

BISHOP'S ITCHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Ordinary Parish Council Meeting 3 March 2025

Present:

Cllr Kettle (Chairman) Cllr Dugmore Cllr J Thomas Cllr N Thomas (Vice Chairman)
Cllr Tressler

In Attendance:

Karen Stevens - Clerk to the Council
Cllr Natalie Gist – District Councillor (part of meeting)

Public: 5

25/44 Chairman's Announcements:

Cllr Kettle advised that he had received the Clerk/RFO's resignation prior to her relocating to Northumberland. She will be leaving the parish council on 30 April 2025. Consideration will need to be given on how to find a successor.

25/45 Apologies:

Cllrs Horsman, Howatson, Lamont and Tagg-Wilkinson
Cllr Natalie Gist for lateness.

25/46 Declarations of Interest:

Cllr Kettle declared an interest in item for item 10 of the agenda – South Warwickshire Local Plan (SWLP) Preferred Options Consultation and will remove himself from the meeting for the item.

25/47 Dispensations:

None required.

25/48 Minutes:

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the ordinary parish council meeting held 3 February 2025, be accepted as a true and complete record of the meeting. Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Tressler, all in favour.

25/49 Public Forum:

Charlie Cherrington advised that he was in attendance for item 11 – Cricket Wicket. Proposal is to make a grass cricket wicket as an interim until a new artificial cricket wicket is installed. There are several volunteers with the appropriate expertise to create this.

A resident raised the issue of parking outside the school at drop-off and pick-up times with many parents parking on the zig-zag lines. When you factor in the speeding cars and number of children milling around it is an accident waiting to happen. He was asked to share the photos with the clerk, and she can send them to the police team at Southam to draw it to their attention. It was agreed that the clerk would write to the chair of governors outlining concerns and asking for the issue to be raised in the school newsletter.

25/50 Proposed Development for 80 New Family Homes on Land West of Gaydon Road :

David Blackadder-Weinstein (Turley) together with Ben Webster and Richard Lomas (Richborough Estates) introduced themselves to the meeting and proceeded to give a short presentation (Appendix C)

25/51 Planning Matters:

- i. At the request of the planning officer, to review the parish council's objection to the following planning application:

24/01024/VARY

Bishops Cross Car Sales, Gaydon Road, Bishop's Itchington – Variation of Conditions 2 and 6 of planning permission 22/01671/FUL (date of decision: 18/07/2023) to allow for amendments to materials and openings and alterations to the approved car park layout. Original description of development: Demolition of car showroom and adjacent bungalow and erection of convenience store with additional retail unit

It was **RESOLVED** that, confirming that the proposed change to condition 12 has been removed from the variation request then the parish council makes no representations to the remainder of the conditions. Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Tressler, all in favour.

- ii. To determine if the parish council wishes to make written representation to the appeal against enforcement notice for the following:

APP/J3720/C/24/3357362

Homes House, Hambridge Road, Bishop's Itchington, CV47 2SB – without planning permission, the following operational development:

- a) The construction of an outdoor swimming pool with pump room and associated patio/hardstanding and
- b) The erection of walls forming a means of enclosure around the swimming pool

It was **RESOLVED** to make no change to the previous response of no representations. Proposed Steve Tressler, seconded Cllr Kettle, all in favour

25/52 Cricket Wicket:

- i. Grass Wicket:

Following discussion, it was **RESOLVED** to give permission for a grass wicket to be created as an interim measure until the artificial cricket wicket is installed. Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Tressler, all in favour.

The parish council advised that the cricket club would need to:

- ensure that they had public liability insurance in place (the parish council may be able to contribute towards the cost of this),
- speak to the ground's maintenance contractors about positioning so they avoid cutting the grass on the wicket,
- section the wicket off to stop footballers running over it.

Cllr Gist joined the meeting.

