

Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village

Joint meeting with Grosvenor, WODC and Eynsham groups held on 12 March 2020

This record has three parts:

A Eynsham groups' key action points agreed at a (part virtual) meeting on 19th March

B Grosvenor's response to questions sent in advance (page 3)

C Notes of the meeting held on 12 March- a record of our questions and summary discussion (page 6)

A Eynsham groups' key action points agreed at a meeting on 19th March

This follows the same priority themes as the meeting.

1 Democratic ownership

- We feel very strongly that this is fundamental and should not be rushed. Community ownership means that all residents have a share in the freehold and buy into the ethos of the GV Trust (eg car limitation, traffic free areas, restrictions on subletting and buy for rent, community energy and management).
- We would like to see a copy of the Collaborative Housing Hub report and we are hoping to co-operate with WODC and others to make sure that meaningful ownership, eg by a CLT, is achieved.
- We encourage WODC to actively pursue options for ownership.
- We welcome the idea of a community farm (owned via a GV Trust) but it needs to be larger and should include the 'retained agricultural land' to the north of the SLG site but outside Grosvenor's current red line. This would give the Trust an income, as well as opportunities for occasional educational and community access etc. This and the 'retained wetland' to the south west, should be community owned and included in the site.
- It is essential that open land within the SLG be protected from further redevelopment.
- In the regrettable absence of open book accounting, we expect openness on viability assessments.

2 Successful place-making and creative design

- As the location of uses will be fixed at outline planning it is essential to take the time now to get it right; for instance the location of the sixth form centre (not college?) looks unacceptable as it is on high ground over a mile from Bartholomew.
- We do not see the logic of submitting an outline application prior to the completion of the AAP, nor the overlap of masterplan, AAP with its own masterplan and potentially two design codes. This will surely confuse and disillusion consultees. We have concern about the impact of coronavirus restrictions on scrutiny and the democratic process. Reserved Matters should not be relied on to secure the quality of the housing. Again, what is the rush?
- We have seen the illustrative masterplan but we understand that the parameter plan(s) are key outline planning documents. We need to see parameter plans showing landscape and land use, access and movement, building height and densities etc with sufficient detail for comment, as soon as possible.
- We think the masterplan should cover the whole SLG area.
- The village centre needs a well designed civic space for gatherings and activities rather than allotment style gardens (although edibles eg local apple varieties could feature here).
- We need assurance that there will be continuity of expert oversight in matters of design, standards, construction and management. We plan to pilot an 'innovation panel'.
- We need assurance that named architects or preferably design competitions will be employed to raise standards of design and innovation.
- The S106 should be drafted at the beginning and amended through the application process. We need to understand the scope and suggest it includes extended community farmland (see below).

3 Genuinely affordable housing

- We encourage WODC to actively pursue options for ownership of social housing.
- We need a commitment to accommodate the full range of 'specialist housing' (as defined in the AAP); the adopted ENP calls for retirement housing which needs to be in the busy centre of the village, not on the edge. It is too early for all potential groups, eg collaborative housing groups, to be identified, but it should not be precluded at this stage. We welcome the commitment to a mixed, tenure blind layout.

- We expect an enforceable guarantee of 50% affordable housing including a stated proportion of housing with 40% discount.
- We expect the Design Code and site planning to allow live/work units and dispersed employment. We challenge WODC's requirement for 40ha employment in one area when there is so much unused business space locally (is the rehabilitation centre still being considered?)

4 Low impact on the planet: energy and fabric

- This still does not have the priority it demands and does not appear in the vision; but zero carbon – energy positive is a GV principle and aim of the Energy Plan. In the Design Review presentation, the climate change section begins at p13 with biodiversity, while energy and fabric are the final item at p48.
- We expect Grosvenor to reflect the ambitions of the Green Building Council and LETI, which they have publicly endorsed, and following their lead to reject the inadequate Future Homes Standard approach.
- We expect to see WODC's energy viability assessment and look forward to working with Ness Scott and the OCC Innovation Hub to raise the ambition for fabric and energy.
- We expect to see Grosvenor's Energy masterplan and the AAP, with quantitative and enforceable minimum energy standards for all dwellings and other buildings to meet the GV principle.
- We need confirmation of the commitment to renewables and anticipated output. District schemes should not be precluded.
- The carbon embodied in the new infrastructure should be offset by payments into a community carbon fund to pay for energy refits/subdivisions of existing houses and buildings in Eynsham.
- We will continue to press for a community energy company, community renewables and the development of a local grid via Project Leo and the Low Carbon Hub and expect other parties to co-operate to achieve the vision of the Energy Plan.

5 Low impact on the planet: transport

- The design must reduce car parking on each plot from the outset, concentrate on shared parking, equipped with charging points and aimed primarily at car clubs and include car free areas.¹
- Will the underpass be completed before houses are built and how is it funded? We remain unconvinced that an underpass will be the preferred route.
- We think that a wide, straight, well designed and surfaced A40 crossing at the Salt Way will be needed before houses are occupied, to accommodate a range of users and horses safely, in a similar way to a level crossing. The design of any bus priority will need very careful attention.
- The idea of perimeter parkland with a footpath linking Eynsham and the GV should be reinstated.
- The OCC rule of two accesses for more than 500 dwellings must not enable through motor traffic (other than public transport) and must not enable a ratrun.
- We need to see WODC's viability assessments for infrastructure.
- We do not understand why the community cannot grow from the centre, rather than starting with two isolated and car dependent perimeter sites.
- We expect the Design Code to set out path and road design and surfacing which clearly prioritises pedestrians and bicycles over vehicles, so cars are 'intruding'.
- We need confirmation of how many off site cycle routes will be provided.
- Routes should include attractive pedestrian and cycling access from the residential areas to the P&R.
- A long term Travel Plan is essential.

