



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Session 4
Date:	30 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_ISH2_SESSION4_30092026

Thu, Oct 01, 2026 8:27AM • 1:34:18

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

flood risk, socio-economics, employment opportunities, local benefits, supply chains, health impacts, active travel, public rights, bridleways, social enterprises, construction phase, noise mitigation, sound insulation, waste management, mineral resources

SPEAKERS

Speaker 15, Speaker 17, Speaker 16, Speaker 4, Speaker 14, Speaker 7, Speaker 12, Speaker 9, Speaker 10, Speaker 13, Speaker 6, Speaker 5, Speaker 11, Speaker 2, Speaker 18, Speaker 3, Speaker 8, Speaker 1, Speaker 19

Speaker 1

Okay, it's 4o'clock, and it's time for this hearing to resume. And I suspect we're all waiting with bated breath to find out what we've decided. We've reviewed the questions that we had in terms of flood risk, and actually, the vast majority tend to be either for the applicant or for the environment agency, so we don't really have anything specific for the local authority. So I think on that basis, we're happy to sort of deal with that as written questions, because I think understanding that you may not be around, I don't think that that affects the questions that that we have. So I think that's fine. We can deal with it in that basis if that's okay. So that means that what we will do, and I suspect the applicant has already realised what we're thinking, that we'll move on to socio-economic matters and deal with those if that's okay, and then we'll run the agenda back in the way that it is. So once we've done socio-economic, we'll then pick up minerals and waste, and then move on to the development consent order. But what we will do is we will keep the timing under review. We said we'll finish at 5:30, and I'm keen that we do because it's been quite a quite a lengthy day for all of us. So, if it comes to a point where perhaps we're looking at the drama consent order, some of those, if not all of those, might well be better dealt with through written questions. We have other hearings in November where actually we can then rehearse those and sort of see where the drama consent order is at that point in time and ask those questions if needs be. Some of the questions we had were issues that I know the council had raised, and then they will resolve themselves during the course of the next handful of handful of weeks. Anyway, so we'll keep that under review. But what we'll do is we'll move on to socioeconomics, minerals and waste, and then see where we get to. So on that basis, if everybody's got their relevant people in think, I'll hand over to that buyer who's going to take us through item 3.3 on the agenda.

Speaker 2

There's already people on online who's raised their hand.

Speaker 1

Thank you. I think that is mr. Hazel from the Environment Agency.

Speaker 3

Thank you, Sir Alex Hazel from the Environment Agency. Please, can I just check that the Environment Agency are not no longer required for the rest of this hearing, given that flood risk topics are now going to be pushed to written questions.

Speaker 1

Yeah, apologies for for missing you. Yes, that's correct. Yes, so we you won't be needed. Yes, if that's it, by all means, you're welcome to stay and listen. But I don't think there'll be any any particular questions that we have for the Environment Agency.

Speaker 3

Okay, thank you, sir.

Speaker 1

Thanks.

Speaker 4

We item 3.3: Social Economics, including health. Before I begin my questions, I would like to draw the attention of all participants to the principal documents that form the basis of my questions under this agenda item. These are ES Chapter Five, Noise and Vibration, AS Dash 066, ES Chapter 12 Social Economics, Including Health, APP-180, ES Appendix 12.3 Health Impact Assessment, APP-298, Shawa District Council Submission RR O24, Oxfordshire County Council Submission RR 109, and written representations submitted by several IPs and APs. I will now turn to ES Chapter 12, Social Economics, Including Health APP-180, paragraph 12.5.9 states that based on the methodology outlined in paragraph 12.2.8, the proposed development could support approximately 9,600 gross direct on-site full-time equivalent jobs within the storage and distribution sector. Then, paragraph 12.7.7 states that the proposed development, when considered alongside the identified cumulative schemes, would deliver a range of employment supporting uses, including logistics and warehousing, industrial office and retail office floor space, together with education and community facilities. Could the applicant explain how the proposed development would generate employment opportunities across a broad range of skill levels, and what measures, commitments, or mechanisms will be used to secure these opportunities for local people.

Speaker 5

Thank you, sir. In the first instance, I'm going to. Turn to Ms. Zoe Crampton of GC Insights, who will assist on that matter.

Speaker 6

Sorry, Zoe Crampton for the applicant. Yes, Chapter 12, Document APP 180, has considered the employment impacts of the proposed development, as you rightly suggest, at operational stage, we've estimated around just over 9,600 gross direct jobs associated with the warehouse and logistic space on the site. The logistic sector itself is a vital part of our economy. It underpins economic activity across virtually all sectors of the economy, and is fundamental to effective functioning and meeting everyday needs of businesses and communities, and so on. I think it is fair to say it possibly has a reputation for supporting lower-skilled jobs, which we have reviewed various market research around the sorts of skills and occupations that it does actually support. And whilst yes, there are some lower-skilled jobs associated with it, it supports actually a much broader range of skills than that, including around 40% of middle-skilled jobs and around one in four jobs at higher-skilled levels. So these include occupations across sort of well a really wide range of occupations. Sorry, let me just refer to my notes across the office, warehouse drivers, managerial roles, IT, automation operatives, heavy goods vehicle drivers, and so the jobs associated with the proposed development are going to be very wide ranging and

appropriately aligned with the skills of the of the workforce. In terms of how jobs will be secured, there is a DCA requirement, DCA requirement 31, that requires the applicant to agree employment schemes with the local planning authority, and this will help to maximise benefits for local residents. I note you also mentioned the cumulative schemes; those comprise a number of different developments, some of which are associated with the logistics sector, but some of which have wider and different employment uses, thereby creating opportunities also across a wide range of occupations and skills levels. It is assumed that each of those will be subject to their own employment and skills agreements with local planning authorities to secure those local benefits.

Speaker 4

Thank you. I will explore that part later on within the agenda. The applicant. I would also like the applicant to explain how the proposed development will support the growth, productivity, and competitiveness of existing businesses within the local area, including any opportunities arising through local supply chains, business collaboration, and workforce development initiatives.

Speaker 6

Sorry, Zoe Crampton for the applicant. The concentration of logistics businesses in one location can create opportunities for existing businesses to become part of occupiers' supply chains. So this could include transport and logistic services, vehicle maintenance, professional and business services, construction and property services, facilities management, and other business-to-business activities. ES Chapter 12 has considered the effects of the proposed development on indirect and induced jobs that could be supported across other businesses through supply chain expenditure and employee spending within the local economy, and we estimate it's expected to support around 3,600 indirect and induced jobs within the subregional economy. Those employment effects would extend across a range of business sectors, including transport and logistics, businesses and professional services, and retail, and so on. The applicant has been already engaging with Oxfordshire Enterprise, with the Oxford Growth Commission, and Oxford-Cambridge Growth Corridor business groups, and is willing to have ongoing conversations with those groups, which will open up access to and links to local businesses.

Speaker 7

Sir, sorry, could I just add Ben Holmes Owens Planning? We touched on this yesterday. I think that that question also drives at what the NPS is talking about, where it where it talks about the drivers of need for SRFIs, and in that it's explaining the variety of economic benefits not only to those businesses on site, to businesses in the local area, and for reference, they are paragraphs 3.81 onwards up to. To 3.97, so the NPS para 381 onwards sets out those drivers of need for

Speaker 4

SRFIs. Thank you. I just like to explore how this initiative. I know you've met with Oxfordshire Enterprise. How would this be secured? Just a guarantee that the local people, tradesmen within the local area, and so on, and businesses will benefit, will capitalise on this opportunity that this development being brought to this area has offered them these opportunities.

