

# **RADWAY PARISH COUNCIL**

[www.radwayparishcouncil.org.uk](http://www.radwayparishcouncil.org.uk)

12, Meadow Way, Fenny Compton, Southam, Warwickshire, CV47 2WD  
07713 892835 [clerk@radwayparishcouncil.org.uk](mailto:clerk@radwayparishcouncil.org.uk)

## **Minutes of Extraordinary Meeting of Radway Parish Council, Radway Village Hall, Wednesday 28th of January 2026.**

**The meeting commenced at 7.30pm**

**2026/page 3**

### **1. Apologies :**

- a. To receive apologies for absence: Cllr. Malcolm Littlewood.
- b. To consider acceptance of apologies. Apologies were accepted. Proposed: Cllr. Colin Mathews, Seconded: Cllr. Colin Mathews.

**Present:** Cllr. Simon Hooker (Chair), Cllr. Penny Gardner (Vice-Chair), Cllr. Colin Mathews, Cllr. James Stephens, Clerk (Helen Hide-Wright), 18 members of the public.

### **2. Declarations of interests and consideration of dispensation requests: None.**

### **3. Financial Administration**

Radway Village Hall – Hall Hire 28 <sup>th</sup> January 2026	£ 16.00
Chambers Endowment Fund – Annual Rent Radway Recreation Ground	£ 250.00

Proposed: Cllr. Simon Hooker, Seconded: Cllr. Penny Gardner.

### **4. Public participation:**

The applicants and residents spoke in relation to planning application 25/03142/FUL (Appendix A).

8.20pm end of public participation.

### **5. Planning**

(a) **SDC Planning Applications: 25/03142/FUL:** Erection of one self-build dwelling to meet identified local need, relocation of existing greenhouse, widening of existing access, and all associated works at Fife House, West End, Radway.

After hearing the representations of the applicants and residents, Cllr. Gardner summarised the findings of RPC's review of the application (Appendix B).

RPC Comment: Object: Unanimous.

Proposed: Cllr. Simon Hooker, Seconded: Cllr. Penny Gardner.

(b) **SDC Planning Decisions:** None

(c) **Planning Comments submitted by RPC since our last meeting:** None

### **6. Other reports and items for future agendas: None.**

### **7. Dates of Future Meeting, commencing at 7.30pm:**

2026: 19<sup>th</sup> March, 21<sup>st</sup> May, 16<sup>th</sup> July, 17<sup>th</sup> Sept, 19<sup>th</sup> November.

**The meeting closed at 8.50pm.**

# RADWAY PARISH COUNCIL

[www.radwayparishcouncil.org.uk](http://www.radwayparishcouncil.org.uk)

## Appendix A.

Residents spoke in support of application 25/03142/FUL:

- i. The applicant provided an overview of the application.
- ii. A resident spoke in support of the design of the proposed building as well as the scheme providing more housing for the village. They expressed concern about being overlooked, as a nearby property.

Residents spoke to object to application 25/03142/FUL:

- iii. The application would set a dangerous precedent for the village.
- iv. Concerns about the resale of the proposed development.
- v. Risk about the paddock being vulnerable to development for housing if the application is successful.
- vi. Concern about setting a precedent for development.
- vii. The Conservation Area is to protect the village. This development could threaten that protection.
- viii. In 2019, a similar application on Langdon Lane was refused. This planning application has parallels with that application.
- ix. CS15 Part F of the Core Strategy: Radway is a village without local facilities.
- x. Any potential builds would have to prove local need.
- xi. The Housing Needs Survey of 2019 was not adopted by RPC. Its use to promote the application is therefore unsuitable.
- xii. Urging SDC to be consistent in its approach to this application.
- xiii. Fife House is a Grade II listed building. The definition on a curtilage is relevant to this application. Resulting restrictions and limitations need to be applied to the application.
- xiv. The PC confirmed that it had raised this matter with the Planning Case Officer and was informed that it was not required. However, the Heritage Statement contradicts this and consequently will now be raised with SDC by RPC. The point to be clarified is whether this proposed development is within the curtilage of Fife House.
- xv. Conflict with CS 15.f. A Need identified by the local community. A question was raised as to whether this scheme is a community led need.
- xvi. Potential to impact on Cotswold Natural Landscape through this proposed development in several ways.
- xvii. Impact upon the Conservation Area and the listed building around the proposed development.
- xviii. The village is consistent in its use of Hornton stone, in contrast to this proposal.
- xix. The proposal would be a new build in a conservation space in an area of outstanding natural beauty.
- xx. The proposal would alter the character of the area within the village.
- xxi. The proposal would set a precedent for new build development in any open space in the village.
- xxii. The “Identified Local Need” within the description of the development was taken from the un-adopted Housing needs report.

