

# Review of the Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area consultation

## CONSULTATION SUMMARY REPORT

A review of the feedback received to the Stanford in the Vale  
Conservation Area consultation.

**MAY 2023**



If you require this report in an alternative format (for example large print, Braille, audio, email, Easy Read and alternative languages) please email [haveyoursay@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:haveyoursay@southandvale.gov.uk) or call 01235 422425.

# CONTENTS

SUMMARY	3
HOW WE HAVE USED THE RESULTS	3
BACKGROUND TO THE ENGAGEMENT	4
ENGAGEMENT METHODOLOGY	5
QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DATA	6
SURVEY	26
COMMUNICATION	31
FURTHER INFORMATION	33

**Note:** When stating percentages in the analysis, we are referring to the percentage of respondents that answered the specific question, rather than the total number of responses to the overall survey. Response percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding up over .5 and rounding down under .5. Words that appear in italics are quotes taken from comments received.

## SUMMARY

Vale of White Horse District Council invited residents to give their views on the Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area Appraisal document that details proposed changes to the conservation area boundary in the following places (from section 8 of the appraisal document):

Proposed **additions** to the conservation area:

- Extension to include verges at western end of High Street
- Extension to include curtilage and dovecote of Cox's Hall
- Extension to include 15 High Street
- Extension to include the former orchard and orchard walls of Orchard House as defined by Green Lane. Includes 9 Horsecroft.
- Extension to include 10, 16-24, 15-27 Horsecroft and their curtilages.
- Extension to include former orchard adjacent to 1 Upper Green (aka The OldHouse).

Proposed **removals** from the conservation area:

- Removal of 25,27 High Street

In total, 14 responses were received during the public consultation period. This is made up of 10 responses via the online survey and 4 responses via email.

The majority of respondents (9) were from individuals/members of the public. Of the remaining 5 respondents, 2 were from local organisations and 3 were from national organisations.

There was a general support for the appraisal and boundary revisions. The Parish council suggested further extending the boundary east of Horsecroft. A recent PhD thesis about Stanford in the Vale was brought to our attention along with comments from a local history group which will be used to update areas of the appraisal with latest findings. A number of small factual corrections were noted and will be implemented for a final adoption draft.

Detailed comments on how the Conservation Team have responded to all the comments received can be found in this qualitative data section of this report.

## HOW WE WILL USE THE RESULTS

The Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area Appraisal is currently undergoing review following the close of public consultation. Once a final draft is produced using the consultation feedback, it will be presented by a Cabinet member at a Cabinet committee meeting to be formally adopted as a supplementary planning document. Once adopted, the appraisal can be used to inform planning decisions and will be available to view on our [conservation areas webpage](#).

# BACKGROUND TO THE ENGAGEMENT

## Purpose of the Conservation Area Appraisal and Boundary Review

### What are conservation areas?

Areas of “special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance” – in other words, they exist to protect the features and the characteristics that make a historic place unique and distinctive.

Local Authorities have a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area. In addition to statutory controls, both National Policy and the Local Authority policies in the Local Plan help preserve the special character and appearance of conservation areas and their setting where it contributes to its significance.

### What is the purpose of a conservation area appraisal?

- Identify special architectural or historic interest and the changing needs of the conservation area;
- Define or redefine the conservation area boundaries;
- Increase public awareness and involvement in the preservation and enhancement of the area;
- Provide a framework for informed planning decisions;
- Guide controlled and positive management of change within the conservation area to minimise harm and encourage high quality, contextually responsive design.

## Summary of the Appraisal Document and alterations to the Proposed Boundary

This document was fully produced and reviewed by the Conservation Team in tandem with the development of a new template to be used for all future appraisals. Stanford in the Vale was chosen as a result of a weighting exercise in which un-appraised conservation areas within Vale of White Horse were prioritised by development pressures. The Conservation Team decided that these priority areas would benefit the most from a conservation area appraisal.

The document provides a summary of the history of Stanford in the Vale and its development, an assessment of its historic and architectural interest, a gazetteer of local interest buildings (non-listed structures) and maps showing various details of spatial and character analysis.


During a review of the existing Conservation Area boundary, the Conservation Team identified areas that are of sufficient interest and significance to be considered for inclusion within the designated boundary and areas that no longer meet the tests and are proposed for removal.

The revisions include:

- Extension to include verges at western end of High Street
- Extension to include curtilage and dovecote of Cox’s Hall
- Extension to include 15 High Street
- Extension to include the former orchard and orchard walls of Orchard House as defined by Green Lane. Includes 9 Horsecroft.
- Extension to include 10, 16-24, 15-27 Horsecroft and their curtilages.
- Extension to include former orchard adjacent to 1 Upper Green (aka The Old House).
- Correction at Penstone’s Court, formerly Penstone’s Farm
- Removal of 25,27 High Street

# ENGAGEMENT METHODOLOGY


How we undertook the consultation.



The consultation ran from Wednesday 1 February until 11.59pm Wednesday 8 March 2023.



Letters were issued to residents of Stanford in the Vale that may be impacted by the proposed changes to the conservation area boundary. The council's consultation database was also contacted and filtered for consultees that live within Stanford in the Vale and may have an interest in the consultation.



