



Environmental Statement Addendum

Himley Village, Bicester

September 2015

Waterman Infrastructure & Environment Limited

2ND Floor, South Central, 11 Peter Street, Manchester, M2 5QR, United Kingdom
www.watermangroup.com

Environmental Statement Addendum

Himley Village, Bicester

Client Name: Property Portfolio Partners Ltd
Document Reference: WIB14995-101-R-1.2.1-DU
Project Number: WIB14995-101

Quality Assurance – Approval Status

This document has been prepared and checked in accordance with Waterman Group's IMS (BS EN ISO 9001: 2008, BS EN ISO 14001: 2004 and BS OHSAS 18001:2007)

Issue	Date	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
First	September 2015	David Unsworth Consultant	Steve Brindle Associate Director	Joanna Bagley Associate Director
Second	September 2015	David Unsworth Consultant	Steve Brindle Associate Director	Joanna Bagley Associate Director

Our Markets



Property & Buildings



Transport & Infrastructure



Energy & Utilities



Environment



Disclaimer

This report has been prepared by Waterman Infrastructure & Environment Limited, with all reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with the client, incorporation of our General Terms and Condition of Business and taking account of the resources devoted to us by agreement with the client.

We disclaim any responsibility to the client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of the above.

This report is confidential to the client and we accept no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known. Any such party relies on the report at its own risk.

Contents

Non-Technical Summary of the ES Addendum

1. Introduction	1
The Scope of this ES Addendum.....	1
ES Availability and Comments.....	1
2. Summary of Proposed Amendments and Consultation Comments	3
Proposed Amendments	3
Consultation Comments of Potential Relevance to the 2014 EIA	4
3. Methodology	7
Assessment of the Effect of the Proposed Amendments on the findings of the 2014 ES.....	7
4. Landscape and Visual Amenity	10
Introduction	10
Baseline Conditions	10
Potential Effects	11
Mitigation.....	15
Residual Effects	15
Summary and Conclusion.....	16
5. Ecology	18
Introduction	18
Baseline Conditions	19
Potential Effects.....	19
Mitigation and Residual Effects	20
6. Socio-Economics	22
7. Waste	23
8. Cumulative Effects	24
Conclusion	27
Figures	29
Appendices	30
Appendix 6.2 Verified Photomontages	30
Appendix 7.4 Note on Defra Metric for Biodiversity Offsetting	31

Non-Technical Summary of the ES Addendum

Introduction

In December 2014, Property Portfolio Partners Ltd (the Applicant) submitted an outline application for a residential led development on land bound by Middleton Stoney Road to the south, and agricultural land to the north, east and west. The Development is known as Himley Village.

Following submission of the application, in response to consultation comments, a number of changes have been made to the application. These are referred to in this document as the Proposed Amendments and are summarised below.

The outline application (Planning Application Reference: 14/02121/OUT) was accompanied by an Environmental Statement (hereafter referred to as the 2014 ES) which set out the likely environmental effects of the Himley Village Development. Comments were received by various consultees requesting further information or clarification in relation to the 2014 ES. The Proposed Amendments and consultation responses could change the significance of environmental effects as presented in the 2014 ES. Therefore, a review has been undertaken and where there is potential for the significance of effects to change, further environmental assessment work has been undertaken, the findings of which are reported in this ES Addendum. This ES Addendum should be read in conjunction with 2014 ES, all of these documents shall be available for viewing at Cherwell District Council (CDC) Development Department in Banbury during normal office hours, or on line via the Public Access service, which can be accessed from the Cherwell District Council website.

Summary of Proposed Changes and Consultation Responses

Five of the Parameter Plans submitted to set the limits of the outline application have changed, these are the Landscape, Land Use, Height, Density and Outline SuDS Parameter Plans.

The changes include reducing the maximum height of the proposed buildings and reducing the density of housing in certain areas of the Site and fixing the mix of uses in certain areas to reduce the level of flexibility sought. In addition, further information has been provided to accompany the Landscape Parameter Plan and SuDS Parameter Plan to provide clarification on the application submitted for approval.

With regard to consultation responses, further consideration of the landscape and visual effects on Bignell Park and the effects of the NW Bicester Ecotown Application 2 were requested by CDC and a variety of consultees requested further information in relation to ecological effects and mitigation. CDC also requested clarification on socio economic and waste effects and confirmation that the cumulative effects remain unchanged despite amendments to some of the Local Plan Allocations.

