



DCO Submission

Consultation Report

Appendix 4

Document 5.1C

On behalf of
Oxfordshire Railfreight Limited

Prepared by Oxalis Planning
March 2026

Appendix 4 –

OxSRFI - Stage 1 'Section 42' consultee responses					
Emailed comments - excluding statutory consultee comments and land enquiries (dealt with seperately)					
Comment ID No.	Date	Type of consultee	Comments	Applicant Response	Have any changes been made to the design of the OxSRFI scheme which are relevant to the comment?
1	19/01/2022	Business - Adalta Real	Please keep me updated	The respondent will be sent an email informing them of the start of the Stage 2 consultation.	No
2	06/04/2022	Resident	Please can I be kept informed on the plans with the Oxfordshire strategic freight interchange.	The respondent will be sent an email informing them of the start of the Stage 2 consultation.	No
3	23/04/2022	Resident	Please keep me updated	The respondent will be sent an email informing them of the start of the Stage 2 consultation.	No
4	23/04/2022	Resident	Please send updates to this Email address MGHarrington	The respondent will be sent an email informing them of the start of the Stage 2 consultation.	No
5	24/04/2022	Resident	Good evening. I note from the plans delivered this week, that you propose to add a bus gate. Why? That isn't in a large town or city? Will this be an additional lane or will that intersection be effectively closed to normal traffic? If it's the latter, traffic from the west of your map will have to drive through Upper Heyford to access the new link road to Bicester. The drive through (old and new) Upper Heyford will be hell for drivers and home owners in this area!	The bus gate has been removed from the scheme following a review of the highways strategy after the Stage 1 consultation.	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme
6	24/04/2022	Resident Business - Oxford Office Furniture	Hi Oxsrfi Can you confirm if you will be installing Electric Charging Stations for HGV and PSV Vehicles and if so how many. We are looking to purchase an Electric HGV and although it will be some years before this site is ready it will give us an indication when we should order the new HGV's due to the fact there is no infrastructure yet available for charging large vehicles. I live in Heyford Park and the Business is Oxford Office Furniture based in Bicester. On another note we currently have 6 Off EV's and we were the First Company to go V2G (Vehicle to Grid) in the UK I kook forward to your reply.	The detailed design of the scheme, which is secured through requirements, will include details in relation to EV charging for the warehouses and HGV parking area for occupiers and users of the OxSRFI site.	No
7	25/04/2022	Resident	Dear Sir/Madam Can you advise who I can speak to regarding career opportunities with OXSRFI? Looking at Senior Management roles in Integrated Logistics, Strategic Development and Operational Implementation.	There are no relevant roles available for the OxSRFI scheme at this early stage of the scheme. The respondent will however be sent an email informing them of the start of the Stage 2 consultation.	No
8	28/04/2022	Resident	Please keep me informed	The respondent will be sent an email informing them of the start of the Stage 2 consultation.	No
9	27/04/2022	Resident	Dear OXSRFI. Under the proposals set out in the OXSRFI Early Consultation Plan that was put through my door, clearly no thought has been given to those of us who live north of the proposed development (Ardley, Fewcott and outlying properties along the Ardley Road) who regularly make trips to Heyford Park, especially to the only local supermarket in the area. There is no need for the B430 to be stopped south of Ardley. Traffic heading north / south, almost all heading north to the M40 or the A43 or south towards the A34, will naturally take the new bypass which will be a quicker route towards their destination. If the B430 were left open north of the main entrance roundabout it would create less impact to those in the local region who require access to Heyford Park, rather than having to head north and then traversing the already busy M40 interchange roundabout to head south. The stopping of the Heyford Park link road will already be an imposition enough. With both proposals in place it will virtually double the journey and introduce the need to navigate a busy M40 roundabout. Also, in previous discussions with Cherwell Council, they declined to reconnect the two severed ends of Chilgrove Drive after the decommissioning of the air base but they told me that there would be a footpath created from the southern end of the northern section of Chilgrove Drive round the eastern edge of the airbase to link up with the southern section. While I see the new footpath round the edge of the base on your plan there is no indication of it linking up with the southern end of the northern half of Chilgrove Drive. I would like you to consider these requests for the alteration of your plans so that local people are less impacted by your plans.	The highways strategy has been developed following a consideration of impacts on local roads, as well as the strategic highways network, with appropriate measures - such as the Ardley Bypass and Middleton Stoney Relief Roads which will reduce traffic through those village centres, and increased capacity at M40 J10 - proposed as a result. The highways strategy has also been developed further to consultation with the local highways authority and National Highways. The scheme includes new rights of way connections around the western of the OxSRFI site providing north-south links.	Yes - updated detail for footway/cycleway/bridleway proposals are included within the draft Sustainable Travel Strategy (as an Appendix to the draft ES Transport Chapter).
10	29/04/2022	Resident	Please keep me up to date with respect to the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange near Heyford, Oxfordshire	The respondent will be sent an email informing them of the start of the Stage 2 consultation.	No
11	30/04/2022	Business - Nicholson Nurseries Limited	Dear OxSRFI team Thank you for your early consultation leaflet, very informative. I wondered if you might connect me with the project team to see if we may assist with landscape architecture and project delivery? We are a team of specialist landscape architects, ecologists and foresters with robust contracting capabilities so can offer a strong design build service or any part thereof.	The respondent will be sent an email informing them of the start of the Stage 2 consultation. With potential future opportunities at the detailed stage of design.	No

Appendix 4 –

12	05/05/2022	Resident	<p>Dear Sirs, We live in this Village and have done so for the last 57 years and this enormous and overwhelming proposal is really worrying. Already we have the suggestion of huge warehousing proposed at Baynards Green and Junction 10 at the Motorway interchange and now further huge warehousing for freight from trains is proposed on the site of Ashgrove Farm. Covering green agricultural land with buildings is very short-sighted since in the immediate future this Country is going to have to be a lot more independent and self sufficient in growing food for the population than it has been up to now. We are currently in a situation where we can no longer obtain wheat, oil and gas from Russia and the Ukraine, and here you are, removing acres of good farming land which could produce crops for the Country. Not only that but with the proposed immense warehousing being put forward at Baynards Green and Junction 10, more warehousing IN THE RURAL COUNTRYSIDE and on greenfield sites in really overwhelmingly over the top.</p> <p>When you consider the extraordinary changes proposed to the B430 making it impossible for people from this Village to go direct (as now) to Middleton Stoney and Oxford by closing the road over the railway bridge and making the route to Middleton Stoney go left at Ardley Road crossroads in order to get on to a new Bypass and use this to reach Middleton Stoney and Oxford it seems completely wrong, let alone inconvenient.</p> <p>You have obviously not had to deal with the M10 Junction and the dreadful mess it currently is, not to mention the lines of queuing traffic waiting to get onto the Motorway or on to Northampton. We have already had three changes to the Junction since the Motorway and Services Area first came into being and still the planners have not got it right. Do you really think YOUR new suggestions will be any better? Somehow I doubt it, judging from the dreadful mess they have made of the previous three changes.</p> <p>It seems totally incongruous to have so many immense warehouses situated in the rural countryside. We already have to contend with an incinerator, the Landfill Site (now a recycling centre), the actual Motorway Services Area, the Greenwaste Company (which used to be Agrivert) on Camp Road and now you are proposing still more warehousing which will use the old Ardley railway station to bring freight to Ashgrove Farm supposedly to remove lorries from the roads.</p> <p>But no, this will not be the case, because having brought the freight to Ashgrove Farm you then have to transfer it to still other lorries and transport it on from there to whichever depot for the goods to which the lorries travel. Have you seen the huge numbers of warehouses there are already in the area?</p> <hr/> <p>At the start of Bicester, on the Middleton Stoney Road, Albion already have, I don't know how many, large warehouses on Howes/Lords Lanes and then on the A41 near Ambrosden there are currently two more enormous warehouses with a third proposed. Also on the road leading to Skimmingdish Lane on the other side of Bicester there are even more warehouses as well as those new ones on the Launton Road. This area is now becoming known as warehouse city.</p> <p>Clearly the main purpose for these road changes is to ensure that HGV lorries do not constantly pass through our Village in order to reach the M40 at Junction 10 but if these vehicles were NOT permitted to take the B430 through the Village from the proposed Ashgrove Farm development but were MADE to use the proposed Bypass only, and not travel straight up through Ardley on the B430 to reach Junction 10, this would overcome the passage of HGV's through Ardley and Ardley residents could still take a direct route to Middleton Stoney and on to Oxford. If Viridor has been successful in ensuring lorries all turn right out of the incinerator site in order NOT to pass through Middleton Stoney, surely it should be possible to make lorries from Ashgrove Farm only use the Bypass in order not to pass through Ardley.</p> <p>Presumably the main reason for making this freight distribution centre is to remove lorries from the roads, but in fact it will do the exact opposite since lorries will be collecting freight delivered by train to Ashgrove Farm and then set off on the roads to the other depots for re-distribution of goods around the country. Even worse than this is the fact that there are already three other freight distribution centres within a thirty mile radius of this proposed development. Why should there be even more distribution centres cluttering up the countryside and building on good greenfield agricultural land? This is definitely very short-sighted, particularly with the current economic situation with the increases in the cost of living. The UK needs as much land as possible in order to provide sufficient food for its population without being dependent upon importing from Countries abroad (such as Russia and the Ukraine). Using valuable greenfield farmland for a freight distribution centre cannot be right.</p> <p>I am putting this forward as an objection to this development mainly on the grounds that this will not achieve the Government's intentions of relieving HGV traffic from our roads, as well as the use of perfectly good agricultural farming land at a time when it is essential this Country caters for its population in an independent and self sufficient manner. Also, of course, that this development is being proposed in a rural and agricultural area.</p>	<p>The highways strategy has been developed following a consideration of impacts on local roads, as well as the strategic highways network, with appropriate highways improvements - such as the Ardley Bypass and Middleton Stoney Relief Roads which will reduce traffic through those village centres, and increase capacity at M40 J10 - proposed as a result. The highways strategy has also been developed further to consultation with the local highways authority and National Highways. Further details are provided within the draft ES Transport Chapter, with further ongoing assessment work to be provided as part of the application submission.</p> <p>National policy has set out that there is compelling need for more SRFIs and that as a result of their locational requirements (such as a proximity to rail and the strategic highways network), countryside locations may be required. The OxSRFI meets these locational requirements. National policy also states that the government is committed to growing rail freight due to the environmental benefits of the sector, with rail freight emitting approximately 76% less CO2 than equivalent transport by road - the OxSRFI scheme will therefore contribute towards the governments targets to reduce CO2 emissions.</p>	<p>Yes - updates to the J10 improvements as informed by further assessment work and proposed developments in the area.</p>
14	06/05/2022	Business	<p>Hi could you tell whether or not the plans include scope for the storage or processing of; * chemicals * explosives * nuclear materials or devices.</p>	<p>These are not proposed as part of the OxSRFI scheme.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Start of Consultation - 9th May 2022</p>					
15	09/05/2022	Resident	<p>Sir/Madam All looks good to me when can you start? Regards [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Supportive comment noted. Works are currently anticipated to start during mid-2027.</p>	<p>No</p>

Appendix 4 –

16	09/05/2022	Resident	<p>As a local resident I'm particularly concerned about these plans, which will turn a rural area into an urban wasteland. The planned location is wholly inappropriate and the plans are not in keeping with the local area, which is quiet and rural inspite the business park, incinerator and viridor site. It does make me question therefore as the organisation behind the plans is not an Oxfordshire registered company (nor mainland UK) whether any time was actually taken to consider sites or where it was simply a case of "well there's already x y and z there what harm will it be?"</p> <p>There's also an abundance of wildlife, including rare birds of prey, living on the land of the proposed development. For a development that is supposed to bring about environmental benefits, its interesting that it will decimate the habitat of so much indigenous flora and fauna, including the likes of buzzards and red kites (whom just a few decades ago were close to extinction as it was).</p> <p>The current infrastructure alongside the proposed road development is simply not sufficient to support the plans, and I think the only way to make it sufficient would be to essentially evict all residents (and wild animals), and tarmac the entire surrounding areas. The roads are already suffering a great deal as a result of increased local traffic.</p> <p>Many of us living locally have moved to the area to live a quieter life away from urban settlements and towns. This would totally destroy any village feel that we currently have and help turn our local villages into suburbs of Bicester.</p> <p>Finally, I appreciate I am sure there is a need for the development however I don't think junction 10 of the M40 is the appropriate site - for some of the reasons mentioned above. It is too far from major settlements to be justified. There are far more appropriate locations along the M40.</p>	<p>National policy has set out that there is compelling need for more SRFIs and that as a result of their locational requirements (such as a proximity to rail and the strategic highways network), countryside locations may be required. The OxSRFI meets these locational requirements due to its location adjacent to the Chiltern Main Line and proximity to M40 J10.</p> <p>The landscape strategy which includes earthworks and bunds will help to prevent or minimise views of the OxSRFI scheme and help integrate it within the wider landscape, which already includes urban influences at Heyford Park, Viridor and at M40 J10.</p> <p>The landscape strategy also incorporates measures for biodiversity enhancements with the planting of over 150,000 new trees and 13km of hedgerow. Impacts on habitats and protected species will be mitigated through measures that will help the scheme deliver at least 10% BNG.</p> <p>The highways strategy has been developed following a consideration of impacts on local roads, as well as the strategic highways network, with appropriate highways improvements - such as the Ardley Bypass and Middleton Stoney Relief Roads which will reduce traffic through those village centres, and increased capacity at M40 J10 - proposed as a result. The highways strategy has also been developed further to consultation with the local highways authority and National Highways. Further details are provided within the draft ES Transport Chapter, with further ongoing assessment work to be provided as part of the application submission.</p>	Yes - planting of 150,000 native new trees wihtin the scheme.
17	10/05/2022	Community Group - ERTA Voluntary Transport	<p>Dear Colleagues, Greetings. I note your development proposal and am please it is envisaged some freight by rail will come about potentially. However, I note M40 to West Midlands and A43 to Northampton/M1/East Midlands links, but no direct rail link either to East-West Rail or Leicester 'Gateway to East Midlands' rail-wise.</p> <p>Our association is voluntary and we are advocating a new-build parallel to HS2 from a new junction east of Claydon Junction on the East-West Rail Link to go via Brackley (A43) to have links with Rugby, Magna Park and the Leicester-Nuneaton rail links. What we need is for professionals to take our idea, work it up and aspire to bring together funders to get that basic rail infrastructure brought about.</p> <p>Likewise, at the base of the Chiltern Main Line, we want tunnels under Old Oak Common to share-use the proposed Heathrow Southern Rail Link via Woking to Portsmouth and maybe if Guildford-Horsham/Shoreham is restored, to serve the port of Shoreham (aggregates for example).</p> <p>I attach our latest newsletter which I trust may be of interest and welcome any interest you may have. We are having a Zoom Meeting on Thursday 7th July and would welcome anyone to give a short talk on the proposal and environmental benefits of aggregately more freight by rail and scoping for that contrast more lorries. Thank you.</p>	<p>The positive comments are noted.</p> <p>The Applicant is working with GB Rail Freight (operator) who consider that the OxSRFI site is extremely well located to meet market needs and deliver rail freight services, and expects the terminal to serve Oxfordshire but also to distribute product towards the south-western Midlands, the upper Thames Valley and into the western home counties as well as western parts of London with further details about rail markets provided as part of the application submission.</p>	No
19	12/05/2022	Resident	Please keep me updated of the plans for the rail freight at Ardley	The respondent will be sent an email informing them of the start of the Stage 2 consultation.	No
20	16/05/2022	Resident	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I strongly object to the installation of the Bus gate on the B4030 between Heyford Park and Middleton Stoney. I think that the effect of the Bus gate on existing traffic particularly that moving east to west will significantly increase traffic on Camp Road at Heyford Park.</p> <p>The junction at the western end of Camp road where it meets the Lower Heyford to Somerton road is wholly unsuited to increased traffic.</p> <p>The Bus gate will also increase traffic moving through the villages of Somerton and North Aston to reach the A4260. This road is hilly, windy, single file in multiple places, and includes multiple narrow bridges at bottom of the Cherwell valley.</p> <p>A solution to resolve this issue would be to scrap the Bus gate, and move the Middleton Stoney relief road southwards.</p> <p>This would enable the 4030 at the point (15) of the Bus gate to connect directly to the Middleton Stoney relief road (16) and (17) allowing free flow of traffic between Caulcott, Lower Heyford and Bicester.</p> <p>Heyford Park link road (13) could then be scrapped.</p> <p>The existing road between Heyford Park (12) and the proposed Bus gate (15) should be upgraded.</p>	The bus gate has been removed from the scheme following a review of the highways strategy after the Stage 1 consultation.	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme

