



DCO Submission

Consultation Report

Appendix 20

Document 5.1H

On behalf of
Oxfordshire Railfreight Limited

Prepared by Oxalis Planning
March 2026

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

OxSRFI Stage 2 consultation log of comments from residents							
No	Date	Name (first & last)	Type of consultee (resident/ business/press/ community group)	Topic (comment on the scheme/ kept informed/ advertising/ press / other)	Summary of comment	Applicant comment in response	Changes to the scheme post Stage 2 consultation which relate to the comment
C1	01/09/2025		Resident	Kept informed - 1	Request to be kept up to date as they own a property on Ardley Road, Middleton Stoney.	Response provided 10/09/2025 setting out details relating to when the statutory consultation begins, when and where exhibition events are, when the webinars are, and also the project website.	
C2	29/08/2025 AND 10/09/2025	Katie Smith	Business	Kept informed - 2	Request to be informed about the OxSRFI and particularly detail for the online webinars.	Response provided 10/09/2025 setting out details relating to when the statutory consultation begins, when and where exhibition events are, when the webinars are, and also the project website.	
C3	22/08/2025 AND 05/09/2025 AND 11/09/2025	Dave Munnings	Business	Pre-consultation enquiry - 1	Pre-application comment about the scheme, and request for further information due to property interest in the area.	Response provided 10/09/2025 setting out details relating to when the statutory consultation begins, when and where exhibition events are, when the webinars are, and also the project website.	
C4	17/09/2025		Resident	Comment on the scheme - 1	Queries in relation to: 1. Operation hours (24/7?) and impacts from noise. 2. Management of light pollution at night. 3. Plans for additional bunding/screening to the left/west of the B430 Ardley Bypass to reduce noise. 4. Desifgn of M40 J9. Positive comment about the reduction in lorry traffic along the B430 and respondent notes they ' <i>support the plan - as long as the key environmental and noise/disturbance issues are addressed.</i> '	Response provided 30/09/2025 setting out how the consultation material can be viewed. Respondent also invited to ask further questions after viewing the consultation material.	
C5	18/09/2025	Andrew Vickers	Business	Pre-consultation enquiry - 2	Request for a copy of the application material.	Response provided 30/09/2025 setting out how the consultation material can be viewed. An offer to post a USB was also made if requested.	
C6	18/09/2025	Barrie Mellor	Business	Pre-consultation enquiry - 3	Queries raised in relation to: - Whether nuclear nuclear bombs will be used on the site. - Whether the following will be stored on site: weapons, explosives, toxic chemicals or materials/devices which could pose a risk to the public.	Response provided 30/09/2025 setting out how the consultation material can be viewed. The Applicant also explained that the proposals do not include any plans to store these materials, and should a future occupier intend to store such materials, specific and explicit permissions or consents would be required. The site is intended to focus on intermodal (containerised) freight.	
C7	20/09/2025		Resident	Pre-consultation enquiry - 4	Query in relation to where is Empire Road.	Response provided 30/09/2025 setting out how the consultation material can be viewed, with an explanation provided as to where Empire Road is.	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C8	21/09/2025		Resident	Comment on the scheme - 2	Concerns raised in relation to the following: - Loss of land for food production. - Increased amount of traffic on local roads and M40 J9, which are already congestion and with further development proposed in the area (i.e., Heyford Park).	Response provided 30/09/2025 setting out how the consultation material can be viewed. An explanation was also provided in relation to any comments about other planning applications or developments in the area which should be directed to the local planning authority. In terms of issues raised, the Applicant has the following response: - the highways modelling demonstrates that the proposed package of highways works – including M40J9 improvements – are successful in attracting traffic back to the strategic road network and off of the local routes, thereby minimising impacts on local roads. - the loss of agricultural land proposed as part of the development is acknowledged, however it should be noted that less than 35% of land on site grade 3a with over 65% grade 3b or other land.	
CONSULTATION BEGAN							
C9	23/09/2025		Resident	Other Enquiry - 1	Employment enquiry from local resident	Response provided 30/09/2025 confirming no vacancies at present.	
C10	23/09/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 3	Concerns raised in relation to impacts from the development on the M40 J10 and Baynards Green (A43/B4100) junctions considering their existing capacities.	The highways outputs demonstrate that the proposals will deliver a betterment to the performance of M40 J10 over a situation expected without the OxSRFI scheme. <i>Baynards Green?</i>	
C13	26/09/2025 & 30/09/2025 & 05/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 4	Concerns raised in relation to: - noise from the rail terminal. - amenity impacts covering air and nighttime pollution. - landscape and visual impacts. - traffic impacts on local roads, particularly considering the other proposed developments in the area (i.e., Heyford Park and Puy du Fou)	In terms of issues raised, the Applicant has the following response: - the noise assessment demonstrates that with mitigation in place, which includes earthworks bunds around the site and an acoustic fence north of the rail terminal, no significant effects are likely on any nearby receptors, albeit a small number of residual adverse impacts may remain during the operation of the scheme. - the air quality assessment demonstrates that with mitigation in place, particularly through the extensive 'active travel' and other sustainable transport measures proposed, there are no significant effects during the operation of the scheme. - landscape and visual impacts will be mitigated through the extensive strategic landscaping scheme which includes earthworks bunds and planting. Once in place, the landscaping scheme will limit views to only relatively limited and filtered views of the OxSRFI development. The Applicant does however accept that there will inevitably be landscape and visual effects from the proposed development. - the highways modelling demonstrates that the proposed package of highways works are successful in attracting traffic back to the strategic road network and off of the local routes, thereby minimising impacts on local roads.	
C14	01/10/2025	David Irvine	Local Business	Other Enquiry - 6	Request by the North Oxfordshire Field Target Club (NOFTC), which is an air rifle and air pistol target shooting club more than 20 years old with about 100 members, to continue to use Adam's Wood for shooting oractice by members of the club - Adam's Wood falls within the OxSRFI Application Site boundary.	The Applicant has spoken to the NOFTC and has agreed for the club to continue using Adam's Wood for shooting practice.	Yes - space for the rifle club is being retained

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C15	03/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 5	Supportive of rail freight but concerns raised in relation to highways impacts on local roads, particularly from road freight and on the A34.	The highways modelling demonstrates that the proposed package of highways works are successful in attracting traffic back to the strategic road network and off of the local routes, thereby minimising impacts on local roads. Improvements at M40 J9, which include a third left-turn lane between the A34 and the M40 northbound, will remove the delay on the A34 during the evening peak hour.	
C16	04/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 6	After looking through your consultation document I can only conclude that the people who have designed these plans have never done anything like this before. It is a complete shambles. It is turning a large swathe of countryside into a carbuncle. It will look hideous. Also the road failures that you are saying are improvements are again poorly thought through and are not improvements at all <i>[repsonses to the community leaflet]</i>. 01. where are you going to make improvements when there is little space there. 02. There has already been disruption with "improvements" being done for over a year, surely it has been improved enough! 03. A new by-pass that will go through more green land, habitats of wildlife destroyed, and leisure areas for the people in the area again wrecked for 1 road. 04. Why are you closing an access point? There are not enough road choices into Heyford as it is. if you are turning it into a bridleway does that mean you are going to give us all horses as i don't see many people with horses around here to make full use of a bridleway. 05. Surely a by-pass will just separate the flow of traffic into two unless there will be no access along the existing road which will mean difficulties for people getting into Ardley. 06, Another half thought again. Not everyone has a bike, horse or is able to walk. Also how will deliveries get into the village? 07. Is someone on a backhand for bridges? This by-pass will definitely cause more traffic congestion. 08. more destruction, if this is the main site onto and off the Carbuncle and will have thousands of trucks going around it, what's going to happen to the quality of air that the residents, cyclists , horse riders and pedestrians are going to be breathing in. Also when there is an incident on the M40, A34 or A43 what will happen then?? 08. If this was to be the main entrance then why is the roundabout not connected directly to the motorway via a new junction. The roads around here are already full of potholes that the council can't afford to fix. 09. This is one of the main routes for people to access the M40 and A43. Closing this road would mean that people would have to drive through Middleton Stoney which would increase travel times and cost and would mean that Middleton Stoney would be a major traffic hotspot. Trucks and lorries and car transporters already have issues getting around the bends there. Also it will be a nightmare when the accidents occur on the surrounding roads (M4. A34,A43). 10. Ridiculous !!! 11. see above. 12. This is just a statement ?? 13. This would have to be made into a dual carriageway to cope with the extra traffic. Also as you would want to shut the other access point (10) you are reducing the roads for the ambulance and fire services to attend any incidents. 14. Closing one junction so you can build another on the same road but is in a worse position for people to come and go on a daily basis is another waste of time and money and just a disruption we can all do without, a bit like HS2 i suppose. 15. The fact you have called this a "relief road" implies that you know that you are making it a traffic nightmare around here. I doubt there will be little relief for the people who live here. 16. Another new roundabout, another obstacle in the way to getting about and not actually needed? or should the roundabout and relief road be in place already without any need for a freight terminat/storage unit/ Carbuncle.	The comments and concerns are noted. The OxSRFI scheme includes a significant number of highways and sustainable transport improvements which will help to mitigate adverse effects associated with its traffic. These measures include significant improvements to the capacity and performance of M40 Junction 10, and significant investment in new and improved local cycling and walking connectivity. These measures are proposed by the Applicant further to the transport modelling and assessment work which has been informed discussions with the TWG.	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

					17. There is no point improving a small bit of road to aid non vehicle users if you don't improve all the roads so they can get there safely, no point in them getting killed or injured going to a nice safe bit. 18. There is one bus every hour. What improvements would help with that? I have used the numbers off the leaflet you sent as the guide points and put some answers to each of them. I can only say that I completely disagree with the idea of having massive storage units which could contain anything alongside a new and upcoming town. If they were going to put the storage units underground so that the countryside was still available and any trucks coming or going joined onto the motorway again underground then that would be a bit better.The amount of heavy traffic will increase and the potholes in the roads will get bigger. The air quality will decrease and the amount of wildlife in the area especially bees and other insects will decrease which is all bad news for people and the environment. Also there are some farms in the area which will find less pollinators helping them to grow the food we need. There are deer in the field you are planning on destroying, not to mention the Kites and Buzzards and Foxes all of which are better than industrial units.If you were going to build anything on that land a small farm, a Doctors surgery or NHS dentist would all be more credible and could be incorporated into the landscape in a friendlier way. I have other things to say but as this is just a starting point for you to ignore everyone and do what you want cos you have the dosh then this will do for now.		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C17	07/10/2025	Lynda Moore	Business	Comments on the scheme - 7	07/10/2025 CPRE Oxfordshire are starting to assess this consultation. There is a significant amount of documentation and clearly, our main focus is the impact on the countryside and environment. We hope the seminar will be giving an overview of the project and we raise a few initial queries. Will there be a condition that all new buildings (particularly the significant additional warehousing) MUST have roof mounted solar ? We strongly support rooftop solar as opposed to land mounted solar on open countryside. How much of the freight proposed for this site is NEW to rail, moving from road as opposed to diverted from other rail freight? E.g. Southampton Are the figures quoted in relation to new hedgerow and new trees gross or net? We seek confirmation of the NET impact on trees and hedgerows, after removal and replanting. Please advise where this information is available in the documentation. We have significant concerns over the bird survey results, which highlights the “ total loss of existing arable and grassland habitats and extensive loss of hedgerows, scrub and small woodland.” Whilst we appreciate there will be replanting to alleviate these losses the report accepts this will take time to establish. Can clarity / reassurances be given on the ongoing maintenance and care of developing hedgerow . Please note – the email given on the Eventbrite invitation for the webinars is incorrect and shows “ consultations” not consultation as per your website. 07/10/2025 Will there be / is there an assessment of cumulative impacts in and around the site as there is significant other development proposed in this area. E.g. theme park planning application	The Applicant response on 07/10/25 to confirm registration for the webinar zoom event on the 7th October and also confirmed Eventbrite is not being used for either of the webinars. A response to the queries raised was provided during the webinar - as a summary: - The proposals do include roof-mounted PV on buildings as part of the Energy Strategy (and Carbon Management Plan), with the potential for buildings to accommodate more PV subject to energy requirements and with the coverage of each unit confirmed at the detailed stage of design. - The freight would be new to rail. - The new hedgerow figures and woodland quoted are gross with further details of net and gross figures found in ES Chapter 6 (Ecology). - Ongoing maintenance and management of habitats will be through the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) (ES Appendix 6.11) - also a DCO requirement - which secures measures required to deliver the biodiversity net gain set out as part of the OxSRFI scheme. - Yes a cumulative effects assessments is included as part of the ES (Chapter 16). The assessment includes a range of developments in the vicinity of the Main Site which include the employment proposals by Albion Land and Tritax at M40 J10, as well as a proportionate assessment of effects with the recent (as yet undetermined) Heyford Park proposals (the 9,000 homes New Town proposals) and the Puy du Fou leisure application (see ES Chapter 1 (Introduction)).	
C18	11/10/2025	Jeff Dalton	Resident	Comments on the scheme - 8	Having reviewed the above plans at a recent exhibition I can see no upside in the proposals for the current residents of Ardley with Fewcott. It appears we will have to endure 2 years of uncertainty followed by 7 + years of major disruption, which will have a significant impact of quality of life, access to local amenities, mental well being alongside a major hit to properties prices and/or ability to sell property. Even when completed access to both Bicester and Upper Heyford will be considerably less convenient and access to the M40 more difficult due to rerouting and the inevitable increase in traffic movements. All in all the plan appears ill conceived, opportunistic and deleterious to local communities with no provisions to counterbalance this. I would expect wide ranging and comprehensive local objections to this scheme to which I shall be adding my voice.	Impacts during the construction phase will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Also, some of the significant highways improvements works, such as the Ardley Bypass, will be delivered in the first phase of highways works to help minimise amenity impacts on the residents of Ardley with Fewcott village. As part of the OxSRFI scheme itself, significant earthworks and bunds which will help to screen views and minimise noise levels to the north. Access to Upper Heyford can be gained from the new Heyford Park Link Road once completed.	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C19	12/10/2025		Resident	Other Enquiry - 7	Good morning, I am writing to you today in my capacity as a MSc Student in Spatial Planning at Oxford Brookes University. I am currently exploring the topic of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, and in particular the economic case for large-scale infrastructure developments. The OXSFRI seems to me a prime example of such a development - and as such, I would be most appreciative of directions to any information regarding the economic case for the OXSFRI. Already I have found much thanks to your website, and am eager to learn of any further to that highlighted therein.	The Applicant team responded: Thank you for your email. In the first instance I would advise referring to the draft ES Socio-Economic Chapter (no. 12) which explains the socio-economic benefits the scheme is anticipated to deliver during both the construction and operational phases. A 'Market Report' is also being prepared and will be included as part of the application submission in due course. I trust this is helpful but if you have further queries, please continue to use the consultation email address: consultation@oxsrfi.co.uk	
C20	13/10/2025	Ma	Resident	Comments on the scheme - 9	Can you detail how many freight trains currently use the railway that passes through Bicester North? Can you outline what agreement is in place to facilitate more freight trains on this line? The railway line through Bicester North heads directly to London Marylebone...where else on the line is there going to be a significant freight terminal? Can you also list any significant companies that have shown an intrest in moving into one of your proposed sheds, and any specifically that use rail freight today? Finally, seeing as the M40 A34 junction is already overcapacity (judged by regular significant delays) how will additional HGV traffic - to and from your proposed terminal be managed?	A suite of Rail related reports form part of the submitted application (see Document series 7.2). Evidence submitted as part of the application confirms that at least four round trip daily freight paths can be provided which confirms the key requirement of the NPS is satisfied, but further paths are considered to exist and work will continue with Network Rail including post any DCO consent - the tameable is often adapted and evolves, and so pathing is not static of fixed. There are no technical or market related concerns with providing the rail freight connectivity required to serve OxSRFI - Southampton is one viable port option, but OxSRFI is not dependent on it. Flows may originate from London Gateway, Felixstowe or Liverpool depending on customer requirements. Routing via Reading and London is significantly less problematic than suggested. Banbury reversals are unnecessary and would be avoided. The Great Western Main Line offers suitable freight windows and is used extensively for similar flows today. Given the stage of the OxSRFI scheme, no potential occupiers are being named but the Market Analysis Report (Document 7.1) highlights a logistics need around M40 J10 and along the M40 corridor. In terms of traffic, significant improvements are proposed at M40 J10 to improve capacity and help address some of the existing issues and challenges.	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C21	16/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 10	Dear Sir. I have attended the recent exhibition and based on the current plans presented I object to the proposals on the following basis: Infrastructure proposals are inadequate.The infrastructure proposals are inadequate for the villages based to the west of Ardley and North West of the facility I.e. Somerton amongst others. There needs to be a relief road to take traffic away from Somerton which is a recognised rat run to and from the A4260 - Traffic volumes already are 1000 vehicles a day -6500 jobs will add considerably to this volume as public transport is inadequate and a car is the majority choice of working people-Somerton is not mentioned in any of the highways improvement plans-Somerton is a village largely without footpaths and already traffic prohibits younger families and older people walking in the village -The uncategorised roads which are Water Street, Somerton Road, Ardley Road, Fritwell Road, Souldern Road which all ultimately lead to A4260 need a bypass. - These are generally poorly maintained roads and single track in places-Somerton has no facilities to support its population and they rely upon the minor roads to be able to travel to railway stations, town centres, food shops and other essential facilities. A linked bypass is required. There needs to be a deterrent for 'through traffic' vehicles on the minor roads. Separate HGV restrictions should be enforced on these unclassified roads Application needs to be considered with other large scale planning applications The development needs to be considered in relation to the other major concurrent planning applications at Heyford New Town, Warehousing proposals at J10 M40, Puy Du Fou. Flooding Risks: The Cherwell Valley is prone to flooding, with areas such as Somerton and Rousham bridge frequently affected. The increased traffic would present significant safety issues. Preservation of Rural Identity: Both the Cherwell Local Plan and the Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan emphasise the importance of protecting the visual and cultural heritage of the Cherwell Valley, including historic churches. Somerton itself is largely within a recognised conservation area. Conclusion In conclusion without further infrastructure improvements and recognition of the factors raised in the letter, then the current plans should be rejected.	The OxSRFI scheme includes a significant number of highways and sustainable transport improvements which will help to mitigate adverse effects, including safety, from traffic associated with the scheme. These measures are proposed further to the transport modelling and assessment work which has been informed discussions with the TWG. These measures do not require a bypass for Somerton village. The Proposed Development design will take account of the need to balance flood risk by allowing fluvial flows to move through the Main Site in such a way that conveyance is not significantly impeded either now or in the future as the result of climate change. Hydraulic modelling of the Proposed Development has been undertaken to determine the extent and depth of flooding at the Main Site, Middleton Stoney Relief Road, and J10 Highway Improvements during a 100 year plus climate change event. This will also ensure flood risk is not increased to existing landowners and human health downstream. The cumulative effects assessments across the ES include a range of developments in the vicinity of the Main Site which include the employment proposals by Albion Land and Tritax at M40 J10, as well as a proportionate assessment of effects with the recent (as yet undetermined) Heyford Park proposals (the 9,000 homes New Town proposals) and the Puy du Fou leisure application (see ES Chapter 1 (Introduction)).	
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	--	---	--