- ii. Quotes for Artificial Wicket: To be deferred to the next Parish Council meeting on 7 April 2025

25/53 County and District Liaison:

Stratford District Council (SDC) – Cllr Gist had previously circulated their report and included:

- District Council Budget 2025/26
 - i. Council Tax will increase by maximum allowed
 - ii. £250,000 will be made available for parish councils and community groups for community facilities
 - iii. £50,000 for trees in parishes
- English Devolution White Paper – initial proposals need to be submitted by 21 March
- South Warwickshire Local Plan
- Community Noticeboard Grant – open for applications
- Community Safety
 - i. Livestock Worrying
 - ii. Anti-Social Behaviour concerns

Warwickshire County Council (WCC) – Cllr Kettle had previously circulated his report and included:

- County Council Budget
- The Devolution White Paper – Interim plan to be submitted by 21 March with a full proposal by 28 November 2025
- Flooding
- Highways:
 - i. The Old Gated Road, Chesterton
 - ii. Chesterton Windmill
 - iii. Drains
 - iv. Seven Trent works on Gaydon Road
 - v. Knightcote Road works
- Education:
 - i. Secondary School Offer Data
 - ii. SEND Issues
- Delegated Budget
- HS2

Due to his Declaration of Interest, Cllr Kettle left the meeting for the next item. Cllr N Thomas took over as chairman.

25/54 South Warwickshire Local Plan (SWLP):

Cllr N Thomas advised that:

- A village wide leaflet drop had been undertaken encouraging residents to read the plan and make comments to SDC
- Formed a working group and discussed the plan at length and the council's response
- Cllr Dugmore pulled together the council's response in a conclusion documents. He was thanked for undertaking the work

- It was suggested that the conclusion document forms the basis of the parish council's response
- There was a comprehensive dialogue on the report
- Encouraged members of the public to share their opinions with the parish council and have received quite a number and it is fair to say in conclusion that we have not seen one positive response to the SWLP within the confines of our area (residential developments F2, F3 and G1, and industrial development SG14)
- Conclusion of the parish council is that we are against those developments, and it appears that the conclusion of local residents is that they are against these developments and this will form the basis of our submission

It was **RESOLVED** that the parish council accepts the conclusion document prepared by Cllr Dugmore as the response from the parish council. Proposed Cllr Thomas, seconded Cllr Tressler, all in favour.

It was agreed that Cllr Thomas would submit the response on the form to SDC on behalf of the parish council.

Cllr Kettle rejoined the meeting

25/55 CCTV:

Following discussion, it was agreed that the provision of CCTV in the play area should be looked at again.

The Clerk was requested to look at what is now available utilising the lighting columns at the hardcourts and obtain quotes for consideration. Cllr Dugmore agreed to help the clerk with this.

25/56 Hidden Garden:

It was agreed that the clerk to obtain quotes to replace the whole of the fence.

25/57 Finance:

- i. To receive monthly financial reports for February 2025:
This was noted (Appendix A)
The clerk advised that she has requested VAT be shown from the start of the financial year
- ii. To receive bank reconciliation reports for February 2025:
Cllr Kettle has checked these and they are correct.
- iii. To approve accounts for payment 3 March 2025:
It was **RESOLVED** that in pursuance of the powers conferred by S137 of the Local Government Act 1972 and believing the expenditure satisfies the requirements of that section, the council approves expenditure of £8,358 (£6,965 plus £1,393 VAT) In respect of the following:
 - a. Arbscope – works to hedge
 - b. Arbscope – tree works
 - c. Russell Pike Media – Printing of leaflets regarding SWLP
 Proposed Cllr Tressler, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour.

As the Chairmans allowance is included in the accounts payable for 3 March 2025, Cllr Kettle left the room whilst the item was discussed. Cllr N Thomas took over as Chairman.

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the accounts payable for 3 March 2025, including the payment of the Chairmans Allowance as per the budget. Proposed Cllr Tressler, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour
In the absence of any other councillors who can authorise the bank payments, it was agreed that Cllrs Dugmore and N Thomas authorise the payments including a legitimate expense claim for Cllr N Thomas of £20 for the purchase of two copies of the SWLP.

Councillor Kettle returned to the meeting and took over as Chairman

25/58 Portfolio Holders Update:

- Cllr N Thomas advised that we have been contacted by BISA enquiring about additional use of the playing field. Currently there is one Sunday team using the playing fields and they would like to increase this to three teams – the current Sunday team, Stockton U13 (for the remainder of this season onwards with the possibility of a name change to Bishop’s Itchington U14’s next season – most of the players are from Bishop’s Itchington) and Banbury United U18’s. This would bring in additional revenue that would be spent on local sporting initiatives including the proposed new pavilion.
The question is whether the current pitches would stand up to the additional usage and the issue of parking.
It was agreed to ask BISA and Football Club to attend the next meeting to make a formal proposal and explain proposals for managing parking
- It has been suggested that a new noticeboard be provided at the entrance to the playing fields and one possibly on the Bishop’s Hill estate. The clerk was asked to apply for a SDC funded noticeboard
- The leaning fence on the hard courts has been monitored since the summer and the angle of lean has not changed. Cllr Thomas will continue to monitor it on a regular basis and report back if any changes occur

