

HARBURY PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting Thursday 30 May 2019 at 7.00pm Harbury Village Hall

Present:

Cllr S Allen
Cllr S Ekins
Cllr C Gibb

Cllr A Knowles
Cllr T Lockley (Chairman)
Cllr A Mancell

Cllr P Summers
Cllr J Thornley
Cllr K Thompson

Members of the Public: 71

County Cllr R Stevens
Mrs L Ridgley, Harbury News

In Attendance:

Mrs C Gwillam, Minute Secretary

19/94

Apologies:

Cllr A Rutherford
District Cllr J Harris

19/95

Declarations of Interest: None

19/96

Dispensations: None

19/97

Public Participation

There was a good turnout from the public, all disapproving of this application; the main points were:

- Clarification on numbers already built: The number of houses in Harbury has already exceeded the maximum 113 mentioned in the Core Strategy; more than 130 to date
- What bearing does the parish have on an application? We have a significant impact on the decision – although Stratford decide, Harbury's views are considered
- Neighbourhood Development Plan adopted by SDC as supplementary planning policy. The land is not identified in the NDP for possible building
- Is Bishop's Hill included in the parish? It used to be, but with boundary changes, it now comes under Bishops Itchington
- If application is refused, what happens? It would go to an Inspector for investigation, then possibly a further appeal to the Secretary of State
- Although 120 is only a small development generally, it is a big one for Harbury

- What does 'All matters reserved except for access' mean? This means the developers will apply again with specific details later
- More development has impact on services, schools, sewerage, etc.
- Although Gladman is a big company and the Oakfields development went through first time, Stratford were not as strict then as they are now. The fact that we now have a Core Strategy will make a difference
- What is a Hybrid plan? There is no difference, it is treated the same as an overall application
- Why is the cemetery included? A piece of land had been offered by a local landowner but during negotiations he, unfortunately, died. The family are aware of his intentions and have offered another piece of land, although not as ideal. This is on-going at present
- Do we need a cemetery and why is it in with the housing? Yes, we do. Although cremations have increased, there are still 5-10 burials per year. Although the parish council are working hard to try and provide one, it may not be possible.
- Assuming this application gets approval, will the parish council be able to shape the development? Yes, in principle. If it passes SDC, full permission will be needed for specific details
- Does the school have capacity? Yes, at present. However, more expensive houses often mean less families
- Will it have an impact on the surgery? Without doubt.

Bush Heath Lane – was this scheduled originally for village development?
No. More housing is inevitable, but not until 2031 (NDP)

- What about countryside deficiency? Known benefits to mental health? This is not in any planning policy at present
- Have there been any studies on the land, i.e. nature? Yes, the land has been farmed for a long time, and land studies are included in the application
- Reference to the pond and the stream with willows – many of these are very ancient trees which need protecting
- Clarification of number of applications yet to be built in Harbury?
There are 3: (1) small one at the back of Manor Road (2) Stapenhall Farm (3) Harbury House plus future applications likely for Muggleston's and The Old New Inn
The field next to Oakfields is for self-build, although this is excluded from the numbers
- Is SDC meeting their Core Strategy targets? Yes, they are meeting targets, 105%. They have a 6.26-year land supply in pipeline
- How long is planning permission valid for? It expires after 3 years.
- Is it worth objecting? Definitely – planning officers read and collate all statistical evidence of objections.
- 6th June consultation – submissions in; 29 July the determined date
- PC meeting with the developers: Gladmans had an informal meeting with HPC. Several issues were pointed out and they were advised to have a public consultation which they were not willing to do as a face-to-face event. However they did an online survey instead.

- What about the electricity low pylons across the field? These will be taken underground in application and buried all the way along. However, the impact will be greater than suggested.
- If objecting, can you mention ecological harm, damage to trees, etc? This is all vague at present because it is only an outline application.
- The internal access point is on a dangerous bend? This was misunderstood as the yellow arrow is for pedestrians only not vehicles

19/98

Planning:

1 19/01211/OUT

Hybrid planning application comprising: Full planning permission for the change of use of agricultural land to cemetery with vehicular access from Temple End; and Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 120 dwellings and associated infrastructure with all matters reserved except for access (vehicular access proposed from Bush Heath Lane)

Land west of Bush Heath Lane (Gladman Developments Ltd)

Each policy was looked at and Cllr Allen went through each one. It was worth looking forensically at all the points as it was apparent there were lots of errors, inaccuracies and anomalies.