6 Biodiversity

- Arable areas need to continue to be managed to favour arable weeds- and included in the site (see above), preferably managed by the same farmer.
- Biodiversity net gain should be achieved within the site area, not offset.
- We would welcome provision for edible streets in the Design Code.
- Traditional allotment space on the edge of the village is old fashioned, unimaginative and too distant from many; better to have the same area in smaller informal growing spaces surrounded by houses.
- We favour wildlife permeable hedges and open fences rather than closed boarded fences.

¹<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/mar/15/forward-thinking-utrecht-builds-car-free-district-for-12000-people>

B Grosvenor's response to questions sent in advance

(NB This was before we had seen the March 2020 masterplan)

Introduction

These are questions we have raised with Grosvenor in the past and are issues of great concern to the local community. They are key to achieving an exemplar development true to the principles of a Garden Village. We are concerned that many of the standards apparently accepted in consultation have been watered down to the point that we can no longer reassure the community that it will be the best it can be. Of particular concern is that Grosvenor have indicated that the high environmental standards which have been an agreed position throughout are being reduced primarily on the grounds of cost, citing the constraints on the site which have been known from the beginning. This is unacceptable given the climate emergency. These questions relate to discussions at our meeting in May 2019. We will explore the main points at our meeting in the light of further information received.

Grosvenor: A robust response to Climate Change, involving reducing/eliminating the impact development on the environment is very important to us. Therefore, we have looked at how we push the commitments in the Outline Planning Application as far as possible (and over and above current standards) to achieve a substantial reduction in carbon emissions from energy required to heat the new homes, as well as achieving a biodiversity net gain.

Whilst doing this, we have had to keep in mind the viability and deliverability of the scheme in the round. As we have explained, the development is going to be delivered through market sales and the involvement of a variety of housebuilders. The onus will also be on them to demonstrate how they comply with increasingly more stringent legislation on carbon. We don't want to make commitments in the Outline Planning Application and achieve a permission that is going to be challenged and changed by the housebuilders as it is undeliverable. We will make commitments that we believe will enable to move to zero carbon as the development is built, if all other stakeholders collaborate to achieve this goal.

1 Democratic ownership

At the last meeting it was noted that ownership, governance and stewardship issues would be taken forward and Grosvenor had talked of a consultation event early this year. What is Grosvenor's experience of different models of community ownership and governance and how are you making sure that the garden village is to a significant extent owned and governed by the community? Will there be consultation on this?

- At the last meeting you said that the site could be subdivided into areas for different ownership models (eg community Land Trusts). What progress have you made on this?
- At the last meeting you stated that Grosvenor can influence Section 106 implementation. Can you explain the scope of your Section 106 commitment?

Grosvenor: We understand WODC has initiated some work to assess the feasibility of forming a Community Trust, however Grosvenor has not been asked to input into this process or participate.

Before we can discuss options available for long term community stewardship, we need to understand from the County and WODC their appetite in becoming involved including adoption of key spaces and long-term commitment to management.

There is nothing in the Planning Application documents being submitted that pre-determines or dictates future outcomes, so this conversation with the authority, the Parish and the wider community will be continuing as the application moves through the determination stage in the next few months.

2 Successful place-making and creative design

At the last meeting we noted 'an independent design and inspiration panel should be put in place'. In the event a Design Review Panel was put in place. At the second review, the Panel commented that the masterplan did not show how it would be innovative or inspirational, or deal with the climate emergency; and that the layouts were a standard developer response. What main features are now innovative, inspirational and deal with the climate emergency?

- At the last meeting you said design competitions will be considered after the outline planning stage. Is that a commitment? Will there be named architects?
- At the last meeting you said there would be a range of delivery partners. On what criteria will they be selected and will it include smaller, specialist contractors/providers?
- How will you achieve continuity in design- will there be an ongoing role for design review or another body? What role will the design review panel have in the design code and detailed design?
- Have you increased density to free up more open space?
- Have you decreased the number and area of roads? Will there be vehicle free areas?
- Has phasing been amended and how?
- Will you make provision for an independent system of site inspection?

Grosvenor: We have evolved the Masterplan to reflect the Design Review Panel comments, but also applied our own judgment as experienced developers of what placemaking principles and deliverability considerations are appropriate for the Garden Village.

Our latest presentation was very well received by BOBMK. There remain matters of details to be addressed that are not appropriate for an Outline Planning Application stage.

3 Genuinely affordable housing

Will you deliver 50% 'affordable' housing (80% of market cost) and of this what % will be social housing (60% of market cost)? How much social housing will be rented accommodation?

- At the last meeting the need for socially mixed, balanced community was agreed.
- Will you ensure that different tenures be dispersed throughout the site?
- How much land will be allocated to specialist housing (for older people, people with disabilities, community owned/collaborative housing student/graduate housing and employment-linked housing)?
- Will you exceed the minimum 5% plots for self build and custom build?
- Will there be live/work units?
- Can you give a breakdown of different tenures by phase (rented-lease or commonhold- shared equity and sale)?

Grosvenor: The delivery of affordable housing, including quantum and the specific tenure mix, is being discussed with WODC as part of a wider viability conversation.

