

Notes from meeting with WPDG and Deeleys.

Tues 21 Apr 1900 hrs, Ilmington Village Café

The following are notes of the conversations, broadly in the order in which they were discussed:

In attendance:

WPDG Tony Bunney

Deeleys Dean Weldon

MFAG Chris Plyming, Lorna Green, Steve Routly, Steve Prosser, Mark Bessey.

1. Introductions around the table.
2. Q from Steve P around relationship with Deeleys.

WPDG exist to identify and bring forward potential development sites for WCC.

At board level it has been approved for acquisition of the allocated site (which they refer to as Site 2, Site 1 being the farmhouse)

Site 3 is the reserve site.

They are putting forward reserve site as lack of land supply at SDC means they can , it wasn't part of tender , but they believe won't have to go out again as percentage is small compared to main tender .

Site 4 is the northeastern quadrant of the site. It was stated by WPDG that there is no intention to develop that site though interestingly there is an access point provided on the site plan presented. (!!?)

Discussion over whether the farmhouse (Site 1) needs to be developed prior to Site

2. WPDG felt it doesn't. Most of MFAG believe from the planning document it does.

I have checked the conditions on 23/00782/FUL, link below , there are 3 significant ones . They need to start by 1/3/27 , it will have AOC (Agricultural occupancy restriction), and old house has to be knocked down within 3 months of occupation of the new one . So, they were right they don't need to finish it first, but they do need to start by 1/3/27.

Also, it says must be built to approved plans , they talked about reducing size of farm buildings as SR challenged the economics, confirmed farm build cost >£1m , and cannot fund with out the cash sales from the houses. Syd dying , solved a big cashflow problem !

<https://apps.stratford.gov.uk/eplanningv2/AppDetail/Index/305816ec-985a-c8fe-dc20-08db46718e0b?route=/Home>

Deeleys are approved as the preferred partner from an initial 6 developers at the start of the process.

They are employed to pursue and deliver PCSA's (Pre Construction Service Agreement) (?) for Site 2. (I'm not clear I understand this fully - this is my known unknown)

WPDG are the developer and will sell the houses (via an Estate Agent)

Deeleys are the design and build contractor. At this stage their contract is to reach the planning approval stage and it does not necessarily lead on that they will build.

From the MFAG there was surprise as this is an unusual business model and WPDG admitted it has not been tested in a residential build project.

3. Q about timelines and stage.

At this stage WPDG have approval to purchase Site 2. There is not approval at this stage to purchase Site 3 (the 'Reserve Site'). There is no plan to develop Site 4 (!!?) The next stage is a detailed pricing scheme by Deeleys, planned delivery early to mid June.

They are looking at a village consultation end of May/June.

Planning complete by Sept/Oct

Build period (from site clearance) 18 months to 3 years.

Approximate house values from £450k (3 bed) to £950k (5 bed) at current market value.

4. Discussions over Proposed Site Plan.

These were wide ranging covering the lack of regard shown to the NP by the plan, including:

Housing density

Driveways and parking – end to end off road parking is not appropriate. Parking issues within the development caused by a lack of off road parking.

Materials – reconstituted stone mentioned by Deeleys (!)

Position of premium housing.

Plot 2 limits vision splays

Plot 21 lacks any access to the back garden

Lack of footpaths

They confirmed no gates for access (Moreton has)

Lack of character

Practical elements of construction discussed, no obvious site compound location.

The broad thrust is that the plan presented is weak with little regard to the character of Ilmington or to the other points raised by the NP. **Probably only houses built of Cotswold stone will be those adjacent to Back Street**

Drainage – Deeleys mooted experimental boreholes (Eco 90?) to drain surface water (?!)

5. Steve R presented the result of the Community Survey with subsequent discussion.

Apparent that WPDG/Deeleys are operating on the presumption (guided by SDC Planning) that access is from Back St.

MFAG stated that we are separately pursuing access from Mickleton Road direct with WCC and SDC.

6. Affordable housing –

Approx 11 properties. Deeleys reported no interest in a housing scheme adopting the properties at this stage.

Affordable houses on plan are those numbered 20-30 ,

Steve R mentioned Warwick Rural Housing as the gold standard. Deeleys have not approached them yet.

