OXFORDSHIRE
STRATEGIC RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

Applicant's Responses to Written Representations

Document number 11.5
Revision -

On behalf of
Oxfordshire Railfreight Limited

October 2026

PINS REF:	TR050008
Document Reference	11.5
APFP Regulation	5(2)(q)
Author	Oxfordshire Railfreight Limited
Date	October 2026
Revision	-

The Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange and Highways Order 202X

Applicant's Responses to Written Representations: Document 11.5

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Following the start of the Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (OxSRFI) Examination on 29 September 2026, Interested Parties were invited to submit Written Representations (WRs) at Deadline 1 (13 October 2026). The Examining Authority (ExA) has requested that comments on WRs are submitted at Deadline 2 (26 October 2026).

1.2 Considering the content of many of the Written Representations received, and the overlap with either responses already provided by the Applicant submitted in response to ExQ1, responses are deliberately proportionate and focused in terms of scope and content. The Applicant has therefore sought to provide a response to the written representation where it is considered helpful to do so and has not sought to respond to each and every point made particularly where these are clearly directly covered by previous responses to Relevant Representations (Document series 9.1/PDA-007, PDA-008, PDA-009, PDA-010 and PDA-011) and to its responses to the ExQ1's (Document 11.3). The Applicant understands that should there be issues which the ExA considers are not appropriately addressed either here or elsewhere by the Applicant, that the ExA may seek to raise additional questions or seek responses as a matter of course within the ongoing Examination process.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
REP1-054	Biffa Waste Services	The Biffa WR states it seeks to *"re-provide our previous comments with further detail".* The key themes included in Biffa's WR are: a) Loss of the in-vessel composting (IVC) facility without replacement capacity b) The Waste Data Interrogator measures throughput, not spare capacity c) The Draft ES referred to a figure of 198,849 tonnes in paragraph 13.4.26 and Biffa has been unable to reproduce that figure from the Environment Agency's 2025 WDI dataset d) The need for the IVC and commercial property arrangements should be considered separately e) Safeguarding and Policy W11 f) Practical capacity is 35,000–40,000 tpa, not the 75,000 tpa permit limit g) An Oxfordshire-only assessment is too narrow	As a result of Biffa's WR re-providing their previous comments made in their RR (RR-015), the Applicant's response (Document 9.1/PDA-007, pages 91-92) to their RR remains relevant. a) See the Applicants response (Document 9.1/PDA-007, pages 91-92) to Biffa's RR. The Applicant's response to ExQ1.12.5 is also relevant. b) As set out in Appendix 35 of the Consultation Report (Document 5.1K/AS-049) responding to comments made during the Statutory Consultation, in the absence of a better source of publicly available data for capacity of waste facilities, it is common practice to use the Waste Data Interrogator as an indicator of the operational throughput of waste management facilities. The use of the throughput actually provides a more conservative value than capacity as the majority of waste facilities do not operate at their full permitted capacity. Where information on the permitted capacity of waste management facilities is available, this has been used instead of data taken from the Waste Data Interrogator. c) ES Chapter 13 (Materials and Waste) (Document 6.13/APP-181) provides an update figure of 204,600 tonnes in paragraph 13.4.31. d) See the Applicant's response (Document 9.1/PDA-007, pages 91-92) to Biffa's RR, which explains that there is

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		h) Odour evidence does not demonstrate that the existing IVC operation is unacceptable	still an approximate 33,000 tonnes per annum over capacity as of 2031 despite removing the IVC. The Applicant accepts the planning permission is permanent despite the lease expiring in 2030 (paragraph 13.4.24, Document 6.13/APP-181). e) The Applicant accepts the IVC site is listed at Appendix 2 of the Local Plan (paragraph 13.4.25, Document 6.13/APP-181). Policy W11 states that development that would prevent or prejudice the use of a safeguarded site will not be permitted **unless** it can be demonstrated that the site is no longer required for waste management. ES Chapter 13 (Materials and Waste) (Document 6.13/APP-181) sets out there would not be a significant effect from the loss of the Ardley IVC, but rather that there would be a negligible impact on capacity. f) As set out in paragraph 7.4.34 of the Consultation Report (Document 5.1/AS-046), the Applicant uses 35,000 tpa as the maximum operational capacity. g) As set out in Appendix 35 of the Consultation Report (Document 5.1K/AS-049) in response to comments made during the Statutory Consultation, in line with the proximity principle, it has been demonstrated that the removal of the IVC will not have an impact on waste management in Oxfordshire and there is sufficient capacity to manage all organic wastes generated by Oxfordshire within the OCC boundary. Please see paragraphs 13.4.22 to 13.4.32 of ES Chapter 13 (Materials and Waste) for more information.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
			Therefore, an assessment of whether there is capacity within surrounding counties of Buckinghamshire, Milton Keynes or West Northamptonshire to manage organic waste from Oxfordshire is not required. h) The Odour Report submitted with the Application (Document 5.4D/APP-165) concludes that odour from a relocated IVC facility would be noticeable within OxSRFI. The report found that there have been a range of complaints made about the IVC facility over the years and a large number of these are from the village of Ardley which is some considerable distance from the IVC facility (around 2km). The report sets out the findings of sniff test surveys which found that odour can be detected around the IVC and across what would be the OxSRFI main site at levels that are described as distinct, strong and very strong. Some of the buildings within the main site would only be 300 metres or so from a relocated IVC facility, clearly much closer than the village of Ardley is from the existing IVC facility. As part of the work to consider a relocation of the IVC facility the Applicant investigated the potential both for mitigation measures and for changes to how the IVC facility may operate (which was provided by the previous site operator Severn Trent Green Power). The Applicant's odour consultants concluded that whilst

