



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
Hearing:	Preliminary Meeting
Date:	29 September 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

AUDIO_OxfordSRFI_PM_SESSION1_29092026

Tue, Sep 29, 2026 4:08PM • 1:15:53

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Preliminary meeting, Rail freight, Examination process, Draft timetable, Change request, Principal issues, Local impact, Site inspection, Transport impacts, Cumulative effects, Written representations, Procedural decisions, AI usage, Common ground, Public hearing

SPEAKERS

Speaker 14, Speaker 1, Speaker 9, Speaker 12, Speaker 3, Speaker 6, Speaker 11, Speaker 8, Speaker 5, Speaker 7, Speaker 2, Speaker 10, Speaker 13, Speaker 4

Speaker 1

Good morning, everybody. It's now 10 o'clock, and it's time for this meeting to begin. So I'd like to welcome you all to this preliminary meeting for the Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Project. Just before I carry on, can I just confirm that everybody can hear me? I think you probably can, judging by the sound. And can I just confirm with Mr. Sherd that the live stream has commenced? If I could, please, get some thumbs up. Thank you very much. My name is Adrian Hunter, and I'm a chartered town planner, and have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application. I'm now just going to ask the other members of the panel, if they could just introduce themselves as well, please.

Speaker 2

Good morning. My name is Alex Oyeade. I'm a chartered transport planner and have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the panel to examine this application.

Speaker 3

My name is Guy Rigby. I'm a chartered civil engineer, and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State also to be a member of the panel to examine this application.

Speaker 1

Thank you, Berth. Together, we constitute the examining authority, or the EXA, as you may well hear us shortened to, for this application, we're also supported by other members of the Planning Inspectorate, some of whom you may have already met as you came in. Our case manager is Mr. Matthew Shard, and he's supported by Mr. Stephen Parker and Miss Lulu Patalino, and they can be found at the back of the room. So, if you do have any questions about procedural aspects, by all means, please approach them, and I'm sure they're happy to help. We also have one other planning inspector as well, who's attending the venue, but just purely for training and to observe the process today. Just a few housekeeping matters, if I could. If I could just ask everyone to make sure devices and everything are set to silent, that'd be much appreciated. Toilets, if you haven't found them, there's two at either end of the corridor. One at that end, and one at this far end here. In terms of a fire alarm, I've been told there isn't anything. So if the fire alarm does go off, it is a real one. And I'll do my aeroplane motions now. The exits are here and here, and then we congregate in the car park round at the front, so I'm told. But hopefully, we won't do that. I think, from what I've been told, there might be

a practice tomorrow, but I'll update you on that tomorrow when we get to that. Our aim today is to keep the proceedings focused and as efficient as possible. So to assist this, Annex B of our Rule Six letter, which for those who've got the examination library references PD005 sets out an introduction to the preliminary meeting process. We hope that you've read this in advance, as we'll only be providing a summary now. You'll find more information about the application on the Planning Infrastructure's National Infrastructure Planning website. We would strongly urge you to familiarise yourself with the website, because this is how we will communicate with you, and this is how we will make documents available for you to review during the examination. Again, if you've had any issues or any problems with that, I'm sure the case team are able to help you with that. Today's meeting is being undertaken in a hybrid way, meaning some of you are present in the rooms, and with some of you joining us virtually using Microsoft Teams, however you've chosen to join us, we'll make sure you get the opportunity to participate should you wish to today. A recording of today's meeting will be made available on the project page of the website as soon as practical on closure of this meeting. With this in mind, please can I ask you, if you do speak, to speak clearly into the microphone, stating your name and who you are representing each time you speak. Quick lesson: it's fairly easy in the microphones. There's just a speak button on and off, and you should get a little red light. So it should be hopefully be fairly straightforward. If you're not at the table and you do want to speak, there is a roving microphone at the back. So, but please do wait until the microphone comes to you before you do speak. There are some spare seats around the front. So, again, if there's points you wish to make and you do wish to come to the front, by all means, do do do that. If you're participating virtually and you wish to speak at any relevant point within the proceedings, please use that hands-up function in Microsoft Teams. However, just please be patient because it may take us a bit of time to come to you, so we won't come to you immediately. But we will invite you to speak at the appropriate point in time. If you are attending virtually and don't want your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera. And if you are in the room and don't want your image recorded either, I think there's probably a couple of spaces right at the far back of the room where the camera won't pick you up. So again, if you do want to do that, the case team can sort of direct you to that when that's the case.

Speaker 1

A link to the planning inspector's privacy notice was provided in our rule. Letter, and we assume again today that everybody's had a chance to familiarise yourself with that document, and that establishes how the personal data of all our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in data protection laws. Again, please speak to the case team if you have any questions or issues around that. The meeting is going to follow the agenda as set out in Annex A of the Rule Six letter, and it would be helpful if you have a copy in front of you. And now I'm just going to introduce a slight little change that we want to make to the agenda. I think items four and five. Item four being the applicant's proposed changes to the application, and item five being the draft timetable, what we're looking to do is just flip those if we could, because we feel actually it might be beneficial to introduce the timetable and the discussions around the timetable before we then talk about the change request, as there may be implications for the timetable. So we thought actually that might work better. I hope that that makes sense and is sensible. So yeah, so we'll do that. Moving on now briefly to explain sort of the purpose of what the preliminary meeting is all about. The purpose of this morning's meeting is to focus on the way in which the application is that the application is proposed to be examined. On that basis, we will only be inviting discussions about the procedural aspects of the examination. The purpose of this meeting is not to discuss either the merits or any concerns that you may have with regards to the application. The merits or concerns can only be considered once the examination of the application begins, which happens following the close of the preliminary meeting. Now, I'm just going to ask those parties who are here today just to introduce themselves. So, when I state your organisation's name, could you please introduce yourself, stating your name, who you're representing, and which agenda item you wish to speak on? If and if you're not representing an organisation, if you could just confirm your name and what your interest is in the application, and on which agenda item you wish to speak, it would also

be helpful if you could let us know how you wish to be addressed. Are you Mr. Misses as well? So, if I could start with the applicant, please.

Speaker 4

Good morning, sir. My name is Alexander Booth, King's Counsel, and I appear on behalf of the applicant, Oxfordshire Rail Freight Ltd, and I'm very happy to be referred to as Mr. I am instructed by Miss Laura Beth Hutton, who is a partner at Eversheds, who is sat immediately to my right, and she is the lead, if you like, in terms of the promotion of the application. So I don't anticipate that during the course of this preliminary meeting others will speak, but it is just possible that one or more of the applicant team may speak. So I'm just going to introduce one or two people on the bench sat to my right. To Miss Hutton's right, immediately to her right is Mr. Ben Holmes of Oxalis Planning, who is leading on planning matters. Two down from him is Mr. Simon Hilditch of BWB, who is leading on highways planning matters, and to his right is Ms. Harriet Maloney, the director of planning for Mount Park. So that's all I was going to do by way of introduction for now.