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C22	16/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 11	I have attended the recent exhibition and based on the current plans presented I object to the proposals on the following basis: Infrastructure proposals are inadequate.The infrastructure proposals are inadequate for the villages based to the west of Ardley and North West of the facility I.e. Somerton amongst others. There needs to be a relief road to take traffic away from Somerton which is a recognised rat run to and from the A4260 - Traffic volumes already are 1000 vehicles a day -6500 jobs will add considerably to this volume as public transport is inadequate and a car is the majority choice of working people-Somerton is not mentioned in any of the highways improvement plans-Somerton is a village largely without footpaths and already traffic prohibits younger families and older people walking in the village -The uncategorised roads which are Water Street, Somerton Road, Ardley Road, Fritwell Road, Souldern Road which all ultimately lead to A4260 need a bypass.- These are generally poorly maintained roads and single track in places-Somerton has no facilities to support its population and they rely upon the minor roads to be able to travel to railway stations, town centres, food shops and other essential facilities. A linked bypass is required. There needs to be a deterrent for ‘through traffic’ vehicles on the minor roads. Separate HGV restrictions should be enforced on these unclassified roads Application needs to be considered with other large scale planning applications The development needs to be considered in relation to the other major concurrent planning applications at Heyford New Town, Warehousing proposals at J10 M40, Puy Du Fou. Flooding Risks: The Cherwell Valley is prone to flooding, with areas such as Somerton and Rousham bridge frequently affected. The increased traffic would present significant safety issues. Preservation of Rural Identity: Both the Cherwell Local Plan and the Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan emphasise the importance of protecting the visual and cultural heritage of the Cherwell Valley, including historic churches. Somerton itself is largely within a recognised conservation area. Conclusion In conclusion without further infrastructure improvements and recognition of the factors raised in the letter, then the current plans should be rejected.	The OxSRFI scheme includes a significant number of highways and sustainable transport improvements which will help to mitigate adverse effects, including safety, from traffic associated with the scheme. These measures are proposed further to the transport modelling and assessment work which has been informed discussions with the TWG. These measures do not require a bypass for Somerton village. The Proposed Development design will take account of the need to balance flood risk by allowing fluvial flows to move through the Main Site in such a way that conveyance is not significantly impeded either now or in the future as the result of climate change. Hydraulic modelling of the Proposed Development has been undertaken to determine the extent and depth of flooding at the Main Site, Middleton Stoney Relief Road, and J10 Highway Improvements during a 100 year plus climate change event. This will also ensure flood risk is not increased to existing landowners and human health downstream. The cumulative effects assessments across the ES include a range of developments in the vicinity of the Main Site which include the employment proposals by Albion Land and Tritax at M40 J10, as well as a proportionate assessment of effects with the recent (as yet undetermined) Heyford Park proposals (the 9,000 homes New Town proposals) and the Puy du Fou leisure application (see ES Chapter 1 (Introduction)).
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	---	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C23	17/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme- 12	I write in response to your invitation to comment on the proposed rail freight interchange on land adjacent to Ardley. Rather than an objection, this is a plea to widen your scope of consideration on the impact this development will have on the surrounding areas and to make plans to mitigate the consequences should the proposed interchange go ahead. One sees the need for continued upgrading of facilities in a modern world, but sadly, that comes at the cost of changing our environment and losing parts of our landscape to industrialisation. I cannot claim to understand the impact such a development will have on our environment and will leave those arguments to people who are far better versed in such matters. Similarly the effect this will have on the lives of those people who live close to the development will, I am sure, be well rehearsed already, so again I will leave that to them. I am concerned however at the wider scope this will have a little further afield from just Ardley and Upper Heyford, especially in surrounding villages such as North Aston. Please let me explain. Over the past five years we have seen a tremendous increase in through traffic in North Aston, since the expansion of the development in Upper Heyford. There are official records available to you which confirm this considerable increase. Other than the county wide policy of 20 m.p.h. restrictions in most villages (which is widely ignored) there has been no other highways improvement to protect villagers. No one seems to have considered the impact the Upper Heyford development has had on those areas and villages which have to suffer access to and egress from such developments. The thought of further expansion in Upper Heyford (9000 new homes?) is frightening. We are more than well aware of what this will mean for us from a traffic perspective. A glance at a map of the area will prove that the shortest and quickest route from Ardley/Upper Heyford to Banbury and the West is that which passes through Somerton and North Aston. This has been made all too obvious, to us here in North Aston, over the increased development in Upper Heyford. Your paper talks about the possibility of providing up to 9,600 new jobs. This means of course traffic arriving at the interchange from many parts plus all the support they and the facilities will require. I urge you therefore to widen your scope of impact and consider the effect the development will have on traffic flow in North Aston and Somerton and to allocate sufficient funds to improve safety in villages such as ours.	The OxSRFI scheme includes a significant number of highways and sustainable transport improvements which will help to mitigate adverse effects, including safety, from traffic associated with the scheme. These measures are proposed further to the transport modelling and assessment work which has been informed discussions with the TWG. Fundamentally, the proposed improvements to the strategic highways network at M40 J10, M40 J9 and the A43, will help to attract traffic to the higher category roads and away from the often less appropriate local road network. The OxSRFI also sets out sustainable transport measures which include the growth of bus services through contributions, improvements to footpath/cycleway/bridleway connections in and around the site as the highways works are completed, and delivery of occupier travel plans (i.e., car share and awareness of public transport services) as employment on the Main Site grows - these measures will help reduce single occupancy usage as part of the OxSRFI scheme. The Applicant has also proposed a Community Liaison Group as one of the DCO requirements, to coordinate progress of the development of the OxSRFI scheme with local stakeholders. The cumulative effects assessments across the ES include a range of developments in the vicinity of the Main Site which include the employment proposals by Albion Land and Tritax at M40 J10, as well as a proportionate assessment of effects with the recent (as yet undetermined) Heyford Park proposals (the 9,000 homes New Town proposals) and the Puy du Fou leisure application (see ES Chapter 1 (Introduction)).
C24	17/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 13	The proposals will have a detrimental effect on the health and wellbeing of those living near the train lines in Bicester. Concerns regarding: Noise & Pollution. There is a school next to the line and this additional noise and pollution will have an effect on the primary school age children and could affect their concentration as well as health.	The study area for ES Chapter 5 (Noise and Vibration) does not include properties along the rail line in Bicester, as it is outside the relevant guidance. It is not reasonable or practicable to consider the impacts which may arise along the entire rail network as a result of the Proposed Development. Once on the wider network, the effects could be diluted by other rail traffic. By considering the effects within the identified study area, a worst-case approach has been undertaken to the assessment of railway noise at the relevant receptors identified in Chapter 5, i.e. before effects are diluted by other rail traffic.

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C26	25/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme- 14	Good afternoon, We would like to formally comment on the above proposal. We strongly request that Clifton and Deddington Parish as a baseline are included in the ANPR camera coverage proposal to reduce the noise and traffic impact caused by the introduction of the SRFI. Clifton is currently suffering from disproportionate high levels of traffic and HGVs caused by new development in the peripheral parishes including Deddington. We request that no proposal is accepted with the appropriate traffic measures to mitigate the direct traffic effect in Clifton. For this reason we request that funding is allocated to cover the following traffic measures: 1. Traffic Calming (Speed Bumps) 2. Appropriate traffic signage in intersections leading to Clifton 3. ANPR cameras to unauthorised vehicles to drive through Clifton. Clifton has no pavements on 50% of the village, we have an aging demographics whilst new families move with small children; the poor control and management of traffic in our village is destroying the community and increasing the risk of life-threatening accidents. Currently we have near misses on a weekly basis due to speeding vehicles, high traffic volumes and unauthorised vehciles travelling via Clifton. We appreciate creating this channel to raise our concerns.	The OxSRFI scheme includes a significant number of highways and sustainable transport improvements which will help to mitigate adverse effects, including safety, from traffic associated with the scheme. These measures are proposed further to the transport modelling and assessment work which has been informed discussions with the TWG. Fundamentally, the proposed improvements to the strategic highways network at M40 J10, M40 J9 and the A43, will help to attract traffic to the higher category roads and away from the often less appropriate local road network. The OxSRFI also sets out sustainable transport measures which include the growth of bus services through contributions, improvements to footpath/cycleway/bridleway connections in and around the site as the highways works are completed, and delivery of occupier travel plans (i.e., car share and awareness of public transport services) as employment on the Main Site grows - these measures will help reduce single occupancy usage as part of the OxSRFI scheme. HGV camera details are included as part of the HGV Routeing Strategy (part of the Transport Assessment (see ES Appendix 3.1), with the strategy being to retain HGVs on the strategic highways netowrk when accessing the Main Site. The Applicant has also proposed a Community Liaison Group as one of the DCO requirements, to coordinate progress of the development of the OxSRFI scheme with local stakeholders.	
C27	25/10/2025	P	Resident	Comments on the scheme - 15	Last Tuesdays Webinar proved most informative although having posed a couple of questions I was horrified to learn that as things stand, Clifton and presumably the parish of Deddington are to be excluded from the planned rollout of ANPR cameras. Putting it politely my immediate reaction was "You must be joking" a reaction shared by many villagers. Attached please find our document outlining precisely why OxSRFI should extend the intended coverage of ANPR cameras to include the Deddington Parish. Your earliest reassurance would be appreciated. (The document has been prepared by local residents to explain why ANPR camera's are required for	The OxSRFI scheme includes a significant number of highways and sustainable transport improvements which will help to mitigate adverse effects, including safety, from traffic associated with the scheme. These measures are proposed further to the transport modelling and assessment work which has been informed discussions with the TWG. Fundamentally, the proposed improvements to the strategic highways network at M40 J10, M40 J9 and the A43, will help to attract traffic to the higher category roads and away from the often less appropriate local road network. The OxSRFI also sets out sustainable transport measures which include the growth of bus services through contributions, improvements to footpath/cycleway/bridleway connections in and around the site as the highways works are completed, and delivery of occupier travel plans (i.e., car share and awareness of public transport services) as employment on the Main Site grows - these measures will help reduce single occupancy usage as part of the OxSRFI scheme. HGV camera details are included as part of the HGV Routeing Strategy (part of the Transport Assessment (see ES Appendix 3.1), with the strategy being to retain HGVs on the strategic highways netowrk when accessing the Main Site. The Applicant has also proposed a Community Liaison Group as one of the DCO requirements, to coordinate progress of the development of the OxSRFI scheme with local stakeholders.	
C28	25/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 16	To whom it may concern, I live at Stoneyford, Clifton. My property has no pavement on the road in front of it and I have to walk on the road for some 50m before getting to the relevant safety of our village pub's forecourt. The recent 20mph reduction of the speed limit hasn't had much of an impact, and HGV's are still a major issue coming through regularly. I would expect OxSRFI to take some sort of action to try and stop this law breaking before anyone gets injured, or worse.	The OxSRFI scheme includes a significant number of highways and sustainable transport improvements which will help to mitigate adverse effects, including safety, from traffic associated with the scheme. These measures are proposed further to the transport modelling and assessment work which has been informed discussions with the TWG.	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C29	29/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 17	I would like to document the following major reservations about this proposal by OxSRFI on the following grounds: Location – less than a mile from my property, nearer to me than any houses in Heyford and adjacent to an established BBONT nature reserve. Light and noise pollution will undoubtedly impact on the indigenous wildlife particularly those nocturnal animals and birds. As the prevailing winds are from the West / South west any overnight noise will be heard in Ardley rather than Heyford. Putting in earthworks and ponds south of the proposed site does not mitigate the effects for Ardley and the Nature reserve. Cost and disruption to the local community which is currently under threat from all sides. Loss of valuable farmland. The proposed site is not predominantly on the disused air base. It is on Ashgrove Farm! We are losing farmland at an alarming rate in the UK, its actually quite scary. Creation of 9600 jobs on site! Oxfordshire is not an area of high unemployment but it does have high housing costs. Where will these people live? The houses currently being built will not attract warehousing staff and there are a lot of warehouses in the plan.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	--	---	--

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C30	30/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme- 18	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. • The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. • The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. • The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. • The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. • Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. • Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I am opposed to the opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
C31	30/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 19	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. • The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. • The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. • The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. • Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. • Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C32	30/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 20	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I am opposed to the opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. - Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
C33	11/01/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 21	In response to your invitation to comment on stage 2 of the Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (OxSRFI) scheme, I take the opportunity to highlight the following aspects. One of the stated purposes of the site – to ‘play a direct role in enabling the transition to a more sustainable economy with rail freight being around 76% more carbon efficient than road freight’ – is unlikely to be fulfilled in any meaningful sense. The link to the Chiltern Main Line seems a ploy for a lorry-driven economy, for two reasons: a) the Chiltern Main Line train line is a busy commuter line which cannot take freight trains in any significant volume and the current train line is physically incapable of carrying standard shipping containers; and b) the positioning of the OxSRFI around the busy M40 motorway and A43 road combined with the emphasis on redesigned road layout betrays the real intention: the creation of a Road-freight Interchange. In the proposal, this can be seen in the secondary mention of potential rail freight, e.g. ‘The Proposed Development is in a highly accessible location, adjacent to Junction 10 of the M40, and with good access to the A43 and A34 which provide connections to key distribution markets including London and Birmingham, but also to the south-coast ports.’ Moreover, the developer admits that 88% of employees to the site would arrive by car, not by train which is ironic for a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange. Furthermore, the lorries going to and from the OxSRFI will be 100% diesel-driven, as would any of the promised-but-unlikely freight trains. In short, the OxSRFI will NOT enable the transition to a more sustainable economy but rather increase fossil-fuel driven transportation through the many lorries and even the few trains going to and from the site. The OxSRFI documents are intransparent about the actual consequences of the plans, spinning the story towards politically correct agendas about the environment. The planned area for construction is green belt land, currently green fields with public rights of way which local residents enjoy. The planned compensation for the loss of green fields, public rights of way and unbroken horizon, the ‘landscaped green space’ will not compensate in reality because the ‘Proposed Footways and/or	The OxSRFI proposals are submitted in response to government policy for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network. In relation to climate change, the OxSRFI proposlas accord with naitonal policy with regard to GHG and climate change adaptation, as well as with existing and emerging local planning policies on this topic, the impact of the OxSRFI scheme on climate change for both the construction and operational phases, in addition to the whole lifetime, has been assessed in ES Chapter 15 (Climate Change) to result in minor adverse effects, which are not significant. The OxSRFI scheme is estimated as being likely to remove more than 53 million HGV miles from the road network per year with emissions reduction as well as congestion reduction benefits. A suite of Rail related reports form part of the submitted application (see Document series 7.2). Evidence submitted as part of the application confirms that at least four round trip daily freight paths can be provided for the OxSRFI scheme using the Chiltern Main Line whcih sits adjacent to the Main Site. This confirms the key requirement of government policy (see the NPS) is satisfied, but further paths are considered to exist and work will continue with Network Rail including post any DCO consent - the timeable is often adapted and evolves, and so pathing is not static of fixed. There are no technical or market related concerns with providing the rail freight connectivity required to serve the OxSRFI scheme. The opportunity to deliver a viable terminal is underpinned by the confidence of GBRailfreight (GBRF) who are the second largest freight operator in the UK and plan to operate the terminal - they have no concerns about W8 nor the suitability of the Chiltern Main Line or its location. The submitted Framework Travel Plan (ES Appendix 3.2) sets out targets which have been agreed with OCC to reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle trips from a baseline of 92% to 68% by year 5, which would	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

					Redirected PROW and/or Cycleways (Off-Road Routes)’ either run alongside the complex – with the view of 25m high warehouses (see point 3 below) – or through the complex, which will hardly provide a better experience of nature if the masterplan images are to be trusted. It will be a concrete experience in its most literal sense, with the added air pollution from the lorries coming and going in an incessant pattern. The 25-metre-high warehouses would be much higher than any other buildings within miles, much larger in footprint than any other buildings within miles, and therefore completely dominate the area in a manner which conflicts entirely with the present environment. The planned green spaces and ‘landscaped mounding’ will not make up for the height and width of these warehouses for, at least, decades. Indeed the claimed ‘campus environment’ – a term usually employed about the grounds of a university or college, in other words a place of higher education – seem entirely misleading for an area dominated by mega-warehouses, trains and manual working. It is fancy marketing to cover up for what is essentially an extra-large warehouse environment built for profit, not for learning or the natural environment. Nor will it help the surrounding built environment. Dorchester Living’s development of Heyford Park on the former RAF/US Air Base of Upper Heyford is highly successful, having built more than 1,200 houses over a decade, and having plans for a total of 9,000 houses, making the area the home of 25,000 people. Resident move to Heyford Park for its quality houses, amenities (school, supermarket, pharmacy, hotel with restaurant and bar), and especially its wonderful surrounding countryside. While residents would absolutely welcome better public transportation, the prospect of thousands of lorries nearby, the mega-warehouses and the lack of a railway station in spite of the rail interchange up for consultation, are certainly not. Even worse, the OxSRFI would block the development of a rebuilt Ardley passenger train station, as recently outlined in the Strategic Rail Plan for Oxfordshire. This passenger train station would – as opposed to the OxSRFI – actually support sustainable transport for the steeply increasing number of residents in the area, allowing them to travel to London and Birmingham without impacting the environment. I predict that the OxSRFI will scare buyers away from the very successful development that is Heyford Park and make current home owners unable to sell their houses. In conclusion, the planned OxSRFI will scare people away from the area, will be the consequence of dishonest marketing, and most fatally destroy rather than save the environment. I therefore strongly protest against the Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (OxSRFI).	represent a notable modal shift of 26% towards more sustainable transport modes (including care share (20%), public transport (8%) and walking/cycling (4%)). There will be adverse impacts on some viewpoints, including rights of way in the vicinity of Main Site. However the proposals have been designed to include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which accounts for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. Maximum building height parameters vary across the site in response to the context. It should be noted that the Application Site is not in the Green Belt. The Applicant is aware of local (OCC and other) aspirations for a new Ardley passnger rail Station, and has discussed this with various consultees. A Passenger Rail Station Note is appended to the submitted Planning Statement and sets out how the Proposed Development is compatible with wider aspirations and ambitions for a new passenger station. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved ‘committed’ developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes. Please note that the approach to the statutory consultation process by the Applicant was to present the reports and plans, including the draft Environmental Statement, which were available at the time. The consultation included exhibitions, zoom webinars and opportunities for comments to allow consultees and local residents to comment and engage with the Applicant team.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C34	11/01/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 22	I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed mega-warehouse project near Ardley, known as the Oxfordshire SFRI. The key deficiencies of the proposal are: The SFRI project appears to be purely a "trojan horse" for an extra-large warehouse estate, served by lorries. You make no commitments for a particular share of traffic to arrive or depart by train. You intend to simply build all the warehouses and some tracks, and - if there are no trains and only lorries - then there will be nothing for residents to say or do. In any case, the planned warehouse capacity far exceeds the capacity required for goods that could realistically arrive by train. The project should commit to building the warehouses in stages, to serve only proven rail traffic. As a minimum, the SFRI should commit as a planning condition to ensuring that, at all times, at least 40% of total freight tonnage (ingoing + outgoing) is actually carried by rail. The Chiltern line is already heavily used, and there is minimal spare capacity for trains, let alone slow-running freight trains. Also, the Chiltern train line will require major rebuilding to be able to carry standard shipping containers. There are no firm commitments from any side (e.g. developer, rail companies) to run services to the new site. As per item #1, the on-site construction of warehouses should mirror actual, demonstrated rail traffic, not speculative pie-in-the-sky “visions”, as is currently the case. The project is 100% focused on diesel propulsion, which is environmentally unsustainable: Under your current proposal, 100% of freight trains will be diesel powered, and there is no provision for fast-charging of electric lorries, meaning that most lorries visiting the site will run on diesel. In order to remedy this deficiency, the relevant parts of the Chiltern Line, as well as the interchange itself, must be electrified, and a commitment must be made for all locomotives serving the site to be 100% electric. Similarly, for lorries, “megawatt” lorry charging facilities must be built as part of the initial site design, alongside a commitment for an escalating share of lorry traffic to be battery powered, reaching 100% electric lorry share no later than 2035. As per your own estimates, 88% of employees will arrive on site by private car. There is no provision for passenger rail to the site, which would be the most obvious way for employees of a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange to get to work. The site must be re-designed to include a passenger station, not just freight sidings. The proposal effectively blocks the development of a high-grade Ardley passenger station, as outlined in the recent Strategic Rail Plan for Oxfordshire. The SFRI proposal makes no provision for getting to Ardley station, and the area where the Park and Ride would be will be taken up by the SFRI. The proposal must be re-designed to include all necessary facilities for Ardley station, including a sizeable park-and-ride that can generate passenger traffic by replacing car traffic currently on the M40/A43/A34. The new Ardley station is also key part of the traffic infrastructure required for the proposed Puy de Fou park nearby. The project will completely destroy a lovely green area with rights of way. Your claim that the mega-warehouse project will result in a "net gain" in biodiversity is based on theoretical modelling that has no link to reality.	The OxSRFI proposals are submitted in response to government policy for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network. A suite of Rail related reports form part of the submitted application (see Document series 7.2). Evidence submitted as part of the application confirms that at least four round trip daily freight paths can be provided for the OxSRFI scheme using the Chiltern Main Line whcih sits adjacent to the Main Site. This confirms the key requirement of government policy (see the NPS) is satisfied, but further paths are considered to exist and work will continue with Network Rail including post any DCO consent - the timeable is often adapted and evolves, and so pathing is not static of fixed. There are no technical or market related concerns with providing the rail freight connectivity required to serve the OxSRFI scheme. The opportunity to deliver a viable terminal is underpinned by the confidence of GBRailfreight (GBRf) who are the second largest freight operator in the UK and plan to operate the terminal - they have no concerns about W8 nor the suitability of the Chiltern Main Line or its location. In relation to climate change, the OxSRFI proposlas accord with naitonal policy with regard to GHG and climate change adaptation, as well as with existing and emerging local planning policies on this topic, the impact of the OxSRFI scheme on climate change for both the construction and operational phases, in addition to the whole lifetime, has been assessed in ES Chapter 15 (Climate Change) to result in minor adverse effects, which are not significant. The OxSRFI scheme is estimated as being likely to remove more than 53 million HGV miles from the road network per year with emissions reduction as well as congestion reduction benefits. There will be adverse impacts on some viewpoints, including rights of way in the vicinity of Main Site. However the proposals have been designed to include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which accounts for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. Maximum building height parameters vary across the site in response to the context. It should be noted that the Application Site is not in the Green Belt. The Applicant is aware of local (OCC and other) aspirations for a new Ardley passnger rail Station, and has discussed this with various consultees. A Passenger Rail Station Note is appended to the submitted Planning Statement and sets out how the Proposed Development is compatible with wider aspirations and ambitions for a new passenger station.	
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	--	---	--