Appendix 4 –

21	16/05/2022	Resident	<p>Please explain what measures will be in place to stop traffic cutting either up or down to the A34 via the B430.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>The highways strategy has been developed to move traffic, particularly HGVs, from local roads to the strategic highways network with appropriate highways improvements - such as the Ardley Bypass and Middleton Stoney Relief Roads which will reduce traffic through those village centres, and increase capacity at M40 J10 - proposed as a result. The highways strategy has also been developed further to consultation with the local highways authority and National Highways.</p>	No
22	23/05/2022	Resident	<p>Dear OXSRFI.</p> <p>Under the proposals set out in the OXSRFI Early Consultation Plan that was put through my door, clearly no thought has been given to those of us who live north of the proposed development (Ardley, Fewcott and outlying properties along the Ardley Road) who regularly make trips to Heyford Park, especially to the only local supermarket in the area.</p> <p>There is no need for the B430 to be stopped south of Ardley. Traffic heading north / south, almost all heading north to the M40 or the A43 or south towards the A34, will naturally take the new bypass which will be a quicker route towards their destination. If the B430 were left open north of the main entrance roundabout it would create less impact to those in the local region who require access to Heyford Park, rather than having to head north and then traversing the already busy M40 interchange roundabout to head south.</p> <p>The stopping of the Heyford Park link road will already be an imposition enough. With both proposals in place it will virtually double the journey and introduce the need to navigate a busy M40 roundabout.</p> <p>Also, in previous discussions with Cherwell Council, they declined to reconnect the two severed ends of Chilgrove Drive after the decommissioning of the air base but they told me that there would be a footpath created from the southern end of the northern section of Chilgrove Drive round the eastern edge of the airbase to link up with the southern section. While I see the new footpath round the edge of the base on your plan there is no indication of it linking up with the southern end of the northern half of Chilgrove Drive.</p> <p>I would like you to consider these requests for the alteration of your plans so that local people are less impacted by your plans.</p>	<p>Repeated comments from 27/04/22 - Applicant response provided above.</p>	No
23	24/05/2022	Community Group - ERTA Voluntary Transport	<p>Dear Friends, Colleagues and Elected Representatives,</p> <p>The Pandemic left much undone as did distract, but now we are gradually getting together using zoom for some audiences and physical meetings for others. We do not wish to disenfranchise those not familiar with modern technology, and we aim to value contributions made by all who can contribute in some constructive way.</p> <p>I attach 2 agendas for 2 meetings. Our meetings are open to all and so all welcome. They will not be going over the same old ground of should we or wait, rather, how to and get to or get out! Development is happening, Government has declared a Climate Emergency and we need a coherent coordinated endeavour to tailor development to protect a course for a new rail route and keep options 'open' more, whilst pressure and influence to encourage all tiers of governance, councils and agencies along with business and developers to invest in seeing what this new rail link could offer and make sustainable whilst balancing public utility with land-use policy and practise. Currently it is a free-for-all and whereas Victorians saw the need for bulk people and goods to go by rail, we have laissez-faire whereby anything goes, whether it is consistent with sustainability principles or not. That must change.</p> <p>We need as many people as want to help, feel able to contribute, head up and front for us in the labyrinth of interfaces such a monumental challenge informs. It can be done and has to start now.</p> <p>In the early 1990's on a sponsored cycle ride, a display at the old Winslow Station, showed a need to support re-railing the Great Central corridor then and people were dismissive saying things like "if we can't get Aylesbury/Oxford-Milton Keynes, what chance Great Central"; but now of course, Oxford/Aylesbury - Milton Keynes is not only on the cards, but being rebuilt. It is the Great Central corridor's turn, and had a little energy been spent to protect the corridor, we would be better off today as a result.</p> <p>Hindsight is a wonderful thing, efforts to reopen have come and gone, but we must learn, re-start where we are at and see the new opportunity. Essential for road and rail relief but needs acumen to draw-in bigger outlets to take an interest, do the studies we are not equipped to and court government support. It can be done and I welcome any support to help us make progress. We are facilitators and idea planters, but other folks can bridge between what we do and making it a reality please.</p>	<p>This email was a general email to those on a mailing list for the ERTA community group, and was therefore not specifically for the OxSRFI Stage 1 consultation.</p>	No

Appendix 4 –

24	29/05/2022	Resident	<p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>Please find below my comments on the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange:</p> <p>Lack of passenger rail access to the site</p> <p>The single biggest shortcoming of the proposal is the lack of a train station for rail passengers, and consequent lack of direct rail-based access to the site.</p> <p>The proposal should be amended to include a re-opening of the passenger station at Ardley. With thousands of employees needing to access the site each day, it is imperative that staff can arrive by rail. If a passenger train station is not built, staff will be forced to arrive by car, putting pressure on the road network and negating any environmental benefit of building a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange. Also, a re-opening of Ardley station will create a valuable amenity for the local community.</p> <p>Confluence with Heyford Park</p> <p>The present design of the site envisions that warehouses are built immediately to the East of Chilgrove Drive (known locally as “Kebab Van Road”). With housing planned on the plot immediately west of Chilgrove Drive the SRFI will effectively create a 2-mile-wide “megavillage” from the Western edge of Heyford Park and all the way to Ardley/M40.</p> <p>In order to preserve Heyford Park as a separate village it is essential that a wide, green buffer is created between Chilgrove Drive and the proposed warehousing. This could, for example, be in the form of a 200 metre wide forested area to the east of Chilgrove drive, which would create shielding, distance, and amenity to the local area.</p>	<p>The OxSRFI scheme will not prejudice the delivery of a passenger rail station at Ardley with further detail to be provided as part of the application submission.</p> <p>The OxSRFI scheme includes a significant landscape strategy which includes earthworks, bunds and planting to the west of the site, with the landscaping area being 100m wide in some locations (which includes alongside Chilgrove Drive).</p>	No
25	15/06/2022	Business - JH Norman and Sons	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>We are writing to OxSRFI to express our concerns regarding the proposed bus gate for the OxSRFI development. At the presentation we attended at Heyford Park, the bus gate was shown to us on the map as being proposed on the B4030. The gate to only allow buses would be situated just after the Bullmarsh Close Road at the village end, and at the other end at the B4030 to Heyford Park turn (which we call Three Post Corner).</p> <p>This effectively cuts off 10 houses from the rest of the village – approximately 10% of the houses in Middleton Stoney. The residents would all have a much longer journey to village amenities – Church, playground, village hall, pub and would become isolated and not feel part of the community.</p> <p>From a Business perspective we are at a loss as to understand how it would be able to work when we have farm buildings which are accessed 24/7 situated along the section of the road which would be buses only. Your representative at the exhibition indicated there would have to be a key fob for us or a gate code. That is practically impossible to implement as we have deliveries going there from a multitude of companies and no two drivers are ever the same. It just wouldn't work.</p> <p>Additionally we have staff living in farm accommodation in the village who would be cut off from the main farm site. When we are calving for example they may come down to the farm 4 or 5 times during an evening to check on the cows and not being able to go the most direct route would add time, cost and miles to the journey.</p> <p>We also envisage a loss of footfall and consequently revenue from our farm gate egg sales and pop up shop as there would be a longer journey time from Middleton Stoney and Bicester to the farm and those kind of purchases are only made when the location is convenient and easily accessed.</p> <p>When we voiced our concerns to your representative regarding the siting of the bus gate he also said another location for it could be from Three Post Corner to Camp Road. That would have huge implications for Middleton Stoney as HGVs coming from the west who currently use that section of road to go north on the M40/A43/M1 would no longer be able to do so and have to head through the village to travel north.</p> <p>To have a bus gate restricting access to our land and buildings, but also cutting us off from the rest of our village cannot be a serious proposition?</p>	<p>The bus gate has been removed from the scheme following a review of the highways strategy after the Stage 1 consultation.</p>	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme
26	16/06/2022	Community Group - OxLEP Skills	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>Could I please be added to any mailing lists regarding consultations for this development?</p>	<p>The respondent will be sent an email informing them of the start of the Stage 2 consultation.</p>	No
27	20/06/2022	Resident	<p>Please add the following to comments in the public consultation on the OXSRFI</p> <p>I object strongly to the “Busgate” proposal - item 15 on your leaflet.</p> <p>Closing the B4030 Middleton Stoney - Caulcott/Lower Heyford road here to local traffic will cause further congestion at other junctions. As an alternative, traffic calming measures on the way into Middleton Stoney would give the reassurance to Middleton Stoney villagers about any increase in traffic caused by the development of Heyford Park and the SRFI which would be unlikely to use this route anyway. But closure here would cause significant inconvenience to locals from surrounding villages as far away as Chipping Norton and force traffic off the B road onto single track roads through Caulcott, Kirtlington and Chesterton.</p> <p>I hope this suggestion will be dropped.</p>	<p>The bus gate has been removed from the scheme following a review of the highways strategy after the Stage 1 consultation.</p>	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme
28	22/06/2022	Business - Oxford Innovation Space	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>Hope you are well.</p> <p>Just a quick email to let you know we have office space available at Heyford Park if needed for the rail freight operations.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	No

Appendix 4 –

29	27/06/2022	Business - Turney Group	<p>[Contains a letter states the following]</p> <p>We attended the public exhibition at Upper Heyford Village Hall on 25th May 2022.</p> <p>We are extremely concerned about the impact the construction of OxSRFI will have on the operation of the P A Turney Ltd business.</p> <p>P A Turney has traded for over seventy years from premises on the crossroads in Middleton Stoney without restriction of opening and closing times and movement of vehicles in and out of the site.</p> <p>Please will you explain how the proposed highway improvement for OxSRFI will allow the business of P A Turney Ltd to continue to operation without restriction as it has done for the past seventy years.</p> <p>We will also be please to recieve the current traffic flow figures for vehicles travelling on routes (a) and (b) below, as the current date and when OxSRFI is operational.</p> <p>Route (a) - vehicles from junction 10 of M40, which use the B430 to Middleton Stoney and turn left to Bicester on B4030.</p> <p>Route (b) - vehicles from Heyford Park and Upper Heyford Airfield which use Camp Road and join the B4030, and travel through Middleton Stoney toward Bicester.</p> <p>It it would help you to find out more about the business of PA Turney we will be please to invite you here for a guided tour of the premises and to answer any questions you may have.</p>	<p>The proposed highways works have been designed to reduce through traffic in Middleton Stoney and Ardley village centres. Access is however still provided to both village centres. Further details are provided within the draft highways works plans and draft ES Transport Chapter. The removal of the bus gate on the B4030 will also help enable traffic from the north-west of Middleton Stoney.</p>	<p>Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme</p>
30	29/06/2022	Resident	<p>Good farming land going to waste when people are going plant based and the Russians taking all the grain we should be keeping this land to grow our own food not building concrete blocks on it shambolic waste of land what idiots decision decided this they will be moaning when flour, barley, wheat go up in price unbelievable waste not impressed!!!!</p>	<p>The majority of the site (over 67%) is either poorer quality agricultural land or non-agricultural land.</p>	<p>No</p>
31	30/06/2022	Business - Energy & Sustainability Consultant at City Science, on behalf of Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Hi there</p> <p>I hope you are well. We are working for Oxfordshire County Council to develop the Oxfordshire Net Zero Route Map & Action Plan, which is the next iteration of the Pathways to a Zero Carbon Oxfordshire (PaZCO) report (attached). The work will be an important steer for Oxfordshire's decarbonisation actions across all sectors moving forwards.</p> <p>As part of the stakeholder engagement for the project, we are holding a virtual Decarbonising Freight workshop on the 13th July and would be very grateful if a suitable person from the SRFI project could join so we can include your perspective. I will send through the invite directly after this email in hopes that you can join.</p> <p>Context and Background</p> <p>The Oxfordshire Net Zero Route Map & Action Plan will be a robust, evidenced-based plan tailored to Oxfordshire's unique characteristics. The Route Map will lay out the high-level goals required to sufficiently reduce emissions to reach Net Zero. The Action Plan will be a detailed set of actions that are necessary to deliver each of the high-level goals depicted in the Route Map.</p> <p>The work will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reflect PaZCO 1's case for accelerating the pace of actions, as outlined in the Oxfordshire Leading the Way scenario o Provide a 'vision-setting' reference point for Oxfordshire stakeholders to use in allocating focus and developing actions o A trajectory of emissions to 2030, against a clear baseline, setting indicative carbon budgets where possible o A three-year action plan, bringing together actions for local authorities, FOP Members, OxLEP and other relevant partners to the county, to identify individual and joint working opportunities. o KPIs that utilise readily available data o A timeline of the key changes and outcomes required against carbon emissions milestones o Demonstrate the cost return on investment, linking to impacts and co-benefits <p>Stakeholder Engagement</p> <p>As part of the project, we are conducting extensive stakeholder engagement, which started with 1:1s and is followed by workshops, focus groups and Action Plan consultation sessions.</p> <p>We are currently developing 5 x 2-hour workshops with the themes of Freight, Rural Transport, Retrofit/Domestic, Finance and Business/Commercial. The aim of the workshops is to validate the longlist of goals and understand what is achievable. Following the workshops, we will refine the draft route map, ready for presentation in the focus groups. I have also attached a PDF which goes into a little more detail on the context of the project and the outputs.</p>	<p>The invitation and general information is noted.</p>	<p>No</p>