Speaker 1

That's fine. Thank you, Mr. Duke. That's helpful. If I could now move on to the local authorities, if I could start with Oxfordshire County Council, please.

Speaker 5

Thank you. Yes. Good morning. My name is Mr. George Gurney. I'll be speaking for Oxfordshire County Council today, and I'm joined here by my colleague Raúl, who I'll introduce himself. Hi, I'm Rahul. I'm Mr. Rahul Chavaraja Lopez, also Oxfordshire County Council.

Speaker 1

Good morning, thank you very much. Can I just check about the arrangements with Cherwell District Council as well? Okay. Yep. Good.

Speaker 6

morning. I'm Mr. Sean Fleet, and I'm Principal Planning Officer for Cherwell District Council, and I'm here to support the examining authority today.

Speaker 1

Okay, thank you. Can I also just check the arrangements between the two of you, sir? Because I think you submitted at the PDA that you were going to represent that the Oxford Council would be the host authorities, but you would be the main party, if you like. Yeah,

Speaker 5

I'll primarily be doing the speaking on behalf of the host authorities today, but I might invite Gerald or District Council to speak if they are sort of primarily district-related matters, and that's probably the procedure we'll follow throughout the hearings.

Speaker 1

So, in terms of submissions that we might get from you, would we get host submissions or would we get a submission from yourselves and a submission from District Council? The

Speaker 5

intention is very much to submit joint submissions, so we are preparing a joint local impact report and aim to provide joint submissions from that point on. Yes.

Speaker 1

Okay. Thank you. I don't think we generally have an issue with that, but can I just check the applicant? Are you happy with with that that approach? It seems to be seems to make logical sense to us. But if long as

Speaker 4

yes, Alexander Booth, the applicant, yes, entirely happy. Thank you.

Speaker 1

Okay, thank you. Okay, I'm now going to move on to those organisations and individuals who've registered to and given their notice that they wish to speak. So, if I could start first with national highways, please. Don't think it's on yet.

Speaker 7

Got it now. Sorry, it's mrs. mrs. Victoria Fowler. So I'm a partner and solicitor at Gowling WLG, representing National Highways, and I'm joined by mr. Jeremy Bloom, who's third-party DCO National Highways Lead East Region, and we're here to support you today. No specific gender item. Thank you.

Speaker 1

I then have a mr. Callum McGough from Motion Consultants.

Speaker 8

Good morning. I'm Callum McGoff from Motion Consultants, and I'm here on behalf of Value Retail, the owners and operators of Bista Village, and I would like to speak on the draft examination timetable and content of future hearings. Thank you very much.

Speaker 1

Thank you. Good morning. Next on my list, I have a Kelly Holden White from North Oxfordshire Residents Action. Whichever one you feel most comfortable with. That's right. You'll need. All right.

Speaker 9

No problem. So I'm from Nora, North Oxfordshire Residents Action, and here to speak on behalf of our organisation.

Speaker 1

Thank you. Then I have a mr. Kwasim Azzam, who I think is joining us virtually. I can see mr. Azzam's details on our screen, but okay. Well, we'll come back to to that if needs be. But if you do want to speak, mr. Azam, please use the hands up function as I as I said. And then finally on my list, I've got mr. Peter Cavall. No. Okay. And then the last one, apologies, is mr. Martin Lipson from Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum.

Speaker 10

Yes, we're both here, Jonathan Boyce and Martin Luther, to my right, we represent the Mid-Shawe Neighbourhood Forum. We represent essentially 12 parishes in creation of a neighbourhood plan, which we believe is unique in the UK. And we do plan to potentially talk on two topic areas. One is in terms of the draft examination timetable, and potentially, depending on how that session goes, any applicants propose changes to the application. In respect of the issue-specific hearing, there may be one point we raise, but I think we might put our hands up at that point.

Speaker 1

Yeah. So tomorrow up to afternoon. Sorry, we won't do the issue specific. So I'll go through the same process to allow you to do that. So yeah. Thank you for that. Okay. That's everybody I have on my list. But can I just check if there's anybody else in the room whose name I haven't read who's wishing to speak? Got a hand up. If you could, there's there's a microphone coming over the table, whichever you choose.

Speaker 11

Thank you, sir. My name is John Broad, and I'm representing CPRE, Campaign for protection of Royal England, and I presume to speak this afternoon.

Speaker 1

That's fine. If you don't want to, again, we'll do the same process this afternoon and introduce. But again, if you do want to speak this morning, by all means raise your hand and we can hear that. Thank you, mr. Broad.

Speaker 11

Thank you.

Speaker 1

Is there anybody else in the room who wants to speak or is expecting to be called to speak? No. Okay. And can I just check again if there's anybody online who was expecting had registered to speak or wishes to speak? I'm not seeing any hands up, so I'm guessing we've we've got everybody covered. So thank you for that. Again, if anybody does decide they wish to speak during the course of this morning's proceedings, please do raise your hand in the room or use the online function, and we will come to you. It is a public meeting, so we will be looking to sort of take comments. You don't have to have registered to speak. So, if there's a comment you wish to make, please please do so. Before I look to move on to agenda item two, anybody got any comments on what I've said? Questions on what I've said in terms of agenda item one? No, I'm not seeing anything in the room or online. Okay, in that case, I will pass over to mr. Rigby, who will take us through item number two.

Speaker 3

Thank you, mr. Hunter. Good morning, everyone. We now turn to item two on the agenda. In order to streamline the running of this event, in Acts B of our Rule Six letter, we've provided an introduction to the preliminary meeting and the examination process, and we've explained how it will be conducted and how you can participate. For expediency, I'm assuming that everyone has read this, and therefore I don't propose to spend time reading it out now. However, it's important that you're clear in your understanding of the process. So, if there is anything you're unclear about about the process of this meeting, this is your opportunity to ask. If you've got any specific points to make regarding the draft timetable, as we've already heard, can I ask that these are raised under item Five. So, on the basis of the information set out in Annex B, are there any questions about the way in which we propose to examine this application? Not seeing any hands anywhere. So, great. Let's move on then to item three. I'll hand over to mr. Yvardi. Sorry, someone there. Did someone have a question they wanted to ask, sir. All right. Yeah. Okay. Thanks. So that's item two sorted for the moment. So I'll hand over to mr. Oyabarde, who will take you into item three.

