

BARFORD SHERBOURNE AND WASPERTON JOINT PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee
held in Barford Memorial Hall on Mon 6 Dec 21

Present:	Cllr T Merrygold (Chairman) Cllr: Mrs W Barlow, J D Billingham, R Clay, Mrs D Haynes, G Jackson, M J Metcalfe, J V Murphy, Mrs R Newsome
-----------------	--

Opening

56 The meeting opened at 7:30pm.

Public Participation

57 Five members of the public attended the meeting.

58 Both Mr M J Sheard and Mr M Griffin voiced their opposition to granting planning permission for the alterations to the Glebe Hotel.

Declaration of Disclosable Interests

59 None was declared

Planning Applications

60	Application No:	W/21/1790
	Description:	Proposed first floor loft conversion, associated roof replacement including the installation of roof dormers. Proposed erection of two storey rear extension. Proposed erection of single storey rear extension to existing garage to include erection of greenhouse to the side elevation. Proposed render finish with timber cladding. Proposed erection of detached garage to frontage.
	Address:	Green Acres, 34 Bridge Street, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8EH
	Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Locker
	JPC Decision:	<p>The JPC objects to this application by reason of:</p> <p>Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours created by overlooking and loss of privacy.</p> <p>Visual impact of the development</p> <p>Effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood Design; bulk and massing.</p> <p>Over-bearing and out-of-scale or out of character in comparison with existing development in the vicinity</p> <p>Loss of existing views from neighbouring dwellings adversely affecting the residential amenity of their owners</p> <p>The adverse effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area</p> <p>The following specific to the quality of the application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Windows shown in the ground floor plan do not appear in the rear gable elevation 2. There are no heights given for the ridge lines 3. The rear of the Guest Bedroom is not completed on the plans and presumably may contain a window which is also not shown on the rear elevation. 4. There is no detail of the surrounding structure (especially the rear wall - proposed or existing) for the swimming pool 5. The outline on the site plan for the proposed detached garage does not match the detail plan drawing

61	Application No:	W/21/2042 & W/21/2043 LB
	Description:	Redevelopment of former Glebe hotel, including partial demolition and construction of 4no. dwellings and conversion to 4no. apartments; including new access, car parking, bin stores, cycle parking and associated infrastructure.
	Address:	Glebe Hotel, Church Street, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8BS
	Applicant:	c/o Agent
	JPC Decision:	<p>Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council OBJECTS to this application on multiple grounds.</p> <p><u>1 - Adverse effect on residential amenity of neighbours</u> by the imposition of three-storey development on the boundary of New Mill House. The proposed fenestration will cause significant and intrusive OVERLOOKING of New Mill House, Old Mill House and No 9 Church Lane.</p> <p>It should be noted that the plans presented do not represent the current layout of New Mill House which has rooms and windows much closer to the boundary than those depicted, and hence the overlooking is worse than might be concluded from the application as submitted.</p> <p><u>2 - Visual impact of the development</u> - the proposal for a three-storey block of "town houses" will totally change the STREETSCENE. Whilst the proposal respects the existing front building line and the overall front footprint, the increase from two storeys at the front to three storeys produces a far more overbearing presence which will dominate both the main Glebe building, New Mill House and Listed buildings opposite the site</p> <p><u>3 - Loss of existing views from neighbouring buildings,</u> particularly New Mill House, Old Mill House and No 9 Church Lane will be severe particularly with the building of three-storeys right up to the boundary. Additionally views across the site will be interfered with.</p> <p><u>4 – Adverse effect on the setting of the Listed Building</u> - Whilst the application seeks to suggest that only the main Glebe building and the Dovecote are Listed that is not the JPC's interpretation believing that the whole site currently enjoys Listed status. Whilst removal of the chalet bungalow/house conversion and its associated link building may be seen as beneficial to the Listed Building, the removal of the 1989 two storey extension and adding three storeys alongside the main building is to further detract from the significance of that Listed Building, rather than to flatter it. A new two-storey proposal would have been much more appropriate. Any new development on this site must remain subservient to the main building.</p> <p>The proposal claims that the overall height is no greater than the existing building, HOWEVER that maximum height is brought forward and is much more obvious from the front, producing a far more dominant appearance, losing the <i>trompe l'oeuil</i> effect which minimises the impact from the frontage.</p>

5 - Highway safety - The creation of a second and third front access is very problematic. The whole of the Glebe frontage is on a complex double bend with significant amounts of on-road parking a regular feature. The new accesses would be pushed further north towards the tightest and most dangerous part of the bend and it is doubtful that such accesses can be constructed in a safe and compliant way. Inadequacy of on-site parking provision will inevitably mean that residents and their visitors will need to park on the frontage exacerbating an already difficult situation.