Appendix 4 –

			<p>Email 2 (06/07/22): Dear All Thank you for agreeing to participate in the Oxfordshire Net Zero Action Workshop on Freight Decarbonisation (LGVs & HGVs) on Wednesday 13th July at 10:00 – 12:00. Please note that the workshop will utilise Miro.com, an online collaborative platform. Note, you do not need to set up a Miro account to participate. To maximum use of the 2 hours available please complete two pre-engagement exercises. 1) Defining the Problem - Please complete the table below and return via email by COP on Monday 11th July. Your response will be anonymised and presented during the session. Consider Oxfordshire’s priority problems that we need to address. E.g. Sector engagement/motivations; Efficiency; Modal Shift; Decarbonisation technologies; Local vs regional issues; Last mile issues; Consolidation; Sector-specific support needs. Section Instruction Your Response Problem Name Identify your priority problem & give it a snappy title Where we want to be What does an ideal situation look like? E.g. If the problem is last mile delivery issues we might suggest “Ample technologies are available within Oxfordshire to enable zero carbon last mile delivery”. Where we currently are Describe the current state within Oxfordshire Gaps Think about all the reasons why there might be a gap between where we want to be and where we currently are. E.g. In the case of last mile delivery, reasons might include: - Knowledge of opportunities - Competitiveness - High cost of alternatives</p> <p>2) Route Map Reflections - Please review the Route Map by the end of the day Monday 11th July. Part of the work in developing a Net Zero Action Plan for Oxfordshire is to understand how different activities contribute to Net Zero. To do this, we’ve developed Route Maps for each sector. Note that the draft is emerging and excludes any updates we have identified through consultation so far. It should be seen as a starting point to think about: • Whether there are any external policies or events that have not been captured • Whether the draft targets are too ambitious or not ambitious enough • Use as a prompt when developing your problem statements, considering where we need to get to meet these national and local targets Please review the Route Map and add any comments or suggestions if appropriate. You can view and review the Draft Route Map for the Transport Sector on Miro, here. Please get in touch if you experience any issues using Miro. Note: The targets have been developed bottom-up by sector and developed from the original PaZCO report and the National Grid’s Future Energy Scenarios. Engagement with the route map should be seen as an opportunity to shape the overall targets. Preparing your thoughts ahead of the session will enable us to run a highly effective session and ensure that we are prioritising Oxfordshire’s biggest challenges. We thank you in advance for your support and engagement.</p>		
32	02/07/2022	Resident	<p>Having viewed the proposals at one of your Upper Heyford exhibitions I would like to make the following comments and observations. My main concern is the proposed road alterations around Middleton Stoney, these were expressed during my visit. We cannot see any justification for the restriction of local vehicles travelling to/from Upper Heyford, Lower Heyford, Chipping Norton or the A44. Our nearest shop is now Sainsbury’s at Heyford Park but we regularly travel to Chipping Norton, Stow on the Wold and Chipping Camden. I thought we are supposed to be saving energy and CO2 but adding miles to journey makes no sense. Approximately 50% of my journeys are in the westerly direction from Middleton Stoney. Yes we and the villagers would like to see less through traffic but this will reduce if the village is bypassed (drivers use quickest route) as suggested on the attached marked copy of your overall plan. On looking at the document “Middleton Stoney - Heyford Park Option Report March 22” this only considers traffic from Heyford Park towards Bicester using the B4030 but there is a considerable amount of traffic going towards lower Heyford, Chipping Norton etc. The existing road linking Camp road to the B4030 can be retained with a new junction at the B4030 where the bypass can be routed to the B403 where it would link with the roundabout as shown. Camp road could then link to the B430 via the new warehouse road thus saving the construction of a road. My other concern is what appears to be excessive use of land for the M40 junction alterations, see option 25, these can in my opinion be altered and simplified as per the attached comments on a copy of the option 11. I hope the above comments can be considered by the relevant team members and should you have any queries please let me know.</p>	<p>The highways strategy has been developed to move traffic, particularly HGVs, from local roads to the strategic highways network with appropriate highways improvements - such as the Ardley Bypass and Middleton Stoney Relief Roads which will reduce traffic through those village centres, and increase capacity at M40 J10 - proposed as a result. The highways strategy has also been developed further to consultation with the local highways authority and National Highways. The bus gate has also been removed from the scheme following a review of the highways strategy after the Stage 1 consultation.</p>	<p>Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme</p>

Appendix 4 –

33	02/07/2022	Resident	<p>1 The government transport infrastructure plans are understood but the climate and environmental emergencies have clearly been ignored in the decision-making. Environmentally this is a very poor choice of location. A brownfield site should be sought if the facility is deemed important to progress. The proposed site is agricultural land that is vital to our food security.</p> <p>2 The proposed M40 junction road layout looks confusing, but it was good to hear that the bulk of SRFI goods traffic would be mandated to use the M40. However, the same arguments apply regarding destroying agricultural and environmentally sensitive land just for the purpose of human ease and greed.</p> <p>3 Ardley and Middleton Stoney bypasses will benefit some villages, but not others as traffic will still need to go west and east as well as north and south. Also, any new roads will have an initial environmental impact on land and wildlife and ongoing impact on air and noise pollution as it is well known that they do not reduce traffic, but increase it. In addition, the proposed bus gate, as explained, will lead to detrimental HGV and other traffic volumes through Heyford Park and the small villages of Upper and Lower Heyford.</p> <p>4 We understand the SRFI landscaping aim, but there will be significant environmental impact from the loss of habitats, and air, noise, and light pollution. Already Ardley children suffer more asthma and windows need to be kept closed because of the M40 motorway and the incinerator. Furthermore, visually attractive landscaping for humans does not necessarily imply it is appealing to wildlife. Wildlife will be excluded from a large area that is presently natural and undisturbed. There will be a very significant biodiversity net loss, including irreplaceable loss of key habitats, established wildlife corridors, native trees, woodland, ponds and scrub.</p> <p>5 We would like information on how the proposals fit in with the preservation of the countryside for arable land for growing crops, which should be a national priority. Taking land out that is currently in use for food production, is fool-hardy and disastrous at any time, but more so when there is a world problem. António Guterres, the United Nations Secretary-General, warned on May 18th that the coming months threaten “the spectre of a global food shortage” that could last for years. Indeed, it will last for many, many years because we have a warming climate as well as the war in Ukraine. Also, the RSPB has reported that one in ten UK species of animals is already at risk of extinction, and over half of UK wildlife is in decline. Taking out even more farmland, hedgerows, ponds, and established trees just to concrete over with warehousing, and pander to over-consumption and profligate importing is plainly irresponsible. Environmental emergencies have clearly been ignored in the decision-making. So specific information on how this development addresses the climate crisis, the food crisis, and the wildlife crisis would be good at any future exhibitions.</p> <p>6 The proposals are misplaced and ill-judged. Planners need to change tack and think about providing what the country really needs, which is food security and preserving every square inch of land possible for nature to thrive.</p>	<p>1. National policy has set out that there is compelling need for more SRFIs and that as a result of their locational requirements (such as a proximity to rail and the strategic highways network), countryside locations may be required. The OxSRFI meets these locational requirements due to its location adjacent to the Chiltern Main Line and proximity to M40 J10.</p> <p>2, 3 & 4. The environmental effects from the highways improvement works and OxSRFI proposals as a whole have been assessed within the draft ES Chapters with measures proposed to mitigate impacts. The OxSRFI includes a significant landscaping strategy with over 50% of the scheme being landscaped green space which will help deliver at least 10% BNG.</p> <p>5. The majority of the site (over 67%) is either poorer quality agricultural land or non-agricultural land.</p> <p>6. National policy has set out that there is compelling need for more SRFIs and that as a result of their locational requirements (such as a proximity to rail and the strategic highways network), countryside locations may be required. The OxSRFI meets these locational requirements. National policy also states that the government is committed to growing rail freight due to the environmental benefits of the sector, with rail freight emitting approximately 76% less CO2 than equivalent transport by road - the OxSRFI scheme will therefore contribute towards the governments targets to reduce CO2 emissions.</p>	No
34	03/07/2022	Resident	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>Further to the invitation to do so on the OXSRFI website, this is a formal request to please keep me updated on the progress of the plans. Could you also please notify me of the formal or informal methods for lodging objections to the SRFI scheme either as part of the consultation process or otherwise. To the extent there is an existing process in place, please add the following, which represent some of my own key objections, as a resident of Steeple Aston, Oxfordshire, to the scheme:</p> <p>1/ It shows a reckless and cavalier disregard for the environmental damage that will be sustained in a key buffer zone between the Cotswolds AONB and the M40/A34/Bicester conurbation at a time when the climate emergency requires remediation of existing damage, not the creation of more.</p> <p>2/ Alleged ‘environmental mitigation’ work on the HS2 project, for example at Launton, has resulted in ecological harm to existing sites of scientific and ecological interest - quite the opposite of their intended effect and therefore significant doubts must overshadow the claims that similar schemes around the SRFI will off-set the damage that will be incurred as a result of this project.</p> <p>3/ Existing road infrastructure is already at breaking point at busy times of the day - notably the M40 and A34. Any additional traffic, let alone heavy goods traffic, will render the situation untenable. Further road development cannot avoid this but will simply result in the funnelling of traffic away from the immediate vicinity into bottle necks where traffic is throttled on the peripheral parts of the area. The resulting harm to humans and local ecology caused by traffic pollution resulting from the increased flow of traffic, vehicles at a standstill and carbon release from excavations will be material and long-lasting (and potentially irreversible).</p> <p>4/ It is false logic to presume that the location for the site should be proximate to existing warehousing, logistics and road and rail infrastructure. Those existing facilities were not designed with the SRFI in mind or to cope with increased loading as a result of it. Had they been so designed, they may well not have been located where they were and would have been provisioned in an entirely different way (to allow for additional load upon them caused by SRFI or by changed patterns of use by the public as a result of disruption from SRFI).</p> <p>5/ Detailed comparative analyses of alternative locations for the schemes have not been published (to the extent they have been conducted at all). A detailed, comparative study of multiple alternative sites should be conducted by an independent and impartial body with proper weighting afforded to likely societal, economic and environmental damage caused thereby in each case.</p>	<p>The respondent will be sent an email informing them of the start of the Stage 2 consultation.</p> <p>1 & 2. The environmental effects from the highways improvement works and OxSRFI proposals as a whole have been assessed within the draft ES Chapters with measures proposed to mitigate impacts. The OxSRFI includes a significant landscaping strategy with over 50% of the scheme being landscaped green space which will help deliver at least 10% BNG.</p> <p>3. The highways strategy has been developed to move traffic, particularly HGVs, from local roads to the strategic highways network with appropriate highways improvements - such as the Ardley Bypass and Middleton Stoney Relief Roads which will reduce traffic through those village centres, and increase capacity at M40 J10 to accommodate the proposed development - proposed as a result. The highways strategy has also been developed further to consultation with the local highways authority and National Highways.</p> <p>4. National policy has set out that there is compelling need for more SRFIs and that as a result of their locational requirements (such as a proximity to rail and the strategic highways network), countryside locations may be required. The OxSRFI meets these locational requirements.</p> <p>5. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) has assessed several sites within a defined search area along the M40 corridor in Oxfordshire, and demonstrates that the OxSRFI site is the most preferable site within the established search area for the delivery of a SRFI.</p>	No

Appendix 4 –

35	04/07/2022	Business - Moniteye	<p>To Whom it may concern, Following the review of your public plans on this project I do not believe that enough consideration has been taken into the knock on effect of the project on local traffic. There has seemingly been absolutely no thought or modelling about the traffic changes to rural roads that will happen as a result of this project being given the green light. This is already a very busy rural area given the massive growth of Heyford and this is only going to make the roads busier and more unsafe unless proper thought is put into mitigation measures.</p>	<p>The highways assessment process has been in preparation for many years, in consultation with the local highways authority and National Highways, with more data and updated assessment work now being presented publicly as part of the Stage 2 consultation within the draft ES Transport Chapter and its Appendices. Further assessment work is also ongoing and will be presented as part of the final application submission. The highways strategy has been developed to move traffic, particularly HGVs, from local roads to the strategic highways network with appropriate highways improvements - such as the Ardley Bypass and Middleton Stoney Relief Roads which will reduce traffic through those village centres, and increase capacity at M40 J10 to accommodate the proposed development - proposed as a result.</p>	No
End of Consultation - 4th July 2022					
36	01/08/2022	Business - City Fibre Network	<p>Email 1: 01/08/22 To whom it may concern, Regarding your letter that we recently received concerning the identification of any potential equipment and / or utilities that we may have within your given defined search area, for the proposed 'Rail Freight Interchange and Warehousing on Land South of the Chiltern Railway (etc.) Project': At present, City Fibre records do not hold any network within your area of interest, so we are unable to provide you with a C3 estimate. However, it is important to know that City Fibre is building network across the country continuously. Therefore, we insist you carry out regular checks using the below service. Please use the City Fibre online enquiry service found at https://plant.cityfibre.com Terms and conditions and a user guide can be found on that page. Please use the following details:</p> <p>Email 2: 05/08/22 To whom this may concern,</p> <p>We have recently just received, via email, a letter from you regarding the Oxfordshire Railfreight Limited proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI). From our search, at present, City Fibre records do not hold any network within your area of interest so we are unable to provide you with a C3 estimate. However, it is important to know that City Fibre is building network across the country continuously. Therefore, we insist you carry out regular checks using the below service. Please use the City Fibre online enquiry service found at https://plant.cityfibre.com. Terms and conditions and a user guide can be found on that page.</p>	<p>Comments noted, with further detail confirmed through the detailed design.</p>	No