Speaker 2

Thank you. Item three on the agenda is the initial assessment of principal issues. You may hear it referred to as the IRP. It may be helpful to have annex C of the Rule 6 letter in front of you. Before I begin my questions, I would like to briefly explain the basis and purpose of this part of the hearing, the principal issues are listed in alphabetical order and not in any order of importance. The issues and

matters listed have been compiled, taking into account the application documents, the comments in relevant representations, submissions we have received to date, and consideration of other important and relevant matters, the list provides our initial framework of the issues and broad subject matters, which we will use to guide us in informing a provisional view as to how the application is to be examined. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, and we will have regard to all other important and relevant matters that may emerge during the examination process. Therefore, the initial assessment of principal issues will not constrain the examination, and we may decide to remove or add to the principal issues for consideration at later stages in the process. That said, the list is not routinely updated as it is only our initial assessment. It is also important to note that some issues may be related and overlap, and we may and we are aware of this. And this will be taken into account and be reflected in our consideration and examination of the application. The poor. Of this agenda item is to provide the opportunity for us to hear any comments that parties may have about the initial assessment of principal issues identified. However, to be clear, we are not looking for submissions on concerns or the merits of the proposals at this stage, as these will be considered once the examination has started. Instead, we are only inviting comments on the broad principal issues that we have identified. Now, I will now invite any comments in relation to the initial assessment of principal issues, and as previously mentioned, please remember to introduce yourself and confirm your name and organisation you are representing, if any. And I have noted that we have the chair of Mid Chawell Neighbourhood Plan, Martin Lipsim, who is willing to talk, and then we have Philip Nostrand, the founder of the Stop the Trojan Horse, who also has elected to speak. So would the relevant speaker come forward one by one, please?

Speaker 11

Thank you. I'm Martin Lipson. My colleague John Boyce is going to speak on our behalf. Okay.

Speaker 2

Thank you.

Speaker 10

Okay. In respect of Annex C, from a procedural perspective, we believe there might be some other items that are opposite to the to ISH1. Is it appropriate for us to raise those items now?

Speaker 2

I think it's best to leave it for IISH one. I

Speaker 1

think what you can probably do is raise the topics if you like, and then we can sort of consider those. But in terms of any detailed discussion on those, no, that'll be for later on. But if there's topics, particular aspects that you think, by all means, that's be fine. Yeah.

Speaker 10

Okay, it's purely topics.

Speaker 1

Pure topics. Yeah.

Speaker 10

About yes. So one of the topics we feel is important are utilities and services, and we didn't essentially see that that is encompassed in any of the other topic areas that are either in ISH1 or ISH2. So we feel that's something that needs to be addressed. There is a request for an accompanied site inspection

that we sent on our letter, but I think that's probably going to be more appropriate to raise in the draft examination timetable. Is that correct?

Speaker 1

Yes, it probably is. Although we've seen the letter, and the way that it'll work is that we will take those on board in discussion with the applicant in terms of formulating an agenda for those. Also, looking at where we've been as well, because we've done an unaccompanied site inspection as well, and also looking at locations that perhaps we can visit again on an unaccompanied basis without having to drag the applicant and all their team round with us. So we will we will look at that, but in terms of further submissions on that, probably no real need because they say we've got your letter in the detail of where you want us to look, and we'll we'll take actions in terms of making sure we we pick up those points and see those.

Speaker 10

Okay, thank you.

Speaker 2

If I may respond to the each the utilities and services, that's actually covered under the issue-specific hearing under residential amenities. So that will be looked into in depth when we come when we conduct the issue-specific hearing. It's under residential amenities. I think it's on ISH one.

Speaker 10

I'm sorry. Is this in Annex C? It

Speaker 2

is the. is the it should be within the annexes of the Rule Six letter.

Speaker 1

Yeah, I think probably more under perhaps some of the socio-economic side of things is possibly where where we've got on the agenda. I think it's IH two. I think is is where that is. But the other thing I would stress is that, and we'll cover this briefly when we talk through the timetable, is that there are opportunities for us to ask questions. So we will pose a series of written questions throughout the process. So there's opportunities. So whilst it may not particularly come up during a hearing, that doesn't necessarily mean to say. We don't view it as being an issue that we need to get further information from. It may be an issue that we feel it's not necessary to explore in an agenda and a forum like this, but it's something that we can explore in terms of posing particular written questions to the applicant or particular written questions to other parties as well, who are responsible for those sort of services, utilities, if needs be.

Speaker 10

Okay, so when you talk about services and utilities, you talk about water treatment, water supply, and power supply.

Speaker 1

That's that's my understanding of what you mean by utilities, and I'm guessing that's that's what you mean. Yes, thank you. And you'll have seen as well that the applicant's been in discussions, and this will come up with Thames Water Anglian services, all those bits and pieces, which will come out through throughout the, and we have the ability to ask them questions as well, should should we need to.

Speaker 2

Have you got any other comment?

Speaker 10

Not at this time. There are other comments, but we'll be raising those later. Okay,

Speaker 2

thank you. I'll now invite Philip Nostrand, founder of the Stop the Trojan Horse.

Speaker 12

Good morning. My name is Philip, mr. Philip Nostrand, and as was said, I am the founder of the Stop the Trojan Horse Community Group, which represents approximately 110 residents in Hayford Park and Ardley. I did make a request to speak at the preliminary hearing here, but that was before I had access to the full agenda. It does look like the agenda has captured all of the all of the topics that I want to go into detail about. So I don't really have anything further to add at this at this time. But I will be speaking in issue specific hearing one and issue specific hearing number two.

Speaker 2

Thank you, mr. Nostrand. can I just check if there is anybody in the room or online that has anything else that they wish to raise on this item before we move forward? Well, can I ask the the county council, Oxfordshire County Council, initially, please?

Speaker 5

Thank you, George Gerny, speaking on behalf of Oxfordshire County Council. Apologies, I forgot to indicate earlier that I wanted to speak on this agenda item. The county council would like to make, while the councils collectively would like to make two recommendations for changes to the APPI. One would be, as we indicated in our procedural deadline A submission, that climate change and resilience is considered as a principal issue in its own right. I don't want to go into the merits of that now, but just the topic. And also, we would like to request that the issue of Arley Trackway Triple SI is separated out from the ecology and biodiversity section, as that is more of a paleontological issue than ecology and biodiversity.

Speaker 2

Those are noted.

Speaker 1

Yeah, that's that's fine. I think I think struggled is the wrong word. I think we moved that item through various different potential areas that it could well fall in, but I think we just-it's an issue that we will cover where that will then fit in terms of hearings and reporting. That's probably for us. But it's-but you're right; it sort of moves in various sort of different locations. But we'll take that on board. Thank you.

