OXFORDSHIRE
STRATEGIC RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

Environmental Statement Addendum

Document 6.18

On behalf of
Oxfordshire Railfreight Limited

Prepared by Oxalis Planning
October 2026

PINS REF:	TR050008
Document Reference	6.18
APFP Regulation	5(2)(a)
Author	Oxalis Planning
Date	October 2026
Revision	-

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT AND ALTERNATIVES

3.0 TRANSPORT

4.0 AIR QUALITY AND ODOUR

5.0 NOISE AND VIBRATION

6.0 ECOLOGY INCLUDING ARBORICULTURE

7.0 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

8.0 LIGHTING

9.0 WATER ENVIRONMENT

10.0 HERITAGE – BUILT AND ARCHAEOLOGY

11.0 GROUND CONDITIONS

12.0 SOCIO-ECONOMIC – INCLUDING HEALTH

13.0 MATERIALS AND WASTE

14.0 SOIL RESOURCES AND AGRICULTURAL LAND

15.0 CLIMATE CHANGE

16.0 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

17.0 SUMMARY OF EFFECTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Addendum to the Environmental Statement (ES) forms part of a 'change application' submitted by the Applicant in October 2026. The changes proposed are described below in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6. This Addendum should be read alongside the submitted ES (referred to as 'main ES'), which is Document Series 6 in the OxSRFI Examination Library.

1.2 The purpose of this Addendum is to consider the implications and any likely effects of the changes to the Proposed Development, and to set out any additional or otherwise different likely environmental effects. In simple terms, this Addendum considers whether the changes to the Proposed Development will result in likely environmental effects not considered or assessed in the ES as submitted to the Secretary of State in March 2026 and in that regard seeks to update the main ES.

1.3 This Addendum is structured using the same environmental topic headings as the main ES, with a section covering the same topic as the corresponding ES chapter.

Proposed Changes to the Application

1.4 The main changes proposed to the application have three discrete elements to them. The main changes relate primarily to detailed, but relatively limited, amendments to the Order Limits. In the case of Changes 2 and 3 the result is reductions to the land included in the Order Limits (i.e. land is being removed from the Order Limits). For Change 1, the Order Limits are amended with some parcels being removed and some new land included as part of ecological mitigation works. This change also results in a minor net decrease in the land for bird mitigation by around 1 ha. The total Application Site area is reduced to 468.8 ha.

1.5 These three elements related to the OxSRFI Order Limits are:

Change 1: Ecological Mitigation (relevant to Work Nos. 29 and 37 as defined in the draft DCO)

A change to the Order Limits and the land proposed to be used for the farmland bird ecological mitigation at the north west of the Main Site. This change results in the removal of plots 2/4a, 2/5 and 2/10 from the Order Limits, and a reduction of plot 2/4, with the addition of new land adjacent to 2/4 shown

on Sheet 2 of the previous version of the Land Plans (Document 2.1B/AS-003). The new land is shown as plots 2/4b and 10/8 on the updated Land Plans submitted at Deadline 2 (Sheets 2 and 10 of Document series 2.1).

This change follows landowner negotiation and reflects landowner preferences for how mitigation and compensation land is provided, and the change results in reduced compulsory acquisition by the Applicant. Details regarding this change are set out in the 'Change Report' (Document 11.2). These changes are also captured through an updated ES Chapter 6 (Document 6.6), as well as several updated Appendices as described in the Change Report (Document 11.2).

Change 2: A4095/B4030 Roundabout (relevant to Work No. 39 as defined in the draft DCO)

A change to the Order Limits to remove land (parcels 9/12 and 9/21 as shown on Sheet 9 of the previous version of the Land Plans (Document 2.1I/AS-003)) following an amended request from the Local Highway Authority (Oxfordshire County Council, 'OCC') to alter the approach to mitigation at the junction. The approach to the delivery of the highway mitigation works at the A4095/B4030 roundabout (Work No. 39) is now to be physically delivered by the Applicant unless OCC confirms that a Section 106 financial contribution should be paid instead (if other committed highways works nearby, which will see OCC deliver an A4095 Bicester NW strategic link road, progress so that the timeline for the two schemes is likely to coincide).

The works which the Applicant would deliver are solely within the Highway, and so other land outside of the Highway is not now required and has been removed from the Order Limits. This results in reduced compulsory acquisition by the Applicant which had previously been included to allow the Applicant's works to tie-in to potential highway works delivered by others on that land. Details regarding this change are set out in the 'Change Report' (Document 11.2).

Change 3: Foul sewer outfall to Bicester (relevant to Work No. 35 as defined in the draft DCO)

A change to the Order Limits adjacent to Middleton Stoney Road within Bicester, Road to remove parcel 9/34 (as shown on Sheet 9 of the previous version of the Land Plans (Document 2.1I/AS-003) following confirmation that the existing Thames Water chamber into which the foul sewer outfall will connect is within the adopted highway and not third party land as previously

understood from drainage records. This results in reduced compulsory acquisition and no new land or interests. Details regarding this change is set out in the 'Change Report' (Document 11.2).

1.6 In addition to the above main changes, dialogue with consultees over the period since submission of the OxSRFI application (in March 2026) has led to other minor updates or changes being made by the Applicant to detailed elements of the Proposed Development, or additional clarifications or updates to various parts of the ES and associated evidence base (ES Chapters or Technical Appendices). Some amendments or updates in this category are also described in the submitted 'Change Report' (Document 11.2), but in summary include:

- Various transport related changes to or additional proposed speed limit changes, changes to the proposed Main Site pedestrian and cycle routes, and other elements of the highways proposals following agreements reached with OCC Highways[1].
- Updates to the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP – see rev A of ES Appendix 2.3/Document 6.2C submitted for deadline 2) to reflect dialogue with or suggestions from various consultees, including the local authorities and Environment Agency (EA). This includes an amendment to the indicative construction programme (Appendix 1 to the CEMP) to include the works described under Change 2 above, and to reflect the anticipated timing of works commencing for the scheme, subject to the DCO being made.
- Updates to and clarifications in the Applicant's Arboricultural Assessment following comments received from Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) with regard to veteran trees in particular (ES Appendix 6.8/Document 6.6H)[2].
- Updates to both ES Appendix 7.4 (Document 6.7D) to include additional ZTVs, and ES Figure 7.11 (Document 6.7J) to include additional photomontages (both documents now revision A), further to discussions with the local planning authorities[3].
- Updates to the Carbon Management Plan (see revision 05 of ES Appendix 15.5/Document 6.15E) to assist with clarifications made in responding to questions from the Examining Authority ahead of deadline 2.

[1] Set out in the Change Report (Document 11.2).
[2] This includes relevant updates in the revised BNG Report and Appendices (ES Appendix 6.9 Parts 1 and 2/Documents 6.6I.01 and 6.6I.02), and updated HMMP (ES Appendix 6.11) referred to in the Change Report (Document 11.2).
[3] Both Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council.

- Clarifications and amendments in the Flood Risk Assessment (ES Appendix 9.2/Document 6.9B) in response to comments from the Environment Agency (EA), and amendments to the Sustainable Drainage Strategy reports for the Main Site, and Offsite and Highways (ES Appendices 9.3 and 9.4/Documents 6.9C and 6.9D), and updates to the Water Framework Directive Assessment (ES Appendix 9.5/Document 6.9E) to update plans showing the Order Limits.
- Updated Built Heritage and Archaeology Chapter (Chapter 10) to include appropriate references to an additional off-site heritage asset (the 'Troy Maze') following dialogue with Historic England.
- Updates to the Ground Conditions Chapter (Chapter 11) to incorporate additional evidence and analysis regarding potential PFAS contamination, including new ES Appendix 11.11 (Document 6.11K). ES Appendix 11.8 is also updated to reflect the latest NPPF policies for consistency within the ES Chapter.