25/59 Reports and Questions:

None

25/60 Exclusion of Public & Press:

A motion was passed for the Exclusion of Public and Press under Section 100A of Local Government Act 1972. (Proposed Cllr N Thomas, seconded Cllr J Thomas, all in favour):

1. Proposed salary increases from 1 April 2025:

It was **RESOLVED** to:

- increase the hourly rate for the role of Play Area Inspector by 3% from 1 April 2025
- to increase the hourly rate for the post of Cemetery Manager to the same rate as the Play Inspector Role from 1 April 2025 and
- to pay the National Joint Council pay agreement once it is announced and backdate the increase to 1 April 2025.

Proposed Cllr Kettle, seconded Cllr tressler, all in favour

2. Disposal of old Laptops:

Deferred until the next meeting.

3. Memorial Bench:

It was **RESOLVED** to purchase a teak bench and fittings from Earth Anchors. Proposed Cllr J Thomas, seconded Cllr Dugmore, all in favour.

4. Quote for repair to raised manhole covers – Mandale Close path:

It was **RESOLVED** to ask Thomas Fox to use instant set tarmac to put a champer around the manhole covers as there is no footfall and the path is not a throughway. Proposed Cllr Kettle, seconded Cllr N Thomas

The clerk was also asked to write to Orbit regarding the raised manhole cover on the path in Scowcroft

5. Mobile Phone Replacement

It was agreed to wait until the new clerk starts to seek their preference as to the type of phone.

The clerk was asked to start the recruitment process for a replacement clerk/RFO

25/61 Date of Next Meeting

The next ordinary meeting of the parish council will take place on Monday 7 April 2025 at 7.30pm at the Community Centre.

Annual Village Meeting – Monday 28 April at 7.30pm at the Community Centre.

Meeting closed at 21.37

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

APPENDIX A

Financial Budget Comparison

Comparison between 01/04/24 and 28/02/25 inclusive. Includes due and unpaid transactions.

Excludes transactions with an invoice date prior to 01/04/24

	Budget 2024/2025	Reserve Movements	Actual Net	Balance	
INCOME					
Bishops Itchington Parish Council					
10	Precept	£110,000.00	£0.00	£110,000.00	£0.00
20	Council Tax Support Grant	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
30	Burials	£2,500.00	£0.00	£2,390.00	-£110.00
40	Sec 136 & Other Reimbursements	£1,300.00	£0.00	£642.18	-£657.82
50	Playing Field	£500.00	£0.00	£544.66	£44.66
60	Interest - Current	£12,500.00	£0.00	£1,484.74	-£11,015.26
61	Interest - Pavilion Fund	£0.00	£0.00	£3,645.38	£3,645.38
70	Grants	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
80	Misc	£0.00	£0.00	£2,172.77	£2,172.77
90	VAT Refund	£0.00	£0.00	£11,331.25	£11,331.25
100	Pavilion Fund	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Total Bishops Itchington Parish Council		£126,800.00	£0.00	£132,210.98	£5,410.98
Total Income		£126,800.00	£0.00	£132,210.98	£5,410.98
EXPENDITURE					
Bishops Itchington Parish Council					
200	Salaries & Expenses	£39,943.00	£0.00	£32,300.85	£7,642.15
210	Councillor Allowances	£500.00	£0.00	£0.00	£500.00
220	Administration	£12,565.00	£0.00	£11,003.48	£1,561.52
230	Grounds Maintenance	£28,202.00	£0.00	£26,113.35	£2,088.65
240	Cemetery & Churchyard	£6,445.00	£0.00	£8,398.10	-£1,953.10
250	Playing Field	£16,886.00	£0.00	£1,865.90	£15,020.10
260	Grants	£10,000.00	£0.00	£5,707.60	£4,292.40
270	Neighbourhood Plan	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
280	Other Expenditure	£500.00	£0.00	£0.00	£500.00
290	VAT	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
300	Contingency	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
310	Parish Office	£5,720.00	£0.00	£4,840.00	£880.00
320	Pavilion Project	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Total Bishops Itchington Parish Council		£120,761.00	£0.00	£90,229.28	£30,531.72
Total Expenditure		£120,761.00	£0.00	£90,229.28	£30,531.72
Total Income		£126,800.00	£0.00	£132,210.98	£5,410.98
Total Expenditure		£120,761.00	£0.00	£90,229.28	£30,531.72
Total Net Balance		£6,039.00		£41,981.70	