Last week, the Council agreed to pass a recommendation that the Garden Village should be zero rated for CIL purposes (land tax) on the back of viability concerns. Having said this, the baseline policy position on affordable housing remains that 50% should be provided, subject to viability.

Grosvenor is doing some work to understand costs/value of different affordable housing options and has already had conversations with the housing officers who will help us understand this.

4 Low impact on the planet

Energy and fabric

Since the last meeting an Energy Plan is being developed. Will you commit to the Energy Plan vision of an exemplar of net zero carbon, energy positive development?

- Emily Hamilton, Senior Sustainability Manager at Grosvenor Britain & Ireland endorsed the excellent 'The LETI Climate Emergency Design Guide. Will Grosvenor commit to be a 'pathfinder' project?
- Will the design code include a requirement to conduct whole life embodied carbon calculations and aim to achieve 40% carbon emission reductions (as in the LETI guide)?
- Will you rule out the use of fossil fuels to heat buildings on the site (as in the LETI guide)?
- Your stated approach is 'fabric first' but you seem to be resisting anything in excess of Building Regulations. Worryingly the proposed BR changes could lead to a *decrease* in fabric efficiency. Will you achieve fabric efficiency of 15-20 kWh/m²/yr as recommended by the CCC (this would include Passivhaus at 15 kWh/m²/yr)?

- Will there be a system to measure and verify energy consumption and disclose energy consumption of all new homes? Will there be incentives for eg using efficient appliances and reducing unregulated energy use?
- At our last meeting you said Grosvenor is prepared to invest some of their own money beyond Section 106 for energy infrastructure and delivery.
- **What progress have you made on options for a Community Renewable Energy Company and use of a local grid?**

Transport

- **How many cycle and pedestrian routes will the development fund, within and beyond the site?**
- Have the physical links to Eynsham now been agreed and funded?
- What will discourage car use to services (education, health)?
- What are the parking standards and is parking provision different from the conventional approach?

Waste

- Is there provision for an integrated waste management system to minimise vehicle movements and landfill?

Grosvenor: We are committing to no gas and going above Building Regulations current standards. Some of the details requested are over and above the appropriate level of detail for an Outline Planning Application (e.g. monitoring energy consumption). WODC must enforce these demands at Reserved Matter stage, when housebuilders will be able to give more information related to a specific phase's types and mix of houses.

5 Biodiversity

At the last meeting Grosvenor acknowledged that biodiversity net gain will be mandatory and connectivity for nature is paramount. What % biodiversity gain can be achieved on the site? Or is it a case of how much damage can be mitigated?

- Will you make provision for biodiversity to be monitored in the short and long term?
- How many trees will be planted? How many will be felled?
- How much carbon will be sequestered?
- Will the Design Code include a requirement to maintain and manage continuous 'big hedges' and arable plant and wildflower meadows to maintain connectivity?
- Where are the community orchards?
- Where are the smaller, dispersed community growing spaces surrounded by houses? Will this be in the Design Code?

Grosvenor: We are trying very hard to achieve a net gain on site. With the Masterplan reaching its final stage we can now re-run the Defra Metric that has been required by WODC as a measuring tool.

Our approach is as recommended in best practice which is to (a) avoid impact all together where possible and (b) if this cannot be avoided to mitigate on site.

We aim to have a planting strategy that retains trees on site and increases the number of trees overall. Details of carbon sequestration will not be possible until Reserved Matters stage where detailed proposals are submitted for approval.

The Design Code, together with the landscape strategy, will require areas to be planted with orchards.

C Notes of the meeting held on 12 March 2020

Attendees

Eynsham groups

Eynsham Planning Improvement Campaign (EPIC): Sarah Couch (Angie Titchen was unwell)

City Farm Management Company: Nigel Pearce

GreenTEA (Transition Eynsham Area): Tony Bovey

Peace Oak Association: Sue Raikes

Town & Country Planning Association member: Ursula Howard

PfT Planning: Daniel Scharf

Eynsham Parish Council: Gordon Beach

Farmer, City Farm: Robert Crocker accepted the invitation but was unable to attend

WODC

Andrea Clenton, Ness Scott, Joan Desmond

Councillors Carl Rylett and Dan Levy

OCC

Councillor Charles Mathew

Jacqui Cox, Infrastructure Locality Lead Cherwell & West Communities, Raymond Cheung (Transport),

Amrik Manku, Growth Manager for Cherwell & West

Grosvenor team

Silvia Lazzerini

Rupert Biggin

Andy Sharpe

Merlene Austin

Richard Burton - Terence O'Rourke

Paul Comerford - Aecom

Jonny Riggall - Stantec (formerly PBA)

Kevin Murray - KMA

Welcome and introductions: Sue Raikes

Sue's introduction

Thanks for coming – and Grosvenor thanks for your answers to questions.

