

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P13/V0146/FUL</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION
<b>REGISTERED</b>	24 January 2013
<b>PARISH</b>	STANFORD IN THE VALE
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Robert Sharp
<b>APPLICANT</b>	David Wilson Homes Southern
<b>SITE</b>	Land Off Faringdon Road Stanford in Vale Oxfordshire, SN7 8NN
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Erection of 76 dwellings (comprising 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings) with associated works (re- submission of application P12/V2075/FUL)
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	22 April 2013 – units reduced to 73
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	433776/193070
<b>OFFICER</b>	David Rothery

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The 2.63ha site lies to the west of Faringdon Road (A417), on the outskirts of Stanford in the Vale. The site lies within an open countryside area comprising various fields. The site itself comprises in the main a large field area of unkempt rough grass land that undulates in cross-section and falls generally towards the south-east towards the nearby Horse and Jockey public house. The application site also incorporates two dwelling houses to the northern corner of the larger field, both of which would be demolished as part of the proposal.
- 1.2 The adjoining land to the west of the application site is used as an industrial employment generating site and is accessed via Ware Road, the narrow road that bounds the northern edge of the application site and takes access off the roundabout off the A417 to the northern corner of the application site. To the south is the public house and a scattering of commercial and agricultural buildings (Foxfield Farm and Manor Farm) which form a small enclave of buildings on this side of the main A417. These buildings are separated from the main village by the road which forms the defined western village edge.
- 1.3 Local village facilities are a five to ten minute walk to the east of the site in the village centre. Here there is the parish church, a post office and supermarket (co-op) and primary school. The village centre pub has recently closed and is being converted into a dwelling house. Stanford in the Vale parish itself has approximately 855 households and an estimated population of 2,093 residents.
- 1.4 A location plan is **attached** at appendix 1

## 2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This is a full application to consider all the planning aspects of the proposed development. The proposal is a major development and is contrary to the policies of the development plan. The proposal has been publicised on this basis.
- 2.2 The proposal is for the residential development of the site with 73 dwellings (amended from initial submission) following the demolition of two existing properties on the site, together with roads, footpaths and associated parking areas, landscaping, amenity space, and open space.

## Vale of White Horse District Council – Committee Report – 22 May 2013

- 2.3 The development would take vehicular access from Faringdon Road to the east which would run to the southern boundary of the site, alongside the Horse and Jockey public house. The access would include roads, footpaths and associated parking areas, landscaping, amenity space, and open space. Pedestrian access would be available to the open space and the public right of way and footpath / cycleway routes would be formed on the site, including an access adjacent to the roundabout.
- 2.4 This proposal for 73 dwellings would result in an estimated additional 176 residents (based upon district-wide average household figures), which represents about an 8.4% increase in the parish population. Across the 2.63 ha site the 73 dwellings would result in a density of 28 dwellings per hectare.
- 2.5 Affordable housing is proposed at 40% (i.e. 13 dwellings). 26.5% of the dwellings are two-bedroom properties or less.  
The proposed mix of dwelling units is as follows:
- 1-bedroom = 4 units all of which are affordable properties
  - 2-bedroom = 34 units of which 16 are shown as affordable properties
  - 3-bedroom = 12 units of which 6 are shown as affordable properties
  - 4-bedroom = 21 units of which 2 are shown as affordable properties
  - 5-bedroom = 2 units
- 2.6 The following documents have been submitted in support of the application:
- Development Design and Access Statement (April 2013 – DWH)
  - Boundary Details (Sept 2012 – DWH)
  - House type and garages planning drawings (April revision 2013 – DWH)
  - Planning Statement (Jan 2013 – Dijksman Planning)
  - Landscape and Visual Appraisal (Sept 2012 – Pegasus)
  - Landscape Management Plan (Sept 2012 – DWH)
  - Landscape Specification (Sept 2012 – DWH)
  - Tree Survey (June 2012 revision - Bourne Landscape)
  - Arboricultural Method Statement (April 2013 – Bourne Landscape)
  - Agricultural Land Classification (July 2012 - Reading Agricultural)
  - Ecological Appraisal (Oct 2012 – Bioscan)
  - Ecological Assessment (Sept 2012 – Bioscan)
  - Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy rev G (Jan 2013 – ICS)
  - Flood Risk Assessment – Addendum to rev G (April 2013 – ICS)
  - Flood Risk EA proforma (Feb 2013 – DWH)
  - Sewer Impact Study V2 (March 2013 - Thames Water)
  - Additional Shallow Soakage Testing (July 2012 – Merebrook)
  - Prelim Geo-Environmental Assessment (Feb 2012 – Merebrook)
  - Transport Assessment (Sept 2012 – MB)
  - Transport Assessment Addendum (Dec 2012 – MB)
  - Transport Technical Note (Jan 2013 – MB)
  - Residential Travel Plan (Dec 2012 – MB)
  - Transport Stage 1 Safety Audit – Stage 1 (Nov 2012 – Williams & Henry)
  - School impact assessment (Jan 2013 – EPDS)
  - Desk based Heritage Assessment (June 2012 – Thames Valley Archaeological)
  - Noise Assessment (March 2013 - April 2012 - Hines and Partners)
  - Services Statement (Sept 2012 – DWH)
  - Statement of Community Involvement (Sept 2012 – DWH)
  - Supplementary Statement of Community Involvement (Nov 2012 – DWH)
- 2.7 The applicants have been in discussion with council officers and others to agree levels

