

BARFORD SHERBOURNE AND WASPERTON JOINT PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee
held in Barford Memorial Hall on Wed 28 Sep 22

Present:	Cllr T Merrygold, (Chairman) Cllr: J T Barrott*, J D Billingham, Mrs D Haynes, G Jackson,
Apologies:	Cllr: R Clay, Mrs L M Jones, M J Metcalfe, J V Murphy,

*Vice Cllr R Clay

Opening

59 The meeting opened at 7:30pm.

Public Participation

60 No members of the public attended the meeting.

Planning Applications

61	Application No:	W/21/1790 Revision 2
	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
	Proposed revision:	Amendments to plans received 13/09/2022: the roof set down for the front gable and the cladding changed to render, removed the front dormer above the garage door and added a rooflight
	JPC Decision:	The JPC objects on the following grounds: Having reviewed the revised plan the JPC is of the opinion that the changes made are minimal and not sufficient to address its previous objection to this application by reason of: Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours created by overlooking and loss of privacy. Visual impact of the development and its effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood. Design; bulk and massing. Over-bearing and out-of-scale and out of character in comparison with existing development in the vicinity Loss of existing views from and light to neighbouring dwellings, adversely affecting the residential amenity of their owners – this particularly relates to the height of the rear gable and the swimming pool enclosure. The adverse effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
62	Application No:	W/22/0992
	Description:	Proposed two storey rear extension and alterations to single storey roof.
	Address:	Milton Cottage, 15 Vicarage Lane, Sherbourne, Warwick, CV35 8AB
	Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Johan Landman & Cornelia Beyers
	JPC Decision:	No objection
63	Application No:	W/22/1111
	Description:	Removal of existing one meter high road side fence from the beginning of the north east boundary to the the Laurels by the first gate post with a six foot wood panel fence approximately 61.5 meters long. With appropriate posts and foot rail.
	Address:	Hillford House, Barford Road, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8DA
	Applicant:	Mr A de Marsac
	JPC Decision:	WDC preempted this by approving the application before a decision was

		made
64	Application No:	W/22/1323
	Description:	New bin store
	Address:	Dragon Yard, Church Lane, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8ES
	Applicant:	Mr B Geaney
	JPC Decision:	No objection
65	Application No:	W/22/1324 LB
	Description:	New bin store
	Address:	Dragon Yard, Church Lane, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8ES
	Applicant:	Mr B Geaney
	JPC Decision:	No objection
66	Application No:	W/22/1332
	Description:	Erection of single storey rear extension with flat roof, installation of new first floor window to rear elevation and replacement of existing windows with new.
	Address:	17 Bridge Street, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8EH
	Applicant:	Mr Pulley
		JPC object on the grounds of the adverse visual impact and the effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area of the glazed rear extension and supports the comments made by the WDC Conservation Officer on that aspect of the planning application. It does not agree however with the Conservation Officer's comments on the use of single glazing. In the current environment where all should be thinking and planning long term about insulating homes, reducing energy consumption, and moving towards to Net Zero, and taking into account WDC's declared Climate Emergency, it believes that the applicant should be allowed to install double glazing which can be done in conjunction with high quality timber windows, and can be invisible from outside the building. This would retain the integrity of the building but still help to reduce the applicant's energy consumption and reinforce WDC's desire to reach Net Zero.
67	Application No:	W/22/1333 LB
	Description:	Erection of single storey rear extension with flat roof, installation of new first floor window to rear elevation and replacement of existing windows with new timber windows.
	Address:	17 Bridge Street, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8EH
	Applicant:	Mr Pulley
	JPC Decision:	As for W/22/1332
68	Application No:	W/22/1389 LB
	Description:	Removal of chimney breast at ground level in rear Victorian extension to building. The chimney has already been removed at first level.
	Address:	18 Church Street, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8EN
	Applicant:	Harrison Projects Ltd
	JPC Decision:	No objection
69	Application No:	W/22/1407
	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:	See below

Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council OBJECTS to this application on multiple grounds.

Preamble:

Many of the JPC objections remain from the previous application and it was dismayed that, despite assurances of intent, the opportunity has not been taken by the developers to consult it and near neighbours to find mutually acceptable ways forward for this site.

JPC members were again very disappointed by the poor quality of this fourth iteration of this application, in particular the plethora of obvious errors and contradictions which occur in the text, many perhaps due to the repetitive use of cut and paste for updating the documents.