Speaker 2

Can I move on to Chairwell District Council if they have any comment, please?

Speaker 6

Thank you, Sean Fleet, Chairwoman District Council. Now I support the comments of my colleagues, George. Those are the two issues we'd like to see addressed. Okay.

Speaker 2

Yeah. Is there any other? Oh, we have someone at the back who is willing to speak.

Speaker 9

Yeah, thank you. Is this working this time? Great. So I'm Kelly Holden White from Nora. That's North Oxfordshire Resident Action. We're a local community group, and I have scanned the documents, and I haven't seen anywhere that the forever chemicals known as PFOS, PFAS, or PFOA have not been mentioned at all. Only in the light of community action groups raising concerns about these, namely Gallowsbrook, which is based at the former RAF airbase up at Hayford. I would like detailed consideration of these forever chemicals, which have been found to be up to 43,000 times the UK or EU legal limit in streams running off of the base. There are 14 streams running off of the previous base, and. It's very likely that there are high levels of these dangerous chemicals coming onto the land. That this development

Speaker 1

probably going to stop because we're not really going to get into the issues. I think the forever chemicals. Yeah, that's the issue. But yeah, that's fine. Thank you very much. I probably answer that. I think yes.

Speaker 2

That issue of the pay facts is actually going to be covered in details in ISH two underground water. So we deal with that when we get to ISH two.

Speaker 1

And if it and if it helps in terms of our IAP under under the groundwater, I think we've got disturbance of existing historic pollutants, which is probably our coded work for picking up the the issue that you're referring to. So, hopefully, that gives you some reassurance. We are aware of that. Yes. Yes.

Speaker 2

Yeah. Okay. I think we go to another person who wish to talk.

Speaker 11

Yes. Thank you. Thank you, sir. My name is John Broad, CPRE. Just you mentioned, or mention was mentioned, was made of climate change. Could I just add food security to that list as well, please?

Speaker 2

Okay. Thank you. Security to climate change. Thank you. Is there any other person in the room or online who would like to speak, please? No, and I cannot see any hand being raised online. In that case, I will hand over to my oh the applicant. I like to ask the applicant if they have anything to comment on.

Speaker 4

Thank you, Sir Alexander Boo, for the applicant. And the short answer is no. We've noted Annex C and the issues there raised, and also noted the further comments of those participating this morning. But we have nothing further to add. Thank you, sir.

Speaker 2

Okay. Thank you. I will now hand over to my colleague, mr. Hunter, who will take the next agenda. Next item,

Speaker 1

thank you. Thank you. Like I said at the start, we're going to flip flip the agenda items around if we could. So this would normally be the applicants' change request, but we're going to pick up the timetable, if we could, and the reason for that hopefully will become clear, in the sense that there may well be some implications for the timetable from the change request. But we thought it was best to introduce the timetable first, and sort of hear comments on that, and then that will then feed into the discussion later on. So, in terms of what is going to help be helpful for you, this agenda item D of our Rule Six letter had the draft timetable there. In terms of our responsibility, the EXA is under statutory duty to complete the examination of this application by no later than six months, which begins with the day after the close of this hearing. As you will see from the draft timetable, we've actually proposed that the examination should be slightly less and close on Thursday, the 25th of March. The reason for this is purely because of the Easter holidays, and it would avoid us having to close on Good Friday. I think that would be the case, or Easter Monday, or whatever the situation would be. So we brought it forward to avoid a close over the Easter period. The timetable that's set out in Annex D is published as a draft, and we anticipate and recognise that dates and deadlines identified may not necessarily suit all parties. We also appreciate that part of it runs over the the Christmas and New Year holiday periods as well. But we've tried to be sort of flexible in terms of deadlines and that sort of stuff to give plenty of time for that period and reviewing comments and providing details back to us. We received comments both from the applicant in terms of the draft timetable and also a number of parties in the room today who wish to speak. So I'll come back to those in due course if I could. But I just wanted to go through a few sort of key things in the timetable as it's in the agenda and also as it's set out in our annex, not going to include in detail, but there's just a few things I just want to draw to everybody's attention before we go on to sort of hearing some some comments, if I could. So, the draft timetable includes dates for potential future hearings, site inspections, and importantly, the deadline for the submission of written submissions and documents by both the applicant and interested parties. It also includes the date upon which the EXA proposes to issue documents, such as our written questions, any schedule of changes to development consent order, and any other Rules 17 letters that we may wish to issue to require further information to be submitted. Within the timetable, we proposed eight deadlines. At each of these, what we've done is we've set out the documents and information that we were required to be submitted at each one. Documents and submissions that aren't listed within those deadlines may not necessarily be received and will only be considered at our discretion. So we've tried to set out a specific order that we want information to be submitted. Documents should be submitted electronically via the planning portal. Again, if anybody has any problems or issues with that, the case team will be able to sort of help and support with with that as well. The deadline for submissions is 23:59 on the day that's set out within the timetable. In terms of hearings, this afternoon, starting at 2 o'clock, we've got issue specific one in this room. Then tomorrow, starting at 10 o'clock, we're holding issue specific two, and then finally on Thursday, we've got compulsory acquisition hearing one. Again, starting at 10 o'clock, and all those hearings will be in this room. Agendas for those meetings have all been published on the National Infrastructure website. But again, if you have problems accessing those, the case team, I'm sure, can point you in the direction of of where they are. In terms of future hearings, we've got a week reserved, which commences on the 9th of November, and that also includes an accompanied site inspection as well. So we've programmed that in as well, and further hearings are also programmed.

Speaker 1

Should be needed on the week commencing the first of February. It is our intention at this stage that all all hearings will be run in exactly this way, so as a blended event. But we do have the right, should we need to, to go to a virtual event, should that be the case. But we'll keep that under review. But our intention at this stage is that everything will operate as a blended event at this this point in time. But I would remind you, and I've mentioned this earlier, that the NSIP process is primarily a written process. So therefore, we'll keep the need for these hearings under review. So if we feel that actually there's no benefit to having hearings, but there's more benefit to issuing questions, then we may well do that as well. Deadline one, which is the most upcoming deadline, is timetabled for Tuesday, the 13th of