1.7 To the extent any of the above additional changes or updates to the Application are relevant to the ES, the following sections of this ES Addendum also identify any implications or updates with reference to the main ES as submitted. As referred to in the topic specific sections below, where considered appropriate some ES chapters have been updated and submitted to the Examination process to include additional or updated information and/or consideration and assessment of likely effects. Those updated Chapters should be read alongside this Addendum.

Policy Context Update - NPPF

1.8 Since submission of the DCO Application the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was updated (in August 2026). The NPPF is not the primary source of national policy for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) such as the OxSRFI proposals. Indeed, the NPPF confirms explicitly that it "*does not contain specific policies for nationally significant infrastructure projects*" (paragraph 13, NPPF, 2026), and restates that such projects are to be determined in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and the relevant national policy statements. Therefore, while the NPPF is a relevant material consideration, the primary source of policy for the Proposed Development is the National Networks National Policy Statement ('the NNNPS'). Given this context – which is set out in further detail in the Planning Statement – the update to the NPPF is not considered to have any material bearing or impact on the policy context for consideration of the OxSRFI proposals.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 The changes made to the Proposed Development (as described above in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6) do not have any material implications on the description of development as set out in ES Chapter 2 (Document 6.2).

2.2 As described the changes are all minor, and will see small-scale reductions to the Order Limits in urban Bicester as a consequence of Changes 2 and 3. The changes described above under Change 1, also have limited implications on the total amount of 'green infrastructure' and ecological mitigation areas, including a minor reduction in land for bird mitigation. The below section on '*Ecology including Arboriculture'* addresses the changes, as does an updated ES Chapter 6 which has been prepared and submitted as part of the wider 'change application'. However, the changes have no implications for the contents of ES Chapter 2 (Document 6.2) as submitted, including paragraph 2.3.32 which remains up to date.

2.3 Change 2 also results in some minor alterations to the description of the highways works at paragraph 2.3.46 of Chapter 2 which refers to works to the A4095/B4030 roundabout at Middleton Stoney Road and Vendee Drive west of Bicester as being subject to a financial contribution (secured via a Section 106 Agreement). As described above, these works may still be secured via a financial contribution by the Applicant and physically delivered by OCC, but the expectation is now that it is more likely they will be delivered directly by the Applicant.

2.4 The changes would have the following effect on paragraph 2.3.46 of ES Chapter 2 (Document 6.2), with the necessary changes shown:

> *"Local highways works are proposed to be carried out at the junctions of Camp Road and Chilgrove Drive, Middleton Road, the B430 west of the Main Site, Quarry Cottages, Middleton Stoney Crossroads and Aves Ditch, all in the vicinity of the Main Site. In addition, works to the A4095/B4030 roundabout at Middleton Stoney Road and Vendee Drive west of Bicester are proposed to be delivered by the Applicant unless requested by OCC to secure these works via a financial contribution ~~by the Applicant~~ to enable works to be delivered by the County Council in due course. Should ~~T~~this ~~will~~ be delivered via a contribution it will be secured through a Section 106 Agreement once the level of contribution has been agreed with the Council."*

2.5 Similarly, reference at ES Chapter 2 (Document 6.2) paragraph 2.3.59 to these same works being secured "*through a Section 106 Agreement contribution*" is also now out of date in light of these changes.

2.6 Change 3 does not result in any changes to ES Chapter 2, including paragraph 2.3.50 which refers to off-site works to deliver a foul drainage outfall to Bicester and remains up to date.

2.7 Therefore, with the exception of the above minor implications for paragraph 2.3.46, the changes to the application have no further implications for the description of development as set out in ES Chapter 2 (Document 6.2) as submitted in the original ES Report.

3.0 TRANSPORT

Introduction

Methodology

3.1 The changes made to the Proposed Development (as described above in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6) do not have any implications or require any change to the methodology used to examine and assess the transport effects created by the changing transport conditions associated with the Proposed Development as set out in ES Chapter 3 (Document 6.3).

Policy Context

3.2 Save for the update to the National Planning Policy Framework that is discussed above (paragraph 1.8), there are no changes to the policy context presented in ES Chapter 3 (Document 6.3).

Baseline Conditions

3.3 There are no changes to the baseline conditions presented in ES Chapter 3 other than changes to baseline public transport conditions, as described below.

3.4 Since the submission of the DCO application in March 2026 there have been changes to some of the baseline bus services that operate nearby. Whilst a change to the current baseline conditions, they do not materially alter the future baseline public transport conditions described in paragraphs 3.4.68 to 3.4.71 of ES Chapter 3, nor the agreed approach to public transport as set out in the Public Transport Strategy (PTS), which is Appendix 5 of the Transport Assessment (TA) (ES Appendix 3.1 Transport Assessment – part 2 of 11) (Document 6.3A.02 / AS-056).

3.5 OCC has requested that the PTS is updated to reflect the changes to the baseline bus services and accordingly the PTS, which is Appendix 5 to the Transport Assessment (see revision v3 of the ES Appendix 3.1 part 2 of 11/Document 6.3A.02) has been updated to reflect the changed baseline conditions and minor text changes also requested by OCC. Note that both tracked-change and clean versions of the updated appendix are provided. The changes to the baseline bus services are summarised in the paragraphs below.

3.6 Thames Travel have taken over the operation of Service 25 that is described at paragraph 3.2.41 of the ES, and from 20 September 2026 it has been combined with former Stagecoach Services H5 and 29 to form new Services 25 and 25A. Service 25 operates hourly between Upper Heyford and the John Radcliffe Hospital, serving Heyford Park, Middleton Stoney, Chesterton, Bicester, Ambrosden and Islip. It replaces connections previously provided by Service H5. Service 25A operates hourly between Upper Heyford and Upper Arncott, serving Heyford Park, Middleton Stoney, Bicester and Ambrosden. It replaces connections previously provided by Service 29. Additional late evening journeys are provided between Bicester, Heyford Park and Upper Heyford, with the last bus from Bicester Village railway station departing at 2300 hours. Services 25 and 25A combine to provide an approximate 30-minute frequency service between Heyford Park and Bicester (including Bicester Village railway station) between approximately 0530 to 2257 hours.

3.7 The Sunday service described at paragraph 3.4.41 of ES Chapter 3 (Document 6.3) has been renumbered 25A and is provided by Stagecoach. It runs between Upper Arncott and Heyford Park, via Bicester (including Bicester Village railway station) on an hourly basis between approximately 0805 and 2000 hours.

3.8 Service 81 that is described at paragraph 3.4.42 of ES Chapter 3 (Document 6.3) is now operated by Z&S Transport rather than Ability, although the route and times of the service have not changed.

Updated Assessment of Likely Effects

3.9 Change 1 and Change 3 described at paragraph 1.5 above do not have any material implications or require update to the assessment of likely effects set out in ES Chapter 3.

3.10 As explained at paragraph 1.5, Change 2 relates to a change to the Order Limits to remove land following an amended request from OCC to alter the approach to mitigation at the A4095/B4030 roundabout (Works No. 39). As described, mitigation at this roundabout may still be secured via a financial contribution by the Applicant and physically delivered by OCC, but the expectation is now that it is more likely Work No. 39 will be delivered directly by the Applicant.

3.11 Therefore, because of the commitment for the Applicant to undertake the works (except for specific circumstances when the works would still be secured via a financial contribution), there is a need to provide further design information for Work No. 39 as explained in the Change Report (Document 11.2). This does not change the design proposals but provides a greater level of detail than previously submitted. That additional design work is presented in an addendum to the TA. The TA Addendum is a new document and is provided as Document 6.3A.12.