of financial contribution towards off-site services which this proposal (through the increase in population and the activities they generate) would add to the use of, and securing on-site facilities such as affordable housing. Financial contributions cover facilities and services such as waste collection, street name plates, public art, education (primary, secondary, sixth-form and SEN), library and museums, waste management, social and healthcare, fire and rescue, highways and transport, police equipment, and local recreational facilities.

2.8 Extracts from the application plans are **attached** at appendix 2.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 **Stanford in the Vale Parish Council** – Object to the proposal on grounds that it is contrary to the local plan policies, the land is subject to flooding and the risks associated with this, traffic implications given the location of the site on the opposite side of the road to the main built up village area.

A copy of the parish council's comments is **attached** at appendix 3.

3.2 **Local residents** – A total of 157 representations had been received from local residents at the time of writing this report, all of which object. The objections are made on the following grounds:

- Traffic highway safety in crossing the main road
- The site is subject to flooding with inadequate drainage
- Increased pressure on local infrastructure and village amenities
- Adverse impact on the open character of the area and loss of open fields
- Will add to parking problems in the village centre (shops, school access)
- Not a sustainable location – requiring car travel to other localities
- Adverse impact on structural integrity of historic Horse and Jockey pub
- Harm local wildlife

3.3 **A Group of Stanford Residents (AGSR)** action lobby – Object to the proposal and note continued inaccuracies in the submitted documentation. Consider the development is not sustainable and should be refused. Concern that the proposed development would have an adverse environmental impact on the drainage infrastructure and a flood risk impact. The scheme does not further the economic, environmental and social well being of the residents of the village now or in the future.

3.4 **County Highways** – No objection subject to suitable conditions to secure highway improvements and contributions towards public transport provision.

3.5 **Design and Conservation Officer** – The creation of the new public open space is a positive improvement to the scheme and the frontage onto Faringdon Road.

There is a lack of variety in the detailing of the proposed dwellings which give the development a uniformity of style and detailing. As presented the dwellings do not readily reflect the character and variety of local buildings and the double parking on many plots will exacerbate the urban character of the development. The scheme could be enhanced by creating visual pinch points by bringing buildings and some boundaries closer up to the highway.

3.6 **Landscape Architect** – Local impact only – many concerns have now been addressed by revised layout details. Only issue appears to be height of wall enclosures with trellis to top.

- 3.7 **Arboriculturalist** – No objection provided tree protection measures are implemented and the vegetation around the perimeter of the site is retained.
- 3.8 **Ecologist** - No objection. There are no significant ecological constraints on this site. More positive proposals for ecological enhancements of a permanent nature included within the scheme can be secured by conditions.
- 3.9 **Natural England** – Standard advice offered. The proposal does not appear to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes.
- 3.10 **Environment Agency** – Standard advice offered as the site lies within flood zone 1 and therefore it is not a high risk location. Standard advice on surface water flooding has been provided and this can be incorporated into a planning condition.
- 3.11 **Drainage Engineer** – no objection subject to conditions.
- 3.12 **Thames Water** – An initial investigation has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development. If planning permission is granted, Thames Water recommends a 'Grampian' condition is imposed requiring a drainage strategy to be completed.
- 3.13 **Environmental Health** –  
*Noise* - The noise report is fairly comprehensive in its approach. Additional information would be helpful, but conditions limiting noise disturbance could be conditioned.  
*Air quality* - The area has not been identified as an area of poor air quality and the proposed development will be unlikely to result in a significant impact on local air quality.
- 3.14 **Housing Services** – The proposal to deliver 73 houses following the demolition of 2 existing dwelling would result in a gain of 71 dwellings. 40% provision of affordable housing would require 28 dwellings, which is proposed.  
  
