomes WDC’s recognition of the Ageing Demographic but does not believe that proposals are adequate for the challenges we all face.

In light of the 2012 ONS results figures and percentages quoted in 4.53 and 4.55 may well understate the proportion of our population requiring or potentially benefiting from Age Related Housing.

We note that 4.51 recognises that in 2011 “22% of households in the district contained someone with a long-term health problem or disability” but goes on to require only 10% provision of “Lifetime Homes Standard” or other adaptable homes and then only in the Strategic Urban Extension sites. Clearly a gross under-provision.

Whilst the emphasis on Primary Health Care is understandable there is a lack of clarity (H5(b) and 4.57) of how criteria might be interpreted and provision for alternative solutions.

H5 in particular would seem to limit provision to the urban areas (including the strategic urban extension sites) and hence preclude most of the rural areas, including preclusion of the more sustainable rural villages (ie most Growth Villages and specifically Barford)

H5 (b) and H5(c) are currently too restrictive. The JPC suggests the addition of “in Growth Villages and other sustainable locations where rural local initiative has demonstrated local need (eg through Neighbourhood Development Plans and/or Housing Needs Surveys etc) and a community will to address that need along with needs of adjacent areas and such need may be met through a broader range of models than might be required in an urban setting.

The above proposal recognises that whilst rural living has changed considerably over recent times – not least by development driven mostly by developers and higher authorities rather than by indigenous rural dwellers – the single common strand is that most rural dwellers choose to live there and wish to remain there for as great a part of their life as possible. The current and Draft Local Plan models do not permit this and at times of increasing dependence distract the elderly (and otherwise infirm) from their communities through “distress relocation” based on clinical need alone. The JPC contends that communities should have a mechanism to rise to the challenge of allowing their elderly to remain within their rural community for the whole of their lifetime with all the many benefits to the elderly and their relatives and friends.

5 – Sherbourne Issues

Cllr Gordon raised some issues with the Chairman prior to the WP discussion but was unable to attend in person due to family illness.

- (i) **Greenbelt line** – Cllr Gordon drew our attention to the line of the edge of the Greenbelt which appears to be aligned with the NW border of the N-bound carriageway of the A46 as it existed before the construction of new Sherbourne Bypass and roundabout. Cllr Gordon had suggested that it should perhaps be aligned with the NW boundary of the retained S-bound carriageway of the old A46 which now links Watery Lane to the Stratford Road A46, and hence incorporate the whole of the area of land between the residual carriageway and the new road alignment. The WP, having checked the definitive maps (1995 and 2011 Local Plans) took the view that the historic line should be allowed to stand and any re-alignment could produce new irregularities as it reached the J15 roundabout. Furthermore as the original line had been NW of the old road it was likely that any review

might well pull back the line to coincide with the NW boundary of the new road, given that such a major road provides an obvious and clear geographic limit to the Greenbelt.

(ii) **Limited Infill Village – Sherbourne Plan – Local Policy Map 19** – Cllr

Gordon raised two points:

- (a) The IVB at its most northern point includes part of the now disused Sherbourne Allotments site – behind a single dwelling. Cllr Gordon contended that the area should not be included. It was not known whether this area is currently occupied by the householder (possibly suggested by the plan). However, as LIV Policy H11 on page 99 specifically limits development to “small gap fronting highway” the WP did not consider that its inclusion or otherwise was material in this case.
- (b) The IVB also included an area east of and parallel to Vicarage Lane between Benedict House and cottages nearer the Old Rectory B&B – marked on the map as Sherbourne Farm. The legend relates historically to the farmhouse on the west side of Vicarage Lane and the parcel of land includes the “Black Barn”. The WP took the view that whilst the proposed line might be seen as maintaining a vague building line between the cottages, the Black Barn and Benedict House it could be seen as desirable to exclude it. The WP noted that Cllr Gordon as occupant/owner of Benedict house had a Disclosable Interest in the subject under discussion and proposed the following wording - << **Local Plan Policies Map 19 (Sherbourne) - The JPC requests that the Limited Infill Village boundary east of the northern section of Vicarage Lane, between Benedict House and cottages to the north should be aligned with the eastern side of Vicarage Lane**>>.