Methodology

The technical authors of the Environmental Statement reviewed the Proposed Amendments and consultation responses and provided a professional opinion on whether they could result in changes to the effects presented in the 2014 ES. Where changes may occur or clarification is required, further information and / or assessment has been undertaken. The technical chapters affected comprise the Landscape and Visual Amenity, Ecology, Socio Economics, Waste and Cumulative Effects ES Chapters.

Landscape and Visual Amenity

This addendum to Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Amenity of the 2014 ES considers whether the revised building height parameter plan would result in any change to the assessment presented in the 2014 ES. In addition, in response to comments received from CDC, the addendum has considered two additional landscape receptors; the historic setting of Bignell Park and the residential setting of Lovelynych House.

Effects of Landscape and Visual Amenity During Demolition and Construction

There would be no change to the assessment of effects on landscape and visual amenity during demolition and construction.

Effects on Landscape After Completion

The addendum assessment has identified a permanent, minor adverse residual effect on the historic setting of Bignell Park. There will be a change in tranquillity on the setting of Bignell Park as a result of the noise disturbance associated with the change in landscape character from arable to planned suburban development which remains an adverse change from the baseline condition.

The addendum assessment has identified a permanent, negligible to minor adverse effect on the residential setting of Lovelynych House. There will be a loss of tranquillity from the baseline condition associated with a suburban development however taking into account the low landscape sensitivity and minor magnitude of change this effect is not considered significant.

There would be no change to the assessment of effects on all other landscape receptors.

Effects on Visual Amenity After Completion

There would be no change to the assessment of effects on visual amenity on completion of the Himley Village Development.

Ecology

The changes to the Landscape Parameter Plan would result in modest increases in the areas of hedgerow, woodland and sustainable drainage features on completion of the Himley Village Development. These changes would not result in significant changes to the overall total area of habitats lost or gained and therefore the significance of effects set out in the Ecology Chapter of the 2014 ES remain unchanged.

In addition to the Proposed Amendments, consultees requested further information in relation to farmland birds, net biodiversity change and standards for buffering and provision of dark corridors. There would be effects on farmland birds but the Applicant would contribute towards off site biodiversity enhancements. Defined, bat (dark) corridors would be created along existing hedgerows that would be retained within the Site and bat structures would be created to mirror the preferred living environment of bats. The minimum width of bat corridors would be 40m.

Socio Economics

CDC requested further clarification on the capacity of primary and secondary schools within a walking distance of the Site. There is sufficient capacity within primary schools within walking distance of the Site to cater for anticipated demand prior to construction of the new school within Himley Village. There is also sufficient capacity within the secondary schools within walking distance.

CDC also requested clarification on the green spaces referred to in the report. Two green spaces were referred to which were either too far distant to be used by the residents of Himley Village or not publicly accessible. However, these green spaces were not used in the assessment of effects.

On the basis of the above, there has been no change to the Socio Economics Assessment and the likely significant effects presented in the 2014 ES.

Waste

CDC requested confirmation that the waste standards required by Planning Policy Statement: Eco-towns A Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 (the PPS) would be achieved. The Site Waste and Resources Plan submitted alongside the application sets targets which are aligned with those of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy Consultation Draft. These are substantially more ambitious than those of the 2007 National Waste Strategy as required by the PPS. The findings of the Waste Chapter of the 2014 ES therefore remain unchanged.

Cumulative Effects

Some changes have occurred to the Local Plan Site Allocations considered as part of the 2014 ES which may affect the Cumulative Effect Assessment on Transport and Socio Economics. In addition, the Landscape and Visual Amenity Assessment did not fully consider the proximity of housing associated with the NW Bicester 2 Application and CDC requested further consideration of this as a cumulative effect.

Landscape and Visual Amenity

The addendum assessment identified minor adverse effects on the setting of Bignell Park and negligible to minor adverse effects on the residential setting of Lovelynych House. This is as a result of the anticipated noise disturbance that would be associated with large areas of the wider setting of the Park changing from arable to planned suburban development. These effects remain within the scale of effects identified within the 2014 ES.