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C35	11/02/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 23	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutoryconsultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park.I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: • The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. • The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. • The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. • The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. • Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. • Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I am opposed to the opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	--	---	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C36	11/02/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 24	This email is a response to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located between Ardley, Heyford Park and Middleton Stoney. I am strongly opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on this land. It will have a catastrophic effect on the countryside, wildlife and our way of life for many reasons including: The impact on transport links in the local area. The M40 J10 at Ardley is already congested. The SRFI development with 9,600 staff and multiple HGV movements will multiply traffic flows on the areas already very busy village and country roads. This is not recognised in the proposal. Impact of multiple proposed developments. The proposal does not take into account the many other proposed developments in the area, including the Hayford Park expansion by 9,000 to 13,000 ADDITIONAL houses, the Ardley J10 Warehouses development and the proposed Puys du Fou theme park. The consequential dramatic increase in traffic is not recognised in any of these proposals and will have a catastrophic effect on the countryside, wildlife and our way of life. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. The impact on the location and surroundings of Ardley and Environs. The proposed SRFI includes approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. This will obliterate farmland and open countryside, reducing residents' access to countryside activities. The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape. The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to local residents with no local long term benefits. Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. Karen Paterson	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	---	--	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C37	11/02/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 25	This email is a response to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located between Ardley, Heyford Park and Middleton Stoney. I am strongly opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on this land. It will have a catastrophic effect on the countryside, wildlife and our way of life for many reasons including: The impact on transport links in the local area. The M40 J10 at Ardley is already congested. The SRFI development with 9,600 staff and multiple HGV movements will multiply traffic flows on the areas already very busy village and country roads. This is not recognised in the proposal. Impact of multiple proposed developments. The proposal does not take into account the many other proposed developments in the area, including the Hayford Park expansion by 9,000 to 13,000 ADDITIONAL houses, the Ardley J10 Warehouses development and the proposed Puys du Fou theme park. The consequential dramatic increase in traffic is not recognised in any of these proposals and will have a catastrophic effect on the countryside, wildlife and our way of life. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. The impact on the location and surroundings of Ardley and Environs. The proposed SRFI includes approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. This will obliterate farmland and open countryside, reducing residents' access to countryside activities. The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape. The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to local residents with no local long term benefits. Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
C38	11/02/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 26	I am writing to formally oppose the proposed Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (OxSRFI) as outlined in your recent correspondence dated 22nd September 2025. In terms of planning and environmental concerns, the proposed development spans over 800,000 square metres of warehousing and logistics space which is a massive industrial footprint, particularly in comparison to the existing size of the close by village of Ardley, which risks overwhelming the rural character of the area. Extensive earthworks could potentially cause damage to local heritage and biodiversity considering that there are several sites of historical interest very close by such as the medieval castle site at Ardley Quarry Wood and the recently uncovered dinosaur trackway found just down the road at Ardley Quarry. While the proposal claims a “net gain in biodiversity” large scale construction and traffic corridors often fragment habitats and disrupt wildlife in practice. I have several concerns about the pressure on the traffic and infrastructure which is already under some strain as it is. Although initially, the idea of the bypass felt like it could be a good idea, with more thought on this I can only see that either the interchange will still funnel significant heavy goods vehicles through local roads, raising concerns about noise, air pollution, road safety and increased travel times or it would meant that it would increase journey times for locals as it would affect accessibility to the village creating a longer way around to get home. Therefore, I am struggling to see how this can be a benefit to anyone living here. The strain on junction 10 of the M40 which is known to be problematic, even with the latest improvements now embedded is a huge concern. I fail to see how a satisfactory solution can be found for this as the proposed slip roads and relief roads alone would not sufficiently mitigate congestion here, especially during peak hours. Villages such as Ardley and Middleton Stoney will face years of construction disruption, followed by permanent changes to traffic flow and accessibility. In addition to the above, I would like to raise the following points: · The chosen location is questionable. Is this the most appropriate site for a strategic rail freight interchange? - Proximity to sensitive villages and limited existing infrastructure (making it an expensive option) raise doubts. · While rail freight is greener than road transport, the overall carbon footprint of constructing and operating such a vast facility may not align with Oxfordshire's climate goals – this needs to be checked! · Has the developer transparently assessed other locations with better existing infrastructure, better rail access and less community disruption? I hope the concerns I've shared here will be met with care and reflection. I stand by my objection with quiet conviction.	The OxSRFI proposals are submitted in response to government policy for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network. The proposals have been designed to include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which accounts for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. Maximum building height parameters vary across the site in response to the context. The ES submitted with the DCO assesses the impacts and residual effects from the OxSRFI scheme on ecology receptors and heritage assets, and concludes that with the mitigation in place there are no significant effects as a result of the proposed development. Indeed, the OxSRFI will deliver a 10% BNG. With specific regards to Middleton Stoney Castle and the Ardley Wood Moated Ringwork (ref. SM2 in ES Chapter 10 (Heritage)), the desk-based assessment (ES Appendix 10.1) determined that the OxSRFI scheme would have no impact on the setting or significance of these Scheduled Monuments. This is due to the distance between the Application Site and the assets, the lack of intervisibility between them caused by topography and dense vegetation/modern development, and the lack of any known contextual relationship. In terms of the trackways - there are areas of the Main Site where the excavations will go down into / through the Shipton Member which is the lower portion of the White Limestone Formation, is more abundant in fossils and is the formation in which it is understood that dinosaur footprints have been encountered. Proposals are included in ES Chapter 11 (Ground) to have a watching brief by a palaeontologist during excavations through this formation. Significant improvements are proposed at M40 J10 to improve capacity and help address some of the existing issues and challenges. The proposed highways works will also help ensure the redistribution (reassignment) of traffic from local roads to the strategic highways network, helping reduce traffic effects (congestion and other) in village centres, including Ardley where the closure of the B430 south of the Chiltern Main Line will reduce noise and air pollution impacts in the village. Key elements of the road infrastructure - such as the Ardley Bypass and some of the M40 J10 works - are being delivered in the first phase of highways works to help minimise impacts during the construction process. The approach to the Alternative Sites Assessment (ES Appendix 2.4) sets out the Applicant's consideration of reasonable alternative sites for the proposed OxSRFI development. It does not seek to justify in detail the suitability of the OxSRFI scheme in its own right as this is covered through other relevant documents (i.e., the Planning Statement (Document 5.4) and DAD (Document series 5.5)).	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C39	11/03/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 27 My comments below are informed by several activities rather than knee-jerk NIMBYism: I attended the Stage 1 exhibition and spoke with your representatives at some length. I had gone with an open mind but was dismayed to see how the plans would decimate so much countryside along with the rural nature of the area while adding to the already gridlocked and accident-prone roads (A34/M40/A43/B430). I wrote to our MP and Councillors at the time with my concerns. I attended the Stage 2 exhibition and again spoke at length to your representatives. I could not find any significant changes about protection of the countryside nor any sustained evaluation of the impact on traffic. The only argument that made sense was that less freight might be on the A34/M40/A43,MI but the evidence was flimsy. Instead, thousands of lorries will add to the traffic problems that already constantly dog the area. I attended a meeting with 13 Parish council reps, District and County Councillors and our MP in which we looked at this proposal along with the other 4 major proposals that will mutually impact each other and the population. As a result, I am totally opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park where I am a resident. My main reasons are as follows: Devastation to the Environment. The countryside from J10 of the M40 to Bicester will be ruined and the whole rural nature of this part of Oxfordshire damaged irrevocably. I was told that Ardley residents are in favour - until they realise the impact of the new slip road that will bring more noise to their village. I am concerned about the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. I do not understand why the previous government did not put in any criteria when they suggested these SRFIs. Traffic. I have local traffic news cutting in on my car radio and there are incidents almost daily, most frequently accidents then gridlock on the A34. There is a domino effect from and to the other roads - M40, A44, A43. These roads just cannot bear any more traffic, particularly lorries. When these arteries are clogged, the local roads become stuck too, so all the surrounding villages are impacted. I questioned the extent to which any account had been taken of current traffic issues before going ahead with the proposed 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving and leaving the site per day. The context of multiple proposed projects. Following on from this, has any survey of traffic taken into account the proposed new town in Heyford Park, with 13000 residents? The SRFI would about this development and impact on the residents who are coming for the peace of rural Oxfordshire. There are two other new warehouse schemes at Baynards Green on the A43 plus the Puy de Fou theme park there. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I did not see any consideration of these in the stage 2 consultation. The irreversible transformation to Heyford Park from rural to industrial. Not only will the agricultural fields be hijacked by the 6.5 million square feet of warehousing will be a dreadful eyesore and noisy, even though we are sold the promise of some screening via trees and footpaths around a haulage centre. If approved, this plan will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents' access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened health of residents every single day. What about the historic environment? The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape. Plans include film studios and parks for leisure. All of these projects are not compatible with the SRFI. I understand that where SRFI applications have been successful (and several have not been), they are on the edge of cities that are already industrial. This rural area in which the road systems are already over-stretched, and will be more so by the huge number of new houses, is not the right location. Additionally, there will be extra rail lines given that the Chiltern Line (with Ardley tunnel) are not suitable. All in all, I am vehemently opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited under on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for safety, for the environment, and for the residents of Heyford Park and surrounding villages. It would completely negatively impact my life.	The Applicant is grateful for your attendance at both the stage 1 and stage 2 exhibitions. In terms of highways - significant improvements are propsoed at M40 J10 to improve capacity and help address some of the existing issues and challenges.The proposed highways works will also help ensure the redistribution (reassingment) of traffic from local roads to the strategic highways network, helping reduce traffic effects (congestion and other) in village centres, including Ardley where the closure of the B430 south of the Chiltern Main Line will reduce noise and air pollution impacts in the village. Key elements of the road infrastructure - such as the Ardley Bypass and some of the M40 J10 works - are being delivered in the first phase of highways works to help minimise impacts during the construction process. Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes. The OxSRFI proposals are submitted in response to government policy for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. The ES submitted with the DCO assesses the impacts and residual effects from the OxSRFI scheme on heritage assets, including the former Upper Airfield and concludes that with the mitigationin place there are no significant effects as a result of the proposed development. A suite of Rail related reports form part of the submitted application (see Document series 7.2). Evidence submitted as part of the applicatoin confirms that at least four round trip daily freight paths can be provided which confirms the key requirement of the NPS is satisfied, but further paths are considered to exist and work will continue with Network Rail including post any DCO consent - the timeable is often adapted and evolves, and so pathing is not static of fixed. There are no technical or market related concerns with providing the rail freight connectivity required to serve OxSRFI.
-----	------------	--	----------	--	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C40	11/03/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 28	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: • The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. • The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. • The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. • The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. • Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. • Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I am opposed to the opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	--	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C41	11/03/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 29	Environmental Issues. * Not enough “off set” for the environmental impact of the loss of agricultural land, hedgerow & trees lost both for the terminal itself and for the bypass for Ardley and Middleton Stoney. How is the area going to have “a net gain through new habitat creation” when acres of land are being concreted over? The information given lacks detail in this regard. *The Chiltern Line is not electrified so this plan will have more diesel trains connecting with large diesel lorries, all putting carbon into the atmosphere. Where is the calculated carbon off set for this increase in our local air pollution? Why is this terminal not being located on an existing electrified line? *Almost certainly the terminal means more heavy traffic on the A34. This is already a very congested road. It cannot take much more traffic without major improvement, particularly to the slip roads around Oxford. This should be done before any more major infrastructure is finalized. *I am not convinced that there is enough mitigation to counter the noise pollution. IE extra hedging & trees to absorb noise from moving & shunting trains, slow moving & reversing lorries. Also controls should be included in the planning to limit activity to between 0800-20.00. Unless trains and lorries become electric. Road planning & design. * The proposed Ardley Bypass meets at the north of the village adjacent to the M40 junction 10 & A43 . This throws both through traffic and local traffic together at that point. Which will mean local traffic will get caught up in the ongoing congestion. Have you tried getting across the M40 recently? A redesign will not compensate for all the extra traffic the Terminus road plan will add to an already busy junction. *The new routes extends driving routes from the south (from Kidlington & Oxford) both for Ardley, Souldern & Somerton residents. The traffic on Station Road in Ardley will not decrease as may be expected but as local traffic will all be using the new northern junction, this will increase traffic at the Ardley Crossroads. In fact Somerton & Souldern villages are not even shown on the plans even though these residents are also affected. *Current road proposal separates Ardley from Upper Heyford/Heyford Park which is our nearest Schools, shops, Chemist & other facilities. It increases journey to School for our youngsters and for Emergency services. The current journey from Ardley to Heyford is 3 miles. Under these plans using the new bypass & onto new road south of Heyford, increases the journey to 9-10 miles. I strongly want to suggest that the B430 and the existing Heyford Link Road are kept open. This would at least provide some mitigation for the issues above and keep a separate route for local traffic. Accepting that it would require height, weight & physical restrictions to prevent lorry usage. If this is not possible then an alternative quicker route to re-link Heyford with the neighbouring villages MUST be included. Two possibilities are at Quarry Cottages which is number 4 on your map or at Gate 10 (Off Somerton Road Ardley). Both these are routes that were lost when Heyford Base was built.	Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The consultation material also set out that that OxSRI scheme will deliver approximately 150,000 new trees and 13 km of new hedgerow. Further details are found in the submission pack in ES Chapter 6 (Ecology). Construction activity will be controlled through the CEMP (ES Appendix 2.3) whihc will help to minimise impacts through a range of mitigation measures. The construction hours are controlled through DCO requirements and are set as: between 07:00 and 19:00 hours on weekdays and 07:00 and 16:00 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays nor on public holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. A suite of Rail related reports form part of the submitted application (see Document series 7.2). Evidence submitted as part of the applicatoin confirms that at least four round trip daily freight paths can be provided which confirms the key requirement of the NPS is satisfied, but further paths are considered to exist and work will continue with Network Rail including post any DCO consent - the timeable is often adapted and evolves, and so pathing is not static of fixed. There are no technical or market related concerns with providing the rail freight connectivity required to serve OxSRFI. In terms of highways - significant improvements are propsoed at M40 J10 to improve capacity and help address some of the existing issues and challenges. The proposed highways works will also help ensure the redistribution (reassingment) of traffic from local roads to the strategic highways network, helping reduce traffic effects (congestion and other) in village centres, including Ardley where the closure of the B430 south of the Chiltern Main Line will reduce noise and air pollution impacts in the village. Key elements of the road infrastructure - such as the Ardley Bypass and some of the M40 J10 works - are being delivered in the first phase of highways works to help minimise impacts during the construction process. Access between local communities will not be cut off, with the new J10 improvements and Ardley Bypass still providing links north and south of the B430. Noise pollution - ES Chapter 5 (Noise and Vibration) assesses the impacts from the OxSRFI scheme which includes measures such as earthwork bunds, woodland planting, and an acoustic fence to the north of the terminal to help minimise noise levels. As a result no likely significant effects are stated as a result of activity form the Main Site, other than at a property which is currently in use as an office on the B430 (Ardley Fields Farm Cottages).	
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	--	---	--

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C42	11/03/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 30	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: · The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. · The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. · The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. · The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. · Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. · Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I am opposed to the opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	--	---	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C43	11/03/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 31	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: [We have added some suggested points here – add any others you want to raise and delete any of the suggested ones you don’t agree with!] · The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. · The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. · The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. · The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. · Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. · Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I am opposed to the opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landscaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
C44	11/03/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 32	I wish to include my comments about the proposal in the consultation documents. I am very concerned about massive traffic increase on the B430 I live in Weston-on-the-Green - a tiny village and am concerned about the impact and through traffic on the village. We cannot cope with more traffic. The B430 already has to accept the overspill from the constantly congested A34, let alone cars and heavy goods vehicles which will surge with this new development. I am also concerned about light pollution. The village has a no lights at night policy - which helps keep the nature of a remote village and is good for wildlife. A massive development like this will spoil the dark sky in the area. I urge you to keep this in mind and do everything to not pollute the sky with artificial light.	The proposed highways improvement will help ensure the redistribution (reassignment) of traffic from local roads to the strategic highways network, helping reduce traffic effects (congestion and other) in local village centres. In terms of Weston-on-the-Green, the Transport Assessment (ES Appendix 3.1) confirms that the proposed improvements to M40 J9, would remove a delay on the A34 approach to M40 J9 in the evening peak hour, thereby keeping vehicles on the strategic highways network. In terms of light impacts, ES Chapter 8 (Lighting) assesses impact on properties in Weston-on-the-Green and states that as the village is approximately 1.2km from the Application Site at its closest point, there will be no measurable change in the light baseline at this receptor, and no breaches in E2 environmental zone criteria. As such there is no significant effect for the village.	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C45	11/03/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 33	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: ● The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. ● The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. ● The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. ● The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. ● Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. ● Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. ● The increase of the population has resulted more disputes, as currently the management company is unable to ensure the land/ space are maintained in the original usage nature. I am opposed to the opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	--	---	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C46	11/04/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 34	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: • The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and have a detrimental effect on the mental health of residents. • The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. • The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. • The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by thousands of extra members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. • Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. • Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	---	---	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C47	11/04/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 35	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I am opposed to the proposed development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landscaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	--	---	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C48	11/04/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 36	I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. This combined with warehousing already under construction in Bicester will ensure local travel chaos for years to come only solvable by further large scale development to transport infrastructure. Which is incompatible with HS2 construction in the immediate area. It would make the new town very undesirable know every journey would start excessive delays to every journey through heavy construction traffic for the next 5 years or more. The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development.The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I am opposed to the opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. - Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
C49	11/04/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 37	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