Delighted that we now have representatives WODC, OCC, Parish and District councillors

- Very few from the Eynsham community are still involved from 60 at first Community Forum. Dropped out because felt could not influence – but we know there is considerable interest in GV – sure elected reps will agree. The Referendum on ENP resounding majority for the NP – 1157 in favour of high standards for growth in Eynsham.
- We can't represent Eynsham – though we represent different organisations in the village and lots of informal conversations. We have stuck with as we thought there was a chance to build an exemplar, something really innovative.. and we are still hoping.
- At our meeting last May and in the charette we felt there was much agreement about standards – and we recorded where we agreed in the notes of that meeting. We are concerned that there seems to be some watering down of those standards.
- We have been told that the financial constraints (viability), including the land value of the site mean that we can no longer expect the highest standards. At our May meeting we asked for Open book accounting. What we mean is an honesty about the finances. We have asked about the net gain for landlords – including the County Council. And the profit for Grosvenor.
- This argument about constraints is not acceptable – these constraints were known from the beginning. We are particularly concerned about energy standards being compromised - especially since we now have a Climate emergency.
- We are pleased to see some aspects of the revised outline masterplan eg the community farm, self build sites, wide green corridors, location of burial space, no fossil fuel commitment etc- but there remain some fundamental issues.
- Many of these seem to stem from issues (maybe even passing the buck) between different parties; owners/Grosvenor/WODC/OCC. We now have two versions of a plan. But no design code which we were told is the

key to standards. The AAP (which we have not seen)- has its own masterplan. This does not demonstrate joined up thinking.

- And these timings don't make sense to us. What is the sequence and why the rush? The key is to get it right. So we are very pleased to have all partners in the room. A huge number of brains are working on this (paid and unpaid!)- we expect them to resolve the conflicts rather than claim it is someone else's responsibility.
- We are concerned from Grosvenor's response that this is not the time for detail. But as ever The devil is in the detail. Even if they are outside the scope of the planning application a robust framework and standards need to be agreed now and continuity and oversight built in. Once planning is agreed when do we get another chance to participate before some key issues get firmed up. The issue of continuity and ensuring standards are achieved in delivery and long term stewardship is an ongoing theme. We are very concerned about continuity and holding the future builders to account especially on energy and climate issues.

Because of the lack of detailed responses, we have a longer list of questions than you hoped for! We need to be very focussed.

1 Democratic ownership: Ursula Howard

1a Our points: Ursula's text:

- We are here, aren't we, because we all want to be convinced still that this is the right development in the right place at the right time. We are not convinced, but hope this meeting will give us confidence and hope to continue to find a long-lasting, beautifully and sustainable community which adheres fully to Garden City Principles. We face an unprecedented affordable/social housing shortage which as of yesterday the Government has recognised we need billions to address
- As far as we know the key principle of democratic ownership – which includes the long-term stewardship of assets - is not yet reflected in the outline masterplan or Design Code. Planning is at an early stage so there is much to play for.
- Democratic ownership eg a Community Land Trust is fundamental to a Garden Village. What is WODC's aspiration? What has happened to the study on community ownership by the Collaborative Housing Hub? We do not understand why Grosvenor has not been involved in this work and to what extent its recommendations will be implemented.
- The Garden City principle of land value capture for community benefit means more than owning public spaces and taking the responsibility of maintaining them. It is also about co-ownership of freehold and community-based regulation, e.g. of sales, lettings and usage. We accept that a full transfer of land is unlikely but we need a clear declaration of the purpose and extent of democratic ownership and how that can be achieved.
- The Trust should be a community-owned asset which manages and gains income from the land, housing and facilities that it owns. The Letchworth model means its accumulated wealth is enabling a second garden city to be developed. We would expect community ownership of a substantial amount of eg social housing, open spaces, community buildings and business space, community farm land etc so that some income is generated.
- We imagine that the community organisation or Trust would be managed by a board of residents, with expert help. All residents would be members, including those in rented social housing, where the Trust owns the property, but also associate membership. We imagine that home owners and others buy into the concept so that they share the ethos, and have a stake in management and other issues such as, for example, regulating subletting as garden suburbs do (esp short lettings Airbnb). Freeholders would pay into the Trust for continuing care of public spaces to high standard and aesthetic (as they do on Taylor Wimpey sites for the land management). The special ethos can add value for all.
- The Trust should be managed by professionals and Garden City experts employed by it. Need to find ways to give "ownership" of community facilities with long term funding.
- How can we ensure that this is taken forward by you and that decisions now will not preclude meaningful ownership?
- The issue of S 106 agreements is critical to affordable housing: what is the proposed commitment to ensure a workable village with high quality infrastructure?
- This project has many stakeholders, including all of us here. Most of us here will be living with this project for our lifetimes and our future generations who'll live here. That's why our voices are strong.

In this light we have some strategic questions.

- We would like WODC to clarify your ongoing actions in relation to the development of a Community Land Trust, which would enable much of the above to be realised.
- Please can you share what you think about how much flexibility and engagement there is from the landowners to achieve true Garden Village aims?
- We would like to ask Grosvenor to consider a ground-shifting possibility which would secure a material and reputational legacy. This possibility would make a model to reduce the inequality in housing, which is shocking in

Oxfordshire. is another Garden City principle. Can you ensure a high proportion of social and affordable housing? Can it be quantified?

- SO: Would Grosvenor Strategic Land, within its structures of management and expertise, be prepared to consider recommending to the Duke of Westminster (and his decision-making people) that Grosvenor, using their charitable arm and resources, BUY THE LAND FROM ITS EXISTING OWNERS AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME AND HOLD IT IN TRUST for the community in binding legal terms until worked-up plans are in place for an ecologically sustainable Garden Village? We ask you to think big, think socially and think long-term in a world facing unprecedented challenges. That is what Garden communities were and are about.

