

SP BROADWAY

Building Relationships



**Statement of Community Involvement
Land off Gavray Drive, Bicester**

July 2021

L&Q Estates

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Community engagement – policy context.....	3
3. Community consultation.....	4
4. Key Issues.....	6
5. Conclusion.....	7
6. Appendices.....	8
6.1. Appendix 1 – Agenda for the ecological stakeholder discussion on 15 October 2020.....	8
6.2. Appendix 2 – Minutes of the ecological stakeholder discussion on 15 October 2020.....	10
6.3. Appendix 3 – Agenda for the stakeholder discussion on 2 December 2020.....	14
6.4. Appendix 4 – Minutes of the stakeholder discussion on 2 December 2020.....	16
6.5 Appendix 5 – Agenda for the stakeholder discussion on 24 February 2021	20
6.6. Appendix 6 – Minutes of the stakeholder discussion on 24 February 2021	22
6.7. Appendix 7 – Consultation website.....	25
6.8. Appendix 8 – Consultation leaflet.....	26
6.9. Appendix 9 – Summary of consultation feedback.....	30

1. Introduction

This Statement of Community Involvement has been prepared to support L&Q Estates, Charles Brown & Simon Digby and London & Metropolitan International Developments' planning application to Cherwell District Council (CDC) for the development of up to 300 houses at land off Gavray Drive, Bicester. SP Broadway was instructed to support L&Q with community consultation and engagement for the proposed development.

The land is allocated in CDC's Local Plan for the development of up to 250 homes under Policy Bicester 13. The applicant originally submitted a planning application to CDC in May 2015 for 180 homes, including affordable housing and public open space. The application was refused in June 2017 as it was viewed to represent 'piecemeal development', as the application only formed part of the overall allocation. An appeal was subsequently submitted to the Planning Inspectorate but was refused in July 2018 on the basis that the proposal was in conflict with the adopted Local Plan, and did not take into consideration the Gavray Meadows Wildlife Site.

L&Q have submitted a new outline planning application for a comprehensive scheme across the entire site, including residential development and associated infrastructure together with a strategy for the protection and restoration of Gavray Drive Meadow Local Wildlife Site and Conservation Target Area.

In anticipation of the submission of a new application, we have worked closely with stakeholders to address their concerns surrounding the development. We have held a number of online stakeholder discussions, hosted a consultation website and sent a consultation leaflet to addresses around Gavray Drive, detailing the proposals and inviting feedback.

This report outlines the consultation process in full and should be read in conjunction with other documents supporting the planning application.

2. Community engagement – policy context

Cherwell District Council's Statement of Community Involvement (2016) states:

Early discussions between developers and planning officers will provide the opportunity to create proposals in the right form that will be attractive to the community and the local planning authority. They can be of great benefit to the application by identifying the key planning issues, avoiding abortive work and speeding up the statutory process.

Developers of larger sites will generally be expected to engage with local communities – residents and community associations and relevant interest groups and statutory consultees or service providers. The Council will expect developers, as part of their application to detail the pre-application consultation they have undertaken (in a statement of consultation) and how comments have been addressed in progressing a proposal – which could take the form of a 'statement of community involvement'. This will ensure that the standard requirements for involving the local and/or wider community are met.

3. Community consultation

L&Q have undertaken a course of political and community engagement in relation to land off Gavray Drive, Bicester since February 2020. This includes a meeting with Pat Clissold of Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester on 14 February 2020. It is worth noting that engagement post this meeting has been conducted remotely due to Covid-19.

Stakeholder Discussions

The consultation process began officially on 15 October 2020 with an online meeting between ecology groups and experts and members of the project team to discuss the ecology mitigation and management strategy of the Gavray Drive Meadow Local Wildlife Site and Conservation Target Area. An agenda (*See Appendix 1*) was sent to invitees and minutes were taken and sent following the meeting (*See Appendix 2*) and hosted on the consultation website.

The ecology stakeholder group invitees included Caroline Ford (Interim Team Leader, Major Projects Planning Team, Cherwell District Council), Bernadette Owens (Principal Planning Officer, Cherwell District Council), Steve Wheatley (Regional Conservation Manager (South East England) Butterfly Conservation), Neil Rowntree (Senior Biodiversity Officer (Oxfordshire), Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust), Pat Clissold (Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester), Pam Roberts (Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester), Dominic Woodfield (Managing Director, Bioscan (UK) Ltd), Charlotte Watkins (LP Biodiversity Officer, LP Planning) and Carole Hetherington (Chair, Langford Village Community Association.)

Wider online stakeholder discussions to consider more general matters including drainage and traffic followed on 2 December 2020 (*See Appendix 3 for the agenda and see Appendix 4 for the minutes*) and 24 February 2021 (*See Appendix 5 for the agenda and see Appendix 6 for the minutes*).

Consultation Website

A consultation website made available at www.spbroadway.com/gavray (*See Appendix 7*) launched on 15 October 2020 detailing the proposals and inviting feedback. All consultation materials were hosted on this website. This website was set up to make the consultation as transparent as possible, and to enable residents to read the minutes of all stakeholder meetings of the Community Liaison Group.

Consultation Leaflet

A consultation leaflet (*See Appendix 8*) for the proposed development was sent on 5 January 2021 to 2,406 addresses around Gavray Drive to inform local stakeholders of the proposals and invite feedback. The leaflet was also shared on the consultation website and on the Facebook pages of local groups: Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester and Gavray Meadows News.

Resident Feedback

Residents' feedback from the consultation leaflet was received from 5 January 2021. Residents had the option to submit their comments until 25 January 2021. In this time, we

received a total of 55 feedback forms, which is 2.29% of the total number of leaflets sent out (2,406).