					The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I would also request measuring the expected noise and light pollution impact on the Heyford Park residents from the proposed development as I can't see these have been assessed to date. These also doesn't seem to be any actual assessments on the sustainable transport for when it will be implemented, as it's going to negatively impact the sustainable transport plans being put in place for 35k thousand residents. What is the strategic value of the project? There seems to be no evidence in the consultation about looking at the local and wider economic uses of it. I am opposed to the opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	- Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	
C50	11/04/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 38	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I would also request measuring the expected noise and light pollution impact on the Heyford Park residents from the proposed development as I can't see these have been assessed to date. These also doesn't seem to be any actual assessments on the sustainable transport for when it will be implemented, as it's going to negatively impact the sustainable transport plans being put in place for 35k thousand residents. What is the strategic value of the project? There seems to be no evidence in the consultation about looking at the local and wider economic uses of it. I am opposed to the opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C51	11/04/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 39 As a resident of Somerton, I wish to register my strong objection to the above application. My principal concerns are set out below. 1. Traffic and Highway Safety Somerton is a small, tranquil rural village covering approximately 800 hectares, with around 305 residents. Traffic levels on our narrow B-roads now average over 1,000 vehicle movements per day — a sharp increase from 300–400 only a few years ago. This growth stems largely from recent nearby developments such as Soho Farmhouse and Heyford Park. Our roads are rural in nature, lacking pavements and therefore unsafe for pedestrians. Several properties have blind exits, and vehicles entering or exiting Water Street must cross a singletrack, weight-restricted (10-tonne) ancient bridge. The M40 Junctions 9 and 10 are already operating beyond capacity, particularly at peak time as are the adjoining A34 and A43 dual carriageways. When fully operational, the OxSRFI is estimated to generate 4,920 two-way HGV movements per day (331 in the AM peak and 300 in the PM peak) — approximately one million per year. Together with the daily travel of some 9,600 on-site workers, this will produce catastrophic volumes of traffic on the local network. When incidents occur on the M40 or A34 — as they frequently do — Somerton becomes a diversion route for significant traffic, including HGVs that struggle on our narrow, winding roads. This already presents a serious safety risk, compounded by unresolved highways issues such as flooding from the Water Street culvert. Any further increase in traffic would be wholly unsustainable. Previous concerns have been raised that the OxSRFI is highly dependent on road traffic, undermining objectives for travel reduction and sustainable transport. Given the project’s heavy reliance on road access and complex highway works, there is a clear risk that it will exacerbate congestion, noise, and pollution, rather than deliver the benefits claimed. 2. Cumulative Impact and Flawed Planning The proposed development must not be considered in isolation. Several other large projects are planned within a 2–3-mile radius of Somerton, including: • Albion Land and Tritax Warehouses – approx. 600,000 HGV movements annually near M40 J9–10 • Heyford Park Expansion – 9,000–13,000 new homes and a proposed new town • Puy du Fou Theme Park – projected 1.47 million annual visitors over 176 operating days Each of these raises significant environmental and infrastructure concerns. Collectively, they represent a profound transformation of the local landscape, transport networks, and rural communities. Yet there is no evidence of a coordinated, strategic assessment of these cumulative effects. Overlapping construction phases across multiple large-scale projects would bring years of disruption — heavy construction traffic, noise, dust, and road closures — which our rural infrastructure simply cannot absorb. A judicial review is therefore warranted if cumulative impacts have not been properly assessed within the planning process. 3. Environmental, Landscape, and Amenity Impacts The development would transform farmland and open countryside, causing major visual intrusion, loss of agricultural land, and a permanent change to the rural character of the area.The Souldern Viaduct provides a valued historic and visual feature across the Cherwell Valley, visible from several aspects in Somerton. Like many older railway structures, it was not designed to accommodate modern freight volumes or axle weights. I am concerned that it may require significant upgrades to maintain safety under increased loads, with potential impacts on train scheduling, speed, and safety. The project will inevitably increase noise, light pollution, and air quality impacts, especially given its 24-hour operation. The Stage 1 consultation already acknowledged that “noise, light, and other pollution are very likely to increase very significantly.” The site lies near areas of archaeological and geological importance, such as the “Dinosaur Highway” near Ardley Quarry, which could be compromised. It remains unclear whether the proposed biodiversity net gain will genuinely offset the extensive ecological losses. Somerton’s interconnected habitats are fragile, and their disruption threatens long-term biodiversity resilience. 4. Questionable Justification and Strategic Need While shifting freight from road to rail is an important national objective, there is insufficient evidence that this specific site offers the most suitable or necessary location. The claimed demand, freight volumes, and traffic models have not been convincingly demonstrated. Without a robust strategic justification, the significant adverse local impacts cannot be justified in the public interest. The rail line that is adjacent to the proposed development is not structured to carry freight and is operating at capacity. This development would not be a rail freight interchange, merely another warehouse and distribution centre. 5. Employment and Economic Considerations The unemployment rate in Cherwell stands at 2.7%, well below the national average of 4.7% — around 2,200 people. The OxSRFI proposes to create approximately 9,600 on-site jobs, in addition to other competing developments in the area. To achieve genuine “levelling up,” such employment-intensive developments would be better located in areas of higher unemployment, where they would provide meaningful local benefit rather than exacerbate labour shortages and housing pressures in rural Oxfordshire. 6. Mitigation and Conclusion I consider this application premature and unsustainable. At a minimum, no approval should be granted unless: • Legally enforceable guarantees that the site will operate as a genuine Rail Freight interchange, with any rail development preceding any building and road construction • A Judicial Review is undertaken. • A Cumulative Impact Board is established to coordinate assessment and mitigation of the four major developments within this small area. For Somerton specifically, this must include: • Effective traffic management measures, including consideration of a Somerton bypass. • Flooding and drainage issues fully addressed. • Demonstrable provision of an adequate community infrastructure. • A comprehensive, independent cumulative impact assessment. Without these safeguards, the proposal conflicts with both local and national planning policies. 7. Final Position For the reasons outlined above, I object to the OxSRFI proposal. I respectfully request that the Development Consent Order (DCO) be refused in its current form, or that any approval be subject to stringent conditions relating to highways capacity, operational limits, environmental safeguards, and a full review of alternative sites. Please ensure this objection is formally recorded and fully considered by the Inspectorate.
				Traffic on Somerton Road from Ardley is very lightly trafficked and the eastbound increase during the morning peak of 35 passenger cars and the westbound increase of 17 passenger cars (all light vehicle trips) would not be a severe impact. In addition, the HGV Routing Strategy which is an appendix to the Transport Assessment (ES Appendix 3.1) includes the additional ANPR camera on the B430 south of Ardley Roundabout which is part of the mitigation strategy to ensure that OxSRFI HGV traffic will not use Ardley Road. The complementary 7.5T environmental weight restriction (except for access) also extends to include the full length of Ardley Road and hence should also assist in deterring non OxSRFI HGV traffic from using the road. Further mitigation for Somerton is therefore not required. In general, significant improvements are propsoed at M40 J10 to improve capacity and help address some of the existing issues and challenges.The proposed highways works will also help ensure the redistribution (reassignment) of traffic from local roads to the strategic highways network, helping reduce traffic effects (congestion and other) in village centres, including Ardley where the closure of the B430 south of the Chiltern Main Line will reduce noise and air pollution impacts in the village. Key elements of the road infrastructure - such as the Ardley Bypass and some of the M40 J10 works - are being delivered in the first phase of highways works to help minimise impacts during the construction process. The submitted Framework Travel Plan (ES Appendix 3.2) sets out targets which have been agreed with OCC to reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle trips from a baseline of 92% to 68% by year 5, which would represent a notable modal shift of 26% towards more sustainable transport modes (including care share (20%), public transport (8%) and walking/cycling (4%)). A cumulative effects assessments is included as part of the ES (Chapter 16). The assessment includes a range of developments in the vicinity of the Main Site which include the employment proposals by Albion Land and Tritax at M40 J10, as well as a proportionate assessment of effects with the recent (as yet undetermined) Heyford Park proposals (the 9,000 homes New Town proposals) and the Puy du Fou leisure application (see ES Chapter 1 (Introduction)). The loss of agricultural land proposed as part of the development is acknowledged, however it should be noted that less than 35% of land on site grade 3a with over 65% grade 3b or other land. There are no technical or market related concerns with providing the rail freight connectivity required to serve the OxSRFI scheme. The opportunity to deliver a viable terminal is underpinned by the confidence of GBRailfreight (GBRF) who are the second largest freight operator in the UK and plan to operate the terminal - they have no concerns about W8 nor the suitability of the Chiltern Main Line or its location. The ES submitted with the DCO assesses the impacts and likely residual effects from the OxSRFI scheme - there are no significant adverse effects in terms of air or light pollution from the proposed development. In terms of noise, the only significant effects relate to existing offices on the B430 (Ardley Fields Farm Cottages).. No other likely significant effects are set out from the proposed development in terms of noise. The scheme will deliver significant economic benefits in terms of job opportunities and training throuhg a DCO requirement for an employment scheme. ES Chapter 12 (Socio-Economics) sets out that approximately 60% of employees are anticipated to come from Cherwell. In terms of the trackways - there are areas of the Main Site where the excavations will go down into / through the Shipton Member which is the lower portion of the White Limestone Formation, is more abundant in fossils and is the formation in which it is understood that dinosaur footprints have been encountered. Proposals are included in ES Chapter 11 (Ground) to have a watching brief by a palaeontologist during excavations through this formation. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London.

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C52	11/04/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 40	Please see below comments that need to be addressed. The proposal covers over 600,000 m² of warehousing plus rail and road infrastructure, transforming a largely rural area into an industrial logistics hub. The scale of this industrial site is out of proportion to the what the local area can support. The landscape, character, and tranquillity of villages such as Somerton, Fritwell, Middleton Stoney, Ardley, and Bucknell would change permanently. The locals road simply can not take any more traffic. It is already at a maximum. The visual impact of vast buildings up to 25 m high cannot be fully mitigated by the current bunding or tree planting plan. This needs to be better thought out or buildings to be reduced in size. The project relies heavily on road transport for both construction and operation. The applicant’s own modelling forecasts hundreds of HGV movements during peak hours and thousands of daily car trips. The M40 Junction 10 and local B-roads (e.g., B430, B4030) are already under pressure and prone to congestion and safety incidents. Especially given the Puy De Fou application and Heyford Park. Proposed highway works (Ardley Bypass, Middleton Stoney Relief Road, and J10 upgrades) would cause years of construction disruption, and it remains uncertain whether they will effectively mitigate long-term impacts. The Transport Assessment does not convincingly demonstrate that existing infrastructure can accommodate the increase in freight and commuter traffic. The road network around M40 J10 is already at or near capacity, and the proposal would create severe, long-term congestion and safety risks that are not adequately mitigated. The Chiltern Main Line has limited capacity for additional freight paths, raising doubts about whether promised modal shift benefits are deliverable. Without strong assurance of rail utilisation, the project risks functioning mainly as a road-based logistics park, defeating its stated sustainability purpose. Night-time lighting, noise, and vibration from 24/7 operations would permanently alter the rural environment. The inadequate plans to create a barrier to absorb the noise and light between the surrounding areas. The applicant has not published a convincing “need case” demonstrating why this site, in this location, is essential. The OxSRFI project adds to existing and planned developments around Bicester, Upper Heyford, and along the A43/M40 corridor, compounding pressures on transport, landscape, and public services. There is no clear long-term management strategy for noise, lighting, or landscape maintenance once operational.	The proposed earthworks and landscaping and planting scheme will help to reduce visual impacts on receptors in the vicinity of the Main Site. Some adverse impacts are however acknowledged within ES Chapter 7 (LVIA). It should be noted that an area of the Main Site, towards south-west, has reduced some building heights following comments received during the Stage 2 consultation. Significant improvements are propsoed at M40 J10 to improve capacity and help address some of the existing issues and challenges.The proposed highways works will also help ensure the redistribution (reassingment) of traffic from local roads to the strategic highways network, helping reduce traffic effects (congestion and other) in village centres, including Ardley where the closure of the B430 south of the Chiltern Main Line will reduce noise and air pollution impacts in the village. Key elements of the road infrastructure - such as the Ardley Bypass and some of the M40 J10 works - are being delivered in the first phase of highways works to help minimise impacts during the construction process. Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. A cumulative effects assessments is included as part of the ES (Chapter 16). The assessment includes a range of developments in the vicinity of the Main Site which include the employment proposals by Albion Land and Tritax at M40 J10, as well as a proportionate assessment of effects with the recent (as yet undetermined) Heyford Park proposals (the 9,000 homes New Town proposals) and the Puy du Fou leisure application (see ES Chapter 1 (Introduction)). The ES submitted with the DCO assesses the impacts and likely residual effects from the OxSRFI scheme - there are no significant adverse effects in terms of air or light pollution from the proposed development. In terms of noise, the only significant effects relate to existing offices on the B430 (Ardley Fields Farm Cottages). No other likely significant effects are set out from the proposed development in terms of noise. A suite of Rail related reports form part of the submitted application (see Document series 7.2). Evidence submitted as part of the applicatoin confirms that at least four round trip daily freight paths can be provided which confirms the key requirement of the NPS is satisfied, but further paths are considered to exist and work will continue with Network Rail including post any DCO consent - the timeable is often adapted and evolves, and so pathing is not static of fixed. There are no technical or market related concerns with providing the rail freight connectivity required to serve OxSRFI. The DCO requirements set out the further detail to be approved by the relevant authority during the detailed stage of design, and this also covers noise, lighting, or landscape maintenance.	
-----	------------	--	----------	-----------------------------	---	--	--

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C53	11/04/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 41	I am emailing you to respond to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: · The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. · The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. · The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. · The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. · Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. · Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I am opposed to the opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	In terms of the relationship between the OxSRFI and Heyford Park, the Applicant can highlight the following points: - Heritage - The Applicant has been in dialogue with Historic England (and CDC conservation officers) regarding the relationship between OxSRFI and the heritage assets on the former Upper Heyford Airfield (an important example of a Cold War airbase in Europe) . As a result of this dialogue, the Applicant has adapted some of the proposed mitigation in direct response to the preferences and advice of these consultees to ensure minimised, 'less than substantial' harm to any heritage assets or their setting. - Amenity and visual impacts - as part of direct dialogue by the Applicant with Dorchester Living, changes were made to help minimise any likely residual adverse effects. Since the Stage 2 consultation the proposed development parameters (as set out on the Parameters Plan, Document 2.5) have been amended on the south-western corner of the OxSRFI Main Site adjacent to both existing consented, and potential future phases of development within Heyford Park. Specifically, changes were made to increase the bund heights and widths, with the maximum building heights also reduced in this part of the Proposed Development. - Landscaping and ecology - the proposals include substantial green infrastructure and landsaping (which account for almost 60% of the total site area) and which includes significant earthworks mounds around the Main Site which help to minimise adverse visual and landscape effects. The OxSRFI scheme also includes new habitats and measures for protected species, and will deliver over 10% BNG. The loss to farmland is however acknowledged. - Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. - Cumulative impacts - ES Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) includes a consideration not only of the approved 'committed' developments, but in light of dialogue with consultees, also consider potential future (but currently not confirmed or approved) schemes including Heyford Park. It is anticipated that other live applications, including Heyford Park, will similarly be asked to provide an appropriate consideration and assessment of cumulative effects with other known or potential major schemes.	Yes - further to dialogue with Dorchester Living, amendments to the south-western parcel of the scheme saw increased bunding and reduced building heights
C54	11/04/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 42	I am opposed to the building of the freight terminal so close to the village. It will impact on so many people with noise and light pollution and vibration. It will be bringing a town environment out to the village where people have chosen not to live in a town. There will be a massive increase of traffic, mainly large vehicles on the roads using the warehouses.	Significant improvements are propsoed at M40 J10 to improve capacity and help address some of the existing issues and challenges.The proposed highways works will also help ensure the redistribution (reassignment) of traffic from local roads to the strategic highways network, helping reduce traffic effects (congestion and other) in village centres, including Ardley where the closure of the B430 south of the Chiltern Main Line will reduce noise and air pollution impacts in the village. Key elements of the road infrastructure - such as the Ardley Bypass and some of the M40 J10 works - are being delivered in the first phase of highways works to help minimise impacts during the construction process. The ES submitted with the DCO assesses the impacts and likely residual effects from the OxSRFI scheme - there are no significant adverse effects in terms of air or light pollution from the proposed development. In terms of noise, the only significant effects relate to existing offices on the B430 (Ardley Fields Farm Cottages). No other likely significant effects are set out from the proposed development in terms of noise. A suite of Rail related reports form part	
Consulation Closed							