Appendix 4 –

OxSRFI - Stage 1 'Section 42' consultee responses									
Comments Form comments - hard copies and from the OxSRFI website									
Comment ID No.	Consultation Event	Q1 - Do you think the reasons for proposing a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange in this location are clearly explained? Please give reasons for your answer.	Q2 - What do you think of the emerging proposals for improvements to M40 Junction 10?	Q3 - Do you have any comments about other elements of the Highways Works proposed, including the Ardley Bypass or Middleton Stoney Relief Road?	Q4 - What do you think of the emerging landscaping and earthworks strategy for the Main Site including the boundary mounding/bunding and extensive tree planting?	Q5 - We will be holding further consultation planned for late 2022 when the technical work has progressed – is there any specific information you would find helpful at the next exhibitions?	General Comments - Please give us your comments on the proposals	Applicant Response (note: references to draft ES Chapters relate to the Stage 2 PIER)	Have any changes been made to the design of the OxSRFI scheme which are relevant to the comment?
Form1	Event 1 - 12/05/22	Yes! This is a 'perfect' site for rail & freight HGVs! As so close to M40 J10 & Existing rail. I welcome this!	Much easier for drivers to navigate & delivery points.	Only landscaping	Maybe an idea for quick & solid noise reduction & an overall comestic look (to keep natives happy). Would be an idea to grow semi mature ley landi fir trees. They grow quick look good & need very little maintenance.	Looks like you doing pretty well today so no. But I would like this to be sooner rather than later. It's a long time coming & I, personally love this!	As an HGV driver myself, I have visited many sites like these proposed & I have seen nearly all the plantings have died, or vermin have eaten them. Tesco RDC @ Lichfield planted 3 column rows around 6ft & they are all still good & no more complaints of ugly buildings or noise from locals.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Noted. 3. Noted. 4. The landscaping strategy also helps to reduce noise levels with an acoustic barrier along the northern boundary of the Main Site to further help reduce noise impacts on receptors. Noise will also be controlled through draft DCO requirement 26. 5. Noted. General. Comments and general support noted - the landscape strategy helps minimise views of the buildings with further details about the species planted to be provided through requirements as part of the detailed design.	
Form2	Event 1 - 12/05/22	Yes - they are clearly explained: 1. Reduce road freight to rail transport 2. Connectivity in the area.	I imagine Ardley residents will benefit but not sure about Heyford Park or anyone else.	They look good on paper but these will impact M40 & A34 which already are overstretched.	They look good on paper - a network of footpaths will be good BUT I oppose the use of farmland - visually & environmentally. It is CRIMINAL.	Yes: That you are NOT using the farmland between Chilgrove Drive and B430. Please use the quarry & west of it and/or the actual Airbase.	The exhibition itself is excellent: very welcoming, informative, well staffed. I came with an open mind and expecting to support the project but I cannot while it uses Greenfield sites.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. The OxSRFI scheme will deliver socio-economic benefits for the local area and wider region in terms of job opportunities and investment. 3. The highways works have been designed following consultation with the local highways authority and National Highways and will help to increase capacity at M40 J10 and J9, and help with access to the site via the strategic highways network. 4-6. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs in the country and also acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver them due to their locational requirements. The OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements for an SRFI and also includes significant levels of green infrastructure to help mitigate impacts and deliver at least 10% BNG across the site. 	
Form3	Event 1 - 12/05/22	Yes - the explanatory boards and earlier leafletting are/were well designed and informative.	Good - this will improve matters for those living in Ardley, at least.	They appear to be making the current 'rat-run' road usage redundant - so good for the villages.	Fine, or will be in time!	Not at present.	Would it not have been environmentally much preferable to use the redundant runways and USAF buildings for this new freight terminus, rather than green field sites, on productive farm land? The runways and hangers will still be there, next to the freight - but what a waste!	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Noted. 3. Noted and agree the OxSRFI will reduce traffic through local village centres of Ardley and Middleton Stoney. 4. Noted. 5. Noted. General. Heyford Park is a Conservation Area and the site has permission and is being promoted for alternative uses and is therefore not suitable for development as an SRFI. Further detail included within the Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2).	
Form4	Event 1 - 12/05/22						Request for Lighting Chapter. Astronomical Observatory. Steeple Aston.	The draft ES Lighting Chapter was available on the OxSRFI website during the Stage 1 consultation, with an updated version available for the Stage 2 consultation.	

Appendix 4 –

Form5	Event 1 - 12/05/22						Lighting Strategy - SQM readings taken locally disagree with the assumptions in 2.3.2. We would like readings to be taken on site to confirm baseline. An SQM of 15-20 is a reading obtained near urban areas!!!! 2.3.3 "The site is described as "intrinsically dark" in the majority of places". (ie) zone E1. Table 1 in 2.3.2 Note 1 says "where an area to be lit lies on the boundary of 2 zones the light limitation should be those applicable to the most rigorous zone, ie sone E1. And yet the site is assessed as E2. HOW??	The draft ES Lighting Chapter states the following: "Based on the baseline survey (Appendix 8.2 and Appendix 8.3), it has been found that the Application Site is broadly characteristic of an E2 environmental zone, with some more urbanised and developed areas surrounding it being more characteristic of an E3 environmental zone. This environmental zone assessment has been confirmed with the Cherwell District Council Environmental Protection Team." The draft Chapter then concludes by stating: "There will be an increase in the lighting baseline and an increase in the visibility of lighting in the landscape, this however will not alter the environmental zone of the area which will remain as is assessed within this Chapter" Please note that operational lighting detail will be controlled through draft DCO requirement 16.
Form6	Event 1 - 12/05/22						Chapter 8 on Lighting: 2.2.3 Also talks of limiting light pollution on intrinsically dark landscapes - this area is one of those. 2.3.3 Example of lighting in area include Ardley Household Recycling Centre and farmhouses. These may have security lights but are not lit throughout the night - we have parked outside the recycling to check for ourselves after dark.	Please see above comments
Form7	Event 1 - 12/05/22			Camp Road in Heyford Park MUST be considered and our children protected. Please please please do not turn our village in the M25! There are so many children in this village - please do not be responsible for harming them.			I understand the need for these things to happen but the local people, residents and children cannot be ignored. The onus is on you to divert excess traffic away rom villages - not through it!	3 & General. The highways strategy proposed aims to direct users of the OxSRFI site to access the development via the strategic highways network, and away from local village centres, such as Ardley and Middleton Stoney.
Form8	Event 1 - 12/05/22						Concern over extra traffic on Camp Road and partial closure of the Middleton Stoney Road. Traffic is bad currently and with extra volume on small roads I worry.	Traffic on Camp Road would be local traffic with HGVs accessing the site via the new main access.
Form9	Event 2 - 14/05/22	Yes, got the general idea within 1st two slides	I think this is a good idea if managed properly	Not at this time	I like the general idea more sustainability		Very good idea	Comments and general support noted.
Form10	Event 2 - 14/05/22						Suggest a noise receptor would be worthwhile in Fritwell, which is largely ignored in this presentation. Increased rail traffic, particularly at night will impact the village and should be considered	The draft ES Noise Chapter explains that the nearest sensitive receptors have been identified where a human or ecological habitat could be exposed to increased levels of noise and/or vibration due to the proposed development. No receptors were identified in Fritwell as part of this process. Please note that operational noise will be controlled through draft DCO requirement 26.

Appendix 4 –

Form11	Event 2 - 14/05/22	The diagrams were really helpful. Some of the written information is clearly commercial 'blurb' composed to fulfil consultant obligations but in some cases not saying much, - in a long winded way. I couldn't see anywhere what Goods in particular would be carried or stored in the warehouses either.	Based on Government 'proposals' direction in 2014 they are now out of date. We need all possible rural land to be 'in play' as we edge nearer to a world food shortage. Also Government are supposed to be putting 'nature' 1st, the concretes over acres of it.	The B430 should not be closed off but left as a restricted route for village traffic only. I am not convinced that the route of the Ardley By Pass (behind existing homes) has enough measures included to limit noise and the visual impact.	I was pleased to see that the rail terminal itself would be submerged. (But then it needs to be level with the railway which is in a cutting!). But the large warehouses will still be a complete eyesore in what is a rural setting. 'Bunds' are welcome around the site but that won't prevent the impact of the lighting and traffic on a site which I suspect will operate 22 - 24 hours a day.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who will be using the warehouses - are they really needed now the world has changed. 2. How many staff will be needed, where will they park, has the impact of workers travelling to and for been taken into account. 3. What will be the working hours? Particularly in terms of lighting and travel. 4. What compensation will those of us affected by the construction get? 	The world has changed since 2014 when Government was looking at such expansions. We could be heading for a world food shortage. We should be preserving all and any arable land. We will be in recession for at least the next 10 years, is this really the best way to spend investment. I am very concerned that this could become a 'white elephant' as there is less money to spend on goods involved	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2 & General. The Government's policy was updated in 2024 and continues to support a compelling needs for more SRFIs, and also acknowledges that given their locational requirements they may need to be build in countryside locations. 3. Changes to the B430 are to help direct traffic, including HGVs, away from local roads. The landscape strategy and lighting strategy will help to minimise views of the site, with traffic directed away from local roads and via the strategic highways network. 4. The warehouses will be built for logistics operators. The site is estimated to deliver around 9,600 new jobs. The site will be operational up to 24 hours a day. Construction impacts will be mitigated through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which includes best practice measures to minimise environmental effects. 5. The majority of the site (over 67%) is either poorer quality agricultural land or non-agricultural land. A Soil Management Plan will also be used as part of the construction process within the CEMP which will ensure protection of the resource and best re-use of soil resources, preventing damage to soils and potential losses
Form12	Event 2 - 14/05/22	Yes. Situated just off J10 of the M40. The problem is the positioning of traffic coming from the south on A34 heading for the SRF must not be allowed to pass through Middleton Stoney.	Good.	The B4030 (Bicester - Middleton Stoney) is already a fast, straight, and dangerous road with NO footpath on either side and overgrown verges. The SRF Development PLUS the new development on this road will increase, vehicular, cycle and pedestrian traffic. The cycle land being proposed is very welcome. It should be on the south side. There should also be a footpath on the north side. There should also be a speed limit of 40 mph.	Good.	I would like to have detailed maps.	Every effort should be made to:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Separate types of road user on the B4030 2. Slow down the traffic on B4030 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Middleton Stoney Relief Road (MSRR) will help reduce the amount of traffic passing through the village centre. 2. Noted. 3 & General. A new right of way is proposed onto the B4030 at the MSRR junction with an additional new right of way from the MSRR which runs northward to connect into the existing 148/4-129/9 footpath that connects into Bicester. The speed limit on the B4030 is proposed to be reduced to 50mph. 4. Noted. 5. Additional maps included within the exhibition boards as part of the Stage 2 consultation.
Form13	Event 2 - 14/05/22	Yes	Much needed	Living in Ardley, this is good.	All good.		Young people need hope - jobs and homes. This is good news. I live in Ardley. I look forward to safer walking routes and footpaths.	Comments and general support noted.

Appendix 4 –

Form14	Event 3 - 20/05/22	Yes, I understand the general need in the area. However, I don't think the case for Bicester have been made V's a Banbury or Oxford location. Compared to other SRFI locations, we are a small country location	The proposals do not address the needs of HGV drivers. The amenities for overnight or short term layby locations have not been addressed. Are there any impact or use data for the Cherwell Services? Could future consultations detail on site, SRFI, HGV amenities	The current traffic volumes on the B430 are huge and make crossing at the A4095 dangerous. Could there be a bypass from that junction to the MS roundabout? This would also help the recreational cyclist.	I would hope native species would be used for the trees on the woodland/structural planting and mounding. The 'airfield fence' area is about 80 acres, is there a possibility of a 200 year lease to a community woodland project?	What is the lifespan of a SRFI, will there be a future case for a cluster of SRFI in the Cherwell area if this one is approved? Could the traffic modelling data be presented to show increases on the M40 and B4030? Could that data also show a decrease in HGV traffic on the A34?	It would be beneficial if a temporary permissive path could be installed soon after earthworks to allow pedestrian use of the airfield fenceline route; rejoining the Aves Ditch public byway.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out that the OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements of an SRFI, with no suitable alternative sites identified along the M40 in Oxfordshire. 2. The OxSRFI includes proposals for a secure, dedicated HGV parking area which will include driver welfare facilities. 3. A new right of way is proposed onto the B4030 at the Middleton Stoney Relief Road (MSRR) junction with an additional new right of way from the MSRR which runs northward to connect into the existing 148/4-129/9 footpath that connects into Bicester. The speed limit on the B4030 is proposed to be reduced to 50mph. 4. Details of the landscaping strategy will be secured through requirements which require planting species to be provided. The site will be managed through a management company with details to be confirmed at the detailed stage of the scheme. 5. The OxSRFI scheme is expected to be operational indefinitely, subject to viability and market conditions. Other SRFIs could be brought in Cherwell given national policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs. Additional traffic modelling will be presented as part of the Stage 2 consultation material within the draft ES Transport Chapter and Appendices - further assessment work is still ongoing, which the final version presented as part of the Application submission. <p>General. local highways works are proposed at Aves Ditch with a right of way connection to it. Further detail secured through the detailed design.</p>	
Form15	Event 3 - 20/05/22			The bus gate is of huge concern to us. We farm @ Park Farm and have staff living in Middleton Stoney and they would have to make a much longer journey. Farm building/field access would be restricted. 12 houses in Middleton Stoney would be cut off from the rest of the villages.				The bus gate has been removed from the scheme following a review of the highways strategy after the Stage 1 consultation.	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme
Form16	Event 3 - 20/05/22	Yes - posters provided reasons and context.	Have concerns about the level of impact during construction eg significant delays due to roadworks whereas at the moment we are rarely impacted by traffic issues at the junction.	Looks positive for Ardley and Middleton Stoney but has negative impact on Heyford Park	Glad to see it has been considered. The landscape and visual boards didn't show close up views of what it will look like eg, from the end of Camp Road. Whilst trees and covering it up is useful, it would still be a shame to lose our views of open fields.	What other proposals are out there near the site. Understand where HS2 and EWR fit with this. Results of noise and vibration studies	Concerned about how this will change the feel/atmosphere of the area from rural village to more of an industrial estate. Level of disruption during construction. How long it will take for trees to disguise outlook.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Construction impacts assessed within the draft ES Chapters, including the draft Transport Chapter. The proposed phasing of the highways works is also proposed to minimise impacts on local communities. 3. Highways strategy is designed to direct traffic away from local roads to the strategic highways network. 4. Selected key views of the proposed scheme are included within the Stage 2 consultation, including the draft ES LVIA Chapter. 5. The draft ES Chapters include a consideration of other schemes in the area, known as cumulative sites, with the full list of the sites available in the Introduction Chapter. The assessment of cumulative effects will be finalised prior to application submission. 	