An online survey was created to gather feedback on the Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area Appraisal document and the proposed changes to the conservation area boundary. The survey asked respondents to provide their views on the Area Appraisal. A copy of the survey and comments received are available to view in this report.



Paper copies of the consultation materials were made available in the Stanford Coffee House and Faringdon Library. Posters were also put on display around the town to help promote the consultation.



A link to the online survey was made available on the council's webpages.

## Reporting methodology

A total of 16 completed responses were received. This is made up of 12 responses received via the online survey and 4 responses via email which were manually added to the results.


The full results to the consultation are included in this report, alongside an officer response.

Any personal information supplied to us within the comments that could identify anyone has been redacted and will not be shared or published in the report. Further information on data protection is available in our [planning consultations privacy policy](#).

## QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DATA

A copy of the quantitative and qualitative data received to the consultation is provided below.

### 1. Are you responding as:



Other (please specify):


- *Parish Council*

Most respondents (10) were received from individuals / members of the public, followed by 5 respondents on behalf of a business / organisation. The remaining respondent selected 'other'.

### 2. Please provide the name of the business / organisation, or other you are representing:

- *Network Rail*
- *Stanford in the Vale Archaeological Research Project. Dr David Ashby, Project Director*
- *Stanford in the Vale Parish Council*
- *also a member of the Local History Society*
- *Historic England*
- *Natural England*
- *Stanford in the Vale Local History Society*

### 3. What is your connection to Stanford in the Vale? Please tick all that apply.



#### Other (please specify):

- *We are the local Parish Council*

A total of 16 respondents answered this question. Most respondents (11) said they live in the Stanford in the Vale. This is followed by 7 respondents who said they have an interest in the area and 3 respondents who said they work here. The remaining respondents said they live outside Stanford in the Vale (2), regularly visit Stanford in the Vale (2) and 1 respondent selected 'other'.

#### 4. Please provide your comments on the appraisal document below.

You can view the Stanford in the Vale Appraisal document on our [website](#). If you are particularly concerned with the proposed boundary revision, you can find more detail on these in section 8 of the appraisal.

If you would like to see this document amended or improved in any way, it would be helpful if you could please explain what changes you are seeking.

ID	Comment	Officer response
209853682	Seems reasonable	Noted with thanks
210272691	<p>Supportive of the proposed boundary changes in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extension of the west end of the conservation area to fully include green at the junction of High Street and A417.</li> <li>- Extension to include garden and curtilage of Cox's Hall</li> <li>- Extension to include grounds and orchard of Orchard House</li> <li>- Extension to include former orchard north of Upper Green/Cottage Road adjacent to The Old House.</li> </ul> <p>Note that of the three parcels of land north of the primary school building:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Millennium Green is administered by the Stanford in the Vale Millennium Green Trust of which the trustee is the Parish Council</li> <li>- The centre field ( in which sheep are pictured grazing) is private land (owned by the owners of Ashdown House)</li> <li>- The school playing fields are (I think) owned and administered by the Diocese of Oxford</li> </ul> <p>None of this land is owned or administered by the Public Purposes Charity.</p>	Noted with thanks
210283371	As a neighbour of Coxs Hall I fully support the extension of the conservation area to include the garden	Noted with thanks
210378999	<p>I was pleased to receive this document. It offers useful and informative historical background and its presentation is impressive.</p> <p>I consider the proposed adjustments to the conservation area to be relevant and appropriate and therefore fully support the revised plan.</p> <p>In recent times Stanford in the Vale has been subject to a number of housing developments which have inevitably changed the nature of what was a well balanced rural village.</p> <p>In my view it is important to maintain an updated</p>	Noted with thanks



	<p>conversation area plan and preserve the setting and character of longstanding natural, architectural and also historical features.</p>	
<p>210708819</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the Somerset Statement of Community Involvement. This email forms for the basis of our response.</p> <p>Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the country's railway infrastructure and associated estate. Network Rail owns, operates, maintains and develops the main rail network. This includes the railway tracks, stations, signalling systems, bridges, tunnels, level crossings and viaducts. The preparation of development plan policy is important in relation to the protection and enhancement of Network Rail's infrastructure.</p> <p>In respect of plan making, the Council is required to engage with some groups to meet the regulations.</p> <p>Network Rail has been identified as a specific consultation body for Local Plans. Rail Network operators have also been identified for consultation on applications for planning permission.</p> <p>Network Rail wish to be consulted on the two main areas of planning both, planning policy, and planning proposals within 10m of railway land or on any development that may adversely affect/impact the safe operation of the railway.</p> <p>Network Rail require to be consulted on Neighbourhood plans where railway/ level crossings are included within the plan area.</p> <p><b>Level Crossings</b></p> <p>Any development of land which would result in a material increase or significant change in the character of traffic using rail crossings should be refused unless, in consultation with Network Rail, it can either be demonstrated that they safety will not be compromised, or where safety is compromised serious mitigation measures would be incorporated to prevent any increased safety risk as a requirement of any permission.</p> <p>Network Rail has a strong policy to guide and improve its management of level crossings, which aims to; reduce risk at level crossings, reduce the number and types of level crossings, ensure level crossings are fit for purpose, ensure Network Rail works with users / stakeholders and supports enforcement initiatives. Without significant consultation with Network Rail and if proved as required, approved mitigation measures, Network Rail would be extremely concerned if any future development impacts on the safety and operation of any of the level crossings listed above. The safety of the operational railway and of those crossing it is of the highest importance to Network Rail.</p> <p>Level crossings can be impacted in a variety of ways by</p>	<p>Appears to be an incorrect consultation response from Network Rail</p>

