

## **Harbury Parish Council**

### **Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting**

**22 June 2017 at 7.30pm**

**The Farley Room, Harbury Village Hall**

#### **Present**

Cllr Lockley (Chairman)	Cllr Christou	Cllr Gibb	Cllr Rutherford
Cllr Thompson	Cllr Allen	Cllr Summers	Cllr Ekins
Cllr Mancell	Cllr Thornley		

**Absent:** None

#### **In Attendance**

Mrs Alison Biddle, Clerk to the Council  
Mrs Carole Gwillam, Minute Secretary  
Michael Wellock (NDP Planning Consultant)

#### **Public**

Mrs Linda Ridgley, Harbury News  
Members of the public: 11

**17/102 Apologies:** None

**17/103 Declarations of Interest:** None.

**17/104 Dispensations:** None.

**17/105 Public Participation**

#### **Eco Homes**

The owner of a field in Bush Heath Lane put forward his case for self-build eco homes by people with a local connection to Harbury. He hoped that the parish council would designate an area of land within the NDP for this purpose which would provide people with the confidence that they have the support of the parish council in this venture. Local residents who are interested in the scheme are present this evening.

Concerns were raised by other members of the public present about this proposal. A survey would be required to evidence the need for this type of development. Could there be any guarantee that the land would be used for self-build only? This could be guaranteed by a legal agreement and planning conditions.

The visual design of existing local eco homes was criticised. In response to this, it was asserted that younger people are more open-minded about contemporary design and are concerned about running costs.

It was pointed out that the draft NDP already contains policies which would allow/support self-build homes. If a particular area was designated for self-build at this late stage it would further delay the progress of the NDP.

**17/106 Harbury Neighbourhood Development Plan – Regulation 14 Pre-submission Public Consultation**

#### **1 Review of Table 1 – Representations from Stratford on Avon District Council**

Comments were noted and minor amendments agreed as per Table 1 at Appendix 1 which included the following, more detailed amendments:

#### Policy H.15 (p58) Traffic Calming

It was agreed that the planning consultant would re-work the wording of this policy to include traffic calming.

#### Policy H.19 (p63-65) Non-designated Heritage Assets

This requires more evidence which the planning consultant will work on. It was also agreed that out of courtesy, owners of non-designated heritage assets would be contacted to let them know that it is proposed to include their property in this list. The parish council will action this.

It was **RESOLVED** to make the amendments as agreed above.

## **2 Review of Table 2 - Representations received statutory consultees, other bodies and members of the public**

All comments were reviewed and the following actions agreed:

### **Policy H.01 New Housing Development**

#### Land West of Village

Mr Tudor has requested that land to the west of the village be included within the settlement boundary. However, this land has always been outside the settlement boundary, and there is strong justification in both the Village Design Statement and the Parish Plan (2005) for protecting the western edge of the village against further development. In addition, Harbury has already exceeded its quota of new housing under the Core Strategy

It was **RESOLVED** that no changes should be made and this area of land to the west of the village should not be included within the settlement boundary.

#### Land off Bull Ring Farm Road

Four people have asked for this site to be included within the settlement boundary. They claim that this site has been included in the settlement boundary since 2005. However, it was not included within the settlement boundary as defined in the Village Design Statement (1998) and the Parish Plan (2005) did not include any reference to the village boundary. The PP did identify several sites at that time for potential development which included the site off Bull Ring Farm Road. This site was included in the first pre-submission draft of the NDP because at the time it was subject to a planning application for homes for elderly people and was supported by the Village with a Vision group. This application was subsequently refused by SDC and as a result, in response to the public consultation on the first pre-submission draft NDP, respondents, including SDC, made comments querying the site's inclusion within the settlement boundary. The parish council took these comments into account and amended the pre-submission draft NDP accordingly with the result that this site was removed from within the proposed settlement boundary. This was regarded as a significant amendment and, following advice from SDC, it was decided to run a second public consultation on the revised pre-submission draft NDP. The responses to that second consultation are the subject of tonight's discussion.

The following points were taken into account:

- SDC's own proposed Built-up-area Boundary (BUAB) for Harbury does not include the site off Bull Ring Farm Road. To pass the examination, the NDP must conform to SDC's planning policy.
- Harbury has already exceeded its housing requirements under the Core Strategy.
- Land included within the settlement boundary supports planning applications in defined circumstances.