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

C55	11/07/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 43	I should like to express my considerable objection to the proposed plan to create a ‘Rail Freight’ warehousing complex in Ardley, adjacent to Heyford Park. For a start, I believe it is on the wrong railway line. Most freight rail traffic must surely need to go from the ports in the south, to the north. This proposal is on an east-west rail line. The rise in level from where the trains would need to branch off, going north, would be too great to allow a link around the west of Bicester. Consequently, trains would need to join the Chiltern line (a very important and busy community service), and travel as far as Princes Risborough before they can reverse back to Ardley. That would effectively block the Chiltern line for at least an hour for every train. I even wonder whether the application to have a rail freight depot, because it sounds ecologically appealing, is never the ultimate intention, and instead it is envisaged all the traffic will ultimately be by road! A considerable number of massive development projects in this area have recently been submitted. They will all interact disastrously, making massive demands on the infrastructure, especially the roads. The chaos that that could create over the next 5-10 years doesn’t bear thinking about and will cost billions. Already the roads around the motorway junction at Ardley are at over-capacity -only a couple of weeks ago there was a virtually stationery tailback of cars from Ardley to Middleton Stoney, stretching south beyond the Heyford Park turning. If the Heyford Park housing plans were to go ahead, one of the sensible proposals would be to have a community station at Ardley, which might help to mitigate some of the otherwise inevitable utterly disastrous road problems that will ensue with that development. I believe, this Rail Freight proposal would seriously compromise that. The number of traffic movements per day that this proposal could account for (including staff and lorry movements) would have a devastating impact on the local roads, especially to the west, where there are only two bridges over the river Cherwell and Oxford Canal (one in Lower Heyford, next to Rousham House, and a smaller one in Somerton). Anyone wanting to get to Ardley from the west, would need to cross these one of these very inadequate bridges. In short, I think this would not be in the right place for its intended purpose and I do not believe the infrastructures (including those that have been proposed) can cope with it.	Significant improvements are propsoed at M40 J10 to improve capacity and help address some of the existing issues and challenges.The proposed highways works will also help ensure the redistribution (reassingment) of traffic from local roads to the strategic highways network, helping reduce traffic effects (congestion and other) in village centres, including Ardley where the closure of the B430 south of the Chiltern Main Line will reduce noise and air pollution impacts in the village. Key elements of the road infrastructure - such as the Ardley Bypass and some of the M40 J10 works - are being delivered in the first phase of highways works to help minimise impacts during the construction process. Construction impacts - these will be managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3) which sets out best practice measures to minimise effects on local residents and other receptors. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London. A cumulative effects assessments is included as part of the ES (Chapter 16). The assessment includes a range of developments in the vicinity of the Main Site which include the employment proposals by Albion Land and Tritax at M40 J10, as well as a proportionate assessment of effects with the recent (as yet undetermined) Heyford Park proposals (the 9,000 homes New Town proposals) and the Puy du Fou leisure application (see ES Chapter 1 (Introduction)). A suite of Rail related reports form part of the submitted application (see Document series 7.2). Evidence submitted as part of the applicatoin confirms that at least four round trip daily freight paths can be provided which confirms the key requirement of the NPS is satisfied, but further paths are considered to exist and work will continue with Network Rail including post any DCO consent - the timeable is often adapted and evolves, and so pathing is not static of fixed. There are no technical or market related concerns with providing the rail freight connectivity required to serve OxSRFI.	
C56	11/09/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 44	OxSRFI Development Objection I am writing as a resident to express my strong opposition to the proposed Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (OxSRFI). This objection is based on multiple concerns related to infrastructure, environmental impact, planning integrity, and community wellbeing. 1. Combined Impact of Nearby Projects This proposal is not aligned with either the Cherwell Local Plan or the Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan. It represents an excessive addition to an already disproportionate level of development in the Cherwell district and in particular to the West and North West of Bicester. The level of development is much higher than almost all other areas of the country, posing serious risks to the character, infrastructure, communities, and ecological balance of the surrounding rural area. The OxSRFI proposal must be evaluated alongside other major developments in close proximity: - Albion Land and Tritax Warehouses – approx. 600,000 annual HGV movements - Heyford Park Expansion – 9,000–13,000 new homes - Puy du Fou Theme Park – 1.47 million annual visitors These projects collectively represent a dramatic transformation of the local area. Yet, there is no evidence of a coordinated strategy to assess their cumulative impact. These developments are within a small radius of each other, and along with all the other housing projects in the local area are not collectively sustainable for the local communities, transport infrastructure, rural landscape, and local ecosystems. Such concentrated urbanisation contradicts national commitments to net-zero emissions, biodiversity protection, and sustainable rural development. The development in the broader area is also significant, including in and around Bicester and the loss of greenbelt land North of Oxford. Overlapping construction phases will result in years of disruption, including noise, dust, traffic congestion, and road closures. Our rural infrastructure cannot absorb this level of disturbance. A judicial review is warranted if these cumulative effects have not been properly considered. 2. Infrastructure Strain and Road Safety Somerton (as with many villages in the area) is a peaceful rural village with approximately 305 residents spread across 800 hectares. Our narrow B-roads, which were not designed for high traffic volumes, now experience	Traffic on Somerton Road from Ardley is very lightly trafficked and the eastbound increase during the morning peak of 35 passenger cars and the westbound increase of 17 passenger cars (all light vehicle trips) would not be a severe impact. In addition, the HGV Routing Strategy which is an appendix to the Transport Assessment (ES Appendix 3.1) includes the additional ANPR camera on the B430 south of Ardley Roundabout which is part of the mitigation strategy to ensure that OxSRFI HGV traffic will not use Ardley Road. The complementary 7.5T environmental weight restriction (except for access) also extends to include the full length of Ardley Road and hence should also assist in deterring non OxSRFI HGV traffic from using the road. Further mitigation for Somerton is therefore not required. In general, significant improvements are propsoed at M40 J10 to improve capacity and help address some of the existing issues and challenges.The proposed highways works will also help ensure the redistribution (reassingment) of traffic from local roads to the strategic highways network, helping reduce traffic effects (congestion and other) in village centres, including Ardley where the closure of the B430 south of the Chiltern Main Line will reduce noise and air pollution impacts in the village. Key elements of the road infrastructure - such as the Ardley Bypass and some of the M40 J10 works - are being delivered in the first phase of highways works to help minimise impacts during the construction process. The submitted Framework Travel Plan (ES Appendix 3.2) sets out targets which have been agreed with OCC to reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle trips from a baseline of 92% to 68% by year 5, which would represent a notable modal shift of 26% towards more sustainable transport modes (including care share (20%), public transport (8%) and walking/cycling (4%)). A cumulative effects assessments is included as part of the ES (Chapter 16). The assessment includes a range of developments in the vicinity of the Main Site which include the employment proposals by Albion Land and Tritax at M40 J10, as well as a proportionate assessment of effects with the recent (as yet undetermined) Heyford Park proposals (the 9,000 homes New Town proposals) and the Puy du Fou leisure application (see ES Chapter 1 (Introduction)). The loss of agricultural land proposed as part of the development is acknowledged, however it should	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

					over 1,000 vehicle movements daily — a stark rise from previous levels of 300–400. This surge is largely due to nearby developments such as Soho Farmhouse and Heyford Park. The absence of pavements makes walking hazardous, and several homes have blind driveways. Water Street requires crossing a single-lane, weight-restricted bridge that is unsuitable for heavy traffic. Junctions 9 and 10 of the M40, along with the A34 and A43, are already congested, especially during peak hours. The OxSRFI is projected to bring 4,920 daily HGV movements and 9,600 commuting workers, creating overwhelming traffic volumes. Somerton often becomes a diversion route during incidents on major roads, further endangering residents. The reliance on road transport contradicts sustainability goals and will likely worsen congestion and pollution. 3. Environmental and Visual Degradation The development would replace open countryside and farmland with industrial facilities, causing significant visual disruption and permanent loss of agricultural land. The Souldern Viaduct, a historic structure visible from Somerton, may require upgrades to accommodate increased freight loads, potentially affecting train safety and operations. The 24-hour nature of the site will increase noise, light pollution, and air quality issues. The initial consultation acknowledged that these impacts are likely to rise substantially. The site is near areas of archaeological and geological interest, including the “Dinosaur Highway” near Ardley Quarry. The proposed biodiversity net gain does not convincingly offset the ecological damage anticipated. 4. Lack of Strategic Justification While the goal of shifting freight from road to rail is commendable, there is insufficient evidence that this site is the most appropriate choice. The projected demand and traffic models lack transparency and robustness. 5. Employment and Local Economic Effects Cherwell’s unemployment rate is 2.7%, well below the national average. The OxSRFI proposes 9,600 jobs, which may strain local housing and labour resources. Government reports show that healthcare services in the area are already under pressure. Previous promises for infrastructure improvements at Heyford Park—such as a new road and health centre—remain unfulfilled (and should be followed up), raising doubts about the delivery of future commitments. The population increase would place further strain on hospitals, emergency services, and essential utilities like water, sewage, and electricity, for which no expansion plans have been clearly outlined. Such employment-intensive developments would be better placed in regions with higher unemployment, where they could offer meaningful economic benefits without overburdening rural communities. 6. Required Conditions This proposal is premature and unsustainable. Approval should be withheld unless: - A Judicial Review is conducted. - A Cumulative Impact Board is formed to oversee all major developments in the area.	be noted that less than 35% of land on site grade 3a with over 65% grade 3b or other land. There are no technical or market related concerns with providing the rail freight connectivity required to serve the OxSRFI scheme. The opportunity to deliver a viable terminal is underpinned by the confidence of GBRailfreight (GBRF) who are the second largest freight operator in the UK and plan to operate the terminal - they have no concerns about W8 nor the suitability of the Chiltern Main Line or its location. The ES submitted with the DCO assesses the impacts and likely residual effects from the OxSRFI scheme - there are no significant adverse effects in terms of air or light pollution from the proposed development. In terms of noise, the only significant effects relate to existing offices on the B430 (Ardley Fields Farm Cottages). No other likely significant effects are set out from the proposed development in terms of noise. The scheme will deliver significant economic benefits in terms of job opportunities and training through a DCO requirement for an employment scheme. ES Chapter 12 (Socio-Economics) sets out that approximately 60% of employees are anticipated to come from Cherwell. In terms of the trackways - there are areas of the Main Site where the excavations will go down into / through the Shipton Member which is the lower portion of the White Limestone Formation, is more abundant in fossils and is the formation in which it is understood that dinosaur footprints have been encountered. Proposals are included in ES Chapter 11 (Ground) to have a watching brief by a palaeontologist during excavations through this formation. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London.
C57	11/09/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 45	Objection to the OxSRFI Proposal I, Kate Sykes, wish to formally object to the proposed Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (OxSRFI). My concerns span multiple areas including infrastructure strain, environmental degradation, and lack of strategic justification. A. Overlapping Developments and Planning Oversight The OxSRFI must be not be evaluated in isolation, but in the context of other major developments within a 5 mile radius, which would significantly transform the area; urbanizing a large proportion of countryside, exacerbating existing traffic and flooding issues, destroying habitats and biodiversity and irreversibly eroding the rural character of the area. - Albion Land and Tritax Warehouses – approx. 600,000 annual HGV movements - Heyford Park Expansion – 9,000–13,000 new homes - Puy du Fou Theme Park – 1.47 million annual visitors Together, these projects represent a massive transformation of the local area. Yet, there is no evidence of a coordinated strategy to assess their combined impact. The overlapping construction timelines will bring years of disruption, including traffic congestion, noise, dust, and road closures. Our rural infrastructure is ill-equipped to handle this. A judicial review is necessary if cumulative impacts have not been properly considered. B. Environmental and Heritage Concerns The proposed development would drastically alter the rural landscape, replacing farmland and open countryside with industrial infrastructure. This change would result in significant visual intrusion and the loss of agricultural land. The Souldern Viaduct, a historic landmark visible from Somerton, may require structural upgrades to handle increased freight loads, potentially affecting train operations and safety. Continuous 24-hour operations will elevate noise levels, light pollution, and air quality issues. The initial consultation already acknowledged that these impacts are likely to increase substantially.	Traffic on Somerton Road from Ardley is very lightly trafficked and the eastbound increase during the morning peak of 35 passenger cars and the westbound increase of 17 passenger cars (all light vehicle trips) would not be a severe impact. In addition, the HGV Routing Strategy which is an appendix to the Transport Assessment (ES Appendix 3.1) includes the additional ANPR camera on the B430 south of Ardley Roundabout which is part of the mitigation strategy to ensure that OxSRFI HGV traffic will not use Ardley Road. The complementary 7.5T environmental weight restriction (except for access) also extends to include the full length of Ardley Road and hence should also assist in deterring non OxSRFI HGV traffic from using the road. Further mitigation for Somerton is therefore not required. In general, significant improvements are propsoed at M40 J10 to improve capacity and help address some of the existing issues and challenges.The proposed highways works will also help ensure the redistribution (reassignment) of traffic from local roads to the strategic highways network, helping reduce traffic effects (congestion and other) in village centres, including Ardley where the closure of the B430 south of the Chiltern Main Line will reduce noise and air pollution impacts in the village. Key elements of the road infrastructure - such as the Ardley Bypass and some of the M40 J10 works - are being delivered in the first phase of highways works to help minimise impacts during the construction process. The submitted Framework Travel Plan (ES Appendix 3.2) sets out targets which have been agreed with OCC to reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle trips from a baseline of 92% to 68% by year 5, which would represent a notable modal shift of 26% towards more sustainable transport modes (including care share (20%), public transport (8%) and walking/cycling (4%)). A cumulative effects assessments is included as part of the ES (Chapter 16). The assessment includes a range of developments in the vicinity of the Main Site which include the employment proposals by Albion Land and Tritax at M40 J10, as well as a proportionate assessment of effects with the recent (as yet undetermined) Heyford Park proposals (the 9,000 homes New Town proposals) and the Puy du Fou

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

					Additionally, the site is close to areas of archaeological and geological significance, such as the “Dinosaur Highway” near Ardley Quarry. The proposed biodiversity net gain does not convincingly offset the ecological damage anticipated. C. Transport Infrastructure and Safety Risks Somerton’s narrow B-roads, originally built for light rural traffic, now see over 1,000 vehicle movements daily — a sharp rise from 300–400 just a few years ago. This increase is largely due to nearby developments. The roads lack pedestrian pavements, and several properties have blind exits. Water Street involves crossing a single-track, weight-restricted bridge. Junctions 9 and 10 of the M40, along with the A34 and A43, are already overburdened. The OxSRFI is expected to generate 4,920 daily HGV movements and accommodate 9,600 workers, creating unsustainable traffic volumes. Somerton often becomes a diversion route during incidents on major roads, compounding safety risks. The project’s reliance on road transport contradicts sustainability goals and threatens to worsen congestion and pollution. D. Strategic Justification and Site Suitability While shifting freight from road to rail is a commendable goal, there is insufficient evidence that this site is the optimal choice. The projected demand and traffic models lack clarity and robustness. E. Economic and Employment Implications Cherwell’s unemployment rate is 2.7%, well below the national average. The OxSRFI proposes 9,600 jobs, which may strain local housing and labour resources. Such employment-intensive developments would be better placed in regions with higher unemployment, where they could offer meaningful economic benefits without overburdening rural communities. In summary, approval should be withheld unless a Judicial Review is conducted and a Cumulative Impact Board is formed to oversee all major developments in the area.	leisure application (see ES Chapter 1 (Introduction)). The loss of agricultural land proposed as part of the development is acknowledged, however it should be noted that less than 35% of land on site grade 3a with over 65% grade 3b or other land. There are no technical or market related concerns with providing the rail freight connectivity required to serve the OxSRFI scheme. The opportunity to deliver a viable terminal is underpinned by the confidence of GBRailfreight (GBRF) who are the second largest freight operator in the UK and plan to operate the terminal - they have no concerns about W8 nor the suitability of the Chiltern Main Line or its location. The ES submitted with the DCO assesses the impacts and likely residual effects from the OxSRFI scheme - there are no significant adverse effects in terms of air or light pollution from the proposed development. In terms of noise, the only significant effects relate to existing offices on the B430 (Ardley Fields Farm Cottages). No other likely significant effects are set out from the proposed development in terms of noise. The scheme will deliver significant economic benefits in terms of job opportunities and training through a DCO requirement for an employment scheme. ES Chapter 12 (Socio-Economics) sets out that approximately 60% of employees are anticipated to come from Cherwell. In terms of the trackways - there are areas of the Main Site where the excavations will go down into / through the Shipton Member which is the lower portion of the White Limestone Formation, is more abundant in fossils and is the formation in which it is understood that dinosaur footprints have been encountered. Proposals are included in ES Chapter 11 (Ground) to have a watching brief by a palaeontologist during excavations through this formation. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London.	
C58	11/10/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 46	I wish to register my strong objections to the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (OxSRFI) Application. My main concerns are set out below: 1. Traffic and Highway Safety Somerton is a small, rural village covering approximately 800 hectares, with around 305 residents. Traffic levels on our narrow B-roads now average over 1,000 vehicle movements per day — a sharp increase from 300–400 only a few years ago. This growth stems largely from recent nearby developments such as Soho Farmhouse and Heyford Park. Our roads are rural in nature, lacking pavements and therefore unsafe for pedestrians. Several properties have blind exits, and vehicles entering or exiting Water Street must cross a single-track, weight-restricted (10-tonne) ancient bridge. The M40 Junctions 9 and 10 are already operating beyond capacity, particularly at peak time as are the adjoining A34 and A43 dual carriageways. When fully operational, the OxSRFI is estimated to generate 4,920 two-way HGV movements per day (331 in the AM peak and 300 in the PM peak) — approximately one million per year. Together with the daily travel of some 9,600 on-site workers, this will produce catastrophic volumes of traffic on the local network. When incidents occur on the M40 or A34 — as they frequently do — Somerton becomes a diversion route for significant traffic, including HGVs that struggle on our narrow, winding roads. This already presents a serious safety risk, compounded by unresolved highways issues such as flooding from the Water Street culvert. Any further increase in traffic would be wholly unsustainable. Previous concerns have been raised that the OxSRFI is highly dependent on road traffic, undermining objectives for travel reduction and sustainable transport. Given the project’s heavy reliance on road access and complex highway works, there is a clear risk that it will exacerbate congestion, noise, and pollution, rather than deliver the benefits claimed. 2. Cumulative Impact and Flawed Planning The proposed development must not be considered in isolation. Several other large projects are planned within a 2–3-mile radius of Somerton, including: Albion Land and Tritax Warehouses – approx. 600,000 HGV movements annually near M40 J9–10 Heyford Park Expansion – 9,000–13,000 new homes and a proposed new town Puy du Fou Theme Park – projected 1.47 million annual visitors over 176 operating days Each of these raises significant environmental and infrastructure concerns. Collectively, they represent a profound transformation of the local landscape, transport networks, and rural communities. Yet there is no evidence of a coordinated, strategic assessment of these cumulative effects. Overlapping construction phases across multiple large-scale projects would bring years of disruption — heavy construction traffic, noise, dust, and road closures — which our rural infrastructure simply cannot absorb. A judicial review is therefore warranted if cumulative impacts have not been properly assessed within the planning process. 3. Environmental, Landscape, and Amenity Impacts The development would transform farmland and open countryside, causing major visual intrusion, loss of agricultural land, and a permanent change to the rural character of the area.	Traffic on Somerton Road from Ardley is very lightly trafficked and the eastbound increase during the morning peak of 35 passenger cars and the westbound increase of 17 passenger cars (all light vehicle trips) would not be a severe impact. In addition, the HGV Routing Strategy which is an appendix to the Transport Assessment (ES Appendix 3.1) includes the additional ANPR camera on the B430 south of Ardley Roundabout which is part of the mitigation strategy to ensure that OxSRFI HGV traffic will not use Ardley Road. The complementary 7.5T environmental weight restriction (except for access) also extends to include the full length of Ardley Road and hence should also assist in deterring non OxSRFI HGV traffic from using the road. Further mitigation for Somerton is therefore not required. In general, significant improvements are proposed at M40 J10 to improve capacity and help address some of the existing issues and challenges. The proposed highways works will also help ensure the redistribution (reassignment) of traffic from local roads to the strategic highways network, helping reduce traffic effects (congestion and other) in village centres, including Ardley where the closure of the B430 south of the Chiltern Main Line will reduce noise and air pollution impacts in the village. Key elements of the road infrastructure - such as the Ardley Bypass and some of the M40 J10 works - are being delivered in the first phase of highways works to help minimise impacts during the construction process. The submitted Framework Travel Plan (ES Appendix 3.2) sets out targets which have been agreed with OCC to reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle trips from a baseline of 92% to 68% by year 5, which would represent a notable modal shift of 26% towards more sustainable transport modes (including care share (20%), public transport (8%) and walking/cycling (4%)). A cumulative effects assessments is included as part of the ES (Chapter 16). The assessment includes a range of developments in the vicinity of the Main Site which include the employment proposals by Albion Land and Tritax at M40 J10, as well as a proportionate assessment of effects with the recent (as yet undetermined) Heyford Park proposals (the 9,000 homes New Town proposals) and the Puy du Fou leisure application (see ES Chapter 1 (Introduction)). The loss of agricultural land proposed as part of the development is acknowledged, however it should be noted that less than 35% of land on site grade 3a with over 65% grade 3b or other land. There are no technical or market related concerns with providing the rail freight connectivity required to serve the OxSRFI scheme. The opportunity to deliver a viable terminal is underpinned by the confidence of GBRailfreight (GBRF) who are the second largest freight operator in the UK and plan to operate the terminal - they have no concerns about W8 nor the suitability of the Chiltern Main Line or its location. The ES submitted with the DCO assesses the impacts and likely residual effects from the OxSRFI scheme - there are no significant adverse effects in terms of air or light pollution from the proposed development. In terms of noise, the only significant effects relate to existing offices on the B430 (Ardley Fields Farm Cottages).. No other likely significant effects are set out from the proposed development in terms of noise. The scheme will deliver significant economic benefits in terms of job opportunities and training through a DCO requirement for an employment scheme. ES Chapter 12 (Socio-Economics) sets out	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

