

Design Development Consultation (30 Jun-29 Jul 2022)

Feedback Summary Report

1. Overview

Christ Church is developing proposals for Water Eaton (also known as PR6a) . The site is allocated for the development of new homes, a primary school and local centre in the Cherwell Local Plan, which was adopted by Cherwell District Council in September 2020.

We have engaged stakeholders and local communities from an early stage in the scheme development process to understand potential concerns and possibilities so we can take them into account.

A virtual Enquiry by Design (EbyD) process took place in July 2021 with invitations extended to community representatives and interest groups, and technical stakeholders to attend and contribute to identifying key issues, concerns and potential solutions regarding development of the site.

The draft masterplan derived from the EbyD process then formed the basis of the proposals we presented for an initial stage of public consultation which followed in October 2021, giving people the opportunity to provide views on the emerging design for the site and contribute to our vision for Water Eaton.

We continued to refine our masterplan for the site; taking into consideration feedback to this first consultation, while progressing with technical assessments and environmental surveys and ongoing detailed discussions with stakeholders. While having not yet reached the stage of being ready to present our draft application of the site, we undertook a further round of consultation to invite views on certain fundamental aspects of the emerging scheme.

This consultation ran from 30 June to 29 July 2022. Feedback was invited on the following specific areas:

- The updated illustrative masterplan
- The movement strategy, which prioritises walking, cycling and public transport
- The location of the primary school, its interaction with the local centre and proposed School Street
- Design approach for Pipal Barns, a non-designated group of c.19th century and later farm buildings located on Oxford Road
- The access strategy, which outlines access to the site from Oxford Road and connectivity to and across the site.

Consultation was held virtually. Information on which views were sought was made available on the project website (with printed material made available on request). We held a virtual consultation event on 12 July 2022 at which members of the project team provided an overview of the areas we were seeking views on, with attendees then invited to ask questions and provide their thoughts and comments.

Over the course of the consultation period 715 individual users accessed the project website, which was viewed a total of 895 times.

In total 57 submissions we received from individuals or representative groups/organisations:

- 33 emails submitted via email to info@watereaton.co.uk
- 21 online feedback forms submitted via the project website: www.water-eaton.co.uk.
- Three feedback forms received through the Freepost address.

Comments and questions submitted during the virtual consultation event on 12 July have also been logged and considered as feedback to the consultation.

Further to the consultation closing we are considering all the feedback submitted to this consultation, together with the findings from ongoing survey and assessment work, to help us fix the parameters for the project and refine our plans for Water Eaton.

We then intend to conduct a final stage of public consultation on our draft outline planning application ahead of submitting it to Cherwell District Council later this year.

The planning application we submit will include a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). This will provide an overview of all the consultation and engagement activity we have carried out over the course of the pre-application development stage, and how we have had regard to feedback received in developing our outline application.

2. Summary of issues raised in consultation submissions

The table below provides a summary of the issues raised in feedback submissions to the consultation, including comments and questions submitted during the virtual consultation event. The SCI we submit with our outline planning application will set out how we have had regard to the issues raised in feedback in developing our final application.

Themes	Feedback – key points summary
Emerging masterplan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about height of buildings proposed – specifically potential for 4-5 storey buildings along Oxford Road – however suggestion was made that height of buildings across the site could vary, with specific recommendation for higher-rise residential blocks in the site interior. • Impact of building height on views of the Cherwell Valley • Opposition to building on greenbelt and productive agricultural land – linking to climate change and food security issues • Concern housing numbers proposed exceeds that indicated in the Local Plan • Small number of respondents supportive of development here - citing lack of housing supply as giving rise to house price inflation, and there being insufficient reason to maintain the land as greenbelt given extent of housing need • Suggestion that building density/height should be increased to capitalise on proximity of site to Oxford Parkway for commuters • Need for rental homes at a fair price, and importance of developer's role in improving Oxford housing stock and delivering 'social housing that creates communities' • Importance of identifying a sensitive architectural vernacular – specific reference made to avoiding of the 'hideous' black bricks seen at Barton Park • Realise aspirations for development to be 'distinctive', village enclaves, garden frontages, classic Oxford village style. • Strong rejection of an amphitheatre – proposal of which is not based on local need. Perceived as 'a design gimmick' in concept and proposed location, and concerns that would impact local residents in respect of increased parking, noise and traffic issues, as well as anti-social behaviour • Strong view that Park extension should serve to encourage 'nature and biodiversity' • Desire to 'see bold targets and commitments' in eco standards from the start of the development with heat pumps, solar panels, batteries, highly insulated, rainwater harvesting • Concern about the green and sustainable features proposed being sufficient to reduce CO₂ emissions • Recommendation that Christ Church needs to build a trusted relationships with the local community • Need for zero carbon construction and zero carbon maintenance of new houses. Examples cited: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) utilising factory/off-site housing manufacture - evidence feasible with Glencore Construction