The addendum assessment identified minor adverse effects on bridleway users associated with viewpoints 5 and 6 where the Himley Village Development would be largely obscured from view by the NW Bicester Application 2 site. This assessment is greater than the 2014 ES as it did not fully consider the proximity of medium to low-density housing associated with the NW Bicester Application 2 development. There would be a noticeable change in the foreground view as a result of these houses which would largely screen the Himley Village Development from view.

The cumulative assessment on all other landscape and visual receptors would remain as presented in the 2014 ES.

Transport

The increase in employment and housing provision within the two allocations identified in the introduction to this section, have the potential to change traffic flows on the roads in and around Bicester. However, the town-wide traffic model on which the Himley Village has not been updated to reflect the changes to the allocations identified and, the changes to the allocations are only likely to affect the traffic flows after 2031. They would therefore not be included within the future baseline traffic flows used in the assessment of Himley Village.



Socio Economics

Due to uncertainties in development coming forward as part of the future allocations, the cumulative socio-economic effects are considered unlikely to change.

Availability of Documents

This Environmental Statement Addendum including the Non-Technical Summary are available for viewing during normal office hours at Cherwell District Council's offices in Banbury. Comments on the planning application should be forwarded to the following address:

Development Department
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
OX15 4AA

If you would like to receive further copies of this Addendum including Non-Technical Summary, please contact:

Waterman Infrastructure & Environment Limited
South Central
Peter Street
Manchester
M2 5QR
email: ie@watermangroup.com

1. Introduction

- 1.1. In December 2014, Property Portfolio Partners Ltd (the Applicant) submitted an outline application, with all matters reserved, for a residential led development on land bound by Middleton Stoney Road to the south, and agricultural land to the north, east and west (Planning Application Reference: 14/02121/OUT). The application, known as Himley Village comprises:

"Development to provide up to 1,700 residential dwellings (Class C3), a retirement village (Class C2), flexible commercial floorspace (Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and C1), social and community facilities (Class D1), land to accommodate one energy centre and land to accommodate one new primary school (up to 2FE) (Class D1). Such development to include provision of strategic landscape, provision of new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access routes, infrastructure and other operations (including demolition of farm buildings on Middleton Stoney Road)".

- 1.2. A plan showing the location of the Himley Village Site (the Site) is presented as Figure 1.1 and application boundary is shown on Figure 1.2.
- 1.3. An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the Himley Village Development was co-ordinated by Waterman Energy, Environment & Design Ltd (now Waterman Infrastructure & Environment Ltd) and an Environmental Statement (ES) was prepared to accompany the outline application. This is hereafter referred to as the 2014 ES.
- 1.4. Since submission of the planning application and following discussions with Cherwell District Council (CDC), changes have been made to the Landscape, Land Use, Height, Density and Outline SuDS Parameter Plans for the Himley Village Development. The changes are hereafter referred to as the 'Proposed Amendments'. Further details on the Proposed Amendments are provided in Section 2.
- 1.5. In addition, a number of comments relevant to the EIA have been made by consultees during the determination period. Where required these comments have been addressed in this document.

The Scope of this ES Addendum

- 1.6. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011¹ (hereafter referred to as the 'EIA Regulations') as amended, this Environmental Statement Addendum reports the findings of the assessment of the implications of the Proposed Amendments on the findings of the 2014 EIA as presented in the 2014 ES. Further information has also been provided, where relevant, to respond to consultee comments.
- 1.7. Information and impact assessments that remain unchanged from the 2014 ES have not been reproduced within this ES Addendum unless explicitly stated. This ES Addendum should be read in conjunction with 2014 ES which is available for viewing at Cherwell District Council (CDC) Planning Department or on line via the Public Access service, which can be accessed from the Cherwell District Council website.
- 1.8. Further detail on the scope of this ES Addendum is presented in Section 3.

ES Availability and Comments

- 1.9. Additional copies of this addendum and Non-Technical Summary are available free of charge. Copies of the full ES are available for purchase. For copies of these documents please contact:

Waterman Infrastructure & Environment Limited
South Central
Peter Street
Manchester
M2 5QR

Email: ie@watermangroup.com

- 1.10. Additional copies are also available for viewing by the public during normal office hours in the planning department of CDC. Comments on the application, should be forwarded to CDC at the address below:

Development Department
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
OX15 4AA

¹ Town and Country Planning. (2011) *Environmental Impact Assessment: EIA Regulations SI 2011 139*.

