

BARFORD SHERBOURNE AND WASPERTON JOINT PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Mon 13 Feb 17 in Sherbourne Village Hall

Present:	Cllr J V Murphy (Chairman),
	Cllr: Mrs W Barlow, R Clay, H Gadsden, Mrs A Gordon, J M Hawkesford, Mrs R Newsome, N F J Thurley, J T Wright,
In Attendance:	Cllr P Phillips (WDC)

Opening

450 The meeting opened at 8:40pm.

451 Two members of the public were present.

Declaration of Disclosable Interests

452 Cllr Mrs Barlow declared a prejudicial interest in W/17/0162 (living very close to the site) and absented herself from the meeting whilst it was considered.

Public Participation

453 There was none.

Planning Applications

- 454 **Application No:** **W/16/2211**
Description: Display of replacement illuminated and non-illuminated signs to the exterior of the building
Address: Granville Arms, 52 Wellesbourne Road, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8DS
Applicant: ENTERPRISE INNS
JPC Decision: No objection
- 455 **Application No:** **W/16/2212LB**
Description: Erection of replacement illuminated and non-illuminated signs to the exterior of the building
Address: Granville Arms, 52 Wellesbourne Road, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8DS
Applicant: ENTEPRISE INNS
JPC Decision: No objection
- 456 **Application No:** **W/17/0143**
Description: Erection of a single storey front extension and replacement roof to front; erection of a single storey rear extension and render.
Address: 18 Keytes Lane, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8EP
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Williams
JPC Decision: No objection
- 457 **Application No:** **W/17/0162**
Description: Outline planning application for the erection of up to 135 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDs) and vehicular access point from Wellesbourne Road. All matters reserved except for means of access.
Address: Land On The East Side Of Wellesbourne Road and South of Sandy Way, Barford
Applicant: Gladman Developments
JPC Decision: **THE JPC OBJECTS TO THIS PROPOSAL**

The JPC finds the development at this site totally unsatisfactory and inappropriate for various reasons, including:

1 – The proposal is not compliant with policies within the **existing**

Local Plan

2 – The proposal is not complaint with and the site is not allocated within the **Draft Local Plan** recently the subject of Inspection

3 – The proposal is in direct conflict with and fails to respect in any way, the current, made, **Barford Neighbourhood Development Plan (BNDP)**. It is accepted that technically the BNDP applies only within its Designated Area, HOWEVER, the proposal clearly seeks to add 135 houses to the Barford settlement, despite the fact that Barford has established a clear “Village Envelope” to demarcate where development is acceptable.

4 – The **2013 Housing Needs Survey** conducted over our three villages established very modest housing need for our villages and these have been more than satisfied through the various developments which we have agreed to accept, in negotiation with WDC, in order to play our part in meeting district-wide needs for housing and Affordable Housing in particular.

5 – The proposal site was not identified as appropriate in **SHLAA**.

6 – **The proposal site is not in Barford parish** and is should not be considered to be part of Barford as a Growth Village in the Draft Local Plan

7 – **The site is within Wasperton parish** and Wasperton is a Non-Growth village in the Draft Local Plan and hence should not attract such large-scale proposals.

8 – **This site is “Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land** and is in constant production of valuable crops. Such land should only be taken for built development where lesser quality alternatives are not available and it is our opinion that such a situation does not exist. This agricultural land should be preserved, particularly at when food security is of such concern

9 – This site sits on **valuable mineral resources** and whilst we would not encourage their imminent retraction NPPF directs that they should not be sterilised by inappropriate development.

10 – The proposal site is in close proximity to simultaneously proposed sand and gravel extraction sites and if they were to go ahead then there would be considerable health and environmental implications

11 – **Traffic implications will be considerable.** Wellesbourne Road is already a busy road, particularly at peak times. The proposal is for a single access point, positioned immediately opposite Bremridge Close, Barford Exchange and Country Car all of which currently overspill their parking onto Wellesbourne Road adding to the congestion and danger in the area. Access from Barford onto the A429 Barford Bypass is by simple T-junctions and is seldom simple and is frequently problematic and dangerous with long queues at peak times due to high levels of commuter through-traffic. The Traffic Assessment provided with the application seems fanciful in the extreme with very low numbers of anticipated vehicle movements for a 135-house estate. Its statement of the quality of local transport bears little relationship to what is actually available in practical terms on the ground and in consequence use of the local bus service is restricted almost exclusively to those with no other choice.

Suggestions that people will willingly walk up to 2km for routine village services is wishful thinking and we all know that they will mostly get into their cars for such trips.

12 – **The visual impact** on the edge of our settlement will be considerable and views into and out of the village will be considerably impacted. BNDP specifically mentioned and valued such views.

13 – **Village Infrastructure** will struggle to cope with a further 135 houses on top of the c.200 already planned (and accepted!) for the Draft Local Plan period/ Specifically, **Barford St Peters School** has been enlarged several times over the last few decades and is now at “single form” entry which means any further enlargement will be difficult or near impossible. The applicants’ assertions that their houses will accommodate many who already use the school

overlooks the fact that their vacated houses are just as likely to attract families with children who will also want to use our excellent school.

14 – **The village drainage system** is already under stress and will be worse with other new houses already approved. Assurance by Severn Trent that it will cope or that they will make improvements are not borne out in practice and there are frequent problems already and several householders are already regularly disadvantaged by this overloaded, under-invested drainage system.

15 – **Barford Village Shop**, a “community shop” built and run by volunteers is an appropriate size for our current community. Contrary to the applicants’ assertions, their proposed development will not “support the enterprise” but would impose extra demands such as stock throughput and storage that it would be difficult to meet in the current building. We do not need extra houses to support our village shop!

16 – The applicants’ **Statement of Community Involvement** is farcical. It is no more than a “tick-box exercise” badly and cynically undertaken. Their circular was initially only delivered to Barford and had no closing date stated. The closing date was later set to January 27th, so Barford had about three weeks to respond. Wasperton was grudgingly circulated much later and were given only 3 days to respond. AND the resulting report and the planning application were submitted on the closing day so the responses were obviously given considerable consideration??? The responses to date show not a single word of support from our community – a situation totally unprecedented in our not inconsiderable experience. NPPF makes it clear that communities should have a voice in planning and that planning should be a collective enterprise and that must mean listening to local opinions on these proposals.

17 – It is our opinion that there is no NEED for this development. The JPC area need has already been fully satisfied by those developments already built and exceeded by others included within BNDP and the Draft Local Plan. WDC district-wide need is adequately met by the Draft Local Plan and we are confident that the Inspector will approve the Draft plan and deem a 5-year land supply in place.

Closure

458 There being no other items on the agenda the meeting was closed at 9:28pm