Neither Cllr J V Murphy nor Cllr M J Sheard was available for this meeting of the JPC' Planning Committee (whence this report comes) but each had sent you their own opinions on the merits of this application (attached below). The Planning Committee examined them, fully identified with the views expressed and voted to add them to this report thus giving them the imprimatur of the JPC.

1 - Adverse effect on residential amenity of neighbours there have been no material changes to size or massing of Plot 1 and the proposed rear fenestration will still cause significant and intrusive overlooking of New Mill House.

2 - Visual impact of the development - the proposal for Plot 1 sits incongruously and unsympathetically with the main Glebe building, the proposal for a two-storey block of three "town houses" (Plots 2/3/4) will be subservient to the main Glebe building and is acceptable.

Whilst a lower pitch roof with hips and window detail to mirror Plots 2/3/4 might be an improvement, it is the JPC's view that it would be best to omit Plot 1 completely.

The JPC notes that the previously proposed chimney stacks on Plots 2/3/4 have been removed – presumably in an attempt to reduce the overall roof line. However we feel that this lends a much more modern appearance to the block which is out of keeping and would prefer to retain the chimneys to break up the roofline.

The proposed roof height of Plots 2/3/4 remains above that of the front of the range of existing buildings. It is this line which defines the view from street level.

3 - Loss of existing views from neighbouring dwellings, In particular New Mill House, Old Mill House and No 9 Church Lane will still be severely affected, especially the building so close to the boundary. Additionally views across the site will be truncated.

4 – Adverse effect on the setting of the Listed Building - Whilst the application seeks to suggest that only the main Glebe building and the Dovecote are Listed it remains the JPC's belief that the whole site currently enjoys listed status. Removal of the chalet bungalow/house conversion and its associated link building may be seen as beneficial to the listed building, and the new two-storey proposal is much more appropriate, subject to the comments concerning Plot 1. Any new development on this site must remain subservient to the main building.

5 - Highway safety - The proposal still to create a second access is viewed as problematic, dangerous and unacceptable. The whole of the Glebe frontage is on a complex double bend with significant amounts of on-road parking a regular feature. The new proposal for an additional access point is still unacceptable and will require entry and exit manoeuvres amongst parked vehicles close to a busy bend with limited visibility.

The access and parking must be redesigned, all within the site, using the existing single access point. The JPC notes that the submission fails to acknowledge the significant on-street parking as a result of visitors to King George's Field recreation facility and is dismissive of on-street parking issues in general.

6 – Inadequate Parking – Despite token compliance with WDC parking requirements it is believed that the proposed townhouses will require more parking than currently proposed 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 previous commentary from the Public Realm Officer and others concerning deployment of refuse and recycling on this site. The proposals now show access from front to rear and *vice versa* for Plots 1, 2, 3 and 4. Collection is expected at the front of the building and this should be controlled by condition to minimise the impact on Church Lane residents.

The JPC finds it difficult to follow precisely how refuse will be handled and stored and its routes.

The proposed new apartment bin storage is viewed as inadequate since, with the latest WDC 123+ arrangements, it will be reasonable to expect all the dwellings to require green bins in addition to the standard two – and we do not believe the bin storage will handle three full size bins, as a minimum, per dwelling.

- 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 almost certainly was 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 has 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 the better to 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.

10 - Traffic figures - The traffic survey quoted is still not credible having been undertaken during the 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 about the safety, practicality and sensibility of the proposed extra front entrance.

11 - Loss of trees - The JPC regrets unnecessary loss of trees to facilitate the development. on this site, including those on the front boundary,

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 it welcomes all genuine efforts to preserve the core parts of the main Glebe building - essentially the pre-1980 elements. It considers the existing converted chalet bungalow/house and its link building to have no merit or place in the setting of the heritage asset.

13 - It is noted that the previous discussion from WDC on s.106 Open Space contributions and request that if this application be approved then such Open Space contributions and appropriate Right of Way contributions should be directed for Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton JPC use at its discretion 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 as an accurate interpretation of this site and appropriate weight is given to such considerations when determining the fate of this important heritage asset.

SUMMARY: Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council does not consider this further 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 recommends that the applicant should reconsider both the prospects for continued hotel use, other uses and more sympathetic routes to conserving this heritage asset.

Comments for Planning Application W/22/1407

Application Summary

Application Number: W/22/1407

Address: Glebe Hotel, Church Street, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8BS

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Helena Obremski

Customer Details

Name: Cllr John MURPHY

Address: 4-6 BRIDGE STREET BARFORD WARWICK

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Commentor

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Cllr John Murphy still OBJECTS to this application on multiple grounds.

