Submission ID: S9234E99C

Bucknell Parish Council objects to the OXSRFI application because adequate protection against additional through traffic in Bucknell has not been demonstrated. This representation concerns only transport impacts on our village. We maintain our request for a Bucknell relief road, supported by enforceable restrictions that remove through traffic from residential streets. The applicant's Transport Assessment (TA) predicts substantial opening-phase diversion through Bucknell but has not adequately demonstrated that its proposed safeguards will prevent it.

Table 9.17 compares the 2031 opening year with and without OXSRFI and its associated highway works. In the evening peak, northbound flow on Ardley Road between Bucknell and Ardley increases from 104 to 384 passenger-car units per hour: an increase of 280, or approximately 269%. Two-way flow increases from 230 to 521, approximately 127%. On Middleton Road, northbound flow rises from 87 to 259, approximately 198%, while two-way flow increases from 180 to 380, approximately 111%.

These are modelled flows expressed in passenger-car units, not observed vehicle counts. Nevertheless, their scale is unmistakable. Almost all the additional northbound Ardley Road traffic, and all the Middleton Road increase, is attributed to reassigned background traffic. The absence of vehicles travelling directly to OXSRFI does not remove the development's responsibility for traffic diverted by its highway alterations.

The mechanism is expressly explained at paragraphs 9.124–9.125: the Ardley bypass reduces delays at the Ardley Road/B430 junction, making routes through Bucknell more attractive. Table 9.15 also predicts an 83% morning-peak increase in northbound Middleton Road flow. Our rat-running concern is supported by the applicant's evidence.

We acknowledge that the submitted scheme now includes 40mph limits on Ardley Road, Middleton Road and Bicester Road, together with a signal-controlled shuttle arrangement at Middleton Road bridge. We welcome these additions to the earlier proposals. However, paragraph 9.126 confirms that the bridge arrangement and relevant speed reductions were not included in the Bicester Transport Model.

Paragraphs 9.127–9.128 instead reason that a possible wait of up to 55 seconds at the bridge, combined with lower speeds, would eliminate the journey-time advantage and therefore the forecast traffic increases. A maximum possible wait is not an average delay: some vehicles will arrive on green. The assessment must model actual signal operation, traffic demand, queues and realistic speed compliance before concluding that diversion disappears.

There is a further problem. Paragraph 9.125 identifies a separate route from north Bicester via Bainton Road and Ardley Road. That route does not pass over Middleton Road bridge. Table 9.18 shows it becoming approximately 60 seconds faster than the alternative via Baynard's Green. Bridge signals cannot deter traffic that never encounters them. The applicant must demonstrate separately whether the Ardley Road speed reduction removes this advantage.

We therefore request revised assignment modelling incorporating all proposed mitigation, with flows for every arm of Bucknell crossroads and each village approach. It should test peak and off-peak conditions, realistic signal settings, imperfect speed compliance, incidents on the strategic network and delayed delivery of later highway works. Results must show residual diversion rather than simply assume it away.

Paragraphs 12.46–12.50 and Appendix 75 assess Bucknell crossroads and report a maximum flow-to-capacity ratio of 45%. We acknowledge that the junction was tested with the higher modelled flows. However, demonstrating that vehicles can negotiate a junction without excessive queuing does not demonstrate that additional traffic is acceptable for people crossing roads, walking, cycling or riding horses.

The Ardley–Bicester route runs through the village, dividing the community. Residents must cross and use these roads for everyday journeys. Middleton Road is a narrow country lane which the Parish Council identifies as having only two designated passing places between the fuel depot and the B4030. The applicant's options appraisal also records that Middleton Road is well used by cyclists. Increased opposing traffic risks obstruction, reversing and conflict with vulnerable users.

The National Networks National Policy Statement requires evidence addressing severance and safety barriers for non-motorised users, and a mitigation strategy informed by their needs. A Bucknell-specific assessment must therefore examine crossing opportunities, visibility, vehicle speeds, footway continuity and the experience of children, older people and disabled residents. Spare junction capacity is not a substitute for this assessment.