	<p>planning proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By a proposal being directly next to a level crossing</li> <li>• By the cumulative effect of development added over time</li> <li>• By the type of crossing involved</li> <li>• By the construction of large developments (commercial and residential) where road access to and from site includes a level crossing</li> <li>• By developments that might impede pedestrians ability to hear approaching trains</li> <li>• By proposals that may interfere with pedestrian and vehicle users' ability to see level crossing warning signs</li> <li>• By any developments for schools, colleges or nurseries where minors in numbers may be using a level crossing</li> <li>• By any development or enhancement of the public rights of way</li> </ul> <p>It is Network Rail's and indeed the Office of Rail Regulation's (ORR) policy to reduce risk at level crossings not to increase risk as could be the case with an increase in usage at the level crossings in question. The Office of Rail Regulators, in their policy, hold Network Rail accountable under the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999, and that risk control should, where practicable, be achieved through the elimination of level crossings in favour of bridges or diversions.</p> <p>The Council have a statutory responsibility under planning legislation to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the rail volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Schedule 4 (j) of the Town &amp; Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order, 2015) requires that "...development which is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway" (public footpath, public or private road) the Planning Authority's Highway Engineer must submit details to both the Secretary of State for Transport and Network Rail for separate approval.</li> </ul> <p>As Network Rail is a publicly funded organisation with a regulated remit it would not be reasonable to require Network Rail to fund rail improvements necessitated by commercial development. It is therefore appropriate to require developer contributions to fund such improvements.</p> <p>We trust these comments will be useful in the preparation of the forthcoming plan documents.</p>	
211282915	Keeping and extending conservation area is vital for the local environment. Additionally the "Important Open	Noted with thanks

	Space" by Cox's Hall is vital to be left open for reasons of conservation.	
211368413	<p>To Whom it may concern</p> <p>I have reviewed the proposed Stanford in the Vale Conservation area consultation document. Please use the following OneDrive link to assess your pdf document ( as the file is to large to attach to this form) which has the areas highlighted in yellow indicating the areas with my related comments. Please download the document to see the comments, which can be seen by clicking on the yellow highlighted area or small speech bubble symble in each highlighted area.</p> <p>The majority of the comments I have made in the document relate to the out dated understanding of the buried and build archaeological environment at Stanford in the Vale. Attached is my PhD thesis on the Archaeology of Stanford in the Vale, which was completed in September 2022. The main sections which will be of help in regards understanding the changing nature of Stanford's buried/standing archaeology and history, are discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, the Results and Discussion chapters. If you require access to the Appendixes, please send an request by email to the above address, as a link can be sent over to access these.</p> <p>I hope this is of help, and if you have any questions please let me know</p>	Noted with thanks, detailed comments below in response to annotated version sent via email
212372817	Parish Council's comments provided as pdf and shown at the end of this table	<p>The building identified as Long Acre and proposed for inclusion in the Parish's suggested extensions is a Grade II Listed Building and will be shown on the maps within the appraisal, it therefore does not need to be added to the non-designated heritage assets list.</p> <p>The proposed extension beyond that already proposed along Horsecroft (areas X and Z) would include a much larger area of open space that currently provides the rural setting to the built form of the Conservation Area. On</p>

		<p>visiting the area, the conservation team noted the attractive rural character of this area and recognised that there is a legible historic routeway here that better defines the historic extent of the built up village – this forms the proposed boundary extension that was consulted upon. Whilst it is noted that the listed Long Acre Farm has historically sat at the furthest extent of the village here, the intervening area is not of the same historic character and would be better remaining outside the designated boundary in order to better define the character of the setting of the conservation area. Guidance on the designation of Conservation Areas recommends that large areas of open space are not included unless they represent former important built areas. Conservation Areas are designed to reflect historic built and man-made areas and the inclusion of open fields and rural spaces outside built settlement edges would erode the significance of the built form. The trackway connection is noted in the draft document as an important connection between rural settlements but further inclusion of open space is not considered to add sufficient historic or architectural interest to the designated area as defined in Historic England guidance. Area Y includes the fields</p>
--	--	---

		<p>to the north of the village connecting to the historic hamlet of Bow. This area was also assessed by the Conservation Team during the assessment of the area and was not considered to contribute sufficient historic or architectural interest to the area. The former Mill and the legibility of this within the existing boundary is considered sufficient. The Ecological value of this area is not in question but would be more appropriately protected within a more wide reaching Neighbourhood Plan policy than within this SPD.</p>
212575349	<p>I have looked through the Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area Appraisal and I am impressed with it.</p> <p>I am impressed with the appraisal document but have a few comments to make.</p> <p>Page 6 left hand page – first sentence of paragraph 3 states: Stanford has had few, but fruitful, archaeological field excavations.</p> <p>This is not true. Relatively few villages have had such detailed archaeological field excavations as Stanford in the Vale has benefited from. David Ashby has based his bachelor, masters and PhD degrees on field work done here.</p> <p>Page 8 – the photo of the church needs a caption. It is Fig. 5</p> <p>Page 9 -right-hand page – 4th line of second paragraph - the word 'workers' needs an apostrophe so it reads: workers'</p> <p>Page 10 left-hand page third paragraph first line – misleading as it reads - correct it so it reads: The most notable additions to the conservation area in the 20th century rather than The most notable additions to Stanford in the 20th century</p> <p>Page 10 labourers in the caption to fig. 7 needs an apostrophe so it reads: labourers'</p> <p>Page 11 right-hand page – fourth line of second paragraph – I think some keep horses for pleasure would be more accurate than many keep horses for pleasure.</p>	<p>We have been provided with Dr Ashby's work which was published after the draft was written.</p>