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
			these may have some effect, they would be insufficient to make a material difference to the odour that might be detected. The previous operator of the IVC facility (STGP) raised during the project's Non-statutory Consultation the importance *"for a waste management facility to be located so as to minimise the potential for adverse amenity effects to occur."* The work completed by the Applicant alongside commercial discussions with potential occupiers has concluded that it would not be possible to relocate the IVC facility without creating adverse amenity effects.
REP1-019	Bucknell Parish Council	Bucknell Parish Councils WR largely raises the same points as in their RR. However, the WR makes the following points to which the Applicant seeks to respond to: a) Concerns that the BTM traffic modelling forecasts traffic increases through the village in the opening year scenario, prior to the Phase 2 highway works being in place. b) Request for a residents-only restriction at the proposed Middleton Road roundabout. c) Welcome the proposed 7.5-tonne restriction covering Bucknell and	The majority of the points raised in Bucknell Parish Council's WR were previously raised in their RR (RR-017), for example the request for a relief road, and therefore the Applicants response (PDA-007, pages 2-3) to their RR remains relevant. The Applicant has sought to respond to a number of points from the WR where it is considered helpful to do so. This is set out below: a) This is discussed at paragraphs 9.125 to 9.129 of the Transport Assessment (AS-055), where it is explained that the BTM does not account for the effects of the proposed speed limit reductions on Middleton Road and Ardley Road, nor the traffic signal controlled shuttle working arrangement on Middleton Road that would increase journey times for drivers using these roads, meaning that traffic would be deterred from using them

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		the OxSRFI HGV routeing strategy but suggest an agreed enforcement programme is necessary.	as journey times would not be quicker than the alternative existing routes. To further mitigate against this in the opening year and also to mitigate against the BTM traffic increases forecast on the Bainton Road / Ardley Route, additional highways mitigation has been agreed with OCC. The additional mitigation is set out in the 'Changes to Speed Limits and Highway Design' section of the change request report (Document 11.2). The additional measures are a traffic calming feature within highway works (Works No 19) to form a gateway into Ardley Village, and the relocation of the speed limit on Ardley Road (the speed limit change between 20mph and 40mph) approximately 150m to the east to coincide with the traffic calming feature. OCC confirm at paragraph 60 of their RR (RR-109) that the additional mitigation is sufficient to act as an additional deterrent. b) The OxSRFI scheme will reduce traffic on Middleton Road, as set out in the table at paragraph 4.47 of the Sustainable Transport Strategy (TA Appendix 1) (AS-055). In addition, the 7.5T environmental weight restriction is to be provided on Middleton Road (and the general Bucknell area) as shown on the Traffic Regulation Plans (AS-017). As such, the measures proposed by Bucknell Parish Council cannot be justified as mitigation for OxSRFI. c) The 7.5T environmental weight restriction is a complementary measure to the wider OxSRFI scheme and enforcement of this would be for the relevant authorities.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
REP1-033	Charlotte Lucia Borrie Harris	This WR is focussed solely on PFAS.	See the Applicant's Post Hearing Submissions (Document 10.3/REP1-016) which provides a comprehensive update in respect of the approach and work undertaken in relation to PFAS by the Applicant. As set out in the Applicant's cover letter for Procedural Deadline A (PDA-001), an updated Ground ES Chapter (Document 6.9/APP-179) and a new Technical Note (Document 6.11K) is submitted at Deadline 2 to address PFAS.
REP1-035	Dorchester Living	The Dorchester Living WR raises the following points: a) Assessment of the wider 9,000-dwelling Heyford Park masterplan and delivery programme during the Examination, alongside existing and consented development and with their different planning status identified. The Applicant must identify effects on delivery, demonstrate any claimed infrastructure benefits and provide the design changes and safeguards required. b) A coordinated landscape scheme for the western interface and approaches to Heyford Park, including Parcel 23, the retained access road, the Link Road and Chilgrove Drive. Drawings, sections	The Dorchester Living WR follows matters raised by DL through Relevant Representations but has been updated with some matters now acknowledged as being addressed and some new matters being raised. Many matters have been addressed by the Applicant in their response to DL's Relevant Representation and have also been covered with answers to questions at the first Hearings and/or through the Applicant's answers to ExQ1. The Applicant has been engaged with Dorchester Living for a long period of time and that engagement continues. Regular meetings are being put in place to discuss the outstanding matters that DL have raised. The Applicant is working with Dorchester Living to prepare a Position Statement between the parties which would provide the ExA with an understanding of the discussions that are on-going and the ambitions of the parties to reach further agreement wherever possible. a) The Applicant has explained its approach to design in the Design Approach Document (Document 5.5A/APP-166) and in the Applicant's Post Hearing Note (Document 10.3A/REP1-017). The approach has, where possible, taken account of all existing committed and planned growth in the area including the proposed

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		and planting specifications must demonstrate the screening available during construction, early operation and after establishment, with maintenance and replacement secured. c) Binding phasing controls coordinating warehouse development, strategic mounding, planting and the Heyford Park Link Road. Bunding and planting must be delivered early to allow establishment, with necessary mitigation in place before warehouse occupation and interim screening, noise and lighting controls protecting residents until permanent measures are effective. d) Enforceable noise and lighting controls protecting existing and future Heyford Park residents and its principal approaches. These must address the combined night-time effects of 24-hour operation, including HGV and forklift movements, loading and unloading, reversing alarms, plant and yard lighting, with applicable limits, monitoring and remedial action	new town at Heyford Park. The New Town would not introduce new homes closer to the OxSRFI site than housing that is committed through existing consent. The Environmental Assessment includes a qualitative assessment of the potential cumulative effects of the Application with and on proposed but not committed development in the area, this includes the Heyford Park New Town proposal as well as proposals for commercial development at M40 J10 and proposals by Puy Du Fou. This is considered to be a robust and proportionate approach given the status and uncertainty in relation to these proposals. b) Significant changes to the Proposed Development have been made in response to discussions with DL. This includes changes to the western interface, both in terms of the building position and heights, the approach to screen mounding and the approach to landscaping. Commitments have been made to the landscaping in this area with instant hedging and the use of heavy standard trees. This commitment is set out in the HMMP and secured through both Requirements 11 and 12. c) The anticipated approach to the phasing of the proposed development is set out in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Doc 6.2C/APP-189) and shown on the indicative master programme at Appendix 1 and on the phasing plans at Appendix 2 of the CEMP. These show that earthworks and landscaping will be completed along both the western (Phase 1) section of the Heyford Park Link

