

BISHOP'S ITCHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting

19 May 2025

Present:

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

In Attendance:

Karen Stevens - Clerk to the Council

Public: 3

25/115 Chairman's Announcements:

None.

25/116 Apologies:

Cllr Kettle, Cllr Horsman,
Cllrs Gist and Rock

25/117 Declarations of Interest:

Cllrs Dugmore and Tressler declared an interest in item 6 on the agenda as they both live off Gaydon Road.

25/118 Dispensations:

It was **RESOLVED** to give Cllrs Dugmore and Tressler a dispensation for item 6. Proposed Cllr J Thomas, seconded Cllr Lamont

25/119 Public Forum:

A resident from Chappel Hyam estate advised that he had strong feelings about the proposed development. They went on to say they were now aware of Stratford District Council Strategic Development Plan and Bishop's Itchington Neighbourhood Development Plan (BINDP). This proposal makes a mockery of the contents of these two documents/plans. CS.16 says there should be 450 new houses with no more than 25% in anyone village location but this village has had more than 450 new houses in total so more than 100% of the new housing mentioned in the Core Strategy. Section 15 says with respect to local service villages development will take place on sites identified in neighbourhood plans and will be small set scale schemes on unidentified but suitable the built-up boundaries sites. The proposed development site does not meet any of these. In the development plan it talks about, because it is outside the built up area, it should be considered as a countryside area and should have minimal impact on the character of the local landscape, minimal impact on the occupants of existing properties, avoid increasing traffic on rural roads, make provision for safer forms of transport, seek to avoid the loss of agricultural land – this development achieves zero of these, if anything it is achieving the direct opposite.

25/120 Planning Matters:

To consider the parish councils response to planning application 25/00829/OUT:

Land to South, Gaydon Road, Bishop's Itchington Outline application for the erection of up to 83 dwellings, associated infrastructure and biodiversity enhancements, all matters reserved except for access to the site from Gaydon Road

- Response must be based on planning regulations and not pro's and cons for the scheme although one positive is if the scheme went ahead it could generate a substantial amount of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money
- Heard a succinct report that has come off the back of the BINDP
- It was clarified that as an outline application the only things that can be decided are the principal of development, the outline of the site and the access
- Highways access is a serious concern due to its location and the fact that it will be a T-Junction. At certain times during the day there will be a significant challenge to enter/exit the planned development
- Large amount of documentation associated the application
- We are trying to encourage people to drop cars and use public transport but there is no bus stop near the proposed development
- Entrance to the proposed development is close to three other entrances and we know it is one of the busiest areas in the village for traffic and it comes off a sharp bend
- A lot of traffic will be generated from 83 dwellings and the majority of the dwellings will have at least two cars
- Just gone through the South Warwickshire Local Plan (SWLP) and have had to comment on three proposals for this village and this is yet another proposal completely outside the SWLP proposals. It is additional, why was it not included? Is this just a development opportunity on top of everything else that is coming along?
- Identical development proposal for Stockton as well (cut and paste)
- Inclined to go along with residents who have shown a strong desire to reject the plans
- Local infrastructure cannot cope with more dwellings – school is full, difficulties with registering with doctors in the area, water/sewage system cannot cope, roads and highways etc.
- Sustainability and their energy statement and the suggestion appears to be that everyone from the development with walk or cycle everywhere
- It suggests that people can cycle to Southam as there is a National Cycle Route, but this cycle route has been downgraded because it is considered too dangerous a road to cycle on
- Mentions a regular and efficient public transport service with links to almost everywhere
- Will be another car-centric development
- 29 of the houses will be affordable housing
- Concerns over wildlife as that part of the village has deer, lots of different species of birds etc.
- Moderate agricultural value
- Local businesses would benefit from additional people being in the village
- Greater contribution to council tax/precept
- CIL funding
- Mentions heat pumps being provided but does not mention solar panels
- Mission creep into the village with one development after another one

Cllr Dugmore advised that the following:

- Housing Land Supply (HLS): Per para 6.1 of the planning Statement, Stratford District Council (SDC) currently has a 24.65-year HLS. The applicant is attempting to discredit this established metric to their advantage. This is clearly subjective and reflects their pecuniary interest in the development of this site,

