

# Mr STEPHEN FRY comments

Page: [Draft New London Plan](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

## 'RORH' = "Residents' Own Redevelopment to Higher Density"

I am the founder and editor of CITY VOICE - a town planning site to enhance local democracy, still currently at initial stage ([www.city-voice.org](http://www.city-voice.org)). (see Twitter [@cityVoicEd](#))

I propose an entirely new development system which I call **RORH**, or **Residents Own Redevelopment to Higher Density**. It is the result of articles that were sent to [www.CITY-VOICE.org](http://www.CITY-VOICE.org). The main one states that rundown areas of Oxford (where City-voice.org started) could be rebuilt to triple Oxford's housing stock. My addition is that:

- 1) this should be done by, and the profit earned by, the residents themselves.
- 2) First you have to agree an aesthetic and micro-infra approach / style that will be the visual and living envy of the whole world. Jane Jacobs, [@createstreets](#), etc etc. Careful, sensitive, ambitious.
- 3) Key is doing the maths with the owners such that a VERY HIGH percentage of the NEW housing is 100% social - a need as vital as having a fire service or roads. This needs to be incorporated into the initial 'ideology'.

I have 3 versions in the following folder:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1Y7tPr07YerwoYuxLI1wBCZazRmAAAn-0w>

- pick them out separately as :

**RORH - 1-page Proposal - Oxford.pdf - at :**

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=1sf7MS5bLrv1kbsgs1EjSteWre1lj9XMk>

**RORH - 12-page Proposal incl 3 articles -- from Oxford Consultation response Jan2018.pdf :**

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=19OMR\\_0aQ1IkL108BoPeC1\\_toO9VyTR6P](https://drive.google.com/open?id=19OMR_0aQ1IkL108BoPeC1_toO9VyTR6P)

- and this is the initial big article aimed to inspire the city where it started (Oxford) -

**RORH - in 36-page OxfHousing planning response Jan2018.pdf:**

[https://drive.google.com/open?id=1HPWO6QeAHAWcMak6vtea\\_IrdNWzj0pvk](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1HPWO6QeAHAWcMak6vtea_IrdNWzj0pvk)

I request kindly please OPEN THESE AND ACCEPT THEM AS integral PARTS of my submission

- the 1-page summary tells it all - the other files add some substance context and excitement

I reproduce below the text of the one-page summary:

----- - - - - **1-page summary file, copied as text** - - - - -----

**‘RORH’ = “Residents’ Own Redevelopment to Higher Density”**

1 A town's number of homes can be tripled if streets are redeveloped to higher density.

No need to be afraid of higher density. The proof is on twitter at **@createstreets**

In this plan:

- (i) We design a streetscape design framework of such quality that all agree it is good;
- (ii) Only if ALL owners consent, whole areas are rebuilt, broadly within the streetscape design framework; work is staggered by parts – people move out of the old into the new as it grows.
- (iii) Consent of all owners is likely IF from it they get: relocation in the same place with more comfort; near-zero inconvenience; an improved environment; and a handsome profit.

Under this proposal, the residents continue to own it, and THEY get ALL the profit.

But: We will not back any scheme unless it starts from an agreed design style framework that will promote, reinforce and dignify the city. The new must be:

– innovative – and an environment that will outshine the world's most beautiful cities... –  
– think Paris – ... Bath – ... Rome –... Amsterdam – (...or ... – Oxford ..) ..

This is an architectural project before it is a social or economic one. It is an economic one for benefit of existing owners. It is social for improving the city (enormously) and providing hopefully a very significant % of social housing. Its main motivation is to alleviate the shortage of housing.

Ageing and underdeveloped (low-rise) districts – where owners can make a good profit – offer the opportunity.

It will

(1) create a new and even better worldwide reputation for our city for great buildings, streets, etc;

(2) triple (or more) current housing stock (annulling pressures on green belt, etc.)

(3) make money for the existing house owners.

(See: [www.createstreets.com](http://www.createstreets.com); @createstreets. @londonyimby. [www.oxfordyimby.org](http://www.oxfordyimby.org) .

A two-storey house built 100 years ago, now in deteriorated condition or even subdivided, might house, say, (4?) people. A brilliantly-designed new residential or mixed building on the same site might house – say? – 24. One can adopt a multiplier variable – for example:

Residential Expansion Factor = EP = 4. (i.e. 4 units become 16)

Simple maths will decide an EP that provides: – for the existing owners, profit or larger premises;  
– for house seekers: reduction of price pressure, toppling the Oxford Housing Price Premium;  
– for key workers: a Key Worker/Social Housing Percentage = SHP, arising from the maths;  
– for all: improved environments, as design will also centre on, for instance, cars underground or away from people, bikes away from cars, and open space and facilities as theme and policy.

Land value appreciation will be the property of the existing owners; development will happen only if every single owner agrees. They will likely all agree if they see that the future result is (i) something they will like, be proud to be part of (likely= very beautiful, functional, elegant, innovative, profitable); (ii) it makes them a handsome profit.

Some more variables/acronyms:

i CPS: Complete Project Size (number of units)      ii SRU: Step Redevelopment Unit  
iii RSR: Redevelopment Speed Ratio =  $SRU/CPS$       iv BA: Bridge Accommodation

The Article by Vermeulen is the inspiration for this present proposal.

2 Note on legislation

If specific planning powers are needed to facilitate these innovations, the mechanism of a Private Bill works well. Explanation available.

-----ENDS --- page 1 of 1 -----

Stephen B Fry

Editor, [www.CITY-VOICE.org](http://www.CITY-VOICE.org) (twitter @cityVoicEd)