## APPENDIX 1

### Harbury Neighbourhood Development Plan

#### Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation (Neighbourhood Planning (General)

#### Regulations, 2012

**Table 1 - Comments from Stratford-on-Avon District Council – March 2017**

Policy related comments:

Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Agreed Parish Council Response
<b>Map 1 – Settlement Boundary</b>	p.29	No additional comments on the proposed changes to the settlement boundary.	Noted – no change.
<b>Section 5 – Policies and Proposals</b>	Policy H.03 (p.35-36)	If housing in the Parish is to meet requirement identified in the Core Strategy, it would seem inappropriate to expect developers to agree the mix of dwellings with Parish Council. Also, schemes cannot be expected to meet the needs of older and younger residents – dwellings may be suitable but occupancy of market dwellings cannot be controlled. Core Strategy does not stipulate that development should provide self-build so wording of this policy is probably too prescriptive.	Comment on agreement of the Parish Council noted. This “should” take place but is not being required e.g. by saying “must”. The Parish Council can offer useful and helpful advice and information to developers on housing needs in the area. Suggest re-wording to: “Before finalising the housing mix on such sites developers should consult and take into account the views of the Parish Council along with up-to-date demographic...”  On the comment about old/young/self-build amend to “including a range of homes to meet the needs of different age groups and, where feasible and viable for those seeking to build their own home.”
<b>Section 5 – Policies and Proposals</b>	Policy H.04 (p.37-38)	Criterion (b) should start with ‘In...’	Amend as suggested.
<b>Section 5 – Policies and Proposals</b>	Policy H.05 (p.38-39)	No additional comments on the proposed changes to this policy.	Noted – no change.

## APPENDIX 1

<p><b>Section 5 – Policies and Proposals</b></p>	<p>Policy H.07 (p.40-41)</p>	<p>The policy is acceptable if fully justified. There seems to be a mismatch between 12 no. LGSs identified in the policy (12 off) and those highlighted in Appendix 2 (15 off). Manor Orchard Green and Frances Road Green do not appear to be highlighted in Appendix 2. It would be helpful if reference letters of LGSs in policy were included in Appendix 2 to make it clear – it is expected the Examiner to ask for this.</p>	<p>Resolve differences in Policy and Appendix. Add in further justification for identified local green spaces.</p>
<p><b>Section 5 – Policies and Proposals</b></p>	<p>Policy H.09 (p.46-47)</p>	<p>No additional comments on the proposed changes to this policy.</p>	<p>Noted – no change.</p>
<p><b>Section 5 – Policies and Proposals</b></p>	<p>Policy H.10 (p.47-48)</p>	<p>No additional comments on the proposed changes to this policy.</p>	<p>Noted – no change.</p>
<p><b>Section 5 – Policies and Proposals</b></p>	<p>Policy H.14 (p.57)</p>	<p>No additional comments on the proposed changes to this policy.</p>	<p>Noted – no change.</p>
<p><b>Section 5 – Policies and Proposals</b></p>	<p>Policy H.15 (p.58)</p>	<p>It is unclear why traffic calming measures have been deleted as they seem appropriate for inclusion in a NDP policy.</p>	<p>Criterion (b) and the accompanying projects were deleted based on SADC's comments at the first Regulation 14 comments stage:</p> <p>“To ask all development (of any scale) to include the highways measures requested is too onerous. Suggest deleting the word ‘All’ at the beginning of the policy.</p> <p>Criteria b) is a WCC Highways function and not a land-use planning matter and should be removed from the policy.</p> <p>It is not clear how criteria c) requesting access to public transport can be achieved, particularly given there are no site allocations for larger development proposals promoted through the NDP and as such the scale of any future</p>

## APPENDIX 1

			<p>development may be too small to require s.106 contributions.</p> <p>The 5 no. bullet points on p.56 are a mixture of WCC Highway functions and possible projects, not policy requirements. It is considered these items may not pass the Basic Conditions tests and may be removed from the policy by an Independent Examiner.</p> <p>It was agreed that traffic calming should be reinstated.</p>
<p><b>Section 5 – Policies and Proposals</b></p>	<p>Policy H.19 (p.63-65)</p>	<p>The policy would appear to be acceptable if it is fully justified. An Examiner will expect to see reasoned justification for all the sites listed in the policy, to ensure they meet the 'set criteria' for local listing.</p>	<p>It was agreed to enhance the documentary evidence/justification for the identified non-designated heritage assets and to write directly to the owners of these buildings to let them know that their property is to be included.</p>

## APPENDIX 2

### Harbury Neighbourhood Development Plan

#### Second Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation (Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, 2012)

**Table 2 - Comments from Residents, Businesses and Landowners**

Policy related comments:

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Agreed Parish Council Response
<b>Natural England</b>			Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	Noted. No change.
<b>Darin Tudor</b>	<b>Policies and Proposals</b>	<b>Policy H.01</b>	Objection seeks amendment of settlement boundary to include two sites to the west of village.	Housing commitments in Harbury have already exceeded those identified in the Core Strategy. Further development will be supported within the settlement boundary. The settlement boundary as defined in the NDP includes the existing built-up area and housing commitments. The "Wilsons land" has not previously been included in the settlement boundary. This is not an error. No change to the plan as a result of this objection.
<b>Caroline Greengrow</b>	<b>Policies and Proposals</b>	<b>Policy H.01</b>	<p>I object to the recommended change in Settlement Boundary for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Land at Bull Ring Farm Road was included in the previous and current Village plan of 2005. There is no reason to change it, it is central to the village and is in close proximity to all local amenities so is very well located</li> <li>• This land was identified by residents of the village in the still current Housing Needs Survey as a site which is ideal for providing housing for the Elderly Population of Harbury. Out of 385 Residents who responded to the</li> </ul>	Comments noted but the site at Bull Ring Farm was deleted following the previous Regulation 14 consultation and the material change in circumstances following the refusal of planning permission for extra care dwellings and houses on the site – ref 15/02254/FUL. No change to plan.

## APPENDIX 2

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Agreed Parish Council Response
			<p>Housing Needs Survey, 151 believe there is a lack of housing in the village. Why remove a Site which could be of use in the future and is right in the centre?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Parish Plan highlights overwhelmingly that the majority of residents believe that there is a need for elderly accommodation in the village centre – this parcel of land was identified as the preferred plot to meet this need</li> <li>• The Parish Plan should take into account the interests of everyone in the village and should not be biased in favour of those closest to the land in question, who perhaps may make the loudest noise against keeping it in the boundary</li> <li>• There is a clear need for bungalows and affordable housing in the village and the Landowners (who have owned this land in the village for 100 years in 2018) are not developers but a family who wish to provide what the village needs and have sought to work with the village to achieve this</li> </ul>	
Jill Varrow		Page 37, para 5.14	<p>There is a need for multi-generation properties where one adult needs to have independent living downstairs that provides them with a bedroom, bathroom, own lounge. This would be in addition to a kitchen, lounge and w.c. for the rest of the family. We require this for an elderly relative but households that have a mix of disabled and able bodied adults will also require this. The new builds do not accommodate this type of living. Also it needs to be affordable.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The HNDP seeks to achieve this objective through the housing policies it contains i.e. H.03 and H.04.</p>

## APPENDIX 2

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Agreed Parish Council Response
Nichola Snell	Policies and Proposals	Policy H.01	<p>I object to the recommended change in Settlement Boundary for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Land at Bull Ring Farm Road was included in the previous and current Village plan of 2005. There is no reason to change it, it is central to the village and is in close proximity to all local amenities so is very well located</li> <li>• This land was identified by residents of the village in the still current Housing Needs Survey as a site which is ideal for providing housing for the Elderly Population of Harbury. Out of 385 Residents who responded to the Housing Needs Survey, 151 believe there is a lack of housing in the village. Why remove a Site which could be of use in the future and is right in the centre?</li> <li>• The Parish Plan highlights overwhelmingly that the majority of residents believe that there is a need for elderly accommodation in the village centre – this parcel of land was identified as the preferred plot to meet this need</li> <li>• The Parish Plan should take into account the interests of everyone in the village and should not be biased in favour of those closest to the land in question, who perhaps may make the loudest noise against keeping it in the boundary</li> <li>• There is a clear need for bungalows and affordable housing in the village and the Landowners (who have owned this land in the village for 100 years in 2018) are not developers but a family who wish to provide</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted but the site at Bullring Farm was deleted following the previous Regulation 14 consultation and the material change in circumstances following the refusal of planning permission for extra care dwellings and houses on the site – ref 15/02254/FUL. No change to plan.</p>