Appendix B

Bishop's Itchington Parish Council				
Accounts Payable 3 February 2025				
To Whom Payable	Ref No	Ex Vat	Vat Payable	Totals
<i>Urgent accounts paid since last meeting requiring the formal approval of the council</i>				
E Biddle (office rent 01/02/25)	s/order	£ 440.00	£ -	£ 440.00
Three Business (mobile sim 22/01/25)	d/debit	£ 4.17	£ 0.83	£ 5.00
E.ON Next (pavilion electricity 21/01/25)	d/debit	£ 68.01	£ 3.40	£ 71.41
OneCom Ltd (Telephone/Broadband 31/01/25)	d/debit	£ 90.82	£ 18.16	£ 108.98
Unity Bank (Service Charge 31/01/25)	250117	£ 9.80		£ 9.80
Paul Sinton (hedge laying 15/1/25)	250118	£ 1,476.00	£ 295.20	£ 1771.20
	Sub-total	£ 2,088.60	£ 317.59	£ 2,406.19
<i>Accounts for payment on 3 February 2025</i>				
Salaries	250201	£ 1,895.83	£ -	£ 1,895.83
HMRC (PAYE February)	250202	£ 475.20	£ -	£ 475.20
WCC Pension Fund (January)	250203	£ 549.83	£ -	£ 549.83
Claranet (Corporate Domain Registration (February))	250204	£ 5.20	£ 1.04	£ 6.24
Expenses V Powell (document boxes)	250205	£ 10.00	£ -	£ 10.00
PWC (Bus Shelter Cleaning - Invoice 226)	250206	£ 45.00		£ 45.00
Southam Garage Doors (Replace door at Community Centre)	250207	£ 750.00		£ 750.00
Thomas Fox Landscaping (Maintenance, hedge cutting and leaf collection)	250208	£ 960.96	£ 192.21	£ 1,153.17
Viking Office UK Ltd (monitors, monitor arm, stationery)	250209	£ 19.40	£ 3.87	£ 23.27
WALC (training session Cllr Thomas)	250210	£ 35.00	£ 7.00	£ 42.00
Waterplus (pavilion water)	250211	£ 31.45	£ -	£ 31.45
	Sub-total	£ 4,777.87	£ 204.12	£ 4,981.99
	TOTAL	£ 6,866.47	£ 521.71	£ 7,388.18

APPENDIX C

Presentation by Turley/Richborough Estates Proposed Development for 80 New Family Homes on Land West of Gaydon Road

Richborough are land promoters so do not build any houses - they partner with landowners to take sites through the planning process. They try to establish the principle for residential, commercial or mixed-use development which typically looks like an outline planning application. They establish the principle, and the principle means of access/egress to the site, fix the maximum number of dwellings and the percentage that would be affordable and also the tenure splits. This is all secured by a legal agreement attached to the planning permission. They also try to fix at outline stage the elements of the site given over to development and those elements of the site that are safeguarded for open space, biodiversity, drainage etc. They try to tie down as much detail as they can at the outline stage and fix those parameters and ultimately if they are successful in getting planning permission, they look to bring the site to market with the collaboration of landowners and their agents to take the site forward. At that point the house builders will typically run the reserves matters application. This is a further round of consent with Stratford District Council that involves consultation with parishes and communities to make sure the detailed design works for everybody. At this point, they step back a little bit but try to control what the house builders can do at reserve matters stage so no surprises further down the track. The only exception is where you find archaeological deposits etc that need to be worked around. It is important to stress that in line with the Affordable Housing policy, 35% of the policy is a biodiversity net gain because of the scheme.

In terms of public consultation, a two-week consultation was held between 6 and 26 February. 74 provisional pieces of feedback which are currently being analysing and writing responses ready for submission as part of the statement of community engagement with the planning application. Raised awareness of the consultation through engagement with the parish, 140 leaflets distributed, social media adds with were viewed over 36,000 times which directed a considerable amount of traffic to the website.

Q: How do you plan to overcome the issues of getting on and off the Gaydon Road which well over subscribed and speeding is a regular occurrence?

A: Prioritised 'T' junction is planned and possibly improve speed calming measures which will form a detailed part of the transport analyst. Although 80 dwellings it does not equate to 80 vehicle movements at the same time every morning at peak times. The traffic engineers they are working with forecasting about one additional trip per minute at peak times from 80 houses.