1b Our points: Advance text:

- As far as we know this aspect is not reflected in the outline masterplan or Design Code and is at an early stage.
- The Garden City principle of land value capture for community benefit means more than owning public spaces and taking the responsibility of maintaining them. We accept that a full transfer of land is unlikely but we need a clear declaration of the purpose of democratic ownership and how that can be achieved.
- The Trust should be a community owned asset which manages and gains income from the land, housing and facilities that it owns. We would expect community ownership of a meaningful amount of eg social housing, open spaces, community buildings and business space, community farm land etc so that some income is generated,
- We imagine that the community organisation or Trust would be managed by a board of residents with expert help. All residents would be members, maybe two different categories for social housing where the Trust owns the property, but also associate membership that home owners and others buy into the concept so that they share the ethos, and have a stake in management and other issues such as, for example, limiting subletting as garden suburbs do and Airbnb. Freeholders would also pay into the Trust for continuing care of public spaces to high standard and aesthetic (as they do on Taylor Wimpey sites for the land management). The special ethos can add value for all.
- It should be managed by professionals employed by the Trust. Need to find ways to give "ownership" of community facilities with long term funding.
- How do we ensure that this is taken forward and that decisions now will not preclude meaningful ownership?
- Will Grosvenor use their charitable resources to achieve this aim and create a legacy?
- How much flexibility is there from the landowners to achieve GV aims?

1c Discussion on Democratic ownership

- Andrea (WODC): The first rural CLT was in Stonesfield (1983). WODC's report on CLTs not finished but they are asking Homes England for support to run 3 sessions for potential groups. SC said this need to appeal to future residents could be hard to establish now; GreenTEA's AGM talk on 22 April was to cover this topic. This is not a unique problem. WODC is exploring options to buy land.
- Silvia (Grosvenor) said the GV should have been a different delivery model (for the democratic ownership we seek). It has been a landowners' consortium from the start. WODC could have CPO'd; there is a disconnect.
- Andy (Grosvenor) said Grosvenor had used different models of management - at Barton they set up a management company in which residents have a share; different parts may have different management eg roads and school by County Council; park by Wildlife Trust
- Charles Mathew said OCC hold land for the people of Oxon.
- Gordon mentioned that WODC made a bad decision in 2016 on Trust and ownership.
- Silvia (Grosvenor) Duke of Westminster family have nothing to do with commercial deals. Grosvenor own Trumpington Meadows and London estates but here Grosvenor cannot buy the land. However they think they can deliver better planning.
- Tony (GreenTEA) as there is no open book accounting we do not know the scope.
- Ursula; why is there such a rush when we are in a state of flux?
- **More work needed on this**

2 Successful place-making and creative design: Sarah Couch

3a Our points:

- We still don't think you are selling this as innovative or inspirational, as an exemplar of low carbon living as GV principles demand. Yes, there are high levels of greenspace and welcome elements, but what would set the GV apart, excite people and draw them in to experience, learn and aspire to replicate? What makes this an exemplar? What's the big idea? As the Design Review Panel said it needs to be bolder on behaviour change, car use with the approach to climate change fully embedded- it needs to be sold as a different way to live. We think there is an appetite to buy into this. (some discussion under transport)
- Major concern about **continuity of oversight** in upholding principles- as was achieved at Eddington. We have suggested an **inspiration panel** to challenge and inspire and we are in discussions with Low Carbon Hub on this.
- There is a danger of leaving key issues to reserved matters- the Design Review Panel warned against this and also highlighted the need for ongoing external review.
- Recent UCL study of design quality: best design generally in high value areas and notable variations of quality by each developer. Bins and parking were the key variables for quality of public space. Cost does not prevent good design.
- **Phasing causes concerns**- as the Design Review Panel said the first phase should be near the centre with access to facilities rather than car dependent locations on Lower Road and Cuckoo Lane. If OCC say site access is a problem let's sort it. The GV needs to demonstrate its credentials from the start rather than build in unsustainability. Also starting on higher land will reveal how site drainage responds. What about timing of A40 and P&R?
- **The location of the 6th form centre** causes concerns- over a mile from the school and on high ground and reached by an underpass. It will generate more vehicles. Can OCC help?
- We are concerned that you will not commit to design competitions.
- Design Review Panel said plan needs more 'placemaking', more variety in rhythm; density can help create community and focus. Will the park be developed to provide more of a focus?

(Ran out of time for:

- Employment- is rehab centre still an option?
- What will Grosvenor and the landowners contribute to make sure that this development is inspirational, innovative, ground-breaking in its response to the climate emergency? Will it be or a catalyst for change?
- How are you taking into account of the future of the aggregate recycling site?
- Will there be provision for training and onsite prefabrication? (Tresham GV has a construction skills centre.)

2b Discussion on Design

- School location and design is OCC responsibility- no other acceptable locations put forward. Andrea (WODC) said OCC were concerned about location next to A40 and access over the road. Andrea explained new location as having safe access under the road, with a natural education route from the Millennium wood via the Salt Way, primary school to 6th form in an attractive part of the site (an admission that the rest of the site is not so attractive?) Cuckoo Lane would have no through road traffic. On design WODC had been in touch with OCC and have suggested a design competition to make a landmark, but not clear how this will be achieved as county has a fixed budget. Needs to be covered in AAP and coding.
- R Burton said location of uses will be fixed at outline planning so important to get it right now; no way back.
- Underpass resulted from WODC feasibility study but more work to do. It would be for pedestrian/cycles. Question: when would it happen? At the same time as the A40 'improvements'? Or later?
- No discussion or comment on suggestions for inspiration panel with continuity of oversight on quality, design competitions or developing the design.
- Although outline application will not include detailed design, SC said it was important that the masterplan/design code did not preclude the development of placemaking.
- The big idea? See some comments in final discussion.