## APPENDIX 2

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Agreed Parish Council Response
			<p>what the village needs and have sought to work with the village to achieve this</p>	
<p><b>Historic England</b></p>			<p>Thank you for the invitation to comment on the Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan. Historic England is supportive of both the content of the document and the vision and objectives set out in it.</p> <p>The emphasis on the conservation of local distinctiveness and the protection of locally significant buildings and landscape character including important views is to be applauded. We also highly commend the approaches taken in the Plan to ensuring that the design of new development contributes to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.</p> <p>We do have one comment in that the Plan makes it clear that the Parish has a rich resource of archaeological remains both above and below ground. Accordingly there is a possibility, both within the settlement boundary and beyond, that this resource will be impacted by new development. Therefore, we would strongly recommend the inclusion within the neighbourhood plan of a policy to cover the appropriate treatment of archaeological remains within the planning process. Perhaps as a new "h)" paragraph in Policy H.01. The Policy below would be suitable and has been adopted successfully elsewhere in Warwickshire:</p>	<p>Amend H.19 to include as follows:</p> <p>"(Development proposals should) take full account of known surface and sub-surface archaeology and ensure unknown and potentially significant deposits are identified and appropriately considered during development after consultation with the Warwickshire Historic Environment Record (HER). Lack of current evidence of sub-surface archaeology must not be taken as proof of absence".</p>

## APPENDIX 2

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Agreed Parish Council Response
			<p>“(Development proposals should) take full account of known surface and sub-surface archaeology and ensure unknown and potentially significant deposits are identified and appropriately considered during development after consultation with the Warwickshire Historic Environment Record (HER). Lack of current evidence of sub-surface archaeology must not be taken as proof of absence”.</p>	
<p><b>Ken Stephenson</b></p>			<p>As a new organisation the HEI has too much prominence within the draft; Harbury has many other equally laudable long established organisations. Bias in favour of any particular group should be avoided. Words such as 'encourage, support etc' are used throughout the draft. Without qualification they can mean anything now and in years to come (?)</p>	<p>Comments noted. The plan treats all organisations fairly. The words “encourage etc. are used in conjunction with criteria to assess planning proposals – only when they meet these criteria will they be encouraged or supported.</p>
<p><b>John Yarnall</b></p>		<p><b>H.15</b></p>	<p>In the light of recent developments, I consider policy H15 and associated policies and objectives throughout the document to be inadequate. Para 3.29 of the plan states that there is a "popular hourly bus service to Leamington and Southam". The service was clearly not sufficiently popular as it has now been replaced with an even less popular 2 hourly service. Against this background I would argue that it is insufficient to simply declare in H15 that it is the policy, "to encourage the use of</p>	<p>Comment noted. The NDP will continue to seek and support transport, including public transport, improvements.  Amend first line on page 23 to read "...there is a popular service..."</p>

## APPENDIX 2

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Agreed Parish Council Response
Sean Neill			General support for the plan.	Support noted.
Mrs Ashling Laycock	Policies and Proposals	H.01	<p>I object to the recommended change in settlement boundary for the following reasons:</p> <p>The land on Bull Ring Farm Road was included in the previous and current Village Plan dated 2005. It was highlighted by residents of the village in the previous and still current housing needs surveys as a site which is ideal for providing housing for the elderly population of Harbury. 151 of 384 residents who responded to the housing needs survey believe there is a lack of housing in the village so why remove a site which could be of use in the future? The current Parish Plan highlights overwhelmingly that the majority of residents believe there is a need for elderly accommodation in the village centre – hence this parcel of land was identified as the preferred option. There is a clear need for bungalows and affordable housing in the village and the Landowners (who are not developers) who are a family who have owned the land in excess of 100 years and wish to provide what the village needs. The parish wishes to encourage people walking to reach facilities so why extend the boundary to add in parcels of land further out of the village rather than utilise the land already within the boundary.</p>	Comments noted but the site at Bullring Farm was deleted following the previous Regulation 14 consultation and the material change in circumstances following the refusal of planning permission for extra care dwellings and houses on the site – ref 15/02254/FUL. No change to plan.

## APPENDIX 2

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Agreed Parish Council Response
Julian Price	Policies and Proposals	H.01	<p>I object to the proposal to remove the land on Bull Ring Farm Road from the village boundary.</p> <p>My family has significant history dating back over 100 years in the village of Harbury. My mother, Diana Price (Nee Robinson), grew up in Harbury Hall and her father, my grandfather, was a wellrespected local figure. He was considered a generous and community focused man. For example, the local parish community were very familiar with Harbury Hall as the Sunday Catholic service was received each week in part of their home. And, during the war, as part of the 'Dig for Victory' movement my grandfather provided allotments for the parish. Allotments that remain in the heart of the village to this day.</p> <p>On the death of my grandparents, and my mother's only sibling, Anthony Robinson, it was discovered that the estate held significant debt. Such that Harbury Hall had to be sold. My mother's only remaining connection with the village being the land on Bull Ring Farm Road and two other small parcels of land.</p> <p>For many years, it had been my mother's wish that a final legacy be left for Harbury in recognition of the fond memories of her childhood in the village. Unfortunately, in 2005, when the land on Bull Ring Farm Road was included in the village plan, my mother's health was such that she didn't have the energy or resources to explore options. She passed the land to myself and my three siblings so that we could. Sadly, my mother passed last year.</p>	<p>Comments noted but the site at Bullring Farm was deleted following the previous Regulation 14 consultation and the material change in circumstances following the refusal of planning permission for extra care dwellings and houses on the site – ref 15/02254/FUL. No change to plan.</p>