3.12 As identified at paragraphs 3.6.6 and 3.6.7 of ES Chapter 3 (Document 6.3), the A4095/B4030 roundabout works are provided as additional mitigation. Under Change 2, the same highway works are to be undertaken, but land will not be needed to allow those works to tie in with third party works. Change 2 is therefore about how the works are secured. This means that two plots of land, over which compulsory acquisition might have been required, can be removed from the Order Limits. The Order Limits are therefore to be reduced, but the same scheme of additional mitigation will be provided at the A4095/B4030 roundabout.

3.13 Accordingly, there are no material implications with regards to the assessment of likely significant effects during the operational phase of the Proposed Development as set out in ES Chapter 3 due to Change 2.

3.14 Notwithstanding the above, to reflect that the works at the A4095/B4030 roundabout are now expected to be delivered by the Applicant, the WCHAR Review Report, which is Appendix 4 of the TA (ES Appendix 3.1 Transport Assessment – part 2 of 11, Document 6.3A.02 / AS-056) has been updated to

incorporate a new opportunity (G33) at the A4095/B4030 roundabout. In addition, the WCHAR Review Report has also been updated to incorporate the changes to the Main Site pedestrian and cycle routes, and changes to speed limits on the Somerton to Ardley Road that have been agreed with OCC (see paragraph 1.6 above), as set out in the Change Report (Document 11.2).

3.15 Accordingly, the WCHAR Review Report which is Appendix 4 to the TA (see revision v3 of the ES Appendix 3.1 part 2 of 11/Document 6.3A.02) has been updated to reflect these changes. Note that both tracked-change and clean versions of the updated appendix are provided.

3.16 Since the submission of the DCO application in March 2026 there has been ongoing discussion with OCC with regards to the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which is Appendix 38 of the TA (ES Appendix 3.1 – part 10 of 11/Document 6.3A.10). As explained in the Technical Note ADC1794-RP-AX-v1 provided at Appendix 2 of the TA Addendum (Document 6.3A.12) and as referred to in OCC's relevant representation (RR-109), it has been agreed with OCC that the implementation of a temporary 20mph speed limit along the B430 within Ardley during the construction phase would be beneficial. The CTMP has therefore been updated to include this additional temporary speed limit. In addition, as also agreed with OCC, the CTMP has been updated to include an additional HGV Routeing Plan that clarifies the HGV construction routes around Bicester.

3.17 Accordingly, the CTMP which is Appendix 38 to the TA (see revision v3 of the ES Appendix 3.1 part 10 of 11/Document 6.3A.10) has been updated to reflect the above changes. Note that both tracked-change and clean versions of the updated appendix are provided.

3.18 The expectation is that the A4095/B4030 works will now be delivered directly by the Applicant. On this basis, the construction activities associated with the works at the roundabout would form part of the Proposed Development. These works have been added to the indicative master construction programme that is provided at Appendix 1 of the updated CEMP (see revision A of ES Appendix 2.3/Document 6.2C). It is anticipated that the works would take around 10 months to complete, commencing in Q4 of 2030 and concluding in 2031.

3.19 Using the construction traffic trip rates set out in the Construction Traffic Technical Note (TA Appendix 37) (ES Appendix 3.1 Transport Assessment – part 10 of 11, Document 6.3A.10) the works would generate an average maximum of 27 HGVs and 39 light vehicle movements per day (during 2031).

In accordance with the permitted HGV construction routes shown at Figure 3 of the updated CTMP (see TA Appendix 38, provided as revision v3 of ES Appendix 3.1 – part 10 of 11/Document 6.3A.10), HGV construction traffic would route to and from Works 39 via Vendee Drive. Table 3.1 below calculates the percentage change in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) on Vendee Drive compared to the 2031 reference case (RC2A) scenario, if all light traffic also used that route.

Table 3.1: Change in traffic flows on Vendee Drive as compared to 2031 reference case

Link	2031 reference case traffic flow (AADT)		Construction traffic average daily flow		Percentage change	
	Total vehicles	HGVs	Total vehicles	HGVs	Total vehicles	HGVs
Vendee Drive	18,435	632	66	27	0.36%	4.27%

3.20 As shown in Table 3.1 the change in traffic flow on Vendee Drive would not exceed 10%. In accordance with IEMA Guidelines (see paragraph 3.2.62 of the ES), a change in traffic flow of less than 10% would not be discernible as background traffic flows can fluctuate by this amount daily.

3.21 Light vehicles could use other routes to travel to and from Works 39, and hence this is also considered at Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Change in traffic flows on other arms of the A4095/B4030 roundabout as compared to 2031 reference case

Link	2031 reference case traffic flow (AADT)		Construction traffic Average daily flow		Percentage change	
	Total vehicles	HGVs	Total vehicles	HGVs	Total vehicles	HGVs
B4030 Middleton Stoney Road	10,438	229	39*	0	0.37%	0%
Howes Lane	10,379	736	39*	0	0.38%	0%
Middleton Stoney Road	15,932	173	39*	0	0.25%	0%

*assessment assumes all light vehicles using each road link

3.22 As shown in Table 3.2 the change in traffic flow on the other arms of the A4095/B4030 roundabout would also not exceed 10% and therefore would not be discernible.

3.23 The construction traffic associated with Works 39 does not therefore alter the study area considered in ES Chapter 3 as part of the assessment of the likely

significant effect during the construction phase of the Proposed Development, and no additional assessment work is required.

3.24 Accordingly, there are no material implications with regards to the assessment of likely significant effects during the construction phase of the Proposed Development as set out in ES Chapter 3 due to Change 2.

Updated Assessment of Residual Effects

3.25 Change 1 and Change 3 described at paragraph 1.5 and the updates and other changes described at paragraph 1.6 above do not have any material implications or require update to the assessment of residual effects set out at Section 3.6 of the ES.

3.26 As described above, the A4095/B4030 roundabout works are provided as additional mitigation as identified at paragraphs 3.6.6. and 3.6.7 of the ES. The same highway works are to be undertaken. Accordingly, there are also no material implications or required update to the assessment of Section 3.6 'Additional Mitigation and Residual Effects' of ES Chapter 3 due to Change 2, save for paragraph 3.6.8 which deals with how the works are secured, which is now as described at paragraph 1.5.

Updated Assessment of Cumulative Effects

3.27 The changes to the Proposed Development described at paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 do not have any material implications for the assessment of the cumulative effects set out at Section 3.7 of the ES.

Updated Summary and Conclusions

3.28 The changes to the Proposed Development described at paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 do not alter the overall summary and conclusions presented at Section 3.8 of the ES.

4.0 AIR QUALITY AND ODOUR

Introduction

4.1 The changes to the Proposed Development, as described in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6, do not affect the methodology or policy context applied in assessing air quality and odour impacts, as presented in ES Chapter 4 (Document 6.4). Similarly, the changes put forward for the Proposed Development do not have

any implications for the baseline air quality and odour conditions, established in Section 4.4 of ES Chapter 4 (Document 6.4).

Updated Assessment of Likely Effects

4.2 Changes 1 and 3 described at paragraph 1.5 do not have any material implications for, or require any updates to, the assessment of likely construction phase or operational air quality or odour effects, as considered in ES Chapter 4.

4.3 Change 2 involves a change to the Order Limits to remove land following a request from OCC to alter the approach to mitigation at the A4095/B4030 roundabout (Works No. 39), with the expectation now that the proposed mitigation works will be delivered by the Applicant directly. The mitigation to be provided at the A4095/B4030 roundabout, and the works necessary to facilitate this, have not changed. It is understood that these works are anticipated to last for approximately 10 months, with work commencing in Q4 2030 and completion expected in 2031. Full details are to be provided through DCO Schedule 2 Requirement 10, in the relevant P-CEMP prior to any works being undertaken.