It was **RESOLVED** to object to this application on the grounds as stated in the council's formal response at appendix A.

The clerk is to be asked to submit the response to SDC and make it available to the public via Facebook and online.

Thanks were expressed to Cllr Allen for all her hard work in scrutinizing this application.

19/99

Date of Next Meeting

The next ordinary meeting of the parish council will take place on Thursday 27 June 2019 at **7.30pm** in the Farley Room, Harbury Village Hall.

The meeting closed at 7.50pm

Signed Chairman Date.....

APPENDIX A
Objections to planning application 19/01211/OUT
Land west of Bush Heath Lane

1. Grounds for Refusal

1.1 This section sets out the grounds for refusal of this planning application by first considering the various development plans at national, local and parish level and then other material considerations.

1.2 *NPPF (8a) “an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;”*

Policy CS.15 in the adopted Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy (2011-2031) states that in Local Service Villages, such as Harbury, further development may be permitted solely on sites identified in a neighbourhood plan, or through small scale schemes on unidentified but suitable sites within their Built-Up Area Boundaries (where defined) or otherwise within their physical confines.

Policy H.01 of the Harbury & Deppers Bridge Neighbourhood Development Plan (Harbury & Deppers Bridge NDP) states *“New housing development will be concentrated within the Harbury village settlement boundary (Map 1)”*

Policy AS.10 of the Local Plan also establishes that, within the rural parts of the district (which includes Local Service Villages), residential development should comprise small-scale schemes located within a Built-Up Area Boundary or otherwise within the physical confines of a settlement.

This proposal, at 120 dwellings is not classed as small scale, nor is it within the Built-Up Area Boundary. This is not a sustainable development as this land is not “in the right places”.

The proposed development does not accord with the provisions of the Local Plan and no material considerations have been identified to override the proposal’s conflict with it.

As such, the proposal does not constitute sustainable development and is contrary to the Local Plan, in particular policies CS.15 (Distribution of Development) and AS.10 (Countryside and Villages).

The proposal is incompatible with Harbury & Deppers Bridge NDP policy H.01 (New Housing Development in Harbury Village) as it does not lie within the settlement boundary

1.3 NPPF (11b) *“strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas...”*

There is neither an independent up to date housing needs survey in place nor a lower than 5 year housing land supply identified by Stratford District Council (SDC). In fact, there are currently 6.26 years of housing land identified **external to the Harbury parish** with an expected increase to these numbers when the new figures are released in July 2019. This clear strategy of a register of housing land allows land to be brought forward at a sufficient rate. SDC consider a trend of over delivery in the early years of the Local Plan period 2011 – 2018 (end 2031) and additional housing beyond this would be in contravention of the Framework paragraphs 23 and 59.

1.3.1 Although the applicant considers the 6.26 years to be over optimistic, they provide no documented evidence of such. On the contrary, the council can provide clearly documented dwelling plans in their Information sheet 023/2018 for:

- 1852 dwellings with outline planning permission (including a 5% reduction buffer)
- 1017 dwellings with permission but not started (including a 5% reduction buffer)

- 1817 dwellings under construction

Policy CS.16 of the Local Plan details the strategic allocation of homes identified for the Local Service Villages, with Category 1 villages, of which Harbury is one, taking approximately 450 homes in total, of which no more than around 25% (113) should be provided in any individual settlement. Data from the plan period between April 2011 and 31 March 2017, shows that a total of 134 dwellings were built or approved in Harbury. There have been at least another 4 approved since then. The applicant’s statement of a ‘modest expansion’ of 120 additional dwellings is a further 90%!

All the LSV Category 1 have taken +800 dwellings between them, therefore over exceeding the 450 dwellings specified in the Local Plan.

The proposed development would clearly exacerbate this situation, resulting in a conflict with the requirements of Policy CS.16, as the scheme would take the settlement well above the overall scale of development identified, meaning an over-provision of housing, significantly in excess of the numbers of homes that have been identified as being sustainable within the Development Plan. This proposal conflicts with Local Plan policy CS.16 (Housing Development)

1.4 NPPF (12) *“Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.”*

Both the Local Plan and the Harbury & Deppers Bridge NDP are considered up to date plans and conflict with this proposal. There are no material considerations identified nor any planning obligations that could be imposed to indicate these plans should be overridden.