Appendix 4 –

Form17	Event 3 - 20/05/22		J10 proposals are definitely needed - proposals look positive and we would support these as part of the plans	Ardley bypass very good idea for Somerton - some kind of restrictions are needed so that the area by the railway bridge, humped backed bridge and river Cherwell bridges which have weight and width restrictions are needed. Somerton is a conservation area and protection is needed. Somerton becomes a rat run when the M40 is closed or traffic problems. Already chaotic at times and additional traffic will add to this as traffic coming to and from Banbury diverted this way when M40 closed. Clear signage and ANPR to enforce traffic routes	More detail on how the end by Somerton will be affected - can someone come back to us on our contact details?			2. Support noted. 3. Weight restrictions for HGVs proposed within Ardley and Fritwell which are designed to prevent HGVs moving through local villages off the Strategic Highways Network. 4. The Stage 2 consultation provides a further opportunity for comment and engagement with the Applicant and consultant team.	Yes - inclusion of weight restrictions in Ardley and Fritwell.
Form18	Event 3 - 20/05/22						I think that this will open up a whole new aspect for local walking and cycling	Comments noted.	
Form19	Event 3 - 20/05/22	Actually no. You have explained how you are going to mitigate environmental damage etc but not why you intend to destroy an area of green belt.	Given the history of motorway 'improvements' in this country, I expect it to last about 5 years before it is as clogged up at it is now.	Well obviously you'll do anything you can to [redacted] the local residents into believing this is a good idea.	Probably ok - but that's not really the point.	I would like to know what the projections are for the increase in <u>local traffic</u> not only from HGVs etc accessing the site but also from the 13,500 employees who will be involved in this once its up and running	I moved to this area to live in the countryside not to live next to a giant corporate warehouse complex.	1. The site is not in the Green Belt. 2. The highways improvements are designed up to the latest highways modelling period which is 2042. 3. Noted. 4. Noted. 5. The highways strategy includes a consideration of traffic on local roads, as well as the strategic highways network, with appropriate measures within the scheme proposed as a result. The highways strategy has also been developed further to consultation with the local highways authority and National Highways. General. Measures are proposed within the OxSRFI scheme to mitigate impacts on local communities with significant benefits also being delivered in terms of new job opportunities, investment and walking/cycling connections.	
Form20	Event 3 - 20/05/22	Yes, and entirely reasonably for the benefit of the wider economy and environment.	Excellent. I think you (as developers) should highlight the legal obligations of infrastructure (the rail and road) coming before any building of warehouses. This would reduce concerns because Dorchester (Heyford Park) did not have these legal	All excellent.	Very well considered in terms of environmental and noise management.	Not at this point apart from the comment made about your legal obligations on the infrastructure	I am very supportive of this development for strategic, environmental and economic reasons.	1. Noted. 2. Noted - the phasing of the highways and rail works are set out within the draft ES Proposed Development Chapter and its Appendices. 3. Noted. 4. Noted. 5. Noted. General. Supportive comments noted	

Appendix 4 –

			obligations so have not delivered on their original plans for the roads.						
21	Event 3 - 20/05/22	Yes - having spoken to officers, clarification over issues have been sought and explained well. Thank you	Headache for commuting currently so any further design to alleviate traffic very welcome	Would appreciate a slip road specifically for village users only (Ardley village only)	Positive - After 10 - 15 years this will be established and looks good. Negative - May not be able to see these benefits for a long time.	Further details on rail freight operations and transport to site - any other facilities planned? For eg community based, hotels, bus routes etc	Concerned when M40 is closed due to traffic currently being diverted through Ardley - to get home in and out of village could prove very problematic especially for emergency vehicles.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. The highways strategy has been designed to increase capacity at M40 Junctions 9 and 10 to help improve the flow of vehicles at these junctions. 3. The M40 J10 improvement works have been designed to increase capacity at the junction for all users. 4. The effects of the landscape strategy in terms of visual screening will strengthen over a 15 year period as planting matures. 5. Details of freight operations to be provided through requirements at the detailed stage of design. No separate community facilities are included as part of the scheme. General. Diversion routes from the M40 a matter for National Highways. 	
Form22	Event 3 - 20/05/22	Somewhat....	They are needed. The junction is already very busy and there are a number of accidents.	Happy to see Ardley and Middleton Stoney proposal of relief roads. Very concerned about the Bus gate, it will cut the village in two. And make journey times to get into village or further afield	The buildings are huge and no amount of landscaping/earthworks will hide them. Nor hide the trains and freight!	Bus gate removed! Clear plan for M40 Jtn 9 and 10		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Noted. 3 & 5. The bus gate has been removed from the scheme further to a review following the Stage 1 consultation. 4. The landscape strategy which includes earthworks and bunds will help to prevent or minimise views of the OxSRFI scheme. 	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme
Form23	Event 3 - 20/05/22	We understand that other sites have been considered. We would have liked to have seen the arguments for and against other sites.	Perhaps a flyover for the B4100 would help the traffic to flow better. The A34 is already full to capacity so that traffic from the south will not be able to move any better (worse) then it does now. Consider extending rail distribution and the use of the rail for passengers.	We do not want more traffic through Bucknell and therefore we are not happy to have a roundabout instead of the T junction.	The montages do not indicate how tall the buildings will look like in reality.	More accurate plans of the earthworks. This is not the only development being considered in this area of Oxfordshire. You have to consider the total traffic expected and also the number of HGVs	Buckwell has a potential big problem with sewerage. On Dec 23rd 2020 14/100 gardens were flooded with sewerage. Some of the problems are due to the insufficient system but also the leachate from Viridor which is piped to us.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out that the OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements of an SRFI, with no suitable alternative sites identified along the M40 in Oxfordshire. 2. The highways strategy has been designed to increase capacity at identified junctions with capacity issues, which includes M40 Junctions 9 and 10, as well as to direct traffic on to the strategic highways network. The proposed improvement works will help to improve the flow of vehicles at these junctions and reduce traffic through the local village centres of Ardley and Middleton Stoney. The OxSRFI will also not prejudice the delivery of a passenger station at Ardley. 3. The highways strategy has been designed to direct traffic on to the strategic highways network. 4. The buildings will have maximum building heights of up to 25.5m, but will vary across the proposed scheme (some will be lower). The montages and heights help to indicate what will be visible over a 15 year period as the scheme is developed. 5. The impacts from construction traffic are considered within the draft ES Transport Chapter. The landscape strategy has been informed by earthworks, with the detailed scheme to be confirmed through requirements as part of the detailed design. General. The draft ES Water Chapter considers foul drainage and confirms that a deliverable foul drainage scheme to an agreed point of connection has been confirmed as achievable by Thames Water (TW), with upgrades to be provided by TW within their wider network. 	

Appendix 4 –

Form24	Event 4 - 25.05.22	Yes but uses up more farmland and rather all warehouses it would be nice to see a manufacturing facility.	Only altered a couple of years ago and Great Wolf proposal alters other M40 junctions around (9).	We live in Upper Heyford and want to still drive through Middleton Stoney to Bicester and do not in any circumstances want to be stopped from doing this with a Bus only directive. The bus in any case is due to end visiting Upper Heyford 2023. (Route 250).	A large swathe of farmland is destroyed forever so the landscaping is just window dressing.	I would like the Bus Gate proposal to be amended for Middleton Stoney at the next consultation.	The scale and alterations required are on too large a scale as such should be scaled down to a more sensible size. Things change (eg: HS2 people working from home).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National policy acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver SRFIs due to their scale and nature, which focused on logistics development and not manufacturing. The OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements for an SRFI. 2. The highways improvements are designed up to the latest highways modelling period which is 2042. 3 & 5. The bus gate has been removed from the scheme further to a review following the Stage 1 consultation. 4. The majority of the site (over 67%) is either poorer quality agricultural land or non-agricultural land and the OxSRFI will include measure to deliver at least 10% BNG. Also, A Soil Management Plan will also be used as part of the construction process within the CEMP which will ensure protection of the resource and best re-use of soil resources, preventing damage to soils and potential losses. <p>General. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs across the country and the OxSRFI scheme responds to the constraints and opportunities of the site.</p>	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme
Form25	Event 4 - 25.05.22	Yes, it seems obvious to have an interchange on M40	This junction has been altered and adapted on many occasions. It is still a nightmare especially at peak times and when M1/A5 is closed. Extra A43 traffic	Bypass and relief road seems a good idea.				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. The highways improvements are designed to improve capacity up to the latest highways modelling period which is 2042. 3. Noted. 	
Form26	Event 4 - 25.05.22	Partially. I understand that there are several locations that could be used, so why Upper Heyford? Where does the proposed freight come from and what would be it's destination - so why Upper Heyford? I am not convinced that many businesses would be willing to foot the cost of treble handling good - ie factory - truck - rail - truck - destination.	J10 has been rebuilt several times already but seems to work well for it's current use. Obviously if the proposed interchange goes ahead another update and an Ardley by-pass would be essential.	How many years would the proposed interchange and new roads take from start to completion? With its consequent noise and interruption and inconvenience?	A site of this size is going to be very noisy and 24 hours per day, and no amount of landscaping or earthworks will eliminate that.	A proper model of the site set in the context of it's surroundings, and a broader and bigger picture of the local environment. What is 'technical work'?	This site is far too large for this location and will totally ruin the old local village environment and our green fields and spaces, and is much too near housing to be acceptable.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out that the OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements of an SRFI, with no suitable alternative sites identified along the M40 in Oxfordshire. National policy also states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs across the country. 2. Noted. 3. The anticipated phasing of the OxSRFI scheme is set out within the draft ES Proposed Development Chapter and its Appendices. 4. The draft ES Noise Chapter sets out mitigation measures which will help to minimise noise on sensitive receptors around the site. 5. Both the Stage 1 and 2 consultations include a visual model and montage images which show how the development will look within its surroundings. <p>General. The OxSRFI scheme responds to the constraints and opportunities of the site and the need for more SRFIs across the country. The draft ES Chapters include an assessment of environmental effects from the proposed development with measures proposed to mitigate impacts.</p>	
Form27	Event 4 - 25.05.22					Waste water treatment. Collection and use of rainwater from roofs.		The potential impacts on wastewater infrastructure will be assessed as part of the foul water drainage strategy at the detailed stage of design. The draft drainage strategy ensures the site can accommodate and store rainwater collected on impermeable surfaces in a sustainable and predictable way.	

Appendix 4 –

Form28	Event 4 - 25.05.22	Yes	Going to take a lot of disruption during construction		Good.		There needs to be something tangible for nearby villages - regular bus routes to Bicester, Banbury and Beyond	1. Noted. 2. The effects during construction have been assessed within the draft ES Chapters with mitigation measures (such as a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)), proposed to minimise impacts. 4. Noted. General. The public transport provision includes connections between Heyford Park and Bicester.	
Form29	Event 4 - 25.05.22						I am interested in senior roles either as part of build process or future use. My background is in strategic execution of programmes within supply chain and logistics - currently with HS2.	Noted - it is estimated that around 9,600 new jobs will be delivered by the scheme. More details about the available opportunities will come forward prior to the development of the scheme.	
Form30	Event 4 - 25.05.22			yes the route from Lower Heyford (B4030) should not be restricted as this will cause Middleton Stoney residents excessive diversion to get to village, and increase Co2 emissions due to longer travel distance.				The bus gate has been removed from the scheme further to a review following the Stage 1 consultation.	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme
Form31	Event 5 - 21.06.22		I do not. It is far from clear that there has been a regiment (ed) assessment of how much warehousing space is required in the long-term - and how much is being proposed. It is horribly reminiscent of passing fads. The rail element appears to be a front behind which to build warehouses as it is not clear that this site is efficiently joined to the main parts by rail.	The proposed bus gate will effectively service this eastern point of the village from the west improving long journeys for those who live there or wish to visit there. The 9000 + new jobs and quote to 18,000 more for journeys per day. The suggestion that only a proportion will come through the centre of the village is based on some information masked no doubt to benefit developers. It is not clear how this information has been proved or back tested.			Generally I am appalled by this proposal which cuts off a portion of the village from the rest and will still result in a significant increase of traffic through our congested traffic lights. It can only make our village environment significantly worse.	1. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs in the country and the OxSRFI scheme responds to the constraints and opportunities of the site. 3 and General. The bus gate has been removed from the scheme further to a review following the Stage 1 consultation. Further work on the highways impacts from the OxSRFI scheme are included within the draft ES Transport Chapter.	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme

Appendix 4 –

Form32	Event 5 - 21.06.22	Yes - sadly. I know that strategically, once the M40 was built and the Chiltern Line upgraded, the area was very important/vulnerable. I might have felt differently some years ago but the village is already, literally (roads) crumbling under the impact of being part of a strategically key area	Junction 10 has never been satisfactory - always too small - perhaps this will help??	The roads, to me, seem an inadequate response , and having just listened in on a conversation involving fellow villages, it would appear that the village is in danger of being split up further: being spread across a crossroads has always been a challenge to village cohesion.	Have seen this before - its an effort - accepted but the very fact that so much focus has been put on landscaping, ecological 'benefits' etc is telling.	The impact of journeys undertaken by workers on the project are of interest	Not happy, but do acknowledge the importance/desirability of freight being transported by rail rather than road. Might be looking to move a bit earlier than intended.	<p>1 & 3. The highways strategy, which includes the Middleton Stoney Relief Road, are proposed to help reduce traffic through Middleton Stoney village centre. The bus gate has been removed from the scheme further to a review following the Stage 1 consultation.</p> <p>2. The M40 J10 improvement works will help increase capacity at the junction.</p> <p>4. The green infrastructure proposals are a fundamental element of the scheme and the OxSRFI proposals will deliver at least 10% BNG.</p> <p>5. Further highways modelling and assessment work is set out within the draft ES Transport Chapter, with further assessment work to be included as part of the application submission. General. Noted.</p>	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme
Form33	Event 5 - 21.06.22	No. We are not privileged to see the governments rationale. I am not convinced that the interchange with the railway is necessary since I do not believe that it will reduce road traffic.	Junction 10 is still a disaster in peak times despite it being rebuilt on three occasions.	We will only be able to access Ardley via Junction 10!. The Middleton Relief Road will not relieve the village of North/South traffic which will continue to be an increasing burden on the village.	Make little difference.	The bus gate is a joke. It has not been agreed through local planning. This is a cheap way of smuggling it through.	This proposal is a disaster to this village and should not be allowed to proceed.	<p>1. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs in the country and that each freight train can remove up to 76 HGVs from the road.</p> <p>2. The M40 J10 improvement works will help increase capacity at the junction.</p> <p>3 & 5. The bus gate has been removed from the scheme further to a review following the Stage 1 consultation.</p> <p>4. The landscape strategy which includes earthworks and bunds will help to prevent or minimise views of the OxSRFI scheme. Additional landscaping is also included within the southern area of the Main Site.</p> <p>General. The draft ES Chapters include an assessment of environmental effects from the proposed development with measures proposed to mitigate impacts.</p>	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme and increase in landscaping to the southern area of the Main Site.
Form34	Event 5 - 21.06.22	No. No thought has been given to the residents of Middleton Stoney.	J10 has been rebuilt 3 times already with all the inconvenience. <u>Not again</u>	The Middleton Stoney LINK road doesn't solve the traffic problems which 9,000 employees will use. There are no provision for S/W bound traffic on the B430. The crossroad being over capacity. I live on the B430 and it is now hell even with a 30 mph speed limit. Thought must be given to motorists going s/w.	These don't usually look like they in time	Look at the traffic, Road layout	<u>THE WRONG PLACE</u>	<p>1 & 3. The Middleton Stoney Relief Road (MSRR) will help reduce the amount of traffic passing through the village centre and will therefore directly benefit residents of the village.</p> <p>2. The M40 J10 improvement works will help increase capacity at the junction.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p> <p>5. Further highways modelling and assessment work is set out within the draft ES Transport Chapter, with further assessment work to be included as part of the application submission. General. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs across the country. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out that the OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements of an SRFI, with no suitable alternative sites identified along the M40 in Oxfordshire.</p>	
Form35	Event 5 - 21.06.22	Yes	Not my main concern	The existing bypass measures do not provide relief for vehicles travelling in from A34 direction. If you are providing 9500 jobs some will be coming from this direction.	Nothing will even begin to provide an acceptable masking strategy for such a sprawling urban development.	Plans for relief of cars from A34	At present, existing householders in Middleton Stoney have very few accessible countryside walks. This will further decimate what we have. The relief road at Dewars Farm will cut in half one walk and buildings will be visible from the central village field. This proposal makes me want to weep.	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3 & 5. The Middleton Stoney Relief Road (MSRR) will help reduce the amount of traffic passing through the village centre.</p> <p>4. The landscape strategy which includes earthworks and bunds will help to prevent or minimise views of the OxSRFI scheme.</p> <p>General. The OxSRFI scheme includes new rights of way connections, including a new connection from the east of Middleton Stoney to Heyford Park in the north-east or onward to existing rights of way to Bicester.</p>	