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		secured before the relevant operations commence. e) A drainage design demonstrating how runoff from screening mounds will be intercepted and managed, including along the proposed bridleway, with delivery and long-term maintenance secured to protect Heyford Park and avoid constraining its development. f) Safeguarding of future Ardley Station and practicable connections to it. An enhanced, direct and accessible footpath/bridleway through OxSRFI must have an agreed alignment and specification, safe crossings, construction protection, delivery, public access and maintenance arrangements. The Applicant must also demonstrate that practicable vehicular access to the station is not prejudiced. g) Justification of the amount and duration of warehouse occupation permitted before the rail freight terminal opens. Requirement 5 must secure timely rail operation, with any necessary additional	Road (HPLR) and along the eastern (Phase 2) Section of the HPLR, prior to the completion of the construction of that Section of the Link Road. The anticipated approach to phasing set out on the Indicative Master Programme assumes that the first warehousing will be occupied a few months prior to the completion and opening of the HPLR. The anticipated approach to phasing assumes that buildings will not be constructed adjacent to the Heyford Park Link Road until after its completion. This is because Phase one of the Link Road is due to be completed very early in the construction process and prior to the construction of buildings in Zone A4 and because Phase two of the Link Road is due to be completed some considerable time before works are undertaken in Zone A3. Requirements 4 and 8 control the phasing of the Proposed Development. Requirement 4 requires the details of the phasing of each component to be submitted for approval prior to work on that component commencing and Requirement 8 requires construction of highway works, including the Heyford Park Link Road (in phases), the first part must be completed prior to occupation of any units, with the second to be completed before the floorspace trigger set in the Requirement. d) The Environmental Assessment includes a comprehensive assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development as a result of noise and lighting.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		occupation limits and delivery triggers incorporated into the DCO so that the rail-based public benefits relied upon are secured. h) Cumulative transport testing incorporating reasonable scenarios for the wider Heyford Park masterplan, identifying capacity constraints, mitigation and delivery responsibilities. A phased access plan must maintain suitable construction and operational access throughout the works, with necessary replacement access available before existing access is interrupted. i) Safeguarding of a practicable private wire route from the Ardley energy-from-waste facility, including necessary crossings, access and protection arrangements, before the OxSRFI layout or works prevent delivery. Utilities, drainage and shared infrastructure must be coordinated between the schemes. j) Plot-specific justification of the extent and nature of the interests sought over each of DL's six plots.	The assessments are based on reasonable worst case assumptions and includes an assessment of the effects of the proposed development on Heyford Park. The assessments conclude that as a result of the embedded and additional mitigation the residual effects on receptors at Heyford Park would not be significant. Noise from plant and machinery, including mobile plant and HGV chiller units, is controlled by Requirement 26. The approach to lighting has been set out in the outline lighting strategy and will be controlled through Requirement 16. e) The approach to and effects of the proposed development on the water environment have been fully assessed and set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter 9. The Main Site sustainable drainage statement [AS-077] confirms that the runoff from the bunds will be intercepted and managed as part of the surface water drainage network. f) The Applicant has set out details of its position on the safeguarding of a future passenger station. This is set out in the Passenger Rail Station Note which is an Appendix to the Planning Statement (Doc 5.4C/AS-050). The Applicant has also submitted a post Hearing Note (Document 10.3B/REP1-018) which explains the range of measures and commitments that will be delivered by the OxSRFI project and which will benefit a future passenger station.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		The Applicant must demonstrate why permanent freehold acquisition is necessary and why lesser interests, highway arrangements or contractual protections would not achieve its objectives. Compulsory powers must be reduced wherever those alternatives provide adequate certainty. k) A schedule identifying affected Heyford Park infrastructure and section 106 commitments, together with replacement delivery arrangements and necessary amendments agreed with OCC and CDC. The Applicant must meet the associated costs and secure those arrangements before acquisition or works prevent DL from fulfilling its existing commitments. l) DCO Requirements and a binding legal agreement securing the necessary safeguards before consent is granted. The agreement must address interface works, construction and operational controls, delivery triggers, funding and responsibilities, maintenance, monitoring, remedial action, liaison and dispute resolution. Continuing	The Applicant has, as part of the change request (Document 11.2), confirmed that a shared use footway/cycleway will be provided through OxSRFI for the benefit of a connection between Heyford Park and a future Ardley passenger station in its former location. The route is to be designed to LTN 1/20 and the detailed design is subject to approval under the relevant requirements of the DCO. g) The matter raised by DL is covered by ExQ 1.5.9 and 1.13.13 and therefore the Applicant directs them to those responses (Document 11.3). h) The Applicant has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of the traffic effects of the scheme including the cumulative effects with committed and planned development. The approach has been agreed with both NH and OCC and further work is not considered necessary. Access along the B430 and Upper Heyford Road will be maintained throughout the works save for isolated short duration events such as for pavement tie-in works. The detailed traffic management measures are subject to approval from OCC under the protective provisions of the draft DCO (Schedule 14 Part 3) (Document 3.1/REP1-003). The routeing requirements for construction HGVs are set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Transport Assessment Appendix 38,

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		negotiations or a Statement of Common Ground alone are insufficient to secure these outcomes.	Document 6.3A.10/AS-064) compliance with which is secured by the CEMP and Requirement 10. i) The Applicant is committed to working with DL to identify a suitable route for a private wire connection. The Applicant considers that there is suitable opportunity along or adjacent to the Heyford Link Road which will be a public highway. j) With reference to Parcel 4/5a this land is only required in the event that Works No. 13B are constructed, these works are only required if DL have not constructed their works at this junction (as shown on the Highway Plans (Document 2.7D/APP-046) prior to the OxSRFI highway works being required. As mentioned in CAH1 and the Applicant's Post Hearing Submissions (Document 10.3/REP1-016), Applicant has considered and updated Article 26 of the draft DCO at Deadline 2 to address the need for powers on this parcel. It is suggested that greater clarity in relation to the land required from DL has been provided by the Applicant than was available when the RR was submitted. The Applicant respectfully refutes the suggestion that the Applicant has been in any way unclear about the land required during the engagement between the parties over the previous six years. The Applicant requires the freehold of the DL plots so that it can deliver the development with certainty. The much improved access to Heyford Park via the new Heyford Park Link Road will replace the substandard