1.5 *NPPF (14) “ In situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided all of the following apply:*

- a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan two years or less before the date on which the decision is made;*
- b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement;*
- c) the local planning authority has at least a three year supply of deliverable housing sites (against its five year housing supply requirement, including the appropriate buffer as set out in paragraph 73); and*
- d) the local planning authority’s housing delivery was at least 45% of that required over the previous three years.”*

We would confirm against these criteria as follows:

- a) The Harbury & Deppers Bridge NDP was ‘made’ on 17 December 2018, less than two years from the target date for determination for this application of 29 July 2019.
- b) The Harbury & Deppers Bridge NDP contains policies and allocations to meet the housing requirements for the Harbury parish area.
- c) Stratford on Avon District Council (SDC) has 6.26 years of housing supply including an appropriate buffer.
- d) SDC housing delivery exceeded 45% over the past three years. The current figure is 105%.

It is true that the Harbury & Deppers Bridge NDP does not allocate sites. Instead there is a settlement boundary and two different policies: H.01 New Housing Development in the Harbury village and H.02 New Housing Development in Deppers Bridge and the Open Countryside

Both these policies identify the need for sustainable managed development. This application is in conflict with policies H.02 (New Housing Development in Deppers Bridge and the Open Countryside) as it does not meet any criteria a-e and H.04 (Local Needs Scheme) as there is no robust and up to date local housing needs information available, nor is this an application to meet such needs. The site is beyond the 400m distance for a bus stop so is not within reasonable walking distance therefore contrary to policy H.04c. There are also no details to secure any housing in perpetuity to meet local need, nor has any exceptional circumstance local need been identified therefore contrary to H.04d. This is a market housing proposal with the minimum required affordable housing element included so policy H.04 is irrelevant.

- 1.6 *NPPF (155) “Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere”*

This proposal does contain a flood risk assessment but does not seem to adhere to its clear recommendations. The proposed housing site off Bush Heath Lane (described as Area 1) has two main areas of flood risk. One is mitigated by way of attenuation but the other in the top northern corner has a 7m easement recommendation. Indicative plans show dwellings within this location.

- 1.7 *NPPF (160) “The application of the exception test should be informed by a strategic or site-specific flood risk assessment, depending on whether it is being applied during plan production or at the application stage. For the exception test to be passed it should be demonstrated that:*
- a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and*
 - b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall”*

This site currently acts as flood mitigation. The flood risk assessment does not take into account pluvial flooding, especially in the northern corner of the site. It also does not consider the cumulative flood risk to the cemetery site, on the basis that the applicant proposes 55% increased impermeability (increasing run off to the watercourse) on site known as Area 1. The soil and agricultural report found evidence of seasonal waterlogging; saturation of the natural drainage system.

Development should be precluded on additional flood risk, contrary to paragraphs 118b, 160 and 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework plus CS.4b and CS.7b of the Local Plan.

- 1.8 *NPPF (170b) “Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... .. recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;”*

Being on the edge of the settlement, these sites are firmly part of the rural setting of this area and the locality. The provision of additional dwellings and the associated domestic character would reinforce a suburban appearance rather than open rural character. Despite the existing built form nearby, new dwellings in this location would intrude further into the rural area. The effect would be the creation of a form of development harmful to the open rural character of the area and that would not safeguard the intrinsic rural character. Although some screening and softening of the edge is included this does not outweigh the harm of change.

Both proposed sites are agricultural land within this semi-rural settlement, most of which is Soilscape 9 type soil - deemed the best and most versatile with high fertility. In fact, the soil and agricultural quality report confirms that 2/3rds (66.5%) of the site Area 1 is of highly productive 3a or better quality. The applicant's statements in their planning statement that the land has limited agricultural purpose and its loss would not be significant in the Framework are categorically untrue.