Speaker 6

Zoe Crampton for the applicant. Well, the DCO requirement 31, about which concerns local employment agreements, will help to secure some of those employment and skills benefits that will arise through both the direct and the supply chain benefits, and that will be done in liaison with Cherwell and Oxfordshire County Council. The applicant is aware of Oxfordshire County Council's own guidance on employment and skills plans, and we'll have regard to that in any discussions they have in that respect. In terms of securing supply chain impacts for local businesses, that extends across both construction and operational phases. At construction stage, the applicant has a strong track record of

working with construction contractors who have their own good practice industry sort of standards of securing those local benefits, and at operational stage, I think that's something that we would sort of have to discuss and take away with us, subject to Mount Parks Agreement.

Speaker 4

I just like a confirmation that okay, the employment skills you did mention that that's part within the DCO requirement. Does that requirement explicitly mention local businesses suppliers? Certain proportion we would make sure that certain proportion of the local businesses would be engaged in within the supply chain. You know, in in terms of procurement strategy.

Speaker 5

Thank you, Sir Alexander Booth, on behalf of the applicant, and I pass to mr. Harley in a moment. But just to say, the DCA requirement, as such, does not currently reference specific percentages or similar. What it provides for is a submission, both of an employment scheme in respect of construction matters and an employment scheme in respect of operational activities, to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. So, in a very real sense, whatever it is, whatever is sought to be secured by the local planning authority can be secured because we require their approval and indeed the tail part of the requirement direct that we have to comply with these schemes as and when they have been approved. So it's not specified in the requirement currently, but of course that's going to be a matter for discussion between ourselves and the local planning authority. I don't know if mr. Harley has anything further to add there.

Speaker 8

No, not really, sir. Apart from to say it's very it's very normal, certainly through the construction phase for our clients, including our current client, but others as well, through their contractors. And we discussed earlier the size of the contracts. The significant work over numerous years. There are real opportunities to support and enable supply chain enhancement and local growth in those in those supply chains, so we can perhaps take away how how we might tie that in somewhere. But it's it's absolutely almost taken for granted, not to be casual about it. It's very normal that that those those sorts of activities would be either either inadvertently or actively sought benefits from the very significant construction activities and investment in that construction phase.

Speaker 9

Sorry, if I may, Laura Beth Hutton, for the applicant, I would also just add that there is a definition as well in in Schedule Two of the DCO of what the employment scheme has to include, which has a list of sort of A to E. I won't read that out now, but it does list a number of things, including preference to be given to procurement of local products and services. So perhaps that addresses some of your points, and it's also very similar approach to to what was done at Northampton Gateway.

Speaker 4

Thank you very much. The two documents that mr. Booth mentioned, I think, would that be subject to the council's approval,

Speaker 5

Sir Alexander Booth for the authority? Yes, sir. Both the schemes in respect of construction and the scheme in relation to operational activities-that is to say, occupiers of the various units-both those employment schemes and those are schemes which contain the details that Ms. Sutton has referred to, albeit not precise percentages as you've identified, but that material will be in those schemes, and those schemes are submitted to CDC for its approval.

Speaker 4

And that will include a procurement strategy in a way.

Speaker 5

Well, I mean, yes, it's the various matters. It's not just that, but it is. It does essentially a master procurement, amongst other things, as identified in the schedule. I mean, I mean, we could read them out, but the list is there for you, sir.

Speaker 4

Thank you very much. Sorry. Yeah, I will now draw the applicant's attention to Table 3.1 of ES, Appendix 12.3, Health Impact Assessment APP-298, which identifies a few key health determinants relevant to the proposed development.

Speaker 5

I think OCC were wanting to come in. Oh,

Speaker 4

sorry. I apologise.

Speaker 10

No worries. Sorry, George Gomez speaking on behalf of Oxford County Council. I was just wondering if you. Well, sorry. I wonder if you might be able to ask the applicant to clarify where in the DCO that a definition of an employment scheme is, because we're struggling to find it, and the the reason that I raise it is that in paragraph 154 of OCC's relevant rep, in working together with Enterprise Oxfordshire, who the applicant has indicated they're speaking with, we indicated a list of topics which should be covered in those employment schemes, we would normally imagine as a community employment plan. We just want to clarify that those two lists corroborate with each other.

Speaker 1

Yeah, I can. The applicant probably corrects me if I'm getting this wrong. But in Schedule Two requirements under Part One, there's the interpretation, and I think the page number is, and it's or it's the PDF page number. I'm not sure. I think it's the actual document page number. It's page 63, and it's almost it's at the very top of that page.

Speaker 10

Thank you. Yeah, we have just as asked the question, we have now found

Speaker 1

it. Always the way.

Speaker 4

I will now draw the applicant's attention to Table 3.1 of ES, Appendix 12.3, Health Impact Assessment APP-298, which identifies a few key health determinants relevant to the proposed development, including opportunities for physical activity and active travel, and access to open space and the natural environment. Could the applicant explain how the proposed development will safeguard, and where possible, enhance existing recreational and active travel facilities while ensuring that these facilities remain accessible, inclusive, and suitable for mobility impaired users.

Speaker 5

So, if you just give me a moment, I was-I have to say-that's one of the agenda items where I don't think, certainly I was not. I don't think the applicant's team were entirely clear where the question was going, and I think you just referred us to Table 3.1 in Appendix 12.3 of the ES. Is that right? Thank you very much. Who's got this? Right, I think, sir. Thank. I finally found it. Apologies. So, if I could look to mr. Hilditch towards the end. Thank you very much.

Speaker 11

Thank you, Simon Hilditch, for the for the applicant. If I make pick up a few bit, few themes, if I don't quite understand the full context, and maybe others are able to assist. In terms of existing recreational facilities within the site and general site area, as I think some of these were mentioned earlier. In the proceedings, the bridleways are run through the main site. They're not particularly accessible at the moment. I think even I think the panel is struggling to be able to actually access them themselves for site visit purposes. And as we described yesterday in quite considerable detail, there's significant amount of additional active travel provisions being provided around the main site, significant increase in the amount of public ridaways and public right-of-way network, significant increase in amount of cycle tracks and cycle connectivity that's being provided as part of the highway works. So, and all those new facilities will be designed in accordance with appropriate standards for inclusivity and the like. So that's sort of the broad picture. I can go into more specific detail with some of the existing issues on the on the existing site, but in in the context of the question, it's a bit difficult to say how we safeguard an existing bridleway within the site that isn't particularly accessible in the first place. If that kind of makes sense, so

Speaker 4

if I can help you there, there are some diversion taking place consequential to this development, diversion of routes, and I think I picked up a bridge being introduced at an area that might not be conducive to mobility impaired, for instance, so where you create a bridge that the mobility impaired cannot use, have you thought about other route that those categories of pedestrians can use? So that's the sort of thing I just like you to explain to me.

Speaker 11

Okay. Okay. Thank you. I'm just going to ask mr. O'Reilly to present the walking and cycling overview strategy plan onto the screen.

