



DCO Submission

Environmental Statement

Chapter 1: Introduction

On behalf of
Oxfordshire Railfreight Limited

Document 6.1

Prepared by Oxalis Planning Ltd
February 2026

CONTENTS

- 1.1 INTRODUCTION
- 1.2 STRUCTURE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT
- 1.3 METHODOLOGY FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT ASSESSMENTS
- 1.4 GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Appendices

Appendix 1.1 – Cumulative Sites Location Plans

1.1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1.1 This Environmental Statement (ES) has been prepared to accompany the application for a Development Consent Order for the Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (known as ‘OxSRFI’). The application is submitted to the Secretary of State via the Planning Inspectorate in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the ‘EIA regulations’). The application is submitted on behalf of Oxfordshire Railfreight Ltd (ORL).
- 1.1.2 The ES chapters which comprise this ES have been progressed following two stages of formal public consultation, the most recent being the Stage 2 (Statutory Consultation) in Autumn 2025, and represent a full assessment of the likely environmental effects of the Proposed Development.

1.2 SCOPE AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

- 1.2.1 The ES chapters are topic specific and the ES was formally ‘scoped’ with the Planning Inspectorate, with the assessment work carried out in accordance with the Scoping Opinion provided to the Applicant in July 2021¹.
- 1.2.2 The points within the Scoping Opinion which are relevant to this chapter are addressed with an appropriate response in the table (1.1) below:

Table 1.1: Response to ES Scoping Opinion

Para Ref.	Inspectorate’s Comments	Applicant’s Response
3.3.1	<p><i>General</i> – tables to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to demonstrate how the assessment has taken account of this Opinion; residual effects (including cumulative effects, the proposed mitigation and/ or monitoring measures, any remedial measures that are identified as being necessary following monitoring; where details are contained in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA report), such as descriptions of National Site Network sites and their locations, together with any mitigation or compensation measures, that inform the findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each ES chapter includes a table which sets out how the chapter has responded to comments from the Scoping Opinion. Tables throughout the ES chapters will be used to identify residual effects, mitigation, monitoring, cumulative effects, and remedial measures as required. Tables will be used in the HRA to inform the description, location, mitigation and

¹ Document Ref 6.32 – ES Scoping Opinion ref. TR050008, July 2021

	of the ES.	compensation of NSNs as required.
3.3.2	<p><i>General</i> – The Proposed Development is anticipated to comprise two NSIPs, the RFI and a highway NSIP, but this is dependent on the nature and extent of the highway options. Should the DCO application include works described as ‘Associated Development’, that could themselves be defined as an improvement of a highway, the Applicant should ensure that the ES accompanying that application distinguishes between effects that primarily derive from the integral works which form the proposed (or part of the proposed) NSIP and those that primarily derive from the works described as Associated Development. This could be presented in a suitably compiled summary table.</p>	<p>The Proposed Development comprises three NSIPs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRFI (including warehousing) (section 26 of the Act); • Motorway construction works to M40 Junction 10 (section 22 of the Act); • Alteration of a trunk road (A43) (section 22 of the Act). <p>The Associated Development includes some highway mitigation works (which are not part of NSIPs 2 and 3), the Central Hub facility, and extensive green infrastructure including strategic landscaping and areas to be dedicated to biodiversity.</p> <p>All components of the Proposed Development are assessed within the ES with effects explained as appropriate to the relevant components within the ES Chapters.</p>
3.3.3	<p><i>Decommissioning</i> – The Scoping Report states that the facility will not be decommissioned at a specific point and is unlikely to be decommissioned at all. The Inspectorate agrees that decommissioning can be scoped out of the assessment on these grounds.</p>	<p>Decommissioning is scoped out, also see paragraphs 1.3.8-1.3.9 of this ES chapter.</p>
3.3.4 – 3.3.5	<p><i>Accessibility</i> – ES to be clear and consistent, including in details between the introductory chapters, project description and the aspect chapters.</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out a clear and consistent approach throughout the ES chapters.</p>
3.3.6 – 3.3.9	<p><i>Baseline scenario</i> – the ES should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of the baseline scenario should be provided, including clarity on which sites are assumed as operational or under construction. • A summary of the site and surroundings which identifies the context of the proposed development, any relevant designations and sensitive receptors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each ES chapter includes a summary of the baseline scenario. The sites included in the cumulative assessment are set out in paragraphs 1.3.16 – 1.3.19 and Table 1.3 of this ES chapter. • A summary of the site and surroundings is included within ES Chapter 2 (Description of Development and Alternatives).