4.4 Potential air quality effects associated with emissions of fine particulate matter / dust from the proposed construction works at the A4095/B4030 roundabout were assessed within ES Chapter 4 as part of the wider Proposed Development and Order Limits. This assessment is presented in ES Appendix 4.3 (APP-125). This assessment determined that with the implementation of suitable mitigation measures, as detailed in Table 4.22 of ES Chapter 4, and to be secured via CEMP/P-CEMPs, potential emissions from construction activities would be reduced and residual effects would be *Negligible*, which is not significant. Change 2 is not expected to have a material effect on the findings of this assessment.

4.5 However, potential air quality effects associated with emissions from traffic generated during the proposed works to the A4095/B4030 roundabout were not explicitly considered in the ES. Accordingly, these potential effects are considered qualitatively within this Addendum.

4.6 As discussed in Sections 4.2.22 and 4.2.23 of ES Chapter 4 (Document 6.4), the study area for the assessment of road traffic impacts on air quality was defined in accordance with joint Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) and Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) planning guidance. This identifies the need for dispersion modelling of potential air quality impacts at existing

receptor locations where changes in annual average daily traffic (AADT) flows exceeding 500 light-duty vehicles (LDVs) and / or 100 heavy-duty vehicles (HDVs) are expected to occur on any road(s). Changes in traffic flows below these thresholds can be reasonably considered to have an insignificant impact on local air quality.

4.7 Traffic information for the proposed A4095/B4030 roundabout works, as presented in Table 3.1 of this ES Addendum, indicates that these works would generate an average maximum of 27 HGVs (considered equivalent to HDVs, in air quality terms) and 39 light vehicle movements (considered equivalent to LDVs, in air quality terms) per day.

4.8 The predicted traffic generation from the proposed A4095/B4030 roundabout works is, therefore, well below the EPUK and IAQM screening criteria, and as such, these changes in traffic flows can be reasonably considered to have an insignificant impact on local air quality.

Updated Assessment of Residual Effects

4.9 There will be no material change to the assessment of likely residual air quality and / or odour effects as a result of the changes to the Proposed Development.

Updated Assessment of Cumulative Effects

4.10 There will be no material change to the assessment of likely cumulative air quality and / or odour effects as a result of the changes to the Proposed Development.

Updated Summary and Conclusions

4.11 The assessment of air quality and odour effects, as presented in ES Chapter 4 (Document 6.4), remains unchanged as a result of the changes to the Proposed Development described in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 of this ES Addendum.

5.0 NOISE AND VIBRATION

Introduction

5.1 The changes to the Proposed Development, as described in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6, do not affect the methodology or policy context applied in assessing

the effects of noise and vibration, as presented in ES Chapter 5 (see revision A of Document 6.5).

5.2 The changes to the Proposed Development are not considered to have any implications in terms of the baseline noise and vibration conditions.

Updated Assessment of Likely Effects

5.3 Change 1 and Change 3 described at paragraph 1.5 above, and also the changes described in paragraph 1.6, do not have any material implications or require any update to the assessment of likely operational and construction phase effects set out in ES Chapter 5 (see revision A of Document 6.5).

5.4 Change 2 relates to a change to the Order Limits to remove land following an amended request from OCC to alter the approach to mitigation at the A4095/B4030 roundabout (Works No. 39). As explained above, it is now more likely that these works would be delivered directly by the Applicant, although it is possible that under some circumstances, a contribution to enable delivery of the works by OCC may be provided instead.

5.5 Under 'Change 2', the same highway works are to be undertaken to provide the same scheme of additional mitigation at the A4095/B4030 roundabout, however land will not be needed to allow those works to tie in with third party works.

5.6 The construction noise effects of these works were not explicitly considered in the ES. At present only high-level information is available regarding these works which are anticipated to take around 10 months to complete and may require some night-time working. The potential impacts and effects of these works are considered in high level qualitative terms using professional judgement. It is noted that full details will be provided through DCO Schedule 2 Requirement 11 in the relevant P-CEMP produced for each works package, prior to any works being undertaken.

5.7 It is likely that similar types of construction activities would be undertaken as those listed in Table 3 of ES Appendix 5.8, albeit on a smaller scale and using smaller equipment given the works proposed and the existing highway infrastructure. The closest receptors to these works are 92 Isis Avenue and 10 – 15 Bromyard. When works are closest to these receptors, they will be approximately 15m away and noise levels are likely to exceed the SOAEL threshold for daytime works. Depending on their duration, a significant adverse (temporary) effect may arise. Once works are beyond 50m from

receptors, adverse but not significant adverse effects are expected during the day.

5.8 Regarding the construction traffic noise associated with these works, it is anticipated this would comprise an average maximum of 27 HGVs and 39 light vehicles per day. Table 5.1 below presents the basic noise level (BNL) for Vendee Drive, with and without construction traffic and determines the magnitude of impact in accordance with the criteria in Table 5.12 of ES Chapter 5 (revision A of Document 6.5).

Table 5.1 Predicted BNL for Construction Traffic

Vendee Drive Links	***BNL LA10,18hr (dB)***		***Change***	***Magnitude of Impact***
	without construction traffic	***with construction traffic***		
1. North of A4095.	71.3	71.4	+0.1	Negligible
2. North of Heaton Road.	69.5	69.6	+0.1	Negligible
3. South of Heaton Road.	69.4	69.5	+0.1	Negligible

5.9 It can be seen from Table 5.1 that the construction traffic noise from 'Change 2' would result in a negligible magnitude of impact and therefore no adverse or significant adverse effects would be anticipated. The predicted noise BNLs assume that all construction traffic is routed along Vendee Drive from the A41. In practice, HGVs will be required to follow this route, as per the updated CTMP which is Appendix 38 of the TA (see revision V3 of ES Appendix 3.1 part 10 of 11/Document 6.3A.10), but light vehicles could potentially travel along other routes. However, given the low volumes of construction trips compared to the existing baseline flows on the surrounding network, the magnitude of any effects would remain as negligible.

5.10 The potential operational effects of these works were considered in ES Chapter 5 (see revision A of Document 6.5) paragraphs 5.5.61 to 5.5.63. It is noted that since submitting the ES, the construction of the Middleton Stoney Active Road Travel Scheme has commenced. Overall, it is not considered that 'Change 2' would result in any material change to the assessment of likely significant effects during the operational phase of the Proposed Development from those set out in ES Chapter 5 (see revision A of Document 6.5).

Updated Assessment of Residual Effects

5.11 Changes 1 and 3 (described at paragraph 1.5) and also the changes described in paragraph 1.6, do not result in any changes to the residual construction or operational noise and vibration effects presented in ES Chapter 5 (see revision A of Document 6.5).

5.12 The undertaking of the construction works to deliver the mitigation associated with 'Change 2' would result in adverse effects at the receptors adjacent to the works, with potentially significant adverse effects when works are within 50m of the receptors and adverse effects when works are over 50m from the receptors. Whether or not a significant adverse effect occurs would depend on the duration of works at the closest distance to the receptors and time of day they occur. These are temporary effects, and no additional mitigation is required beyond the measures already identified to mitigate and minimise construction noise in the ES (see paragraph 5.5.1 of ES Chapter 5, revision A of Document 6.5). Such measures include enclosures, temporary barriers and appropriate management of hours for noisy tasks.

5.13 As per paragraph 5.6.2 of ES Chapter 5 (see revision A of Document 6.5), opportunities to implement further, more specific construction mitigation measures will be explored as part of the production of the P-CEMP for each phase of the Proposed Development when more detailed information is available about how the works will be undertaken and the programme. This is secured in the draft DCO (Document 3.1/REP1-003) in Requirement 10 of Schedule 2. It is also noted that these effects would occur as a result of these highway improvements whether delivered by the Applicant or another party (such as OCC).