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
			current access and reference to the area of land to be acquired was not only to the size of the plots but to the significance of what is being acquired in comparison to what is being provided in its place which will be of benefit to Heyford Park. The Applicant has included some additional explanation in the Statement of Reasons submitted at Deadline 2 dealing with the DL plots. k) The Applicant has confirmed that it is happy to assist DL and provided its view on the implications for their planning obligations. The Applicant has confirmed that it is for DL to engage with Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council to suggest that an exercise should be undertaken so that all parties are clear what the Councils will be seeking/require in respect of the DL planning obligations which could be affected by OxSRFI. Clearly it cannot be resolved by the Applicant alone, nor is it the Applicant's responsibility to do so (or to fund it). l) DL suggest that a binding legal agreement is required between them and Applicant to secure 'safeguards' relating to the interface, construction and operational controls, delivery triggers, funding and responsibilities. The Applicant does not agree this is necessary or appropriate. The DCO is a Statutory Instrument and that secures how the OxSRFI development and mitigation must be delivered. The Applicant is required to comply with that, which gives ample security to DL as to the commitments with which the Applicant must comply. It is not appropriate to enter into agreements which duplicate or could conflict with or undermine the DCO.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
NO EXAMINATION LIBRARY REFERENCE	Duns Tew Parish Council	The Duns Tew Parish Council WR is focused entirely on highways. In particular concerns are raised regarding several roads, junctions and bridges west of OxSRFI being unsuitable for additional vehicle movements.	The light vehicle trip distribution for the Proposed Development is presented at Appendix 10 of the TA (Document 6.3A.03 /AS-057, pages 3 to 43). The HGV trip distribution for the Proposed Development is presented at Appendix 11 of the TA (Document 6.3A.03 /AS-057, pages 44 to 70). Transport modelling outputs showing the assignment of the Proposed Development traffic in the 2034 Completion Year are provided at Appendix D of the Bicester Transport Model Forecasting Report document, which is TA Appendix 14 (Document 6.3A.04/AS-058). Outputs are provided showing traffic flows in passenger car units (PCUs) and total vehicles. Separate outputs showing the assignment of the light vehicle development traffic, and the HGV development traffic are also provided. This confirms that very little light development traffic is forecast to travel to and from the west of the Main Site.
REP1-020	Environment Agency	The EA WR confirms that no further issues are added beyond those included in their RR (RR-042). Appendix 1 of the WR provides an update for each of the 49 issues previously raised and in summary: - 4 issues are now resolved - 14 issues are now resolved subject to additional information being submitted	The Applicant's position in respect of the points the EA raised in their RR (RR-042) are summarised in Document 9.1B (PDA-009). The Applicant has not been able to respond to each point in the EA's WR in detail at this Deadline but confirms that engagement with the EA is ongoing in an attempt to resolve the remaining issues, with the view to agreeing a comprehensive Statement of Common Ground. The Applicant will be able to provide further updates at ISH4 as appropriate and/or at Deadline 3.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		- 1 issue is partially resolved - 1 issue is partially resolved but the EA are reviewing additional information - 29 issues remain unresolved	The Applicant's responses to the EA's comments on the dDCO are included in Document 11.4.
REP1-040	Gallos Brook	The WR from the Gallos Brook Campaign group repeats concerns about the presence of PFAS in the local environment. Much of the WR refers to the historical use of the former RAF Upper Heyford, and to work undertaken by the Campaign Group, and released by the MoD, as well as data released by the Environment Agency (EA). The Representation also refers to the contribution made at ISH2 by the Applicant team in response to discussions about PFAS, including a verbal summary given of new testing and analysis within the proposed OxSRFI site.	The ISH2 discussion regarding PFAS was considered useful by the Applicant. It is unfortunate that the WR expresses some concerns that the information is not in the public domain – it was made clear in discussions at the Hearing that this new evidence was to be submitted as part of the wider 'change application'. As referred to at the Hearing, the Applicant has now (Deadline 2) submitted a technical note (as a new ES Appendix) (Document 6.11K), and an updated ES Chapter 11 (Document 6.11) which incorporate the new testing evidence and results following additional assessment of PFAS within the Main Site. It is understood this is the first time there has been any such testing on the site, and the Applicant therefore hopes it is considered helpful in terms of further adding to the wider understanding of the extent to which PFAS has migrated from the former Airbase site, and in what concentrations in different parts of the local hydrological systems. As discussed at the Hearing which included reference to data collected and published by the Campaign Group itself, the results from the work undertaken show that the OxSRFI site has considerably lower levels of PFAS than other watercourses nearby, including the Gallos Brook. The Applicant's view is that the new data submitted directly responds to the Campaign Group's desire to see the detail of the analysis undertaken.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
REP1-042	Heyford Park Community Action Group	Heyford Park Community Action Groups WR raises the same points as in their RR (RR-056).	See the Applicant's response (PDA-007, pages 19-23) to the Heyford Park Community Action Groups RR (RR-056).
REP1-043	Matthew Bazeley	This WR raises similar points to those raised in their RR (RR-093). An additional point is raised requesting that the Ardley Bypass should have noise reduction measures, for example bunding between the road and Ardley.	The majority of the points raised in the WR were previously raised in their RR (RR-093), and therefore the Applicant's response (PDA-007, pages 82-83) to their RR remains relevant. The Ardley Bypass will incorporate noise reduction measures both in the form of bunding and a low noise road surface. ES Appendix 7.7 (Illustrative Landscape Cross Sections) (Document 6.7G/APP-252) shows landscaping to the west of the bypass being approx. 30-35m wide and 4.5-5m tall. ES Chapter 5 (Noise and Vibration) (Document 6.5/AS-066) confirms at paragraph 5.5.3 that the Ardley Bypass will be constructed with a low noise road surface.
REP1-021	Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum	The MCNPF WR raises the following points: a) The location of the proposed development and alternatives considered. b) Concerns with regards to the use of the BTM to examine the transport impacts of the Proposed Development. c) MCNPF raise concerns regarding potential traffic increases on the section of the B4030 between the	a) The Applicant refutes in its entirety that their alternative site assessment is in anyway insufficient. As described during ISH1 and set out in the in the Applicant's Post Hearing Submissions (Document 10.3/REP1-016) a comprehensive assessment has been undertaken which concludes the OxSRFI site is the most appropriate within the defined market area. b) The BTM is approved by OCC for use in development control work. Further, as explained at Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.01/AS-055), prior to the use of the model, a review of the BTM was undertaken in 2021 to ensure that the model validation was appropriate to assess the changing transport conditions associated with the OxSRFI scheme. That work concluded that the BTM is suitable to assess the