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Low carbon/Passivhaus developments and suggestion to use JCT standard contract rather than Design and Build ○ Orientation of houses to maximise solar gain key ○ Consider siting the Oxford Stadium at Water Eaton ○ Trees bordering Banbury Road should be planted to create a wider buffer zone ○ Turning A1465 into urban corridor has potential to be ‘isolating and endless’ ● Request for clarity on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stewardship and how the park extension will be protected from development and inappropriate use ○ ‘Binding’ legal covenants that will be in place to ensure developer and future owners adhere to agreed items ○ How the Park Extension will become an extension to Cutteslowe Park ○ Use of the term ‘mobility hub’ – perceived to be synonymous with transport for those with limited movement ● Current lack of community facilities in the area cited; suggestion that provision is made for local pharmacy/medical services to be included, pending loss of golf course also raised ● Whether existing residents as well as new will have access to allotments ● Insufficient water supply to cater for planned building north of Cutteslowe Park ● Increased flood risk to immediate and surrounding area; need to design storm capacity of at least 100 years plus 10 per cent due to climate change and flood risk ● Notable concern over the location of play area near Cutteslowe Park – traffic generation, over supply of play areas in Cutteslowe Park, at odds with natural area. Greater need for somewhere for teenagers
<p>Prioritising cycling, walking and public transport over use of private car</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approach generally welcomed and regarded as required. Described as ‘exactly the right approach’ ● Need to enable significant improvements to existing public services (specifically bus services) to ensure concept works – ‘good facilities on the site are meaningless in isolation from broader connectivity’ ● Concerns that cycle superhighways ‘deposit cyclists straight back on to busy roads in North Oxford ● Concern cited in respect of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ lack of a good connection to Kidlington (including the P&R entrance crossing) as well as pinch points over the A34 and rail bridges and the Kidlington roundabout ○ suggestion that existing shared path on the west side of Oxford Road remains unchanged until PR6b goes ahead ○ residents on site will have more than one car per household and contribute to/be affected by congestion ● Concern expressed that Kidlington roundabout and A34 bridge towards Kidlington are unsafe for users ● Controlled parking zones/resident parking zones essential to prevent commuters parking on the site ● Concern that inadequate parking will see cars parked on roads ● Need to make sure adequate provision for people with limited mobility or disabilities who are unable to walk/cycle and/or access public transport

