

APPLICATION NO.	P17/V1708/RM
SITE	Bow Farm Bow Road Stanford in the Vale Faringdon, SN7 8JB
PARISH	STANFORD IN THE VALE
PROPOSAL	Reserved Matter application following Outline Approval P14/V2822/O. Erection of 19 new dwellings.
WARD MEMBER(S)	Robert Sharp
APPLICANT	Mr Daniel Ede
OFFICER	Adrian Butler

This application is presented to planning committee because an objection from the Parish Council has been received.

RECOMMENDATION

That approval is granted subject to the following conditions:

Compliance

1. Approved plans
2. Retention of hedges and protective fencing
3. Permitted development removal plots 19 – 28 – Classes A and B
4. Landscaping implementation

Prior to Occupation

5. Road surfaces to be provided
6. Parking and turning spaces to be provided
7. Implement boundary details

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This is a reserved matters application pursuant to the outline permission granted under application no. P14/V2822/O for 19 dwellings. That application considered the principle of development, traffic movements and highway safety issues, landscape and visual impacts and flood risk. This reserved matters application is therefore not an opportunity to re-examine these matters.
- 1.2 The outline permission was subject to a legal agreement that secured eight affordable dwellings, financial contributions towards school improvements, public transport improvements, and a footpath connection to the south.
- 1.3 This application seeks approval for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Amended plans have been submitted seeking to address concerns raised by the Parish Council and district council officers.

- 1.4 The 19 dwellings comprise eight two and three bedroom semi-detached affordable houses and 11 three and four bedroom detached market houses. The dwelling heights are between 8m and 8.5m to ridge.
- 1.5 Access is taken from Bow Road using that permitted and in place to serve the approved scheme of 17 dwellings immediately west of this site (permitted under application no. P15/V2128/RM). That scheme is under construction.
- 1.6 The proposed dwellings are accessed from a large cul-de-sac. A 10m wide landscape buffer is provided along the eastern boundary as expected by the outline permission.
- 1.7 The site location plan and layout plan are **attached** as Appendices 1 and 2.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 2.1 A summary of the responses received to the current proposal is below. A full copy of all the comments made can be seen online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk

Parish Council	<p>Object. Their concerns may be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with the applicant's assertion that the layout has a looser feel. The singularly linear plot layout, has become significantly more urbanised than the indicative layout shown with the outline application. • Fails to respond to the rural nature of the surroundings. • Need a layout that is more in keeping with the village setting, provides more visual interest, whilst also providing natural buffers to the open countryside beyond. • Appears to be a lack of imagination relating to shared street space as specified by the Vale design guide. • Affordable housing should be integrated and not discernibly different. • Shrub and herbaceous planting plan is unimaginative, and given the delicate nature of this site we would like to see better thought out plan that maintains the rural aspect throughout the site. Commend native species. • The originally proposed farm access was to pass through the wooded boundary, but the newly proposed access from the extended "hammerhead" gives an even more urban feel to the layout. • No details of Public Open Space have been proposed, which is contrary to local policy. • Maintenance of the same and site boundaries requires clarification. • We had hoped that the greater part of the proposed footpath would follow a non-linear, non-tarmac approach, in keeping with the edge of village, rural feel.
----------------	---

Local residents	<p>Four letters of objection have been received from local residents. Their objections may be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools and local infrastructure are at capacity. No development should be allowed until these are improved • This is high ground and the proposals will be visually intrusive • The higher ground means dwellings will cause overlooking • Increased traffic • The speed limit on Bow Road should be made 20mph • Increased risk of accidents • Site is outside the village and destroy part of the countryside • Additional street lighting will cause light pollution • No details of how the scheme will be sustainable e.g. no solar panels proposed • Percentage of affordable housing seems higher than policy requirements • Increased risk of flooding • Impact on water vole if surface water run-off is discharged to the Frogmore Brook • Consent is not given to discharge surface water to the Frogmore Brook.
Oxfordshire County Council	<p><u>Highways</u> Objected to the original plans submitted.</p> <p>No objection to the revised plans: Visitor parking should be provided.</p> <p><u>Conditions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Car parking to be provided in accordance with the district council standards. <p><i>(Officer note: A request for financial contributions is made but these cannot be secured through a reserved matters application. Contributions towards public transport improvements were secured as part of the outline permission).</i></p>
Drainage engineer	No objection
Countryside officer	No objection
Landscape Officer	<p>Comments on the original plans submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no indication of any POS proposed on site.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no engineering plans to give an idea of site level, draining etc. • No maintenance access shown to buffer planting areas to the rear of the proposed housing. • Walls extend into the buffer planting but should terminate at the end of the gardens. • The affordable units are different from the rest of the site. • How are the proposed rear garden boundaries to be secured against the retained existing hedgerows on the western and eastern boundaries? • The character of the western section of the site with dense on-street parking, no front gardens and limited trees breaking up the frontage parking does not make this area of the site tender blind and is at odds with the character of the rest of the site. • The proposed planting details are generally acceptable. <p>Amended Plans: no further comments received.</p>
Forestry Officer	<p>Original Plans: Endorses the landscape officer comments.</p> <p>Amended Plans: No further comments.</p>
Waste management	<p>Comment: Request a plan which shows access and turning for this council's refuse vehicle.</p>
Urban design officer	<p>Comments on the original plans submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 'T' junction appears over engineered • House type needs to turn a corner • Connection with the site to the west is needed • Boundary fences should not be in the public realm • Parking dominates the affordable housing frontage – tree planting is needed every four spaces • Landscaping strip to the east seems to be dead space • Eastern boundary needs a sensitive, bespoke approach • Are the materials locally distinctive?