October. Currently, and amongst other items, we want to receive representations too on specific action points that may well be raised over the next few days of hearings, written representations from all parties, local impact report from the councils, as well as requests to be heard at future open floor hearings and compulsory acquisition hearings should also be submitted at that deadline as well. I've referred to our written questions. We will have a series of written questions that we'll be issuing shortly after we close compulsory acquisition hearing one. So as soon as we can practically do that, we will be issuing those, and they'll be available on the website for everybody to look at. And they will have questions that will be posed to the applicant, to the council, perhaps to other parties as well. The deadline for submission of those at the moment is deadline two, which is the 26th of October. We've also programmed within the timetable other options through written questions as well. So second written questions, if need be, were published on the 11th of December, and we have provision for a third set of questions, the date of which is the 23rd of February as well. And finally, what we've also asked for is closing statements as well from all parties that wish to make them, and final versions of all documents. And these need to be submitted by deadline seven, which at the moment is the 16th of March. So that was a really quick sort of counter through the timetable in terms of what we do, and hopefully that explains sort of how the timetable and how the examination will run. I've got a number of people that wish to speak. I know the applicant have registered; they wish to speak as well. But then I've got mr. McGough and mr. Lipscomb, as well, who's also registered, wish to speak. And again, as we go through, if there are others who wish to make comments, please please raise your hand. Same online as well, and we will come to you in due course. But if I could start with mr. McGough, please.

Speaker 8

Thank you, mr. Cal McGoff, on behalf of Value Retail.

Speaker 1

Sorry, I'm not sure quite picking up the microphone just yet. That's all right.

Speaker 8

Callum McGoff, on behalf of Value Retail, at this stage, our comments primarily relate to the proposed examination procedure, and in particular the scope of future issue-specific hearings. We consider that transport impacts are likely to be one of the principal matters in dispute during the examination, and would therefore welcome the examining authority giving early consideration to a dedicated hearing session focused on highway and transport matters, in particular, agenda item, or if necessary, a standalone session dealing with cumulative traffic impacts and the adequacy of the applicant's cumulative assessment. The proposed rail freight interchange is in an area with substantial existing growth pressures and a number of committed, planned, and emerging developments across the area, which have the potential to place significant additional demands on both the strategic and local highway network. From our client's perspective, it is essential that the examination fully tests the applicant's traffic modelling and assessment framework, ensuring that it appropriately captures the combined effects of these schemes, both individually and collectively. We consider there are a number of questions that would benefit from focused examination, including whether all relevant, committed, allocated. Reasonably foreseeable developments have been included within the cumulative assessment. The basis on which developments have been included or excluded from any modelling, whether the assessment adequately reflects the timing and phasing of growth expected across the area, the sensitivity testing undertaken to understand network performance under alternative growth scenarios, the implications of cumulative demand for key locations, including the Junction 9, the M40, and the A41 corridor, which are clients' primary concerns. Whether the mitigation package relied upon by the applicant remains effective when considered against cumulative rather than scheme-only impacts, and the extent to which residual cumulative effects may affect existing businesses, visitors, employees, and wider network users. Thank you very much.

Speaker 1

Thank you. That's great. That's noted. I think I don't know if you're coming to ISH too, but certainly transport is one of the agenda items on that. But we'll certainly make a note of those comments. Yeah.

Speaker 8

No. If if possible, we would like to provide written representations in advance of a future issue-specific hearing, with the intention being to do that prior to the Tuesday the 13th deadline.

Speaker 1

Yeah, I think we'd happily receive your written representations. Yeah, absolutely. If I could turn to Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan, please.

Speaker 10

Yes, Jonathan Boyce, Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Planning Forum. So, in our letter setting out our intention to attend the preliminary meeting, we mentioned ecology. Specifically, we're meaning paleo ecology associated with the dinosaur trackways, and this is really a point of procedure more than anything. So we understand the applicant has issued quite a late appendix update for their environmental statement, posted 17th of September. So doesn't give us a great deal of time. We haven't been able to look at it in any great detail yet, but as a procedural point, if these are late submissions and they are relevant to our written representations, which are targeted for October the 13th, what is the ruling from the examination authority on that topic?

Speaker 1

Probably going to ask you a question. Not quite sure what what you mean. What do you mean by our ruling? Are you are you trying to say that you don't have sufficient? You don't feel you have sufficient time to respond to those?

Speaker 10

That's essentially it. I'm using this as an example. What is the ruling essentially from the examination committee if there are late postings from the applicant of documents that are associated with areas of our interest in terms of our written representations. How do we deal with that, and how would you deal with that?

Speaker 1

See, I'm not sure they're late in the sense that they're and that's how the process will work. Documents will be updated probably in response to comments, questions, doesn't reps. So the applicant, I suspect, will be updating updating documents as we go through the process. In terms of how we would respond, that that's the deadline. We have the statutory duty to deal with it within the six months. The deadlines that we set out are there to to deal with that.

Speaker 10

Well, let me try and work to example then, so 13th October is our written representation deadline. Is it feasible? Is it appropriate for the applicant to be posting a document that might actually relate to our written representation, say two or three days before that deadline? That won't

Speaker 1

happen because we won't publish it. We will only publish documents at the deadline dates. So we won't be the applicant. If the applicant in that example was to submit something early for deadline one, those documents would not be published until deadline one. So you will-that's the purpose of the timetable

and the purpose of the deadlines to establish. Because we fully recognise that the applicant produces a document. We are then inviting comments from interested parties yourselves, and we want those to come in in a set order. We can't then control it if documents are being published throughout that whole process. We have to have them in the document and the deadline order that we've set out. So, in terms of the information that's in front of you, that's the information that you'd be looking to prepare your relevant representations on your written representations. Sorry, it is possible the applicant may update information at deadline one, and you will then have the opportunity to then comment on those and provide updated comments at deadline two. And that's how the process will work. So, just because we've we've invited your relevant reps at deadline one does not stop you then from submitting further information, updated details, comments on anything that's come in. So at each deadline, we will be inviting comments on anything else that was submitted at the previous deadline. So if, for example, deadline one there's there's an update on a particular issue. That you've got a, you've already made comments on. At deadline two, you will then have the opportunity to provide your comment on that updated information, and and it works in that sort of iterative process. Is is how it, how it should smoothly run.

Speaker 10

Perfect, perfect. Thank you very much for that clarification. Appreciate it.

Speaker 1

Was there anything else on on the timetable? Is that that everything you've got on the timetable? If I yeah, good. I'm not seeing anything else. I think I'll go over go over to the applicant if I could, please.