Speaker 4

Are

Speaker 11

you okay with the light? Is that still? Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Hopefully that will appear on the screen shortly because I think that gives the overall context of the diversions of the existing public rights of way. That is loading now. A bit like yesterday, there may be a bit of a lag between when I talk and when it then appears appears on the screen. The as I said, the broader way is running through the main site, so from the southwest corner to the northeast corner, which are numbers 109, 28, and 10930, and then you've got the 10929. The 10929 was severed by the by the airfield, so that doesn't go anywhere to the to the north west. And there's a southern area. They end on the existing Upper Hayford Drive, 60 mile an hour road, not particularly easy to to access. In the northeast corner of 109, 20 sorry 10930, that current requires users to go through a gate and practically vault over a double rail safety barrier into the middle of the B430. So, none of these are particularly accessible and safe. The diversion or substitution from a bridal way point of view, as talked about earlier, is the perimeter bridal way around the whole of the western boundary of the main site, connecting along the the historical age ditch route, which was severed by by the airfield. That then to the very north of the plan, there there's existing there was.

There's a new bridge proposed over the railway sidings, and existing bridge over the existing railway line. And both of those bridges, all the the approach gradients, etc. will all be to appropriate standards for mobility, for inclusivity, mobility. The parapets on the existing bridges will be increased in height where needed to cater for appropriate use, so suitable height for horses, for example. So that deals with the existing bridleways running through the main site. There's also the bridal way off to the eastern side, which runs alongside the the M40. That requires use at the moment to cross over the level crossing over the railway. The diversion for that again is along a suitably and appropriately designed route, which takes uses over an existing bridge. Again, that existing bridge will be the parapet will be graded as necessary, and then the alignment will continue all the way up to the B430 station road, and then there'll be a new route alongside the bypass, but suitably separated from and separated from the bypass that takes users back up to the Ardee Road at the northern end. So all those new routes, as I sort of alluded yesterday in an overall context, there's a lot of existing severance issues caused by the airfield and the M40, and we address quite a number of those existing issues within the context of our scheme, so hopefully that answers the the question.

Speaker 4

Yes, it does. Thank you.

Speaker 2

Can I make a comment on on what was just

Speaker 4

yeah? Thank you, Adam

Speaker 2

Nostrand from from Stop as a Trojan Horse. I just need to correct a few factual points here. So you said that at the. And accessing involves climbing over a double height. I'm sorry.

Speaker 12

Sorry.

Speaker 2

Oh, sorry. This gentleman here said that climbing over a double height it requires climbing over a double height safety barrier, and in fact, the the access goes around the safety barrier. There have been some access difficulties that I've also raised previously with the council that had to do with, and I was told that that was a highways issue that some of the grass hadn't been cut around the safety barrier. So just to clarify, there has been a grass cutting issue, which I believe has now been resolved at that end. So, just to clarify, there is a level access route in at the at the Ardley end, and then I mean more broadly to this gentleman's suggestion that the this proposal would make the site more accessible. I think that's a bit rich, given that presumably this land is somehow under the already under the control of the of the land of the applicant here, and that the principal issue is with access is that there are two locked gates and one location where there's barbed wire that blocks one of the the entrances. So I think if there are access problems, I think the applicant would probably do well to work with the landowner to solve those access problems, rather than presenting this proposal as the solution to those those problems. Thank you.

Speaker 4

Can I ask the applicant to respond to mr. Nostrand's concerns, please?

Speaker 5

So the short point. I'll turn to mr. Hillage in a moment. But the short point is that it's not said on behalf of this applicant that this development or the purpose of this development is in any sense to rescue the status of various bridleways or public footpaths at present. What is said and your question related to what this development will do, and we have pointed out what it will deliver, and that is essentially where we set out our stall. And if there are disputes as to fact, as to what the position currently is from one week to another in terms of access. That's not a matter that I think we can get into the detail of. But I will just look to mr. Hilditch if there's anything further he wishes to add. No, sir, there's not. Thank you.

Speaker 4

Okay. Thank you. If I can just move to the submissions made by Chowa District Council RR O24 and Oxfordshire County Council RR 109. Can I ask either of the council to explain to the applicant the sort of commitments to comment on the sort of commitment to local employment and including apprenticeships, logistics, education and training, and inclusive economic initiatives such as the use of social enterprises within the supply chain and voluntary volunteering opportunities. If you can just please explain that to the applicant.

Speaker 10

Hi, yeah, George Gene, speaking on behalf of Oxford County Council. Unfortunately, we haven't got any of our socio-economic specialists here, so I can't answer that in full detail. All I can do is refer back to the relevant representation where we refer to the community employment plan, which is something we we might condition on other developments if we were to be the consenting authority, and the requirements of what we might consider to be within a community employment plan, and we are able to share draft conditions with the applicant if that is helpful.

Speaker 4

If you come, please, Bill. I have got a few questions for the applicant here. Now, thinking about what I've just laid out about within the Chawai District Council submission and Oxfordshire County Council submission, could the applicant explain the extent to which social enterprises would be engaged within the construction and operational supply chains of the proposed development, including any procurement policies, targets, commitments, or other mechanism that will be used to secure associated social value. Outcomes for the benefit of our listeners, all participants. In short, those sort of social enterprises they relate to non-profit organisations. You know, they work in. You know, instead of enjoying their profit. They plough that into social development within the local area, so they're quite different from the one we spoke about earlier. So these sort of social enterprises within the supply chain, how and volunteering opportunities, how would the development Providers,

Speaker 5

sir. My, we may need to take that away, but my initial thoughts are as follows. I mean, we've spoken earlier on about requirement 31 and the need to make submission to the LPA in relation to local employment schemes, I mean, to be clear, I mean the parameters of what can be included within such a scheme is not restricted to procurement from local suppliers and so on. I mean, the definition that the panel has already referred to at the beginning of Part One of Schedule Two to the draft TCO, speaks in terms about an apprenticeship scheme. So, in circumstances where there are voluntary organisations in the local area, and let's say the local planning authority is aware of them, liaising with them. There's no reason why the local planning authority could not look to liaise with us also to promote their involvement. So, I mean, I think that's probably all I can say at present. I'm looking to mr. Harley, who's nodding suitably furiously. So, I think that's it's the same mechanism that we would use to secure that, sir, and that would be a requirement of the DCO, and again in the gift of the LPA.

Speaker 4

Thank you, the council

Speaker 13

Sean Fleet, Cherwell District Council. Looking back at the DCO and the description of the phrase employment scheme, which sets out that framework for apprenticeships and other elements, and also further down the requirements of number 31 relating to employment, which links in in one the sort of construction element and two the ongoing occupation of the warehousing, so it covers those two aspects, which is fine. But looking back at the description of employment, there is peppered in there the references across to the construction phase. So it's unclear at times whether that description is actually specifically to construction only, or a broader ongoing operational as well. I think we'd appreciate some sort of straightening out of that use of the word construction, and just having it so that it covers both phases, and not perceived to be sort of separated out. Thank you.

Speaker 4

Thank you, mr. Fleet, for for clarifying that. Would the applicant comment on that? Whether you are in a position?

Speaker 5

Yes. I mean, the position. I suppose I would take mr. Fleet away from the definition at the beginning of Part One. At that point, and refer him to the body of the requirement. And noting that paragraph 31.1 is concerned with the construction phase, if I can put it that way. And there is an employment scheme which must be submitted and by us and approved by them in relation to that phase, but paragraph 31.2 is not concerned with construction. It's concerned with the occupation of a warehouse, and in that context also, whenever there is occupation or indeed a change in occupation, there needs to be submission and approval of a further employment scheme, that that's not a construction scheme. So we do have regard to both. Sorry, I'm just going to pass to Ms. Hutton.

