Joint Climate & Environment and Economic & Social Overview and Scrutiny Committee Monday 14 March 2022

Having considered the report and the masterplan, Members would like to make the following comments to Cabinet, prior to their decision on Wednesday 16 March 2022:

- The number of houses referred to is described as 'about 1000 houses' Members would like this
 to be a more finite number following experiences in Carterton / Brize Norton where development
 had vastly exceeded initial understandings;
- 2) Concerns were raised regarding the layout of the school and associated access points can these be checked by Cabinet? It was also noted that OCC should be consulted on this;
- 3) It was noted that no reference had been made to the provision of a burial site Cabinet are asked to consider future provision or at least reference to a contribution in Appendix I;

4) Drainage

- a) It is noted that there will be 4 separate landowners and applications strategies need to be in place that are robust and tested;
- b) There is no information regarding foul drainage so further indication is required as to how this will be managed;
- c) The drainage needs to be looked at as a cumulative impact & the Council needs to find ways to get Thames Water to invest, looking at the site as a whole rather than piecemeal;
- 5) There should be an ambitious net gain in biodiversity across the whole site, with developers aiming for 10% as a minimum a request for pollinators and hedgehog highways to be incorporated from the beginning. Please can Cabinet look to the incoming Environment Act for guidance?;
- 6) The bus routes detailed in the masterplan are incorrect and need amending;
- 7) Construction traffic should not be directed through the village and Members support the comments made by OCC. Cabinet are requested to insist that there is no construction via Thornbury Road and alternative routes are detailed;
- 8) The Chill Bridge bridleway needs to be preserved and remain as existing, because it is the only access to countryside;
- 9) The parking strategy is lacking, ambiguous and not definitive. Whilst the EVCP proposals were ambitious, it was not tested against capacity to deliver. The document was not clear if it was aiming to deliver lower car usage;
- 10) Cabinet to ensure the Masterplan blends with the guidance from Thames Valley Police relating to cycle stores / parking as it was felt this contradicted their security advice;
- II) Primary school the references to form entry need to be consistent throughout document and should reflect the comments from OCC;
- 12) There needs to be more detail about self build provision, in line with Council policy as the 5% requirement is not prescribed in the document;

Joint Climate & Environment and Economic & Social Overview and Scrutiny Committee Monday 14 March 2022

- 13) Sustainability whilst Members noted and welcomed the recommendations put to the developer from Cllr Harvey there was a feeling that the masterplan needs to include an ambition to achieve greater sustainability levels;
- 14) Formal recommendation that the sustainability pages in the masterplan are rejected and there should be a requirement that the 2025 future homes standard is met from day I of development;
- 15) The phasing should be implemented as per the recommendations made by OCC;
- 16) Request that the developer looks at an Infrastructure Phasing Delivery Plan and more information should be given around the bullet points on page 123. It was felt that any gaps in the plan could be funded / commissioned by Council officers as per the Garden Village AAP; and
- 17) It was felt that phase 5 was too late to be bringing in community infrastructure and the local centre needed to be developed earlier in the scheme to encourage community cohesion.

Note: Whilst Members recognised the reasons that this was a developer led document, following the decision made by Cabinet in May 2021, there was some feeling that this had been a retrograde step, resulting in a Masterplan that was lacking in ambition and detail.