3 Genuinely affordable housing: Sarah for Angie Titchen

3a Our points:

WODC will establish mix (this had already been discussed)

- How will specialist housing (for older people, people with disabilities, community owned/collaborative housing student/graduate housing and employment-linked housing) be accommodated?
- ENP consulted widely on housing needs and these categories should be followed (did you say this Sue? Not me)
- Echoing the EPIC position, DRP said there was a need for multi use centres, shared workspaces and live/work. How will this be achieved?
- We note you will not exceed the minimum 5% plots for self build and custom build?
- Will there be live/work units?
- We do not think 4 storey should be ruled out.
- How will different tenures be mixed and tenure blind (no perceptible design and quality differences) and will it be set out in the Design Code or on a masterplan?
- Will the build quality of different tenures be different?
- What is the range of delivery partners? Does it include smaller/untraditional contractors or organisations?

3b Discussion on Housing

- Andrea (WODC) AAP will decide policies and principles and housing mix; many small 1-2 bed units required.
- AAP has policy on 'specialist housing' but no clear requirement to provide all of these in the masterplan.
- Conversations between WODC and city around MOU; not all social housing will be allocated to Oxford. District controls allocation.
- Oxford city defining affordable provision/location.
- WODC own no social rented housing but are considering buying land for social rent.
- Some will be sold to housing associations e.g. Cottsway.
- Grosvenor: Housing will be tenure blind and maximum number of housing type in each area will be defined to ensure a mix.
- Live/work units will not be located but design code will include some higher storey heights to allow conversion in an organic, more traditional way.
- Silvia: shared ownership 80% market rent. AAP and masterplan do not include 4 bed exec houses.
- Social housing from waiting list with variable discount.
- Kevin Murray (KMA): there will be regular 5 to 7 year reviews of a multi year process
- Gordon (EPC) says city has no unmet need and worried we will not have a say on these reviews.

4 Low impact on the planet; energy and fabric: Sarah Couch

4a Our points:

- Very few advance answers supplied. Good points: No gas, and in advance of building regs, Heat recovery, Energy hub at P&R; for technology eg batteries; PV panels and green roofs (**but** only in Northern Neighbourhood), possibility of smart grid "electrical forecourt" for EV charging for residents and locals rather than at house (good) but commitment needs to go further. Grosvenor are programme partners for the new Green Building Council framework for net zero carbon buildings. Emily Hamilton, Senior Sustainability Manager at Grosvenor Britain & Ireland endorsed the excellent 'The LETI Climate Emergency Design Guide.
- Will Grosvenor commit to be a 'pathfinder' project?
- Since the last meeting an Energy Plan is being developed. **Will you commit to the Energy Plan vision of an exemplar of net zero carbon, energy positive development?**
- Will the design code include a requirement to conduct whole **life embodied carbon** calculations and aim to achieve 40% carbon emission reductions (as in the LETI guide)? How will it be considered in choice of materials?
- You state 'Target fabric energy efficiency of 46 kWh/m²/year subject to viability and building regs' (not good enough but not clear if this is total regulated energy or heating only; space heating demand for an average Building Regulations property now is 54 kWh/m² and total energy about 80-100. LETI recommend 35 kWh/m²/yr total and

15 for heating; Passivhaus heating 15 kWh/m²/year, CCC 'New build homes should deliver ultra-high levels of energy efficiency as soon as possible, and by 2025 at the latest. This should be consistent with a space heat demand of 15-20 kWh/m²/yr.)

- 'High spec glazing'- triple or single?? Need to define standards of airtightness etc in Design Code?
- Why no district level energy eg ground source in wet east part of site?
- How much energy will be exported to the grid?
- Local grid mentioned but how and who?
- Have you made progress with option for a Community Renewable Energy company?
- Community renewables?
- Standards need to be set now – not as Reserved Matters
- Will building standards also apply to all housing types and community buildings?
- Will Section 106 money be used to support community energy generation for the GV and for the wider Eynsham Energy Plan area?
- How far advanced is your Energy Strategy?
- Need to build in support for behaviour change as project proceeds.

4b Discussion on Energy

- Zero carbon – energy positive is a GV principle and aim of Energy Plan – not there yet.
- Can we go further, catch the wave?
- Ness Scott (WODC) – energy plan not completed yet; she has had a recent meeting. Need to assess energy performance.
- **WODC have commissioned their own viability assessment by LETI's founder.** Fabric will be fundamental. Looking at running costs of the occupants, standards and viability.
- **Cannot look back to old standards, must look ahead.**
- Daniel Scharf (PFT Planning) – embedded carbon. Grosvenor are programme partners of Green council (see above) so they must believe this. What do you emit as you build?
- Jonny Riggall (Stantec): trying to find a way through conflicting standards to an energy plan Masterplan spatial design and orientation to make use of westerly winds but protect from cold north east winds with planting : but no credit for spatial layout. At plot level looking at orientation and shading. **They have developed an energy masterplan. Agreed this discussion needs to be continued and fabric specification confirmed. We need to meet again to follow this up.**
- **Extent of commitment to renewables unclear.**
- **No progress on community energy or energy company- need to follow up.**
- Nigel (City Farm) commented that the site is windy and that windpower may be an option (with changes in planning policy).

5 Transport: Tony Bovey

5a Our points: Tony's text

Climate Emergency

- Travel is a major source of greenhouse gases (40%+ ONS), pollution and danger (car travel).
- The physical environment affects us, our feelings, thoughts and behaviour. Indeed it is the source of many life joys, satisfactions and dissatisfactions.
- Design of the GV, especially its movement network and corridor design, will constrain, enable and encourage certain behaviours and satisfactions.
- Grosvenor has accepted these principles at a high level, as has WODC in their AAP?

