

**Minutes of a meeting of STANFORD IN THE VALE PLANNING AND FINANCE SUB-COMMITTEE held on
Monday 20th June 2022**

Present: Cllr. Middleton (Chair) Cllr. Isaacs Cllr. Lewis

Apologies: Cllr. Williams-Cuss Cllr. Bailey

PF/01/06/22 P21/V3524/FUL – *Land West of Faringdon Road, Stanford in the Vale - Variation of condition 1 (approved drawings) on application P18/V2056/RM changes to site layout (Residential Development for up to 100 dwellings with associated access)*

ON THE RESOLUTION OF Cllr. MIDDLETON

SECONDED BY Cllr. ISAACS

IT WAS RESOLVED that:

Stanford in the Vale Parish Council OBJECTS to this application on the following grounds.

Housing mix

We are still convinced that the 'home offices' are, in reality, bedrooms in disguise.

Type S is the most egregious example, in which the layout has been deliberately engineered to stay below the NDSS limit. Firstly, the positioning of the door is completely illogical compared to that of bedroom 1; it appears that the landing space has been arbitrarily enlarged to restrict the 'office' size.

Secondly, for type S, the storage area adjacent to the 'office' is fundamentally part of the office room itself. Section 10.h of the NDSS states that storage space such as "a built-in wardrobe counts towards the Gross Internal Area and bedroom floor area requirements". In this scenario, the total room area, including the storage, clearly exceeds the NDSS limits of 7.5m². This is even without repositioning the 'office' door, as mentioned above. We contend that this is yet another instance of the developer gaming the system to the disadvantage of the local community and district council by adding a spurious storage space simply to come within the NDSS limits. Furthermore, this has a net effect of distorting the number of available bedrooms across the entire development and altering the housing mix adversely compared to the actual need as identified in the SHMA.

There are numerous other examples in which the home office space seems generously proportioned in comparison to that of the accompanying bedrooms, and in which storage, doorways and landing space appear positioned to artificially maintain the floor area of the home office just below 7.5m². To give one example, in type C2 the storage area on the landing is being used to remove area from the 'office' in an attempt to stay below NDSS limits.

We remain concerned about the adverse socio-economic effects of artificially suppressing the number of effective bedrooms. The consequences of this are numerous and include: lack of adequate school provision; shortage of parking and amenity space; and a general lack of appropriate funding for infrastructure for the actual occupancy in practice. The NPPF is designed to ensure sustainable developments and, where the above is called into question, this makes the proposed amendment contentious.