<p>3.3.10 – 3.3.13</p>	<p><i>Forecasting methods or evidence</i> – the ES should contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent information about timescales for the surveys which underpin the technical assessments. • Consistency and definitions for establishing significance and the resulting conclusions. • Details of difficulties encountered compiling the information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each ES chapter includes appropriate details about the relevant surveys and the definitions for establishing significance and the resulting conclusions. • The final ES chapter (17: Summary of Effects and Conclusions) also sets out a consistent method. • A section setting out the limitations is included within each ES chapter.
<p>3.3.14</p>	<p><i>Residues and emissions</i> – The EIA Regulations require an estimate, by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions. Specific reference should be made to water, air, soil and subsoil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation and quantities and types of waste produced during the construction and operation phases, where relevant.</p>	<p>The relevant residues and emissions are included within each ES chapter as relevant.</p>
<p>3.3.15 – 3.3.17</p>	<p><i>Mitigation and monitoring</i> – Any mitigation and monitoring relied upon for the purposes of the assessment should be explained within the ES, with reference to residual effects. The ES should also address how any mitigation and monitoring proposed is secured, with reference to specific dDCO requirements or other legally binding agreements. The Applicant has also set out that a mitigation strategy and mitigation tracker will be included within the ES.</p>	<p>The relevant mitigation measures and monitoring required are included within each ES chapter as relevant. The final ES chapter (17: Summary of Effects and Conclusions) also includes a mitigation tracker. It should be noted that the mitigation strategy is not a separate document but is set out throughout the ES chapters, with the mitigation tracker summarising the measures proposed as part of the OxSRFI scheme.</p>
<p>3.3.18</p>	<p><i>Human health</i> – A separate chapter on human health is not necessary but human health is scoped into the assessment and should be signposted to matters of relevance.</p>	<p>Human health is assessed through the ES as relevant, with ES Chapter 12 (Socio-Economics) including a Health Impact Assessment as ES Appendix 12.3.</p>
<p>3.3.19 – 3.3.21</p>	<p><i>Risks of major accidents and/or disasters</i> – Major accidents and disasters should be scoped into the assessment, therefore, where significant effects are likely to occur. The ES should include a description and assessment (where relevant) of the likely significant effects resulting from accidents and disasters applicable to the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>A description is included within this ES chapter, paragraphs 1.3.10 – 1.3.15</p>

3.3.22	<i>Climate and climate change</i> – The ES should include a description and assessment (where relevant) of the likely significant effects the Proposed Development has on climate (for example having regard to the nature and magnitude of greenhouse gas emissions) and the vulnerability of the project to climate change. Where relevant, the ES should describe and assess the adaptive capacity that has been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development.	A description and assessment of the likely effects on climate are included within ES Chapter 15 (Climate Change).
3.3.23 – 3.3.25	<i>Transboundary effects</i> – The Inspectorate stated: “ <i>Having considered the nature and location of the Proposed Development, the Inspectorate considers that significant transboundary effects are unlikely.</i> ”.	The Applicant agrees with the Inspectorate and therefore, as set out in the Scoping Report, concludes that the Proposed Development is not likely to have significant effects on a European Economic Area (EEA) State and therefore does not consider transboundary effects within the ES.
3.3.26	<i>Reference list</i> – A reference list detailing the sources used for the descriptions and assessments must be included in the ES.	References for the sources used are detailed within each ES chapter.
3.4.1 – 3.4.3	<i>Coronavirus (Covid-19) environmental information and data collection</i> – advice in relation to the collection of information and data during government restrictions relating to Covid-19.	Given the timescales for the preparation of the DCO application, there were no government restrictions for the collection of information and data relating to Covid-19.
3.5.1 – 3.5.3	<i>Confidential and sensitive information</i> – advice in relation to maintaining confidential information.	The Applicant acknowledges this advice and will adhere to it.