Speaker 4

Thank you very much, Sir Alexander Booth, on behalf of the applicant. Just first, very briefly on on that last point, we on the applicant side see matters entirely as you've set them out. The picture you've painted, it's an iterative process. I just did want to flag, however, I don't. I'm not quite sure what's being referred to in terms of a late submission. I don't know whether that's our response to relevant reps or the updated archaeological strategy agreed with the county council, which has been provided. We don't accept that we're providing documents late. Putting that to one side, sir. As regards timetabling, we note the draft timetable, and of course we're looking to work as flexibly as we possibly can with that draft timetable, and there's only two points really that I'd wish to raise. Both of those points have been foreshadowed in our letter of I think it's the 15th of September, document reference PDA 001, where we addressed a number of issues in terms of timetabling, there were just essentially two points. The first of those is that, in relation to deadline two, that is potentially looking to be quite a bottleneck in terms of the material the applicant is going to have to generate, and as we note in that correspondence, that would be the deadline for responses to any local impact reports, and also responses to written reps, which will themselves only have been submitted on the 13th of October, some 13 days previous. In addition, as per that letter, you'll be aware that our proposal is to submit the formal change application at deadline two. Also, given we have potentially such a lot to do in a relatively short space of time, what we're seeking is some degree of flexibility insofar as we would be providing a substantive response where possible in relation to all matters at deadline two, but where we're not able to do that, it would mean a provisional or headline response at deadline two, with, if necessary, a more substantive response at deadline three. So that's point one, sir. The second point is just in relation to the series of future potential hearings slated for that week of the. I believe it's the 9th of November. As we indicate in the letter, we do have some difficulties in terms of team availability. And suppose what we're asking is that certain hearings, in particular, if there is to be an ISH three and a CAH two, those hearings are held on the Tuesday or the Wednesday of that week, which we don't anticipate, subject to the XA's availability, should be problematic. We're not suggesting please hold them on the Monday, we're just saying those two hearings on either the Tuesday or the Wednesday, potentially with the open floor

hearing or the ASI on the Thursday. The ASI could be on the Monday. I don't know, but we're asking for some assistance, if possible, from the panel in relation to that. If that's okay, I don't think there's anything further though that we'd wish to raise in terms of timetable, thank you, sir.

Speaker 1

Thank you for that. Dealing with the last point first, yeah, we'll note that, and we can certainly take that away and do what we can, and we can bear that in mind as we're preparing the agendas for those if we need those. In terms of deadline two, yeah, it won't surprise you. We'll we'll take that one away, and we'll we'll consider that as you can appreciate. We've got a lot to got to balance up and and and and decide how that works. But we will we will take away those comments and and and understand those. Yeah, but that's that's understood.

Speaker 4

So before we go any further, I'm just going to ask: the air conditioning was working incredibly well for a moment, and now I don't. The feeling from my end of the room is that it's pumping out hot air. So I was just wondering if there was anything we might do in relation.

Speaker 1

Okay, that's probably well above my pay grade. So I will get somebody who's more superior qualified to deal with the air conditioning. I just thought it was me getting warm, but perhaps isn't. Perhaps he's not. In terms of the timetable, that's everybody that I've got who wanted to speak. But just before I we move on, is anybody in the room who's got anything else they wish to raise on the draft timetable? No, I'm not seeing any hands. And is there anybody else online who would like to make any comments on the draft timetable? Again, I'm not seeing any any comments. So, thank you for those comments. In terms of how it works from here, we'll consider those those comments have been made carefully, and as soon as practical after today's meeting, through our Rule Eight letter, we will issue the final timetable, which will be the timetable for the examination. But, like I say, we will take into account all the comments that we've received, and that Rule Eight letter should should come out at some point next week. I would suspect with a final timetable in. Just on the timetable, I'd just like to sort of take this opportunity just to highlight the importance that information is submitted in accordance with the deadlines. This is sort of the one opportunity that we get as inspectors to sort of say it's really helpful for us to to get information in when we when we expect. And whilst we do have the ability to accept late submission to the examination, but this is at our discretion, and should only be in exceptional circumstances, as we've already discussed. Late submissions do restrict the ability of other parties involved in the examination to respond to those in a timely manner, and therefore do jeopardise the examination timetable. So it's important you note that if you do need to submit something and it is late, there is no guarantee that it will be accepted. So that's just a sort of a health warning from from us. Okay, I have nothing else on the timetable. So in that case, I'm going to pass from item five back to item four, over to mr. Rigby on the the change request.

Speaker 3

Thank you, mr. Hunter, and hello again, everyone. So we are with slight change to the order. So we're now back to item four on your agenda, and I just wanted to ask the applicants about the proposed changes. We note from section one of your covering letter, which you submitted at procedural deadline A, that a significant element of the change application relies upon reaching agreement with a third party, which is outside the applicant's control. The applicant does not envisage being in a position to confirm the timing of such application with absolute certainty. However, the applicant is hopeful that the formal change application could be submitted at deadline two, and we also note your description of the proposed changes in section three of your covering letter, which you also submitted at deadline A, procedural deadline A. So, bearing in mind what we've just heard about the timing of deadline two, and

the timetabling of the second round of hearings, which was covered in section one of your covering letter, if you could please outline how you intend to accommodate your proposed changes within the examination timetable, perhaps with reference to the second compulsory acquisition hearing and the timing of that. If you could just speak to that, please. Thank you.

Speaker 4

Thank you very much, Sir Alexander Booth, on behalf of the applicant. So I don't know whether it would assist if very briefly I provided the examination with a headline as to what these changes are, because I appreciate that whilst the examining authority is very familiar, having read the letter we submitted at procedural deadline A, just for the wider examinations' benefit, if I just rode over those more generally, so others knew what was being discussed.

Speaker 3

Yes, yes, very briefly, just so that we get an idea of the size of the issue. Thank you.

Speaker 4

Well, sir, as as you are aware, a number of changes have been proposed by the applicant in light of the discussions and engagement held since the examination application rather was submitted on the 31st of March. We've identified those changes in our letter of the 15th of September, the one I referred to a moment ago, PDA 001. There are three substantive changes we say which we propose to make. The first of these is a change to the order limits to substitute land outside the order for land currently proposed for compulsory acquisition in order to deliver ecological mitigation, and that's to remove plots two, four a 252 10 and to reduce plot two four and then add in land adjacent to plot two four. The reason for that change application, or the reasons are constructive discussions with the landowner and a change in agent and a new approach, which has. To the parties essentially reaching agreement, right, and that's in the

Speaker 3

northwestern. Sorry, that's in the northwestern part of the. That's absolutely right. Development, isn't it? Yeah. Yes, thank you.