We consider this development would bring:

- A large magnitude of change in this open countryside location
- A major adverse landscape effect in this open countryside location
- A large magnitude of visual change in this open countryside location
- A major change to visual effects in this open countryside location
- High visual sensitivity from construction stage onwards

The applicant downgrades such changes by deeming the site in question as a small proportion of the rest of the character area. The Feldon character area extends far beyond the Harbury parish and as such the whole Feldon area should not be taken into consideration for this application, merely the sites in question.

This development would be in opposition to paragraphs 17, 109 and 170b of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy CS.5 of the Local Plan.

1.9 Design and Distinctiveness

1.9.1 The proposed development in Area 1 is insensitive to the location, in terms of setting, existing built form and landscape character. The proposed density is exceptionally high for the village as a whole at a projected 28½ dph, whereas the Harbury parish and indeed the close proximity newer developments – Hereburgh/Ridgley Way and Oakfields developments are nearer 20dph.

There is some inaccuracy/inconsistency between the Heritage Statement pg17...

“The proposed development within the Site Area One will be of a built form and character in line with that of the neighbouring 21st century developments of Bush Heath Lane. As such, the development will seek to continue the scale, and use of materials which will ensure it is legible as a modern extension of Harbury, distinct from the historic elements of the village, which the Harbury Conservation Area recognises and which forms an integral part of its character and appearance”

...and the Design & Access Statement pg40...

“The key characteristics of the ‘Village Streets’ will include a higher density arrangement of dwellings and a high proportion of linked dwellings. It is intended that this would create a greater sense of enclosure and continuity of

frontage in order to reflect existing positive characteristics within the historic core of the village”

A built form and character in line with Oakfields would be low density coarse grain development. A high-density fine-grained part of development to reflect the village centre in immediate proximity to this would be out of character. The centre of the village is within one of the two conservation areas in the Harbury village, with many listed and period properties and is in no way linked or relevant to a modern development on the edge of the village. Development at higher densities also inevitably provides less on-site infrastructure and therefore places greater pressure on existing infrastructure.

The predicted density and layout are in conflict with sections D1 and F1 of the SDC Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document

It is contrary to policy CS.9 parts B2, B3 and B8 of the Local Plan and policy H.05D of the Harbury & Deppers Bridge NDP

- 1.9.2 There is also a proposal for a pedestrian link into the Oakfields development. This would be across private land and is potentially undeliverable, with no methodology included.

There is a single access road planned for vehicular traffic.

This is in conflict to Local Plan CS.9 part B4, B6 and also NPPF paragraphs 91a and 102e plus C3 of the SPD stating “In residential developments, where possible, vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access into the site should not be from a single point, but should allow for the possibility of entering and exiting the site from several different locations...”

This application is also contrary to the Harbury & Deppers Bridge NDP policy H.15 (Highways and Transport) as this does not provide “safe and suitable access” as per H.15a

In a 4.21ha site, with a proposed 120 dwellings, a single point direct access with no choice of movement is undesirable at best.

1.10 Roads, Transport and Traffic

- 1.10.1 An extra 120 dwellings could generate an extra 240+ vehicles using the local road network and village centre plus delivery and service vehicles. Harbury already struggles with congestion and has commissioned a Warwickshire County Council study for the centre of the village. We also consider this will have an impact of extra traffic along Bush Heath Lane plus knock-on effects on key local congestion points on the Fosse Way, and the B4100. This traffic generation is a material consideration.

- 1.10.2 There is a proposal to widen Bush Heath Lane from 3.5m to 4.8m to allow for vehicular access at Area 1. This is at the edge of the village perimeter and is accessed externally from a long narrow straight lane. This proposed junction is outside the village 30mph limit and the configuration of this road remains an existing highway safety issue that is likely to be exacerbated by the proposed development. Bush Heath Lane at this point is currently unsuitable for this purpose. The road has no pavements in either direction, is only 4.2m wide, and has no central road markings. This compares to the minimum mandatory width for a new rural road of 6.0m where the road has occasional use by buses or heavy goods vehicles. The road should be widened to 6.0m and a pavement and kerb should be provided on one side all the way from Five Ways junction (for the popular walking area at Thwaites) to the pavement that will shortly be provided at Henrys at the entrance to the village.

This application is contrary to the Harbury & Deppers Bridge NDP policy H.15 since it would not provide “safe and suitable access” as per H15a in the proposed form.