1.2.3 The table (1.2) below sets out the topics covered by the individual ES Chapters:

Table 1.2: Environmental Statement Chapters Guide

<u>Chapter number</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Environmental Statement Topic/Heading</u>
1	Oxalis Planning	Introduction
2	Oxalis Planning	Description of Development and Alternatives
3	ADC Infrastructure	Transport

<u>Chapter number</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Environmental Statement Topic/Heading</u>
4	Phlorum	Air Quality and Odour (including Human Health)
5	Vanguardia	Noise and Vibration (including Human Health)
6	FPCR	Ecology including Arboriculture
7	FPCR	Landscape and visual effects
8	Design For Lighting	Lighting
9	BWB	Water Environment (including Flood-Risk, Drainage and Water Quality)
10	RPS and Marrons	Heritage (Built and Archaeology)
11	BWB	Ground Conditions
12	GC Insight	Socio-economic (including Health)
13	WSP	Waste
14	Land Research Associates	Agricultural land
15	RPS	Climate Change
16	Oxalis Planning	Cumulative Effects
17	Oxalis Planning	Summary of Effects and Conclusions

1.2.4 Each topic specific ES Chapter includes a statement of competence regarding the author's experience and any relevant credentials.

1.2.5 In addition to the above, a non-technical summary of the ES has also been prepared summarising the key findings in a relatively brief and simple form.

1.3 METHODOLOGY FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT ASSESSMENTS

ES Assessment Methodology

1.3.1 The assessment methodology for each topic area reflects best practice and established guidance specific to that topic, where relevant, and each topic specific ES chapter explains the proposed methodology being applied.

1.3.2 However, the assessment methodology for each topic area broadly involves the following stages, albeit where appropriate with regard to best practice or other forms of guidance, some topics may include methodologies specific to that topic:

- Description of existing baseline environmental conditions formulated by site visits, surveys, and collected information.
- Introduction and adoption of appropriate criteria and conjecturing methods to enable the significance of change to the environment to be assessed.
- Reasoned prediction of the nature and significance of changes to the environment as a consequence of the construction and operational activities of the Proposed Development. This includes any ‘embedded’ mitigation measures included within the proposals.
- Identification of any ‘additional’ mitigation measures, if and where appropriate, which would eliminate or minimise likely significant effects.
- Reference to any residual effects that may occur after mitigation has been implemented.
- Cumulation with other planned (committed) developments.

1.3.3 The ES assesses the likely impact of the Proposed Development with regard to each of the environmental topics and reaches a conclusion on the level of significance of any likely impacts with regard to:

- i. The construction phase of the Proposed Development;
- ii. The operational phase i.e., all the Proposed Development completed in place and operational;
- iii. The residual effects remaining once proposed mitigation measures have been applied.

1.3.4 Each ES chapter explains the detailed approach to the assessment but in general terms, these include consideration of whether likely effects are:

- i. Direct or indirect; temporary, or permanent;
- ii. Over the short term (0-5 years), medium term (6-14 years), or long term (15 years plus); and
- iii. Whether the effects are judged to be positive (beneficial) or negative (adverse).

Consideration of issues relevant from the Finch case

- 1.3.5 In relation to whether the EIA Regulations require assessment of likely significant upstream and downstream direct and indirect effects, the Applicant has had regard to the decision of the Supreme Court in the ‘Finch’ case².
- 1.3.6 The proposed OxSRFI scheme would increase the capacity to process goods arriving by rail and to store goods prior to onward transport by road, and vice versa with goods arriving by road for onward transport by rail. However, the OxSRFI would not be the direct or indirect cause of either the upstream manufacture of goods or the downstream use of goods that may pass through OxSRFI. Whilst the OxSRFI scheme could facilitate the processing and storage of increased quantities of goods, it would not be the direct or indirect cause of the effects from any upstream or downstream activities.
- 1.3.7 Notwithstanding the Applicant’s firm opinion that the OxSRFI scheme would not be the direct or indirect cause of the effects from upstream or downstream activities, the Applicant recognises that following Finch there could be a level of uncertainty around what may properly be regarded as the direct and indirect effects of any project. For this reason, the Applicant and ES consultant team has given consideration to the scenario in which additional activities associated with the upstream manufacture of goods or the downstream use of goods are regarded as direct or indirect effects arising from the Proposed Development. Having explored this scenario, the Applicant and ES consultant team have been unable to quantify the likely upstream or downstream direct or indirect effects, due to the absence of available information in relation to future effects – likely users (customers) and economic sectors in which they operate which are currently unknown. It therefore follows that no meaningful assessment of upstream or downstream effects is capable of being carried out.