5.14 The changes to the Proposed Development described at paragraph 1.5 which are associated with 'Change 2', do not result in any changes to the residual effects identified in ES Chapter 5 (see revision A of Document 6.5) during the operational phase of the assessment.

Updated Assessment of Cumulative Effects

5.15 The changes to the Proposed Development described at paragraph 1.5 and 1.6 do not have any material implications for the assessment of the cumulative effects set out at Section 5.7 of ES Chapter 5 (see revision A of Document 6.5).

Updated Summary and Conclusions

5.16 The changes to the Proposed Development associated with Changes 1 and 3 (as set out in paragraph 1.5), and also the changes described in paragraph 1.6, do not have any material implications for the summary and conclusions presented in section 5.8 of ES Chapter 5 (see revision A of Document 6.5).

5.17 Paragraph 5.8.3 of ES Chapter 5 (see revision A of Document 6.5) indicates that the construction noise and vibration impacts were generally below the threshold of significant effects. However, consideration of the construction works associated with 'Change 2', indicates that when works are within 50m of the receptors near this roundabout some significant adverse effects may arise. This will depend on the time of day the works occur and the duration that the works will be near the receptors. These effects will be managed through the implementation of Best Practicable Means (as stated in the ES) and detailed noise assessments that will be undertaken for the P-CEMPs which are secured by the draft DCO (Document 3.1/REP1-003) by Schedule 2 Requirement 10.

5.18 There are no changes to the cumulative effects as reported in ES Chapter 5 (see revision A of Document 6.5) paragraph 5.8.7.

5.19 Overall, it is concluded that there is no material change to ES Chapter 5 (see revision A of Document 6.5) paragraph 5.8.8, which indicates that the Proposed Development complies with the requirements of the NNNPS and other relevant local and national policy.

6.0 ECOLOGY INCLUDING ARBORICULTURE

6.1 The change application as defined in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 above includes 'Change 1' which is directly relevant to ES Chapter 6 Ecology and Arboriculture (Document 6.6). In addition, dialogue with consultees over the period since submission of the OxSRFI application (in March 2026) has led to other changes, clarifications or updates being made by the Applicant to the ES Chapter and various ES Appendices (as outlined in paragraph 1.6 above). This includes further bird survey data gathered since submission, as well as updates to other details which form part of ES Chapter 6, including in response to comments or questions regarding the Shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment (sHRA, ES Appendix 6.10/Document 6.6J).

6.2 Therefore, an updated ES Chapter 6 (Document 6.6) has been prepared and submitted to incorporate the changes to the Order Limits and associated amended ecological (bird) mitigation scheme, with associated updates to the

relevant Appendices (including the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment and metric details, and an updated Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan). Those updated documents reflect the changes made and incorporate any updates in terms of the assessment of likely significant effects from the Proposed Development.

6.3 For the avoidance of doubt, Changes 2 and 3 relating to changes to the Order Limits associated with highways works in Bicester have no impact on the assessment or conclusions of ES Chapter 6 (Document 6.6) as submitted.

7.0 LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Introduction

7.1 The proposed changes described above (at paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6) have no implications for the methodology for the assessment of landscape and visual effects. The Policy context has also not materially changed.

Additional Information

7.2 Additional Photomontages (see revision A of ES Figure 7.11/Document 6.7J) and Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTVs) (see revision A of ES Appendix 7.4/Document 6.7D) have been included with this Addendum ES. This additional information has been prepared in response to requests and matters raised as part of the Consultation and Examination process.

7.3 In respect of the Photomontages (see revision A of ES Figure 7.11/Document 6.7J), there are no changes to the originally submitted Photomontages (ES Figure 7.11/ Document 6.7J). However, the additional Photomontages comprise an additional image/ sheet for each original Photomontage Viewpoint that depicts the extent of the Maximum Building Height parameter for each viewpoint location. These additional images/ sheets have been added to the originally submitted Photomontages at pages 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30, 34, 38, 42, 46, 50 and 54 of revision A of ES Figure 7.11 (updated Document 6.7J).

7.4 In respect of the updated ZTVs (see revision A of ES Appendix 7.4/Document 6.7D), a series of additional ZTVs have been prepared for the Proposed Development. These are accompanied by an Explanatory Note to support the different ZTV plans. As noted for the Photomontages above, these ZTVs are additional to the originally submitted versions (ES Appendix 7.4/Document 6.7D).

Baseline Conditions

7.5 Change 1 does see additional (alternative) land parcels brought into the Order Limits in the north-west area of the Main Site for the purposes of delivering part of the required ecological mitigation. However, the nature of the proposed use of this additional land – involving a combination of planting and/or agricultural management activity to provide suitable habitats for a range of farmland bird species – will have minimal, if any, landscape and visual effects. Similarly, the land now removed from the Order Limits will remain in its current agricultural use and so can be expected to remain consistent with the current baseline.

7.6 Changes 2 and 3, which will see the Order Limits reduced within the urban area of Bicester, and the changes described in paragraph 1.6, have no implications for the assessment of landscape and visual effects.

Updated Assessment of Likely Effects

7.7 The implications of the changes described in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 of this ES Addendum are negligible in nature, and negligible in scale. There will be no discernible change to the overall likely landscape and visual effects from the Proposed Development as a result of these changes.

Updated Assessment of Residual Effects

7.8 There will be no material change to the assessment of likely residual landscape and visual effects as a result of the changes in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 of this ES Addendum.

Updated Assessment of Cumulative Effects

7.9 There will be no material change to the assessment of likely cumulative landscape and visual effects as a result of the changes in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 of this ES Addendum.

Updated Summary and Conclusions

7.10 The assessment of landscape and visual effects as set out in ES Chapter 7 (Document 6.7) remains appropriate and unchanged as a result of the changes as described in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 of this ES Addendum.

8.0 LIGHTING

Introduction

8.1 The proposed changes described above (at paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6) have no implications for the methodology for the assessment of lighting effects. The Policy context has also not materially changed in relation to the proposed lighting or its effects.

8.2 Changes 1, 2 and 3 (as detailed within Paragraph 1.5), and also the changes described in paragraph 1.6, have no implications for the lighting baseline work carried out to date.

8.3 The effects on lighting from the changes to the Order Limits are assessed below.

Updated Assessment of Likely Effects

8.4 Changes 1, 2 and 3, and also the changes described in paragraph 1.6 (as detailed in this ES Addendum) have no implications for the Assessment of Likely Impacts from lighting.

Updated Assessment of Residual Effects

8.5 Changes 1, 2 and 3, and also the changes described in paragraph 1.6 (as detailed in this ES Addendum) have no implications for the Assessment of Residual Effects from lighting.

Updated Assessment of Cumulative Effects

8.6 Changes 1, 2 and 3, and also the changes described in paragraph 1.6 (as detailed in this ES Addendum) have no implications for the Assessment of Cumulative Effects from lighting.

Updated Summary and Conclusions

8.7 Changes 1, 2 and 3, and also the changes described in paragraph 1.6 (as detailed in this ES Addendum) have no implications for the summary and conclusions on lighting.

9.0 WATER ENVIRONMENT

Introduction

9.1 The changes to the Order Limits of the Proposed Development (including Change 3) as described in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 of this ES Addendum do not affect the methodology or policy context applied in assessing water environment impacts, as presented in ES Chapter 9. Similarly, the changes to the Proposed Development do not have any implications for the baseline water environment conditions, established in ES Chapter 9 (Document 6.9).

9.2 Updated consultation and engagement have been undertaken with the Environment Agency (EA) since preparation of the Main ES Report. Where relevant, comments and feedback arising from this ongoing consultation have informed amendments and clarifications to the assessment. These changes are set out below and have been incorporated within this ES Addendum as appropriate.