Appendix 4 –

Form36	Event 5 - 21.06.22					Detailed rationale of other potential option sites that have been considered and why they could/couldn't work	Hugely impactful on local greenspace - where is the safeguard to prevent further expansion? Details needed of where else this could be located.	5. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out that the OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements of an SRFI, with no suitable alternative sites identified along the M40 in Oxfordshire. General. The green infrastructure proposals are a fundamental element of the scheme and the OxSRFI proposals will deliver at least 10% BNG. Details of the green infrastructure proposals are included within the draft ES Ecology and LVIA Chapters and their Appendices.
Online comments forms								
Form37	Online comments	They require much more detail in regards to the phases in which they propose to carry out the project and how it will affect local stakeholders. There is little information in regards to how the various needs of different wildlife that currently exist in the area will be incorporated. Especially those who are far less common through the UK.	That they won't do much more than to give better access for HVGs to the M40 once completed and more confusion to the junction.	I understand the reasoning for the Ardley bypass but also appears to be another reason to build on green field land. Increasing the time to access local roads surrounding Ardley.	There is little information about how the site will sound or look from key points around Heyford park and the surrounding rights of way.		What is the proposal for the existing rights of way through the site if approved while the construction is carried out? What is the plan for any existing wildlife in the area while the works are carried out before the proposed hedgerow and trees are mature and established enough to support any wildlife? What will be done in terms of mitigation of litter and waste throughout the site? Will the current water courses running through the site be tested and checked regularly for pollution and biodiversity?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The draft ES Description of Development Chapter includes the anticipated phasing of the development and the environmental impacts from construction have been assessed as part of the draft ES Chapters. 2. The M40 J10 improvement works will help increase capacity at the junction. 3. The Ardley Bypass will help reduce traffic through the village centre and therefore also reduce environmental impacts on local residents. 4. The draft ES Noise and LVIA Chapters include assessments on the noise and visual impacts from the OxSRFI on identified sensitive receptors around the site. <p>General. A sustainable travel strategy which includes new footway/cycleway/bridleway links throughout the local network is included as part of the Stage 2 consultation material - works to existing rights of way will be confirmed through the detailed design stage. Impacts on existing wildlife during construction will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). A Waste Management Plan will be required during operation to manage waste procedures. The landscaping scheme (which includes water courses) will be managed by a management company with details confirmed at the detailed design stage.</p>

Appendix 4 –

Form38		See no.6	See no.6	See no.6	See no.6	See no.6	<p>My general comments are focused on the footpaths which will be lost. These currently run from St Mary's close alongside the fields and to the M40 motorway. The footpath runs alongside the M40 towards the railway where it crosses over to a beautiful path leading to the digester. There is also a lovely footpath which runs from the last house before the railway bridge along Station Road called 'Uplands'. The footpath runs through 3 fields towards the motorway and again, to the railway. I use these footpaths often and it would be a shame to lose them.</p> <p>Having looked at the maps at yesterdays consultation in Ardley (14/5/22) it seems that the footpath by the motorway, will be taken away.</p> <p>Also, as we live alongside the B430 and Bucknell Road, we are concerned that the volume of traffic will increase along the Bucknell Road. This is a busy, fast road used by traffic from Bicester, and would hate it to be even busier and noisier.</p> <p>However, we will be happy to lose the horrendous large lorries using the B430.</p>	<p>The footpath along the M40 (part of 109/26) is proposed to be removed but alternative rights of way routes are proposed within the vicinity of the area to facilitate north-south and east-west movement.</p> <p>The highways strategy is designed to reduce traffic on local roads and move users of the site towards the strategic highways network and new highways improvements, such as J10 and the Ardley Bypass. HGVS in particular will be directed to the strategic highways network.</p>	
Form39		<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<p>I have read through all the documents and attended an exhibition with an open mind. The policy of utilising more rail transport for freight is a good one. I see the positive aspects of the proposals for residents, that include the bypasses to Ardley and Middleton Stoney. However, I object with principles to the location on GRENNFIELDS. This will completely transform the rural nature of the area.</p> <p>One reason for the choice is the connectivity, particularly to the South via the A34 and North via the M40 and M1. These roads are already subject to accidents and clogged traffic. I receive traffic news every day and more often than not it includes a problem on the M40 and A34. The lorries going on these roads, plus other such hubs have been located in more industrial area.</p>	<p>National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs in the country and also acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver them to their location requirements. The OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements for an SRFI .</p> <p>he highways strategy has been designed to increase capacity at M40 Junctions 9 and 10 to help improve the flow of vehicles at these junctions and the use of these junction by users of the OxSRFI site.</p>	

Appendix 4 –

Form40	Yes, the national imperative to reduce road freight is paramount. The location is also well chosen	The original junction was poorly designed and this is a great improvement.	It all seems sensible to me. There need to be adequate measures to prevent HGVs going south on B430 and then west on A4095.	Good, the buildings look to be well concealed. Planting could help create good wildlife habitats.	Traffic modelling, possibly Vissi animation.	Seems a good idea which has been well planned.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Noted - the J10 improvement works will increase capacity of the junction. 3. Noted. 4. Noted and the planting details will be secured through requirements as part of the detailed design stage. 5. Further highways modelling and assessment work included as part of the Stage 2 consultation, with further assessment work to be provided as part of the application submission. General. Supportive comment noted. 	
Form41	They are clearly explained but it is not clear why you cannot use brown field sites on Heyford Park airbase.	Any 'improvements' which require bulldozing greenfield land are nonsense.	Building a relief road for my village would involve bulldozing further green space at Dewars Farm therefore exacerbating the situation.	It will never replace the existing green fields you will be bulldozing.	Why have you not earmarked brown field land for this project?	There is no justification for selecting green field land for this development. I object in the strongest possible terms.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 & 5. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out that the OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements of an SRFI, with no suitable alternative sites identified along the M40 in Oxfordshire. 2, 4 & General. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs in the country and also acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver them to their location requirements. The OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements for an SRFI . 3. Environmental impacts from the OxSRFI scheme, and the measures required to mitigate impacts, are set out in the draft ES Chapters. 	
Form42	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	I am 11 and Middleton Stoney. I don't want the fields around my house to be built on because I love to play around and in the area. I love to just have fun and be me in the only countryside we have near us and you are building on the road that goes to my school and I don't want to be late every day because of it. Please please please don't build it.	The Middleton Stoney Relief Road will help reduce the volume of traffic running through the village centre and thereby providing environmental benefits to residents of the village.	
Form43	Generally the explanation was put. But lots of things were not. Examples: what lighting will be used, light pollution will be high from this proposal. People working at the proposal, will have to travel by car, as no public transport. This will add to the already congested B430.	The proposal for the m40 junction are poor. Cutting off local villages, that will also force through traffic to the motorway junction going via Caulcott and Somerton,.(bus gate and road removal) B430 traffic will be worse as no provision for improvement, Weston on the green to Ardley.	This will not help the B430 traffic from Weston to Ardley, in fact will make it worse.	Not enough trees being planted, we are in a climate emergency. We should be planting and not concreting.	<i>left blank</i>	Terrible proposal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lighting strategy is included within the draft ES Lighting Chapter and its Appendices. A public transport strategy is included within the draft ES Transport Chapter and its Appendices. The Middleton Stoney Relief Road will help reduce traffic through the village centre. 2 & 3. The M40 J9 and J10 improvement works will help increase capacity at these junctions. The bus gate has been removed from the scheme further to a review following the Stage 1 consultation. 4. The scheme will involve the planting of in excess of 150,000 new native trees. General. Noted. 	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme and planting of 150,000 native new trees within the scheme.

Appendix 4 –

Form44		<p>Understand explanation but fails to give anywhere near enough consideration to the huge environmental and practical disruption that will be caused by a project of this side to the local area.</p>	<p>Catastrophic damage to and loss of green space in local area if project went ahead. Junction 9 and 10 are both already busy junctions so idea of increasing the traffic through these areas is completely untenable.</p>	<p>Road changes will force more traffic through Middleton Stoney especially with growing size of Heyford Park already. HGVs already using this area as a rat run for the air base and this proposed project will simply bring more large vehicles into the area.</p>	<p>Shambolic attempt to try and hide the fact that this project is a financially driven, private sector initiative that has no authentic interest in the impact it could have on a Green and quiet part of the country. The suggestion that the tree-planting will in some way offset the damage caused by this huge industrial project is quite frankly insulting to residents in the region. We have seen the type of tree planting associated with this kind of project before including around the warehouse developments in Bicester and it is a token gesture to make the financiers and political individuals involved in the project feel better about the damage they are causing to the existing landscape.</p>	<p>Clear evidence to show other possible sites for the project. Clear evidence of who has signed off on the project reaching this point already. Clear evidence of the projected financial benefits/profits likely to be made by those involved. Clear evidence showing why such a large area of countryside needs to be wiped out in this way. Clear evidence as to why this project cannot be re-sited to other existing “brownfield” or development areas.</p>	<p>Shameful that those involved would try and steamroller a project of this size through under the guise of it being a “positive addition” for the region. Were this huge industrial footprint be allowed to happen the damage and change to the region it would cause would be catastrophic....expect that as word gets out there will be huge opposition to the project.</p>	<p>1 & General. Environmental impacts from the OxSRFI scheme, and the measures required to mitigate impacts, are set out in the draft ES Chapters. 2. The green infrastructure proposals will deliver at least 10% BNG. The M40 J9 and J10 improvement works will help increase capacity at these junctions. 3. The Middleton Stoney Relief Road will help reduce traffic through the village centre. HGVs will be restricted to using the strategic highways network to access the site. 4. The green infrastructure proposals are a fundamental element of the OxSRFI scheme. 5. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out that the OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements of an SRFI, with no suitable alternative sites identified along the M40 in Oxfordshire. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs in the country and also acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver them to their location requirements. The OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements for an SRFI . The OxSRFI scheme will be delivered by unpack Logistics EU Sarl (Mountpark) who are a leading developer with a proven track record in delivering high quality logistics developments across the UK/Ireland and Europe.</p>	
Form45		<p>I am fully in support of national measures to transfer freight from road to rail but remain to be convinced that this is a location which is useful with regard to achieving this aim. The Chiltern line does not connect major manufacturing or importing areas. I am worried that this will turn out to be yet another warehouse development which encourages (rather than discourages) motorway use. Can planning permission be framed in such a way as to preclude use by companies using only road transport?</p>	<p><i>left blank</i></p>	<p><i>left blank</i></p>	<p><i>left blank</i></p>	<p><i>left blank</i></p>	<p><i>left blank</i></p>	<p>The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out that the OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements of an SRFI, with no suitable alternative sites identified along the M40 in Oxfordshire. The Chiltern route is included within the Strategic Rail Freight network. The occupiers within the OxSRFI scheme will benefit from access to rail served freight.</p>	

Appendix 4 –

Form46	Yes	They make sense and the junction could do with considerable improvement.	The road layout makes sense, however there is concern about the added impact of car movements for workers at the site. Adding a passenger station with cycle links to Bicester and local villages would significantly improve the proposal, reduce the cars going in and out and would relieve pressure on Bicester and Banbury for commuters from Cherwell going in to the towns.	Unsure	Details of open spaces and rights of way.	<i>left blank</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Noted - the J10 improvement works will increase capacity at the junction. 3. The OxSRFI scheme will not prejudice the delivery of a passenger station at Ardley. Additional rights of way links which provide comments to Bicester are included within the sustainable travel strategy. 4. Noted. 5. The landscape strategy includes proposals about accessible rights of way connections through the site which provides access to areas of open space within the scheme. 	
Form47	No. Presenting the destruction of countryside and 24 hour HGV traffic as enhancing the environment is Orwellian. There is no mention of the light, sound and other pollution this will cause.	This will lead to significantly more traffic and a huge amount of disruption and environmental damage.	<i>left blank</i>	This whole project is completely wrong. Trying to hide the damage is lipstick on a pig. It is a port mitigation when compared to the huge damage this scheme will do.	Detail on the noise pollution, the light pollution, the carbon and other pollutants used in construction of the site and roads, the air pollution caused by the extra traffic.	The whole proposal is obscene. It involves the destruction of countryside and massive air, light and noise pollution in the name of environmental progress.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 & 5. The OxSRFI scheme includes green infrastructure which will deliver at least 10% BNG, plant more than 150,000 new native trees and provide over 13km of new hedgerow. The draft ES Chapters include an assessment of environmental effects from the proposed development with measures proposed to mitigate impacts. 2. The highways strategy proposed aims to direct users of the OxSRFI site to access the development via the strategic highways network, and away from local village centres, such as Ardley and Middleton Stoney. See also point 1 re: the draft ES. 4. The green infrastructure proposals are a fundamental element of the scheme. <p>General. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs in the country and also acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver them due to their locational requirements.</p>	Yes - planting of 150,000 native new trees within the scheme.
Form48	Yes, it is clear why it is being proposed in this location and how it sits within the national strategy for rail freight.	Unclear	Unclear how the relief road will impact residents of Ardley and Middleton Stoney	Supportive of the extensive tree planting	Visuals showing the proposed development from Heyford Park, the airfield and other surrounding viewpoints Details of the lighting strategy and biodiversity enhancement strategy. Impact on traffic from the jobs being created and from lorry movements.	Support the principle of the development. I query where people will come from to fill the jobs being created, I'm not very familiar with employment rates but there seems to be a lot of jobs in the area. Will the creation of jobs result in a lot more commuting as people travel by car to reach jobs. Sustainable transport should be encouraged to reach the employment opportunities.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2 & 3. Noted - the draft ES Transport Chapter and its Appendices includes details about the design and justification of the highways strategy and improvements works. This includes an explanation for how the Middleton Stoney Relief Road and Ardley Bypass will reduce traffic through the village centres. 4. Noted - in excess of 150,000 new native trees will be planted as part of the OxSRFI scheme 5. The draft ES LVIA Chapter includes selected visuals of the OxSRFI scheme. The draft ES Lighting, Ecology and Transport Chapters also include further details on the lighting strategy, biodiversity enhancements and highways impacts from the scheme, with measures included to mitigate impacts. <p>General. The draft ES Socio-Economic Chapter sets out how and where the jobs are anticipated to be filled. Sustainable travel opportunities are also set out in the draft ES Transport Chapter and its Appendices.</p>	