² See – *R (on the application of Finch on behalf of the Weald Action Group) v Surrey County Council and others [2024] UKSC 20 (‘Finch’)* – in Finch, the Supreme Court considered, in relation to an application for planning permission for the drilling of oil, whether the environmental impact assessment carried out before the consenting of that project required to assess greenhouse gas emissions which would occur when oil extracted, after being refined, should be burnt as fuel. The Supreme Court held that it was inevitable that the oil extracted would be refined then undergo combustion, which would produce greenhouse gas emissions. It held that combustion emissions would be effects of the project. It also recognised that such emissions could be easily quantified. Whilst the facts in Finch related to effects on climate, the Applicant acknowledges that the judgment is of potential wider application to other environmental aspects.

Decommissioning

- 1.3.8 Given that the Proposed Development is expected to be operational indefinitely, subject to viability and market conditions, the decommissioning stage of the assessment has been scoped out of the ES as agreed within the ES Scoping Opinion³.
- 1.3.9 The Applicant acknowledges that in the long term, the Main Site may be re-developed or adapted on a plot-by-plot basis in response to operator requirements and/or new occupiers. Any such ‘piecemeal’ redevelopment would be expected to be undertaken in accordance with current and future legislation and guidance, and would also be subject to separate planning applications and planning requirements and conditions.

Major Accidents and Natural Disasters

- 1.3.10 In accordance with the regulations, consideration has been given to the identification and assessment of *‘major accidents or natural disasters relevant to the development’*.
- 1.3.11 This component of the amended regulations is applied to all forms of NSIP, including nuclear power stations and other forms of infrastructure where there are a range of potential risks which could have major implications for the environment, public safety and/or national economic performance and resilience.
- 1.3.12 With regard to this proposed Rail Freight Interchange there is the Upper Heyford Southern Bomb Store Upper Tier COMAH site to the north-west of the Main Site which requires consideration. However, that site is within the red line boundary of the wider Upper Heyford scheme⁴, which includes 400 new homes immediately to the south-west of the Southern Bomb Store area with no risks identified to residents. No additional comments or concerns during the Stage 2 (Statutory) Consultation have also been raised by any consultee in relation to the Bomb Store. Therefore, the Applicant considers there are no major vulnerabilities or major risks to the OxSRFI scheme from the Bomb Store.

³ Document Ref 6.32 – ES Scoping Opinion ref. TR050008, July 2021 – paragraph 3.3.3, and summarised in Table 1.1 above.

⁴ Cherwell District Council planning application ref. 25/02190/HYBRID

- 1.3.13 The EIA regulations seek risks to be assessed arising out of vulnerability of the development to major accidents or disasters only “*where relevant*”. The only other types of disaster or accidents foreseeable would include such events as train crashes, terminal container safety related issues, or building fires. All of these operational risks are exceedingly rare, and not unique to this proposed development. These types of risk apply commonly to many other forms of large-scale distribution or industrial development sites, and are also experienced at many ports. They can be properly managed through standard health and safety activity, building and other relevant regulations regarding the operation of a rail freight terminal and large-scale warehousing, and through following operational best practice.
- 1.3.14 Any risks associated specifically with the rail component of the OxSRFI scheme, including the intermodal terminal, will be managed with regard to the relevant regulations/guidance imposed by Network Rail and the Health & Safety Executive (HSE).