- 1.10.3 We have the following comments in response to the applicant’s planning statement, there are many errors and inconsistencies:

Paragraph 3.2.6 – There are no “two bus stops” within the recommended 400m walking catchment as stated. The 498 service referred to operates just once a week, on Thursdays, and calls on request only in Temple End, with no specific bus stopping point. The “further bus services” from the village centre do not give access to Daventry at all, and the Banbury service (498 and 501) operates only twice per week and are completely unsuitable to be “used as part of the working commute”. The 498 on Thursdays arrives in Banbury at 1025 and the 501 on Saturdays arrives in Banbury at 0957.

Paragraph 3.2.7 – Hawarden Rail Station is not “located approximately 1.2km from the site”. It is located 120 miles away, near Chester, and has services only to Wrexham and Bidston. It is not relevant to the planning application.

Paragraph 3.2.7 – The bus service does not offer “access to railway stations at Banbury”, “with Banbury station offering extensive connections to other major centres”. The bus service from Harbury to Banbury operates only twice per week (498 and 501) and does not serve Banbury rail station.

Paragraph 4.3.12 – The Transport Assessment does not show “there are a variety of sustainable modes of travel to reach nearby services and facilities” as almost all references to bus services are incorrect. Harbury’s current bus service might be at best described as a two hourly service to Leamington, only serving bus stops more than 400m from the proposed development, but even that is a generous description, as there is a gap in the bus service to Leamington of 3h20m (1335 to 1655) on weekdays.

Paragraph 5.3.4 – There are no designated bus stops within 400m of the proposed development. No bus services from Harbury provide access to Banbury or Daventry “as part of the working commute”, and the two-hourly bus to Leamington (665) only stops more than 400m from the proposed development.

1.10.4 We have the following comments in response to the applicant’s planning statement, there are many errors and inconsistencies:

Paragraph 4.4.1 – The statement “The site is well situated to take advantage of existing public transport infrastructure” is incorrect, as is the illustration at figure 4.3. The proposed development is at least a 15 minute / 500m walk to the nearest bus stop in Harbury Village Centre. The bus operator requires passengers to be at the bus stop five minutes before scheduled departure. The 665 bus then takes at least 25 minutes to reach the centre of Leamington, totaling 45 minutes. It is impossible to reach the wider Leamington area as shown in figure 4.3 within 40 minutes or 60 minutes, even if immediate onward bus connections are available.

Paragraph 4.4.4 – The 498 service operates once a week on Thursdays only, stopping on request. There are no designated bus stops on Temple End as stated, and no designated bus stops with the “recommended 400m walking catchment”.

Paragraph 4.4.5 – The bus frequency shown in Table 4.2 is completely wrong, and highly misleading. The 498 service does not operate at every 30 minute frequency – it operates just once a week on Thursday. There is no 67A service anywhere near Harbury, and no service at all that operates with the claimed frequency of every 30 minutes, seven days a week. The 501 service operates just once a week on Saturdays and does not operate with the claimed frequency of every “10-30 mins”, seven days a week. The statement “...although there is statistical analysis that people will walk further if a good level of service is delivered outside the accepted maximum walking distance as is the case here” needs to be substantiated – what is “good”? The 665 service, operating to Leamington every two hours, but with a gap of 3h20m (1335-1655) is not defined as “good” by current village residents, many of who live within 400m of a bus stop.

Paragraph 4.4.6 – None of the services listed “offer an arrival in Leamington, Banbury or Daventry before 9am in the morning”. The 665 service (not listed in figure 4.2) offers weekday arrivals in Leamington at 0656 and 0755, from Harbury bus stops more than 400m from the proposed development. It is impossible to reach Daventry or Banbury by bus before 9am.

