

**Minutes of a meeting of STANFORD IN THE VALE PLANNING AND FINANCE SUB-COMMITTEE held  
remotely on  
Monday 12<sup>th</sup> July 2021**

**Present:** Cllr. Middleton (Chair)      Cllr. Dixon      Cllr. Isaacs      Cllr. Warren  
Cllr. Lewis                                      Cllr. Bailey

**Apologies:** Cllr. Williams-Cuss

**PF/01/07/21 To discuss planning applications**

**P21/V1281/FUL – Land west of Faringdon Road**

**P21/V1506/FUL – Land west of Faringdon Road**

On the resolution of Cllr ISAACS

Seconded by Cllr Middleton

IT WAS RESOLVED that there were OBJECTIONS to both applications

**P21/V1281/FUL – Land west of Faringdon Road**

**Stanford in the Vale Parish Council OBJECTS to the application for the reasons shown below**

We note that the applicant’s Planning Statement (pp. 18/19) is drawn from the Oxfordshire SHMA, and refers to Table 65. For clarity, Table 65 is titled “Estimated dwelling requirement by number of bedrooms (2011 to 2031) – Market Sector”. This neither denotes the recommended Housing Mix, nor reflects the LPA’s adopted requirements.

**Table 65: Estimated dwelling requirement by number of bedrooms (2011 to 2031) – Market Sector**

Sub-area	1 bedroom	2 bedrooms	3 bedrooms	4+ bedrooms
Cherwell	6.2%	23.1%	46.2%	24.6%
Oxford	10.7%	24.9%	38.9%	25.5%
South Oxfordshire	5.7%	26.7%	43.4%	24.2%
Vale of White Horse	5.9%	21.7%	42.6%	29.8%
West Oxfordshire	4.8%	27.9%	43.4%	23.9%
<b>OXFORDSHIRE</b>	<b>7.0%</b>	<b>24.4%</b>	<b>42.9%</b>	<b>25.7%</b>

Source: Housing Market Model

The SHMA Strategic Housing Mix can instead be found at Table 91

**Table 91: Conclusions regarding Strategic Mix of Housing**

	1-bed	2-bed	3-bed	4+ bed
Market	5%	25%	45%	25%
Affordable	25-30%	30-35%	30-35%	5-10%
All dwellings	15%	30%	40%	15%

We draw the LPA’s attention to the fact that the percentages used in the summaries provided by the applicant are therefore skewed. The figures provided in Table 91 are referred to within the Local Plan, Section 6.4 which states “The assessment identifies that there is most need in the Open Market sector for 3-bed units with the lowest need for 1-bed units. For affordable housing, there is a greater need for 2-bed units with the lowest need for 4-bed units. It is important that new housing addresses any imbalance within the existing stock and the impact of demographic and household change”. Having consideration for the correct Strategic Housing Mix (Table 91), and comparing that to the housing mix as proposed by the applicant’s Planning Statement, we find the new housing mix to be substantially below requirement for both 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings which, given the significance allocated to them in the Local Plan, appears to be at odds with the aims of Core Policy 22. Furthermore, we note that the proposed increase in “4+ bed” dwellings results in an additional seven 5-bed dwellings, with no change to the underlying 4-bed numbers. Whilst we agree that the SHMA

does not provide any breakdown beyond 4+, this would appear to be an extreme interpretation of the category.

Stanford in the Vale Parish Council conducted a Housing Needs Survey in 2012 which further corroborates the requirement for more smaller dwellings.

The applicant asserts that the market has changed since the SHMA was produced in 2014. This is to be expected. However, the Local Plan makes reference to the SHMA and calls out the greatest need for 3-bed units. Further the SHMA identifies the importance to building out smaller dwellings in order to release existing larger dwellings to the open market. The SHMA states *“It is important that new housing addresses any imbalance within the existing stock and the impact of demographic and household change.”* Thus it is clearly the intention of the SHMA that housing need is met by addressing any historic shortfalls in housing types.

The applicants’ cover letter suggests that the application includes new housing types to respond to their perceived shift in the market to create space for flexible uses. However, the Planning Statement (4.2) highlights that where they have adapted their house types for home working, in response to the impacts of the Coronavirus pandemic, these rooms have been classed as a “study” not a bedroom. It is therefore utter nonsense to suggest that additional 5-bed dwellings provide this flexible use, since it contradicts the developer’s own assertions.