Notwithstanding this, does the design, from what we can see, encourage convenient and equitable access to facilities and opportunities within and without the site in the best way to ensure:

- safety
- convenience
- health
- and minimal direct and indirect environmental harm?

In the same way, we must ask does the inferred movement pattern promote

- a unique sense of place,
- feelings of belonging and perceptions of quality,
- residential satisfaction,
- and personal and communal sociability?
- What we have seen and heard would indicate that the proposal, at least, has the right intentions. The devil is in the detail.
- Looking in more detail, we have to ask how different is the design from the all too familiar car dominated suburb of the mass house builders? Does the physical pattern of buildings, spaces, land uses and networks sufficiently reduce the dominance of the car and its physical infrastructure?
- Can the design reduce car travel and prioritise active safe travel and public transport to meet promised principles?
- Designed in car travel is difficult to change because of the inertia of learned behaviours and rigidity of physical infrastructure. The design must get it sufficiently right now with the flexibility to adapt to future changes in travel technology and behaviour.

Interdependence

- Likely travel patterns cannot be considered in isolation. Layout, location, land use, density, networks, connections, road design and parking are all of a piece. Hence the overlap with other questions.

Place and Quality

- Recent research has shown that streets and public space are a major determinant of quality and satisfaction as seen by residents.
- Is the area of blacktop roads, parking and bins implied by the design conducive to the future Good Life of the GV?
- Streets have purposes beyond car movement. They are also the arteries of community engagement and sociability, among others. Streets matter!

Location, land use and connection

- 5 and 10 minute walking zoning is a powerful design criterion that we strongly support.
- We know the traffic congestion, noise, pollution and danger posed by parents driving their children to school.
- Is the sixth form centre best located for the GV and Eynsham? A location closer to Eynsham would be better for pedestrian and cycling access by students.

Phasing of Building

- Should the first phase be on the edge of the village, thereby designing in car travel?
- Why not build the first phases in the village centre, a more convenient and logical place to start?
- Does the commitment over time progressively to reduce parking provision, and to have some parking away from dwellings that can be reallocated for other uses in future, mitigate the propensity for car travel? Or should there be more radical reduced parking from the outset?

Network and Road Design

- Internal routes should be safe, convenient, attractive, well lit and appropriately surfaced and aligned.
- Do cars have priority? Walking and cycling must. Road specification does not have slavishly to follow highway authority standards. To do so risks creating, by default, a placeless and sterile environment.
- There should be no through route for cars - only buses- to discourage car use within the GV and rat running off the A40. Why is OCC objecting?
- How will charging points be provided? An electric forecourt has been suggested.

Public Transport

- What is the maximum walking distance from the nearest bus stop within the GV?
- Has pedestrian and cyclist access to the park and ride been designed in?
- There is a commitment to safe cycle access Hanborough Station. How would this be done?
- What is the scope- hindered or enabled by the network layout- for innovative bespoke public transport solutions within the GV?

Access to Eynsham and Employment

- Is the underpass at Old Witney Road suitable?
- Is it only for pedestrians and cyclists? (already answered)
- How will parking be controlled on the approach roads?
- How can homes and jobs be linked in the GV?
- More dispersed employment would in principle encourage healthy travel and discourage car use.
- Can the amount of employment parking (how many spaces?) be reduced or actively managed for reduction over time?

Advance text: other points

- Design Review Panel said this needs to go further to embed behaviour change. GV needs to make a clear commitment to sustainable travel and make it a selling point to new residents that they are buying into this future- eg limited parking.

- Design Review Panel said Grosvenor/WODC need to challenge parking provision on site from the start. (number of spaces per dwelling and position on street). Sequence and location of building phases will constrain healthy travel.
- First phases (Design Guide) should have excess parking away from curtilages so that the land can be re zoned when the development is fully connected.
- At present it risks being just another residential suburb. Little about integrated transport linkages etc, learning from smart cities.
- Need provision for electric community transport- but how?
- Could there be incentives to reduce car parking and use and/or charging to fund non-car alternatives? How?
- How will the scheme limit car use to access to services (6th form education, health)?
- What are distances and experience for Eynsham residents?
- Have you produced a Travel Plan?
- Have you considered air quality, pollution?
- What incentives will there be to limit employment car use??
- Local centres should have appropriate level of retail and social provision (not major supermarkets that would attract car shoppers from further afield).

Relationship to Eynsham and beyond

- Underpass- Is it funded? Design of other crossings?
- How many cycle and pedestrian routes will the development fund beyond the site?

Waste - not discussed

- Bins and waste affect satisfaction. Is there water conservation in building design? eg, grey water for WC flushing, watering.
- What is the refuse plan?

