

## Salford Priors Parish Council

### Minutes of a Planning Committee Meeting of the Parish Council held in the Eddie Clarke Suite, Salford Priors Memorial Hall on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2025.

**Present:** Councillors: K James (Chairman), R Green & J Meakins  
Donna Bowles, Clerk to the Parish Council

**Also in attendance:** 4 members of the public.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Apologies considered and accepted for absence:</b> Cllr Price
<b>2.</b>	<b>Register of Interests:</b> Members were reminded of the need to declare an interest in any applications and leave the room if necessary. Dispensations – none received Members were also reminded of the need to declare predetermination on any matter.
<b>3.</b>	<b>Public Contributions and Questions:</b> - A question was raised about the time gap between this planning committee meeting and the one held on February 27, 2024. It was explained that the Committee meets only when application comments are due between full Parish Council meetings, unless the application is minor and can be handled under delegated powers. - A local newspaper has reported that 27,000 new homes are planned for the district with some large scale proposals for Bidford-upon-Avon. Cllr James clarified that Salford Priors does not fall within Bidford-on-Avon who are in phase one of the development phase. Salford Priors falls under phase two, which consists of smaller-scale application sites. However, Stratford District Council has not defined the exact size of these small-scale developments. The Call for Sites process has now concluded, and the submitted options are under review, with no further opportunities to propose additional sites at this stage of the consultation.
<b>4.</b>	<b>Acceptance of Minutes:</b> The Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 27 <sup>th</sup> February 2024 at the Baptist Church Hall, Dunnington were agreed by the Council to be a true record of the meeting and signed by the Chairman.
<b>5.</b>	<b>Planning Matters:</b> <b>Applications Considered:</b> a) <b>25/00044/REM</b> Proposed - Reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for Plot 2 only pursuant to outline application 22/02022/OUT for 16no. self-build and custom housebuilding plots at Land West Of Evesham Road, Salford Priors, WR11 8UR. Following consideration Clerk to respond “Salford Priors Parish Council has no objections, as it aligns with the plot passport”
<b>6.</b>	<b>South Warwickshire Local Plan:</b> The SWLP is a very detailed document and Cllr James advised to concentrate on the areas involving Salford Priors. Members considered their responses to the following questions: <b>Do you broadly support the proposals in the Vision and Strategic Objectives: South Warwickshire 2050 chapter? Yes</b> 1) Balanced and sustainable approach to growth is essential to ensure that new development meets the diverse needs of our local communities while maintaining the character of our area. 2) It is also important to ensure that the accommodation needs of gypsy, traveller, and travelling show-people communities are met in suitable locations, with access to essential services and facilities. 3) Any new development must be accompanied by appropriate investment in local infrastructure, including healthcare, education, and community services, to support both new and existing residents.  <b>Do you agree with the approach laid out in Draft Policy Direction 3- Small Scale Development, Settlement Boundaries and Infill Development? Yes</b> 1) Balance the need for housing delivery with the protection of local housing needs and the appropriate scale of development for each settlement. 2) Review of the settlement hierarchy should ensure that any reclassification reflects local infrastructure capacity, environmental constraints, and community sustainability. 3) Neighbourhood Development Plans as a mechanism for allocating housing and employment land in smaller settlements is welcome, as it allows communities to shape development in a way that meets local needs.

- 4) Site selection must consider local infrastructure, services, and environmental impact to prevent overdevelopment in inappropriate locations.

**Do you agree with the approach laid out in Draft Policy Direction 5- Infrastructure Requirements and Delivery? Yes**

- 1) There must be stronger guarantees that these contributions will be sufficient, timely, and directly benefit the local area.
- 2) Too often, infrastructure delivery lags behind housing development, placing increased strain on local roads, healthcare, schools, and public services before mitigations are in place.
- 3) The A46 corridor must be carefully considered to ensure they provide genuine benefits to local communities, rather than simply facilitating through-traffic at the expense of local road networks and environmental quality.
- 4) Any transport upgrades serve local needs first, rather than prioritizing regional and national traffic movements.

**Do you agree with the approach laid out in Draft Policy Direction 6- Safeguarding land for transport proposals? Yes**

- 1) Support, in principle, the proposed road and rail projects, their successful implementation depends on a robust and fully costed delivery plan that prioritizes local needs and mitigates potential negative impacts.
- 2) Relief road projects, require thorough evaluation to ensure they provide long-term congestion relief without exacerbating environmental and community impacts.
- 3) A fully costed and transparent delivery plan, including clear timelines, funding sources, and impact assessments, is crucial to ensuring these infrastructure projects deliver real benefits for Stratford-on-Avon District and the wider county.

**Do you agree with the approach laid out in Draft Policy Direction 5- Infrastructure Requirements and Delivery? Yes**

- 1) There must be stronger guarantees that these contributions will be sufficient, timely, and directly benefit the local area.
- 2) Too often, infrastructure delivery lags behind housing development, placing increased strain on local roads, healthcare, schools, and public services before mitigations are in place.
- 3) the A46 corridor must be carefully considered to ensure they provide genuine benefits to local communities, rather than simply facilitating through-traffic at the expense of local road networks and environmental quality.
- 4) Any transport upgrades serve local needs first, rather than prioritizing regional and national traffic movements.

**Do you agree with the approach laid out in Draft Policy Direction 7- Green Belt? Other**

- 1) SWLP must fully reflect the significant changes introduced in the 2024 NPPF, particularly the new concept of "Grey Belt" land.
- 2) While the reclassification of certain Green Belt land may provide flexibility for development, it is essential that this does not lead to an automatic presumption in favour of development.
- 3) SWLP must continue to uphold the fundamental principles of Green Belt policy—preventing urban sprawl, protecting the countryside, and encouraging regeneration of brownfield sites within urban areas first.
- 4) SWLP to direct growth to the most sustainable locations while maintaining the integrity of the wider Green Belt.

**Do you agree with the approach laid out in Draft Policy Direction-8- Density? Other**

- 1) Setting clear density guidelines will help create balanced, attractive, and sustainable places while ensuring that new developments respond appropriately to their local context. Any policy should provide flexibility for site-specific considerations while ensuring that density levels support long-term environmental, social, and economic sustainability.
- 2) Density policies should also prevent excessive land consumption and sprawl, encouraging well-designed, sustainable growth that contributes positively to rural communities.
- 3) The policy needs to carefully managed to avoid overdevelopment, ensure high-quality design, and maintain adequate green space and infrastructure capacity.

	<p>Cllr James advised members of the committee to review the other consultation policies and to submit individual comments.</p> <p>A full synopsis of members' comments will be published on the Parish Council's website.</p>
7.	<p><b>Closure of Meeting:</b> The Chairman closed the meeting at 20:30 hrs</p>

Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

DRAFT