Mention of Discount Market Sales (I'm afraid another known unknown for me) . **I think they have to sell at 80% of whole market value to be affordable, this will be in a S106 and secured in perpetuity**

They admitted there was too little green space and would have to commute a sum to SDC/ Parish Council . There may be a lever here to pull – ie get some land form site 4

LG and others pointed out they were putting the 'cheap' houses and expensive houses the wrong way around. ie 5 beds should be by playing field. SR made point you have to drive past a row of 10 houses with virtually no parking (so cars will be on road) to get to the 5 beds, they will also have school noise.

7. Next meetings.

In this discussion it became apparent that WPDG/Deeleys at this stage are planning to present the presented Site Plan for the village consultation and therefore do not seek further engagement with MFAG in developing their ideas to reach a plan that we can support.

MFAG felt this is a mistake, that the village welcomed the development but would as a whole want to ensure that the design respected the NP as a minimum.

Subsequently I sent an email to Tony and Dean this morning emphasising that point, copied below.

Summary (personal opinion):

In my view a useful meeting to meet personalities and demonstrate the strength and depth of the MFAG team who are clearly across this in more detail than the WPDG and Deeleys team. And this was only half the team!

There seem to be big holes in their scope and planning. At this stage I think they are weighing up whether the development makes financial sense.

The site plan is very weak.

I am cynical about Site 4 suddenly appearing with potential access.

I'm disappointed that they seem to listen politely and then disregard any adherence to the NP. I fear they will try to steamroller through the most profitable option and we will then have to fight rather than work together.

Chris Plyming

SR opinion , they have made their minds up and unlikely to change regardless, SDC will support on density as need to count as many houses as possible. Parking is going to be a disaster, and there is no green space (pond will be fenced) – Wilkins Way is half the density !

Read their website statements- says will have 'good open space' !

WPDG has selected Deeley Group as its delivery partner for a new farmstead and housing redevelopment in Ilmington

Warwickshire Property and Development Group (WPDG) received detailed planning permission on 1st March 2024 for the replacement and relocation of a farmhouse and barns, with a new access, within a County Council owned farm in Ilmington. The replacement farmstead consent enables progression of the Neighbourhood Plan allocated development site, including the existing farmstead, at Back Lane in Ilmington.

After a formal tender process WPDG has appointed Coventry based Deeley Group to bring forward the residential scheme at Mabels Farm in Ilmington.

Deeley Group, a family-owned business will be working with WPDG, to prepare a full planning application to submit to Stratford-on-Avon District Council, with early engagement already taking place with Ilmington Parish Council.

This is an opportunity to bring forward a much needed mix of house types and tenures, in this affluent village, which aims to provide a chance for both growing families and downsizers to stay in the area. The scheme will include a 35% affordable housing provision, as well as good quality open space and improved accessibility to the village amenities and adjacent play area and recreation ground.

And Deeleys talk about community and a partnership with stakeholders as a value

Our values



I think both should be challenged, I note Chris email below , I think needs to go to WPDG board members and Deeley board members urgently, and if they refuse to change plans before village consultation, we should lay out the issues to the villagers ahead of the event. The more I think about it , they more I think we have a big battle , and might have to play hard !

Copy of email sent to Tony Bunney and Dean Weldon 22 Apr:

Morning Tony and Dean,

Thank you for your time yesterday evening, very useful from our point of view and we will brief the MFAG and subsequently the IPC at meetings next week.

I did want to revisit the idea that you don't necessarily intend to take into account our feedback on the density and design and layout prior to holding a village consultation.

I do think this would be a mistake.

The village intends to hold any development at least to the NP and as we raised last evening the current density and design and layout falls short of that.

I do think a smoother way forward is for you to revisit the density and design and layout and get together in the next few weeks for at least one and perhaps several sessions prior to a village consultation.

We are representing the village and of course would like to be arriving at the village consultation with a plan that we can at least broadly support. At this stage we don't support the plan and we would have to make this clear to the village prior to a consultation.

As you know we support the development in principal but we will do everything we can to ensure that it is done to fit the unique character of this village and to the highest possible standards.

To that end I hope we do have the opportunity to further develop ideas before going to a village consultation.

Very best, Chris