Speaker 9

Thank you, Laura Beth Hutton, for the applicants. We're happy to take away the definition and look at alternative or revised or additional wording that the local authorities would like us to. I would just like to highlight the reference. I think there's only one reference to construction within the definition, but that is under the preface of a letter E. Other measures where appropriate, brackets, including but not limited to a recruitment and training programme for construction employees. There is also training. Mentioned elsewhere under item B, and that's just for all employees. So that, combined with the two separate elements of the requirement itself, I think is intended to grow everything. But as I say, more than happy to discuss that there were two.

Speaker 4

If I can just add, I don't know if it's still there. If you've including included volunteering opportunities, which is very critical for the younger generation nowadays, because it's always a problem that people don't give them opportunity if they can't have a business. How can they progress? So that would the applicant be amenable to including that particular volunteering opportunities, maximising that for the local youth.

Speaker 9

Thank you, Laura Beth Hutton, for the applicants. I think we're more than happy to specifically add that reference to volunteering, there is reference to work placement opportunities for students and unemployed persons in the locality. So, students and the younger generation are accountable, but very happy to add the specific reference to volunteering.

Speaker 4

Thank you. I will now turn to ES Chapter. Sorry, mr. Broad.

Speaker 14

Thank you, sir. John Broad, CPRE. There's a number of issues have been covered over the last few minutes. If I can go back a little bit, when you were talking about footpaths and whether they were going to be redirected or whatever, it doesn't alter the fact. I think you might admit, because it's fairly stark, startlingly obvious, that at the moment you walk along a footpath which is out in the countryside, as in fact my colleague here has some wonderful pictures showing him walking across the fields. Once this is built, you might still have a footpath, so you might still get the exercise, but you'll be looking at the wall of a shed. So it's not quite the same thing, and it might detract from people using the footpath. So it's kind of a double-edged sword in a way. Provides, you know, you redirect it so it doesn't go through the site, but then you do still go along the edge of the site, which means you're walking along on alongside sheds. Anyway, there's nothing we can do about that. It's just an obvious fact. The next thing you mentioned or asked the question about local businesses, and what immediately came to my mind, of course, was one of the ideas of the present local plan for Charwell and the future local plan is that future development should be alongside the major conurbations, namely Kidlington, Bicester, Banbury, not in the open countryside. And one of the reasons for that, or two reasons really, one is the employment is very close potentially. We. means they can walk and cycle to it. Whereas, if you put it out in the countryside, it all becomes a bit of a challenge to try and get there. The other thing is, the employees from a site that is next to a conurbation would then go into the town or into the area. They would use local restaurants and shops because they're nearby. Anybody who works in this particular site, apart from going into the local villages, really, they're going to be on site all the time they're working there, and then they'll go home. So, the the answer to your question is extremely limited for local use or local local industry to be able to feed in. There is an industry aspect which I tend to agree with the applicant, and mainly because we've got so many warehouses built round Bicester that Bicester is now called Warehouse Town because there's so many. They are building a new one at the moment down the A41 towards Ayldbury. When they finish that, those people who are building that would love to come along and help you build this new site. So I think we've probably got quite a skilled force, workforce, around the Bicester area to come and build more sheds. Not that I approve of that, but it seems to be something that's happening. As to the employees, the number of employees, I was particularly interested in the total figure being 9600, but. Around what was the figure? Possibly 3000 odd. Well, it depends. It doesn't matter really. There will be a number who would be doing the construction work, and so you kind of need to divide this into two parts, one of which will blur into the other, because this site will be developed over a period of years. So when the there's two things happen. One is the groundwork, so you'll need ground workers and construction workers, which the applicant has mentioned they have companies who come and do that for them. So that's very good, but they're not local. Probably they might happen to have some of them. Certainly, some of the dump trucks from my friends at Churchill might be working for them. But then, once the first building is erected, you'll have construction workers building the first building, which is potentially could be local workers, as I explained, then they will possibly move on to the next building. But once the site is completely built out in three or four years, that number of employees will now cease to exist.

Speaker 14

So the only local people will be people who are doing things like one of the things I was going to ask a question on later on: fitting solar panels on the roofs of all the warehouses, establishing air source heat pumps. That kind of work could be very local; could be local people coming. But the actual occupiers will be coming from we don't know where we've got to discuss that yet, but I discussed it earlier, suggesting that trying to find some 20,000 people for these developments in this area is going to be extremely hard. Thank you.

Speaker 4

Thank you, mr. Broad. Before I'll pass this to the applicant, I'm pretty sure the applicant has estimated the not just the number of jobs within this site, the other jobs that will be created externally, even in the immediate local area, I think that was estimated collectively. This uses estimated to support 27,500 gross direct full-time employment jobs. So it's not just this development area in isolation; is the impact the the activities of this development will have on creating jobs externally? So I will pass on to the applicant to address the issues.

Speaker 14

Forgive me, sir. Just just for a split second, the the important word in what you just said is local. Yeah. In other words, it's not next to a conurbation. It's out in the countryside, and therefore is not strictly speaking local. Thank you. Sorry.

Speaker 5

Thank you, sir. I'm just going to address very, very briefly, one further time, this locational issue, and that is, and I've already made the point to the examination, that strategic rail freight interchanges, by their very nature, are restricted where they can be located and must be located next to suitable rail access and also the strategic highways network. So I pause there. That's the first point. The second point, in relation to workforce, I'm going to turn in a moment to Ms. Crampton. But the short point here is, essentially, in terms of net additional full-time equivalent positions, it's in the order of 7,000, just over 7,000. We're aware of the concern raised yesterday as to where those jobs will be filled from. What's said is, well, look, there aren't people around, and similarly, there are other logistics developments that are also being promoted at present. I'll come to those in a moment, but firstly, so dealing with this development, the position here is that yes, that's right. This is a significant development, and we make no apology for that. We're very proud of it, and it's a significant objective of government policy to grow the network of developments such as this. But in addition to that, there is a significant volume of residential development being promoted in this area. There is significant residential growth, as there needs to be, and the occupants of these dwellings will require employment to sit alongside that residential growth. So, so that's point one. The second point. Here is that there is currently, whilst very high levels of employment in this area, relatively speaking, to other parts of the country, it's right to say there is also a significant amount of outcommuting from the local area. That is to say, people resident in this area travelling somewhere else to work, and we say that this development is one that will address both of those issues. It will address the need for employment on the back of the residential growth, and it can serve to address, in some part, the current issue without commuting. So, so those are the two points that I would make, and I'm going to pass to Ms. Crampton in a moment, but the further point I make in relation to the picture that's painted, as to this development coming forward and then other developments coming forward, so I mean there are, to my knowledge, two other significant developments being promoted elsewhere. Those were refused, or I think there was in fact no decision from Chilwell District Council in relation to both of those schemes, and there is currently a planning inquiry ongoing in relation to them. I don't know whether the inspectorate will ultimately grant consent for them or not, but it doesn't cause myself or the applicant any concern as to whether or not those developments would be consented. I mean, firstly, in terms of need, which is not for today. There's such a huge deficiency of supply that there's a need for multiple developments. But secondly, in terms of employment, insofar as other developments were consented, it's not a situation where the job demand will drop on day one, on the same day, for the totality of employment, that's not how this will work. As I know you understand, sir, there will be a phased provision of jobs, and very likely, if those developments are consented, they would come forward in advance of this one because this is a development that, by its very nature, has significant infrastructure requirements. That infrastructure needs to be delivered, both in terms of the highways works and the provisions that mr. Hilditch has

spoken to, and also in the rail terminal and the rail-related works. So it will be a more a delayed delivery of this development. Those developments will come forward very possibly at an earlier stage, but this is an employment requirement, if you like, that will be taken up on a phased basis over a period of years. So it's not a concern of the applicant. I don't know. I've sought to cover most of the ground. Is there anything that Ms. Crampton would wish to add in that context?