5b Discussion on Transport

- Car parking in NW Bicester development doesn't work- **needs better approach.**
- **Can pedestrians/cycles have priority over cars through surfaces, detailed design** (Design Code)?
- Grosvenor want to challenge parking provision. **OCC agree to a progressive approach to reducing car parking- need to prepare now for the future; Tony/EPIC : Need to be radical approach for minimum car parking agreed at the outset.** Second car use will change- need fewer on site spaces.
- Tony: May need to challenge Highways standards.
- **Proposed through route for cars: Jacqui (OCC) OCC concern about displacement onto A40 but willing to discuss further. She said that the aim of the through route was *not* to take traffic off the A40. This needs to be watched very carefully, as OCC at the design charrette said that it was.**
- Tony: Welcomes walkable neighbourhoods – needs to be secured in AAP, also distance to bus stops.
- **Pedestrian/Cycles to the park-and-ride via underpass; design in AAP.**
- Raymond (OCC): OCC don't want lots of junctions but there will be several new ones (? two new crossings to park and ride and two new roundabouts to P&R and W Eynsham 'spine'. As part of P&R scheme- may be others. **At grade crossing at Salt Way will be wider. Needs careful design as this will be used to access GV possibly more than underpass.**
- OCC: can't have cul-de-sac over 500 m without another access. [Comment: access, yes, but it doesn't need to be a permanent through route; it can have a movable barrier for buses.]
- The discussion on building first in the village centre, such as it was, was inconclusive. Comment: Is it true that OCC won't allow access from Cuckoo Lane?
- **Cycle route to Hanborough- is it funded?**
- Community transport option. Need flexible approaches with linking short facilities e.g. shared minibuses.
- **Access to Eynsham still incomplete.**

6 Biodiversity: Nigel Pearce

6a Our points: Advance text: (edit out anything not covered by Nigel?)

- **When will you know if you can achieve and prove net gain with effective connectivity when the great majority of the land of European importance for arable plants will be developed and rare vulnerable species will be disturbed?**
- Need for flower meadows. Three typologies for diversity. Succession paradox – trees have fewer plant species but do give sequestration. Need to retain species-rich farmland, which has the best strategy for biodiversity. Meadows and pasture the most biodiverse land use. Woodland less so, but as important for carbon sequestration and human well-being. Scrub also necessary. The best balance of all three.
- Grosvenor plan better than Andrea's for arable land in north east. Grosvenor can be complimented on the seriousness with which they are taking this issue, but they have a huge task to get anywhere near biodiversity net gain. Remember the Greek derivation of 'eco'; oikos - a home. Grosvenor/WODC/OCC will be destroying countless homes with their development. These must be replaced. Government policy. Offsetting elsewhere is an unaccountable copout.
- Need for radical action to increase biodiversity within site (not off site). Northern stream corridor and hedge zones will need protection and active enhancement and connectivity with land beyond the GV boundary.
- Grade 2 and 3a land. Irresponsible to build all over it. Grosvenor better than Andrea in this regard. Cricket ground an imaginative idea.
- Retention of managed arable land allows three potential sources of income: natural capital payments for farmland dedicated to nature recovery; continued tenancy by farmer; crop production for sale.
- Changes to run off from development. Existing drains. Will the Eynsham Mead Ditch be retained? (they said so, but not clear on plan). Not clear from either diagram. How have you revised your plans to take a sequential, risk-based approach to flooding and development?
- Phasing should be considered . Better to start on higher ground (backs up starting with primary school).
- Implementation risks (all aspects). How can we be sure that fine words will become fine actions with permanent outcomes?
- Allotments and shared growing areas/gardens rather than insisting on formal allotments alone. Growing areas are open and communal (eg Peace Oak). There should be dog free natural areas. Need smaller local growing spaces eg communal squares
- How will ground nesting birds be protected? Need to limit access by pets
- How can arable plant sin housing are work/ DRP questioned this.
- Challenge traditional boundaries. No fences (except possibly picket). Hedge planting. Dry stone walls acceptable in some places.
Prefer hedges/picket fences to walls and close boarded fences. Could be part of village design guide. Need to allow interconnectivity eg hedgehogs.
- Build in swift bricks etc. in code
- Welcome community farm
- You agreed that connectivity for nature is paramount: but the masterplan breaks through key corridors. How will you protect connectivity for wildlife?

Other points from Nigel:

- Welcomes some aspects eg retention of arable/farmland in community farm.
- Protected farmland should be tenant farmed with crops and bringing in income.
- Need to accommodate animal movement- hedgehog highways, swift bricks etc.
- Confusion between Grosvenor's and Andrea's plans. Which one prevails?
- Likes cricket ground, good for social cohesion.
- Nigel prefers smaller growing areas as at Peace Oak Eynsham.

6b Biodiversity discussion

- Biodiversity mitigation report will be included in the outline planning application. Nigel appreciates efforts to achieve net gain, but this is hard to achieve when so many wildlife homes will be destroyed.
- Nigel: is large area west of recycling site due to Landfill gas report? Grosvenor said it was because of air quality.
- **Can arable land continue to be farmed by tenant during development?**
- Continuity is the key – builders don't follow the rules.
- The biodiversity management plan needs to be measurable and enforceable.
- Gordon: WODC have poor record on enforcement of conditions.

- Grosvenor: great lengths of hedgerows to be added but do not count in net gain calculation.
Nigel: yellowhammers (present on site) need hedges and non-intensively farmed arable land.

7 Final discussion

- Silvia: Grosvenor keen to submit application in April and will spend the rest of the year agreeing details on governance etc. Sees application as the beginning of the process; cannot be approved until AAP adopted. AAP 6 months late.
- Andrea: they are working collaboratively. APP will go to committee in April.

What would you like the GV to be known for when complete?

- Richard Burton: people would be proud to live there, it would be known for its quality and the natural environment, a place where it is easy to get to know your neighbours.
- Silvia: personal priority is gardening including in the street: **(some in masterplan)** (NB Eynsham GreenTEA has started this in a small way with Edible Eynsham!)