9.3 During this consultation, the EA noted a lack of consistency and clarity in relation to the groundwater effects considered within the assessment. In response to these comments, Table 9.3 of ES Chapter 9 (Document 6.9) has been updated and is reproduced below as ES Addendum Table 9.3, with amendments highlighted **in *bold italics***. It should be noted that these potential effects are already described in detail within the Assessment of Effects presented in ES Chapter 9 (Document 6.9) and are included within ES Addendum Table 9.3 for completeness only.

Updated Table 9.3: Issues Considered in the Assessment

Issue	Potential Effects
Construction Phase (including Demolition): Water Environment	
Geomorphology	Sediment from construction areas washed off into watercourses increasing turbidity and impacting on morphology.
	Change in drainage strategy altering flows to receiving watercourses affecting geomorphology.
Groundwater Quality	***Contaminated runoff or spillages from construction areas impacting groundwater quality.*** ***Reduced groundwater quantity resulting from reduced infiltration through compacted ground during construction activities.***

Issue	Potential Effects
Water Quality	Contaminated runoff or spillage from construction areas impacting surface water.
	Change in drainage strategy altering flows to receiving watercourses affecting water quality.
Flood Risk	Temporary storage of materials reduces the volume of floodplain storage increasing flood risk.
	Increased flood risk due to existing surface water flow paths being interrupted, diverted, or created by construction works, or due to increased compaction of ground or increase in impermeable area.
	Change in drainage strategy altering flows to receiving watercourses affecting flood risk.
Surface Water Drainage	Discharges from construction activities leading to increased flows to the surface water network increasing the risk of flooding from the surface water drainage.
	Sediment from construction areas washed off into surface water drainage causing blockage and flooding.
Wastewater	Increased flows during construction due to additional workers discharging to the wastewater network.
Water Supply	Increased demand on existing water supply/water resources to support construction activities.
Operational Phase: Water Environment	
Geomorphology	Potential effects due to realignment of two limbs of the upper reaches of the Ashgrove Brook: disruption of quantity and dynamics of flow and sediment supply due to changes in bed and bank form, channel planform, cross-section, and gradients.
Water Quality	Runoff from increased impermeable areas increasing sediment loading in watercourses.
	Shading from watercourse culverts affecting aquatic vegetation and water temperatures.
Groundwater Resources	***Contaminated runoff or spillage from operational activities impacting groundwater quality.*** ***Reduced groundwater quantity resulting from reduced infiltration through increased impermeable areas.***
Flood Risk	Increased runoff due to additional impermeable areas increases flood risk.
	Changes to existing, or creation of new, channel structures (e.g. culverts) reduces capacity and increases flood risk.
	Changes in drainage strategy – increased runoff leading to an increase in flood risk.

Issue	Potential Effects
	Increased fluvial flood risk due to loss of floodplain storage arising from elements of the Proposed Development within the floodplain.
	Increased flood risk due to existing surface water flow paths being interrupted, diverted, or created by the Proposed Development, or due to increased impermeable area.
Surface Water Drainage	Increased runoff due to additional impermeable areas increases flood risk.
	Changes to highways resulting in increased surface water runoff increasing flood risk.
Wastewater	Additional treated effluent impacting surface water quality if appropriate wastewater collection and treatment is not provided.
	Increased discharges to the existing foul sewerage system leading to flooding if insufficient capacity is available.
Water Supply	Increase in potable water demand, requiring new infrastructure and affecting sustainability of supply from local water resource zone.

9.4 Consultation with the EA also identified that the Study Area indicated in the ES Chapter 9 (Document 6.9) did not extend across the full extent of the Order Limits within Figure 9.1, however as noted in the Applicant's response to the EA (Document PDA-009) the requested update would not materially affect the assessment and the Applicant confirmed that the correct assessment had been undertaken. It should be also noted that, as described in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 above, the Order Limits have been updated and maps shown within ES Appendices 9.2 to 9.5 (Documents 6.9B to 6.9E) have been updated where relevant and included as part of the Deadline 2 submission. The updated Study Area includes additional areas; however, the works proposed within these areas are limited (e.g. signage and to provide access) and are not anticipated to give rise to any material impacts on the water environment, therefore, they have not been considered in any further detail.

Baseline Conditions

9.5 The latest Risk of Flooding from Surface Water mapping was used at the time of writing the ES Chapter 9 (Document 6.9). It is noted that this mapping has been updated since the submission, but a comparison of the mapping shows negligible differences. In any event, bespoke hydraulic modelling has been undertaken of the watercourse(s) which is a more accurate representation of flood risk.

9.6 Therefore, there are no changes to the water environment baseline conditions.

Updated Assessment of Likely Impacts

9.7 There will be no material change to the assessment of likely water environment impacts as a result of the changes described in this ES Addendum to the Proposed Development.

Updated Assessment of Residual Effects

9.8 There will be no material change to the assessment of likely residual water environment effects as a result of the changes described in this ES Addendum to the Proposed Development.

Updated Assessment of Cumulative Effects

9.9 There will be no material change to the assessment of likely cumulative water environment effects as a result of the changes described in this ES Addendum to the Proposed Development.

Updated Summary and Conclusions

9.10 The assessment of water environment effects, as provided in ES Chapter 9 (Document 6.9), remains unchanged as a result of the changes described in this ES Addendum to the Proposed Development.

10.0 HERITAGE – BUILT AND ARCHAEOLOGY

10.1 An updated ES Chapter 10 (revision A, Document 6.10) has been prepared and submitted to incorporate changes made following further dialogue with Oxfordshire County Archaeological Service and Historic England since submission of the OxSRFI DCO Application in March 2026. It includes a new ES Appendix 10.9 (Document 6.10K) which comprises an assessment of the setting and significance of a scheduled Turf Maze (referred to in the Chapter as SM3). It also includes reference to the recently submitted updated version (revision V6) of the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (ES Appendix 10.8/Document 6.10H).

10.2 In addition to reflecting the additional information or updates agreed, the updated ES Chapter 10 (revision A, Document 6.10) also reflects the changes made to the OxSRFI Order Limits and other changes as set out above in

Section 1 of this ES Addendum. Therefore, please refer to the updated Chapter 10 (revision A, Document 6.10).

10.3 However, for the avoidance of any doubt, none of the changes now made have any implications on the assessment of likely significant effects from the Proposed Development as set out in ES Chapter 10 (revision A, Document 6.10) as submitted. The nature of the works to provide ecological mitigation under Change 1 will not have any implications for on- or off-site heritage features or assets, being comparable to (baseline) agricultural uses already present on the relevant parcels. The reduction of the Order Limits and the delivery of infrastructure works in the highway will similarly not have any implications for the assessment already undertaken and conclusions reached in ES Chapter 10 (revision A, Document 6.10) as submitted.

11.0 GROUND CONDITIONS

11.1 An updated ES Chapter 11 has been prepared and submitted (at Examination Deadline 2) to reflect changes or clarifications made following further dialogue with the Environment Agency (EA) since submission of the OxSRFI DCO Application in March 2026 regarding groundwater receptors, and to incorporate additional evidence and analysis undertaken by the Applicant regarding 'PFAS' chemicals in the local environment. The updated Chapter includes an additional technical Appendix relating to the assessment of PFAS (ES Appendix 11.11/Document 6.11K).

11.2 In addition to reflecting that clarified or additional information, the updated ES Chapter also reflects the changes made to the OxSRFI Order Limits and other changes as set out above in Section 1 of this Addendum. Therefore, please refer to the updated Chapter 11 (Document 6.11).