	<p>Page 11 right-hand page – last paragraph. Change to read: the church of St. Denys, the services and bell ringing having taken place there for nearly a millennium. Rather than saying having run continuously which clearly isn't the case.</p> <p>Page 17 right-hand page – second paragraph – add an apostrophe to labourers so it reads: labourers' cottages</p>	
212228614	<p>Firstly, we would like to say that the Consultation Document is an excellent piece of work - interesting, thorough and well-written. Many congratulations.</p> <p>We agree with all the conclusions and recommendations in the Consultation Document, but have a further suggestion which we would like to see incorporated.</p> <p>We live in _____, a Grade II listed property located at _____. The house and outbuilding fall within the current Conservation Area, as does a non-contiguous part of our garden. Together these represent about 50% of the total curtilage area. The other 50% of the curtilage is currently outwith the Conservation Area. This part of the property contains a rectangular walled area (probably a kitchen garden originally) which appears on the 1878 Ordnance Survey map as well as a length of 6' high dry stone walling which also appears on the 1878 map.</p> <p>I attach a pdf map showing Priors Close. The full property area is shaded grey. The conservation area boundary is marked in red and walls outside the conservation area dating from earlier than 1878 are marked in blue. I also attach three photographs showing views of the relevant stone walling. (see appended below)</p> <p>Our view is that the Conservation Area should be amended so that the entirety of the curtilage of Priors Close is included within it to ensure that all the stone walls on the property shown in the 1878 OS map are given appropriate protected status.</p> <p>If you would like to arrange a visit to inspect the property and conservation assets, please contact us on 07545 300034.</p>	<p>This is very useful information and we are very grateful to have had it brought to our attention.</p>
212615865	<p>Priors Farm Barn, Chapel Road</p> <p>Appendix C: Non-Designated Heritage Assets, page 37</p> <p>Priors Farm Barn property has existing commenced permission 'Commencement of P15/V0182/FUL by construction of 46rtn parking to P15/V0182/FUL' under P18/V0734/LDP issued 3 May 2018.</p> <p>P15/V1044/DIS 'Discharge of conditions' covers the materials considered acceptable including:</p>	<p>Thank you for highlighting this as the conservation team were not aware of this planning history.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rendered plinths - Monocouche through colour cement-based render 'ivory'</li> <li>- Roof - natural slate Britlock Sandtoft 'graphite'</li> <li>- Cladding - Siberian larch</li> </ul>	
213675855	<p>Dear Sir/ Madam,</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the conservation area appraisal for Stanford-in-the-Vale.</p> <p>We welcome the writing of a conservation area appraisal for the conservation area and have no specific comments to make.</p>	Noted with thanks
213676242	<p>Thank you for your consultation request on the above dated and received by Natural England on 1st February 2023.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England does not consider that this Conservation area appraisal poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.</p> <p>The lack of comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may wish to make comments that might help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of any environmental risks and opportunities relating to this document.</p> <p>If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.</p>	Noted with thanks
213678053	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>The attached are a combination of comments by knowledgeable members of the Local History Society and one or two of my own. Separately, I will shortly forward the work of the University of Winchester archaeologist, Dr David Ashby, who has conducted numerous investigations in SITV since 2008.</p> <p>No one queries the conclusions in the appraisal concerning the Conservation Area. All are complimentary about the extensive work on the history of the village but find that there is room to offer help in light of recent research and extensive local knowledge. We hope that</p>	<p>Mapping issues have been noted and will be amended in the final draft to provide easier reference.</p> <p>Many of the detailed comments made repeat those made by other consultees.</p> <p>Corrections and References will be updated within the draft</p>