- Principle of Development: Reference paragraph 7.6, the increase in housing need does not outweigh the need for it to take place in a sustainable manner. Regarding CS.16 and its requirement that not more than 25% should be provided in any one settlement, Bishop's Itchington has been overdeveloped already and by a substantial margin. Within the core strategy period (noting that the Core Strategy was adopted in 2016, five years after it was due to be in effect) at least 482 new dwellings have been approved within the parish boundary for zero tangible gain in infrastructure.
- Statement of Community Engagement: The developer has presented a 24-page document to say they posted it on Facebook and attended a parish council meeting,
- Compliance with the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP): Notwithstanding paragraph 7.12's claims about compliance to CS.7 (green infrastructure) CS.25 (healthy communities) BINDP4 (Design) and part L, these are all reserved matters and no information about them exists or hold weight in this outline application. Paragraph 7.20 makes an unsubstantiated claim of accordance with BINDP1. BINDP1 refers to the in-principal acceptability of development inside the built-up area boundary (BUAB). Policy BINDP1 "seeks to manage future housing development within the BUAB". This site is not within the BUAB and contradicts BINDP1 in principle. On the grounds of scale, this proposal contradicts BINDP2 which seeks affordable housing development of up to 10 dwellings where a local need has been established. Local need is established by the most recent Housing Needs Survey (HNS) which does not support development of anything like this scale,
- Compliance with Core Strategy: Paragraph 7.20 also claims accordance with AS.10, citing little more than an LVA as its justification. This is a narrow view and only addresses that "impact on the character of the local landscape". Policy AS.10 goes on to include communities and environmental features in its scope. Particularly respect to residential development, AS.10 seeks "small scale schemes for housing" led by NDPs or identified local need. The proposal here is far in excess of any identified need (ref Dec 2023 HNS). Furthermore, AS.10 reinforces this point, requiring that developments are 'small scale' even where they are out with the BUAB, and must accord with CS.15 and CS.16. While the Core Strategy (CS) does not define 'small scale' in absolute terms, this development amounting to around an 8% increase in the number of dwellings in the BUAB, cannot reasonably be argued to be 'small scale',
- Public Open Space Contributions: The provision of a LEAP seems somewhat cynical when one exists mere metres away. This creates small, pocketed communities and undermines the cohesion that a community such as Bishop's Itchington thrives on. A better agreement would be for a substantial contribution to shared village sports and recreation provision, some examples of which the landowner is very familiar with.
- Sustainability of the Cat 1 LSV: Bishop's Itchington is one of five 'Cat 1 LSV's'. This applicant makes assertions that the policy should not be "overly restrictive to locating development where it is most sustainable". We would consider the sustainability in this context to be a reflection of the settlement's capacity to absorb new housing without harm to such things as its community, its environment, its economy and its service infrastructure. Policy CS.16 exists to prevent this being uncontrolled sprawling development. As it stands, Bishop's Itchington has delivered nearly twice the housing that the plan deemed sustainable, or over four times that number if the windfalls are considered. Notwithstanding the CS's separation of these from the delivered development, they nevertheless exist, and their impacts are felt by local health and education services, as is their impact to the local transport network. Bishop's Itchington alone has delivered almost three times the LSV

windfall that the plan anticipated for all LSV's. Since CS.16 is now grossly exceeded, a large development such as this, in this location, cannot be soundly assumed to be 'sustainable' as it has not been evaluated with these number of dwellings imposed on it. It is so far out with the plan that it cannot be considered contributory to the plan.

- **Travel Plan:** The travel plan speaks of walking within the village to replace car journeys and cycling for travelling further afield. Unfortunately, this is a pipe dream. Paragraph 3.30 asserts that cyclability of Southam and Harbury, being within 8km. It fails to recognise however that the distance is not the problem. The poor standard of driving and the attitude of a proportion of drivers towards vulnerable road users makes the route to Southam unsafe in the eyes of many who could otherwise easily complete the journey. Paragraph 3.32's Reliance on STRAVA data is not only lazy research but represents a limited proportion of the population. STRAVA users are likely to be competent, confident and enthusiastic cyclists. They are unlikely to be the people who LTP4 is trying to promote out of cars. Paragraph 3.44 refers to the 665-bus service claiming that its eight services a day would facilitate commuting. These services are typically 1:20 to 2 hours apart. Residents are, given the long waits and dead time this timetable brings, more likely to default to private car use. Since the addition of 480+ houses to the parish, the bus services have reduced, not increased, further highlighting that the claims made in this assessment are unrealistic – the claimed demand is simply not materialising. The net outcome will be an increase in private car use, as predicted by the transport assessment which further contravenes AS.10.
- **Transport Assessment:** This has a lot of regurgitated content from the travel plan. TRICS forecast trip generation is 40 and 41 trips for the AM and PM peak periods respectively, while true data from Chapel Hyam Avenue indicates the reality to be higher at 64 and 53 per hour, respectively. Which direction these turn is anyone's guess, but it has the potential to create a 5-10% increase in either direction (but not both).

It was **RESOLVED** to 'Object' to Planning Application 25/00829/OUT due to the planning reasons outlined above by Cllr Dugmore. Proposed Cllr Lamont, seconded Cllr Dugmore, 4 in favour, one abstention

25/121 Replacement Clerk/RFO:

The current Clerk will leave the parish council on 31 May 2025.

Recruitment process needs to be re-stated as soon as possible.

A local qualified clerk is prepared to provide basic cover whilst the post is readvertised.

It was agreed to discuss this item fully under confidential matters.

25/122 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 Tressler, all in favour):

1. Replacement Clerk/RFO

It was **RESOLVED** that the parish council will:

1. re-start the recruitment process,
2. Cllr J Thomas, Cllr Horsman (if available) and the Clerk meet with the possible locum clerk to establish suitability, expectations, level of hours, rate of pay etc,
3. The employment of a locum clerk to be placed on the agenda for the meeting of 2 June 2025

Proposed Cllr Lamont, seconded Cllr Tressler, four in favour, one abstention.

It was **RESOLVED** that the current clerk will ‘clerk’ the meeting on 2 June 2025 and provide an induction morning with the locum clerk (if required). An invoice to be submitted to the parish council for the work. Proposed Cllr Lamont, seconded Cllr Tressler, all in favour.

25/123 Date of Next Meeting

The next ordinary meeting of the parish council will be held on 2 June 2025 at 7.30pm at the Community Centre, Ladbroke Road, Bishop’s Itchington, CV47 2RN

Meeting closed at 20.35

Signed.....Chairman

Date.....