

**Design Meetings with Watery Lane and High Street Residents
Thursday 25th March 2021**

By Zoom

Present

Giles Baxter (GB) - Chair

Rob Hollin (RH) – Steering Group representative

Kevin Brady (KB) - architect

10 Watery Lane residents attended the Watery Lane meeting at 6pm

18 High Street residents attended the High Street meeting at 8pm

These notes are a summary of the issues discussed across both meetings, not a verbatim record.

Issue	Impacts	Summary of Discussion
Ownership of the Planning Application	Both Sites	<p>Q. How can we trust the developer and architect not to submit an application with poor design and layout, such as a mini ‘Great Western Park’</p> <p>A. The planning application, i.e. the NDO, is submitted by the Parish Council who are the <u>Qualifying Body</u>, and have absolute power of veto over the NDO.</p>
Options for the layout of the Allotments Site	Allotments	<p>Q. What are the options for the Allotments layout that will be submitted to SODC for pre-application advice?</p> <p>A. The current scheme will not be taken forward. There are 3 broad options currently being considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A variation of the current scheme increasing the spacing between the proposed housing and Watery Lane gardens, with a greater landscaping buffer along the new lane adjacent to the footpath, reducing the impact and to avoid overlooking toward immediate neighbours, and maintaining the general openness of the site where the footpath meets Watery Lane at Courtiers.

Issue	Impacts	Summary of Discussion
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A revised scheme with the buildings concentrated along the <u>western</u> edge of the allotments site. The project team did express the view that SODC were unlikely to support this option because of its impact on openness. • A third scheme with a substantially different layout, yet to be developed.
Layout of the Paddock Site	Paddock	The project team explained that the SE House (name) that would overlook a number of properties adjacent to SE corner of the Paddock site will be removed from the next iteration of the scheme, the area of that building returned to green space, and the remainder of the site reconfigured.
	Both Sites	<p>Q. Will residents most directly impacted have the opportunity to see the schemes before they are submitted?</p> <p>A. Yes, it is the intention of the SG to involve residents in the design of the site that directly impacts them.</p>
Number of Houses	Both Sites	<p>Q. What scope is there to change the number of houses?</p> <p>A. Nothing has been decided. No respondent suggested we should increase the number of houses. In determining the number of houses, and quality of build including environmental performance, there is a trade off between number of houses, build standard, impact on residents, distribution across sites, and financial benefit to the community.</p>

Issue	Impacts	Summary of Discussion
Eco Performance	Both Sites	<p>Q. Will the development be zero-carbon?</p> <p>A. We cannot say at this stage. Zero carbon comes at a considerable cost, potentially to the point to which there would be no financial benefit to the community. However a significant improvement over current standards is envisaged and costed in. The key to reducing carbon footprint is reducing demand, which starts with the shape and layout of buildings. For example, a ‘box like’ terrace is inherently more energy efficient than detached buildings with irregular outside forms. We will exceed future building regulation energy performance standard ‘Future Homes Standard’ which require an improvement of 31% over current standards.</p> <p>A. On the supply side, features such as heating using ground source heat pumps, and electric vehicle charging points will be ‘standard’.</p>
Biodiversity	Both Sites	<p>Q. How will the development lead to a net gain in Biodiversity?</p> <p>A. Both sites leave a lot of undeveloped area suitable for 'natural' landscaping, wildflower planting and mixed species tree planting amongst other opportunities for enhancing biodiversity e.g. surface/rainwater drainage may be fed into 'detention basins' or dry ponds via integrated swales - open landscaping features which manage the flow of stormwater as part of a combined sustainable drainage & landscaping strategy.</p>
Cemetery	Allotments	<p>Q. Why does the scheme include a Cemetery?</p> <p>A. The cemetery was part of the design brief.</p>
Line of Fig Trees	Allotments	<p>Q. The scheme has removed the line of trees bordering the allotments. Do these need to be removed?</p> <p>A. Noted. Will look at how these can be retained.</p>
Visual Impact/Height of Buildings	Allotments	<p>Q. The 2 storey ‘gateway’ house will create a ‘wall of brick’.</p> <p>A. It is currently proposed that this building will be 1.5 storeys. The visual impact of this building will be reviewed.</p> <p>Q. Is there scope for buildings to be single storey?</p> <p>A. This will be considered in the next iteration. Many respondents have commented on the lack of bungalow type houses for elderly residents.</p>