Speaker 6

Thank you, Zoe Crampton, for the applicant. I well, just going back on the terms of local that have been raised for the purposes of socio-economic ES Chapter 12, local is defined as Cherwell District, so not just the immediate vicinity around the site, and that's the area at which some of the impacts have been assessed, together with a sub-regional area, which was devised based on travel to work patterns and incorporates Oxfordshire, South Northampton, Aylesbury Vale, and Stratford-Bonavon. And that's the area across which we would expect some of those induced and indirect impacts, such as employee spending and supply chain benefits to be distributed across the extent to which those can be secured locally, as we've already discussed, will depend on employment plans that will be employment skills plans that will be agreed in due course. A figure for construction jobs was mentioned, which I just want to clarify: the socio-economic ES chapter calculated the average number of construction jobs to be around 790 jobs per annum. Those include both on-site and off-site jobs, so not necessarily all taking place on-site at any one time. And again, because of the mobility of the construction workforce distributed across a wider area than just local, and again, the extent to which those jobs can be and the benefits associated with them can be secured locally will be determined by the employment and skills plans agreed with the local planning authority.

Speaker 1

Have a question, if I could, which actually directed to the host authorities, if I could, which picks up on the point we heard about employment growth and significant residential development that's proposed. I'm presuming that, in terms of the allocations of those, there's been some research studies of the types of employment that will come forward within that plan period, and your allocations therefore reflect the type of employment that is going to come forward.

Speaker 13

In terms of the larger housing development at Tupper Hayford, that's adjacent to the site, that's coming through third. Planning application route, so that's the process. Personally, it's not an area that I have a lot of knowledge and experience with. My colleague who was here earlier would have been a better place to answer that one. So that's maybe something in written responses we'd be better to fulfil that answer with.

Speaker 1

If you could, I think that would that would be helpful. Yeah.

Speaker 4

mr. Broad, please.

Speaker 14

Thank you, sir. John Broad, CPRE. I must thank the applicant again for giving me the ammunition. Exactly as you proposed, the issue of finding the employees will possibly be from the surrounding area, and when we were talking about transport, that was the issue I raised earlier-that you need the transport to come from areas like Northampton, out as far as Swindon, out towards Aylesbury, and remember Aylesbury expanding really rapidly at the moment, so they probably won't have a lot of employees left, even down as far as Swindon, which also has, by the way, another huge warehouse

area of its own. And of course, when when it was said that these developments need to be near a motorway junction and on a rail line. I think some of them probably are. Is Northampton? I'm not sure whether it's on a railway line, but it's certainly on a road road junction, and that's next to Northampton Town. So it is local, as I was explaining before. The other aspect, which I think, in answer to the inspector's question just now, there is also a whole line of development yet to be built, employment development, yet to be built from Junction Nine up to Vondae Drive. That's each side of the present Siemens research development building, which has just been completed, so that is a massive employment area that's going to absorb, hopefully, some of the people who are going to move into the Bicester area, and something which again is starkster and the obvious: if you want to move into a house, as I did once. You had to have a job, so you already had a job before you moved in. Otherwise, you wouldn't get a mortgage. So the first generation of all those people who are moving into those 7,000 houses on the eco town will already have a job. Otherwise, they won't get a mortgage. So they'll not be looking for a job in an in a warehouse, and they probably wouldn't want a job there anyway because it wouldn't pay the mortgage, unless they were in the technology aspect, which I admit there are high-tech workers in this area. The rest of it in the future will be almost fully automatic. Automation is taking over, so the number of people required is also going to be reducing. Thank you.

Speaker 4

As the applicant got any comment on what mr. Brother has just discussed?

Speaker 5

So I don't. I don't propose to respond to that.

Speaker 4

In relation to what Minister Broad has just mentioned, I picked up in terms of this area is a lower employment area. What it needs to attract is quality quality jobs area quality jobs. So I just pick up the logistics, education, and training. Is that part of the employment agreement that the applicant is proposing?

Speaker 5

Sir, yes, it is, and indeed, I know Ms. Hutton, who is more familiar with the text of the definition than I can assist if I go wrong, but yes, absolutely, training is part of it, and we would anticipate indeed it's required that we submit a scheme for approval by the local planning authority to secure suitable training, and you've heard already from Ms. Crampton about the the misconception, the common misconception on the part of the wider public, perhaps shared by mr. Broad, as to the qualitative provision of jobs in the logistics sector. So I don't propose to go over that any further. But I don't know if Ms. Hutton has anything to say beyond no. So we're happy.

Speaker 4

Thank you. Now I will now turn to. I think I've got everyone. I will now turn to ES Chapter 12, Social Economics, Including Health, APP Dash One 8o. Table 3.4 indicates that that ES chapter five noise and vibration concludes that during the operational phase, most receptors will experience either negligible or minor changes in noise exposure arising from road and rail traffic. Significant adverse effects are identified only at one assessed residential receptor, named T10. I think that is IC's Avenue Bista. However, paragraph 5.5.46 of ES Chapter Five further states that although predictions were undertaken at a single receptor in this location, the analysis suggests that similar effects are likely to occur at all properties situated to the north of this section of Middleton Stoney Road, where facades are located within approximately 36 metres of the edge of the eastbound carriageway. Now, could the applicant therefore identify the sensitive residential receptors along Middleton Stoney Road that are expected to experience significant nighttime noise effects during operation of the proposed

development, explain the mitigation measures proposed to address those effects, and set out how such mitigation will be secured and monitored.

Speaker 5

Thank you, sir. So, in order to identify both the affected properties and the scheme of mitigation and what is proposed, I'm going to turn in the first instance to Anne Thompson of Air and Acoustic Consultants, who's sat down the table. Thank you, sir.

Speaker 15

Anne Thompson for the applicant, the receptors that have been identified are those within 36 metres of that eastbound carriageway, and they will be identified in a plan that's part of the Section 106 document. It's an appendix to the 106 Section 106. I think it could also be included in a later update to our chapter. To be clear, in one of the appendices, because currently there isn't a plan in the chapter that identifies those affected properties. In terms of the mitigation that has been identified for those properties, we are proposing that the mitigation would be a sound insulation package. Well, it would be a contribution towards a sound insulation package that the residents could instal, and that mitigation would be secured via the Section 106 agreement.

Speaker 4

Thank you. When you say chapter that you're going to update, what particular document is that? So that I can be clear, and what chapter within that document that needs to be updated, please. It

Speaker 15

would be the noise and vibration chapter, which the current document is AS 066, but it might sit better within the appendix, which would be APP 232, which will be the road traffic noise predictions, an assessment, so it could sit in the back of that appendix.

Speaker 4

Can you please be specific, either of the document, which, where will it sit, please?

Speaker 15

In Appendix Five Point 12, the current examination library reference for that document is APP 232.

Speaker 4

Okay. Thank you,

Speaker 9

sir. If I may also, Laura Bethson, for the applicant, just to be clear, the current draft section 106 agreement, which was submitted with the application, was very much in draft form, as you will see from the watermark and the number of square brackets that that remain in it. And we're very much still talking to the local authorities about that, and we're waiting for comments. The plan itself, identifying the properties to which Ms. Thompson refers, is not appended yet, but it will be.