11.3 However, for the avoidance of any doubt, none of the changes now made have any implications on the assessment of likely significant effects from the Proposed Development as set out in the ES as submitted. The nature of the works to provide ecological mitigation under Change 1 will not have any implications for ground conditions or contamination issues, being comparable to (baseline) agricultural uses already present on the relevant parcels. The reduction of the Order Limits and the delivery of infrastructure works in the highway will similarly not have any implications for the assessment already undertaken and conclusions reached in Chapter 11 as submitted.

12.0 SOCIO-ECONOMICS – INCLUDING HEALTH

Introduction

12.1 The changes made to the Proposed Development (as described above in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6) do not have any implications or require any change to the methodology used in assessing the socio-economic effects.

12.2 There are no material changes to the policy context presented in ES Chapter 12 (Document 6.12).

12.3 There are no material changes to the baseline conditions presented in ES Chapter 12 (Document 6.12).

Updated Assessment of Likely Effects

12.4 Changes 1 and 3 do not have any material implications or require an update to the assessment of effects set out in ES Chapter 12 (Document 6.12).

12.5 Whilst Change 2 may result in a change to the cost of construction to reflect delivery of the works at the A4095/B4030 roundabout by the Applicant, this is not expected to lead to a material change in the demand for temporary construction jobs. Change 2 therefore does not require any change to the assessment of likely impacts and therefore the significance of effect remains as stated in ES Chapter 12 (Document 6.12).

Updated Assessment of Residual Effects

12.6 The changes to the Proposed Development described at paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 do not have any material implications or require update to the assessment of residual effects set out in ES Chapter 12.

Updated Assessment of Cumulative Effects

12.7 The changes to the Proposed Development described at paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 do not have any material implications or require update to the assessment of cumulative effects set out in ES Chapter 12 (Document 6.12).

Updated Summary and Conclusions

12.8 The changes to the Proposed Development described at paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 do not alter the overall summary and conclusions in relation to Socio-Economics including health.

13.0 MATERIALS AND WASTE

Introduction

13.1 This addendum reviews the implications for materials and waste of the changes proposed through the OxSRFI Change Application (described above at paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6). The review has been undertaken against the assessment scope, methodology, baseline, mitigation and conclusions reported in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13).

Methodology

13.2 The methodology remains as set out in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13). The changes do not materially alter the quantities or types of materials required, the quantities or management routes for waste, the sensitivity of materials and waste receptors, or the significance of the effects previously reported.

Policy Context

13.3 The legislative and policy framework identified in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13) remains applicable. The proposed changes do not alter the requirement to apply the waste hierarchy, maximise reuse and recycling, use materials efficiently, comply with the Duty of Care and environmental permitting regimes, or protect safeguarded minerals and waste infrastructure.

Baseline Conditions

13.4 The material resources, waste infrastructure and landfill-capacity baseline described in Chapter 13 remain representative for the assessment of the changes. The changes do not introduce a new materials or waste receptor, affect the assessed status of Ashgrove Farm/Biffa IVC or Ardley Landfill, or alter the baseline sensitivity assigned to the relevant receptors.

13.5 None of the proposed changes alters the assessment methodology, applicable policy context or baseline conditions reported in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13). There is no change to the regional waste-management and landfill capacity, the safeguarded status of the Ashgrove Farm/Biffa IVC facility, or the assessment of works associated with Ardley Landfill.

Updated Assessment of Likely Effects

13.6 Change 1 – The amendment changes the configuration of land within the Order Limits used for farmland bird mitigation but does not materially alter the construction works, cut-and-fill balance, material demand or waste arisings assessed in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13). Any minor materials or green-waste arisings associated with establishing and maintaining the mitigation land would be managed through the measures already identified in the CEMP and SWMP.

13.7 Change 2 – A4095/B4030 roundabout. The works may require limited quantities of conventional highway materials and may generate excavated material, road plannings and other construction waste. These materials and wastes are consistent with those already identified for the Highway Works in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13) and would be managed through the existing CEMP (ES Appendix 2.3/Document 6.2C), phase-specific CEMP, SWMP and MMP commitments.

13.8 Change 3 – Foul sewer outfall. This is a minor boundary adjustment and does not change the nature of the connection works or materially affect material demand, excavation quantities, waste types, waste-management routes or the effects assessed in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13). No additional mitigation is required.

13.9 Additional changes noted in this ES Addendum will also have no material change on the likely effects already set out in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13).

Updated Assessment of Residual Effects

13.10 With the mitigation and management measures secured through the phase-specific CEMPs, SWMP and MMP (see revision A of ES Appendix 2.3/Document 6.2C), Changes 1, 2 and 3 would not give rise to any new or materially different residual effects. The residual effects for material use and construction and operational waste remain as reported in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13) (slight adverse and not significant).

13.11 No change to the significance conclusions arises from any individual element of the Change Application. Works at the A4095/B4030 roundabout introduce small-scale highway construction activity within adopted highway land, but this remains within the previously assessed types of activity and is adequately addressed by the existing mitigation framework. The additional or redistributed

quantities would be negligible to the project-wide material requirements, regional aggregate supply, waste-treatment throughput and landfill capacity assessed in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13).

13.12 Additional changes noted in this ES Addendum will also have no material change on the residual effects already set out in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13).

Updated Assessment of Cumulative Effects

13.13 The three proposed changes would not materially alter the Proposed Development's overall demand for materials or generation of waste and would not introduce a new pathway for cumulative effects with other committed developments. The cumulative assessment presented in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13) therefore remains valid. Existing opportunities for coordinated reuse of excavated material between suitable donor and receiver sites, where practicable and compliant with the relevant regulatory framework, also remain unchanged.

Updated Summary and Conclusions

13.14 The proposed changes have been reviewed against the Materials and Waste assessment in ES Chapter 13 (Document 6.13). None of the changes materially alters demolition, earthworks, material demand, waste generation, waste-management capacity or mitigation requirements. No additional materials and waste mitigation is required, and the previously reported slight adverse, not significant residual effects and cumulative-effect conclusions remain unchanged.

14.0 SOIL RESOURCES AND AGRICULTURAL LAND

Introduction

14.1 The proposed changes described above (at paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6) have no implications for the methodology for the assessment of soil resources and agricultural land effects. The Policy context has also not materially changed in relation to the effects on soil resources and agricultural land.

<u>Baseline</u>

14.2 Changes 2 and 3 (as detailed within Paragraph 1.5), and also the changes described in paragraph 1.6, have no implications for the baseline work carried out to date. Change 1 amends the amount of agricultural land impacted by the OxSRFI development. However, the change only relates to land included for ecological mitigation. The overall reduction in the Order Limits is also reflected in an updated version (revision 2) of the Agricultural Quality report (ES Appendix 14.1/Document 6.14A) which is submitted for deadline 2.

14.3 The quality of the land included through Change 1 was estimated using desk study information and the findings of the adjacent detailed surveys. This is judged an appropriate approach given that the land is not to be developed, and as such it will retain its agricultural potential, and the soil resource will be retained and protected.

14.4 The effect on soil resources and agricultural land from changes to the Order Limits are assessed below.

Updated Assessment of Likely Effects

14.5 Changes 2 and 3, and the changes described in paragraph 1.6 of this ES Addendum, have no implications for the Assessment of Likely Impacts on soil resources and agricultural land.

14.6 With Change 1 now included, the overall extent of grade 3a lost as a result of the OxSRFI scheme is 37.7 ha, which is about 8% of the total Application Site. The likely effect of this loss remains as set out in ES Chapter 14 (revision A of Document 6.14).

Updated Assessment of Residual Effects

14.7 Changes 1, 2 and 3, and the changes described in paragraph 1.6 of this ES Addendum have no implications for the Assessment of Residual Effects on soil resources and agricultural land.