Cumulative Effects

- 1.3.15 Each ES chapter considers potential or likely cumulative effects. These can be broadly defined as the potential for the Proposed Development to have different types of effect on the same receptor (‘intra-project’ impacts), and the effects of the Proposed Development when assessed cumulatively in the context of other planned (committed) projects (‘inter-project’ impacts).
- 1.3.16 With regard to inter-project cumulative impacts, the Transport Assessment (TA, ES Appendix 3.1) considers a wider range of sites and proposals, including scenarios based around growth being planned in the draft Local Plan for Cherwell District. This approach and the list of sites was agreed with the relevant consultees via the Transport Working Group and ensures a robust assessment of potential cumulative effects is an inherent part of the TA. Data from the TA also informs the assessment of Air Quality and Noise, meaning these too are cumulative in nature.
- 1.3.17 Judgements about which sites were relevant and appropriate for inclusion was a focus of dialogue and agreement between the Applicant and the local planning authority. The list of planned (committed and some other) projects which are to be considered within each of the other topics as part of the cumulative assessment comprises those set out in Table 1.3. As set out, this includes some sites which are not ‘commitments’, but subject to live planning applications. While there is some uncertainty regarding the future delivery of some of these sites, the view was taken in part in response to dialogue with

local consultees that some consideration of emerging and potential nearby schemes was relevant to aid and inform understanding about wider potential future cumulative impacts. The list has also been informed by the ES Scoping Opinion (Document 6.32). **Appendix 1.1** includes site location plans for the sites considered following dialogue with the LPA.

1.3.18 In addition to the list set out in Table 1.3 below, the LPA also suggested the following additional site be considered:

- Land south and west of Camp Road, Heyford Park (OS Parcel 0043).

1.3.19 The site is not a committed development, with no planning permission or allocation in an adopted Local Plan. This has not been taken forward by the Applicant as part of the cumulative sites assessment because at the time it was put forward for consideration it was only subject to pre-application dialogue. It was not until February 2026 that a valid application was in the public domain, by which time the Applicant had completed its assessments and was finalising the application for submission.

Table 1.3: List of projects included within the ES cumulative assessment

REFERENCE/S	DESCRIPTION & ADDRESS	Distance from Main Site	Status
<p>Heyford Park</p> <p>10/01642/OUT (Approved 22/12/2011)</p> <p>18/00825/HYBRID (Approved 09/09/2022)</p> <p>Recently submitted application, ref. 25/02190/HYBRID</p> <p>Local Plan ref: Policy Villages 5, Former RAF Upper Heyford (forms the majority of the allocation)</p> <p>Draft Local Plan ref: Policy HEY 1 Heyford Park Strategy</p>	<p>Description: Consent for 1,175 homes, and allocated for 2300 in adopted local plan.</p> <p>Proposed redevelopment to deliver a new settlement of approx. 9,000 dwellings, new commercial, business and employment uses (approx. 60k sqm), four primary schools, one secondary school, three wind turbines, and a range of other community facilities.</p> <p>Address: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester</p>	<p>Heyford Park's eastern boundary is adjacent to the Main Site</p>	<p>Application for 1,175 dwellings approved.</p> <p>Recent (2025), live planning application for 9,000 new dwellings.</p> <p>Allocated in Adopted Local Plan for approx. 2,300 dwellings. Draft Local Plan (Reg 19) does not propose additional growth.</p> <p>Note: Recent government announcement shortlisting the site for new town potentially up to 13,000 homes (New Towns Report Sept 2025). it should be noted that the government has more recently announced that Heyford Park will not be taken forward at this stage as one of the seven 'new town' proposals⁵</p>

⁵ See the following link: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/seven-new-towns-proposed-to-kickstart-housebuilding-push>