Speaker 4

Thank you. Now I'll just point to Chawa District Council submission RR o2 four. I will quote. However, in line with its monitoring of Section 106 funding, on other side, the council could undertake some tasks to facilitate the installation of supplemental glazing, but could offer no certainties that this will be undertaken in a sufficiently timely manner, or to a sufficient level of coverage to offset the harm arising from a proposed third-party project, to enable to classify and to enable to classify and noise infiltration to be considered anything less than adequate to address this risk, it is recommended that the

applicant take a lead role in funding any allocations or provide funding through a section one of this agreement for the administration of the funds towards home improvements. Would the applicant comment on that? Because it appears as if the Chawa District Council doesn't have enough resources to manage this process.

Speaker 5

So it may be that I or we have misunderstood the position of the council, and or rather, there's been some breakdown in communication. But to be clear, there is no expectation on the applicant's part, that works would be undertaken by the council, or indeed that there would be any significant material monitoring for the council to undertake. What is proposed is essentially that the applicant will make a financial contribution. Affected properties, or rather, the owners of affected properties, will be able to draw down that money from the local planning authority because we'd make that payment to the authority pursuant to the 106, and it wouldn't be a question of the local planning authority having to do anything as regards the carrying out of works, it would be a matter for the owners of the affected properties as to what they did and how they utilised those funds. So that's all we were suggesting that the local planning authority do.

Speaker 9

Thank you, Laura Beth Uton, for the applicant. Just, just to add, as I say, this was our initial draft, our offer and suggestion to the local authority. We have not received any revised or amended drafting, other than what you see in the relevant representation. We are awaiting that from the council. We are very happy to discuss the detail of the drafting, but the intention is very much that there isn't any burden on the authority, and it's for the homeowners to use the funds as appropriate.

Speaker 4

Thank you. Before I move on to Mitchell Community Plan, I would just like Chowa District Council to comment, please.

Speaker 13

Thank you, sir. Yes, so Sean Fleet, Chowal District Council. Yes, certainly we don't see the Section 106 pot being a fund of money that the council itself we would directly go and instal windows into people's property. We anticipate that the plan will show something like a dozen or so properties along Middleton Stoney Road, and that pot of money, which will be X pounds, will come to the authority. At that point, though, the dozen or so properties identified on the plan will be able to approach the authority and say, "Can we have some money, please? We'd like to improve our double glazing into triple glazing, or single glazing into double glazing, and it's at that point we're then left with a request for X 1000, Y 1000 pounds to instal windows. We have no resources, we have no skills. We have no knowledge to understand if that request is reasonable. If somebody was to say, "I would like 50,000 pounds to do a few windows, we might well issue a cheque for 50,000 pounds. We have no way of managing that flow of money out and knowing if it's spent reasonably. And should the homeowners then have taken the money, we have no monitoring capacity to know if those windows are installed, and are of a sufficient grade to lessen the noise that is entering bedrooms, habitable rooms that might be affected by the property. We also don't have that ability to sort of control the timescale when that happens. So, this notice, a letter would be sent, I think, by the applicants to the homeowners to say this scheme is now running. We wouldn't be able to sort of drive and steer people to make applications. I know there's deadlines within the agreement itself, at the moment, but we can't control when the works are done, how quickly the window installers finish the process, and how many of those dozen or so properties need to be treated to what level to ensure that the noise being received by the receptors, the people who live in them is of a sufficiently low level that the noise generated by the passing lorries in the night isn't going to be detrimental to residential amenity and their health. So there's a lot, as we see it on the

council, to check, verify the spend, see what's being used, timeliness of delivery of that work. In theory, there might be something that works there, but there's something we're struggling with at the moment internally to see how we can shape this to make it an effective tool and obligation to help ameliorate the noise. It's it's a very unusual 106. Thank you.

Speaker 4

Thank you, mr. Fleet. I think the applicant wants to respond.

Speaker 9

Thank you, Sir Laura Beth Hutton, for the applicant. I think rather than take up examination time, chewing and froing over over the drafting and how amendments can be made, that's not quite how the draft works at the moment, but I suggest we take this away with the local authority, and obviously we'll be able to come back at the next deadline with hopefully some progress. I would just, of course, implore the council to engage with us on the detail of the drafting, and we're very happy to very happy to do that.

Speaker 4

Thank you very much. I will now call ask Mid Chowell Neighbourhood Plan for to comment.

Speaker 16

Yes, hello, Jonathan Boyce, representing Mid Chowel Neighbourhood Plan Forum. These measures will not obviously be remedial; may have remedial effect on the external amenity of these properties and their enjoyment. But it does occur to me, knowing that several other SRFIs. do have residential properties in very close proximity to the railheads and other operating warehouses. So, I'm sure there must be a best practice that can be transferred over from those other warehouses into what the applicants are considering. Thank you.

Speaker 4

May I ask the applicant to respond to that, please?

Speaker 9

Thank you, Sir Laura Beth Hutton, for the applicant. Yes, indeed, and there is noise insulation measures containing the Section 106 Planning Agreement for the West Midlands Interchange.

Speaker 4

Thank you, mr. Broad, please. Thank you, sir. John Broad, CPRE.

Speaker 14

I wasn't sure whether to include this in the transport section, but seeing as transport makes a noise, I left it till today because it was probably more applicable. But I know from what I've read, the all the warehouses are going to have solar panels on the roof, or as many as they can pack on them. I hope they're going to have battery storage because otherwise it's a complete waste of time. But that's something for them to work out. And of course, the electricity supply for the whole site is another question altogether, but we'll ignore that for a second. I did notice also that they have in the parking spaces EV, and by that I presume they mean car parking EV recharging points. What I was going to raise is much more important from the point of view of the HGVs, the future is electric. So you don't need so many EV car charging points. What you need are drive-through HGV electric vehicle charging points. Now the reason I left it to this today was exactly the point that was just being raised about the HGVs making noise. If they're electric, they don't. They do from the point of view of when they're reversing, making horrible beeping noises. But we all know about those. That's something which we

can't really. Deal with too much, but the noise of the diesel engines, and this was one of the other reasons I was raising the point about electrifying the track, the rail track, because if the if the electric if the train is electric, then you don't end up with that thundering great diesel engine that's making a racket as well. There is apparently a way around it, which is the tri-energy powertrain units, which might get over that problem. But the point I was trying to make is, you need to put in on this site EHV charging points because that is going to be the future, as people realise, especially at two pounds a litre at the moment for diesel. People are realising it's now cheaper to buy a diesel lorry, and yes, they can do the range. They are all over Europe. They are coming to this country soon. Thank you.

Speaker 4

Thank you, mr. Broad. Can I ask the applicant to comment on that,

Speaker 5

sir? Very briefly, a short point from me, which is that, as you will be aware, it's not a position where we could, as the applicant, undertake environmental assessment on the basis of 100% electric fleet, and on that basis, attest that there will be no noise issue. That would be completely inappropriate, and that's not what we've done. We have to assume a worst-case scenario in terms of fleet and fleet noise as generated, and it's on that basis that the assessment is undertaken, and that the mitigation has been identified in the same way that that mitigation is already employed in the context of the West Midlands Interchange. So that's essentially the position, and that's why we have assessed on this basis. But I'll turn now to mr. Harley, who will provide some further, more informed detail.

Speaker 8

Thank you, Smooth. Thank you, sir. Just briefly, and you're clearly familiar with the relevant representations from various parties and our responses to that. In our response to so the issues of alternative fuelling, including electric HUEs, was raised by Oxford's relevant rep, and we provided a response in our we provided response to their own rep, which you will see. So, and in brief, that refers to HCV refuelling both electric and hydrogen. Essentially, the first thing to say is this is about future proofing, as it is about meeting. There is no current demand from occupiers for electric HTVs. They're not running widely. It's not. It's not adopted technology in that regard, but it's clearly coming, and you'll see in our response. Essentially, we are saying that the infrastructure to allow that in the future will will be incorporated. So it's not a now thing, but it's something we're alert to and and have acknowledged, and we'll make provision for should it should it come as as anticipated, and it may.

