

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.