Updated Assessment of Cumulative Effects

14.8 Changes 1, 2 and 3, and the changes described in paragraph 1.6 of this ES Addendum, have no implications for the Assessment of Cumulative Effects on soil resources and agricultural land.

Updated Summary and Conclusions

14.9 The changes described in paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 of this ES Addendum have no implications for the summary and conclusions on soil resources and agricultural land.

15.0 CLIMATE CHANGE

Introduction

15.1 The proposed changes to the application, as set out in Section 1, have been reviewed with regards to their effect on the assessment on and from climate change, as set out in ES Chapter 15 (Document 6.15).

15.2 Change 1: Ecological Mitigation (relevant to Work Nos. 29 and 37 as defined in the draft DCO) comprises the removal and addition of plots proposed for the farmland bird ecological mitigation. This change does not affect the assessment of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions arising from the Proposed Development. This is because the GHG assessment reviews changes to baseline emission sinks and sources, with particular focus on changes to woodland and peat environments given these have the greatest potential impact from an emissions perspective. Given the proposals do not result in any change (either addition or removal) to woodland or peaty soils, there will be no material change to the emissions presented within ES Chapter 15 (Document 6.15), and as such no change to the conclusions presented.

15.3 With regards to the climate change risk assessment (CCRA), the proposed change does not affect the assessment presented, which focuses on built environment receptors and development users. Where climate change would affect ecological receptors, this is assessed within ES Chapter 6 (see revision A of Document 6.6) as an intra-project effect.

15.4 Change 2: A4095/B4030 Roundabout at (relevant to Work No. 39 as defined in the draft DCO) comprises the delivery of highway mitigation works by the Applicant (in place of a financial contribution). Such works would result in embodied carbon emissions associated with their construction (i.e. from the materials used, transport to site, and on-site construction works) and were previously unaccounted for quantitatively in the calculation of GHG emissions arising from the construction of the Proposed Development, as presented in ES Chapter 15 (Document 6.15). Given the magnitude of emissions arising from the construction of the Proposed Development (334,139 tCO2e), and with only 14% of such emissions comprising those arising from the Highway

Works, it is unlikely that emissions arising from the Change 2 works would materially affect the magnitude of emissions reported. This is further supported by the elements of the Highway Works which contribute the most to the emissions total, comprising the Ardley Bypass and M40 J10, both of which present significantly greater construction works than those proposed under the Change 2 works.

15.5 Furthermore, where the Change 2 works are delivered by the Applicant, they would be required to comply with the Carbon Management Plan. As such, it can be expected that emissions arising from the construction of the Change 2 works would be reduced where feasible.

15.6 It can therefore be concluded that emissions arising from the Change 2 works would not be material in the context of the Proposed Development, and would be minimised where feasible. There is therefore no change to the significance assessment presented in ES Chapter 15 (Document 6.15) regarding the construction phase.

15.7 With regards to the operational phase, GHG emissions may arise from vehicle movements in the locality of the Proposed Development which may be affected by the Change 2 works, i.e. from changes to traffic within the wider network as a result of the new or changed highways infrastructure. The assessment of such emissions presented within ES Chapter 15 (Document 6.15) was informed by traffic data outputs from the Bicester Transport Model, and as such considered changes to the network as a whole. The change in the Order Limits does not change the proposed mitigation or the traffic data used. As such, no further update to this assessment is required. Furthermore, the assessment concluded that emissions arising from operational vehicle movements affected by the Highway Works are negligible (0.5% change from future baseline). Such emissions were not considered further within the assessment of operational emissions.

15.8 With regards to the Climate Change Risk Assessment (CCRA), the proposed change does not affect the assessment presented, which assesses potential impacts to the Highway Works as a whole, and as such accounts for all elements of the Highway Works where they are delivered by the Applicant. Further assessment of the specific change works is not required.

15.9 Change 3: Foul sewer outfall to Bicester (relevant to Work No. 35 as defined in the draft DCO) only comprises a change to the Order limits to remove a small parcel of land, with no change to the infrastructure proposed. As such, no update to the assessment of GHG emissions or to the CCRA is required.

Updated Assessment of Likely Effects

15.10 The assessment of likely significant effects as set out in ES Chapter 15 (Document 6.15) remains unchanged having considered the changes now proposed, and remains relevant as submitted.

Updated Assessment of Residual Effects

15.11 The assessment of residual effects as set out in ES Chapter 15 (Document 6.15) remains unchanged following consideration of the changes made to the application.

Updated Assessment of Cumulative Effects

15.12 The changes proposed to the application do not affect the conclusions reached within the assessment of intra-project effects, or inter-project effects within ES Chapter 15 (Document 6.15).

Updated Summary and Conclusions

15.13 The changes proposed to the application do not affect the conclusions reached within ES Chapter 15 (Document 6.15). As such, the conclusions previously reached are still applicable and require no further update.

16.0 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

16.1 The proposed changes to the OxSRFI application will have minimal (negligible) effects overall and so also negligible, if any, discernible effects on the assessment of cumulative effects. Changes 2 and 3 will result in less land affected by development, with the proposed OxSRFI works in both cases - highways works on the A4095/B4030 in Bicester, and the foul sewer outfall to Bicester – retained only within the existing highway, with third party land removed from the Order Limits. The nature of these changes means no new or different effects are likely overall, including when considered in the context of the potential combined (cumulative) effects alongside other ES topics ('intra-project' effects), and with other relevant development schemes ('inter-project'/cumulative effects).

16.2 Change 1 will see a different combination of land parcels used to form the farmland bird ecological mitigation as part of the OxSRFI proposals, and as

set out above (and in the updated Ecology and Arboriculture ES Chapter 6), this alternative package will result in an appropriate level of ecological mitigation and compensation which is no worse than that previously proposed (as submitted originally).

16.3 The changes to the Order Limits as a result of Change 1 have negligible implications for agricultural land lost as a result of the OxSRFI scheme, however, consistent with the approach taken to ecological mitigation in the ES as submitted, this does not affect the overall conclusions of the ES on this topic, nor does it have any material implications on the overall conclusions regarding cumulative effects. An updated Agricultural Quality report (see revision 2 of ES Appendix 14.1/Document 6.14A) has been submitted to incorporate the updated Order Limits areas.

16.4 Therefore, the likely overall cumulative effects of this amended mitigation package are unchanged from those identified in ES Chapter 14 as submitted originally (see revision A of Document 6.14).

17.0 OVERALL SUMMARY OF EFFECTS

17.1 As set out in this ES Addendum with reference to each of the ES topics addressed within the ES, the proposed changes to the OxSRFI application will have minimal (negligible) effects on the overall assessment of likely residual effects of the Proposed Development.

17.2 The reductions in the Order Limits represented by Changes 2 and 3 remove third party land from the area affected by highways and foul drainage works in Bicester. The ecological changes proposed under Change 1 will result in no greater an environmental effect than the originally submitted proposed farmland bird ecological mitigation scheme.

17.3 Consideration has been given to the highways works (Change 2) now likely to be delivered by the Applicant, with the likely effects from construction assessed and shown to be negligible, save for potentially significant temporary construction noise effects at the nearest receptors which will be managed through the P-CEMP. Similarly, the changes under Change 1 have been fully considered both in this Addendum, and through the updated ES Chapter 6 (see revision A of Document 6.6) and associated appendices with regard to ecological effects.

17.4 That same change also has some minor implications for the assessment of effects on soil resources and agricultural land, albeit due to the proposed uses of the land now included those effects are negligible and not significant.

17.5 Therefore, in conclusion, these changes do not have any material implications on, or result in changes to, the overall assessment of likely effects of the Proposed Development as set out in ES Chapter 17 (Document 6.17).