### **Housing Types**

We note the introduction of House Type J which reintroduces 2.5 storey dwellings with dormer windows into the application. We had previously agreed with the applicant that these were an inappropriate interpretation of the local vernacular and do not accurately reflect the existing character of the village, where these would appear only on one or two notable dwellings. Furthermore, the design is at odds with the VWHDC Design Guide, particularly with regards the alignment of fenestration (or lack thereof) across the dwelling. This issue is also noted in types K1 & K2, where the rear first floor windows appear to have arrived from a scatter method rather than architectural design.

### **Entrance Feature**

The stone entrance feature only appeared as part of the application for the Marketing Suite (P20/V0030/FUL and P20/V0031/A). This was supposed to be temporary and in fact it was a condition of the permission that: ‘The building, parking spaces and entrance feature walls hereby permitted and any ancillary works and structures shall be removed from the site within three years of the date of this permission or after the sale of the last property within the development, whichever shall occur first.’

We contend, contrary to the applicant’s statement that there are no other examples of reconstituted/mock stone entrance walls to developments within the village. There are several ancient natural stone walls, usually relating to single dwellings, but these are significantly different to the proposals here. Further, the amended proposals appear to destroy the existing hedgerow, which would also have an impact on bio-diversity. Additionally, this is contrary to the requirements of Local Plan Part 1, Appendix A, Western Vale Sub Area, “West of Stanford in the Vale” which requires the development to:

- Minimise the visual impact on the countryside
- Ensure the landscape structure builds on existing landscape features
- Incorporate additional tree planting along the A417

The proposals appear to suggest that they would result in the removal of significant quantities of hedgerow along the boundary with the A417, which we find to be unacceptable and contrary to the requirements outlined above. NB: we draw your attention to the applicant’s Design & Access Statement which sets out on Page 46 that the applicant will “retain existing perimeter landscape features”.

## **Trees**

The proposals include the use of Amelanchier arborea 'Robin Hill' and Magnolia Kobus. The former requires non lime soil; the Vale of the White Horse is renowned for its chalk hills, and therefore the soil is far from lime free. Magnolia Kobus is a Japanese species. We advocate the use of appropriate native species throughout.

## **Climate Emergency**

Given VWHDC & Stanford in the Vale Parish Council's declaration of a Climate Emergency, combined with the developer's intention to implement the Future Homes Standard (Design and Access Statement (Page 51)), we suggest that any new strategic development should be required to demonstrate low carbon heating with immediate effect. We also believe that the lack of solar energy use across the proposals means that the development as a whole cannot be considered sustainable.

**We therefore recommend that the application is withdrawn or refused and the applicant reverts to their existing permission.**

## **P21/V1506/FUL – Land west of Faringdon Road**

**Stanford in the Vale Parish Council OBJECTS to the current proposals for the reasons set out below.**

- Original plans safeguarded the existing hedgerow
- Retention of the existing boundary is noted within Design & Access Statement, and also requirements of the Local Plan Part 1, Appendix A, West of Stanford in the Vale.
- However, the current proposals appear to suggest a shared cycleway/footway following the A417 carriageway on the southern side, which would result in the loss of the existing hedgerow and have a negative impact on both biodiversity and the impact of the development on the countryside.
- Instead, we contend that at the point of the Toucan Crossing, the shared cycleway/footway should cross directly into the estate, rather than following the A417. This would provide better permeability, as well as additional protection for pedestrians, and ensure the boundaries were retained as originally planned.
- Furthermore, every effort should be made to reduce the level of urbanisation that the current S278 application outlines – this should be in terms of minimum number of low level lighting poles, minimal poles for the toucan crossing, etc.
- The S278 drawings now include a “new infiltration ditch”. Again, this should be incorporated through the wider site drainage requirements: e.g. the use of swales etc. as used in other parts of the site, and could be set back from the carriageway, behind the existing hedgerow to provide a more attractive, eco-friendly drainage solution.
- The footway on the edge of the site travelling north arrives at a dead end, with no pedestrian refuge or similar.
- The Maintenance Bay shown is unnecessary – it would be better to improve the existing arrangement at the top of Joyces Road, rather than introduce an additional hazard and urbanisation on this section of the A417.
- We believe it would be beneficial to include 1 or more SID units as part of the traffic calming measures in the vicinity.