Residents were asked to answer the following questions and provide any comments:

1. What types of housing do you think would be most suitable for the site? (i.e. number of bedrooms / flats or houses / older persons provision)
2. What are your views on providing some / limited public access to Gavray Wildlife Meadow? Do you have any suggestions for how this could be managed?
3. Do you have any comments on the Illustrative Masterplan layout?

58.18% of the forms raised general questions on matters including noise, affordable housing, and traffic. A full summary of the feedback received was shared on the consultation website (*See Appendix 9*).

4. Key Issues

L&Q have addressed the following key points as part of their application and as the consultation and engagement progressed:

'Piecemeal development'

L&Q have submitted a planning application for a comprehensive scheme across the entire Gavray Drive site, following initial refusal of the original application on the basis that it represented 'piecemeal development'.

Protection and restoration of Gavray Drive Meadow Local Wildlife Site and Conservation Target Area

L&Q have submitted a planning application for Gavray Drive, which will include a strategy for the protection and restoration of Gavray Drive Meadow Local Wildlife Site and Conservation Target Area. Discussions have taken place with the stakeholder group on how the Local Wildlife Site and Conservation Target Area could be maintained and managed.”

Water management

At the last stakeholder meeting on 24 February 2021, L&Q addressed concerns about water management following flooding in the area over the 2020 Christmas period. Stakeholders were ensured that the development will not result in an increase in flooding, and where possible a betterment will be provided to third party land.

5. Conclusion

SP Broadway has overseen an appropriate programme of community and stakeholder consultation on behalf of L&Q for the proposed development on land off Gavray Drive, Bicester.

A large amount of consultation has been carried out with stakeholders prior to the submission of a planning application. A number of stakeholder discussions were held, a website was launched and a consultation leaflet was distributed to addresses around Gavray Drive, detailing the proposals and inviting feedback. This programme of consultation has allowed us to address and allay any stakeholder concerns or comments, including about water management.

The new planning application is now also for a comprehensive scheme across the entire Gavray Drive site, which will include a strategy for the protection and restoration of Gavray Drive Meadow Local Wildlife Site and Conservation Target Area, demonstrating that L&Q have resolved the concerns raised during the previous application and appeal.

6. Appendices

6.1. Appendix 1 – Agenda for the ecological stakeholder discussion on 15 October 2020



**Ecological Stakeholder Discussion
to discuss Gavray Drive**

**Thursday 15 October 2020
9:30 – 11:00 am**

Zoom Conference Call

AGENDA

Item 1: Welcome and overview of consultation	David McFarlane – SP Broadway (Facilitator)
Item 2: About L&Q Estates	Russell Crow, Planning Director – L&Q Estates
Item 3: Planning update	Peter Chambers, Associate Planner – David Lock Associates
Item 4: Ecology mitigation and management strategy discussion	Tom Wigglesworth, Director – EDP
Item 5: Discussion on masterplan update	Sarah Murray, Director – Edge Urban Design
Item 6: Community input and open discussion	All
Item 7: Next Steps	Russell Crow, Planning Director – L&Q Estates David McFarlane – SP Broadway (Facilitator)

INVITEES

Caroline Ford	Interim Team Leader, Major Projects Planning Team, Cherwell District Council
Bernadette Owens	Principal Planning Officer, Cherwell District Council
Steve Wheatley	Regional Conservation Manager (South East England) Butterfly Conservation
Neil Rowntree	Senior Biodiversity Officer (Oxfordshire), Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust
Pat Clissold	Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester
Pam Roberts	Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester
Dominic Woodfield	Managing Director, Bioscan (UK) Ltd
Charlotte Watkins	LP Biodiversity Officer, LP Planning
Carole Hetherington	Chair, Langford Village Community Association

PROJECT TEAM ATTENDEES

David McFarlane (Facilitator)	SP Broadway
Hoda Taher	SP Broadway
Russell Crow	L&Q Estates
Aritz Kaushik	L&Q Estates
Darren Mace	L&Q Estates
Peter Chambers	David Lock Associates
Arwel Owen	David Lock Associates
Sarah Murray	Edge Urban Design
Tom Wigglesworth	EDP

6.2. Appendix 2 – Minutes of the ecological stakeholder discussion on 15 October 2020



Gavray Drive Ecological Stakeholder Discussion

Venue: Zoom Conference Call

Date: 15 October 9:30am

Attendees: Neil Rowntree (Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust), Pat Clissold (Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester), Pam Roberts (Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester), Dominic Woodfield (Bioscan UK Ltd), Carole Hetherington (Langford Village Community Association)

Apologies: Caroline Ford (Cherwell District Council), Bernadette Owens (Cherwell District Council), Steve Wheatley (Butterfly Conservation)

Project team attendees: David McFarlane, SP Broadway (DM1); Hoda Taher, SP Broadway (HT); Russell Crow, L&Q Estates (RC); Aritz Kaushik, L&Q Estates (AK); Darren Mace, L&Q Estates (DM2); Peter Chambers, David Lock Associates (PC); Arwel Owen, David Lock Associates (AO); Sarah Murray, Edge Urban Design (SM); Tom Wigglesworth, EDP (TW)

Item 1: Welcome and overview of consultation

1.1. DM1 opened the meeting and gave introductions and apologies for absence were noted.

Item 2: About L&Q Estates

2.1. RC explained that the issue with land control for Gavray Drive has been resolved as L&Q now control the whole Bicester 13 allocation.

2.2. RC said that L&Q Estates are committed to the delivery of the Gavray Drive site and ensuring all competing interests align.