Q: Is this based on a formal TRICS analyst?

A: Yes

Q: What location did you survey?

A: Not known but will check with the engineers and email the clerk if that helps.

A: Yes, as it points to how valid that data is.

Q: You talk a lot about consultation, and we are familiar with what we have seen pop up on Facebook repeatedly so 36,000 impressions is not correct as I have seen it 6 times. Also, a large proportion of the village do not media platforms including Facebook so when are you going to run a public meeting for them?

A: There are no plans to run a public meeting.

Q: Why not?

A: Partly to do with the outline nature of the application and the fact that the council then runs its own statutory consultation after the application is submitted

A: That is a consultation with the council they are not the public

A: The District Council's is a statutory consultation

Q: 140 leaflets is not even 10% of the village so how do you get a sense of penetration that you have consulted with a representative number? This is a small village, that is a big impact – 140 roughly knowing the lay of the land there, you have only probably hit those that are facing it. How are you going to tackle, address and inform all those people who are going to deal with these. You said it was an extra trip a minute. An extra trip a minute cumulatively, with the extra minute from the 81 next to it, the 375 that are going to happen at the top of the village plus potentially a few more, not just one a minute, its 60 per hour.

Q: A prioritised junction is it left turn or right turn?

A: The priority would be both ways

Q: And how far away would that be from the island that has been created by the coop?

A: A sufficient distance – appreciate this sounds a bit vague but we can follow up with that amount of detail

Q: Just trying to show you what to expect. You have come in and are airing this with us, we are just trying to show you what we know we will be challenged on by residents – we have been here many times before.

A: All the information will be submitted with the application. In terms of asking how consultation, we do not have an ambition to reach every single member of the community. I think by publicising to those nearest to the site and meeting the parish council, that there are opportunities for other channels that may not be those that we control ourselves to share the message more broadly and then, District Council is going to have statutory consultation. Before any home can be built there will have to be another round of engagement with the application.

Q: We are familiar with the planning process and thank you for the explanation of an outline planning application. Everyone in the village had a leaflet about the South Warwickshire Local Plan – it is dead easy to mail drop everyone in this village, there is no excuse. In terms of the leaflet itself, there is quite a lot of text in it. You talk about the 35% provision, 10% biodiversity net gain – every single one of them is a bare minimum according to the core strategy. What are you going to bring as a benefit – I did not see anything in that leaflet that is a benefit. You talked about the traffic calming, that is a mitigation of the problem you bring so at best it's a net zero outcome. What are you going to bring to the village?

A: We are taking a positive compliant stance in terms of those baseline proposals. I take your point; we are trying to hit future homes summits in terms of the actual construction of dwellings as well. Perhaps there is a discussion to be had about whether we go beyond buildings regs in terms of the fabric first approach. In terms of the onsite provision, we are exceeding policy requirements for open space provision. We are trying to make efficient use of the site, but this works both ways, it must strike a balance that's acceptable in initial landscape terms as well. We are open to suggestions for how we can look to provide more on-site benefits. We are in listening mode and are happy to understand things.

Q: 35% - are they all shared ownership?

A: No, the split in Stratford is commonly about 65% affordable/social rent and 35% intermediate so can be shared ownership. It is a prescribed mix.

The parish council appreciates some of these are reserved matters type questions and so they won't necessarily be for you to answer but we have raised issue with applications in the past where that have simply stuck to part m and said that is what we are going to do, that is the base we are going to do but as we know, Chris, you fought hard for the core strategy and the content of it, sustainability, energy efficiency, there is an expectation, certainly from us and increasingly from people in the village to go one better. I have seen particularly good examples of developments in terms of energy efficiency. If we get another 80 horrible Persimmon cardboard boxes, I don't think people are going to be very happy – no disrespect to anyone who lives in one of those houses, but I have seen better, far better. The last point I was going to make is that I found the leaflet promoting all the bare minimum as some sort of favour to the village, I found somewhat disingenuous and would encourage you to do better.

Q: Before finalising and submitting an outline planning application Stratford on Avon District Council, Richborough held a public consultation from 6 February to 20 February. Where was that held?

A: It is an online consultation. It was not an in-person event. Since the pandemic certainly, we have found it to be standard to not actually hold in-person events partly because of the amount of engagement we can get online, we can get many more answers online.