<p>Bicester expansion/eco-town – key consents include:</p> <p>14/02121/OUT (Approved 30/01/2020)</p> <p>14/01675/OUT as varied by 19/00347/OUT (Approved 18/07/2019)</p> <p>21/04275/OUT (under consideration)</p> <p>22/01070/SCOP (Issued)</p> <p>Adopted Local Plan ref: Policy Bicester 1, NW Bicester Eco-Town</p> <p>Draft Local Plan ref: Policy BIC H1 NW of Bicester</p>	<p>Description (allocation): 6,000 homes total, local centre hubs, 4 primary and 1 secondary school and other community facilities, and 10ha (min.) employment. – allocated in 2015.</p> <p>Additional 1,500 homes proposed in emerging new Reg 19 Plan.</p> <p>Address: Land north-west of Bicester (land between north of the B0430 and south of the B4100)</p>	<p>Approx 1 – 1.5km from Highways Works; approx. 2.5km from Main Site.</p>	<p>Some planning applications approved – phased implementation, under construction and occupied in part.</p> <p>Allocated in Adopted Local Plan for 6,000 dwellings. Proposed to be allocated in draft Local Plan (Reg 19) for proposed additional 1,500 dwellings.</p>
<p>Great Wolf leisure resort</p> <p>19/02550/F (Approved at appeal 16/03/2020)</p> <p>Varied through: 21/04158/F (approved 29/03/2022)</p>	<p>Description: New leisure resort (sui generis) incorporating waterpark, family entertainment centre, hotel, conferencing facilities and restaurants with associated access, parking and landscaping.</p> <p>Address: Land adjacent village of Chesterton, east of the M40, south of the A4095.</p>	<p>Approx 2km from Highways Works; approx. 3km from Main Site</p>	<p>Application approved at appeal</p>

<p>David Wilson homes residential site (was Pye Homes)</p> <p>15/01357/F (Phase 1 – south) (approved 14/09/2023)</p> <p>21/03523/OUT (Phase 2 – north) (approved 14/09/2023)</p> <p>22/03063/F (new application for the whole site) (approved 12/03/2025)</p> <p>Local Plan ref: Policy Villages 5, Former RAF Upper Heyford (a smaller part of the allocation)</p>	<p>Description: Residential development for 123 homes</p> <p>Address: Land north of Camp Road and east of Larsen Road, Heyford Park</p>	<p>Approx 250m at closest point from western edge of Main Site</p>	<p>Applications approved</p> <p>Allocated in Adopted development plan.</p>
<p>Distribution development proposals (by Albion Land and Tritax) in the vicinity of the A43, north of M40 Junction 10</p> <p>Albion Land applications: 21/03266/F (infrastructure only), 21/03267/OUT (east of the A43), 21/03268/OUT (west of the A43)</p> <p>Tritax application (also known as Symmetry Park): 22/01340/OUT</p>	<p>Description: Total 580,000 sqm (GIA) of logistics floorspace between the Albion Land and Tritax proposals, broken down as follows:</p> <p><i>Albion Land</i> – 280,000 sqm (GIA) of logistics floorspace between the two sites.</p> <p><i>Tritax</i> – 300,000 sqm (GIA) of logistics floorspace.</p> <p>Address:</p>	<p>Less than one km of proposed works at M40 J10. Around 2.5 - 3km from Main Site</p>	<p>Applications recently refused (January 2026) but they are still retained within the cumulative list due to the possibility of one or both schemes being consented on appeal.</p> <p>Not allocated for development in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Not proposed to be allocated in draft Local Plan (Reg 19).</p>

(all applications refused)	Land in the vicinity of the A43, north of M40 J10 <i>Albion Land</i> – east and west of the A43, south of the B4100 <i>Tritax</i> – east of the A43 and Baynards Green, predominantly north of the B4100		
M40 J9, associated with Tritax development (for Siemens), and wider proposed (draft) allocations 22/01144/F (Approved 16/02/2023) 25/00284/F (under consideration) Draft Reg 19 allocation Policy BIC E1, Land east of J9 M40 – 45.8 gross, 30ha deliverable employment land	Description: (1) Up to 56,162 sqm (GIA) of B2 floor space and ancillary uses (22/01114/F) (2) Up to 163,337 sqm of B2 and B8 floor space (25/00284/F) Address: Land adjacent to M40 J9, north of the A41 and west of Little Chesterton	Around 7km south from the Main Site, but within 500m of proposed OxSRFI works at Junction 9.	Planning permission approved for application 22/01144/F but not allocated Application 25/00284/F is under consideration and is proposed to be allocated in the draft Reg 19 Local Plan.
Richborough Estates 21/04289/OUT (Appeal allowed 05/03/2024)	Description: Residential development for up to 230 homes Address: North of Camp Road and west of Chilgrove Drive	Adjacent to the Main Site	Application approved at appeal.
Puy du Fou 25/02232/OUT (under consideration)	Description: Tourism development which consists of mix of show	Approx 2km east of the Main Site	Live planning proposals (not yet determined) – not ‘committed’. Not allocated for development in the Adopted Local Plan.