Speaker 14

Forgive me, sir. That John Broad, CPRE again. I wasn't suggesting that you're going to get 100% EHGV fleet tomorrow. You're quite right. You need to plan for the future. That's all I was suggesting. So you put some drive. They need to be drive-through. They are special charging points. They charge over a megawatt, so they're not like your car chargers. They're serious chargers. They need battery storage to work, which is why I mentioned battery storage. So you need to be planning, exactly as you you said just now, for the future, not planning for the past. It is coming. Thank you,

Speaker 4

thank you, mr. Broad. I think the applicant has confirmed that is something that you will consider. Now, the question now is, how do we secure that?

Speaker 8

That may be one for us to take away, sir. If I can give you a headline, an initial response, and perhaps we'll come back to you in in writing if you're keen for us to do so. We have an energy strategy as part of the scheme, and a carbon management plan, and they they speak to each other in in a number of

different ways. I suspect through the adoption of energy strategy details, these are the sorts of measures that would come through that requirement 18 and 19. Thank you, Lord Beth. Also relevant, sir. Let me just find those. So yeah, requirement 18, sir. We must comply with the energy strategy. And 19 is a similar form of words relating to the carbon management plan. Requirement nine, criteria N of Part two, so that's requirement nine 2n, refers to HGV parking and welfare. Facilities and refuelling. So I think there's a number of hooks there for us to have to submit and agree details of how this and other measures form part of the detail when it as it comes through.

Speaker 4

Include sort of future innovation, because it's not just excuse me, it's not just submitting it for the for what is happening now in the near future because this development is going to carry on for a long time. So by the time the the by the opening time of this development, technology might have changed. So how does that address the technological innovation,

Speaker 8

Steve Harley? For the applicant, sir. I mean, opening year is 2031, sir. So, I mean, to what extent technology has transformationally moved on is, you know, open to some discussion. But I think the points we made, and we've tried to make it ourselves, we are we are future proofing through the provision of passive and active EV charging for cars, and as I've confirmed, passive or future proofing for EV HD or electric HDVs in the future as well. I'm not much. I'm not sure what more we can say, sir, in terms of making provision, there are also comments about hydrogen, which hasn't come up in questions, and I hesitate to go there.

Speaker 4

And within the energy statement that needs to be submitted via the requirement, is it right to say that this, you know, researching into taking account of possibility of the electric vehicle charging points for HGV will be incorporated, stated in that possibility of installing it in the future, if it's possible. Would that be incorporated into the energy strategy?

Speaker 8

Steve Harley, for the applicant, as I've said, sir, I think I think it would. But it's it's a currently the commitment is to future proof to allow it in the in the future. Should there be the demand that we're anticipating may may come, to the extent that that how that how that will be worded, that's something we can look at. I can't actually recall, if I'm honest, what it says currently. The the energy strategy has submitted. You can check. I certainly will, and maybe that's something we need to look again at. But I think the energy strategy is the right focus.

Speaker 4

Thank you, mr. Halley. Unless there's anybody in the room who wants to Comment. I think I've come to the end of this item. Oh, sorry, mr. Broad.

Speaker 14

Yeah, apologies. It's me again, John Broad, CPRE. I just wanted when we were talking about the footpaths earlier on and the sites of things. I noticed we haven't included the heritage site. There is a small area which has got a heritage area in it, and the idea is that that's a grade two listed building, I believe, and it is in the documentation is going to be used for something, so that's good. But from a point of view of its location, which is why it's grade grade listed historically, it's going to be in a canyon. If you look on the plan, I know it's an indicative plan, but it's going to be in a canyon of sheds. It's not exactly the right setting, is it? Anyway,

Speaker 4

Sorry. Can I take that as general comments, or yeah? Thank you. I think that's the conclusion Of the agenda item,

Speaker 1

thank you for that. Again, sort of conscious of the time, we're sort of quickly approaching half past five, which is when we said we wanted to do. However, I think there are a couple of questions on minerals and waste. In particular, I think perhaps not necessarily for the applicant or the council, but I think for mr. Stewart Van Huene Biffer, I think he's been waiting patiently online, and I know that that we have just one or two questions for him, if that's possible. So I think we might might do that and then see see where we where we get to, but I suspect that might will be the the. Under the discussion in terms of what we want to do or what we've got time for realistically, but if I hand over to mr. Rigby now.

Speaker 17

Thank you, mr. Hunter. Thank you for waiting patiently, mr. Irwin. I've got under this item questions about two issues. The first one is the proposed loss of the existing waste facility within the site, which is currently operated by Biffa Waste Services, and the other issue is the potential sterilisation of mineral resources. Now, in view of time, I wish to hear from Biffa Waste Services who are online waiting, and I will then propose to put the remainder of my questions into writing in order to save time. So, I will take submission from Biffa Waste Services and invite the applicant to respond. Thank you.

Speaker 18

Thank you, James Stewart Irving, for Biffa. Just to clarify that, I'll be responding on the waste point. I haven't made any representations on sterilisation of minerals. Our principal concern is that the proposal would remove a strategically important waste management facility without providing any replacement capacity. ARDI plays a vital role in treating Oxford's food and garden waste, supporting recycling performance, carbon reduction, and the circular economy. The applicant has not demonstrated where this capacity will be replaced in accordance with planning policy or how the waste currently managed at Hardley will be treated in the future. We are particularly concerned that the justification for the facility's removal appears to be driven by perceived odour constraints in apparent consultation with potential future occupants. Biffa was neither consulted on these discussions nor involved. The applicant's odour assessment was undertaken without any operational input from Biffa. The IVC operates under a permanent planning permission, an approved odour management plan, and Environment Agency regulation. The applicant's own odour evidence recorded very limited complaints acknowledges that odour sources in the area are not confined to the IVC facility. The facility is an existing lawful use, and national planning policy is clear that new development should not place unreasonable restrictions on established operations. The facility is specifically safeguarded in Appendix Two of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, Part One, Core Strategy, recognising the contribution that it makes to Oxfordshire's waste management capacity, the safeguarding of waste management facilities has become a significant issue nationally in recent years, particularly as the county seeks to substantially increase recycling and treatment rates. I have worked with the Environmental Services Association to produce research papers on this issue. In our view, the correct response is not the removal of safeguarded waste infrastructure, but the application of the agent of change principle and appropriate mitigation within the proposed development. Just on a couple of other points that have arisen today, there's been quite a lot of discussions about significantly raising employment levels, and I would just flag that the site also employs people, and not replacing the site would therefore be a loss of employment opportunities at that particular location. And again, another matter of conversation was the substantial increase in residential development taking place nearby, but not just there. Actually, quite substantial amount around the whole county. And you can't have that level of residential development without the necessary infrastructure to support it, including waste management facilities. So we'll just

be losing capacity. You know, when really we should be safeguarding all the capacity that we have, and if anything, increasing it. And I think for now, I'm happy to hand over again.