2.3. A stakeholder asked if L&Q Estates would take on the management of the open space on the site? RC explained that the mechanism for the long term management of open on the site is undecided.

Item 3: Planning update

3.1. PC explained that Policy Bicester 13 is the key focus in terms of what the development must adhere to.

3.2. PC said that Gavray Drive is an important site for Cherwell's housing delivery, given its allocation for up to 300 houses.

3.3. PC said that L&Q Estates had submitted a pre-application submission to Cherwell District Council (CDC) in the summer to begin the discussion with officers and get some guidance in terms of the scope of the application. PC added that L&Q Estates have been in discussion with Caroline Ford at CDC which has led to separate discussions with Charlotte Watkins, LP Biodiversity Officer and Oxfordshire County Council on drainage at the end of August. CDC

will be responding to the submitted Environmental Impact Assessment scoping report in early November and will provide their pre-app response at the same time.

3.4. A question was asked how CDC have responded to the reduction in unit yield given that indicative submitted plans show around 200 homes proposed? PC said that CDC have indicated that L&Q Estates must justify the reasons for the reduction in units but acknowledged the site constraints and complexity.

Item 4: Ecology mitigation and management strategy discussion

4.1. TW went through a presentation on the ecological constraints and opportunities, proposed avoidance and mitigation, restoration and enhancement and biodiversity net gain.

4.2. TW said that the information on habitats and species on the site has been obtained through numerous historical surveys and data searches dating back to 2004. TW added that EDP started updating the surveys in August 2019 and will be finished later this year and that the detailed scope was provided to Charlotte Watkins, Butterfly Conservation, BBWOT and Natural England in April 2020.

4.3. TW explained that the most noticeable trend on site from the many surveys that have been undertaken is the lack of management and the encroachment of scrub so L&Q Estates are looking to restore the grass and bring it back into management.

4.4. TW explained that the development will avoid the Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and the Conservation Target Area (CTA). TW added that L&Q Estates will also implement measures during construction to protect the important habitats that are not being developed which will form part of the overall mitigation strategy.

4.5. TW said there is a policy requirement for net biodiversity gain but that the calculation method doesn't capture particular enhancements for protected species and the value of bringing this site into long term management.

4.6. It was asked whether the development parcels shown in the plans are now fixed? RC said that the masterplan is not completely fixed as L&Q Estates are still working through the viability and technical assessments – however the consultant team are tasked with exploring the deliverability without development in the Conservation Target Area. The stakeholder said this is *'welcome news'*.

4.7. It was commented that the mitigation and management strategy is excellent and that they are happy to work with the team. The stakeholder said they will reserve comments on the biodiversity net gain point as they have a few issues with the condition assessments but that they believe 10% net gain is probably achievable. It was agreed that L&Q Estates will provide working net gain calculations to stakeholders.

4.8. A stakeholder asked whether the development, as is proposed, can *'wash its own face'* in open space calculation terms without any need to go into the retained habitats? SM said yes. The stakeholder commented that hopefully there is enough open space to route most of it through the designated route. Another stakeholder asked how L&Q Estates will support

future management of the wildlife site? RC said future management is something L&Q Estates are looking to discuss in more detail over the next 4-5 weeks before bringing forward a plan.

Item 5: Discussion on masterplan update

5.1. SM displayed draft versions of the Constraints Plan, Opportunities Plan, Consolidated Constraints & Opportunities Plan, and latest Masterplan.

5.2. SM explained that protection of the Conservation Target Area is a key consideration across the land. SM added that a noise buffer may be needed alongside the railway line that runs along the northern edge, that L&Q are keen to retain the routes of the various existing public rights of way and that testing is being undertaken of the extent of the floodplain on the site.

5.3. SM explained that the most significant part of the development will be in the north western section and that L&Q Estates are exploring the potential for development in the south eastern corner for C2 (residential accommodation and care to people in need of care) and C3 (dwellings) uses.

5.4. SM said that L&Q Estates are still in the process of exploring densities across the site and how the numbers will be delivered.

5.5. A stakeholder asked whether the north western area will contain flats? SM said it will be a combination of detached, semi-detached and terrace properties and that there may be the inclusion of some flats but this will be subject to density testing and mix of houses. The stakeholder also asked whether this will include 30% affordable housing? SM said yes.

5.6. A stakeholder said they have no issue with the retirement provision suggested as retirement and extra care apartments may be better suited neighbours for the sensitive parts of the site than open market housing.

5.7. A stakeholder commented that affordable housing could be provided by increasing the density on the west which would protect the borders of the CTA. RC said a mix will be put in place by a housebuilder. The stakeholder asked what the effect of creating a building platform along the east of the site will be on drainage to the CTA and on the East-West footpath? DM2 said L&Q Estates intend to keep the platform outside of the CTA and the footpath at its current level.

5.8. A stakeholder said they are keen to work with L&Q Estates on CTA management but that they need reassurance about the mechanism of delivery. Another stakeholder said they want to be reassured that the plans will be realised but they are aware that this is an outline planning application. Another stakeholder added that they would also like to be reassured on the flooding and drainage proposals on the site as there has been flooding in Langford. The stakeholder added that they will be taking a careful look at how plans progress for C2 uses on the site as the area is "surrounded" by C2 use and they do not want to become known as the retirement side of Bicester.

5.9. RC said L&Q are anticipating that they will go beyond the level of detail that an outline planning application would usually provide on this matter. RC added that he will look to make clear to any housebuilder buying the site, that they have signed up to its long term ecological management.