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		A4260 and the road connecting to the western end of the HPLR. d) The narrow and structurally weak hump back bridge through Somerton between OxSRFI and the A4260 has likewise not been assessed. The OxSRFI forecasts indicate traffic increases approaching three times existing levels but there is no assessment of the bridge's load bearing capacity, ability to accommodate increased traffic or resulting queues and delays. e) Lighting impacts f) Rail in particular pathing g) Impacts on SSSIs and Ancient Woodland h) Construction phasing of numerous schemes	impact of the OxSRFI scheme, and this is agreed with the Transport Working Group. c) Traffic increases on this section of the B4030 do not meet the thresholds set out in the IEMA Guidance (ES Chapter 3 (Transport) (Document 6.3/APP-171) for inclusion in the study area for detailed assessment and hence no further assessment is required. d) HGV traffic from OxSRFI is not permitted to use the local road network through Somerton as set out in the HGV routeing strategy (TA Appendix 6 (Document 6.3A.02/AS-056). Furthermore, the complementary measures include implementation of an environmental weight restriction on the Somerton to Ardley and Somerton to Fritwell roads as shown on the Traffic Regulation Plans (Document 2.9/AS-017). ES Chapter 3 (Transport) Document 6.3/APP-171) includes assessment of the road links through Somerton and connecting with the A4260. Whilst the would be an increase in traffic on this route due to the Proposed Development, absolute traffic volumes remain low. The assessment concludes that there would not be significant adverse impacts as a result of the Proposed Development on this road link. e) See the Applicant's response to ExQ1 Q1.7.9 – Q1.7.12 and Q1.11.7 (Document 11.3). f) See the Applicant's response to ExQ1 Q1.17.3 (Document 11.3).

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
			g) In respect of Ancient Woodland see the Applicant's response to ExQ1 Q1.7.4 – Q1.7.6 (Document 11.3). For a response on SSSIs see the Applicant's response to ExQ1 Q1.7.2 (Document 11.3). h) The Applicant has allowed for interface with other committed projects or potentially committed projects within the design of the highway works where appropriate as follows: - At the A43 / B4100 Baynard's Green junction, by accounting for the potential works at that junction by Albion and/or Tritax in the event they receive consent as shown on Highway Plans 2.7A (APP-043) and 2.7W (APP-065) - At the Camp Road / Chilgrove Drive junction by securing an appropriate solution both following, and in the absence of, the committed Heyford Park signalised junction as shown on Highway Plan 2.7D (APP-046) - At the A4095 / B4030 junction by agreeing a mechanism with OCC for a s106 contribution to be made in lieu of works in the event a larger scheme at that junction is to be provided, likely due to the A4095 Bicester NW link road scheme.
REP1-044	Moto Hospitality Limited ("Moto")	The WR raises the following points: a) That the alterations to the existing MSA access arrangements protect the safe and efficient operation of	a) Chapter 11 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.01/AS-055) provides a comprehensive assessment of the operation of M40 Junction 10 and Baynard's Green and includes a summary of the VISSIM microsimulation assessment work that is provided at Appendices 42 and 43 of the Transport

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		the Services and identify any mitigation or amendments required. b) Explanation of how increased journey times are considered acceptable in terms of the MSA's operational performance, particularly for HGV traffic and customers travelling towards the A43 corridor. c) Eddisons refer to Problem 2.16 in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit within Transport Assessment Part 10, Appendix 36 (Interim Road Safety Audit and Response Report), which identifies concerns relating to weaving, lane changing and driver hesitation associated with the access proposals. Moto requests that the Applicant identify the evidence demonstrating that the proposed signing, lane markings and speed management measures sufficiently mitigate those concerns, particularly for HGV drivers, abnormal-load drivers and unfamiliar motorway users accessing the Services. The Applicant should explain how the audit concern has been addressed	Assessment (Document 6.3A.10/AS-064). The VISSIM assessment work includes a detailed breakdown of journey times at the junction complex, including journeys to and from the MSA allowing operational effects to be understood. Swept path assessment of HGV access and egress at the MSA is provided at Appendix B of the M40 Junction 10 Design Strategy Record, which is Appendix 31 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.09/AS-063). Under the proposed arrangement, the MSA will be provided a new dedicated left turn lane for traffic arriving from the A43 north and traffic for the MSA arriving from the M40 south will be provide with a dedicated lane at the Ardley off-slip. b) Appendices 42 and 43 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.10/AS-064) provide journey time analysis of the existing and proposed M40 Junction 10 and Baynard's Green complex. Paragraph 11.44 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.10/AS-064) explains that the existing Baynard's Green roundabout is a significant constraint on network capacity, restricting and suppressing traffic on the B4100 and A43 southbound towards M40 Junction 10 and the MSA. This is clear from Table 11.11 and 11.12 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.10/AS-064), which records a latent demand (traffic not able to enter the VISSIM model due to congestion) of 1,143 to 1,636 vehicles in the AM peak

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		and what measures would be secured as part of the proposals. d) Identify any assessments of the resilience of MSA access and egress during the lunchtime inter-peak, seasonal peaks, abnormal traffic conditions associated with incidents, and temporary restrictions arising from construction phasing. The Applicant should also explain what surveys, calibration checks and validation exercises were undertaken specifically for Cherwell Valley Services and how it has verified that MSA traffic and HGV demand have been assessed robustly. e) Whether foreseeable changes in MSA demand have been considered during construction and operation, having regard to the additional HGV activity generated by the SRFI and the national policy support for increased HGV parking provision. The Applicant should clarify whether the proposed on-site HGV parking and driver facilities would meet the development's operational needs, and whether any additional demand at Cherwell	hour in the Reference Case (RC1 and RC1 Sensitivity Test scenarios). This congestion impacts drivers seeking to access the MSA from the north. Paragraph 11.44 of the Transport Assessment goes on to explain that this latent demand must be considered when interpreting the result at junctions south of Baynard's Green, where true operational performance of the junctions in the Reference Case scenarios is masked by vehicles unable to enter the network and hence traffic flows at the Padbury, Cherwell and Ardley junctions are underrepresented in these Reference Case scenarios. This is demonstrated by the analysis summarised at paragraph 11.58 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.10/AS-064), for the RC3A scenario (Reference Case that includes for the Albion Land improvements at the Baynard's Green junction). With the constraint at Baynard's Green addressed in this scenario, but with no improvements to M40 Junction 10, the VISSIM assessment demonstrates that there would be significant operational constraints on the M40 northbound off-slip at Ardley Roundabout in the Reference Case, with traffic queuing back to the M40 mainline, creating safety concerns and impacting drivers seeking to access the MSA. Therefore, whilst there are increases in journey times for drivers departing the MSA and travelling north to the A43 due to an increase in distance needed to travel under the proposed M40 Junction 10 layout, the proposed highway works will address existing and future congestion at the junction complex and provide