					The Souldern Viaduct provides a valued historic and visual feature across the Cherwell Valley, visible from several aspects in Somerton. Like many older railway structures, it was not designed to accommodate modern freight volumes or axle weights. We are concerned that it may require significant upgrades to maintain safety under increased loads, with potential impacts on train scheduling, speed, and safety. The project will inevitably increase noise, light pollution, and air quality impacts, especially given its 24-hour operation. The Stage 1 consultation already acknowledged that “noise, light, and other pollution are very likely to increase very significantly.” The site lies near areas of archaeological and geological importance, such as the “Dinosaur Highway” near Ardley Quarry, which could be compromised. It remains unclear whether the proposed biodiversity net gain will genuinely offset the extensive ecological losses. Somerton’s interconnected habitats are fragile, and their disruption threatens long-term biodiversity resilience. 4. Questionable Justification and Strategic Need While shifting freight from road to rail is an important national objective, there is insufficient evidence that this specific site offers the most suitable or necessary location. The claimed demand, freight volumes, and traffic models have not been convincingly demonstrated. Without a robust strategic justification, the significant adverse local impacts cannot be justified in the public interest. 5. Employment and Economic Considerations The unemployment rate in Cherwell stands at 2.7%, well below the national average of 4.7% — around 2,200 people. The OxSRFI proposes to create approximately 9,600 on-site jobs, in addition to other competing developments in the area. To achieve genuine “levelling up,” such employment-intensive developments would be better located in areas of higher unemployment, where they would provide meaningful local benefit rather than exacerbate labour shortages and housing pressures in rural Oxfordshire. 6. Mitigation and Conclusion Somerton Parish Council considers this application premature and unsustainable. At a minimum, no approval should be granted unless: A Judicial Review is undertaken. A Cumulative Impact Board is established to coordinate assessment and mitigation of the four major developments within this small area. For Somerton specifically, this must include: Effective traffic management measures, including consideration of a Somerton bypass. Flooding and drainage issues fully addressed. Demonstrable provision of an adequate community infrastructure. A comprehensive, independent cumulative impact assessment. Without these safeguards, the proposal conflicts with both local and national planning policies. 7. Final Position For the reasons outlined above, I, along with the Somerton Parish Council, formally object to the OxSRFI proposal. I respectfully request that the Development Consent Order (DCO) be refused in its current form, or that any approval be subject to stringent conditions relating to highways capacity, operational limits, environmental safeguards, and a full review of alternative sites. Please ensure this objection is formally recorded and fully considered by the Inspectorate.	that approximately 60% of employees are anticipated to come from Cherwell. In terms of the trackways - there are areas of the Main Site where the excavations will go down into / through the Shipton Member which is the lower portion of the White Limestone Formation, is more abundant in fossils and is the formation in which it is understood that dinosaur footprints have been encountered. Proposals are included in ES Chapter 11 (Ground) to have a watching brief by a palaeontologist during excavations through this formation. Location and need for OxSRFI - the OxSRFI proposals responds to government policy which identifies a need for additional SRFIs across the country. The location of the OxSRFI scheme meets the requirements for connectivity to freight rail network and strategic highways network - Government Policy (in the National Networks NPS) recognises that the infrastructure connectivity and scale required of SRFIs means they may need to be 'in the countryside'. The OxSRFI will also be the only SRFI currently on the M40 with good access to both Midlands and South-Eastern markets and distribution networks, including an ability to serve parts of London.	
C59	11/10/2025	Richard Gillian	Resident	Comments on the scheme - 47	I agree with the objections raised by Somerton Parish Council. The several large-scale planning applications in the area have a large cumulative impact and should not be considered in isolation.	A cumulative effects assessments is included as part of the ES (Chapter 16). The assessment includes a range of developments in the vicinity of the Main Site which include the employment proposals by Albion Land and Tritax at M40 J10, as well as a proportionate assessment of effects with the recent (as yet undetermined) Heyford Park proposals (the 9,000 homes New Town proposals) and the Puy du Fou leisure application (see ES Chapter 1 (Introduction)).	
C60	11/12/2025		Resident	Comments on the scheme - 48	Objection relating to Ardley station and congestion this scheme would cause due to closure of the B430 narrowing stretch. Fears of congestion as a whole from this scheme and uncertainty on the Middleton Stoney diversion and the proposed bypass around the village. Concern for fly tipping and rubbish deposits, impact of growing villages and nearby development proposals coming forward and also noise and light pollution, time for tree planting to deliver benefits.	The Applicant is aware of local (OCC and other) aspirations for a new Ardley passenger rail Station, and has discussed this with various consultees. A Passenger Rail Station Note is appended to the submitted Planning Statement and sets out how the Proposed Development is compatible with wider aspirations and ambitions for a new passenger station. In general, significant improvements are proposed at M40 J10 to improve capacity and help address some of the existing issues and challenges. The proposed highways works will also help ensure the redistribution (reassignment) of traffic from local roads to the strategic highways network, helping reduce traffic effects (congestion and other) in village centres, including Ardley where the closure of the B430 south of the Chiltern Main Line will reduce noise and air pollution impacts in the village. Key elements of the road infrastructure - such as the Ardley Bypass and some of the M40 J10 works - are being delivered in the first phase of highways works to help minimise impacts during the construction process. The Middleton Stoney Relief Road - the traffic modelling predicts that the impact of MSRR will be to reduce total traffic flows through the centre of Middleton Stoney by 31% with no further highways improvements proposed around the village. Mitigation measures as part of the OxSRFI scheme are proposed to minimise impacts in terms of likely effects on the amenity (noise and light) of receptors.	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

OxSRFI consultation log – comments forms
Date last updated

No.	Date	Name (first & last)	Event/Online	Question 1 (Policy context and explanation)	Question 2 (Highways mitigation at J10)	Question 3 (Sustainable Transport strategy)	Question 4 (changes since Stage 1, incl IVCF removal)	Question 5 (Landscaping and earthworks at site boundary)	Other Comments	Applicant comment in response	Changes to the post Stage 2 consultation relate to the
CF1	01/10/2025	██████	Middleton Stoney - 1	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	Can the noise + vibration survey results be shared? Why were only 2 of the roads at the MS crossroads surveyed.	The full results of the noise and vibration assessment forms part of the submitted application (ES Chapter 5 and Appendices). This assessment had not been concluded at Stage 2 consultation due to the ongoing highways modelling (and so lack of all required data) at that time.	
CF2	01/10/2025	No Name	Middleton Stoney - 2	Middleton Stoney. In the wrong place, it will blight the area.	How many more times has J10 got to be rebuilt since 1990. 3 so far.	Dream on. People will use cars	The village needs a total bypass. Not half a job	All a dream	The risk of flooding to a lower level in Middleton Stoney. 4 houses have been flooded seriously twice in 4 years from water in fields.	Comments noted, including the concerns and scepticism regarding Travel Plan measures, and of the value of the proposed Middleton Stoney Relief Road (MSRR). The likely benefits of these elements of the proposals forms part of the submitted application, including in terms of the approximate 30% traffic reductions in Middleton Stoney (and associated noise and air quality improvements). Flood-risk is assessed in ES Chapter 9 (and appendices) - the drainage works proposed, including use of a range of sustainable drainage measures, will provide some betterment to down-stream areas with reduced risk of flooding in storm events.	
CF3	01/10/2025	No Name	Middleton Stoney - 3	No answer	Traffic mitigation plans don't go anywhere near far enough - so much proposed development in a region that is disconnected + fails to account for increased traffic in area.	Absolute Token Gesture - This is a warehouse proposal not a SRFI. Need to be honest about what you propose to do to redcue traffic in an already "over-tracked" area	Middleton Stoney is already a huge pinch point - only way to mitigate it is to put a full bypasss in.	Doesn't go far enough	This is not a suitable location for a development of this size - Train Tracks not on appropriate line for what is proposed.	Comments noted, including the concerns and scepticism regarding Travel Plan measures, and about the value of the proposed Middleton Stoney Relief Road (MSRR). The likely benefits of these elements of the proposals forms part of the submitted application, including in terms of the approximate 30% traffic reductions in Middleton Stoney (and associated noise and air quality improvements). The proposed landscaping and Green Infrastructure proposed is significant, and accounts for some 60% of the total Application site area. This provides a range of benefits by way of mitigation, as well as biodiversity net gain, and enabling new public access to walking and cycling routes. The Chiltern Main Line is suitable for an SRFI, and as set out in the Application documents (including the Planning Statement), the OxSRFI proposals meet the defined criteria and requirements for an SRFI as set out in national policy (the National Policy Statement for National Networks).	
CF4	02/10/2025	██████	Online - 1	No answer	The proposals are helpful in theory, but problems remain. 1. The M40 is frequently closed because of accidents, or traffic jams cause traffic to take a different route. This route invariably leads them through Middleton Stoney, a small village already inundated with heavy traffic from all directions. There need to be restrictions in place to actively prevent traffic (not just discourage it) from coming through the village. 2. Vehicles approaching from the south are far more likely to this, not only from the M40 but from the A34 which also sees frequent closures and traffic jams that vehicles, including lorries, try to avoid by driving through the village. For your proposal to work there would also need to be restrictions on heavy goods vehicles using the roads through the village entirely (not just a recommendation, but an enforced weight limit). You are also promoting 9,600 new jobs, which means almost 20,000 return journeys, most of which will be by car and many of which will come through Middleton Stoney (as noted in the next section, it is likely most people will still choose to drive).	These do not go far enough. It is still more convenient and ingrained in our culture for most people to drive, and taking the bus would need to be heavily incentivised / number of vehicles permitted on the site limited. Your employees will presumably be coming from a range of different locations at different times of day, and it will remain their default to drive unless strong measures are taken to prevent this. I understand that this equates to an extra 9,600 vehicles per day, or close to 20,000 journeys (assuming they don't even leave the site during the day).	No answer	Great in theory. However, the trees are saplings which would take more than a decade to grow to a height which would make a difference. They also seem to be entirely deciduous trees, which means no coverage in autumn, winter and early spring. An improvement would be a combination of mature deciduous and evergreen coverage.	The proposals do not take into account the large number of other sizeable developments in the area: the amount of traffic generated by these combined developments creates a huge and negative impact on Middleton Stoney. The heavy traffic is increasing from all directions, and nothing is being done to mitigate this. Please be aware of the huge proposed expansion at Heyford Park, the enormous amount of building at Bicester, the proposals for Puy du Fou etc. The level of traffic is hazardous to health: the air is heavily polluted, with cars and far too many lorries. It causes noise pollution, from the sound of engines and the loud rumbling of heavy vehicles. It is dangerous for people to walk on the very narrow pavements and cross the roads which have no pedestrian crossings. It is beyond inconvenient: already it is sometimes impossible to get into our own drive because of the long queues of traffic which will not let anyone through when moving as everyone is so desperate to get through the traffic lights when they are green. There need to be more measures in place to PREVENT traffic from entering Middleton Stoney (HGV bans in the village, cameras), and to positively encourage people to use public transport.	The indication of support for the intentions regarding improvements at M40 J10 are noted and welcome.The local problems around Junction 10 of the M40, and local concerns about through-traffic, including when the M40 is closed or congested, are well understood. The Transport Assessment (TA) models the road network, informed by direct and detailed input from the Transport Working Group (TWG) of National Highways and OCC Highways. The TA shows that the driving conditions (including reliability and journey times) will be improved by the OxRFI works, addressing or improving many of the existing challenges. The Middleton Stoney Relief Road (MSRR) will improve conditions in the village centre, with around 30% less traffic travelling through the village with the MSRR in place. However, the B430 will remain an official diversion route for the M40 in times of closure.The sustainable transport proposals are considered appropriate and comprehensive, and would see significant investment (in excess of £3m) to enhance existing or add new bus services to and from the site whicl would improve connectivity to, from and between a number of surrounding communities nearby while also enabling employees at the OxSRFI site to travel by public transport. New bus services will be defined to tie-in with shift changes where appropriate, and reviewed regularly as activity on the site evolves with time. In addition, significant improvements to walking and cycling routes, including off-road routes, will enable 'active travel' locally for commuting and leisure. The planting will include a range of specimen sizes from the outset, including some more mature specimens, but the majority of new trees will be planted as young trees. The new tree planting in total accounts for approximately 60ha across the application site as a whole. The planting mix is varied and would not be expected to consist of only decidious species.	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

										The issue of cumulative effects has been addressed in the final submission, with considerable work undertaken since Stage 2 consultation. The TA is cumulative in nature, with the modelling undertaken explicitly including traffic from a wide range of planned (local plan allocations) and consented sites to provide a robust assessment of the likely effects of the additional traffic from OxSRFI in addition to the traffic already expected on the network as other sites come forward. Although not a standard approach, the TA and other parts of the Environmental Statement also provide consideration of non-committed potential future sites (including the Heyford Park 'new town' and Puy du Fou) based on information in the public domain. The TA shows reliability and journey times will be improved by the OxRFI works, addressing or improving many of the existing challenges even in the context of future traffic growth from other developments.
CF5	03/10/2025	No Name	Heyford Park - 1	Clear but misguided. I'm sure there are better locations to serve the home Councils to the SE/SW of the country, given that there are already SRFIs fairly close to Ardley.	All the development proposals in the area should be rejected. Preserving rather than destroying, countryside should be the main priority in this area.	Not sure where people are going to walk or cycle from in order to get to the site. And, given the decrease in bus services post Covid, who will be paying to keep them going. This seems cosmetic rather than practical. Not to mention, unlikely to succeed.	The green washer facility was always going to come to an end. The bus gate was a ridiculous idea in the first place.	A blatant attempt to "green up" what is an abhorrant proposal.	I sincerely hope this plan does not come to fruition.	The general objection and concerns are noted, including with regard to other development proposals beyond the OxSRFI scheme itself. The proposals would deliver a range of measures to reduce carbon emissions and deliver environmental benefits, with DCO Requirements proposed to secure these measures, including high-efficiency buildings and on-site renewable energy. The proposed cycling and walking improvements are an important part of the 'active travel' and travel plan measures proposed, and include on- and off-road links.
CF6	03/10/2025		Heyford Park - 2	No answer	No answer	There needs to be an attractive + direct cycle + ped crossing east <-->west between Heyford Park + the prospective Ardley Passenger rail station. The current proposals do not provide this. At the very least the proposed bridleway crossing point north of the rail freight stationshould be a suitable standard (gradient of ramps/surface material) to connect into the passenger rail. County Council must ensure all developments are connected for walking +cycling	No answer	Scheme should seek to deliver muhc more than 10% BNG. Warehouses should include a scheme of bird/bat boxes. Lighting should be kept to a minimum	Better cycle/ped connections required to connect across all planned + future developments.	Comments noted regarding the importance of cycling and walking connections to and from Heyford Park - the scheme would deliver extensive new and improved cycle and walking connectivity, including to Heyford Park, and other nearby settlements including Ardley. While there are local aspirations for a new passenger Station (potentially on the site of the former Ardley Station), there is no formal proposals or confirmed business case, nor a confirmed site for any new Station (so ensuring cycling or other links to a new Station isn't yet possible). BNG is not mandatory for the scheme, but the submitted application details confirm that, despite this, it will deliver a 10% gain. The habitat mitigation and enhancement works include bat and bird boxes, as suggested.
CF7	03/10/2025		Heyford Park - 3	Yes	No	I question if maximum opportunity is being made to futureproof this development in the context of other developments proposed (mainly Dorchester's application for 9000 homes & Ardley passenger station). Pedestrian & cycle routes from Heyford Park to potential new Ardley Station should be allowed for & bunds shouldn't prevent future connectivity.	No answer	These should be delivered alongside connectivity &public footpaths/cycleways including potential future routes if the Ardley Passenger station comes forward.	Do all the proposed footpaths provide connections for pedestrian & leisure routes for residents & employees. Providing connections to the proposed new town seems crucial. Have traffic assessments accounted for the proposed new town? Will there be outside space & circular walking routes for employees working there?	The point made about taking opportunities for 'future-proofing' are noted. The Applicant is aware of emerging proposals for a 'new town' at Heyford Park, and its reliance on a future new rail Station closeby, potentially at the site of the former Ardley Station. The Applicant has engaged in dialogue with Dorchester, and with OCC, about related issues, and a Passenger Rail Station Note is appended to the Planning Statement (Document 5.4, Appendix 3) confirms that the OxSRFI proposals would not prejudice a future station if it were delivered on the site of the former Ardley Station. The landscaping, and integrated new connectivity would enable easier access to desinations to the north of the Chiltern Line, including to any new future railway Station. However, were that Station delivered as part of the 'new town' (if approved), it would also be expected that other new links would be delviered via the new town site itself. The network of proposed walking and cycling routes within OxSRFI would enable circular leisure and other walking for residents and employees.

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

CF8	10/10/2025		Online - 2	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	Completely irresponsible for the council or government to consider further development at OxSRFI until the existing developments in the region which have already put huge strain and damage into the surrounding infrastructure are addressed first. Local residents have been repeatedly let down by irresponsible and untrustworthy developers who have failed to put the appropriate infrastructure development work in place; have been disingenuous with sharing the impact of the increased traffic through surrounding villages and who have not followed through on the linked section 106 projects needed just to service existing growth.OxSRFi is a WAREHOUSE development project that will significantly increase traffic in the surrounding areas and put even further strain on a infrastructure that is already well beyond capacity. Mitigation plans shared at the recent consultation do not go anywhere near far enough for the size of the project and the suggestion that the Middleton Stoney relief road will only be built in phase 2 once income has started to come into the site is irresponsible, immoral and yet another example of a complete disregard for the consequences of development on this region. No further consideration for development should be given to any company until a comprehensive and joined up traffic mitigation plan is developed & delivered and surrounding villages are invested in to offset the damage already caused. In addition, given the raft of other major developments in the area (Puy de Fou; Heyford Park, Himley Village, Tritax and others) further projects need to be paused until the impact of these multitude of developments is addressed COLLECTIVELY rather than in isolation as is currently the case.	Comments noted including with regard to bad past experiences with developors not delivering appropriate infrastructure, or following through on commitments made. The Applicant has an excellent track-record of delivering major development sites, and has submitted a comprehensively planned high-quality proposal with an appropriate package of mitigation to manage, minimise or avoid potential significant adverse effects. If approved, the DCO will require delivery of the scheme and mitigation as proposed, including the significant investment in new highways and rail infrastructure, and this can be enforced by the Local Authority. The phasing of the infrastructure is early in the build programme, ensuring new road links are in place as early as feasible. As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) the OxSRFI proposals will not be determined by the Local Authority, but will instead be determined by the Secretary of State for Transport. However the Applicant has worked closely with the Local Authorities (CDC and OCC) and will continue to do so.
CF9	10/11/2025		Ardley - 1	No answer	There is still no "slick" route onto M40 Southbound from the new Ardley Bypass b430. All the extra HGV and all the extra domestic housing vehicles from Heyford Park will have to traverse the complex double roundabout and overpass bridge to reach the Southbound entry. I think there is merit in adding a simplified route from the new Ardley Bypass B430 using a flyover or similar that joins to the new M40 southbound entry sliproad. This takes a huge amount of strain from the complex overpass/double roundabout of J0. See attached map with drawing options.	No answer	No answer	I was dissapointed not to have a cross-sectional representation of the Heyford Park link road like you had done for there viewpoints. This makes me concerned that there are elements to hide about the landscaping, bunding and tree planting along Heyford Park link road.	No answer	Comments about the highways proposals and design at M40 Junction 10 are noted. These proposals have been assessed and modelled by the Applicant in conjunction with the Transport Working Group(TWG) including National Highways and Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), and followed an extensive period of 'optioneering' with numerous potential configurations considered, with some assessed as part of the iterative design process. The proposals would provide more reliable journey times than the current Junction 10 arrangements for local road-users and deliver additional capacity which would help address some of the existing issues and challenges, and are considered an appropriate form and scale of mitigation for the OxSRFI scheme, while also providing some wider improvements.
CF10	17/10/2025	Samantha	Online - 3	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	I oppose the freight trains,we have enough trains coming through,im one of the closest houses if not thee closest house to the train track..its already effect my work trains all the way through the night,I had to stay right next to clapham junction for a month,even their trains stop at midnight until 6am,which is a respectable time..my house shakes and there are cracks in the exterior walls and possibly through the living room floor..where have all these trains come from allnof a sudden?	Concerns about additional trains on the Chiltern Main Line are noted and the emphasis on night-time noise. However, the Chiltern Line does not allow night-time running, and this would not be changed by the OxSRFI proposals. The submitted application provides an assessment of the likely noise effects of the Proposed Development, including from the rail freight terminal.