We continue to request a properly designed and funded relief road around Bucknell, accompanied by measures preventing the existing village route remaining an attractive shortcut. The applicant already recognises the value of diverting traffic around settlements through its Ardley bypass and Middleton Stoney relief road. Bucknell deserves an explicit assessment against the same objective of protecting communities from through traffic.

We acknowledge the TA's predicted traffic reductions after completion in 2034. However, the Forecasting Report confirms that both the 2034 and 2042 development scenarios assume the full highway mitigation package. The 2042 sensitivity tables therefore do not test delayed delivery of the Middleton Stoney relief road. Long-term forecasts cannot establish that Bucknell is protected during the intervening years or if delivery slips.

The applicant should assess Bucknell relief-road options against enforceable access restrictions and other alternatives, reporting traffic removal, safety benefits, feasibility, cost and delivery. We recognise that the development's contribution must relate to its impacts, but a bypass must not be dismissed without that assessment. Any proposed alternative must demonstrate equivalent protection. Funding, necessary land arrangements and delivery milestones should be secured through the consent and associated obligations, with occupation tied to the protection required for each phase.

Pending delivery of a relief road, and without withdrawing our request for it, we require a funded package agreed with Oxfordshire County Council following consultation with this Parish Council. It must include the proposed 40mph approach limits, supported by effective enforcement and speed-reducing design, while retaining any lower village limits. Signs alone cannot substantiate assumed changes in driver behaviour.

At the proposed Middleton Road roundabout, our requested residents-only restriction should be developed into a legally enforceable access-only arrangement, retaining necessary access for residents, businesses, deliveries, farms and emergency services. Its design must prevent through journeys towards Bucknell and Bainton Road without merely transferring them to another village approach. Suitable traffic regulation orders, camera enforcement where lawful, or a controlled filter should be assessed and funded.

We welcome the proposed 7.5-tonne restriction covering Bucknell and the OXSRFI HGV routing strategy. However, paragraph 4.84 says additional enforcement of the weight limit need not be included because site HGVs are separately

monitored. That leaves unanswered how other prohibited HGVs will be deterred and violations addressed. An agreed enforcement programme is necessary; the weight limit also does nothing to control diverted cars and vans.

The Construction Traffic Management Plan already prohibits heavy construction vehicles from using existing weight-restricted routes, including Ardley Road between Ardley and Bucknell. We welcome this. However, paragraph 4.2 gives workers' cars routing priorities rather than an explicit Bucknell through-route prohibition. Paragraph 6.5 leaves the HGV monitoring mechanism unspecified, while paragraph 6.6 envisages warning letters and possible driver replacement. Require approved routes, monitoring locations, sanctions and response deadlines before works start, expressly covering workers' cars and vans.

The uncertainty log includes Heyford Park and North West Bicester development, while a sensitivity scenario includes Tritax at Baynard's Green. We therefore recognise that cumulative assessment exists. However, the log does not identify Puy du Fou by name. The applicant should reconcile the housing entries with Hawkwell and the proposed Heyford Park expansion, explain exclusions and test additional development. It should also test delayed delivery of the North West Bicester strategic link road, which the log assumes by 2031. These assumptions affect the attractiveness of routes through Bucknell.

Temporary closures and diversion signs must keep displaced traffic on suitable roads. A phase-by-phase programme must identify which Bucknell safeguards operate before each network change, including when construction and occupation overlap. Protection must address diverted background traffic as well as vehicles serving OXSRFI.

Before consent, we seek an agreed baseline of classified traffic counts and speeds on all village approaches, together with binding limits on development-related increases, published monitoring and funded remedial measures with deadlines. Monitoring must cover construction, opening and completion, including reassigned traffic. Promises to review problems after they arise are insufficient. Until a relief road or demonstrably equivalent protection is secured, Bucknell Parish Council maintains its objection.

Please note that we have also received correspondence identifying our Interested Parties Reference Number as [redacted].