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		Valley Services has been allowed for. f) whether a Cherwell Valley Services-specific construction access strategy has been prepared, and demonstrate how access, visibility, signing and operational performance would be maintained through all construction phases.	significant journey time savings for the MSA arrivals from both the A43 north and M40 south. The trade-off for these significantly improved arrival journeys to the MSA is increased journey length and hence journey time increases for some departing journeys from the MSA. c) The issues identified within the Interim Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) and response report (TA Appendix 36 (Document 6.3A.10/AS-064) have been incorporated into the highway design submitted for the Examination. The Applicant recognises the importance of the matters raised and has now completed a formal Stage 1 RSA to further review the safety of the proposed highway works at M40 J10 (and the wider scheme). This Audit is submitted at Appendix 4 of the TA Addendum (Document 6.3A.12) submitted at Deadline 2 and the response report is in the process of being agreed with National Highways. The response report will explain how the audit concerns are to be addressed and confirm which stage of design this is to take place (i.e. some matters raised may affect the preliminary highway design, some are matters for the detailed design). If further amendments to the preliminary highway design are required these will be undertaken and submitted into the examination at a future deadline. d) The VISSIM microsimulation modelling forms a key component of the suite of modelling tools used to assess the impact of OxSRFI and the embedded

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
			Highway Works at Baynard's Green and M40 Junction 10. It was developed by AECOM on behalf of National Highways. The VISSIM assessment simulates the forecast traffic conditions across this part of the network for the agreed assessment scenarios and replicates the likely on-street conditions through its use of PC-MOVA. The original VISSIM base model was constructed using a range of observed traffic data sources including automatic traffic counts (7-day, 24-hr), junction turning counts (AM and PM peak hour) and ANPR surveys (AM and PM peak hour). The data was thoroughly reviewed by AECOM and deemed appropriate to underpin the VISSIM model as approved by National Highways. The surveyed traffic data included traffic flows to and from the MSA. For the 2031 RC1 and DS1 scenarios, National Highways requested that assessments should be provided that applies OxSRFI traffic and the forecast traffic growth from the BTM to the observed traffic data described above (the BTM traffic forecasts include traffic growth for vehicle trips to and from the MSA). These model runs were provided, reported as the RC1 and DS1 Sensitivity Test in the Transport Assessment, and are the model runs that National Highways have based their recommendations on. Hence, the forecast journey times for the RC1 and DS1 Sensitivity Test scenarios shown at Appendix 42 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.10/AS-064) are based on traffic flows that originates from traffic survey data.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
			Further, comparing the flows in the DS1 and RC1(Sensitivity Test) scenarios (which are based on the surveyed traffic data) and the DS3A and RC3A scenarios shows a strong correlation, with the DS3A and RC3A flows generally higher. Therefore, there is confidence that the forecast traffic data associated with the MSA in the BTM and VISSIM assessments is representative. Outside of the morning and evening peak hours traffic flows across the Baynard's Green and M40 Junction 10 network are materially lower. During the early option testing phase of the project, the inter-peak and off-peak periods were considered in network LinSig models, with the inter-peak traffic flows shown to be c.89% of the average peak hour flows and the off-peak period at c.26% of the average peak hours. Hence, outside of the peak hours the embedded Highway Works at Baynard's Green and M40 Junction 10 would continue to provide operational benefits but there would be less traffic. The MOVA traffic signal control would optimise green time based on real time traffic demand and therefore should peak demand for the MSA occur outside of the morning and evening peak hours then the junction complex would have sufficient capacity to accommodate it. e) The Applicant anticipates that the proposed on-site HGV parking (HGV park and on-plot parking) will meet the development's operational needs. f) Ongoing discussions are taking place with National Highways to demonstrate that that construction and

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
			operational flows through M40 J10 can be accommodated whilst both the phase 1 and phase 2 works are carried out and this includes for maintaining access to the Services. The Applicant will provide an update on this in due course.
REP1-022	National Highways	The WR raises the following points: a) Road Safety Audit 1 being reviewed, thereafter departures need to be approved by NH. b) WCHAR is considered to be satisfactory. c) NH supports the Applicant's proposal to deliver the mitigation work in two phases in principle but, on reviewing the information provided in the Transport Assessment, requires further information on: - Whether the Phase 2 works overlap with Phase 1 and what impact this has in terms of construction flows and traffic management restrictions. - How the construction of the Phase 2 works in combination with Phase 1 traffic following opening would affect the	a) The Stage 1 RSA has now been completed and agreed by both NH and OCC and is submitted at Deadline 2 (Document 6.3A.12). The response report is in the process of being agreed with NH. The response report will explain how the audit concerns are to be addressed and confirm which stage of design this is to take place (i.e. some matters raised may affect the preliminary highway design, some are matters for the detailed design). If further amendments to the preliminary highway design are required these will be undertaken and submitted into the examination at a future deadline. The departures from standard are in the process of being agreed with NH with several now approved. b) The Applicant notes and welcomes NH's confirmation of this. c) As noted in para 2.8 of NH's response ongoing discussions are taking place with National Highways to demonstrate that that construction and operational flows through M40 J10 can be accommodated whilst both the phase 1 and phase 2 works are carried out. The Applicant will provide an update on this in due course. d) The Applicant is in ongoing discussion with NH on this matter and is hopeful that agreement will be reached to