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

CF11	20/10/2025		Online - 4	Yes I do think your explanation is clear, I can see how this is justified but whether it will improve the lives of those who live in the area is entirely debatable	Doing more work at Junction 10 is very worrying. The M40 and the A43 have fairly recently been improved. Basically it would seem that all these improvements are going to be shelved in the light of more road works. There will inevitably be total chaos while these works are being done - years if a road around Ardley is going to be built. Yet again this does not improve the lives of those who live in the area, it makes the lives of those people and all those who commute on these roads a nightmare for years to come. It might settle down in about 10 years time but the existing landscape and people using the roads on a daily basis will be paying the price and will not agree with this project.	Quite frankly this does not make any sense at all. There are virtually no buses in this area, why would you suddenly put a bus going to this depot. Is it likely that people working there, probably on shifts and coming from all over the county and beyond are going to be able to make use of a bus - from where? As for cycling and walking, they already do that in any case and not to access a railfreight depot. Every time there is yet more development in this area we are all told fairy stories of wonderful public transport systems being put in place - it is a smokescreen to hide the scale of the development planned.	Getting rid of any bus gates has to be a good thing and sensible.	I am sure once this is finished - many many years away - the landscaping will look reasonable. It is the years and years of building and disruption that bothers me.	As ever with these large developments nobody seems to address the apparently smaller issues such as sewage and water. How is all this going to be dealt with. In the last few years we have had more and more development in this area, it is overbuilt to say the least. Nothing is ever done to cope with the amount of facilities that these developments require. This is why we in the villages are suffering with overflowing sewage pipes when there is a lot of rain. Are there going to be ponds incorporated to deal with the flood water that will have nowhere to go since all the fields will have been built over. Quite frankly I doubt any comments from anyone locally will make any difference at all. All these enormous developments are given planning permission, the lives of those that live here do not matter to central government any longer, these consultations are really a waste of all our time.	The recognition of the national policy context and drivers of need for the OxSRFI are noted and welcomed. The weariness of more improvements at M40 Junction 10 is understood, however, unlike past incremental attempts to improve this key junction, the OxSRFI proposals would deliver a more substantial upgrade to the junction as a whole, and deliver more meaningful improvements in performance (capacity, journey times, and reliability). The proposed sustainable transport strategy including new and enhanced bus services will connect the site to Bicester and Banbury, and other communities along these routes, including enabling improved bus connectivity with major development at Heyford Park. Bus services will be integrated with shift change times at the OxSRFI site, and use will be incentivised and encouraged through Travel Plan measures. The strategy will be monitored and respond to changes in demand or needs in terms of bus services and timetables. The positive comment regarding the proposed landscaping is noted and welcomed, as are the concerns about the likely effects during construction process. The construction programme is as short as it can feasibly be, and the proposed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will help minimise or avoid adverse effects on nearby communities. Support for the removal of the earlier proposed 'bus gate' is noted. The points regarding local drainage and water capacity are noted - the Applicant is in ongoing dialogue with Thames Water regarding water supply, but has agreed a point of connection for the foul drainage. In terms of storm events, the OxSRFI sustainable drainage strategy proposals will better regulate water discharge from the site, reducing the downstream risks of surface water flooding.
CF12	26/10/2025		Online - 5	No answer	1) The planners should also bear in mind that there are also ongoing planning schemes underway to expand the North West Bicester Ecotown, expand Heyford Park by 13,000 homes and build a historical theme park at Puy de Fou. The Bicester Transport Model does not include these proposed development and traffic to and from existing developments (e.g. the Ecotown) has not been validated and may be underestimated. Will junction 10 and the lanes around Heyford cope with the increased traffic of all of these schemes put together? 2) Traffic modelling should consider what will happen to traffic when the M40 or the top end of the A34 is closed due to an accident or if lanes are closed due to roadworks. It would also be prudent to model peak times for Bicester Village (e.g. Black Friday). At present, huge amounts of traffic goes down the B430 and B4100 on days when the motorway is closed/clogged and OxSRFI will make this worse.	1) During construction: 1) The junctions on the B430 should be done one at a time to minimise disruption to local traffic and ensure that there is always a route free of roadworks. 2) The new Heyford Park link road must be opened before the slightly more northerly junction that leads from the B430 to Heyford is closed, to ensure that cars driving between Bicester and Heyford have an alternative route. 3) There is also a planning proposal as part of the Hawkwell housing development that proposed cutting off Bucknell Road by the Bicester Ring Road, as well as moving the Bicester Ring Road to go through a new tunnel under the railway. The timing of the work in Middleton Stoney should be done after these proposed works to ensure that there is always a clear route from Bicester to Heyford. 2) I am concerned about how many lorries will end up driving south along the B430 from the site towards the A34. The route south along the B430 goes through Ardley, Middleton Stoney and Weston on the Green. Even with current	I support these changes	No answer	Archeological excavations should consider the potential for dinosaur footprints as well as human activity.	The submitted Transoport Assessment (TA) is cumulative in nature, with the modelling undertaken explicitly including traffic from a wide range of planned (local plan allocations) and consented sites to provide a robust assessment of the likely effects of the additional traffic from OxSRFI in addition to the traffic already expected on the network as other sites come forward. Although not a standard approach, the TA and other parts of the Environmental Statement also provide consideration of non-committed potential future sites (including the Heyford Park 'new town' and Puy du Fou) based on information in the public domain. The TA shows reliability and journey times will be improved by the OxRFI works, addressing or improving many of the existing challenges even in the context of future traffic growth from other developments. The phasing of the proposed infrastructure reflects the desire to deliver improvements early in the build programme, balancing commercial and environmental considerations including minimising adverse effects, including temporary construction effects, on nearby communities. The proposals include an HGV Routeing Strategy which would see all HGVs arriving or departing the OxSRFI site doing so via the improved M40 Junction 10 to the north (via the new Ardley Bypass once open, prior to occupation of the site itself) - this would be enforced through ANPR cameras, and prevent HGV traffic associated with OxSRFI adding to traffic in villages south on the B430 corridor. Support for the removal of (not extending the lease of) the IVC green waste facility, if approved, is noted, as is support for the removal of the earlier proposed bue-gate from the scheme. The point made regarding potential dinosaur footprints (palaeontology), as well as further archaeological investigations, is noted and this issue has been considered. The geological layers at which the Ardley Trackways SSSI footprints were found is considerably deeper than the vast majority of the excavations required on the OxSRFI site, and so the potential for encountering similar features is considered low. However, this issue was raised in dialogue with the local authorities, and the proposed DCO Requirements includes a palaeontological 'watching brief' during relevant works as suggested by OCC.

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

						traffic, there are often big jams around Middleton Stoney and the sliproads linking the B430 are extremely short, making it really dangerous for lorries to pull out onto the A34. What measures will be put in place to prevent lorries from driving south down the B430. 3) What measures will be put in place to reduce queues of traffic going northbound up the B430 up to the Middleton Stoney traffic lights? These often build up at normal times. 4) To reduce traffic between Bicester and Heyford, the No. 25 timing, frequency and reliability of the No 25 bus should be improved to allow more people to make that journey by bus rather than by car. The developer could also consider funding a school bus between Bicester and Heyford to reduce the impact of their highway works.						
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

CF13	29/10/2025		Online - 6	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	I received a 4-page consultation document dated 23rd September 2025 & therefore I attended one of the exhibitions. My comments arise on other matters which I do not understand to have been covered by boxes 1-5 above. 1. As I live in Wendlebury I do not think that sufficient attention has been paid to the fact that the B430 from the turn-off north from the A34 to Western-on-the-Green - Middleton Stoney - Ardley - Junction 10 M40 and southwards from Junction 10 M40 is frequently congested because of the problems of the A34 leading to Junction 9 M40 and to the A41 BEYOND junction 9. Also the congestion to leave at J9 M40 often tails back to under the B4030 over bridge. I asked a few people at the exhibition because I could not see sufficient details on the boards at the exhibition. I was told that there will?/may?/might? be an additional access lane from the A34 northwards onto the M40 northwards at Junction 9. I found someone to talk about drainage if this were to happen. Additional hard surfaces increase speed of run-off onto the land and Wendlebury Brook, along the village street, is already vulnerable to the speed of run off into the brook upstream from the M40. 2. I was told at the exhibition that the ROAD VEHICLES, involved in regrouping rail freight goods to the road, via the warehouse/sheds which will be constructed opposite the Ardley recycling plant; 'would be told to return to J10 M40' and not go via the B430 to Western-on-the-Green to gain access to J9 M40 or via the proposed Middleton Stoney Relief Road Junctions 14 and 16 (Page 3 in the delivered leaflet) to Bicester and then to A41 to Aylesbury or to J9 M40 and Motorway or to A34 southwards. How could such an 'instruction' be enforced? These days, in 2025, when sat nav north of J10 M40 shows that J9 M40 southwards is tailing back on the M40 then traffic exits at J10 M40 and goes down the B430 and the B4030 to avoid the bottleneck at J9 M40. 3. The B430 is an ordinary road it is not a dual carriageway. 3.1 Highways Improvments map (page 3 in the delivered leaflet): Proposed "New Junction" on B430. This does not seem adequate to cope with flow from A430 and Middleton Stoney relief Road (proposed junction 16 to proposed junction 14). When you add in the proposed junctions 11,12 and 13 in the light of the national proposal for a new town of at least 9,000 additional houses at Heyford Park, the four intersections: 11-14 - seems totally inadeqaute. 3.2 The Heyford Park residents in the 9,000+ houses proposed would have to access the road networks and also travel to Bicester for the local facilities, employment and passenger rail transport to London, Oxford and the East West passenger service passing through Bicester. 4. I understood at the exhibition that the idea of a passenger railway station is not part of the OxSRFI remit that across the tracks from the intermodal rail terminal there is still space from the pre-1960s passenger station at Ardley to have a passenger station again in the future. This possible project in which the OXCC has stated an interest in 2025 would never be possible if there is no	Comments noted from the perspective of a Wendlebury resident. Responses to key issues are provided below:- The proposed highways works do include improvements at Junction 9 of the M40 as well as improvements at Junction 10 - the Junction 9 works seek to mitigate the potential additional traffic using that junction, and are cognisant of other works proposed at that junction as part of development being proposed adjacent to Junction 9 - the approach to the assessment of, and mitigation at, Junction 9 has been discussed and agreed via the Transport Working Group of National Highways and OCC Highways (and Cherwell District).- The HGV Routeing Strategy would ensure HGVs arrive and depart at the OxSRFI site from the north, avoiding impacts on communities and the road network south on the B430 - this would be enforced via ANPR cameras, and an associated system of fines.- The Transport Assessment (TA) takes into account all consented and planned growth (or 'committed' development) working from lists of other development sites agreed with the Transport Working Group . In addition, consideration has also been given to the potential for effects associated with other, non-committed (i.e. not yet determined) planning applications referred to in these comments, including the 'new town' at Heyford Park, and the Puy du Fou leisure scheme. The Applicant understands the applicants for those other planning applications in the area are also being asked to consider cumulative issues to ensure local decision-makers have an appropriate understanding of potential issues and/or need for additional mitigation. The OxSRFI proposed highways works deliver mitigation for its traffic when assessed in the context of other planned growth, plus some betterment in terms of performance and capacity on the nearby road network - the highways works are appropriate for the OxSRFI scheme, albeit other sites, if approved, may be asked to also provide further mitigation and improvements elsewhere on the network.
------	------------	--	------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	---	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

									connection out of Heyford Park for residential road users to navigate their way through and around the large warehouse sheds to reach a passenger station in Ardley. I consider that 2 National projects, SO NEAR EACH OTHER, should be considered together for the long-term future. If this is not done NOW there will be a similar disaster to the one years ago which in 2025 requires the reconstruction of Junction 10 and improvement to poor connections from J10 M40 and the connection to the A43 are known, and remembered, locally even more than 20 years ago.	
									5. Infrastructure 5.1 Adequate electricity supply to the warehouses and other structures. I consider that this could be a serious problem without planning carefully in view of the other national proposals for the 9,000+ houses at Heyford Park. There are already problems in the Bicester area with effective supply to industrial projects involving machinery. 5.2 It is essential for OxSRFI to assess the likely fresh water supply pressure and adequate foul water treatment foul water treatment for the same reasons as with regard to electricity supply. Conclusion: A great deal WAS made in the printed leaflet and in the large exhibition panels of the consideration of environmental factors to which attention has been paid in this proposal. Citizens are not persuaded by this; they know that the immediate environment will be destroyed and take years to partially re-establish in new hedgerows and trees and planting. Nothing can counteract the enormous number of truck movements 24/7 between the terminal and the warehouse structures: with noise, lights, air pollution and then road movements away from the terminal complex. Bicester is already known as 'shed town' because of the exiting warehouses to the west and east and the planned employment buildings to the south on A41 from Bicester to J9 M40. Residents are quite used to seeing enormous trucks and lorries using roads that they 'are not supposed to'. Please consider several factors above which I have not read, seen, or heard, explained sufficiently to me so far.	The power and other utilities required by OxRFI can be secured and delivered. are fully assessed and considered in the Environmental Statement (ES), including those effects associated with the proposed development of this currently largely agricultural site. The ES ensures the decisoin-maker has a good understanding of the likely effects - both adverse and beneficial - should the scheme be approved.

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

CF14	31/10/2025		Online - 7	No- there is no infrastructure in place for this to be anything more than a heavy goods vehicle 24hr a day centre- no rail approved to meet this project.	They are not nearly enough to handle just heyford park proposed housing project- let alone this plan or the attraction projects using the same off ramp. All side roads still country lanes not nearly big enough to manage traffic flow and not maintained for current road use- they will crumble with more	You can't even catch a reliable bus to bicester. Roads not wide enough or equipped for lorry vehicles & cyclists. No walking paths that are safe to get to either end of the village. Everyone blames each other for nothing matching up or taking ownership for actioning FULL route from M40 to bicester or heyford park.	No	Would not change noise, light & air pollution from so many heavy goods lorries. This is jot a rail to van project- you have no confirmed rail investment & it will be another HS2 disaster.	No planning for roads, traffic management and environment around this location- should not be approved to go ahead before infrastructure is in place to handle just building this, let alone the daily running	Comments noted, including the concerns regarding the need for highways infrastructure improvements, including the desire to see early delivery of infrastructure - the submitted application includes proposals to deliver key elements of the proposed new infrastructure as early as feasible in the construction programme, including the Ardley Bypass. Similarly, the proposed rail terminal is proposed to start early and be available for use early in the operational phase - the required level of initial rail freight paths have been identified, and are deliverable. The highways mitigation proposals take into account traffic expected from a wide range off committed and planned sites (as part of a cumulative assessment), and the application has also given consideration to the live but not determined proposals at Heyford Park and the leisure proposals east of the M40 (Puy du Fou).The proposals include significant investment in new and improved bus services to serve the site and these will improve the bus connectivity for a number of nearby communities, enabling more frequent travel to and from key centres nearby, as well as the OxSRFI site itself.The application includes comprehensive assessments of likely effects with regard to lighting, noise and air quality - there are no likely residual significant effects with a range of mitigation and design measures proposed to minimise effects.	
CF15	11/01/2025		Online - 8	Yes - its clear	In addition to the OxSRFI project there are within a 5km radius of Ardley the following: - A'New Town' at the former RAF upper Heyford Airbase. The immediate plan is for 9,000 new homes, an ambition in the future to reopen the Ardley Rail Station. - Puy du Fou (PdF), a French company, have submitted plans for a 'Show Park' near junction 10 of the M40 motorway, north of the village of Bucknell, near Bicester. The number of visitors are projected to be approximately 1.5 million per year. - Albion Land and Tritax Symmetry have submitted plans for approximately 370 acres of arable farmland close to Junction 10 M40, the A43 and B4100 (Banyards Green), to become warehousing and offices, with modifications to the Baynards Green roundabout. Much of this has already been approved. - In addition, there are significant growth plans for the nearby town of Bicester. Doubling the population to around 50,000 people. Have all of these been taken into account as part of the transport strategy? The government have identified Upper Heyford as one of the 12 'New Towns'. As part of that, there is a proposal to open up Ardley Train station. This is not shown in any of the OxSRFI plans - surely it would make sense to incorporate this at this stage - link road from Upper Heyford to the station, access road from the B430 and car parking?	No comment	No comment	No comment	The plans currently state that the Ardley bypass and the Middleton Stoney relief roadwill be in place before the OxSRFI is operational. This means there will be years where all the construction traffic and materials will be passing through these villages - adding to the already congested roads. The bypass and relief roads should be in place before construction on the site starts.	The concerns about potential future cumulative effects are understood. The Transport Assessment (TA) takes into account all consented and planned growth (or 'committed' development) working from lists of other development sites agreed with the Transport Working Group of National Highways and OCC Highways (and Cherwell District). In addition, consideration has also been given to the potential for effects associated with other, non-committed (i.e. not yet determined) planning applications referred to in these comments, including the 'new town' at Heyford Park, and the Puy du Fou leisure scheme. The Applicant understands the applicants for those live planning applications are also being asked to consider cumulative issues to ensure local decision-makers have an appropriate understanding of potential issues and/or need for additional mitigation. Comments noted regarding proposed highways works phasing - however, the timing of the proposed delivery of the Ardley Bypass (and associated site access) is as early as is feasible in the construction programme to minimise the period during which the construction process takes place in advance of that new infrastructure. The Environmental Statement (ES) includes assessment of the likely effects of the construction process in the context of that programme, and the proposals include measures to minimise or avoid likely effects.	