Item 6: Community input and open discussion (questions were taken throughout all items covered)

Item 7: Next Steps

7.1. RC said that L&Q Estates see ongoing consultation will be carried for Gavray Drive and that later this year they expect a full public consultation which may be a leaflet drop in the local area and a questionnaire and feedback form on the GD website which is currently live. RC added that another stakeholder discussion in a few weeks time would be useful and now that the consultation process has started, L&Q Estates hope to see a planning application submitted at the end of this year or early next year.

Steve Wheatley of the Butterfly Conservation sent the following email in advance of the discussion:

*"From: Steve Wheatley
To: Tom Wigglesworth
Cc: Hoda Taher
Date: 15/10/2020*

Dear Tom and Hoda,

Apologies, I cannot attend the stakeholder discussion.

Butterfly Conservation has no major objections to the proposed Ecological Management & Mitigation Strategy 2020 (edp0124_r042a). If this plan was implemented we feel it would conserve the existing butterfly and moth interest.

There are a few minor amendments and refinements to the proposed management that we would propose. I will send these over separately.

Best regards,

Steve Wheatley"

6.3. Appendix 3 – Agenda for the stakeholder discussion on 2 December 2020



**Christmas Stakeholder Meeting
to discuss Gavray Drive**

**Wednesday 2 December 2020
11:30am – 1:00pm**

Zoom Conference Call

AGENDA

Item 1: Welcome	David McFarlane – SP Broadway (Facilitator)
Item 2: L&Q Estates update	Russell Crow, Planning Director – L&Q Estates
Item 3: Planning update	Peter Chambers, Associate Planner – David Lock Associates
Item 4: Ecology mitigation and management strategy update	Tom Wigglesworth, Director – EDP
Item 5: Community input and open discussion	All
Item 6: Next Steps	Russell Crow, Planning Director – L&Q Estates David McFarlane – SP Broadway (Facilitator)

INVITEES

Caroline Ford	Interim Team Leader, Major Projects Planning Team, Cherwell District Council
Bernadette Owens	Principal Planning Officer, Cherwell District Council
Steve Wheatley	Regional Conservation Manager (South East England) Butterfly Conservation
Neil Rowntree	Senior Biodiversity Officer (Oxfordshire), Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust
Pat Clissold	Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester
Pam Roberts	Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester
Dominic Woodfield	Managing Director, Bioscan (UK) Ltd
Charlotte Watkins	LP Biodiversity Officer, LP Planning
Carole Hetherington	Chair, Langford Village Community Association
Maureen Thompson	Headteacher, Langford Village Community Primary School
Paul Hollidge	Headteacher, Longfields Primary School and Nursery
Nicholas Dolden	Cherwell, CPRE Oxfordshire
Cllr Nick Cotter	Bicester South & Ambrosden ward member
Cllr Dan Sames	Bicester South & Ambrosden ward member
Cllr Lucinda Wing	Bicester South & Ambrosden ward member

PROJECT TEAM ATTENDEES

David McFarlane (Facilitator)	SP Broadway
Hoda Taher	SP Broadway
Russell Crow	L&Q Estates
Aritz Kaushik	L&Q Estates
Darren Mace	L&Q Estates
Peter Chambers	David Lock Associates
Arwel Owen	David Lock Associates
Sarah Murray	Edge Urban Design
Tom Wigglesworth	EDP
Dave Lawes	Hydrock

6.4. Appendix 4 – Minutes of the stakeholder discussion on 2 December 2020



Gavray Drive Stakeholder Discussion

Venue: Zoom Conference Call

Date: 2 December 11:30am

Attendees: Pat Clissold (Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester), Pam Roberts (Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester), Dominic Woodfield (Bioscan UK Ltd), Carole Hetherington (Langford Village Community Association), Paul Hollidge (Longfields Primary School and Nursery), Nicholas Dolden (CPRE Oxfordshire), Cllr Dan Sames (Cherwell District Council)

Apologies: Caroline Ford (Cherwell District Council), Neil Rowntree (Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust)

Project team attendees: David McFarlane, SP Broadway (DM); Hoda Taher, SP Broadway (HT); Russell Crow, L&Q Estates (RC); Aritz Kaushik, L&Q Estates (AK); Peter Chambers, David Lock Associates (PC); Sarah Murray, Edge Urban Design (SM); Tom Wigglesworth, EDP (TW); Dave Lawes (Hydrock)

Item 1: Welcome

1.1. DM opened the meeting and gave introductions for the benefit of new attendees and apologies for absence were noted.

Item 2: About L&Q Estates

2.1. RC explained that L&Q have taken a fresh approach to the latest proposals which now cover the entire Bicester 13 allocation and as a result the ecological management of the site can be delivered.

2.2. RC said L&Q are looking to engage fully with all local stakeholders to work together for the best outcome for the site.

Item 3: Planning update

3.1. PC explained that the site is allocated in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and a pre-app process is being undertaken with Cherwell District Council (CDC) Officers Caroline Ford and Bernadette Owens. PC added that specific discussions have taken place with Oxfordshire County Council on drainage and a discussion on ecology has taken place with Charlotte Watkins, LP Biodiversity Officer.

3.2. PC said that the Environmental Statement Scoping Opinion has been issued by CDC since the last stakeholder discussion. PC added that L&Q had submitted a report setting out what was proposed to be covered in the Environmental Statement which the Council have largely agreed with but they disagreed on noise and air quality and asked for them to be included which L&Q will do.

3.3. PC said that the Environmental Statement will include the outcome of surveys and technical work to be submitted with the application. Work on the production of this document is currently being undertaken.

Item 4: Ecology mitigation and management strategy update

4.1. TW explained that detailed survey work on the ecology of the site has been carried out over the years and that these are now being updated but that no significant new discoveries, other than an otter spraint, have been noted. TW added that this will not require the current strategy to be revisited and that delivering a net gain for biodiversity was key to the masterplan design.