Policy H17 requires affordable housing to be distributed evenly across the site and to be indistinguishable in appearance from the market housing. The proposed distribution meets this policy requirement.
- 3.15 **County Archaeologist** – There are no archaeological constraints to this scheme
- 3.16 **Equalities Officer** – Requires storage areas for wheeled bins so that they are not left on the pavement to cause obstruction to pedestrians and wheelchair users.
- 3.17 **Waste Management Team** – Requires storage areas for wheeled bins per plot to be provided with collection points clear of parking areas.
- 3.18 **Lesiure Services** – Maintenance of open space areas should be clarified and secured either by adoption by the parish council or through a management company.
- 4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**
- 4.1 [P12/V2075/FUL](#) - Refused (20/12/2012)  
Erection of 76 residential dwellings with associated works (amended description follow receipt of amended plans on 18 December 2012).

**5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE**

The local plan was adopted in July 2006. The following relevant policies have been considered to be saved by the Secretary of State's decision of 1 July 2009 whilst the Core Strategy is being produced

- 5.1 Policy GS1 provides a general location strategy to concentrate development within the five main settlements.
- 5.2 Policy GS2 indicates that outside the built-up areas new building will not be permitted unless on land identified for development or the proposal is in accordance with other specific policies.
- 5.3 Policy DC1 requires new development to be of a high design quality in terms of layout, scale, mass, height, detailing, materials to be used, and its relationship with adjoining buildings.
- 5.4 Policy DC4 requires development on sites of 0.5 ha or more to contribute to public art to significantly contribute to the development or the local area.
- 5.5 Policy DC6 requires hard and soft landscaping to protect and enhance the visual amenities of the site and surroundings and to maximise nature conservation and wildlife habitat creation.
- 5.6 Policy DC9 seeks to ensure development will not unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties or the wider environment.
- 5.7 Policy NE4 covers sites of nature conservation importance and the need to protect valued wildlife habitats.
- 5.8 Policy NE9 says that development in the Lowland Vale will not be permitted if it would have an adverse effect on the landscape, particularly on the long and open views within or across the area.
- 5.9 Policy NE10 says that development which would harm the essentially open or rural character of areas on the urban fringes and in the important gaps between settlements will not be permitted.
- 5.10 Policy NE11 seeks to enhance the landscape character of areas which have been damaged or compromised.
- 5.11 Policy H11 allows limited development of not more than 15 dwellings within villages such as Sutton Courtenay subject to design issues and not losing open space.
- 5.12 Policy H13 seeks to limit new housing development outside the built-up areas of settlements.
- 5.13 Policy H16 requires about 50% provision of housing to be two-bedroom or less for schemes of more than 10 dwellings and 10% should meet lifetime homes standards.
- 5.14 Policy H17 requires 40% provision of affordable housing for schemes of more than 5 dwellings.
- 5.15 Policy H23 refers to housing schemes providing open space at 15% for the larger villages.

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)**

- 5.16 *Residential Design Guide – December 2009*  
Offers guidance on housing design and layout.
- 5.17 *Sustainable Design and Construction – December 2009*  
Code for Sustainable Homes guidance to achieve level 3 and working to level 4 by 2013.
- 5.18 *Open Space, Sport and Recreation Future Provision – July 2008*  
Advice for the provision and maintenance requirements for open space areas.
- 5.19 *Affordable Housing – July 2006*  
Provides further guidance in relation to policy H17.
- 5.20 *Planning and Public Art – July 2006*  
Sites over 0.5 ha should provide a contribution towards public art in line with policy DC4.