2. Summary of Proposed Amendments and Consultation Comments

Proposed Amendments

- 2.1. Since submission of the planning application, and following discussions with CDC and other consultees, changes have been made to the Landscape, Land Use, Height, Density and Outline SuDS Parameter Plans for the Himley Village Development. No changes have been made to the Site Plan, Demolition Plan or Movement and Access Plan.
- 2.2. A summary of the Proposed Amendments are set out below and a full set of Parameter Plans, as revised, are included as Figures 1.2 and 5.1 to 5.7, which replace the equivalent figures from the 2014 ES.

Landscape Plan

- 2.3. The landscape plan has been revised to 'fix' the quantum of strategic Green Infrastructure (GI) and is accompanied by table, providing a breakdown of areas to confirm that the 40% GI has been achieved.

Land Use Plan

- 2.4. The land use plan has been revised to reduce the level of flexibility sought, specifically:
 - The area around Himley Farm has been given over to hard / soft landscape only. Previously this area was landscape or social or community uses;
 - The area to the west of Lovelynych House has been given over to housing. It was previously housing or other uses;
 - The area to east of Lovelynych House has been given over to housing or C2 uses. It was previously housing or other uses;
 - The area given over to housing or other uses has been reduced against the primary road;
 - Minor adjustments have been made to the areas shown as hard / soft landscape to reflect adjustments to the landscape parameter and set backs from Lovelynych House; and
 - The key has been updated and use classes added for clarity.

Height

- 2.5. Reductions in height have been made, specifically:
 - At the north western boundary where maximum heights are now up to 13m rather than up to 19m as previously proposed;
 - In the southern area to the west of Lovelynych House where heights are now up to 10m (nearest Lovelynych House) rather than up to 13m or up to 16m previously;
 - Heights fronting Middleton Stoney Road near to Lovelynych House are now up to 13m whereas they were previously up to 16m; and
 - East of Lovelynych House heights are up to 13m whereas they were previously up to 16m.
- 2.6. Minor adjustments have also been made to the areas shown as hard / soft landscape to reflect adjustments to Landscape parameter and setbacks from Lovelynych House.

Density

- 2.7. Reductions in density have been made, specifically:
- At the north western boundary where the density has been reduced to 30-45 dwellings per hectare rather than 35-55 dph as previously proposed;
 - At the south western boundary where the density has been reduced to 15-25 dph rather than 20-35 dph as previously proposed.
- 2.8. Minor adjustments have also been made to the areas shown as hard / soft landscape to reflect adjustments to Landscape parameter and set backs from Lovelynch House.

SUDS

- 2.9. Amendments have been made to the layout of swales, specifically:
- Within the central portion of the Site, to the east of Lovelynch House where one horizontal and four vertical swales are now proposed rather than the previously proposed four horizontal;
 - Swales have been re-routed to utilise the village pond and avoid the newt ponds;
 - The discharge has been re-routed to the north of Middleton Stoney Road / Howes Lane / Vendee Drive roundabout; and
 - The plan has been supplemented with a storage attenuation table to demonstrate that the volume of attenuation required can be met.

Other Parameters / Assumptions on which the 2014 EIA was Based

- 2.10. The changes to the proposed building heights and unit densities do not change the maximum floorspace areas applied for as part of the outline planning application.
- 2.11. The Health Care Facility proposed as part of the application has been confirmed as a private facility and would not be a National Health Service doctors surgery as was potentially the case in the initial application.

Consultation Comments of Potential Relevance to the 2014 EIA

- 2.12. Following submission of the outline application a number of consultation comments of potential relevance to the technical assessments forming part of the 2014 EIA were received. The relevant comments are summarised below. Reference is not made in the text below to consultation comments where no queries were raised or to those consultation comments (or parts thereof) where requests were made for planning conditions to be applied to any planning consent. It is assumed that CDC will apply planning conditions as requested by the consultees in order to ensure that the assumptions made within the 2014 ES and/or additional detail required to confirm those assumptions are implemented as part of the Himley Village Development.

