

HARBURY PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting Thursday 7 September 2017 at 7.30pm The Tom Hauley Room, All Saints Church, Harbury

Present:

Cllr T Lockley (Chairman)
Cllr S Allen
Cllr C Christou
Cllr S Ekins
Cllr C Gibb

Cllr A Rutherford
Cllr P Summers
Cllr K Thompson
Cllr J Thornley

Absent: Cllr A Mancell

In Attendance:

Mrs A Biddle, Clerk to the Council
Mrs C Gwillam, Minute Secretary

Public:

Mrs L Ridgley, Harbury News
Mr K Cockell, Henry's Representative
Members of the Public: 32

17/141 **Apologies:** Cllr A Mancell

17/142 **Declarations of Interest:** None

17/143 **Dispensations:** None

17/144 **Public Participation**

Various questions were asked, primarily about the land at Vicarage Lane:

- What is the purpose of a conservation area? It is to ensure that development is sympathetic to surroundings, not designed to stop development.
- Has Harbury reached its full housing quota under the Core Strategy? The Core Strategy for Harbury was 113 maximum at 2031 and the village already has 134 new dwellings (either built or committed) which is 21 over the quota.
- Neighbourhood Development Plan – what status and impact does this have? Unfortunately, the draft NDP carries very little weight until it has been adopted. The NDP highlights what the village wants. If this had already been in place, would it have stopped this development?
- One of the councillors knows the orchard (the planning site) very well as family lived in an adjacent property and worked for the landowner. This is private land with no public access and the understanding has always been that this land would one day be developed.
- More affordable housing is what is required in the village to encourage younger people to stay in the village where they grew up, not more large houses. The only gain is by property developers.
- The site has been part of the historic curtilage of Wissett Lodge, a listed building, for as long as can be remembered; there is still access to the garages at the rear of Wissett Lodge.

- Residents of adjacent properties look out over the site but there is no entitlement to a view.
- The tree locations shown on the planning application are different to the actual locations on the ground. Some of the trees earmarked to be saved would not flourish when the extensive and close proximity of the development is underway.
- Mrs Ridgley referred to Harbury Society's general concern. It was imperative to ask SDC for an archaeological survey as the site was previously undeveloped and originally part of the vicarage as far back as medieval times.
- If it did go ahead, then more attention should be paid to access by construction vehicles, particularly in relation to Church Street.
- Owners of the land do not live here. Several people have tried to buy the land over the years, purely to retain the space, but owners were never interested. Can it be purchased for the community?
- Spitfire's design for the site contains a number of stock designs, not tailored to Harbury's needs. Their flagship house at the entrance to the site, is an example – stonework, tiling, etc.
- Has anyone considered the services? Sewers replaced, grass area paved over, etc.
- The central ash tree – canopy has been reduced, by an unknown contractor; it is a well-known fact that the roots are as wide as the original canopy, so reduction does not alter roots – these could damage the houses. SDC guidelines (No.6) as specified has not given enough space. The trees by Nos. 9/10 will overhang and be unbalanced, taking light.
- Although the Mulberry tree (an historic rare tree, at least 70, possibly 100 years old, although Spitfire states it is only 30 years old) is destined to stay, this will be reduced by a third – what impact will this action have on the longevity of the tree?
- Traffic management should be given serious thought by SDC, if permission is granted, and agree a mitigation plan with WCC Highways to limit impact on the village. Unfortunately, this will not be decided until after the decision; the council are still awaiting replies from various statutory bodies.
- It was pointed out that there were various incorrect measurements on the plan.
- Is there any limit to development? Unfortunately, the National Planning Policy Framework of 2012 removed many previous policies/restraints.

There were no further comments.

17/145 Planning Applications

1 17/02311/FUL

Demolition of existing dwelling (No.4 Vicarage Lane) and erection of 10 residential dwellings with associated access, car parking, landscape and associated details
Land at Vicarage Lane

Councillors discussed this, and the following points were made:

- Calculations on central traffic movement are somewhat flawed; there is no doubt that development will encourage extra traffic and there are diametric views on this issue.
- Various unresolved issues – firstly, that of the housing quota under the Core Strategy. This has been met and exceeded, and has a major impact on the local infrastructure, surgery, public transport, etc.

- A key reason for objection (although it is infill not back land development) is impact on the conservation area, historic Wissett Lodge and other listed buildings, as well as loss of habitat, trees, biodiversity.
- Strong emphasis should also be made regarding the materials used (e.g. natural not reconstituted stone) and a robust process to inspect these various aspects at each stage should be implemented.

It was **RESOLVED** (Cllr Lockley proposed, Cllr Gibb seconded) to object to this application on the grounds of:

- (i) housing numbers already exceeded
- (ii) highways – access and traffic
- (iii) impact on conservation area
- (iv) impact on local ecology and biodiversity

2 17/02026/FUL

Proposed single storey extension to front of property

6 Wagstaffe Close

It was **RESOLVED** to make no representation.

3 16/03142/REM (amended)

Application for reserved matters (scale, layout, appearance and landscaping) for 195 residential dwellings following grant of outline planning permission (ref 13/03177/OUT) and alterations to affordable housing provision. (Nature reserve subject to a separate reserved matters application).

Harbury Cement Works

To consider amendments as per applicant's covering letter dated 24 August 2017

It was **RESOLVED** to make no representation.

4 17/01630/FUL (amended)

Full application for the erection of 5 no. independent retirement dwellings, communal bin store and footpath link

Henry's, Bush Heath Lane

Mr Cockell, on behalf of the developers, was in attendance in the hope that the council would reconsider removing its objection. There is already planning permission for development on this site under the previous planning application. Mr Cockell emphasised that it had been decided to make a new application to cover all the amendments rather than making various minor amendments to the existing planning permission. This was due to a mistake in submission by the architects, and had led to some confusion. The council's objection was based on the premise that as a new application, it should be considered afresh on its own merit and with regard to the policies on housing quotas contained in the Core Strategy.

However, after some discussion, and after considering the advice of the planning officer, it was **RESOLVED** to reluctantly withdraw the council's objection; there were no further representations.

17/146

Junior Football Goals

It was reported that the cross bar was bent; although it appeared safe, it was not secure. As safety was paramount, it was suggested that this be replaced; the cost was £295, supply and delivery (not installation). As some of the culprits had been identified, the parents had agreed to contribute.

It was **RESOLVED** to order this replacement as a matter of priority, but to ask the parents for a contribution at a later date.

17/147

Date of Next Ordinary Meeting:

The next ordinary meeting of the parish council will take place on Thursday 28 September 2017 at 7.30pm in Harbury Village Hall.

The meeting closed at 8.50pm

Signed.....Chairman Date.....