**Appendix B.****Planning response to Land at Fife House 25/03142/FUL****Key Points:**

The report can be summarised into the following key points:

- The quoted Housing Needs Survey is out of date and was not adopted by the Parish Council and therefore should not carry any weight in the decision making of this application.
- The proposed use of build materials do not reflect the village's established Hornton Stone vernacular. The most recent new buildings within the Village have all been constructed using Hornton / ironstone materials.
- The outward extension of the village would interrupt the rural approach to the village and would introduce a building into an area described as countryside. Furthermore, the proposal is likely to set a precedent for further development.

1. The Planning Statement associated with this application refers to the Principle of Development as an un-met need identified in the Housing Needs Survey. The referenced Housing Needs Survey is obsolete for the following reasons:
  - It is over 5 years therefore out of date.
  - Under NPPF, planning decisions must be based on up-to-date evidence.
  - The survey was not adopted by Radway PC, see minutes dated 16th July 2019.
  - No open market housing has been delivered in Radway since the survey was conducted, meaning its assumptions have not been tested or updated.
  - Since 2019 the UK has experienced significant economic change affecting housing affordability. A survey undertaken in 2019 does not reflect current financial need.
2. Under Policy CS.15 part f Radway is classified as 'All other Settlements' whereby development is restricted to small-scale community-led schemes which meet a need identified by the local community.
  - The proposed development fails to comply with and is contrary to policy CS.15 part f. It is not a community-led scheme, and there is no evidence that it meets an identified need by the local community.
3. Policy CS.11 the proposal would result in the loss of an important open space within the designated Cotswold National Landscape, thereby adversely affecting the character and appearance of this area.
4. Policy AS.10 states that proposals 'will minimise impact on the character of the local landscape' and 'minimise impact on the occupiers and users of existing properties in the area' and 'make provision for sustainable forms of transport'. AS.10 part J states

# **RADWAY PARISH COUNCIL**

[www.radwayparishcouncil.org.uk](http://www.radwayparishcouncil.org.uk)

that 'A new single dwelling in open countryside which is of exceptional quality and design and makes a positive contribution to the character of the local area'.

1. The proposal fails to comply with Policy AS.10 for the following reasons:

## **I. Impact on the Character of the Local Landscape**

The proposed use of materials would harm the character and appearance of the local landscape. The Stratford upon Avon District Council Character map identifies this area as within the Cotswold Fringe, where any new development is expected to reflect local distinctiveness, including the use of traditional local ironstone. The proposed materials do not respond appropriately to this guidance and would therefore erode the established character of the area. As such directly contravenes part J of this policy.

## **II. Impact on Existing Users**

The proposed site of the new dwelling is located opposite the village church, which has no off street parking provision. The Church is the home of the permanent Battle of Edgehill Exhibition, which attracts tourists. In addition the Church serves as a place of worship and venue for community events.

During Church services, exhibition visits and community activities, vehicles are routinely parked on both sides of the road, a long established and locally supported arrangement that enables continued use of this important building.

The proposed access and dwelling would significantly disrupt this arrangement, to the detriment of church users, local residents and visitors to the exhibition.

Furthermore the proposed widening of the existing gateway would directly encroach upon the area currently relied upon by Church visitors for parking. The submitted visibility splays fail to acknowledge or accommodate the parking needs associated with the Church.

## **III. The site is not sustainable as Radway has no local amenities**

I. In accordance with paragraph 105 of the NPPF, development should be located where the need to travel is minimised and where opportunities exist to make use of sustainable transport modes. Due to the distances involved, future residents would be unlikely to travel by foot and would most probably choose to go by car.

II. The site is 4 miles from Kineton and 3.8 miles from Tysoe Village centre. As a result residents would be dependant on the use of a car to access services and facilities in the neighbouring villages.