Landscape and Visual Amenity

- 2.13. CDC confirmed that the Landscape and Visual Amenity Assessment was comprehensive and proportionate but noted that the effects on Bignell Park Historic landscape receptor had not been addressed. In addition, the housing associated with the NW Bicester Application 2 (Planning Application Reference 14/01641/OUT) would screen views of Himley Village for visual receptors on the bridleway shown in viewpoints 5, 6 and 7. This was not considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Amenity Assessment.

Ecology

- 2.14. CDC, Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust and Bioregional requested further information to demonstrate a net biodiversity gain is achieved on the Site through use of a Biodiversity Impact Assessment (Defra) metric. In addition, given that farmland birds would be adversely affected by the Development, off site mitigation was sought by means of a commuted sum to enable purchase of land or a farm scheme to be implemented. Further clarification was also requested to demonstrate compliance with the Eco Town Masterplan and specifically, standards for buffering of hedgerows and ponds, dark corridors and biodiversity in the built environment.
- 2.15. CDC also raised that if roads are adopted, lighting will be required to meet to meet adoptable standards, limiting the flexibility in lighting design. The ES therefore needs to confirm that this has been taken into account.

Transport

- 2.16. OCC, Middleton Stoney Parish Council, Bicester Parish Council, Caversfield Parish Council and Network Rail requested further information regarding mitigation proposals in relation to transport infrastructure provision, upgrades and its delivery. OCC also referred to a limit on the provision of homes across the entire NW Bicester Masterplan area prior to delivery of the strategic link road.
- 2.17. Further work has been undertaken in relation to the transport infrastructure and phasing assumptions. However, this does not change the traffic assumptions or traffic data upon which the 2014 EIA is based. Therefore, the traffic and transportation effects as set out in Chapter 8 of the 2014 ES would remain unchanged and no additional information is required as part of this ES Addendum.

Flood Risk and Drainage

- 2.18. The Environment Agency requested further information in relation to the Flood Risk Assessment and specifically, demonstration that there are viable outfall locations for surface water discharging from the Site and information on how and where the required surface water attenuation will be provided on the Site. In addition, the Environment Agency and Natural England recommended that measures were put in place to ensure the long term maintenance of SuDS infrastructure.
- 2.19. A letter setting out further details in relation to the outfall locations and capacities and swale capacities was provided to the Environment Agency on 11 May 2015. Subsequent to this, the SuDS parameter plan and swale capacities have been updated, which has led to a slight increase in the overall volume of surface water attenuation provided. This was confirmed to the EA in a letter dated 9th September 2015. The information provided in the letters does not alter the assumptions upon which the 2014 EIA was based and therefore the effects set out in the Water Resources Chapter of the 2014 ES remain unchanged and no further information is necessary as part of this ES Addendum.
- 2.20. Thames Water and the Environment Agency stated that further information would be required pre-development to confirm what water and waste water infrastructure upgrades would be required to serve the proposed Development and meet the proposed water efficiency targets. The use of grey water and/or blackwater recycling was broadly supported but further information on the treatment and disposal of grey water and blackwater would be required pre-commencement of the Development.
- 2.21. It is expected that this requirement would be conditioned as part of any planning consent for the Himley Village Development and no further information is required at this stage.

Heritage

- 2.22. English Heritage (now Historic England) raised in their consultation response that the Development would cause some harm to the significance of the Grade II listed barns at Himley Farm, as set out in the Built Heritage Chapter of the Environmental Statement. However, they confirmed that the harm is mitigated to an extent by planning for large areas of open space to the north and north-west of the buildings and by providing a small green buffer around the Site as a whole. They set out that the detailed design of the landscaping and the detailing and scale of buildings closest to Himley Farm are key to effective mitigation. A condition was recommended on any planning consent to enable these comments to be taken into account at the reserved matters stage.

Socio-Economics

- 2.23. Cherwell District Council asked for the school capacity data and green space data used in the socio economics assessment to be reviewed as some schools / green spaces were considered too far distant and/or not accessible to be relevant.

Waste

- 2.24. Cherwell District Council stated that *'Whilst targets are identified for recycling and diversion from landfill no proposals are identified that set out how this is to be achieved. The PPS seeks a sustainable waste and resources plan, covering both domestic and nondomestic waste and suggests this should demonstrate how targets will be achieved monitored and maintained, amongst other things. It is suggested that this approach is followed to show how waste targets will be achieved.'*

Cumulative Effects

- 2.25. CDC raised the fact that changes had occurred to the allocations considered as part of the 2014 EIA through the Modification to the Local Plan, which has subsequently been adopted. This has increased the allocations in relation to Bicester. The potential implication in terms of cumulative effects should therefore be considered.