This latest (FOURTH) latest iteration of these applications takes little note of comments levied earlier, and in my opinion the application still falls far short of that which should be acceptable on such an important and high profile site at the centre of Barford Conservation Area and adjacent to important Listed Buildings

Visual impact - the proposal for a two-storey block of three "town houses" will be subservient to the main Glebe building and is acceptable. Whilst ALMOST respecting the existing front building line, the proposal pushes part of the block of three forward and pushes Plot 1 higher and closer to New Mill House.

The height of Plot 1 and the dual pitch steep and high roof remains completely out of place in its setting alongside the original Glebe and the 2-storey extension proposed. Plot 1 should be much reduced and modified or deleted completely. As presented it is no improvement on the existing extended and enlarged original bungalow. If a version of Plot 1 is really essential to the viability of this site then it should be a simple extension of plots 2-4.

Effect on residential amenity of neighbours of two-storey Plot 1 immediately adjacent to the boundary of New Mill House. This will cause significant OVERLOOKING of New Mill House, even with the modified fenestration at the rear.

Traffic safety - The whole of the Glebe frontage is on a complex double bend with significant amounts of on-road parking a regular feature. The new access is still too close to the bend and in addition to reducing on-road parking will make access and egress quite dangerous. All parking must be accessed via the single existing access.

Inadequate Parking - It is believed that the proposed townhouses will require more parking than can be accommodated on site, especially when 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.

Parking must not be displaced onto Church Lane where there are already problems. The provision of a pedestrian access from Church Lane suggests that this may be a deliberate intention?

Additionally the current parking and access proposals remove much of the existing green frontage, despite claims to the contrary from the applicant.

Traffic figures - The latest traffic survey quoted is not credible - still waiting full recovery from the pandemic and taken when some schools were closed. Any observation at peak commuter or school times will indicate the true level of traffic endured on Church Street.

Poor quality application - there are many inaccuracies and inconsistencies - too many to list and already well documented by others. I consider that the ADDENDUM TO DESIGN & ACCESS AND HERITAGE STATEMENTS to be non-credible, fairly disrespectful and verging on mansplaining - the statements should not be taken at surface value.

I suspect that the owner and agents remain determined to develop this site, rather than re-energise or re-imagine its use, so I would request that this application be refused and that they come back with a still more sympathetic and less intrusive scheme for consideration, perhaps using Barford Village Design Statement and Barford Neighbourhood Development Plan as their guides.

Comments for Planning Application W/22/1407

Application Summary

Application Number: W/22/1407

Address: Glebe Hotel, Church Street, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8BS

Proposal: 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.

Case Officer: Helena Obremski

Customer Details

Name: Cllr Michael Sheard MRICS

Address: The Old Mill House High Street Barford

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Commentor

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I refer to the further application on this site, neighbourhood notification dated 6.9.22, and these comments apply equally to the Listed Building application W/22/1408LB.

I object to this application, and would draw your attention to the following comments, errors, inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the details that have been lodged on 26 August.

The application is substantially a resubmission of the amended details contained in applications 21/2042 and 2043LB. This application was refused, and I have to ask "substantially what has changed" There has been some adjustment of the building height and provision of chimneys and separation from the rectory of the town houses, handing of plot 4, and some explanatory notes on the drawings, but substantially the proposals are the same

I consider that this application should be refused in line with the reasons previously given in the decision dated 17/3/22. There remains errors and inaccuracies in the material that has been lodged, and that were identified previously, and there are new errors and inaccuracies presented in the supplemental documents that have been generated for this new application the application, in my view cannot be properly assessed until these errors are rectified. I will review my overall opinion when the errors are rectified/confirmed. It is also worth noting that there has been no public consultation held on this scheme.

DRAWINGS:

Both street view Impressions SK01 and R207 are misleading as the existing vegetation to Church Street, which has been drawn in outline as staying, is in fact shown to be removed, see comments below on the Highways and Visibility splay requirements. The street scene will be therefore affected

Plot 1 footprint is located much closer to New Mill House than the previous chalet bungalow, with severe overlooking from ground and first floor windows looking directly into habitable rooms in New Mill House, and its garden. This is not acceptable.

The two proposed bin stores are located on the Church Street access points. They are shown as having a capacity of eight wheelie bins. With the current waste and recycling regime, I contend that each demise will require a minimum of 3 bins, making 12 bins and 4 food caddies per bin store.