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

CF16	11/01/2025		Online - 9	No there is no need. With planned HGV technology trucks will have close to zero emission. The location is not suitable for expanded HGV raffic loading and unloading will massively increase traffic.	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	The bubble has burst on the need for more warehousing... nobody can give me any company name, of companies waiting to sign up.	The 'need' for the proposals is partly established by national policy (the National Networks National Policy Statement) which identifies a 'compelling need' for additional SRFIs, and by work undertaken by the Applicant set out in the Market Analysis Report (Document 7.1).The comment regarding a lack of named occupiers is noted. It would be unusual, although not unheard of, to have a named occupier committed to a scheme at this stage in the planning process. On submission of the application in Spring 2026 it will be a further 15 months or so before a decision is taken, and on the basis of an approval (which is clearly not guanteed), it is then a further 18months or 2 years until the first building might be operational. With much uncertainty remaining, it would be unusual for a named occupier to 'sign-up' formally to a proposal. However, the Applicant has had, and remains in, active contact with a number of prospective future occupiers of warehousing on the site. However, GBRailfreight are named as the intended operator of the OxSRFI rail terminal if the proposals are approved, and they have been working with the Applicant for some time.
CF17	11/02/2025		Online - 10	Yes	Yes. Recognised. Designated routes for HGVs without doubt requires enforcement probably by cameras??	No	No	No	No	Insufficient consideration given to junction 9 of the M40 & its overcapacity both from southbound M40 exit (up to 1 mil tailback on the slip road at times) & on the southbound A41 from Bicester at juntion 9 causing gridlock & rat running through local villages.	The scepticism regarding the highways information, and landscaping proposals is noted. Improvements to Junction 9 of the M40 form part of the proposals, as well as the comprehensive upgrade proposed to Junction 10. These proposals have been assessed and modelled by the Applicant in conjunction with the Transport Working Group (TWG) including National Highways and Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), and followed an extensive period of 'optioneering' with numerous potential configurations considered, with some assessed as part of the iterative design process. The proposals would provide more reliable journey times than the current Junction 10 arrangements for local road-users and deliver additional capacity which would help address some of the existing issues and challenges, and are considered an appropriate form and scale of mitigation for the OxSRFI scheme, while also providing some wider improvements.

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

CF18	11/02/2025		Online - 11	The explanation for proposing the SRFI in this location is not entirely clear in that it doesn't take account of the rural nature of the surrounding area or the developments already taking place. This part of north Oxfordshire is characterised by its location in the heart of middle England. It is a landscape of unspoilt countryside, picturesque villages with many thatched Cotswold stone cottages bringing a peaceful British charm to an area where people enjoy bringing up their children, gardening, walking their dogs etc. In addition, the area around the proposed site is rich in wildlife and supports important ecosystems. Developing a rail freight interchange would cause significant habitat destruction and disrupt local flora and fauna. Irreplaceable green spaces and agricultural land would be lost, reducing biodiversity and the ecological value of the region. I urge the council to consider the long-term environmental consequences. Residents in the villages surrounding Heyford Park are already suffering from increased noise, light and other types of pollution, as well as increased traffic, including HGVs, generated by the ongoing development. The proposed SRFI would be the final nail in the coffin for the area.	The proposed improvements to junction 10 of the M40 will cause unnecessary upheaval and misery in view of the climate emergency that is imminent The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change say urgent action is needed to try and limit the most catastrophic effects of these climate changes. The Climate Change Committee in the UK has gone further, saying that significant climate effects are already present and will intensify considerably over the next few decades, necessitating urgent adaptation measures and a rapid reduction in global emissions to mitigate the worst outcomes. So the necessary reduction in consumption and imports, generated by the upheavals, will make the SRFI a worthless asset, certainly within 20 years.	The Cumulative Effects Assessment (ES Chapter 16) acknowledges the Heyford Park development but fails to adequately assess the combined impact on local villages of: - Existing Heyford Park traffic increases on local roads - Proposed OxSRFI and Tritax warehousing traffic increases - Traffic growth on the B4030 corridor, the B430, A43, A34, A4260 and the M40 itself. The local infrastructure is not designed to accommodate the heavy flow of freight traffic that a rail interchange would bring. The increase in road traffic would create significant congestion, particularly in areas already prone to high traffic volumes, such as the A43 and A34. The additional strain on local roads, including possible road widening and upgrading, would cause disruption to daily life for residents and raise concerns about road safety. Additionally, the economic burden of investing in infrastructure improvements would fall on local taxpayers, and this money could be better spent elsewhere.	I see what you are doing here – trying to get people embroiled in the detail – forgetting the fundamental fact that we should be conserving every acre of green space for growing trees and food to try and enable life on earth to continue.	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) as a concept is attractive, but in reality it cannot work. Organisations such as Friends of the Earth have concerns about its ecological impact: - Enormous habitat loss: BNG does not address the root cause of habitat loss, potentially leading to 'environmental deserts' rather than true biodiversity recovery. - Complex needs of species: The current approach may not sufficiently consider the complex needs of many species and habitats. - Metric flaws: The algorithm used for the BNG metric has been criticized for potentially devaluing valuable habitats.	While the development is being promoted as a catalyst for economic growth and job creation, there is little certainty about the long-term viability of the project. Changes in global supply chains, shifts to digital logistics, and growing emphasis on sustainability could render such large-scale freight interchanges obsolete in the future. The risk of long-term under-utilisation could leave the area with a vast, underused industrial site, leading to financial strain and an unsightly, unproductive landscape. The jobs created may not be enough to outweigh the negative consequences for local residents, particularly if they come at the cost of the region's charm and farming capacity. In conclusion, I believe that the proposed rail freight interchange at Heyford Park represents an unnecessary and damaging development that would harm the local environment, reduce the quality of life for residents, and create long-term economic risks. I urge you to carefully reconsider this proposal.	Comments and objection to the principle of the OxSRFI proposals are noted, including the view that the improvements to M40 Junction 10 will only deliver negative outcomes. The submitted ES includes an assessment of the proposals in the context of Climate Change (ES Chapter 15), which includes a carbon management plan and other technical information regarding the range of measures proposed or integrated within the scheme to reduce carbon and other emissions in the context of climate change mitigation and adaptation, and in the context of UK carbon budgets. The ES also directly considers and assesses potential likely effects in terms of noise, air quality and lighting (among other issues), and confirms no significant residual effects with proposed design and mitigation measures in place. The cumulative effects of OxSRFI with all other planned and committed development are assessed in the submitted ES, with considerable work completed since Stage 2. The submitted Transport Assessment (TA) is cumulative in nature, with the modelling undertaken explicitly including traffic from a wide range of planned (local plan allocations) and consented sites to provide a robust assessment of the likely effects of the additional traffic from OxSRFI in addition to the traffic already expected on the network as other sites come forward. Although not a standard approach, the TA and other parts of the Environmental Statement also provide consideration of non-committed potential future sites (including the Heyford Park 'new town' and Puy du Fou) based on information in the public domain. The TA shows reliability and journey times will be improved by the OxRFI works, addressing or improving many of the existing challenges even in the context of future traffic growth from other committed developments. The objections or concerns to the concept of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and the metrics used to calculate it are noted - the Applicant is applying the national (DEFRA) metric and has ensured the scheme will deliver in excess of 10% BNG, despite not being mandatory for this project. The scheme will retain some key habitats and ecological features, and deliver a range of additional or enhanced habitats, including increased water based habitats and significant additional woodland and other habitats compared to the baseline. The OxSRFI proposals are a direct response to national policy which sees enabling a shift of freight from road to rail as a key element of the long-term strategy for transport and economic development, linked in part to objectives to deliver a significant growth in rail freight by 2050. There is an identified need for SRFIs, and the proposed development will help address some of that need, while delivering a range of environmental and economic benefits.
------	------------	--	-------------	---	---	---	--	--	--	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

CF19	11/04/2025		Online - 12	No, looking at all of the different displays at the ardley/fewcot consultation, I could not see anything that actually showed why this was a strategic location. The return on the economy in the area was low. But I also don't expect this to impact the local economy greatly, as a strategic rail freight should be a county wide benefit. Everything on what was shared, shows no investigation in to why this location is strategic for the country. Based on Oxfords economy, which is mainly research, development, fintech, and tourism there is little to no strategic benefit for the country in having it at this location. The GVA per employee was also low, far lower than the surrounding area, and the documents talk about brining in employees from Banbury. So overall, I see this has a low value for the local area, but also low value for the country wide impact. I have really struggled to gain any understanding as to why this is a strategic locations. Even when asking at the consultation not a single person could answer anything other, than it must be, because why would we be spending £1b to build it. I went to this consultation with an open mind, as I am massively supportive of infrastructure investment. And came away sorely disappointed that this location seems very poorly thought out, with little about it being strategic, other than in name.	I think the entire developments of the local area need to be assessed as one for the highways perspective. The current process doesn't work. With everything planned J10 needs significant work, more so than what's proposed. I'd go as far to say that we need an additional junction, with a Junction 10a and 10b that feed different developments	I disagree with most of the assessment as it focused on the travel too and from the site, but none of the wider impacts. Bus services are already undersupplied from what should be provisioned, the plans talk about brining in employees from outside the area (I assume due to the GVA per employee being much lower than other planned works and what's available in the area) therefore majorly increasing traffic and travel. The implementation of this will also have a direct impact on the future Ardley rail station that will be drastically needed with all other developments going on in the area. In addition to that I asked about what we need the rail for in the local economy, and the only answer that could be given was Tesco. And that still needs transport by HGV!! The location is so poorly thought out that even the plans itself says it will increase HGV movements by 300 a day!	Removing the composting facility I personally feel is a very bad idea. We should be striving for more green energy, and a project like this will require even more energy generation. I'm disappointed there was nothing on the rail being electrified. I always thought the bus gate was a bad idea. The whole project feels like it's something based on an economy of the past, and not looking to the future at all.	While technically it's possible to argue a net gain, it's a very tenuous argument. From an environment impact perspective, this is not a net gain, it is a loss of green space, a loss of green energy generation facilities, and increase in direct transport emissions, and increase in on road HGVs and there for wider indirect transport emissions impacts too. The timeline for implementing the boundary is also excessive, unacceptable and needs to be in a way that provides proper biodiversity in parallel with the construction, not a 'potential net gain' that takes 15 years to come to fruition.	I have been pro every single development in this area, from great wolf, poy du fue, extra housing, rail etc. I was expecting to be positive on this too, as I was expecting there to be an actual strategic plan behind the location. When looking at the plans in depth and taking with the team during the consultation, there is nothing strategic about this, other than some bit of rail already exists. It feels like some stuck their finger on the map between to points, and didn't look any further than that and put together some documentation to try and make out it is strategic, which after any scrutiny completely falls apart. The benefit to the local area isn't there as GVA per employee is lower than other developments, and when you take into account the scale and size of this; that makes this even more questionable. The strategic part of this makes no sense, what is being transported, and between where? Oxfordshire already has on railway that makes sense strategically and that's at Plant Oxford MINI. There isn't any large manufacturing here that needs to be shipped by rail. There is no information on the wider economic impact for the country, and based off Oxfordshire main economic exports, I expect that's because there aren't many.	Government policy (and legislation) define schemes of this nature and size as 'strategic' rail freight interchanges - this term is therefore not one specially chosen or applied by the Applicant. However, the site's location is strategic in terms of it's connectivity to national road and rail networks (key criteria set by national policy), and its location which means a significant portion of the UK population are within a 4 hr drive, making it a key location for strategic distribution/logistics development. The M40 corridor is underserved by strategic distribution sites, and does not include an SRFI.The proposed sustainable transport strategy will enhance bus connectivity in the area as a whole, enabling more journeys via bus to local destinations, not only to and from OxSRFI. The relationship with the aspirations locally (by OCC, and Dorchester) for a potential new passenger station are understood, and the relationship between OxSRFI and a potential Station have been considered. The Passenger Rail Station Note (Planning Statement, Document 5.4, Appendix 3) confirms that the OxSRFI proposals would not prejudice a future station if it were delivered, as has been suggested, on the site of the former Ardley Station.The concerns about the loss of the green waste composting (IVC) are noted, although the Applicant notes this facility does not generate power (unlike the nearby, off-site 'energy from waste' facility which will remain in place).The objections or concerns to the concept of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and the metrics used to calculate it are noted - the Applicant is applying the national (DEFRA) metric and has ensured the scheme will deliver in excess of 10% BNG, despite not being mandatory for this project. The scheme will retain some key habitats and ecological features, and deliver a range of additional or enhanced habitats, including increased water based habitats and significant additional woodland and other habitats compared to the baseline.The comments and questions about economic need and value are noted - since Stage 2, the Market Analysis Report has been completed and forms part of the submitted application (Document 7.1). This, plus the socio-economic Chapter of the ES (Chapter 12) help set out the likely economic impacts and market context - contrary to the comments made, there are significant flows of freight relating to numerous key sectors of the economy between ports and cities across the UK. The OxSRFI proposals are a direct response to national policy which sees enabling a shift of freight from road to rail as a key element of the long-term strategy for transport and economic development, linked in part to objectives to deliver a significant growth in rail freight by 2050. There is an identified need for SRFIs, and the proposed development will help address some of that need, while delivering a range of environmental and economic benefits.
------	------------	--	-------------	---	--	--	---	--	--	--

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

CF20	11/04/2025		Online - 13	Whilst a policy context is provided there is limited explanation as to the need for a strategic rail freight interchange in the area i.e. that there is any broader demand outside the curtilage of the site. Access to potential end users in Bicester is limited by proposed restrictions on the B430 route and should be better explained? What measures are proposed to encourage use of the facility by potential users (offsite)	The geographical relationship of J10 to Ardley village is poor as there is no transition from high speed road into the village environment and this is currently poorly managed. The proposed arrangement retains an oversized geometry and poor legibility for drivers of the change in character into the village. The proposals should allow for the closure of the southern end of station road (at the railway bridge) potentially by reconfiguration of the Ardley Road junction possibly as a mini-roundabout? Ideally the local roads would be reconfigured to close the direct access into J10 altogether i.e. access the village indirectly from a new junction on the bypass. The proposed layout of J10 is complex particularly from a legibility perspective of users headed to the A43 north. The diverge for the second merge, which will to take the majority of the demand is substandard and it is unclear whether the anticipated benefits would be realized.	The walking and cycling routes are generally a positive development including the establishment of routes across the M40. More detail is needed to understand the precise nature of the routes. In particular a route between Ardley and Heyford Park is needed which does not require users to navigate through the middle of the logistics park. Whilst such a route is indicated it is unclear if this is a utility route suitable for journeys to school etc (lit, bound surface, suitable gradients) or a recreational route. It should be the former. The turbo lane around the site access roundabout is undesirable from a walking and cycling perspective and it is unclear why this is being promoted. Across the motorway are appropriate parapet heights proposed/separations from traffic. The public transport strategy is not ambitious at 8% as other Oxfordshire employment sites such as Milton Park report up to 27.5% bus use. A similar model should be considered here. The benefits of the additional services do not benefit Ardley and a integrated approach should be considered including whether the structure of the road network for Ardley could be adapted to allow it to be served by buses potentially by removing the turbo lane and/or providing a left bus only slip? Should Banbury services route via the B4100 rather the B4260 and/or extend through to Bicester?	It is unclear why a WS2+1 carriageway is being promoted now for the bypass and whether the alignment complies with co-ordinated link design philosophy. If not is the proposed speed limit appropriate and does overtaking need to be controlled? It would be helpful if geometry could be reported both in horizontal and vertical and visibility envelopes were shown.	Screening of the site and the roads is important for the local community. These should be established as early as possible	No answer	The proposed OxSRFI is in a location which will meet an identified national and local need for additional strategic warehousing, and will deliver this in a way which maximises the potential for freight to be moved from road to rail. The highways proposals in terms of their purpose, and the capacity they would provide, are set out in the submitted Transport Assessment, and are shown on the various Works Plans and Highways Plans which form part of the application. The technical design and characteristics of the roads proposed has been developed in liaison with the Transport Working Group of National Highways and OCC Highways, and Cherwell District Council), and follows design and safety standards. The Applicant understands the value in seeking to plant screen vegetation eatly where possible to help establish screening to infrastructure and other development - that is the proposed approach at OxSRFI.
------	------------	-------------	-------------	---	---	---	---	---	------------------	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

CF21	11/04/2025		Online - 14	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	No answer	In response to the Stage 2 statutory consultation into the proposal to develop an Oxford Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI) on land located to the east of Heyford Park. I am opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe this proposed development raises numerous issues for both current and future residents of Heyford Park. This includes: • The impact on the location and surroundings of Heyford Park. The proposed SRFI includes significant development of the land immediately adjacent to Heyford Park, including approximately 6.5 million square feet of warehousing. I am concerned that if approved, this will lead to a loss of green space and open countryside, reduce residents access to countryside activities, and contribute to the worsened mental health of residents. • The impact on the historic environment. The proposed SRFI includes development of land directly adjacent to Heyford Park, and abutting the former RAF runway. The former RAF Upper Heyford airbase is designated as a conservation area, reflecting the role that the airbase played in the Cold War years. The proposals submitted by ORL show that the warehouse buildings will be visible from the runway, which I believe will damage the unique cultural and historical landscape which contributes to making Heyford Park a desirable place to live. • The scale and length of disruption. The SRFI proposal, if approved, would include a long period of development time, during which there would be considerable disruption, noise, pollution and traffic works. I believe this disruption – the noise, air pollution and	These comments and objections are noted, including with regard to potential impacts on future possible residents of Heyford Park. Key points in response are set out below:- OxSRFI would increase access to green spaces and to the site as a whole - the proposed Main Site currently has limited public access (PROW which cut across or within the site), and there will be additional walking and cycling routes and greater connectivity and opportunity to easily reach local destinations with the scheme in place than currently.- The application (at Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 10) includes an assessment of potential effects on the historic environment, including on nearby Conservation Areas at the former Upper Heyford Airbase and elsewhere, and other heritage assets (including scheduled monuments and potential archaeology). The methodology, and conclusions, have been discussed with Historic England and Cherwell DC. The assesement identifies likely 'less than substantial harm'. - The likely effects of the construction process are considered and addressed in the ES, with mitigation set out in a framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP, ES Appendix 2.3, Document ref 6.2C) which helps minimise or avoid significant effects during that period.- Transport infrastructure including highways forms a major element of the proposals, and of the assessment in the ES. The relationship with the aspirations locally (by OCC, and Dorchester) for a potential new passenger station are understood, and the relationship between OxSRFI and a potential Station have been considered. The Passenger Rail Station Note (Planning Statement, Document 5.4, Appendix 3) confirms that the OxSRFI proposals would not prejudice a future station if it were delivered, as has been suggested, on the site of the former Ardley Station.- The likely environmental effects, including some likely benefits, are set out in the ES (document series 6), and summarised in the Non-Technical Summary (Document 6.30). The OxSRFI will deliver a net gain (in excess of 10%) in biodiversity, despite not being mandatory to do so. There are no significant likely effects regarding noise or lighting on Heyford Park (current or future residents).- The ES includes an assessment of cumulative effects - the Transport Assessment (ES Appendix 3.1) takes account of the traffic from an extensive list of planned and committed developments including the planning permissions at Heyford Park, and also has regard to uncommitted but potential future schemes including the Heyrford Park 'new town', and Puy du Fou leisure park.- The Applicant's
------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	---	---

App 20– s47 and other bodies list and consultation responses

									traffic changes – will all be detrimental to the current residents of Heyford Park, who live on land directly adjacent to the proposed development. • The impacts on transport links in the local area. I am concerned about the considerable increase in traffic on local roads created by 9,6000 members of staff and hundreds of HGVs arriving at the site per day. I am also concerned that the proposal would prevent future plans for a passenger train station on the site of the former station at Ardley, which is vitally needed for the people of Heyford Park. • Environmental impacts. I am concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed SRFI, including the impact on biodiversity and wildlife, as well air quality and noise and light pollution of our local area. • Impact of multiple proposed developments. I am concerned that the proposal does not take into account the many proposed developments in the area, including new homes, other warehouses, and a theme park. These developments, when considered together, risk irreversibly damaging our local area and creating uncontrollable levels of congestion. I am opposed to the opposed to the development of an SRFI by Oxford Railfreight Limited on land adjacent to Heyford Park. I believe the proposed development raises numerous issues for the residents of Heyford Park, which are not outweighed by any of the proposed benefits.	assessment of the overall 'planning balance' of impacts and benefits is set out in the Planning Statement.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---