### **Other Policy Documents**

- 5.21 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – March 2012**
  - Paragraph 14 & 49 – presumption in favour of sustainable development
  - Paragraph 47 – five year housing supply requirement
  - Paragraph 50 - create sustainable inclusive and mixed communities
  - Paragraph 99 – flood risk assessment
  - Paragraph 109 – contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment

### **6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

#### *National advice*

- 6.1 At the heart of the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Within the context of the NPPF, planning permission should be granted where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, unless any adverse impacts would so significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole (paragraph 14).
- 6.2 The current lack of a five year supply of housing sites in the district is due to the lack of delivery of new housing by developers rather than an under-supply of allocated housing land. This has primarily been caused by delays in progressing some major allocations due to the economic downturn and the delay in bringing forward the council's new local plan. The current lack of a five year housing land supply justifies some flexibility in line with the NPPF in the consideration of planning applications which do not accord with local plan policy.
- 6.3 This approach is by necessity of a time-limited duration and is aimed at identifying sites considered suitable to address the housing land shortfall whilst still meeting relevant sustainability and design criteria as referred to in the NPPF. An assessment has been made of the case put forward by the applicants that this proposal meets the requirements of the NPPF for providing sustainable development to help address the current housing land shortfall and, as a result, it is considered that the principle of the proposed development is acceptable.
- 6.4 It is clear the application is contrary to local plan policies GS2 and H11. However, whilst the council does not have a five year housing land supply, these policies are inconsistent with the NPPF. The proposed development, therefore, needs to be considered on its site specific merits and whether it constitutes a sustainable form of

development as defined in the NPPF.

*Use of land*

6.5 Paragraph 109 of the NPPF says that “the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment”, and paragraph 111 says that planning decisions “should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has previously been developed (brownfield land).”

6.6 The site has been used for low activity uses in the past, so it cannot be claimed to represent brownfield land in this regard. The site lies within the countryside and its development for housing is contrary to local plan policies GS2 and H11. However, as indicated above this is not a restricting factor given the current housing land shortfall. In these circumstances, other site specific matters need to be considered, in accordance with the NPPF.

*Sustainability credentials*

6.7 The NPPF puts strong emphasis on housing being used to further enhance rural vitality. The site is in a peripheral location to the main village area with its limited range of services (school, shop, post office, etc.). The proposal would help to ensure the long term provision of the existing facilities and may, speculatively, encourage others to be provided for the benefit of the whole community.

6.8 Concern as to the sustainability credentials of the scheme has been raised, indicating that this is a car borne development which would not support local public transport infrastructure. However the village does offer a modest range of services (shop, post office etc.) which this development would assist in supporting and retaining for the community. The location of the proposal separated from the main village area (but alongside the remaining village public house) would be addressed through the provision of a light controlled pedestrian crossing which is acceptable to the county highways officer.

*Cumulative impact considerations*

6.11 This is the first major proposed housing development within the parish area or an adjacent parish area seeking to assist in addressing the identified housing land shortfall across the district. Other locations may result in future applications, but there are no other large sites currently before the council for consideration. The proposal would result in an increase of about 8.5% in the existing parish housing stock with a commensurate increase in population within the ward of about 8.4%.

*Social infrastructure*

6.12 There has been some local concern that existing social and physical infrastructure within the village could not cope with the proposed increase in population resulting from this proposal. However, contributions can be secured to offset the impacts arising from the development. The applicant has agreed to the principle of addressing these needs through contributions which can be secured through a section 106 legal agreement.

*Access arrangements*

6.13 The site would be accessed off Faringdon Road from the east. The access is shown with acceptable vision splays following the receipt of amended plans. Some off-site highway improvements would also be required and could be secured through legal agreements.

6.14 Some local concern has been expressed that the proposed access would cause traffic congestion along Faringdon Road due to the use of the proposed light controlled pedestrian crossing, slowing traffic down and encouraging other roads within the village

to be used as rat-runs to avoid the crossing point. Concern has also been made at congestion within the village from more vehicles seeking to access the limited parking spaces available to serve the village facilities, such as the shop. Neither of these concerns has generated objections from the County Engineer on traffic generation or highway safety grounds regarding the proposal.

*Affordable housing*

- 6.15 The affordable housing requirement has been confirmed by the applicant to be workable as part of the scheme. The distribution of the affordable housing across the site is acceptable and the mix provided meets housing services requirements.