Appendix 4 –

Form49	Yes	I don't like how much building is happening in this area; how much wildlife is being displaced/killed by the huge amounts of development. It feels like Bicester is becoming an urban sprawl, rather than a market town in a beautiful rural area. This, I guess, is the price we pay for living in a location that has been targeted by so many (this scheme, Great Wolf resort, endless building of houses). It is no longer a lovely place to live.	My major concern is regarding highways and specifically the proposed bus gate at Middleton Stoney. My husband and I own a tiny pub in Caulcott (Horse and Groom), further along the B4030. The proposed plan would totally eradicate our passing trade; something that could only have a significantly detrimental impact on our livelihood. I do not think that the proposed plan of sending all of the traffic that currently comes along this road along Camp Road is a viable option. Large numbers of heavy vehicles come along; Camp Road has speed bumps and chicanes; not to mention a school with sites on either side of the road. Road safety on Camp Road would be hugely compromised.	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	I want to see that you have monitored road use in this area and come up with a viable highways option.	I don't like this plan; suspect it will go ahead against this will of the local population anyway. Please don't kill our business.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. The OxSRFI scheme includes green infrastructure which will deliver at least 10% BNG, plant more than 150,000 new native trees and provide over 13km of new hedgerow. 3. The bus gate has been removed from the scheme further to a review following the Stage 1 consultation. 5. The highways strategy includes a consideration of traffic on local roads as well as the strategic network with appropriate measures within the scheme proposed as a result. The highways strategy is proposed further to consultation with the local highways authority and National Highways. 6. The extensive pre-application process is proposed to provide local residents and businesses the opportunity to review and comment on the proposals prior to them being finalised. 	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme and planting of 150,000 native new trees within the scheme.
Form50	1 No as it fails to address the cumulative impact of this and other consented and proposed developments in the area in terms of traffic, visual intrusion, protection of the environment and impact on the rural nature of the surrounding area.	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	6 For the reasons stated above I wish to oppose the application. It should be located on a brownfield site in an urban area not on largely greenfield land in the middle of the countryside. Generally but especially on occasions when the M40 is closed there will be a large number of vehicle movements on the local roads from this and the other developments mentioned above	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The draft ES Chapters include a consideration of other schemes in the area, known as cumulative sites, with the full list of the sites available in the Introduction Chapter. The assessment of cumulative effects will be finalised prior to application submission. 6. . National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs in the country and also acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver them due to their locational requirements. The OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements for an SRFI 	
Form51	Yes. Close to M40 and railway.	About time to! DoT should have done a better job 30 years ago.	All looks good.	Its good to see the landscaping and tree planting but do not hide it totally. Lets have some of the buildings looking good (note the arty Ardley incinerator) and to be see from the surrounding areas. It is important not hide infrastructure. Let people see its there. We will all make use of it indirectly.	Please give the real reason that the old air base cannot be used and don't pedal miss truths about nature reserves and why wind generators cannot be installed. That is that the site is protected just in case it needs to be re-opened as an operational air base.	I found myself being a little insulted at the consultation. As someone who has retired from 'infrastructure development' I did not need to have things explained in over simple terms. My attempts to stop the otherwise excellent representatives from simplistic commentary failed. Otherwise, keep up the good work. I look forward to breezing though J10 in a few years time.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Noted. 3. Noted. 4. The landscape strategy does help to minimise views of the buildings. The draft Design Approach Document (DAD) also includes proposals for the design of the buildings, which will influence the detailed design stage of the scheme. 5. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out an assessment of the Heyford Park site which concludes that the site is not available. 6. Noted and no offense intended in explaining the OxSRFI scheme. 		

Appendix 4 –

Form52		No I don't. The rail connection piece is particularly unclear and doesn't seem to me to make sense	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	The rail detail has been updated as part of the Stage 2 consultation material.	
Form53		No, not really. I was informed they are looking at various sites up and down the UK and although the M40 and railway line run close by Upper Heyford, I fail to see why digging up acres of farmland and destroying countless trees and habitats in the process, is a good enough reason to site it here.	Anything that can be done to improve J10 of the M40 is very welcome indeed. It is very poorly laid out and extremely confusing to drivers using it for the first time.	These 2 relief roads would be an absolute necessity should SRFI be built at upper Heyford as the increased traffic would be intolerable. However, no thought whatsoever has been given to the residents of Upper Heyford (park, not village) as some of the new employees at the facility who live over to the west would likely travel along Camp Road to reach the depot. This road is currently abused by HGVs, car transporters and various lorries using the road 24 hours a day 7 days a week. I understand a new approach road is due to be built by Dorchester Living for HGVs onto the flying field which cannot happen soon enough. But without a relief road around Heyford Park, these HGVs etc will just be replaced with	I cannot imagine anything will be able to hide the development or even disguise it. Why chop down full grown trees which actively help neutralise CO2 to replace them with saplings that, if they survive, will not be much use to cleanse the pollution from our air until they are bigger.	What exactly is the technical work? This sounds like permission to build is a given and you are just going through the motions of public consultation.	<p>There has to be a better location to site such a build rather than farmers fields in-between small villages. There is already so much traffic using Camp Road and it was not built to take such a high volume of traffic. In parts it has collapsed with the weight of vehicles using it all day every day. There are various traffic calming measures, chicanes and sleeping policemen along its length causing traffic to stop start all the way along, making more noise and pollution as engines slow down, brakes squeal, engines start up again then speed to get through the next chicane before the car coming in the opposite direction gets there.</p> <p>Buying a house in Heyford Park was sold as living in a village, a rural idyll, in beautiful, unspoilt and peaceful countryside. We have been sold a lie.</p>	<p>1 & General. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs in the country and also acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver them due to their locational requirements. The OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements for an SRFI also includes significant levels of green infrastructure to help mitigate impacts and deliver at least 10% BNG across the site. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out that the OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements of an SRFI, with no suitable alternative sites identified along the M40 in Oxfordshire.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. The highways works have been designed following consultation with the local highways authority and National Highways and will help to restrict HGVs to accessing the site via the strategic highways network.</p> <p>4. The landscape strategy, which includes extensive earthworks, bunds and the planting of new trees, will help to minimise views of the proposed development. Further details are set out in the draft ES LVIA Chapter.</p> <p>5. The draft ES Chapters are supported by extensive technical work to understand the environmental effects from the proposed development.</p>	

Appendix 4 –

			<p>hundreds of cars travelling to and from work at the new site 24 hours per day 7 days per week. This will cause an increase in air pollution, noise and present a greater risk to the school children and pedestrians who regularly walk along Camp Road. When I asked the representatives at the public exhibition I attended in Upper Heyford Village hall whether a new road around Heyford Park and the villages of Lower and Upper Heyford would be built, I was informed that I had raised a good point because no, apparently it has not been thought of.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 4 –

Form54		<p>No. The rationale for moving freight from road to rail is not in contention but the means by which this proposal will achieve anything other than the exact opposite - namely an increase in road freight and road use in general - is singularly absent. Scant regard is had to the true environmental impact despite the climate emergency and there is a complete absence of any acknowledgement that increased supply of freight to the site will necessarily increase, hugely, road traffic to the region, which is already buckling under crippling over-development and traffic congestion. The treatment of serious issues of global significance, around environmental, cultural and societal damage as a result of this project is derisory. The logic of the move from road to rail is a fig-leaf behind which to conceal the clandestine construction of a warehouse city that will lay waste to a huge swathe of land and which will bring devastating environmental damage to the region at a time when we should be remediating existing damage.</p>	<p>The existing junction 10 deals adequately with existing traffic flows even at peak times and acts a reliable means to funnel traffic as a result of a limited number of traffic constraints (traffic lights and roundabouts). Further expansion is unnecessary and the proposal simply demonstrates the hugely damaging increase in traffic that will be caused by the OXSRFI. With the project's proponents claiming that the project alone will cause well over 1250 additional car trips and circa 300 additional heavy goods vehicles in morning and</p>	<p>It is well known that road schemes generate traffic rather than reducing it. Research shows that average increases in traffic in the short term (3-7 years) from thirteen traffic schemes across England was over 7% and rose in the medium term (8-20 years) to a staggering 47%. These increases are in addition to underlying traffic growth that would have occurred in any event. See for evidence: Sloman L, Hopkinson L and Taylor I (2017) The Impact of Road Projects in England.</p>	<p>The landscaping will release carbon unnecessarily, the planting will take decades to produce a positive carbon impact as young trees actually have a negative carbon footprint as is well known and the destruction to wildlife, existing old and sometimes ancient hedges, bio-diverse ecosystems and mature trees cannot be reversed by a cosmetic over-plastering after the event.</p>	<p>A comprehensive comparative study by an independent and impartial academic body of (i) the true environmental damage that will be caused by the project and (ii) of the merits of developing this site over other alternatives and (iii) the true impact on traffic flows over a 20-year period arising from this site (iv) the impact of the project on existing infrastructure and in particular existing rail and road networks and whether this may necessitate additional works to these to cope.</p>	<p>1/ This scheme shows a reckless and cavalier disregard for the environmental damage that will be sustained in a key buffer zone between the Cotswolds AONB and the M40/A34/Bicester conurbation at a time when the climate emergency requires remediation of existing damage, not the creation of more. 2/ Alleged 'environmental mitigation' work on the HS2 project, for example at Launton, has resulted in ecological harm to existing sites of scientific and ecological interest - quite the opposite of their intended effect and therefore significant doubts must overshadow the claims that similar schemes around the SRFI will off-set the damage that will be incurred as a result of this project. 3/ Existing road infrastructure is already at breaking point at busy times of the day - notably the M40 and A34. Any additional traffic, let alone heavy goods traffic, will render the situation untenable. Further road development cannot avoid this but will simple result in the funnelling of traffic away from the immediate vicinity into bottle necks where traffic is throttled on the peripheral parts of the area. The resulting harm to humans and local ecology caused by traffic pollution resulting from the</p>	<p>1 & General. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs in the country and also acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver them due to their locational requirements. The OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements for an SRFI and also includes significant levels of green infrastructure to help mitigate impacts and deliver at least 10% BNG across the site. National policy also states that Rail freight is estimated to reduce emissions on average by 76% per tonne per km travelled when compared to road freight, equating to around 1.4m tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions saved each year. Rail is one of the most carbon efficient ways of moving goods over long distances and can also reduce congestion – depending on its load, each freight train can remove up to 76 Heavy Goods Vehicles from the road. The rail freight industry resulted in 5.56 million fewer lorry journeys in 2020/21. 2 & 3. The M40 J10 improvement works, where there are identified capacity issues, will increase capacity at the junction. The highways works have been designed following consultation with the local highways authority and National Highways and will help to increase capacity at J9 and J10. 4. The landscaping scheme will take 15 years to mature. The landscaping scheme has been assessed and will deliver over 10% BNG. An assessment of the scheme on Climate Change is included within the draft ES Climate Change Chapter. 5 & General. The OxSRFI scheme is supported by an extensive draft ES which assesses the environment effects from the proposals. Once submitted, the scheme will be assessed by the appointed examining authority on behalf of the Secretary of State prior to determination. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out that the OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements of an SRFI, with no suitable alternative sites identified along the M40 in Oxfordshire.</p>	
--------	--	--	---	---	--	---	--	---	--

Appendix 4 –

evening peak hours alone, the region will become a pollution black-spot. As is well-known, such estimates prove to be wildly understated so we can expect, based on mean historic data on other schemes, for actual traffic increases to be significantly above these levels. Moreover, to describe the change as a highways "improvement" (as you do on the website) shows a complete lack of impartiality. A change is not automatically an improvement. It might be the very opposite. The phrase is misleading because the question of whether the change amounts to an improvement or a deterioration assumes a set of agreed criteria by which to assess this and that is not present and therefore serves only to beg the very question at issue.

increased flow of traffic, vehicles at a standstill and carbon release from excavations will be material and long-lasting (and potentially irreversible).
4/ It is false logic to presume that the location for the site should be proximate to existing warehousing, logistics and road and rail infrastructure. Those existing facilities were not designed with the SRFI in mind or to cope with increased loading as a result of it. Had they been so designed, they may well not have been located where they were and would have been provisioned in an entirely different way (to allow for additional load upon them caused by SRFI or by changed patterns of use by the public as a result of disruption from SRFI).

Appendix 4 –

Form55		<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<p>As a resident of Upper Heyford, I would like to object to the proposals in their entirety. The proposals are wholly unacceptable and unwelcome for the following reasons: Any loss of agricultural land in a time of climate crisis and potential food shortage is: at best short sighted and at worst utter stupidity. The disruption caused by construction, especially of new road junctions, will be very significant. We are lucky enough to have almost 100% employment so any employees will need to drive to and from the site daily, thereby greatly increasing harmful pollution. Combined with the Great Wolf development at Chesterton and proposed warehousing at Baynard's Green this becomes one of three huge industrial developments very close together: this is not sustainable! Do we really need this development, as only ten rail movements per day are planned? Is this just an attempt to simply put more warehousing in/on the M40 corridor – affecting noise, light and air pollution. Think hard; think again for the sake of the environment!</p>	<p>The majority of the site (over 67%) is either poorer quality agricultural land or non-agricultural land. A Soil Management Plan will also be used as part of the construction process within the CEMP which will ensure protection of the resource and best re-use of soil resources, preventing damage to soils and potential losses. The environmental impacts from the construction of the OxSRFI scheme are assessed as part of the draft ES Chapters. The draft ES Socio-Economic Chapter identifies the proposed housing growth in Cherwell and also the issue with out-commuting of residents for work. The OxSRFI proposals will therefore provide job opportunities to accommodate the proposed housing growth and reduce out-commuting in the District. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs in the country and also acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver them due to their locational requirements. The OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements for an SRFI. The highways strategy includes improvement works to M40 J9 and J10 to increase identified capacity issues at those junctions.</p>	No
--------	--	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	--	--	----