Paragraph 4.4.7 – The “existing services on Temple End” consist of the 498 service just once a week. There is no “wider network to Harbury Village”, and the site is not “accessible by bus”. The “potential improvements to local bus provision” that are “still being considered” should be part of the planning

application. Whilst one does not aspire to the frequency of services described inaccurately in Table 4.2, a minimum frequency of a bus every 30 minutes 0700-1900, Monday to Saturday, with some late evening Friday / Saturday services, and an hourly Sunday service, operating to Leamington railway station and Leamington Upper Parade, would be necessary to establish that the site is “accessible by bus”. An additional bus stop should be provided adjacent to the proposed development entrance on Bush Heath Lane, enabling a bus service to operate every 30 minutes on a circular route Leamington – Harbury Gamecock – South Parade – Vicarage Lane – Bush Heath Road – Bush Heath Lane – Park Lane – Harbury Supermarket – Leamington. The service would serve all existing bus stops, and a new one adjacent to the entrance to the proposed development on Bush Heath Lane. For this service to be described as “good” (paragraph 4.4.5) the adult return fare to Leamington should be capped at £5, the buses and the service subsidised and contracted for a minimum of ten years, with 95% 0-10 punctuality, real time bus information at bus stops, contactless payment, wi-fi, full disabled access and vehicles less than five years old all mandatory requirements of the contract.

Paragraph 4.5.1 – The statement “The site is therefore considered to be accessible by sustainable modes of travel in line with national and local transport planning policy” is completely wrong, as a result of all the information provided in this Transport Assessment being completely inaccurate. The Transport Assessment must be completely rewritten and resubmitted to have any validity whatsoever.

It should also be noted that Harbury’s main bus service, the two hourly 665 service, Monday to Saturday, and 67C on Sundays, are operating only with a subsidy from section 106 funds associated with developments in Napton and Kineton, and the future of this service under current bus funding arrangements is not assured.

1.10.5 We have the following comment in response to the applicant’s Design & Access Statement, there are many errors and inconsistencies:

Page 14, section 2.3 “A Sustainable Location”, fourth paragraph: There are no designated bus stops within 400m of the proposed development as claimed, and the 498 service referred to operates just once a week on Thursdays, serving Temple End on request only. No bus services from Harbury provide access to Banbury or Daventry arriving “before 9am in the morning and could therefore be used as part of the working commute”. The two-hourly bus to Leamington (665) only stops more than 400m from the proposed development. The statement “which provide a good level of service” requires substantiation – what is “good”? The 665 service, operating to Leamington every two hours, but with a gap of 3h20m (1335-1655) is not defined as “good” by current village residents, many of who live within 400m of a bus stop.

1.11 Socio Economic

122 FTE jobs over a four-year build-out and 14.7m construction spend – there are no assurances that this will use local labour, nor benefit the local economy.

The contribution to the local economy from the spending power of future occupants of dwellings in a location adjacent to the physical limits of a village identified as a Local Service Village is likely to be modest on a comparative basis to the parish as a whole.

The New Homes Bonus payable to East Riding Council of £600,000 would not benefit Stratford on Avon District Council in any form. (Planning Statement paragraph 6.2.1)

1.12 Statement of Community Involvement

Page 12, second bullet point; response to “Local schools are at capacity”: The response refers to “possible contributions and mitigation strategies for increasing education capacity in the local area”. This is not acceptable for primary education, and a specific commitment enabling children from the Harbury C of E Primary School catchment area to be educated at Harbury C of E Primary School is required.

“Mitigation strategies” to achieve this objective should include both capital funding for school improvements and revenue funding to support additional class teachers and teaching assistants where necessary for extra classes where these classes are not initially large enough for all costs to be met from income through the National Funding Formula for schools.

Such mitigating strategies should be put in place for a minimum of ten years, and should commence when the first houses are occupied, so that additional places can be made available at Harbury C of E Primary School as families move into the village, and not 1-2 years later

390 leaflets distributed – there were 1331 households in the Harbury Parish at the 2011 census, taking into account businesses, this is much less than 30% of the community.

This does not conform with the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) standards of either **Integrity** – ‘ensuring the consultation has an honest intent’ nor **Visibility** – ‘ensuring maximum promotion for each individual consultation’

1.13 Housing Mix

The development does not comply with the housing mix specified in CS.19 of the Local Plan, the SPD S3.2 or the Harbury & Deppers Bridge NDP policy H.03 (Securing a Suitable Mix of Housing Types, Tenures and Sizes in New Development). See below for reasoning.