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		operation of the SRN and how the Phase 1 works are demonstrably sufficient to safely accommodate the Phase 1 development traffic. d) Land discussions in terms of undertaking highway works and dedicating land as adopted highway. e) Ongoing discussions relating to temporary possession powers over plot 3/31 which is the access for the Motorway Service Area. f) Ongoing discussions relating to NH rights over land where temporary possession is sought to maintain boundary fences. g) Ongoing discussions relating to retaining or extinguishing NH rights over several plots.	avoid compulsory acquisition. The Applicant has provided the list of plots that falls within this category to NH. e) Plot 3/31 is on the access road into the MSA. The works on this plot are effectively an extension of the highway works at M40 J10. On this basis the Applicant considers that the protective provisions for the highway works already apply to this plot on the basis that it will be captured by the definition of "specified work". f) The Applicant is in ongoing discussion with NH on this matter and anticipates that agreement will be reached, as the Applicant recognises that NH may need to exercise this right whilst the works are being undertaken. g) The Applicant is in ongoing discussion with NH on this matter and anticipates that agreement will be reached. The Applicant is of the view that rights over certain plots need to be extinguished as they are incompatible with the works, such as those within the landfill area. However, the Applicant believes that suitable alternative rights can be provided in all cases.
REP1-026	Natural England	The NE WR states that their position has not progressed since their RR (RR-101). They provide the following updates on the issues raised:	The Applicant has not been able to respond to each point in the NE's WR in detail at this Deadline but confirms that engagement with NE is ongoing in an attempt to resolve the remaining issues, with the view to agreeing a comprehensive Statement of Common Ground. The Applicant will be able to

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		a) The proposal includes the direct loss of part of a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which has ecological and geological features of interest. Although the project has an ecological mitigation plan which includes the creation of replacement habitat, NE have some concerns about the assessment procedure and the conclusions of the Environmental Statement in relation to these impacts. b) Regarding ecological features, the Applicant has acknowledged NE's concerns in the Applicant's comments on Relevant Representations (PDA-007). NE expect that Environmental Statement: Chapter 6 will be updated to address their concerns. c) With regard to the impacts on geological interest features, NE maintain that further evidence is required to demonstrate that the proposed mitigation would maintain the stratigraphic integrity and scientific interest of the notified geological feature.	provide further updates at ISH4 as appropriate and/or at Deadline 3. a) The Applicant understands that this comment relates to NE's concern in respect of the approach to the assessment of "embedded" and "additional" mitigation. The revised ES Chapter submitted at Deadline 2 addresses this, and the Applicant confirms that this does not affect the conclusions or residual impacts. b) The revised ES Chapter 6 (Ecology including Arboriculture) (Document 6.6) submitted at Deadline 2 and addresses this point. c) See the Applicant's response to ExQ1 Q1.11.31 (Document 11.3). d) The Applicant has received NE's comments on the draft SoCG and will continue to engage, and will respond before Deadline 3. e) The Applicant welcomes NE's confirmation that their comments on the draft DCO are resolved.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		d) Natural England provided written feedback to a draft SoCG on the 26th August 2026. e) The Applicants responses in PDA-008 address NE's comments on the draft DCO.	
REP1-027	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Comments related to the draft DCO and Protective Provisions.	Discussions are ongoing with NR in an attempt to agree the drafting of the Protective Provisions and the DCO.
REP1-045	Nicholas Wilkins	The WR raises the following points: a) Cumulative impact of proposed developments, particularly in relation to highway impacts. b) The potential for warehouse facilities not located at OxSRFI to use the rail terminal and associated highways impacts. c) Interaction between OxSRFI and a potential Ardley passenger station.	a) See the Applicant's response (Document 9.1/PDA-007, pages 5-6) to the CPREs RR (RR-019) in respect of cumulative impacts under point 3. b) As set out in the Rail Report (Document 7.2A/APP-312), the rail terminal will operate as a fully open-access facility enabling occupiers not located at OxSRFI to incorporate rail into their supply chain. The highway impacts associated with the rail terminal being an open-access facility is accounted for in the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A/AS-055). c) The Applicant has set out details of its position on the safeguarding of a future passenger station. This is set out in the Passenger Rail Station Note which is an Appendix to the Planning Statement (Doc 5.4C/AS-050). The Applicant has also submitted a Post Hearing Note (Document 10.3B/REP1-018) which explains the range of measures and commitments that will be delivered by the OxSRFI project and which will benefit a future passenger station.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
REP1-046	North Oxfordshire Resident's Action ("NORA")	The WR raises the following points: a) Cumulative impact of proposed developments. b) PFAS.	a) The issue of cumulative impacts was raised by NORA in their RR (RR-106) which the Applicant responded to in their Relevant Representation responses (Document 9.1/PDA-007). b) See the Applicant's Post Hearing Submissions (Document 10.3/REP1-016) which provides a comprehensive update in respect of the approach and work undertaken in relation to PFAS by the Applicant. As set out in the Applicant's cover letter for Procedural Deadline A (PDA-001), an updated Ground ES Chapter (Document 6.9/APP-179) and a new Technical Note is submitted at Deadline 2 to address PFAS.
REP1-047	Philip Norstrand	The WR raises many similar points to those raised previously in their RR (RR-114), including scale, the suitability of the Chiltern Line for rail freight, Ardley passenger station and PFAS. The WR however raises new points: a) No compelling need for compulsory acquisition b) There are preferable alternatives to the proposed development c) Additional visualisations of the proposed development are required	The Applicant's response (PDA-007, pages 84-88) to the previous RR (RR-114) address the majority of the points raised in relation to scale, the suitability of the Chiltern Line for rail freight, Ardley passenger station and PFAS. Since the Applicant's response additional information has been submitted by the Applicant in terms of scale (Document 10.3A/REP1-017). and Ardley passenger station (Document 10.3B/REP1-018). The Applicant's responses to ExQ1 sections 6 and 13 (Document 11.3) are also directly relevant to the matters raised. In respect of PFAS, the Applicant's Post Hearing Submissions (Document 10.3/REP1-016) provides a comprehensive update in respect of the approach and work undertaken in relation to PFAS by the Applicant. As set out in the Applicant's cover letter for Procedural Deadline A (PDA-001), an updated Ground ES Chapter (Document 6.9/APP-179) and a new Technical Note is submitted at Deadline 2 to address PFAS.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
			In respect of the new points raised, the Applicant responds as follows: a) The Applicant does not agree. The compelling case is set out in the Statement of Reasons (Document 4.1). See also the Applicant's response to ExQ1.4.3 (Document 11.3). b) See the Applicant's response to ExQ1 in particular ExQ1.13.1, ExQ1.13.4 and ExQ1.13.5 (Document 11.3). c) The Applicant is working with OCC and CDC to prepare additional photomontages, some which of which were submitted at Deadline 2 (Document 6.7J) with the remainder to be submitted into the examination shortly.
REP1-051	Richard Allen	The WR raises the same cumulative point as raised previously in their RR (RR-119). The WR raises additional points: a) PFAS b) Concern with the current operation of the Baynard's Green roundabout. c) Concerns about road problems on the A43 and M40 having knock-on impacts and concerns about	a) In respect of PFAS see the Applicant's response to REP1-047 above. b) The traffic congestion and constraint caused by the existing Baynard's Green roundabout is understood and recognised by the Applicant (Chapter 3 and Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.01/AS-055), which is why the Proposed Development includes a comprehensive improvement scheme at the junction. c) The Proposed Development includes comprehensive highway improvements at M40 J10, the A43 and A43 Baynard's Green junction, which will significantly reduce congestion at these locations, helping to reduce rat-