4.2. TW displayed one of the drawings contained in the Ecological Mitigation and Management Strategy and spoke about the change in the composition of the fields east of the Brook, which have now become dominated by tall vegetation and scrub therefore a key pillar of the proposals is to bring the site back into management. TW said a management scheme has been designed which balances the competing interests between species that require different habitat conditions.

4.3. TW said the general feedback received at the last stakeholder discussion has been cautiously optimistic, with useful feedback being provided by two stakeholders and two others outlining their intention to provide feedback. There was overall support for the principle of design and the management proposals, but stakeholders were seeking further assurances about securing management in the long-term. TW explained that discussions with management companies for the site have begun and that two commercial management bodies (The Land Trust and Greenbelt Limited) have provided their proposals and quotes. TW explained that The Land Trust operate on a lump sum endowment model which is invested and returned to the management of the site and Greenbelt Limited operate on a service charge model. Ongoing discussions are taking place with Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust and CDC also for the management of the site.

4.4. RC said L&Q are exploring approximate costs and the Greenbelt Limited model could come to approximately £2.50 a week for residents. RC added that this is expected to be secured through the S106 agreement but this will be discussed with CDC during the application process. A question was asked whether the 4 options for management companies includes The Land Trust? RC answered yes but that cost information from Wildlife Trust and CDC is yet to be received so of the two models that have provided costs, Greenbelt Limited is a model with which L&Q are familiar with and thus may be the preferred choice.

4.5. A stakeholder asked for clarification on how Greenbelt Limited operate. RC said that each resident will pay a service charge per week or year and that residents will be aware of this when purchasing properties. The stakeholder asked whether this is just for the management of the wildlife or for the play area? RC said the money will go towards the maintenance of all open space on the site. The stakeholder said the onus being put on residents and not the developers is *'quite unfair'*. Another stakeholder commented that this is a commonly used model. TW explained that the 4 companies mentioned have been approached because they have specific experience at managing areas of ecological interest.

4.6. TW said the one area that could benefit from stakeholder input is whether anyone has knowledge of local grazier schemes?

4.7. A stakeholder asked whether residents will have access to the managed sites? RC said that existing residents in the area will also benefit from access to the site. The stakeholder also asked whether the existing path around the edge of the site will remain? RC said yes and that the management of the site will include the upkeep of the pathed area.

4.8. A stakeholder commented that this would work out to about £26,000 a year. Another stakeholder asked whether these costings will be made available to view as the yearly figure sounds 'lower' than expected? The stakeholder added that information about Greenbelt Limited would be useful to understand how much has been allocated to the wildlife management elements and asked what level of control the chosen management company would have once they are in control? RC said L&Q will circulate cost breakdowns by Greenbelt Limited and The Land Trust to stakeholders. RC added that the site will be sold to a housebuilder who would then be expected to work with the management company. TW added that the management plan will form part of the S106 agreement. A stakeholder said they would be concerned that there is a risk of the management plan not being met once the land is sold to a housebuilder and added that an endowment with the S106 will offer more security for the local wildlife site. Another stakeholder commented that they have had 'bitter' experience with management companies who do the bare minimum and therefore would like to see real 'concrete commitments' from L&Q. RC said that management companies are commonly used to maintain sites and that if Greenbelt Limited were to stop upkeep of the site, they would stop being paid so there is incentive for them to manage the site well. RC said he will share Greenbelt Limited's plans with stakeholders. The stakeholder said the creation of a management committee made up of local residents and external advisors could work well for the upkeep of the site and RC is happy to put this concept to the management companies.

4.9. A stakeholder asked whether there will be provision for regular monitoring or surveying of the CTA? TW said yes as one of the key elements of the management plan is a periodic review and monitoring to ensure the management objectives are being met. The stakeholder commented that Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre review Local Wildlife Sites on a 5-year cycle. TW said this type of record keeping is a passive process as there is no direct link between the record centre and influencing the management of the site.

4.10 TW said in his presentation at the last stakeholder discussion, he provided a summary of the preliminary biodiversity calculations for the site which showed that a net gain of over 10% will be achieved. A stakeholder commented that he believes net gain is achievable and will provide his written feedback soon.

Item 5: Community input and open discussion

5.1. RC said the potential for C2 extra care housing is still being explored and hopefully more will be known early next year.

5.2. A stakeholder asked whether the proposals will include plans for educational use? RC said there is nothing specific but there has been a suggestion to provide a guided walk and information boards. Another stakeholder said that it is clear from the response to the Scoping

Report that Langford residents and wider Bicester residents value the area for teaching their children about wildlife. RC said he will take into consideration any comments that are made as matters are progressed and welcomed any ideas from stakeholders in this regard.

Item 6: Next steps

6.1. DM said L&Q are intending to send leaflets on their proposals to residents living in the area. A stakeholder asked for new Langford to not be missed out in the radius for the leaflet drop.

6.2. RC said a planning application will likely be submitted in March 2021 as most of the work will be completed by February. RC said he welcomes any comments from stakeholders outside of the group discussions and that another stakeholder update will not be likely until the end of the public consultation period in February.

6.3. A stakeholder asked whether the S106 agreement will include funding for the Langford Community Hall? PC said that full S106 requirements are yet to be determined. It is expected that the S106 content will be discussed in detail with CDC once the application is submitted.

6.4. A stakeholder said that he noticed reference to fly tipping on some of the application documents and asked for clarification on this. Another stakeholder said the fly tipping is not related to the invertebrate mats left around.