Speaker 4

So the position there was that heads of terms had been agreed in respect of the new land it was proposed to include. Matters have proceeded further, and now we have not just agreed heads of terms. We have a draft legal agreement in circulation, so matters are proceeding as we had hoped, and we've consulted with the relevant bodies, both Natural England and the Wildlife Trust, in relation to the ecological mitigation purpose that this land will serve, and they are content with the position, so it's full steam ahead in terms of making that proposal a reality. The landowner is on board, and also relevant consultees. So that's change one, sir. The second change, as we say in that letter, is in terms of the land at the A 409 5b 4030 roundabout. and that's the removal of certain plots 912 and 921. The result of that is further constructive engagement with the county council, which is no longer seeking works at the junction which were previously considered necessary. It's really a question of other development not coming forward on the time frame that was previously anticipated, the county council is now content that the applicant can carry out works in the existing highway. So there's no need for us to seek CA powers in relation to land in order to carry out works outside of the highway. And there, the landowner again has been notified that there wouldn't be a need for their plot,

Speaker 3

and basically on that change, then there's land disappearing, but no land being added. You're not asking for any more land. You're just no, no, no.

Speaker 4

It's taking land out. What I'm going to do is, if you'll forgive me, I'm briefly going to run up, shut that door, and come back. All right, thank you

Speaker 13

very much.

Speaker 4

Somebody's building something, no doubt reconstructed through there. Slightly distracting.

Speaker 3

Yeah, maybe the new aircon.

Speaker 4

And then, lastly, it's a question. The third change is also a removal of a plot, removal of plot 934, and this is concerned with the foul sewer outfall to Bicester. Previously, we'd been advised by Thames Water that a particular chamber access lay within the plot. In fact, it's within the public highway, and there is no need, therefore, to acquire that plot. Again, the landowner has been notified, and so again, sir, to take your point, it's not a question of adding land in; it's a question of taking land out. So, so all three of those changes are illustrated on the plan. I think at Appendix Two to that 15 September letter. All three of those changes are made in response to dialogue with relevant parties. In addition, at Appendix Three to the letter, there are a list. There is a list rather of a number of what we say are very minor changes to the scheme. And so, what we are proposing, sir, is that we submit a single change application at deadline two, by which time we anticipate that the draft legal agreement may well have been concluded. There wouldn't be the need for a drip feeding of changes, which is always of a concern. I would expect through the XA and also potentially third parties. We want to wrap this all up in a single change application, which could be made at deadline two. In relation to issues arising, I mean, we do not see that there would be any particular issues arising in relation to any of those changes, such that there would be any concern that at the second series of hearings in the week of 9th November that any party would be prejudiced. And so far as notification and so on is concerned, I mean that the relevant parties we say have essentially already been notified and consulted with, and therefore there wouldn't be any prejudice were our application to be made at that point, but of course, the applicant is here in a listening capacity, and that's what we say is reasonable and appropriate. But to the extent that the XA has views, we'd be keen to hear them.

Speaker 3

Thank you. We've. I'm glad to note that you're concentrating on deadline too, because obviously the following deadline is a month later, and by that time it will be quite hard to work the changes through the examination. Because as Mr. Hunter said already, we only have six months, so so long as you're conscious of what you may need to do in that time, because we're effectively talking about an examination within an examination. So no,

Speaker 4

the intent would very definitely be to make the application to change the deadline too.

Speaker 3

Thank you. Is there anyone else who wants to speak? I've asked the question that I wanted to ask about the changes. Oh yes.

Speaker 13

Quick question. You said there was changes to the A 495. Sorry. Ah, sorry, Christopher Barry. I'm resident.

Speaker 14

Yeah. To the

Speaker 13

roundabout the A 495.

Speaker 14

Yeah.

Speaker 13

You said there's been changes to the plans for that roundabout. Can you explain what you actually mean and how it will affect the residents?

Speaker 3

Yeah, thanks. If I could ask the applicant to very briefly just reiterate what you said about land being taken out and not being put back.

Speaker 4

Thank you, sir. Alexander, please, for the applicant. What I'm going to do is provide a very brief summary of the position, which I hope is sufficient. But to the extent it's not, I'm going to pass the ball down the line to mr. You don't

Speaker 3

want anything on the content, just on the process.

Speaker 4

Yes. Well, on just on the process, the position is that there are plots of land which are located more or less adjacent to that roundabout of the B4030 and the A4095, we were proposing to compulsorily acquire those plots with a view to undertaking works. Those works, it was previously understood, were going to be necessary in order to accommodate both our development and other planned developments that were coming forward, we've been in close liaison with the county council in relation to those matters. The county council has now advised that it's not necessary that those works be undertaken. I believe this is because other works have not progressed towards delivery in the way that was anticipated, and in those circumstances, given it's not necessary for us to undertake those works, it wouldn't be appropriate, nor would could we properly seek compulsory acquisition powers in order to acquire the land to carry out the works. Because if they're not necessary, the compelling case wouldn't stand. So I mean that's essentially so. What we're doing is seeking to take out of the order two plots. I believe it is two plots that were formerly within the order. We're not proposing to take them, and we're not proposing to carry out the works. But what we can do as well, if this would assist in terms of the substantive point, because I appreciate we're not getting into the substance. No, is that mr. Hilditch could speak to the gentleman outside of the examination? He's just the gentleman is waving his hand now. Yes, mr. Hilditch could speak to the gentleman outside of the inquiry.

Speaker 3

Okay.

Speaker 13

Yeah. Okay.

Speaker 1

Just if I could sort of help as well in terms of the way the process process would work from your perspectives, because because I appreciate perhaps sat at the back of the room hearing change requests might be slightly confusing. So so in terms of the process, the applicant has identified to us that they want to make the change, but they haven't formally made the changes yet. They will formally submit it to us at deadline two is the timetable that they're looking to do that. At which point we will, we as the XA will decide whether we accept that change. If we accept that change, then that will then become part of the examination, which will then give you an opportunity to then see those changes. And what we're saying to the applicant is, if it comes in a deadline too, that then gives my maths are great, six more deadlines to the end of the examination for residents to see those changes and make any comments on the implications of any of those changes. So that's that, and that takes us back to some of the discussions we're having about why the timetable is really important, because it then allows you that opportunity to comment on those. Is

Speaker 3

there anybody else who's got any queries on the process behind the changes at the moment? We'll deal with the substance of them in the examination. Okay, in which case I'll hand back to mr. I will hand over to mr. Ubibade for item six. Thank you.