Incidentally the comment dated 12 September from "WDC Contract Services" is inaccurate and ill informed. They have stated 'no objection' as bins will be emptied from Church Lane. This is not the case, and is to be prohibited, as they previously stated. Furthermore the emptying of wheelie bins (possibly 16 across two closely located positions, at a given time, with the refuse truck waiting in the narrow carriageway of Church Street, will further add a challenge to the traffic flow of Church Street in busy times

RCA REGENERATION LETTER 25 August 2022

There are 7 bullet points on this letter: (my numbers follow the points)

1. I disagree about retention of the Church Street Hedgerow. I have set out on site the vision splay requirements of the new access that has been drawn. The x dimension of 2.4m from the edge of the carriageway places the drivers eye behind the boundary wall and hedge by approximately 0.75m. If the Y northbound dimension of 39m is then marked on the carriageway, it can be seen that the 39m point is part of the way around the bend, making visibility impossible from this point. The fact that it is located around the bend will mean that the vegetation to Church Street will be substantially compromised. Indeed the 39m point is beyond the Glebes northern boundary, thus creating issues as described in the Road Safety audit.
2. The case officer will have a view as to how many spaces are required for each part of the development. The drawings now show 1 visitor parking space for the 4 No apartments and also 1 visitor space for the 4 townhouses
- 5 The statement "For the avoidance of doubt, the windows are the same size and proportion found on the existing extension." Is plainly inaccurate.

Reference to the elevational overlays shown on drawing R214 shows that on the front elevation, the number of windows has increased, and on the rear elevation there is again an increase in the number of windows at 1st floor level, they are much larger than existing, and the cills are substantially lower than the existing. This will lead to an increase in overlooking of adjacent properties, One of which is an occupied grade 2 listed building (Old Mill House) The other listed building that has its setting materially affected by this development is the Dovecote located in 7 Church Lane. It should be noted that the rear window cills to the extension have previously been lowered, contrary to the original consent for the extension, and there is no record in the Planning History of this been consented.

7 Whilst the ridge line of the town houses has been lowered in this current application, it is still higher than the 'effective ridge height' seen to this existing block, the higher ridge used for the comparison is set back from the road and is not visible from Church Street

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT:

This document is now entitled Revision B, but it is the same document as previously submitted, save for the notation to Rev B. The use of this document is misleading, lazy and inaccurate. It was wrong when used in the last application, it is now even further from an accurate representation of the plans. I will comment separately on the separate Addendum.

12.11 : 3rd para, one bedroom has en suite bathroom, with a 'Jack and Jill' door. It refers to second floor accommodation, there is none shown on the plans

12.12 : Refers to a study to plots 1, there is none.

It refers to a triple aspect living room to plot 1, this is not shown, indeed a window on the south western elevation is unacceptable to New Mill House, and would create further overlooking.

It refers to 3 bedrooms at first floor level all with en suites, there are 4 bedrooms at this level, 2 with en suites. It refers to games room and 2 further beds at 2nd Floor level, there is no second floor. There are no roof lanterns shown to the staircases, but they are described as such.

In the light of past objections to the height and overlooking of previous schemes, If this application is granted, I would like a specific condition prohibiting the creation of habitable space in the roof spaces of the new plots

12.13 : refers to 9 pane windows at second floor level, there is no second floor in the new build.

12.14 : The noted 'six panel door and fan lights a blind window and a lower ridged link roof' is shown as a metal gate and open path on the drawings. The space is not roofed.

5th para discusses 'hipped dormer windows' there are none.

12.15 : it states that plots 2,3,4 each have 3 nine pane sash windows at ff level, there are in fact 2 No in each unit. Refers to dormers again, none shown.

12.16 : 4th para calls up estate fencing between apartments and plots, drawing R219 shows no such fence. The noted reinstated railings and yew hedging will impact the visibility splay to the new plot entrance, which is already compromised. (see above)

'House Frontages' calls up a new single dwelling access point from High Street. This is not the case, all 4 are shown off the new (unsatisfactory) entrance. Are the cycle stores to the plots shown as the sheds?

The document refers to 'both new entrances', there is only one new entrance planned.

14.1 : refers to 2 new vehicle and access points not 1, it refers to 3 pedestrian access points not 2

19.2: This states that the 'apartment refuse will be collected from Church Lane', this has been prohibited by WDC. (see comments above)

Re the new build, the 4 cycle stores and communal refuse store are separate buildings.

19.3: states that there are 3 car parking spaces per apartment, there are 2 shown per apartment with one visitor space.

The car parking for the plots is 13 total in one area, not as described being in 2 discrete areas.