Speaker 17

Thank you very much. Could you please respond briefly, sir? Yes,

Speaker 5

thank you, sir. I'm going to respond very briefly. Firstly, myself, and I'm going to pass down the line to mr. Ben Withers of WSP, who speaks as the expert on waste matters for the applicant. So, sir, I mean, just four short points. I mean, firstly, as regards rights and site assembly, as I know the XA is aware, what is proposed by the applicant is to allow the current lease, which BIFA holds, to expire. It's not a question of seeking, or well, it's not a question of exercising compulsory purchase powers. In the ordinary course of events, we would expect that lease to expire, and then we would look to build out. Secondly, what's talked of is the need and the need for this facility and the capacity that it provides. mr. Withers will speak in a moment to this issue, but what the applicant says is that there is, in fact, surplus capacity within the waste plan area, certainly in the context of the current adopted waste and minerals plan, that position can be contrasted with the nationally significant infrastructure project which we are bringing forward, and for which there is a compelling need, as identified in the national networks NPF. And then, lastly, the final point I'd make in that regard is that the applicant doesn't doubt that there is current employment on the site at present. What's proposed and the figure that I identified in terms of the operational provision was a net addition of just over 7,000 jobs. So we have had regard to that consideration. But on that basis, I'm just going to turn briefly to mr. Withers to see what points that he thinks he should respond to as regards those made on behalf of Biffa.

Speaker 19

Ben Withers, WSP, on behalf of the applicant. In terms of the odour, I'm not. I'm not proposing to address that point at the moment. We may need to respond to that in writing. Can

Speaker 17

you speak into the microphone, please? We're having difficulty hearing you. Thank you.

Speaker 19

With regards to the comment about oda and our odour assessment that was undertaken, I'm not proposing to address that, we may need to take that away and respond in writing. Just to confirm what mr. Booth was saying around the current capacity, we've undertaken an assessment. It's in Table 13.22 within Chapter 13 of the environmental statement, and that looks at you know the the current capacity and forward capacity to 2031, and confirms that there is sufficient capacity within Oxfordshire without that facility being in place. There isn't really anything more to add to that. I know that Oxfordshire may want to come in and talk about that. We're in discussion with Oxfordshire around this particular point with their statement on common ground.

Speaker 17

Thank you, Oxfordshire County Council. Do you have any comments?

Speaker 10

I think, in the interest of time, we will provide a written response to that.

Speaker 17

Thank you very much indeed.

Speaker 1

Okay, that that concludes the item. I'm told. There we go. Yes,

Speaker 17

we'll put the rest of what we were going to ask into written questions in view of the time. Thank you very much, everyone.

Speaker 1

So, given the time, I think what we'll also do is we'll also move the questions that we had under drama consent order into writing as well. It's probably fair to say that they were only a number of questions that we had that we felt was pertinent for today. But there's a whole host of other questions that we have in the DCO as well, so we can add those into those when we when we issue our our written questions at some point stage next week. I suspect, unless there was anything particular that the applicant wanted to flag up on those questions that we needed to be aware of, but if not, we can we'll proceed on on that basis. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. In terms of the next item, we sort of review sort of various actions. I don't think we've got any particular action points that we identified. Although there was a number of matters, I think the applicant agreed to sort of take away and submit to us, or to take away and sort of provide in writing. I'm guessing the applicant has probably got a note of all of those, unless you need me to go through,

Speaker 5

well, sir, I mean we will have a note. The risk is it's not quite the same as your note, but we can look to provide that to we can look to provide that to you on an informal basis. That'd be the way, and then we can double check

Speaker 1

that with ours. In terms of yeah, in terms of sort of stuff that's on our note, which is probably more than taken away, there were sort of submit surface and groundwater testing results undertaken on site by the updated Chapter 11, which may well be something that mentioned anyway through the change request and bits and pieces, an updated CMP to affect the PFAS issue, which I think was something we'd already talked about, and then we had updated ES Appendix 5.12, which deals with the noise-sensitive receptors on Middleton Stoney Road, and the discussion we had around that. And then there was to liaise with the CDC Council, in particular, on relation to the Section 106 agreements and agree the wording of of that, and then there was discussions around the the employment scheme as well. If I remember, and how that would work as well. So yeah, okay, great, thank you. Yes,

Speaker 13

Sean Fleet, Chairwoman Council, were you looking for a written update on the Upper Heyford site with the residential development from ourselves,

Speaker 1

not per se. Other than in relation to, and it's a good point because we did discuss this in relation to the allocations of employment use and the housing allocations. By all means, in your. In your local impact report, an update would would probably be helpful, but not predict not a specific notes. But if you want to include that in the local impact report as an update, and now that this the position that that will probably be helpful to us, I suspect.

Speaker 4

Oxfordshire County Council, you like to comment?

Speaker 1

Okay, I think that's the note of everything that I think we're looking to do action-wise. In terms of the next item, any other business? Is there anything else in the room that anybody would like to raise at this stage? The applicant. So

Speaker 5

there's one matter on behalf of the applicant, and that is in relation to the potential for a site visit to Ardley passenger station. Network Rail have confirmed that they can accommodate the XA, and it would be a small group accompanied site visits to the passenger station on at 1 p.m. on the 9th of November. That would be the day before the hearings start, or indeed potentially, I don't know if you're proposing to sit on the afternoon of the of the Monday, but that week, next week of hearings in any event.

Speaker 1

Okay, that's that's enormously helpful. We can we can set that away and see whether that would work, but that might well that might well work for us in terms of in terms of numbers. I'm suspecting that probably the way we might do that is sort of slightly informal access required site visit, where it is perhaps just the EXA being accompanied by by Network Rail, just to sort of, from a health and safety perspective, to make sure that that we're there. And wasn't expecting that would be the whole sort of examination coming along. It would just be on on that basis. Okay, thank you. That's that's helpful. Has anybody else in the room got anything they wish to raise, or anybody online that they wish to raise the Npub Forum.

Speaker 16

Yeah, given that the opportunity to visit the Ardley Station site, there's a paucity of information about how the site is laid out and how it how it looks. So, if there's any opportunity from the the applicant to provide us with a little bit more detail potentially on how that looks, that would be great. Thank you.

Speaker 1

So, in terms of in terms of what? Sorry,

Speaker 16

photographic material, but potentially of the site, and and maybe some diagrammatic diagrammatic representations of its potential proximity to the rail freight and railheads, etc.

Speaker 1

Okay, I'm still. I'm not quite sure what what I'm still not quite sure what you're asking about. We

Speaker 16

only. I've only ever seen one. I've only ever seen one photograph of the the old Ardley station, and you know, in terms of maybe some other perspectives of what that station looks like, what the site looks like today will be quite useful.

Speaker 1

That that might be something Network Rail might well be able to to supply as part of that technical.

Speaker 16

And the the rationale for that is, you know, looking in terms of access, is the available availability of space or land for car parking, or at least a bus turnaround and those kinds of things. Okay.

Speaker 1

Okay. Thanks. It may be something Network Rail can look into that, but I'm not. That's not sure. That's something the XA we require per se, but the network won't be able to help out. Is anybody else in the room who's got anything that they wish to say at this point? No. Okay, and there's nobody online, so thank you. I think that concludes our business for today. As I mentioned earlier, a recording of today's meeting was published on the National Infrastructure website as soon as practical upon the close of today. If you've registered to attend tomorrow's meeting online, again, please note that the link won't work. So you'll need to use the link for tomorrow's compulsory acquisition hearing. And then that's just a further reminder for anybody else: tomorrow's compulsory acquisition hearing in this room tomorrow, commencing at 10 a.m. But with a 9:30 registration, the time is now 5:35, and this issue-specific hearing is closed. Thank you very much for your contributions.