Expected mix (as per Local Plan CS.19)

Dwelling Size	CS.19 Market Mix	CS.19 Affordable Mix	Overall CS.19 Mix	Built ² 2011 – 2017
1 bed	5-10%	15-20%	9-14%	7%
2 bed	35-40%	35-40%	35-40%	30%
3 bed	40-45%	35-40%	38-43%	30%
4+ bed	15-20%	5-10%	12-17%	27%

Proposed mix (as per Socio-Economic Sustainability Statement section 3.2.1)

Housing Type	Affordable	Market	Total
2-bed semi-detached	22	0	22
3-bed semi-detached	20	17	37
4-bed detached		49	49
5-bed detached		12	12
Total	42	78	120

To summarise the differences:

1 bed	Expected 9-14%	Proposed	0%	= Inadequate provision
2 bed	Expected 35–40%	Proposed	18%	= Inadequate provision
3 bed	Expected 38–43%	Proposed	31%	= Inadequate provision
4 bed+ provision	Expected 12-17%	Proposed	51%	= Sizable over

This significant deficiency in smaller properties (1-bed to 3-bed) in the indicative mix is unacceptable and certainly no indication of a sustainable development. The complete lack of affordable provision for 1-bed and 4-bed+ is also unacceptable.

This is also completely different from the Design & Access Statement stating, “*It is proposed to provide a choice of house types ranging from single occupancy units to family sized accommodation*”. We see no ‘single occupancy units’ proposed in any form.

The Design & Access Statement also adds “...*the DAS demonstrates the site could accommodate a scheme that would be in scale and character with its surroundings and Pocklington through delivering dwellings of a suitable size...*”

Suitably sized for *Harbury* rather than *Pocklington* would be in line with the housing mix as per CS.19 of the Local Plan. The indicative mix would indicate less focus on “meeting local need” and more about a “meeting financial targets”. There has been no

thought as to what the district or the parish actually require, but what will earn the most profit.

1.14 Cemetery

This is a steeply sloping site, from 118m to 107m on elevation. It represents severe physical environmental and physical constraints as cemetery usage.

The www.gov.uk guidance on human burial:

“A burial site must be at least 30 metres from any spring or watercourse not used for human consumption or not used in food production”

As this site is bounded by a watercourse, a significant proportion (40%) of this is unsuitable for interment. In fact, the applicants claim that this could provide 211 years of burials in Harbury is untrue and the correct figure is closer to 100 years. There is also a buried 11KV cable on this site which would reduce this useable area further.

The site may require implementation of a site wide sustainable drainage system due to its intergranular and low porosity soil type. The flood risk assessment also indicates that small aquifers may occur in the slope.

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) advises caution and proper risk management when manual handling of coffins occur. Trolleys are often used but will be unable to navigate pathways or car parks that have integral sustainable drainage such as Grasscrete due to increased trip hazards. This is an injudicious proposal unsuited for the type of use.

There is no mention of any pathway to access the new seating area.

The NPPF (179) says *“Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner”*

A sloping site would be at higher risk of land stability issues, especially since it would be disturbed at regular interments.

We consider this site inappropriate to cemetery use, and contrary to paragraph 179 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.15 Air Quality

It is noted that the assessment is completed using receptor locations in Bush Heath Lane, Temple End and Farm Street. We are also concerned at the impact of air quality in the village centre (High Street / Mill Street) of the proposed development, as a result of residents making regular short trips by car to the shops there. As the shops are more than 400m from the proposed development, this is highly likely and should be part of the Air Quality Assessment.

1.16 Other

Letter to parish council dated 5th April 2019

Third bullet point: more information on the “£800,000 contribution” must be provided, and assurances given that these funds will be committed entirely within the Harbury Parish Council area, and Southam College, and not a widely defined “local area”.

Fourth bullet point: local buses and a bus stop will first have to be provided within 400m of the proposed development to attract extra patronage.

Seventh bullet point: more information on the “around £250,000 will be available directly to the Parish Council” must be provided. Assurances must be given that these funds will be committed entirely within the Harbury Parish Council area.

Summary

We consider there are significant and demonstrable adverse potential impacts as a consequence of this development and the social, economic and environmental benefits it might bring do not outweigh these. The proposal is unsustainable as a whole and the parish council objects to this application.

We would also like to highlight the entire inadequacy of the application. The professionalism of the entire set of documents is poor and littered with factual errors and ‘cut and paste’ sections from other locations/applications.