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		congestion and rat-running through local villages. d) Concerns with the BTM, stating it is out of date and incorrect.	running. This is confirmed by OCC and CDC at paragraph 8.1.10 of their joint Local Impact Report (REP01-029), where they state: *"There has been extensive work on assessing the impact and options for mitigating the proposed development's impact at Junction 10 of the M40. This is the right approach to safeguard the villages and local Bicester roads from vehicles travelling longer distances. This is summed up in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, Appendix 3.25 in paragraph 4.1 with vehicles reassigning to higher category roads."* d) The BTM is approved by OCC for use in development control work. Further, as explained at Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.01/AS-055), prior to the use of the model, a review of the BTM was undertaken in 2021 to ensure that the model validation was appropriate to assess the changing transport conditions associated with the OxSRFI scheme. That work concluded that the BTM is suitable to assess the impact of the OxSRFI scheme, and this is agreed with the Transport Working Group.
REP1-052	Smith & Sons	Smith & Sons WR raises the same points as in their RR (RR-130). The WR suggests that following site investigation works undertaken in 2017, draft legal documents are in place to enter into a lease over the land where the Middleton Stoney Relief Road is proposed.	The Applicant has responded to the points made in Document 10.2 (REP1-015) and in their response to ExQ1.8.15 (Document 11.3). As confirmed at CAH1, the Applicant has agreed heads of terms with the landowner where the north-western section of the Middleton Stoney Relief Road is proposed and detailed legal negotiations are now underway.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
REP1-031	Southern Electric Power Distribution Limited ("SSE")	SSEs WR is focussed entirely on Protective Provisions.	Discussions are ongoing with SSE in an attempt to agree the drafting of the Protective Provisions and progress has been made since the initial hearings. Outstanding matters relate to deemed consent, insurance and security levels.
REP1-032	Upper Ouse Water Management Board	Confirms that negotiations are ongoing with the Applicant in respect of contractual obligations under the Land Drainage Act.	The Applicant confirms that positive and ongoing dialogue is underway to seek agreement.
REP1-054	Value Retail Management (Bicester Village) Limited	The Bicester Village WR raises the following: a) The mitigation works at Baynard's Green associated with the Tritax and Albion Land schemes are included in all future-year modelling scenarios, despite there being risks these applications are not approved. There has been no assessment of this scenario in the Transport Assessment. b) The Baynard's Green Roundabout works illustrated on the Highways General Arrangement Plans (Document 2.7A) differ significantly from those proposed as part of the Albion Land and Tritax schemes. It is therefore unclear whether the DCO scheme is compatible with the appeal schemes, what works would	a) This risk is understood and this is why the highway works shown at Baynard's Green on highway plan Document 2.7A/APP-043 show the highway works that would be constructed by OxSRFI in the absence of the Albion and/or Tritax scheme coming forward. The RC1 and DS1 scenarios (specifically consider the future baseline position without the Albion Land (and Tritax) scheme and without their mitigation scheme at Baynard's Green. The strategic modelling for these scenarios is presented at Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.01/AS-055) and the detailed modelling of M40 Junction 10 and Baynard's Green for these scenarios is presented in Chapter 11 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.01/AS-055). b) The highway works shown at Baynard's Green on highway plan (Document 2.7A/APP-043) show the highway works that would be constructed by OxSRFI in the absence of the Albion and/or Tritax scheme coming forward. The schemes have been designed independently and therefore some level of difference in

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
		be delivered in practice and by whom. c) While it is stated that the DCO will include provisions for OxSRFI to implement an alternative highway improvement for Baynard's Green should OxSRFI come forward ahead of the Albion Land scheme, no assessment is provided to justify this approach. d) The WR requests the Applicant should: - Clarify what works are actually planned at Baynard's Green, and how they would be delivered; - Assess traffic impacts in a scenario where the Albion Land scheme does not proceed. e) Motion seeks clarification on the schemes included in the assessment scenarios as part of the cumulative assessment of transport effects.	design is expected, especially as there are different underling traffic forecasts. In the event that the Albion and/or Tritax scheme is consented on appeal and comes forward then the draft DCO (Document 3.1/REP1-003) makes it clear at Requirement 8(4) that OxSRFI is obliged to provide an alternative scheme. This alternative is shown on highway plan Document 2.7W (APP-065), and this shows the works needed at this junction for OxSRFI in addition to that being provided by Albion / Tritax. This is explained in the Explanatory Memorandum (Document 3.2/REP1-005). c) The approach set out above is justified on the basis that OxSRFI has to have an implementable scheme and cannot be beholden to works carried out by others over which it would have no control. The Applicant refers to the discussion held at CAH1 on this matter (Document 10.3/REP1-016). d) If neither the Albion or Tritax schemes are consented then the OxSRFI highway works would be provided as shown on highway plan Document 2.7A (APP-043). If they are consented and come forward then the alternative highway works shown on highway plan Document 2.7W (APP-065) would be provided. This approach provides certainty that OxSRFI would mitigate impacts at this junction irrespective of whether or not the Albion / Tritax scheme proceeds.

WR Reference	Name/Organisation	Summary of Key Themes Within Representation	Applicant Response
			The assessment of the traffic impacts in the scenario where the Albion / Tritax scheme does not proceed is found at Chapters 9 and 11 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.01/AS-055). e) Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Document 6.3A.01/AS-055) provides the background to the agreement of the assessment scenarios with the Transport Working Group. The Applicant also refers to the response to this matter set out in the Applicants comments on Value Retail Management's Relevant Representation (Document 9.1/PDA-007) and to paragraph 8.1.32 of the Joint OCC and CDC LIR (REP01-029), at which they confirm that the "*Uncertainty logs for transport modelling were checked by OCC and CDC and found to include all appropriate committed development in the reference case".*