Appendix 4 –

Form56		<p>Whilst the need for further SRFI was explained, we felt the reasons for choosing Ardley were not clearly defined/explained in relation to other terminals and the movement of freight via other locations. Undoubtedly this will have impact on the local area - residents/wildlife/environment, etc - with increased HGV traffic and noise pollution whilst building the terminal and later operating the terminal. The B430 already has increased traffic due to the EFW incinerator</p>	<p>Junction 10 does need improving as traffic doesn't flow, however i am concerned that improvements here will be seen as the easier solution to getting on/off the M40 as J9 is already over loaded. Increased traffic volume to/from J10 could be detrimental to the surrounding areas with rat runs being over stretched. As residents of Ardley who work in Bicester, we are both concerned about the impact to our commute.</p>	<p>See answer 2 - will there be any restrictions to the back roads in the area to deter LGVs and HGVs from finding short cuts?</p>	<p>We support the use of mounding, bunding and tree planting to provide sound barriers. However, there will be a period of time before the trees mature when their benefit will not be fully felt. Whilst we hear the dull rumbling of the M40 traffic, depending on wind direction, we fear the noise from the SRFI will be more strident and stop start. An example will be reversing sounders on vehicles, movement of containers, train movements - stopping and starting. As a resident of Quarry Cottages, noise from the SRFI is our biggest concern when inside and especially sitting in the garden.</p>	<p>It would very helpful to have a more detailed understanding of the level of vehicle movements not only for the SRFI, but also as a result of the changes to the road network. And then the resulting pollution levels - both noise and emissions - expected. We would also like to understand the growth plans for use of the terminal and how the volume of traffic, both by road and rail, will increase as use of the terminal grows. Presumably this will include extending the operating hours, so what does this look like? We would also like to understand the employment levels created by the terminal and how it is proposed employees get to site, possibly via organised transport, but also the impact on local infrastructure caused by increased commuting to a rural location.</p>	<p>Extension to the bridleway over the railway and to the north of the terminal is a positive, however it is a concern that foot and traffic volume on Somerton Lane, where Quarry Cottages are located, will increase. There are already poor facilities for dog walkers to park and turnaround without imposing on residents. Also the lane is in poor condition, increased traffic will only deteriorate this further. Finally, there is potential for a negative impact on property values whilst the terminal is under planning and construction. And once the SRFI is operating there is high potential that those values will not return to market levels. This particularly concerning for owners of Quarry Cottages.</p>	<p>1 & 2. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out that the OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements of an SRFI, with no suitable alternative sites identified along the M40 in Oxfordshire. The OxSRFI scheme is supported by an extensive draft ES which assesses the environment effects from the proposals. The highways strategy is designed to reduce traffic on local roads and move users of the site towards the strategic highways network and new highways improvements, such as J10 and the Ardley Bypass. HGVS in particular will be directed to the strategic highways network. 3. Weight restrictions for HGVs proposed within Ardley and Fewcott which are designed to prevent HGVs moving through local villages off the Strategic Highways Network. 4. Construction impacts, including noise have been assessed and can be managed through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which included best practice measures to minimise environmental effects on the nearest sensitive receptors. 5. The Stage 2 consultation includes the draft ES Transport Chapter which includes further details about the traffic movement and the impacts and proposed mitigation (with assessment work being finalised prior to the application submission), and details about the proposed bus service provision which would run between Heyford Park and Bicester. The phasing of the OxSRFI, including the rail terminal, are included within the draft ES Description of Development Chapter. 6. The footway/cycleway/bridleway proposals are included as part of the draft ES Transport Chapter.</p>	<p>Yes - inclusion of weight restrictions in Ardley and Fewcott</p>
Form57		<p>I am not in favour of the chosen location.</p>	<p>left blank</p>	<p>left blank</p>	<p>I am not happy with the proposed landscaping - the images I have seen are based on the trees after 15 years and we are still able to see the roofs of the warehouses after 15 years. This is directly in my view line from 2 of our upstairs bedrooms - including the master bedroom- this will without a doubt affect our house value and it would be something that I would notice each and every day! We have chosen to live here as it is a rural location.</p>	<p>More information on the noise, as this is being described as something like "within an tolerable level". Will there be a train driven overnight?</p>	<p>left blank</p>	<p>1. The Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) which is an Appendix to the draft ES (Chapter 2) sets out that the OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements of an SRFI, with no suitable alternative sites identified along the M40 in Oxfordshire. 4. The proposed landscape strategy will help to minimise views of the OxSRFI scheme, but will not remove all views. The design, materials and colours of the buildings will be proposed to enable them to blend into the landscape - further details are included in the draft Design Approach Document. 5. The updated draft ES Noise Chapter is included as part of the draft ES which forms part of the Stage 2 consultation material.</p>	

Appendix 4 –

Form58		Yes	<p>In the immediate area of Junction 10, they are generally sensible. The control of the roundabout where traffic emerges from the site will be challenging - especially if the northbound B430 traffic is not going to tail back to Middleton Stoney</p>	<p>The wider traffic plans are naive in the extreme! It appears that little or no thought has been given to what will happen to existing traffic coming from the west on the B4030 heading to M40 J10 and especially those vehicles going to Bicester. All eastbound traffic on the B4030 heading to Bicester will be forced through Heyford Park (leading to gridlock) or on the circuitous route to the staggered (staggeringly stupid!) new B430 junctions. The bus gate west of Middleton Stoney is a ridiculous concept! Bicester Village and Bicester North train stations are effectively removed as a serious option for anyone living west of Middleton</p>	<p>Generally good although I think the sight lines are too tightly drawn around the immediate site and the mitigation of the wider blight on the local rural landscape has not been considered.</p>	<p>I would like to see much more transparent availability of modelling data. I would also like to see a much wider consultation reaching out to the west - to Steeple Aston, Woodstock, The Bartons,... Some specific modelling of Bicester Village Mall and Chiltern Trains traffic to Bicester Village and Bicester North stations must be included for the consultation to be credible.</p>	<p>My view is that if infrastructure like this is needed, which, with the current consumer driven economy and profligate spending habits, I suspect it is, then selecting a centrally located site near existing road and rail routes is probably the least worst option. However, the nation should not expect to benefit at the expense of serious local detriment so, for those nationally desirable outcomes to be achieved, the cost of mitigating the negative impact on the local scene must be factored in and borne nationally. I see no evidence of this in the planning consultation. It is clear from OxSRFI's Public Exhibition sessions that little or no thought has been given to the impact west of the site, especially with regard to traffic crossing the Cherwell. All eastbound B4030 traffic will be forced through Heyford Park or on the new circuitous route to the B430. Such naive thinking must be countered if the national benefit is to be achieved in a way that respects and repays what the local scene is offering the nation.</p>	<p>1. Noted. 2 & 4. The Stage 2 consultation includes the draft ES Transport Chapter which includes further details about the traffic movement and the impacts and proposed mitigation (with assessment work being finalised prior to the application submission). 3. The bus gate has been removed from the scheme further to a review following the Stage 1 consultation. 5. The draft ES LVIA Chapter includes an assessment of the landscape and visual effects from the OxSRFI scheme. General. The costs to deliver the scheme have been considered by the Applicant as part of the preparation of the application. The updated draft ES Transport Chapter assesses traffic movement resulting from the proposed OxSRFI scheme.</p>	<p>Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme</p>
--------	--	-----	---	--	---	--	--	---	--

Appendix 4 –

Form59		<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<i>left blank</i>	<p>OxSRFI identifies that the overall development will generate 9,607 on-site FTE jobs within transport and logistics alongside an unknown quantity of Temporary Construction Employment opportunities. Whilst new jobs in Oxfordshire bring a host of economic benefits, consideration is needed to ensure new vacancies resulting from the development align with local skills to help reduce in-commuting to the region and mitigate the impact of the development on the local labour market.</p> <p>Oxfordshire has consistently experienced a tight labour market which means additional jobs can increase pressure on the local labour market, resulting in rising wages for skilled workers and increasing inequality. To address this issue, the economic benefits need to be maximised and shared across Oxfordshire with training initiatives that target Oxfordshire's most deprived wards where there remains significant pockets of inequality, unemployment and low skills/qualification attainment.</p> <p>The Oxfordshire Skills Board would want to further understand how the developer and employer intends to address local employment and training issues considering the long-standing labour shortages both in the Construction and the Logistics, Manufacturing and Supply Chain industries within Oxfordshire.</p> <p>The Oxfordshire Skills Board would recommend and can support the development of a Community Employment Plan in partnership with the Local Authority, OxLEP and other relevant stakeholder groups to identify training, skills and employment initiatives related to the construction and/or end-use phase of the development. For more information on Community Employment Plans, please refer to the Community Employment Plan Evidence Paper which was endorsed by the Oxfordshire Growth Board in 2017 and can be found on our website at: https://www.oxfordshirelep.com/skills/our-programmes/community-employment-plans</p>	<i>left blank</i>	<p>The draft ES Socio-Economic Chapter includes proposals for a employment and skills plan - both during construction and operation to help address any training and skill shortages, and will also include measures to help engage the community in employment opportunities</p>	
--------	--	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	---	-------------------	---	--

Appendix 4 –

Form60		<p>No, inadequate consideration has been given for climate and environmental impacts, including using land used for food production rather than a brownfield site. The environmental impacts will reach beyond the Ardley/Middleton Stoney areas, including into the Ardley and Heyford Conservation Target Areas (CTAs), the Upper and Lower Cherwell Valley CTAs, Tusmore and Shelswell CTA, their Biodiversity Action Plan species, floodplains and waterways, and sites designated as Local Wildlife Sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The impacts will not only local but national and globally, with yet more depletion of the environment, our planet, its climate and ecology.</p>	<p>Whilst positive that the much of SRFI goods traffic would be mandated to use the M40, the overall proposal will still be destroying agricultural and environmentally sensitive land - this is unacceptable, even more so now we live in a time when we need to be very sensitive to the climate and environmental emergencies.</p>	<p>The Ardley and Middleton Stoney bypasses will only partially address access and traffic issues, as traffic will need to go west/east as well as north/south. New roads will also impact negatively on wildlife and air/noise/water/land pollution. The proposed bus gate will lead to detrimental HGV and other traffic volumes through Heyford Park and the small villages of Upper and Lower Heyford</p>	<p>We understand the SRFI landscaping aim, but this will not and cannot compensate for the environmental impact of the loss of habitats, and air, noise, land, water and light pollution. Wildlife will be excluded from a large area that is presently theirs, and the impacts of pollution will render remaining areas unsuitable for their needs, or at best less suitable. There will be a huge biodiversity net loss, including irreplaceable loss of key habitats, established wildlife corridors, native trees, woodland, and scrub.</p>	<p>We want to see evidence that due diligence has been done, and the true impacts of the proposed development on the environment, ecology, climate and the future of farming and food production have been properly assessed, both legally, morally and ethically. With our land, air and water now toxic, the fundamentals of our planet's ecology undermined, it is simply beyond comprehension that developers and planners should think they have the right or understanding to further degrade our world and any hope there is for the species currently living in it.</p>	<p>Shame on those responsible. To you, reading this, stand up and speak out - your voice counts and you can influence for a better way.</p>	<p>1, 4 & 5. The draft ES includes chapters on Climate Change and Ecology (as well as other environmental topics such as air quality, water, agricultural land and light), which assess the environmental effects from the OxSRFI on climate and biodiversity (and other topics) at this stage of the scheme with further assessment to be completed prior to the submission of the application. 2. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFI locations in the country and also acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver them due to their locational requirements. The OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements for an SRFI. It should also be noted that the majority of the site (over 67%) is either poorer quality agricultural land or non-agricultural land. Also, A Soil Management Plan will also be used as part of the construction process within the CEMP which will ensure protection of the resource and best re-use of soil resources, preventing damage to soils and potential losses. 3. The Middleton Stoney Relief Road and Ardley Bypass will reduce traffic through the village centres. The bus gate has been removed from the scheme further to a review following the Stage 1 consultation. General. The proposed OxSRFI scheme is strongly supported by national policy in order to address several issues which include climate change impacts, congestion, market demands for storage and distribution.</p>	<p>Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme</p>
Form61		<p>No, although there is need for road freight to move to rail, this train line is not of a scale that will be able to link in a meaningful way and there will still be a significant amount of road traffic to and from the site.</p>	<p>Yes this is important as the J10 and surrounding roads are inundated with traffic</p>	<p>I have concerns that the relief road will give other contractors the green light to create further developments. Especially given the recent applications for green belt development on the A43. I believe a cumulative impact of all these developments should be considered.</p>	<p>I still have concerns about the impact on biodiversity and wildlife not just on this site but the impact on the surrounding area, especially as there is a SSSI within very close proximity as well as ancient woodlands.</p>	<p>Yes the consultation has not given presentations and information to other local communities impacted including Fritwell, Somerton and Souldern. Fritwell in particular will be impacted from vibration, noise, and air pollution.</p>	<p>I will be objecting to this proposal as it stands as i do not feel in provides sustainable rail freight given the size of the rail service to this area, I also have significant concerns about noise, air, light pollution and also vibrations from the works and increase in rail traffic from heavy freight on the local communities.</p>	<p>1. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFI locations in the country and also acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver them due to their locational requirements. The OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements for an SRFI. The updated draft ES Transport Chapter has been developed in consultation with the local highway authority and National Highways, and assesses traffic movement resulting from the proposed OxSRFI scheme. 2. Noted. 3. The Middleton Stoney Relief Road and Ardley Bypass will reduce traffic through the village centres. The draft ES Chapters include a consideration of other schemes in the area, known as cumulative sites, with the full list of the sites available in the Introduction Chapter. The assessment of cumulative effects will be finalised prior to application submission. 4. The draft ES Ecology Chapter assess the biodiversity effects from the OxSRFI. The Chapter also includes measures to deliver at least 10% BNG. 5. The draft ES Noise & Vibration, and Air Quality Chapters explain that the nearest sensitive receptors have been identified where a human or ecological habitat could be exposed to increased levels or effects due to the proposed development. No receptors were identified in Fritwell, Somerton or Souldern as part of this process. General. Consultation with Network Rail has confirmed capacity for at least 4 trains a day for the site with further details to be set out as part of the application submission. The environmental impacts from the OxSRFI scheme are assessed within the draft ES Chapters, with further assessment work to be included in the application submission.</p>	

Appendix 4 –

Form62		They are clearly explained but I feel the countryside aspect to this location has been overlooked. Apart from the Ardley recycling centre, all the surrounding landscape is natural Oxfordshire countryside which will be completely destroyed by this development.	They are unnecessary without this development	The journey time from Upper Heyford to Bicester will be increased whilst destroying the natural habitat of the area.	I would prefer to see more tree planting and less warehousing	If this is already a forgone conclusion- what is the point of a public consultation?	<i>left blank</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National policy states there is a compelling need for more SRFIs in the country and also acknowledges that countryside locations may be required to deliver them due to their locational requirements. The OxSRFI site meets the locational requirements for an SRFI. 2. Noted. 3. The bus gate has been removed from the scheme further to a review following the Stage 1 consultation. The draft ES Transport Chapter includes an assessment of highways impacts on the area from the proposed development, with further assessment work to be presented as part of the application submission. 4. The OxSRFI scheme will include the planting of over 150,000 trees within the landscaping strategy. 5. . The Stage 2 consultation provides a further opportunity for comment and engagement with the Applicant and consultant team. 	Yes - removal of the bus gate from the scheme and the planting of 150,000 native new trees within the scheme.
--------	--	---	---	--	---	--	-------------------	--	---