6 – Inadequate Parking – Despite token compliance with WDC parking requirements it is believed that the proposed 5/6-bedroom townhouses will require more parking than can be accommodated on site just for residents’ use, even before service vehicles and visitors are considered. The parking proposals are so tight, even for the limited numbers, that it is doubtful that all users may be able to enter and leave in forward gear. This is particularly the case as on-street parking availability is extremely limited at and near this location. In particular the proposal should not encourage or cause parking to be displaced to Church Lane, with or without use of rear access to the proposed buildings, as Church Lane is very narrow and already under great pressure from its own residents, the Church and King George’s Field. Additionally the current parking and access proposals would remove much of the green frontage which currently shields houses opposite and is an important element of the setting of that part of the village.

7 – The JPC notes the commentary from the Public Realm Officer and others concerning deployment of **refuse and recycling** on this site. The proposals as shown give no sensible access from front to rear and *vice versa* for plots 2, 3 and 4. Collection is expected at the front of the buildings which means that wheelie bins etc will need to transit the houses themselves, or perhaps more likely be left on Church Lane adding to the congestion there. There needs to be a proper communication route between front and back for all purposes, in either direction.

8 - The JPC regrets the loss of a much-valued amenity from the community. The JPC did apply to register the Glebe as an Asset of Community Value but that regrettably was denied due to its residential status. The gym and leisure facility was much used and valued by locals and must certainly have been profitable. Records suggest that the whole hotel enterprise traded profitably although the recent service and maintenance levels did not encourage local patronage - surely more of a

management problem than pertaining to the site *per se*? Claims that the opening of Barford Bypass have caused a loss of passing trade are simply not true. The recent bona fide traffic counts show that traffic figures have steadily increased, by dint of opportunity and other factors, since the bypass opened. Additionally since the bypass opened the brown sign scheme has been updated to better inform the A429 traffic of the Glebe facilities available to them.

9 - Alternative Uses - The application whilst dismissive of ongoing hotel use is similarly dismissive of alternative uses. The consensus locally is that it could make a good conversion to a care or elderly housing facility. The local need is well established and others are currently reviewing such provision locally.

10 - Traffic figures - The traffic survey quoted is not credible having been undertaken during the current pandemic and with schools closed. A conservative assessment suggests that the figures promoted understate the usual traffic by at least 50% and this must add doubt to the safety, practicality, and sanity of the proposed extra front entrances.

11 - Loss of trees - The JPC regrets unnecessary loss of trees on this site, including those on the front boundary and particularly the fine Walnut (T37) which the application seeks to downgrade and fell to facilitate the development.

12 - On a positive note the JPC welcomes the elements of this application which genuinely seek to preserve and support the specimen Cedar of Lebanon, particularly the reduction in vehicle damage and the grassing over of much of the Root Protection Area.

In a similar vein the JPC welcomes all genuine efforts to preserve the core parts of the MAIN Glebe building - essentially the pre-1980 elements. At the same time, whilst never having been in favour of its construction, it would prefer retention of the 1989 extension in preference to its replacement with an inappropriate 3-storey apartment block. The JPC considers the converted chalet bungalow/house and its link building to have no merit or place in the setting of the heritage asset.

13 - The discussion from **WDC on s.106 Open Space contributions** is noted, and it is requested that if this application be approved then such Open Space contributions and appropriate Right of Way contributions should be directed for Barford JPC use given the extra loading this development would inevitably have on the immediate local infrastructure, rather than being dispersed further afield as referenced in the WDC submission.

14 - Barford Heritage Group's earlier submission on this site is noted and it is recommended that this is closely studied, being an accurate interpretation of this site, and appropriate weight is

		<p>given to such considerations when determining the fate of this important heritage asset.</p> <p>SUMMARY: Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council does not consider that this application is a suitable proposal for this site or the village, and respectfully asks that WDC Planning Committee should REFUSE permission in this case and recommend that the applicant should reconsider both the prospects for continued hotel use, other uses, and more sympathetic routes to conserving this heritage asset, including, in the case of the Dovecote, working with the local community.</p> <p><i>ADDENDUM: The applicant's agent has by private communication informed us that they intend to address many of the issues, raised at their public exhibition held at The Glebe and in this submission, by way of amendments. If that were to be the case then the JPC would be happy to reconsider its position on such a revised application and would hope to be re-consulted by WDC.</i></p>
--	--	--

Closure

55 There being no other items on the agenda the meeting was closed at 7:40pm