	<p>theatres (7 indoor and 6 outdoor), x3 hotels (total 350 rooms), a conference centre (1,000 capacity) and other ancillary facilities (shops, stalls, toilets and food & beverage outlets). If approved, would be open to the public only during April to October every year (not 12 months) and would include night shows up to 11pm. During November to March the conference centre and hotels would operate, with staff maintaining the grounds and performers rehearsing for shows.</p> <p>Address: Land North And East Of Manor Farm Bainton Road Bucknell</p>		<p>Not proposed to be allocated in draft Local Plan (Reg 19).</p>
--	--	--	---

1.4 GLOSSARY OF TERMS

1.4.1 A Glossary of Terms describing the physical components of the OxSRFI scheme are set out in Table 1.4 below and corresponds with the Components Plan (Document 2.13) which accompanies this ES as part of the wider consultation material.

Table 1.4: Glossary of Terms for Physical Components of the OxSRFI Scheme

Development Element	Description
Application Site	the land encompassed within a red line boundary being all the land affected by the proposals to be described as the “Order Limits”. This is the maximum extent of the land likely to be affected by the Proposed Development and will be reviewed as the scheme proceeds through consultation and engagement with stakeholders.
Ardley Bypass	a bypass to the east of the village of Ardley, including realignment of Ardley Road and associated works to footpaths and bridleways.
Ardley Tunnel Works	works to provide W8 gauge through the tunnel
Ashgrove Cottages	the retention of the existing cottages and their re-use for rail and estate management and other facilities
A4095 / B4030 roundabout works	[the section 106 contribution for] the highway works to improve the A4095 / B4030 roundabout
Biodiversity and Landscaping Enhancement Areas	these areas provide both biodiversity and landscaping enhancement as part of the landscaping scheme, and includes land both within and outside the Main Site
Central Hub	the development within the central part of the Main Site, centered around the listed building and also includes Ashgrove Cottages, is to be used for a potential range of estate management and other facilities for workers and visitors on the Main Site
Ecological Mitigation Areas	these areas provide ecological mitigation, includes land both within and outside the Main Site
Foul Drainage Outfall	the provision of foul drainage outfalls to Bicester and potentially to Ardley
Heyford Park Link Road (HPLR)	the length of new road between the B430 and Heyford Park including the Secondary Access.
Highway Works	the J9 Highway Improvements, J10 Highway Improvements, Ardley Bypass, Principal Access, Middleton Stoney Relief Road, Heyford Park Link Road, Secondary Access, Other Local Highway Works, A4095 / B4030 roundabout works and active travel works.
J9 Highway Improvements	the highway works to be carried out in connection with the improvement of J9 of the M40 motorway.
J10 Highway Improvements	the highway works to be carried out in connection with the improvement of J10 of the M40 motorway, including works to the A43 Baynard’s Green roundabout and associated works to the local road network.
Landfill Works	the area adjacent to the Chiltern Main Line Railway which will include highways works, an opening to allow a rail connection into the Main Site and the relocation of landfill material.

Main Site	the area to be occupied principally by the Rail Terminal, the rail served warehousing, the Central Hub including Ashgrove Cottages; incorporating rail connections from the Chiltern Main Line.
Middleton Stoney Relief Road (MSRR)	a relief road to the north east of the village of Middleton Stoney linking the B4030 to the B430.
Order Limits	this is the maximum extent of the land likely to be affected by the Proposed Development and will be reviewed as the scheme proceeds through consultation and engagement with stakeholders
Other Local Highway Works	the highway works to be carried out at the junction of Camp Road and Chilgrove Drive, Middleton Road, the B430 west of the Main Site, Quarry Cottages, Middleton Stoney Crossroads, Aves Ditch and Chilgrove Drive.
Principal Access	the principal access to the Main Site from the B430.
Proposed Development	the entirety of the development for which approval is sought.
Rail Terminal	the terminal which deals with the transfer of containers from rail to HGV and vice versa.
Secondary Access	the secondary access to the Main Site for buses, emergency vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists only from the Heyford Park Link Road.
SRFI	the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange terminal