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 P14/V2822/O - Approved (01/03/2016)

Outline application for erection of 19 new dwellings.

- 3.2 P13/V1949/O - Approved (23/04/2015)
Demolition of existing agricultural farm buildings. Erection of 17 new residential units, conversion of two barns to three residential units (already consented ref P12/V1739/FUL) (revised drawings received March 2014)
- 3.3 P15/V2128/RM – Approved (31/03/2016)
Reserved matters application for the demolition of existing agricultural farm buildings and the erection of 17 new residential units and the conversion of two barns to three residential units (conversion already consented under ref P12/V1739/FUL) following grant of outline planning permission under ref P13/V1949/O.
- 3.4 P16/V1959/NM - Approved (08/08/2016)
Non material amendment to application ref. P15/V2128/RM - (Reserved matter application for the demolition of existing agricultural farm buildings and the erection of 17 new residential units and the conversion of two barns to three residential units (conversion already consented under ref: P12/V1739/FUL) following grant of outline planning permission under ref: P13/V1949/O) for installation of air source heat pumps and two additional parking spaces to rear of Nos 1 & 26 Bow Road).

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 The site area is less than 5ha and fewer than 150 dwellings are proposed. The proposal is not EIA development.

5.0 MAIN ISSUES

- 5.1 The main issues are:
1. Principle of development
 2. Affordable housing and housing mix
 3. Access and parking
 4. Appearance
 5. Landscaping
 6. Layout
 7. Scale
 8. Residential amenity
 9. Drainage
 10. Historic environment

Principle of Development

- 5.2 The principle of development is established through the extant outline planning permission for 19 dwellings on this site – application no. P14/V2822/O.

Affordable Housing and Housing Mix

- 5.3 The application provides 40% affordable dwellings in accordance with the s106 agreement accompanying the outline planning permission. The affordable housing mix approved at outline stage, set in the s106 agreement and met in this application is:
- 5 x 2-bed units for rent

- 1 x 3 bed unit for rent
- 2 x 2-bed units for shared ownership

5.4 The market housing mix approved at outline stage and met in this application is:

- 2 x 3-bed units
- 9 x 4-bed units

Access and Parking

5.5 Access is from Bow Road between no's 2 Bow Cottages and 26 Bow Road. This is an existing approved point of access to the approved 17 dwellings immediately west of the site. It is the logical access to use and was anticipated at outline application stage and shown in the draft s278 agreement which is appended to the completed s106 agreement. A refuse vehicle swept path plan has now been submitted and shows the council's refuse vehicle can access the site and turn within it (hence the "over engineered" turning heads mentioned by the urban design officer).

5.6 Car parking provides at least two spaces per dwelling whilst the larger dwellings have three external spaces plus garages. Garages measure 3m x 6m internally and can be counted as parking spaces. Space could be provided for visitor parking and this can be required by planning condition if necessary. However, the proposal provides 56 parking spaces whereas the County Council parking standards would require 47 spaces with eight of them unallocated. I consider adequate parking is proposed and the need for a condition requiring visitor parking is not needed.

Appearance

5.7 The house types include units similar in appearance to those permitted on the adjacent site under application no.P15/V2128/RM. They are compatible with their surroundings. Their appearance is generally simple with balanced elevations with vertical emphasis. The forms are rectangular under pitched roofs. Occasional units have feature gables adding variation. Entrances face the streets. A submitted plan names the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs. These Materials are a red/brown multi stock brick or artificial stone under slate or plain concrete tiles. The same materials have been approved for the 17 dwellings on the adjacent site (P15/V2128/RM). They are therefore, compatible and acceptable on this site.

5.8 The affordable houses are distinguishable through their semi-detached form and size this being a response to affordable housing need set by the outline permission and the market housing mix permitted. In terms of materials they are to be constructed of the same bricks and tiles as some of the market dwellings. The design and access statement explains the registered provider has sought the affordable dwellings in one part of the site to make management easier. They are not in a cluster exceeding 15 and therefore, the grouping is reasonable.

- 5.9 It is considered the appearance of the development accords with core policy 37 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and Design Guide principles 52, 56, 57, 61 and 62.

Landscaping

- 5.10 A 10m wide buffer is provided to the eastern boundary as expected by the outline permission and this was also expected to be the 15% public open space in accordance with saved policy H23 of the Local Plan 2011. This breaks the appearance of the development in views of the village edge and provides a landscaped and soft edge to the boundary integrating it with countryside beyond. Planting consists of native species. Existing boundary hedges are retained. A condition can be included requiring protective fencing to be erected to protect existing hedges during construction works.
- 5.11 Frontages to most dwellings have tree planting and hedges which soften the street scene and break up the 'groups' of parking spaces. Boundary walls are in the public realm between dwellings which are positive features. The domestic boundary treatments do not extend into the landscape buffer and have now been removed on the amended plans to allow access to the landscape buffer. The proposal accords with Design Guide principle 33 and core policies 37 and 44 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.