*Visual impact - appearance, landscaping, layout and scale*

- 6.16 Good design and layout is a key aspect of sustainable development and the NPPF is explicit in seeking high quality outcomes. The submitted proposal has been considered in accordance with the advice in the NPPF and it is viewed that the scheme is acceptable in terms of the site specific considerations.
- 6.17 The layout has a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings which provides a suitable development to complement and add to the existing mix of dwellings in the village. The proposed provision of two storey dwellings would be considered acceptable on the periphery of the village.
- 6.18 The detailed appearance and design of the dwellings reflect a traditional feel with solid materials and a pitched roofscape. There is a mix of dwelling types to cater for different housing requirements, and the pallet of materials offers individuality whilst retaining elements of a common approach throughout the proposed development.
- 6.19 The proposed dwellings offer passive surveillance of the surrounding public areas and are appropriately separated from the existing dwellings that border the site.
- 6.20 Adequate private garden space is provided and the proposed layout relates well to the surrounding development in the area. Privacy distances within the development and to neighbouring properties are achieved in accordance with the Residential Design Guide.
- 6.21 The proposal retains and maintains the existing field boundaries to the site with additional landscaping provided throughout the proposed layout.

*Impact on the residential amenity of neighbours*

- 6.22 The proposed layout would not have any direct harmful impact on the residential amenity of adjacent properties in terms of overshadowing, light pollution, over-dominance or loss of privacy. The proposed arrangement would provide adequate spatial separation between properties in accordance with the Residential Design Guide.

*Heritage assets*

- 6.23 The NPPF requires that account should be taken of the desirability to sustain and enhance heritage assets. The proposal has no heritage assets within the site or within the surrounding area. The application has not identified any heritage asset in the local area that would be subject to any adverse impact from the proposal.

*Drainage and flooding issues*

- 6.24 There are no drainage issues identified which the appropriate drainage advisors consider are of issue. The use of conditions would address the concerns that have been made.



7.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 This proposal does not accord with the development plan and it has been publicised as a departure. However, in the light of the current shortfall in the council's five year housing land supply, the proposal's location with close availability of services and facilities should be afforded appropriate weight. As the proposal would result in a sustainable development in terms of its relationship and proximity to local facilities and services, the principle of the proposal is considered to broadly accord with the NPPF.
- 7.2 In site specific terms, the proposal shows an acceptable development on the site and is not considered to be harmful to the landscape character of the area, the residential amenity of nearby properties, any local heritage assets or highway safety and, therefore, given the current housing land shortfall, it broadly complies with the NPPF.
- 7.3 The proposed development is considered to be capable of being accommodated in the locality, provided suitable contributions are secured to on-site and off-site services and infrastructure. This takes into account the housing land shortfall which needs to be addressed and the sustainability benefit of the larger settlements taking a fair proportion of the required additional housing to support and ensure the retention of existing services.
- 7.4 In addition, the scheme could come on stream quickly, as all the necessary criteria are in place for swift development on site which will assist in helping to address the current housing land shortfall.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

**It is recommended that the decision to grant planning permission be delegated to head of planning in consultation with the committee chairman subject to:**

**1. Completion within the agreed PPA period of section 106 agreements for on-site affordable housing provision, contributions towards off-site facilities and services including highways works, education improvements, waste management and collection, street names signs, public art, library and museum service, social and health care, fire and rescue, police equipment, local and area hub recreational and community facility improvements.**

**2. The following conditions, including the requirement for the commencement of development within 12 months from the date of the issue of planning permission to help address the immediate housing land shortfall:**

- 1. TL1 - Time limit (12 months)**
- 2. MC2 - materials**
- 3. LS1 - landscape**
- 4. LS4 - tree protection details**
- 5. RE6 - boundary walls and fences – including walls to open frontages**
- 6. Plot curtilage boundaries**
- 7. Plot restriction to southern boundary**
- 8. Ecology**
- 9. Drainage requirements**
- 10. Construction traffic management plan**
- 11. Travel information packs**
- 12. Access visibility**
- 13. Parking provision**
- 14. Building height parameters**
- 15. Refuse bin storage**
- 16. Roof top aerials**

- 17. Maintenance of open space areas**
- 18. Protect and maintain hedges during development operations**
- 19. Approved drawings**

**3. If the required section 106 agreements are not completed in a timely manner and so planning permission cannot be granted by the determination deadline of 6 June 2013, in accordance with the agreed PPA, it is recommended that authority to refuse planning permission is delegated to the head of planning in consultation with the chairman and vice-chairman.**

Author / Officer: David Rothery - Major Applications Officer  
Contact number: 01235 540349  
Email address: david.rothery@southandvale.gov.uk