Q: Sorry, the pandemic finished in 2021, four years ago and having been both a District and County Councillor, I have seen in parishes all the way across my patch, 11 separate parishes public consultations have meant people visiting the community and putting boards up, signs up and being there to meet with the residents. The consultation you have had is on Facebook.

A: We have our own website that we have been promoting it on

Q: Yes, the contact with the village is through Facebook village community group. What about those residents that are not members of Facebook, what about those people who do not use social media, what about those who would like to have a conversation with you to understand the implications of what is going on? That has not happened so in fact, as far as I am concerned the words public consultation was held between 6th and 20th is materially inaccurate. Second point I would like to make is you say this is core strategy compliant – in what way:

A: In terms of the principle, we accept that it is outside the settlement boundary. It is a greenfield site; it is not allocated so I take your point. I think there is a case to be made in terms of the District Council's housing plight/position for the need on new housing in the short term

Q: Is it in the physical confines as currently understood of the village or is it outside the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB)?

A: it is outside the boundary.

Q: Has it ever been enclosed within the BUAB in draft or any other form?

A: Not to our knowledge. We appreciate that SDC are trying to bring forward the new South Warwickshire Local Plan (SWLP) and appreciate that perhaps it does not look at granular sites, I say granular, but 80 dwellings are not insignificant, it looks at more strategic locations. We think there is talk of potentially a further local Plan to deal with the smaller site allocations. All preamble and we wish the council all the very best, but we are trying to respond to the current housing crisis as defined by the government and the short-term problems of lack of housing.

Q: Let's look at housing numbers under current policy CS16 - what was the number of houses allocated to Bishop's Itchington?

A: I defer to your knowledge on that.

Q: But surely you said you were compliant with the Core Strategy?

A: In the sense of wider policies for the affordable housing and open space provisions and things like that, yes. In the terms of principle development, we appreciate your point. Our point is that there are wider dual considerations to justify a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.

Q: What is SDC's 5-year housing land supply at the current time?

A: 24.65 years is what they are claiming. There is a lot of conjecture around the figures, personally we put that figure down at below 5 years

Q: Has SDC ever lost an appeal because it does not have a five-year housing land supply in the last 6 to 7 years?

A: Not in the last 6 to 7 years but it has previously.

Q: Under the core strategy as it currently sits, has SDC lost an appeal?

A: Not that I am aware of.

Q: Thank you. So, the core strategy to deliver more than 5-year land supply has never been successfully challenged by a developer:

A: I defer to your knowledge on that.

Q: Thank you. Interesting as you say it is compliant with everything else. The timing of this causes some concern because you know under the SWLP, which I have declared an interest in, has suggested that the residents of Stratford district do not want to see 'bolt on' additions to existing settlements and this view is now advancing at pace. Has this not been dropped in now to take advantage of the fact that we have not got a new plan in place because you know when a new plan is in place, if that policy is adopted, will rule this site out?

A: We wouldn't say taking advantage of it, no. We think there is a shortfall in housing delivery. We will have to agree to disagree on that but that does not prejudice the fundamental process more widely.

Q: Shortfall? We have twenty something years of a 5-year housing land supply, that is not a shortfall. Bishop's Itchington was allocated 112 houses.

The policy was that no settlement shall provide more than a quarter of the total distribution in a Category 1 local service village. Across several villages, that is 450 and our allocation was 112.5. We have received more than 500 in the last 10 years. In the planned period referred to, the bulk of these, two-thirds arrived. Any claim that is plan led is nonsense, it is speculative and the fact that this has appeared at the same time as at least two other proposals is not coincidence. About the only thing there is a coincidence with is the fact that there is a plan coming up that might shut them down in the future.

A: The timing is more responding to the message coming out following last year's election that there is an appetite to build 1.5 million homes within this parliament and the request for the strategic led plan is not going to deliver this. It is going to be smaller developments that will deliver this, and we are responding to that rather than being tactical.

Q: We are not dealing with the whole country; we are dealing with Stratford district. As I have said already, and you have volunteered, SDC has 24-year housing land supply. How does it fit in with the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) policies? Which specific NDP policies do you think this falls into?

A: It is probably not supported by the NDP policies but there is certainly, in the terms of more generic policy requirements, that we can make the case that we can reflect local aspirations in terms of design and matters like that. I appreciate it is not in Neighbourhood Plan and its sites.

Q: Have you read the NDP?

A: Yes, I have.

Thank you for your contribution. We will be interested to see the application that come forward and watch this space.