	<p>you will be able to take our comments into account in developing the final version of the document as, no doubt, it will need to stand as an important public document for many years.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>COMMENTS ON DRAFT STANFORD CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL, 7 Feb 2023</b></p> <p>General comments</p> <p>The pdf reader I am using does not work with layers; in this case it does not allow me to turn off the Instructions or to view the conservation area map.</p> <p>The Stanford appraisal seems to me to be well presented. I cannot see the map of the conservation areas, but the selection of buildings, both designated and non-designated, seems both fair and appropriate.</p> <p>Specific comments on the text</p> <p>Section 3.0, 2nd para: It is a bit of an overstatement to talk of “extreme” population fluctuations, as changes in Stanford were probably no greater than any other comparable village. Stanford was relatively large and prosperous in medieval times with a peak population probably just in excess of 400 in the early 14th century, dropping to perhaps around 200 after the Black Death. From 1400 onwards there were centuries of steady increase, reaching a population of 1075 in 1861, before dropping again in line with the national decline in agricultural prosperity. The suggestion that Stanford may have been larger in the past than in more recent times is not borne out by the population records.</p> <p>Section 4.1, 3rd para, last sentence: The charter was granted, and Church Green would have been the logical location for a market and fair, but there is no written record so far located which would support its actual implementation. The last part should read, “of what was then a large settlement”. Being “called a town” is at best controversial, and at worst untrue; certainly it was not constitutionally or functionally a town.</p> <p>Section 4.1, 5th para: Should end, “though no evidence exists for this”. (It is generally believed that Richard and Anne were married sometime between March and June 1472 at Westminster. There is no evidence at all that Stanford was the venue.)</p> <p>Section 4.1, 6th para is nonsense in that it mixes up who “held” the manor and who might have been a “lessee”; also it was not “fractious”. It should read, “After the Battle of Bosworth Field in 1485 the manor of Stanford was forfeit to the victorious Henry VII (NOT the VI) and after some years in the Crown’s hands the manor was held from 1520 in succession by the Fettiplace, Englefield and Knollys families. It was then divided into two moieties held by two prominent families until the late 18th century when it was reunited under Edward Loveden of Buscot Park.”</p>	<p>document.</p>
--	--	------------------



Section 4.2: Vine Cottage predates the Reformation; it is essentially timber-framed.  
 Section 4.3: The canal opened in 1810, not 1820.  
 Section 5.2: Historically sheep were far more important and numerous than dairy or beef herds.  
 Section 5.2: 2nd para: “ maintains its historic use as a festival and market place” is misleading. It is not used as a market place at all, and the summer fete is a relatively modern happening.  
 Section 5.3, 2nd para: “Horsecroft”, not “Horsecroft Road”.  
 Section 5.3, 3rd para: As a resident of Chapel Road I can assure you that it is anything but “low-traffic and quiet”. From 5:30am for nearly three hours it sees a very high traffic flow.  
 Page 33, caption to 20 High Street: We have drawings which confirm this was built as the schoolteacher’s house at the same time as the school itself.  
 Page 35, caption to The Anchor: Records show the lease as a pub back to 1799.

#### COMMENTS

1. Page 6 left hand page – first sentence of paragraph 3 states: Stanford has had few, but fruitful, archaeological field excavations.  
 This is not true. Relatively few villages have had such detailed archaeological field excavations as Stanford in the Vale has benefited from. David Ashby has based his bachelor, masters and PhD degrees on field work done here.
1. Page 8 – the photo of the church needs a caption. It is Fig 5
2. Page 9 -right-hand page – 4th line of second paragraph - the word ‘workers’ needs an apostrophe so it reads: workers’
3. Page 10 left-hand page third paragraph first line – misleading as it reads - correct it so it reads: The most notable additions to the conservation area in the 20th century rather than The most notable additions to Stanford in the 20th century
4. Page 10 labourers in the caption to fig. 7 needs an apostrophe so it reads: labourers’
5. Page 11 right-hand page – fourth line of second paragraph – I think some keep horses for pleasure would be more accurate than many keep horses for pleasure.
6. Page 11 right-hand page – last paragraph. Change to read: the church of St. Denys, the services and bell ringing having taken place there for nearly a millennium. Rather than saying having run continuously which clearly isn’t the case.
7. Page 17 right-hand page – second paragraph – add an apostrophe to labourers so it reads: labourers’ cottages

	<p>To the above and to David Ashby's notes I have only the following to add:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. p16 C. Millennium Green is administered not by the PPC, but by the Millennium Green Trust created by the Parish Council for that purpose.</li> <li>2. p31 App C: 53-55 High St. Originally a single farmhouse dating to 1726 (builder's plaque on wall), consistent with large fireplaces at either end. The conversion to three small residences was much later. The present arrangement in two residences dates from the 1960s.</li> </ol> <p>David refers to material on Horsecroft in your report (not Horsecroft Road, by the way). This led to some local discussion on Horsecroft's complicated past, leading to the following suggestions for some sight rewording in your report, viz:</p> <p>p7 ... trade route eastwards via Charney Bassett towards Abingdon ...</p> <p>p12 ... The line of the ancient route, once a Roman road, today becomes a dirt brideway at the end of Horsecroft as it ...</p> <p>Please feel free to come back to us with any queries.</p>	
213678784	<p>The following has been extracted from an annotated copy of the consultation draft document by Dr. David Ashby as the original file was too large to attach to the survey and too large to include in the consultation report.</p> <p>Page 4 Highlighted text "The farming hamlet of Bow" Comment: However, it should be noted that 'Bow' is part of the parish of SITV</p> <p>Page 6 Highlighted text: "Stanford has had few" Comment: This is not totally true. They have been quite a few fruitful excavations. Over 63 test pits and 19 evaluation trenches as part of research alone, plus communal archaeological work.</p> <p>Highlighted text: "besides St. Denys" Comment: Vine Cottage and Church green cottages have both also had in depth building surveys which have been published.</p> <p>Highlighted text: "Cox's Hall, Orchard House, Cromwell House, and Manor House," Comment: Vine cottage and the Old Rectory should be added to this list</p>	<p>We are very grateful to have received such detailed comments on the draft. At the time of writing this draft, Dr Ashby's Thesis had not been published and is not a report that can be easily accessed for the purposes of drafting this Development Management tools and SPDs.</p> <p>Updates will be made to the document where the information provided by Dr Ashby corrects or improves upon the detail already provided in the document.</p> <p>We do not propose to add large amounts of new detail as the document is intended as a tool to aid the assessment of development proposals and provide a context to</p>

