

Meeting between MCG and Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire (TWO) 22 November 2011

Questions asked of TWO – and answers as of 22 Nov 2011.

First draft corrected by Andy Cattermole of TWO who gave consent to put corrected version on MCG website.

Meeting of Jessica Brod, Suzanne Crafer and Jim Asher (MCG) with Andy Cattermole (Taylor Wimpey Oxfordshire) at 16:30-18:00 at the Taylor Wimpey Abingdon office (Windrush Court) on 22 Nov 2011.

Current process and timescales – what steps and when will they happen?

- AT/MAD News consultation in December issue
- detailed design brief by 1 Jan > architect design > financial review
- 2nd consultation event: end-Jan/start of Feb

What will be shown at the next TWO exhibition?

- consultation responses from 1st exhibition
- residential layout
- plan of replacement area and elevation of community building
- floor plan for the community building
- first exhibition had 275 attendees, of which 166 returned questionnaires; 6-7 (~4%) preferred the whole field to be developed; ~45% preferred the option for the half nearest the entrance; ~12% preferred the other half; ~19% did not want any residential development on the field.

What questions will you be asking?

- Qs on design, layout of housing and community building

How will feedback be collected?

- paper questionnaire and on-line inputs

What is TWO expecting from a design spec?

- detailed submissions from AT on requirements for hall(s), meeting room(s), bar, storage requirements, etc.
- sustainability, eco standards, how it will raise funds to maintain it
- The architects have designed this type of building before (examples were requested, which TWO will try to obtain). Their experience will be important and TWO is relying on them to guide the design process.
- Key assumptions will include issues such as multiple use; use of room dividers to provide flexibility; capacity to support more than one event at a time.
- TWO does have experience of community and commercial buildings, inherited from the Taylor Woodrow side of TW, although TW now focuses on residential developments. In addition TW have planning permission and are providing a

new Cricket Club and associated pavilion for Wokingham Cricket Club as they are releasing their old club ground for residential development.

When does TWO expect to submit planning applications?

- 4-6 weeks after the consultation
- TWO will submit three applications: (1) Full details of a replacement facility/pitches etc; (2) full details of the residential layout; (3) Outline plans for the residential scheme
- TWO also expects to write to every property in Marcham about its plans as they are submitted.

Any flexibility about what TWO submits by way of plans?

- Opportunity to influence the proposed plans after the consultation and before plans are submitted, depending on how extensive they are.

How are section 106 requirements satisfied in this case? Benefit to Marcham?

- Financial considerations are set by VWH/OCC formulae and contribute towards infrastructure (education, transport, waste, etc)
- TWO is championing a local application of benefit – ultimately not in TWO control, therefore subject to lobbying (see school Q) by all interested parties.

Who will build the community facility if plans are passed? (Why has the position changed since September?)

- TWO is now committed to build the new facility – to keep timescales down and to make the scheme more efficient. The land transactions are not otherwise affected.
- Even though TWO building, an independent cost consultant would be appointed to ensure that TWO deals honestly and transparently with AT.
- AT would own and be responsible for the building

What are the anticipated timescales for building a community facility?

- laying of drainage and pitches may be started early after planning consent; in discussion with Sport England about transition arrangements
- If plan is passed locally (not called in to an Inquiry), ground work would start in late 2012; building start in Jan 2013; estimated completion within 9 months for use by late 2013.

In the event that plans are passed, what opportunities do the community have to influence any necessary design changes after that point?

- There is a 3-month judicial review period allowed for after consent is given to a planning application – this provides a window to consider late changes to the plans.
- If any late considerations affect the size or extent of the building, then a new planning application would be needed
- If only internal layouts are affected, this would not require a fresh planning application

Has TWO explored other options, including building houses on the edge of the village and a community Facility on the field?

- Yes TWO did look at the alternative of a residential area on the edge of Marcham, but housing outside the village envelope runs contrary to planning policy, whereas housing inside the village envelope is acceptable; recreational development in the countryside is supported. TWO remain of the view that their current proposal is more policy-complaint than the alternative.

What is TWO's response (if any) to the VWHDC Interim Housing Supply proposals?

- TWO will be making a screening application as a matter of course, but do not otherwise see their proposals in this context.

Can TWO confirm that the proposed development area is limited to the Football field half of the Anson Field?

- TWO confirmed a figure of 49% of the field, the part nearer the road. They are applying for 50-55 houses, and are committed to that (although they recognise planning pressures to fit more in may come into play). 40% of the scheme would be low-cost (some for rent, some shared ownership). As yet, a Housing Association has not been appointed.

Is there a reason for the pond (speculations about the need for a drainage soakaway?)

- No, there is absolutely no requirement for a pond; it was shown only to illustrate how the area might be used. It is not their say in the end; the existing play facilities (which did not appear on the exhibited proposals) will be shown on the more detailed plans.

What is TWO's Plan B in the event that detailed plans are rejected by VWHDC?

- TWO will appeal if the principle of development is refused.
- If there is an issue of detail, TWO would seek to amend the plans in the first instance.

What are TWO's plans in relation to the school?

- TWO has met with School and is in contact with Iain Brown; trying to put together a package for Section 106 spend on the school and not outside the village (track record in Swindon; not yet in Oxon).

Closing points

- TWO wants this to be a scheme that they can be proud of and are keen to get it right for the village (it helps them commercially, too). Andy Cattermole stated that he is committed to open consultation and to being open and transparent.

- TWO made a formal on the record offer to present their plans to MCG directors, or all of MCG (and Marcham Parish Council) at the time of second consultation event, e.g. shortly before consultation event. TWO would also be willing to present the scheme to MCG prior to the application being submitted.
- TWO thanked MCG for the invitation to attend the Members/Open Meeting on 24 November and will send one observer: Andrew Green, who will make himself know to us, but will not otherwise participate actively in the meeting. They do not intend to answer any questions then, as they wish not to influence our meeting, but will be happy to receive and questions of ideas channelled though to TWO after the meeting.

22 Nov 2011