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All streets restricted to 20mph; using shared space, road surfaces and street furniture to indicate and reinforce this • Speed limit on Oxford Road should be restricted to 30mph • Outside PR6a - in terms connectivity – build simple pedestrian/cycle bridge over Cherwell at ford on bridleway from PR6a to Islip • Evidence of capacity check to ensure local roads and new layout can cope with predicted new vehicle numbers requested • Question whether access roads intended for regular buses or minibuses and whether developer offer a subsidy • Park and Ride should double in size, shuttle buses installed for public going to Oxford, development should subsidise bus service. Information requested on measures in place to contain overflow of parking demand. • Much larger ‘green countryside’ gap needed between P&R and development to prevent coalescence • Need to increase rail services between city and Oxford Parkway or development of tram system to mitigate traffic and encourage use of public transport • Will there be a link to Croudace site? • Cycle routes through Cutteslowe Park should not be lit/have streetlights – to prevent light pollution, urbanisation and protect wildlife • Have/should park stakeholders be consulted on proposed cycle routes through the park and extension?
<p>Oxford Road proposal to separate the cycle way and footway from the road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the concept broadly welcomed – regarded as safer and likely to encourage increased uptake in cycling and move away from cars • Cycle path should give people choice – use Banbury Road or slower path that could join up with path across top of Cutteslowe Park • Limited number of respondents view it as inadequate – describing it as a ‘white elephant’ and ‘pointless’ as section only along site frontage and needs to be along entire road – north to south • Concerns that delivery of this comes at expense of loss of trees and green corridor • Any ‘slow’ path to Cutteslowe Park should not use green corridor space
<p>CYCLOPS junction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority viewed this as a ‘good plan’ • Limited number believe it ‘won’t work’ and ‘should be scrapped’ – specific concerns cited as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More thought needs to be given to angles of roads entering and leaving the development to ensure ‘cannot sweep in or out of development at higher speeds.’ ○ Providing inadequate means for south bound cyclists to cross ring road on travelling into the city ○ Design will exacerbate issue of traffic backing up from Water Eaton P&R traffic lights down to roundabout and along Oxford Road in Kidlington.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repeated request that number of access points onto the development is limited • Concern flagged for privacy of St.Frideswide's Farm and access for delivery versus prevention of use of access track for parking • Stationary cars and new tall buildings will create wind tunnel and effect will increase pollution – this needs to be studied and mitigated • Suggestion residential courts and spurs are shared usage, and large service ducts are installed under spurs.
Primary school location and layout, interaction between primary school and local centre. Concept of School Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location both welcomed and questioned. • Conflicting suggestions that school should be located further north in the development to reflect catchment will be from 6A, 6B and other areas, while others stated should be more central. • Assertion that the primary school needs to exclusively serves immediate area otherwise will just give rise to increased traffic; jeopardising safety of children walking/cycling to school and resulting in parents using Cutteslowe Park/ Harbord Road for parking • Co-location of school and community centre 'good option' • Request for clarity on specifics of community facilities proposed - current 'lack of amenities [is] very real' • Suggestion that 'high walls' should not be used around school perimeter as would impact sight lines across and through development • Light and noise mitigation for local streets to school queried. • Support for school street concept, but not at expense of causing 'traffic to block up down the main road, block access for road users or emergency vehicles.' • Approach needed to encourage children to cycle or walk 'independently' to school.
Pipal Barns Design approach Alternative suggestions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgment that while demolition may be the easiest answer, clear preference for retention on grounds of 'heritage value,' adding historic character to the site and maintaining 'aesthetic appeal' • Suggestions range from 'leave as they are,' 'a new community hub', 'retain barns to reduce feeling of generic housing estate' 'retail outlet' 'remote working space' 'preserved and used as wildlife havens', medical centre – potentially privately financed • Repeated concern for protected species found at barns and their care
Environment and ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide swallow nesting sites • Suggestion of wetland put forward and/or large water feature – assist surface water, wildlife, joined up with P&R lagoon • Plans should include clear commitment to planting, use of native species supporting wildlife

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site signing up to 'Building with Nature' accreditation generally welcomed• Suggestion that eastern boundary green corridor becomes a nature trail with stream and decking like Barton Park• Concerns over wildlife during construction• Concern that the Green Infrastructure Corridor was being 'side-stepped,' was 'not best practice', was not 'meeting the aspirations of planning guidelines'• Assertion that wildlife/green corridors should be 'highways for nature'; they are not 'landscaping schemes', and not cycle spaces• Concerns raised that shared streets/cycle ways/footpaths will be ineffective as green corridors• East West corridors 'muddled' 'critical plan safeguard current high-quality biodiversity'• Consider fungal and biological variety of life, invertebrate and vertebrate life• Concern for badgers, skylarks, lapwings and biodiversity• Clarity on who will be responsible for managing and maintaining public areas, farmland, new planting in coming decade• Request Banbury/Oxford Road trees and rough area is 'protected'. If it is removed, it must be 'replaced by an enhanced corridor', and that best mature (or near) trees on western road flank are retained with new planting in between |
|--|---|