	<p>Page 7  Highlighted text: "bridleway"  Comment: Horse croft was only recently (in the last 100 years) changed to a bridleway. prior to this it was a road/track joining Charny Basset to SITV</p> <p>Page 8  Highlighted text: "The Romans were especially active"  Comment: What about the pre-Roman evidence? There is archaeological evidence for Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age activity at Stanford.</p> <p>Highlighted text: "1086 as having 51 households"  Comment: This should have a reference to: Morris, J. 1979. Domesday Book. Phillimore, Chichester</p> <p>Highlighted text: "royal charter in 1230, permitting a weekly market and annual fair"  Comment: This should have a reference:  <a href="https://archives.history.ac.uk/gazetteer/gazweb2.html">https://archives.history.ac.uk/gazetteer/gazweb2.html</a></p> <p>Highlighted text: "Little Ice Age and the Black Death, and partly due to a collapse in the wool trade to Europe, meant growth in Stanford plateaued."  Comment: Reference missing: Ashby, D. 2022. Stanford in the Vale in Context: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Rural Settlement Development in Oxfordshire. PhD Thesis, University of Winchester</p> <p>Highlighted text: "Black Death"  Comment: Plague rather than black death. most likely anthrax or typhoid</p> <p>Page 9  Highlighted text: "Most of the workers housing around Horsecroft and along Chapel Road was built during this time to accommodate the new labourers"  Comment: As well as Bow road as part of the brick works</p> <p>Highlighted text: "Vine Cottage"  Comment: This was not replaced, it was more expanded/adapted. there is still a late medieval crook house at its centra</p> <p>Highlighted text: "Manor House"  Comment: This was stone during the Medieval period, not timber.</p> <p>Highlighted text: "The Compton Census of 1676 notes a population of 260, after a loss of 33 in 1649 due to plague."</p>	<p>build upon. Very detailed assessments should be provided by developers and their contractors in support of proposals as per Local and National Policy Requirements – high levels of very specific detail would be beyond the remit of this document but improvements will be made to references to Dr Ashby’s research in order to aid interested parties to find out more.</p>
--	---	--

Comment: Missing reference.

Highlighted text: "Cox's Hall"

Comment: The current coxes hall building was, however it is highly likely that the current wing is an extension of a earlier medieval stone hall, as indicated by documentary source and archaeological evidence.

Page 10

Highlighted text: "today the United Reformed Church)"

Comment: This is now in private ownership

Page 11

Highlighted text: "The earliest evidence of a settlement appears in linear form on High Street along what would have been a bridleway connecting Shellingford and Charney Bassett."

Comment: I presume this is making reference to the Roman settlement? If so this is not the earliest evidence for a settlement. There is archaeological evidence for a nucleated settlement at SITV in the Neolithic.

Highlighted text: "This historic shift from one development pattern to another resulted in the "long, straggling village" pattern we see today, and is a key ingredient to Stanford's special interest."

Comment: The archaeological evidence suggests that the High Street and Chapel Road were likely laid down from the Roman period, with a fort and related features. Therefore its straggly nature much predated its post Saxon form.

Highlighted text: "Village plots are generous"

Comment: It should be noted that the majority of these large garden plots likely date back to the medieval period.

Page 13

Highlighted text: "Much of the limestone rubble used might have come from the nearby Shellingford Quarry"

Comment: As well as SITV own quarry pit, which was located where the Farm Piece estate now is.

Page 15

Highlighted text: "The small areas"

Comment: This forms Lower Green, one of the 3 important Greens in the village.

Page 16

Highlighted text: "but are today administered by a Public Purposes Charity"

Comment: Only Millennium Green is overseen by the charity. The sheep paddock is in private hands (Owned by

Ashdown House).

Highlighted text: "may once have been private land"  
Comment: There were all part of the Manor House farm estates.

Highlighted text: "Millenium Green"  
Comment: Has an earthwork at its northern end which forms the Saxon, Medieval and post medieval Manor House platform.

Page 18

Highlighted text: "Upper Green"  
Comment: Upper green also has a rectangular earthworm relating to the Pound which was once located on it. likely medieval in date.

Page 22

Highlighted text: "The council will aim to"  
Comment: Should be added that subtable archaeological surveys for example building recording, excavation, geophysics, watching briefs should be undertaken prior to development work being undertaken, to prevent the loss of the archaeological environment, recored by record.

Page 25

Highlighted text: "United Reformed Church"  
Comment: It should also be esquires made with Historic England to add it to the Listed Buildings register, to prevent demolition/major external changes.

Page 26

Highlighted text: "Stanford's oldest residential building: Orchard House"  
Comment: This is not Stanford's oldish residential hose. Vine Cottage and the Church green cottages are much older.

Page 27

Highlighted text: "Selected Bibliography"  
Comment: Update bibliography with missing reference's, as stated in previous comments.