6.5. A stakeholder asked when updated plans about the relative distribution on houses either side of the brook will be made available? RC said a high level masterplan will be included on the consultation leaflet in January.

6.5 Appendix 5 – Agenda for the stakeholder discussion on 24 February 2021



<p style="text-align: center;">Stakeholder Meeting to discuss Gavray Drive</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Wednesday 24 February 2021 1:00pm – 2:30pm</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Zoom Conference Call</p>

AGENDA

Item 1: Welcome	David McFarlane – SP Broadway (Facilitator)
Item 2: L&Q Estates update	Russell Crow, Planning Director – L&Q Estates
Item 3: Planning update	Peter Chambers, Associate Planner – David Lock Associates
Item 4: General technical update	L&Q Estates team
Item 5: Community input and open discussion	All
Item 6: Next Steps	Russell Crow, Planning Director – L&Q Estates David McFarlane – SP Broadway (Facilitator)

INVITEES

Caroline Ford	Interim Team Leader, Major Projects Planning Team, Cherwell District Council
Bernadette Owens	Principal Planning Officer, Cherwell District Council
Steve Wheatley	Regional Conservation Manager (South East England) Butterfly Conservation
Neil Rowntree	Senior Biodiversity Officer (Oxfordshire), Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust
Pat Clissold	Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester
Pam Roberts	Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester
Marion Beaver	Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester
Dominic Woodfield	Managing Director, Bioscan (UK) Ltd
Charlotte Watkins	LP Biodiversity Officer, LP Planning
Carole Hetherington	Chair, Langford Village Community Association
Maureen Thompson	Headteacher, Langford Village Community Primary School
Paul Hollidge	Headteacher, Longfields Primary School and Nursery Cherwell, CPRE Oxfordshire
Nicholas Dolden	Cherwell, CPRE Oxfordshire
Cllr Nick Cotter	Bicester South & Ambrosden ward member
Cllr Dan Sames	Bicester South & Ambrosden ward member
Cllr Lucinda Wing	Bicester South & Ambrosden ward member

PROJECT TEAM ATTENDEES

David McFarlane (Facilitator)	SP Broadway
Hoda Taher	SP Broadway
Russell Crow	L&Q Estates
Aritz Kaushik	L&Q Estates
Peter Chambers	David Lock Associates
Sarah Murray	Edge Urban Design
Tom Wigglesworth	EDP
Dave Lawes	Hydrock
John Charlesworth	Hydrock
Simon Mirams	Hydrock
Jenny Baker	Markides Associates

6.6. Appendix 6 – Minutes of the stakeholder discussion on 24 February 2021



Gavray Drive Stakeholder Discussion

Venue: Zoom Conference Call

Date: 24 February 1pm

Attendees: Pat Clissold (Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester), Pam Roberts (Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester), Marion Beaver (Save Gavray Meadows for Bicester), Dominic Woodfield (Bioscan UK Ltd), Carole Hetherington (Langford Village Community Association), Nicholas Dolden (Cherwell, CPRE Oxfordshire), Cllr Dan Sames (Cherwell District Council), Cllr Nick Cotter (Cherwell District Council)

Apologies: Neil Rowntree (Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust)

Project team attendees: David McFarlane, SP Broadway (DM); Hoda Taher, SP Broadway (HT); Russell Crow, L&Q Estates (RC); Aritz Kaushik, L&Q Estates (AK); Peter Chambers, David Lock Associates (PC); Sarah Murray, Edge Urban Design (SM); Tom Wigglesworth, EDP (TW); Dave Lawes, Hydrock (DL); John Charlesworth, Hydrock (JC); Simon Mirams, Hydrock (SDM); Jenny Baker, Markides Associates (JB)

Item 1: Welcome

1.1. DM opened the meeting and gave introductions for the benefit of new attendees and apologies for absence were noted.

1.2. HT gave an overview of the feedback received from the online consultation which took place last month. DM added that a summary of the feedback will be uploaded on the website.

Item 2: L&Q Estates update

2.1. RC explained that L&Q have taken a fresh approach to the latest proposals and are looking to fully engage with local stakeholders to reach common ground.

Item 3: Planning update

3.1. PC explained the project team have been engaging with Cherwell District Council (CDC) during the pre-app process, which has seen the environmental impact assessment scoping opinion issued by CDC. PC added that technical assessments are now underway, and another period of consultation will take place once an application is submitted.

Item 4: General technical update

4.1. DL explained that Hydrock are working on various technical appraisals for submission with the planning application. DL said that Hydrock are in contact with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), Environment Agency (EA) and other relevant environmental stakeholders at CDC and are in the process of producing reports for the environmental statement. DL added

that a site visit will be conducted this week to determine its condition and whether to proceed as planned to carry out ground investigations.

4.2. SDM explained that Hydrock are working in line with National Planning Policy Framework policy to ensure that the development does not result in an increase in flooding elsewhere and where possible, a betterment will be provided to third party land. SDM said that Hydrock have engaged with the Environment Agency to secure their hydraulic model of the area. SDM added that they have reviewed available photos of flooding in the area over Christmas to understand the magnitude of the issue and that this will be used to sense check the modelled flood risk along with investigating mitigation measures. As part of the modelling exercise, they have looked at lowering areas of the site (to the west of the watercourse) and the Environment Agency's model will be run against proposed ground levels to confirm that there will be no impact downstream.

4.3. JC displayed an image of the drainage proposals for the western side of the site which incorporate sustainable drainage systems which aim to contain a '1 in 100 year' flooding event plus 40% climate change in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). JC added that limitations on water flows and QMED have been discussed and agreed with the LLFA and Hydrock need to ensure that any runoff from the site and surface water discharge to the brook does not result in an increase in water and limits it to the average weather event. JC explained that the limitation will also apply to more extreme weather events and a cascading effect will also be implemented to provide exemplary levels of surface water treatment which will come to a final resting basin prior to discharge through a water course.