Issue	Impacts	Summary of Discussion
Ownership Type – Social Housing	Both Sites	<p>Q. Why so many social houses? Social tenants often do not have a car and the bus service is poor.</p> <p>A. SODC planning policy requires 40% of all new housing on sites with 10 units or more to be Affordable Housing.</p> <p>Q. Is there scope, for example, to submit the NDO as two applications, one per site, with each site having 10 units or less?</p> <p>A. The Steering Group will be re-examining the numbers of Affordable Housing, including consulting SODC about whether there is scope for flexibility on the 40% rule. Whilst a number of residents have expressed views that there is no need for social housing, others have expressed the opposite view, i.e. that we do need some social housing. So it is a balancing act between competing voices.</p>
Surgery – 2019 NHS Primary Care Plan	Both Sites	<p>Q. Is the plan for the surgery part of the 2019 NHS Primary Care Plan?</p> <p>A. The surgery is one of four practices in a Primary Care Network (PCN). The PCN plan retains the CH practice, and includes provision for expanded services that will be shared with the Berinsfield practice which does not have room to expand.</p> <p>Q. What is the plan for primary care plan for Culham?</p> <p>A. To the best of our knowledge Culham will have its own primary care practice which would join the existing PCN.</p>
Process	Both Sites	<p>One resident made the statement that they felt the process has been unfair, and that this made them sad. They were glad that there is now discussion, and that the initial plan has been rejected. Everyone needs to be happy.</p>
Impact of Bypass	Both Sites	<p>Q. What will the impact be of the bypass?</p> <p>A. Through traffic will reduce significantly.</p>
Geometry Of Road Access	Paddock	<p>Q. Can we see the report of the geometry of the road?</p> <p>A. Yes, when it is received. At this stage, discussions with the highways consultants on the proposed access to the paddock site have been via phone and email only.</p> <p>Q. Two residents expressed major concerns about the proposed access to the paddock site given the volume and speed of traffic at that point, and the existence</p>

Issue	Impacts	Summary of Discussion
		<p>of an unsighted brow. The entrance needs to be rethought and moved further west. The proposal is ‘an accident waiting to happen’.</p> <p>A. The PC has been in discussion with OCC Highways. Traffic calming measures could include a 20 mph limit, and/or moving the 30mph zone westwards along the A415. The traffic ‘picture’ will be very different from today. OCC Highways’ views on proposed access will be sought as part of the pre-application advice.</p>
Drainage and Water Run Off	Both Sites	<p>Q. How will drainage and water ‘run off’, e.g. flash floods, be managed?</p> <p>A. The development an opportunity to reduce the risk of flash flooding, through engineering design.</p> <p>Q. Can we see the water report?</p> <p>A. Yes, when it is received. The report will consider both the challenges of water management, and propose landscaping and engineering solutions, for example dry ponds.</p>
Ownership of communal spaces	Both Sites	<p>Q. Who will have responsibility for ownership of communal spaces?</p> <p>A. This will form part of the agreement with the landowner and developer, and be written into the legal agreement.</p>
Further Development	Both Sites	<p>A resident expressed concerns that the development in two locations will encourage development across the field opposite. Extending the envelope of the village is not prudent, and will create opportunities for Infill.</p>
Parking/Impact on High Street	Both Sites	<p>Q. Will there be enough parking?</p> <p>A. The scheme provides for about 30 additional spaces for public parking compared with today. The need is greater than this. The Steering Group tried to achieve the optimum balance between providing additional spaces, and not turning the allotments site into a massive car park. If the scheme does not go ahead, visitors could lose the right to use the Barley Mow car park, which will impact residents in the High Street.</p>