Page 28


Highlighted text: "No settlement features of this date have been identified so the occupation is likely to have been nomadic and ephemeral, probably drawn to the area by the river and its tributaries"  
Comment: This is not true. there is evidence for constant settlement activity at SITV since the Neolithic onwards, as well as lots of hunter gather activity with flint working

	<p>areas in the Mesolithic. See: Ashby, D. 2022. Stanford in the Vale in Context: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Rural Settlement Development in Oxfordshire. PhD Thesis, University of Winchester</p> <p>Highlighted text: "or farmstead"  Comment: Defiantly a settlement, most likely a fort with vecus. See: Ashby, D. 2022. Stanford in the Vale in Context: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Rural Settlement Development in Oxfordshire. PhD Thesis, University of Winchester</p> <p>Highlighted text: "Ashdown House"  Comment: Passable evidence also for an early Saxon timer framed hall in Ashdown House paddock. See: Ashby, D. 2022. Stanford in the Vale in Context: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Rural Settlement Development in Oxfordshire. PhD Thesis, University of Winchester</p> <p>Page 29  Highlighted text: "pound"  Comment: The Pound was located on Upper Green and likely dates to the Medieval period. there is a earthwork and archaeological evidence for this: See: Ashby, D. 2022. Stanford in the Vale in Context: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Rural Settlement Development in Oxfordshire. PhD Thesis, University of Winchester</p> <p>Highlighted text: "The Manor House dates to the C16th"  Comment: The current manor house. however it overlays earlier manor house structures dating to the Medieval and Saxon periods. See: Ashby, D. 2022. Stanford in the Vale in Context: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Rural Settlement Development in Oxfordshire. PhD Thesis, University of Winchester</p> <p>Highlighted text: "Cropmarks"  Comment: There are parchments and earthwork, not crop marks.</p> <p>Page 30  Highlighted text: "Cox's Hall"  Comment: And Wall Approximately 15 Metres South of Coxs Hall also II*</p>	
--	--	--

**5. You can upload any supporting documents using the button below.**


3 respondents attached supporting documents to support their comments which can be found in the Appendix.

## 6. Which of the following describes how you identify yourself?




Most respondents identify as a male (9) and only 2 respondents identify as a female.

## 7. How old are you?



There was a fairly even spread of respondents across the age brackets with 2 respondents each from the 45-54, 55-64, 65-74 and 75+ age groups. Only one respondent is aged between 25 to 34. The remaining respondent preferred not to say.

**8. What is your ethnic group?**




**Other (please specify):**

- Please note you will not eradicate racism by asking questions like these

Most respondents (8) said they are from a ‘White British - English, Welsh, Scottish and Northern Irish’ ethnic group. 2 respondents preferred not to say and the remaining respondent selected ‘other’.

**9. Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more?**



**If yes, please specify:**


- Server Dyslexia, Dysgraphia, Hypermobile Ehlers-Danlos Syndrome (hEDS)

Most respondents (9) said their day-to-day activities aren’t limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more.



Only 1 respondent said yes, due to *Server Dyslexia, Dysgraphia, Hypermobile Ehlers-Danlos Syndrome (hEDS)*. The remaining respondent preferred not to answer this question.

**10. How did you hear about the review of the Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area appraisal?**



**Other (please specify):**

- *Local History society*

Most respondents (5) heard about the Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area consultation via email and word of mouth (5), followed by the council’s website (3). The remaining respondents (3) heard about the consultation via their parish council (1), district council (1) and the remaining respondent selected ‘other’.

# SURVEY

A copy of the online survey is provided below.

## Review of the Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area

We are carrying out a review of the conservation area in Stanford in the Vale.

As part of the review process, we are now inviting comments on the Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area Appraisal document. This includes proposed changes to the conservation area boundary in the following places (from section 8 of the appraisal document):

- The addition of green verges at the western end of the High Street and the former orchards adjacent to Orchard House and 17 Upper Green.
- The additions of 9-10, 15-24, 27 Horsecroft, and 35 High Street.
- The removal of 25-27 High Street.
- Small boundary adjustments at Bear House, Cox's Hall, Penstone's Court, and Hunter's Piece.

In some areas, the revision is intended to update any issues caused by past mapping and changes to property boundaries over time. In other areas, the boundary could be extended to areas that add to the architectural and historic interest of the area and are therefore worthy of including within the designated boundary.

You will have the opportunity to comment on the above proposed changes and Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area Appraisal document in this survey.

You can find out more information about the review and download the appraisal document on our [website](#).

We are inviting your comments on the proposed changes during a five week consultation period which runs from Wednesday 1 February until 11.59pm Wednesday 8 March, 2023.



### Personal details

If you are responding as an individual, you are not required to provide your name or personal details. If you are responding on behalf of a business, organisation, or other we will ask for its name and this information may be published. Any personal information you provide to the council within your comments that could identify you will not be published. Further information on data protection is available on in our [privacy statement](#).

### Queries?

If you have any questions on the draft appraisal, survey or require it in an alternative format (for example large print, Braille, audio, email, Easy Read and alternative languages) please contact our Conservation team at [conservationconsults@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:conservationconsults@southandvale.gov.uk) or call 01235 422600.