4.4. JC displayed an image of the drainage proposals for the eastern side of the site, which include a piped system. Hydrock will be looking to attenuate surface water flows on site and discharge water from the site being controlled to a level no greater than the median greenfield run-off rate, QMED.

4.5. A stakeholder commented that drainage matters need to be simplified in the future for the benefit of everyone's understanding and asked what volume of water currently accumulates on the site and how this will be dealt with? The stakeholder also asked whether porous surfaces would be used, whether water retention systems are being looked at and how future proof the discussed model is against flooding? JC explained that they are looking at the '1 in 100 year' flooding event plus a 40% allowance for climate change over that period of time. SDM added that in terms of future proofing fluvial flood risk, a 35% and 70% allowance will need to be looked at.

4.6. A stakeholder asked whether the proposed model needs to change given the frequency of flooding over Christmas? SDM assured the stakeholder that the model is not out of date and is independently reviewed by the Environment Agency. SDM added that he welcomes receiving photos of the flooding which occurred. Another stakeholder asked whether flood risk will be exacerbated by the development or remain as it is? SDM explained that in terms of policy, no increase in flooding must be demonstrated and Hydrock aim to ensure that the discharge from surface water on the site does not increase. JC added that surface water run off post development will be less than or equal to the current runoff rate. A stakeholder asked why a betterment situation is not achievable now given that it was for the previous application? SDM said that this is the result of the updated modelling and an increased allowance for

climate change. The stakeholder also asked where the discharge on the eastern end of the site will go? JC explained that this will be discharged onto the highways drainage which currently drains into a sewer.

4.7. A stakeholder highlighted the importance of ongoing management and maintenance of the Langford Brook in terms of flood risk and asked what L&Q are doing to ensure this is done. SDM agreed with the importance of ongoing management/maintenance and explained that under the Land Drainage Act this falls to the Riparian Owners in the first instance with the EA and Lead Local Flood Authority ultimately being responsible for the maintenance. SDM explained that areas off-site are outside of L&Q's control and therefore this would be the responsibility of others.

4.8. RC gave an update on the long-term management of the land and explained that the S106 agreement will outline various potential methods for the management of the land. RC added that the Greenbelt Limited document which was circulated to stakeholders explores costs but does not tie the company down to manage the land. A stakeholder expressed concerns about Greenbelt Limited's track record and added that he would like certainty that the future management mechanism will be suitably funded. Another stakeholder expressed similar concerns and added that the history of the site needs to be given more thought. RC explained that the Management Strategy produced by EDP would be enshrined in any Outline planning consent. In doing so L&Q were going beyond most Outline applications, and provided that appropriate potential management bodies were set out in the s106 then there could be confidence that Management Strategy would be delivered. TW added that L&Q have reached out to various management companies, including BBOWT, who explained that the site does not meet their acquisition criteria. A stakeholder suggested a local community interest group could take on the management. RC invited any proposal from the stakeholders.

4.9. JB gave an update on traffic and highways and explained that the internal roads within the site will have a 20mph limit. A stakeholder asked whether a 40mph limit can be implemented on the ring road? A councillor on the call explained that he will look into this. Another stakeholder asked whether S106 funding will be used to improve the junction between Wretchwick Way and Peregrine Way, as this was agreed for the last application? JB said she is expecting Oxfordshire County Council to come back with the same request.

Item 5: Community input and open discussion (questions were taken throughout all items covered)

Item 6: Next steps

6.1. RC explained that the points discussed will be considered and that another stakeholder discussion will take place before submission if required.

6.7. Appendix 7 – Consultation website

L&Q Estates

[Home](#)

[About L&Q Estates](#)

[Planning Background](#)

[Consultation](#)

[News](#)

[Feedback Form](#)

Gavray Drive, Bicester

L&Q Estates have begun a process of community consultation and engagement for the development of land off Gavray Drive, Bicester.

The land is currently allocated in Cherwell District Council's Local Plan, adopted in July 2015. We are in the process of preparing a new outline planning application for a comprehensive scheme across the entire site, including residential development and associated infrastructure together with a strategy for the protection and restoration of Gavray Drive Meadow Local Wildlife Site and Conservation Target Area. We are committed to working with the local community to achieve something we all can be proud of for generations to come.

Site investigation work is due to take place in the coming weeks in order to check groundwater conditions and to carry out site investigations. Ahead of the site investigation works there will also be some scrub/vegetation clearance to enable the works to take place; these works will take place in early February. Please [click here](#) for more information.

Take a look around the website to find out more about our proposals and our ongoing community consultation process, including a consultation [leaflet](#) which discusses the vision and emerging proposals for the land.



L&Q Estates



Land to the north of GAVRAY DRIVE **BICESTER**

L&Q Estates is preparing an Outline Planning Application for new homes on land to the north of Gavray Drive.

WE WANT YOUR VIEWS

This leaflet has been prepared so we can share our vision and emerging proposals for the Site and most importantly to ask for your feedback regarding our development proposals. Your comments will help shape the finalised proposals before we submit a planning application to Cherwell District Council.

Land to the North of Gavray Drive, Bicester

The land to the north of Gavray Drive is located to the east of Bicester in close proximity to the town centre. It is within walking distance of the towns existing services and facilities providing for sustainable development.