Speaker 2

Thank you, mr. Rigby. I will now go through the item six, which deals with our procedural decisions. Firstly, the use of artificial intelligence or AI In submissions, all participants in the examination are directed to PIN's guidance for submitting information that has been generated or altered by AI. A link to this guidance is in our Rule Six letter. If any party uses AI to create its submission. It is important to let us know this doesn't include basic spell checks or grammar tools. In this context, all parties should specify which AI systems or tools have been used. This. Source of the information that the AI system has based its content on, on what parts of the submitted information or representation AI has been used to create or alter. In addition to telling us that you have used AI, as with all other information submitted to us, it is your responsibility to ensure that it is fit for purpose, accurate, complete, and not misleading. By following this guidance, you will help the EXA to understand the origin and accuracy of the information submitted, thereby supporting a fair and impartial examination of the application. If you do not declare the use of AI in any evidence submission where it has been used or remove evidence of AI authorship, such as watermarks, the EXA reserves the right to reject the submission. The EXA has requested local impact reports from Oxfordshire County Council and Charwell District Council, and welcomes local impact report from any other relevant local authorities defined in Section 56A of the Planning Act 2008, who may wish to submit one. In relation to some of the principal issues being discussed at this meeting, the EXA will be assisted by the preparation of statement of common ground between the applicant and the certain interested parties, the aim of a statement of common ground is to agree information and to inform the EXA and all other parties by identifying where there's agreement and where the differences lie at an early stage in the examination process, it should provide a focus and save time by identifying matters which are not in dispute or need to be or need not to be subject of further evidence. It can also usefully state where and why there may be disagreement about the interpretation and relevance of the information, the EXA has already undertaken an unaccompanied site inspection of the surrounding area. The applicant has been requested to prepare a draft itinerary for the accompanying site inspection. In addition, the EXA has invited interested parties to submit suggestions for locations that they consider should be visited as part of the accompanying site site inspection. At the site inspection, the at the accompanying site inspection, the EXA will specifically wish

to see relevant parts of the Adley Cotton and Quarry Triple SI, the site of the former Adley Station, the former Adley landfill site, Ashgrove Cottages, and Ashgrove Farm, the eastern end of the Upper Hayford Airfield to enable views back towards the main site. The AXA has provided set guidelines on the submission of updates and relevant documents. DXA has also exercised its discretion to accept the following additional submissions: late relevant representation by Network Rail Infrastructure Limited, late relevant representation by the Garden Trust, late relevant representation by British Horse Society, late adequacy of consultation response by West Berkshire Council, late relevant representation by Ministry of Defence National Armaments Director Group, a statement of common ground between applicant and network rail by the applicant. Multiple applicants' responses to section 51 advice following acceptance. In addition, the ESA requested that comments on the relevant representations be submitted in advance of this meeting. I will now ask if there are any comments from Oxfordshire County Council, Sherwell District Council, at this point.

Speaker 5

George Gurney, speaking on behalf of the. Councillors, no, I don't think we've got any comments at this stage.

Speaker 2

Okay, thank you. I will now go over to the applicant if there is any comment.

Speaker 4

Alexander Booth, on behalf of the applicant, thank you, sir. No, I mean we've noted the various procedural decisions taken, and we're apprised of all of that, and we're going to do our very best, of course, to conclude the statement of common ground. For example, that you're seeking, we've noted a couple of caveats again in our procedural letter of the 15th of September regarding the likelihood and reality of us being able to conclude a statement of common ground with, say, Biffa or Smith and Sons. But it will then be a question of providing position statements by those parties, whereas statements of common ground simply isn't a realistic proposition. But in the main and in generality, we definitely do anticipate being able to conclude statements of common ground. Indeed, we've done so already with some of the key players. So we will keep all of those procedural decisions in my term. Thank you.

Speaker 2

Thank you.

Speaker 1

Just just on those other ones that perhaps won't be statements of common ground, if you could just keep us updated as to you know sometimes they suddenly change to statements of common ground, or others sometimes change from statements of common ground. So if you could just let us know how things may well change throughout the examination, that would just be helpful. Yes, sir. So thanks.

Speaker 2

Has any other person got any comment, whether online or? Thank you.

Speaker 10

Yes, relative to the use of AI in written representations, the guidance we're reaching to the people who are working on written representations is that they use AI for finding source documents rather than necessarily creating written representations. But my question is: How do we actually represent that statement? Do you want us to head that out in our written representations, or how would you like us to communicate that to the examination authority? It

Speaker 2

should just be in the form of footnotes after you've written your representation, and to say you you have adopted AI for certain part of the written representation, so that we can see it in writing.

Speaker 13

Thank you.

Speaker 2

Any other person, whether online or in the room?

Speaker 14

David Jackson, I'm chair of the parish council of Duncan's Chew, which is a village five miles west of the site. I'm concerned when we talk about site visits that the cumulative effect of not only this development but many others for those villages where there are is a Grade II start listed bridge, and also a canal bridge. Those are the roads west. We know already historically that traffic impacts are great when developments happen accessing this area from Junction 10. So, could that be borne in mind? Thank you.

Speaker 2

We note that considered now in terms of the site visit that we will be undertaking.

Speaker 1

Just just on that, I think if if you could submit that to us in writing in terms of the deadline for for submission of these documents, that means we can then make sure we get the right the right locations that you're thinking of, and if they are publicly accessible, then that's something we don't necessarily need to do as an accompanied site inspection. It's something we can do as an unaccompanied. But if you let us know the details, then as mr. Agabaya says, we can we can take those into account and factor those in.

Speaker 2

I cannot see anybody online wishing to speak. In the absence of that, I'll now hand over to mr. Hunter, who will deal with agenda item seven.

Speaker 1

Thank you. So, agenda item seven is any other matters. I'll start in the room. If there's anything else anybody else wants to raise at this Stage. I'm not seeing any hands. Anybody online who's got a particular point that they wish to raise that's not not been covered? Again, I'm not seeing any hands. And finally, does anything the applicant wishes to raise at this point? Alexander Booth for the applicant. No, thank you very much, sir. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Well, moving on to the close of the meeting. Thank you. That completes our business this morning. So we trust the agenda has covered everything that you wanted to talk about, and I think we hopefully given everybody the opportunity to to speak who wanted to do to speak and to make comments to us. As I mentioned at the start, recording the live stream and a note of this preliminary meeting will be added to the project webpage as soon as possible after the close of this meeting. I'd also like to remind you that the first hearing of the examination will take place, issue-specific one, in this room. It will commence at 2 p.m. but registration will start. At 1:30, hopefully it will be a little cooler by the time we get around to that. We'll see what we can do in the break. So, if you have registered to attend online, please do use the link that's been sent to you. It will be a different link to the one you've used for this morning's link. Again, if you've got any problems, speak to contact the case team. Same applies to anybody watching the live stream. Again, it will be a separate link, but again, the case team should be able to help if if that's the case. The

examination authority aims to publish our rule eight letter, which will contain the final timetable and arrangements for the examination going forward. We aim to do that as soon as possible, likely to be next week. But the time is now 11:17, and this preliminary meeting for the Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange is now closed. Thank you for your time and your input.