Layout

- 5.12 Layout is constrained by the width of the site, development to the west and the need for a buffer on the east boundary. The proposal responds to these constraints by providing a single road lined with dwellings with connections to the field beyond in terms of farm access to the fields. A footpath link required by the outline permission is provided on the western boundary. The layout of the approved housing to the west only allows the one connection point. The site is not large or wide enough to allow connecting streets within it. It is as permeable as the constraints allow and the site is easily navigable.
- 5.13 Focal points are provided by plots 32 and 23 and 24. The landscaped buffer provides a positive edge to the village. The street scenes are landscaped with parking broken by planting and no longer impacting in sight lines. Being short streets should limit traffic speeds.
- 5.14 The density of development amounts to a little over 17 dwellings per hectare. This is below the 30 dwellings per hectare expected by core policy 23 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1. However, it is consistent with the lower density character of the area and responsive to this rural edge of the village.
- 5.15 Given the site constraints the proposal is reasonably compliant with policy 37 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and the Design Guide.

Scale

- 5.16 The ridge heights of dwellings range from some 8m to 8.5m. Lengths and widths of dwellings vary. The scale of the proposed dwellings is consistent with the new dwellings being built on adjacent land and typical of the variations in sizes of dwellings found in the locality. e.g. there are small

cottages to larger detached dwellings and farmhouses close to the site. The scale of development is considered to respond to the characteristics of the locality.

Residential Amenity

- 5.17 The Design Guide expects a distance of at least 21m between dwellings with main windows facing one another. The plans have been revised to provide at least 21m between the proposals and dwellings permitted to the west.
- 5.18 Existing occupied dwellings are all more than 21m from the proposals and in the case of dwellings fronting or side on to Bow Road are separated from the site by the intervening dwellings permitted under application no. P15/V2128/RM.
- 5.19 There may be some indirect overlooking from first floor windows in plot 23 of a swimming pool in the grounds of Bow House to the north. Views would be oblique and partly screened by the boundary hedge and screening around the pool. I note the application site does not include a piece of land directly 'behind' the swimming pool. The swimming pool is most likely to be in use in the warmer months of the year when people may wish to be outside rather than in a bedroom. I am not convinced any overlooking of the pool is sufficient to justify refusal or a further redesign of the layout. I consider there will be no unreasonable loss of privacy, overshadowing or overbearing impact for any existing residents.

Drainage

- 5.20 Planning conditions attached to the outline planning permission require a sustainable surface water drainage scheme and foul water drainage scheme to be agreed prior to development commencing and implemented before the occupation of any dwellings. These conditions remain relevant. Some concern has been expressed that the development to the west has been permitted to drain to the Frogmore Brook which is not in the developer's control. Drainage details for this current application have not been agreed.

Historic Environment

- 5.21 The site is not within the conservation area and there are no listed buildings on site. The Stanford in the Vale conservation area is some 150m to the south west, as is the closest listed building (the grade II listed The Elms). The site is separated from these heritage assets by the existing development being built adjacent and there is no impact on their setting. In responding to the outline application the County Council archaeologist advised there are no archaeological constraints.

6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 This application has been considered in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.2 The principle of development, traffic generation and highway safety implications and flood risk are all established through the outline permission

and conditions attached to that permission. Drainage is subject to conditions on the outline permission which require details to be approved. They are not matters to re-examined as part of this application. Infrastructure improvements and 40% affordable housing are secured through a s106 agreement associated with the outline permission. The outline permission also set the housing mixes which the proposal complies with.

- 6.3 This proposal seeks approval of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the development. Paragraph 56 of the NPPF attaches great weight to the design of the built environment.
- 6.4 The submitted plans demonstrate that nineteen dwellings can be reasonably accommodated on this site in an acceptable form and in compliance with adopted design policies and guidance. In addition, the proposals have no unreasonable impact on neighbours.
- 6.5 I recommend that the reserved matters are approved.

The following planning policies and guidance have been taken into account:

VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2031: PART 1:
CORE POLICIES 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 20, 22, 23, 24, 33, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47.

VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2011:
SAVED POLICIES DC3, DC4, DC5, DC6, DC7, DC9, DC12, H23, NE9.

DRAFT VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2031 PART 2:
A publication draft of this Local Plan has been produced and is presently subject to consultation (the consultation period expires on 22 November 2017). Following consultation it is intended to submit the Local Plan Part 2 for Examination. Relevant policies in the Local Plan Part 2 include: CP4a, DP16, DP20, DP23, DP28, DP33, DP36, DP37, DP38.

VALE OF WHITE HORSE DESIGN GUIDE 2015

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE

Case Officer – Adrian Butler

Email – adrian.butler@southandvale.gov.uk

Tel – (01235) 422600