Our emerging proposals comprise the development of up to 300 dwellings, including affordable homes, large areas of public open space, including play areas, new recreational routes linking to the improved existing Public Right of Way and significant enhancement to Gavray Wildlife Meadow with a long term management plan

In advance of the submission of an Outline Planning Application, we are now consulting the local community on our emerging proposals. The proposals have been informed by various site assessments, including a series of technical and environmental studies.

About L&Q Estates

This Site is being promoted by L&Q Estates, one of the UK's most successful strategic land promotion and acquisition businesses working closely with stakeholders to tailor projects which maximise the potential of a site and deliver new homes and facilities that meet the needs of the local area. L&Q Estates is a 'Place Maker' - ensuring that placemaking is at the forefront of their ethos, generating high quality neighbourhoods for diverse communities.

We would like to hear your views and we will review and respond to feedback as we finalise and submit our proposals and designs.





Our Proposals

Our proposals will deliver a range of benefits as follows:

- The delivery of up to 300 dwellings with a mix of market and affordable homes (compliant with policy requirements) contributing to local housing needs;
- A range of new homes, ranging from smaller starter homes to larger family dwellings, and potentially some extra care properties designed for residents aged over 55;
- Approximately 75% of the site to be retained as green space;
- High quality public open spaces and landscaping sensitive to the existing character, enhancing the environment for residents and benefiting the local community with the inclusion of equipped play areas and natural play trails;
- Restoration and enhancement of Gavray Wildlife Meadow, including a long term management plan to ensure longevity of its ecological and biodiversity benefits, with the potential to provide some public access to integrate this asset into the community, offering educational opportunities;
- Sustainable drainage with features to support and enhance the ecological value of the Site; and
- Improvements to the existing Public Right of Way that crosses the Site, providing access to the wider settlement and areas surrounding Bicester including Langford, Chaucer Business Park, Bicester Park Industrial Estate and Launton village.

WE WOULD LIKE YOUR COMMENTS

L&Q Estates is keen to hear your views on the emerging development proposals before they submit the Outline Planning Application, which is expected to be in Spring 2021. We welcome any comments that you may have, including what you might want to see on the Site.

This is not the last time you will be able to make comments on these proposals. Once the planning application is submitted to Cherwell District Council you will also be able to submit formal comments to the Council directly. These comments will be considered by the Council when they determine the planning application. In the future, there will be further opportunities for safe engagement to allow more involvement in how the detail of the scheme might look.

We are particularly interested in your answers to the following questions:

1. What types of housing do you think would be most suitable for the Site? (i.e. number of bedrooms / flats or houses / older persons provision)
2. What are your views on providing some/limited public access to Gavray Wildlife Meadow? Do you have any suggestions for how this could be managed?
3. Do you have any comments on the Illustrative Masterplan layout?
4. Please provide any other comments you have on the proposed development.

Please send your comments to **Hoda Taher of SP Broadway** via email at **hoda@spbroadway.com** or call **07963 314856**. Alternatively, you can visit our website **<https://www.spbroadway.com/gavray>** to fill in a feedback form, or send your comments by post to: **Freepost SP BROADWAY** (SP BROADWAY must be in capitals).

Please submit your comments by **Monday 25th January 2021**



SP Broadway (Thomas House, 84 Eccleston Square, London, SW1V 1PX) & **Edge Urban Design** (Suite 2, 7 Buttermarket, Thame, Oxfordshire, OX9 3EW) are conducting this consultation on behalf of **L&Q Estates** (Gallagher House, Gallagher Way, Warwick, CV34 6AF). When we refer to "we" or "us" we mean the three of us.

If you submit comments and include your address we will only use your address to analyse the areas from which comments are being submitted. The information you submit and your personal data will not be passed to any third party.

The information you submit will only be retained for as long as is necessary for the purposes of the planning process for this development. If you wish to withdraw your consent at any time please contact us using the contact details on this leaflet.

If you would like to know more about how your information will be processed, please contact us using the contact details on this leaflet.

Prepared by:



**SP
BROADWAY**
Building Relationships

6.9. Appendix 9 – Summary of consultation feedback



Gavray Drive Feedback Summary – 5 January 2021 to 25 January 2021

Summary of issues raised in feedback by residents following the 2,406 consultation leaflets sent to addresses around Gavray Drive on 5 January 2021.

We received 55 feedback forms, which is 2.29% of the total number of leaflets sent out (2,406).

Some feedback covered the following points:

- The preservation of the wildlife meadow – 1.82%
- The suggested paths and careful management plan of Gavray Meadows – 1.82%
- Provision of housing for older residents – 3.64%
- The use of land which has been in the planning stage for many years – 1.82%

32 of the 55 (58.18%) feedback forms received raised general questions including:

- Noise concerns – from industrial estates and trains for new residents, noise disruption from construction to wildlife and residents – 9.09%
- Concerns that there are no safe crossings for pedestrians on Gavray Drive and need for speed limits around the development – 3.64%
- Affordable housing and first time buyer homes – 9.09%
- The proposals are not necessary given all the current and future developments in the area – 3.64%
- Kingsmere houses have still not been sold – 1.82%
- Will there be lighting along all the routes? – 1.82%
- Could provision be made for some local shops? – 7.27%
- Commitment to the long term maintenance of the area – 18.18%
- Retention of trees – 3.64%
- Donation to CDC to assist with the provision of school places and additional medical provision – 1.82%
- Concerns about the increase in traffic – 9.09%

- Why not reinvigorate the town centre as opposed to building more housing? – 1.82%

19 of the 55 (34.55%) feedback forms received indicate concern about the proposals. Reasons for concern include:

- Recent flooding in the area, particularly over Christmas 2020
- Loss of Gavray Wildlife Meadows
- Burden on infrastructure in Bicester – school places and medical provision