### What happens next

After the consultation period ends, we will consider your comments and make appropriate

changes to the draft document and boundary revision before we proceed to adopt it via the council's cabinet process. Once adopted, we will publish the cabinet **report, new Conservation Area Appraisal document and adopted revised boundary on our website.**

## A bit about you

### 1. Are you responding as: \*

- an individual / member of the public
- a business / organisation
- Other (please specify):

### 2. Please provide the name of the business / organisation, council or body you are representing:

### 3. What is your connection to Stanford in the Vale? Please tick all that apply.

- I live here
- I work here
- I live outside Stanford in the Vale
- I regularly visit Stanford in the Vale
- I have an interest in the area
- Other (please specify):

## Your comments

### 4. Please provide your comments on the appraisal document below.

You can view the Stanford in the Vale Appraisal document on our [website](#). If you are particularly concerned with the proposed boundary revision, you can find more detail on these in section 8 of the appraisal.

If you would like to see this document amended or improved in any way, it would be helpful if you could please explain what changes you are seeking. \*

## 5. You can upload any supporting documents using the button below.

Choose File

## 5. Our commitment to equal access for all

We are committed to making sure that residents have equal access to all council services. Please help us to keep track of how successfully we are achieving this by ticking the appropriate boxes below.

All questions are optional. All information is confidential and will only be used to help us monitor whether views differ across the community.

## 6. Which of the following describes how you identify yourself?

- Male
- Female
- Neither of the above (specify below if you would like to)
- Prefer not to say
- I identify as:

## 7. How old are you?

- 16-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65-74
- 75+
- Prefer not to say

## 8. What is your ethnic group?

- Prefer not to say

### White

- English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish, British
- Irish
- Gypsy or Irish Traveller
- Any other white background

### Asian or Asian British

- Indian

- Pakistani
- Bangladeshi
- Chinese
- Any other Asian background

**Black or Black British**

- Caribbean
- African
- Any other black background

**Mixed or Multiple Ethnic Groups**

- White and Black Caribbean
- White and Black African
- White and Asian
- Any other mixed background

**Other Ethnic Group**

- Arab
- Other (please specify):

**9. Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more?**

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

If yes, please specify:

**10. How did you hear about the review of the Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area appraisal?**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Email          | <input type="checkbox"/> District Council  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Instagram      | <input type="checkbox"/> Poster  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Facebook       | <input type="checkbox"/> Word of mouth   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Our website    | <input type="checkbox"/> Letter  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Twitter        | <input type="checkbox"/> Newsletter  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parish Council | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify):<br><input style="width: 380px;" type="text"/> |



# COMMUNICATION

A copy of the email notification issued to the council's consultation database is provided below.

**Subject:** Your comments are invited on the Review of Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area

Dear [NAME]

We are emailing to invite you to have your say on proposed changes to the conservation area in Stanford in the Vale as this may be of interest to you.

## **What is a conservation area?**

The village's conservation area is the designated area of special architectural or historic interest which exists to protect the features and characteristics that make Stanford in the Vale a historic, unique and distinctive place.

## **Why are we reviewing the conservation area?**

It is a requirement that all councils coordinate and publish appraisals for the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas and that these proposals are reviewed from time to time.

This is the first comprehensive Conservation Area Appraisal document that has been produced for Stanford in the Vale. The document has been authored by the Conservation and Design Team at the Vale of White Horse District Council. We have a statutory duty to consult the public on this new document before it is adopted.

## **Have your say as part of our review process**

As part of the review process, we are now inviting comments on the Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area Appraisal document.

You can download the appraisal and find out more information about the review on our website. <https://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/stanfordconservation>

## **How to comment**

We are inviting your comments on the Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area Appraisal document during a five-week consultation period which runs from **Wednesday 1 February until 11.59pm Wednesday 8 March**.

The quickest and easiest way to comment is to use our [online comment form](#).

Note that this is a unique link just for you and is tied to your email address. If you would like to forward this message to anybody else, please refer them to the [public link to the survey](#).

## **What happens next**

After the consultation period ends, we will consider your comments and make appropriate changes to the draft document and boundary revision before we proceed to

adopt it via the council's cabinet process. Once adopted, we will publish the cabinet report, new conservation area appraisal document and adopted revised boundary on our [website](#).

We look forward to hearing your views.

Kind regards

**Boris van der Ree**

Conservation Enquiry Officer

Vale of White Horse District Council

---

If you need support to access the consultation materials, have any queries about the survey form or require it in an alternative format (for example: large print, Braille, audio, email, Easy Read or alternative languages) please email [conservationconsults@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:conservationconsults@southandvale.gov.uk) or call 01235 422600.

**Opt-out:** If you do not wish to receive further emails from us like this, please [click here](#), and you will be removed from our consultation mailing list. Please note, we may still need to contact you for certain consultations if we have a legal obligation to do so.

**Data protection:** Please refer to our planning consultations privacy statement regarding how your personal data is used for this consultation, available on the consultation page of [our website](#). If you would like to know more about the council's data protection registration or to find out about your personal data, please visit [our website](#).



## FURTHER INFORMATION

For information about the consultation or the results presented in this report, please contact:

### **Consultation and Community Engagement Team**

South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils

01235 422 425

[haveyoursay@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:haveyoursay@southandvale.gov.uk)

To enquire about the council's work on the Stanford in the Vale Conservation Area consultation, please contact:

### **Conservation Area Team**

South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils

01235 422 600

[conservationconsults@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:conservationconsults@southandvale.gov.uk)

END.