## APPENDIX 2

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Agreed Parish Council Response
			<p>My siblings and I have long considered what would be a fitting legacy. But it was only in 2010 when we were approached by Harbury's 'Village With A Vision' action group that we embarked on a plan to develop an elderly care facility for the ageing population of Harbury. Who otherwise would have to move out of the village. Between us we have spent a considerable amount of time and over £100,000 trying to get planning for a scheme addressing what we were informed were the needs of the village.</p> <p>We are not wealthy developers who can afford to throw money at property schemes. We are four families with young children, looking to deliver on our mother's wish. I am shocked and heartbroken to see that all our time, effort and financial investment in Harbury is considered with such contempt that a proposal to move this land out of the village boundary, where it has been for a considerable time, would even be tabled. A decision to remove this land out of the village boundary, would mean that all future options for a Robinson legacy in Harbury would be over.</p> <p>For this reason, I object to the proposal to remove the land on Bull Ring Farm Road from the village boundary.</p>	
Steve Brough		H.01	<p><b>Outline proposal</b></p> <p><b>1.0 History</b></p> <p>During the past twenty years, Harbury has had a number of new housing developments built on the periphery of the village, including</p>	<p>This site should not be included within the settlement boundary as policies H.03 and H.04 already make provision for this type of housing. It was agreed to strengthen this by amending H.04 to include additional clarification with reference to self-build at paragraph 5.15.</p>

## APPENDIX 2

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Agreed Parish Council Response
			<p>Percival Drive, Hillside and, recently, the new David Wilson site.</p> <p>.</p> <p>All these sites are mainstream housing schemes, built by large developers, producing high density urban style housing estates, the like of which can be seen within most towns and cities throughout the country.</p> <p><b>2.0 Developments</b></p> <p>Although this adds numbers to the Governments housing targets, the type and style of housing does nothing to enhance a village environment, or reduce its reliance on fossil fuels.</p> <p>There is a significant Self Build, Eco house movement sweeping the country. However, people wanting to build their own Eco house, usually for local occupancy, find it very difficult to acquire a suitable building plot.</p> <p><b>3.0 Comment</b></p> <p>Harbury, I feel, is unique in its support for environmentally friendly projects. We have the Harbury Energy Initiative supporting numerous Eco projects and the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) is very supportive of a low carbon, energy efficient, sustainable future for Harbury.</p> <p><b>4.0 Proposal</b></p>	

## APPENDIX 2

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Agreed Parish Council Response
			<p>I am the owner of a parcel of land situated on Bush Heath Lane, as identified on the attached plan. The land has three developed boundaries; Bush Heath Lane to the east, the new David Wilson site to the south and a private road to the north.</p> <p>The site could accommodate possibly 6 to 8 individual serviced building plots to allow local families the opportunity to build their own Eco house.</p> <p><b>5.0 Advice</b></p> <p>I have been in discussions with Roger Coy Partnership; Architects who have already been involved with an Echo house project within Harbury, and also the proposed development of the sustainable swimming pool at Harbury School.</p> <p>The Architects have indicated that they could provide a design brief to ensure that the proposed homes would be built to the required design parameters to meet appropriate Eco credentials.</p> <p><b>6.0 The Site</b></p> <p>The site is very well situated for Eco houses, as it is predominately South facing and is unshaded, therefore receiving the maximum solar gain.</p> <p><b>7.0 Local Need</b></p>	

## APPENDIX 2

Respondent	Section	Reference/NDP page	Comment	Agreed Parish Council Response
			<p>A local family has already expressed a desire to take a plot to build their own family Eco house on the site.</p> <p>The proposal would also comply with the Governments new "Right to Build" Scheme.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>I would be pleased to work with the Parish Council to promote the proposal within the NDP. The project would provide a unique opportunity for the village to utilise the NDP as a means to earmark this piece of land as a specific site for residents, with a local connection, to self build their own Eco house.</p> <p>I would envisage that the plots would be fully serviced and any prospective purchasers would be fully supported by the Architects. If required, advice and guidance would be offered to help them realise their aspirations to achieve a sustainable home, which they can justifiably be proud of.</p>	