21.1 : Discusses the No7 Church Lane 'being acquired by the hotel' which contradicts the 'separate private ownership' stated.

21.2 : refers to 'Two Splendid Listed Buildings' there is only one within the red line, the dovecote is outside the application site.

ADDENDUM TO DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

1.10 The note that 'the only alternative may be to board up etc'.. is incorrect. The Village have attempted to engage with the developer to investigate a potential solution to this site, but all attempts have been ignored

2.2.8 see comments above re the window sizing

2.3.2 and 2.6.7 I fail to see how the current landscape frontage can be enhanced when one considers the new entrance perforation and the requirements for visibility splays (see comments above)

TRANSPORT STATEMENT

The same document has been lodged again, with the same inaccuracies, but also supplemented by the "Statement of Common Ground" which I will comment upon separately

Comments have previously been made on the preceding applications regarding the timing of the traffic survey, taken as it was during lock down and school recess. Traffic flows were again not representatively recorded.

The Development Summary calls up 5 bedrooms to each plot, there are 4, it is acknowledged that WDC parking standards are unaffected by this error

Page 3 states that the housing plots car parking area will include a gate, this is not feasible and has been omitted from the plans

The new access is considered to be too close to the bend to be safe.

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND REF HIGHWAYS

3.1 The accommodation schedule error is repeated

5.1 The latest traffic count undertaken in July 2022, is not representative, the private schools in Warwick were on holiday, and office attendance is still lower due to the pandemic.

3 in the 'guide to on street parking' refers to primary sources of car parking are the church and the local primary school. There is no mention of the increasingly popular King George's Field (which attracts users from outside of Barford) and of the day nursery in Church Street, both of which impact the parking and space available in this part of Church Street, (See photographs from Mark Griffin)

I am pleased to see that a Road Safety Audit has been completed, as requested, It is disappointing to see the design engineers response however:

The findings of the Independent RSA need to be acted upon rather than dismissed.

2.1 See comments above re visibility splay, Provision of the 39m vision splay will materially and

adversely affect the front (Church St) boundary vegetation.

2.2 On street parking can be problematic at present, see comment above and photographs provided by Mark Griffin. It is not accepted that 'the overwhelming majority of trips from the development will use a left turn out, ie A429 and M40. These are all family dwellings, the schools are all in Warwick and Leamington, as is a large business Park, and town centre shopping. All turning right out of the 'gates'.

Incidentally waiting restrictions are not appropriate in this residential street, with 'tidal' parking requirements, in a Conservation Area.

2.4 Photographic evidence held by the LPA contradict the statement regarding 'no parking at all adjacent to the site'

The requested swept path analysis for, for example, removal lorries needs to be provided. The swept path analysis provided is very limited.

HERITAGE STATEMENT

Whilst there is an addendum to the Heritage Statement included, there is no Heritage Statement included in this application as scheduled on your Planning Portal

REFUSAL NOTICE TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS W/21/2042 AND 2043LB

A review of the reasons for the Councils decision identifies that most of not all of the concerns still apply and therefore this consent should be refused.

Notifications

70	Application No:	W/22/0221
	Description:	Erection of two storey rear extension, rear dormer, side passage with disabled access ramp, front porch and front roof windows.
	Address:	4 Wasperton Lane, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8DT
	Applicant:	Mr S Clarence
	JPC Decision:	The JPC objects to this development on the grounds of the unsatisfactory visual impact created by its design, and it questions, in these times of climate change and global warming, the logic of removing solar panels
	WDC Decision:	Granted
71	Application No:	W/22/0483
	Description:	Erection of two storey front, side and rear extension
	Address:	26 Wellesbourne Road, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8EL
	Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Aujla
	JPC Decision	No objection
	WDC Decision:	Granted
72	Application No:	W/22/0548
	Description:	Proposed installation of a solar farm and associated development.
	Address:	Land to West of A46 Sherbourne.
	Applicant:	PD412WAR Ltd
	JPC Decision:	See comments below
	WDC Decision	Refused
73	Application No:	W/22/0752
	Description:	Proposed new garage
	Address:	44 Church Street, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8EN
	Applicant:	Graftomgate Development Ltd
	JPC Decision:	No objection
	WDC Decision	Granted
74	Application No:	W/22/0753 LB
	Description:	Proposed new garage
	Address:	44 Church Street, Barford, Warwick, CV35 8EN
	Applicant:	Graftomgate Development Ltd
	JPC Decision:	No objection
	WDC Decision:	Granted

Closure

75 There being no other items on the agenda the meeting was closed at 8:25pm