5. CS.5 Landscape NPPF section 12 & 16 - The proposal conflicts with Policy CS.5 and the heritage and design objectives of the NPPF. The proposed site is surrounded by listed

## RADWAY PARISH COUNCIL

[www.radwayparishcouncil.org.uk](http://www.radwayparishcouncil.org.uk)

buildings, a registered park and gardens and a designated historic battlefield. Policy CS.5 seeks to conserve and enhance landscapes of historic value, and this approach is reinforced by the NPPF section 16, which required great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and their settings.

The proposal would cause significant harm to the historic character, significance and setting of the village and its surrounding heritage assets. The proposal fails to demonstrate that this harm has been clearly justified.

The proposal would constitute the undesirable outward extension of the village. Furthermore, if approved, the proposal would set a precedent for further development which would prove difficult to resist, the cumulative effect of which would be detrimental to the character of the village.

### 6. CS.8 - Historic Environment

An independent report was conducted by Stratford on Avon District Council to identify the architectural, historical and environmental qualities of the Radway Conservation Area. Page 10, section 4.3 of the report states: *the approach to the village along Tysoe Road is well enclosed by wild hedges. St Peter's - Open areas are visible between gaps at the cricket ground, and then as the lane turns sharply right at the entrance to the village a small field of allotments occupies the inside of the bend, behind a well trimmed hedge. The character of the lane is set strongly by high hedges and narrow rough verges: it is the countryside extending into the village.*

The proposed dwelling would fundamentally erode this identified character. Development on this site would interrupt the rural approach to the village and introduce built form into an area explicitly described as countryside. This would permanently alter the transition between open landscape and village.

Furthermore, the proposal would in effect extend the village beyond its established boundary, undermining the historic settlement pattern and setting a harmful precedent for further encroachment.

### 7. CS.9 states that *All forms of development will improve the quality of public realm and enhance the sense of place, reflecting the character and distinctiveness of the locality.* It goes on to state that *The individual settlements and landscapes across the District have their own distinctive character which has evolved through their historical development and management. They are highly valued and need to be preserved for future generations to enjoy. This distinctiveness is what defines a place and is often the key attraction of an area.*

The proposal would cause significant harm to the Character and distinctiveness of Radway. The village's identity is strongly defined by its historic built form and the prevalent use of local ironstone, which contributes to a coherent and locally distinctive townscape. The proposed design and choice of building materials do not reflect or respond to this established character. The introduction of non-

## RADWAY PARISH COUNCIL

[www.radwayparishcouncil.org.uk](http://www.radwayparishcouncil.org.uk)

traditional materials would appear visually incongruous within the context of surrounding ironstone buildings and would undermine the architectural coherence of the village.

### 8. CS.12 - Special Landscape Areas

Radway lies with the Cotswold Fringe which has been identified as a Special Landscape Area. CS.12 states that *Development proposal relating to settlements that lie within a Special Landscape Area must respect the current and historic relationship of that settlement.*

The proposed development fails to comply with this requirement. The siting of the dwelling would represent an inappropriate outward extension of the village beyond its established boundary, disrupting the historic relationship between Radway and the surrounding countryside. This form of encroachment would erode the clear settlement edge.

In addition, the proposed design and choice of building materials do not reflect the established local vernacular of Radway. The introduction of materials not commonly used within the village would appear visually intrusive and out of keeping with the prevailing ironstone character, further undermining the historic coherence of the settlement within the landscape.

### Conclusion

The proposed development is fundamentally unacceptable in principle, location and design. The application relies on an out-of-date and non adopted Housing Needs Survey. Furthermore the proposal would undermine the character and distinctiveness of Radway and its historic through inappropriate siting and the use of materials that do not reflect the village's established ironstone vernacular.

Taken cumulatively, the harms identified are substantial, wide-ranging, and enduring. The proposal causes demonstrable harm to landscape, heritage, character, sustainability and community interest and sets a damaging precedent for further village encroachment. No public benefits have been identified that would outweigh this harm.

For these reasons, the application is contrary to Policies CS.15, CS.11, AS.10, CS.5, CS.8 & CS.12, as well as the NPPF and should therefore be refused.

### Conditions

If this application receives Approval we ask approval is given with the following conditions:

- Permitted Development rights are removed including the erection of sheds

## **RADWAY PARISH COUNCIL**

[www.radwayparishcouncil.org.uk](http://www.radwayparishcouncil.org.uk)

- Restriction on parking caravans or motorhomes
- No future development of the gardens, paddocks or land adjacent to the property
- To be built in local Horton / iron stone.

All surrounding hedges to be protected.