3. Methodology

Assessment of the Effect of the Proposed Amendments on the findings of the 2014 ES

- 3.1. The authors of each technical chapter of the 2014 ES reviewed the Proposed Amendments and consultee comments described in Section 2 to provide a professional opinion on whether they would result in any significant changes to the significance of effects set out in the 2014 ES or whether additional assessment would be required to determine if the effects have changed a result of the Proposed Amendments. The results of this review are set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Review of Changes and Consultee Comments

Chapter	Summary of Proposed Amendments and Consultee Comments	Response/Methodology
6 Landscape and Visual Amenity	<p>Relevant Proposed Amendment: Amendments to the Height Parameter Plan.</p> <p>Consultee Comments (CDC): Provide an assessment of the impact on the setting of Bignell Park and Lovelynych House. Consider the cumulative effects of the NW Bicester Application 2.</p>	<p>The landscape and visual assessment set out in Chapter 6 of the 2014 ES has been reviewed to take into consideration the revised Parameter Plan and the comments received. The review is presented in Section 4.</p> <p>Consideration of the cumulative effects is provided in Section 8 of this ES Addendum.</p>
7 Ecology	<p>Relevant Proposed Amendment: Changes to the Landscape Parameter Plan.</p> <p>Consultee Comments (Various): Demonstrate that a net bio diversity gain is achieved on the Site. Confirm off site mitigation for farmland birds. Confirm with regard to buffering, dark corridors and biodiversity of the built environment.</p>	<p>The Ecology Assessment as set out in Chapter 7 of the 2014 ES has been reviewed and commentary is provided in Section 5 below.</p>
8 Transport	<p>Relevant Proposed Amendment: None</p> <p>Consultee Comments (Various): Further information, investigation and proposals for mitigation in relation to transport infrastructure provision and upgrades and its delivery are required.</p> <p>OCC: There is a limit on the provision of homes across the entire NW Bicester Masterplan area prior to delivery of the strategic link road.</p>	<p>Further information has been provided in relation to transport infrastructure provision. However, this would not result in any changes to the traffic data or assumptions on which the 2014 ES is based.</p> <p>None of the Proposed Amendments would affect the traffic data or findings of the Transport Chapter of the 2014 ES. As such, the effects presented within the Transport Chapter of the 2014 ES remain unchanged and no further assessment has been undertaken.</p>
9 Air Quality	None	<p>As no changes have been made to the traffic data upon which the Air Quality Assessment was based, the effects presented within the Air Quality Chapter of the 2014 ES are considered to remain unchanged and no further assessment has been undertaken.</p>

Chapter		Summary of Proposed Amendments and Consultee Comments	Response/Methodology
10	Noise and Vibration	None	As no changes have been made to the traffic data or other assumptions upon which the Noise and Vibration assessment was based, the effects presented within the Noise and Vibration Chapter of the 2014 ES are considered to remain unchanged and no further assessment has been undertaken.
11	Water Management	<p>Relevant Proposed Amendment: The SuDS Parameter Plan has changed.</p> <p>Consultee Comments (Environment Agency): Demonstrate that there are viable outfall locations for surface water discharging from the Site and information on how and where the required surface water attenuation will be provided on the Site.</p>	The additional information provided to supplement the FRA and changes to the SuDS Parameter Plan do not alter the assumptions upon which the 2014 EIA was based and therefore the effects set out in the Water Resources Chapter of the 2014 ES remain unchanged and no further information is necessary as part of this ES Addendum.
12	Ground Conditions and Contamination	None	There is considered to be no change to the assessment of effects as presented within the Ground Conditions and Contamination Chapter of the 2014 ES. No additional assessment is therefore required.
13	Agriculture and Soils	None	None of the Proposed Amendments are considered to affect the findings of the Agriculture and Soils Chapter of the 2014 ES. As such, the effects presented within the Agriculture and Soils Chapter of the 2014 ES are considered to remain unchanged and no further assessment has been undertaken.
14	Built Heritage	<p>Relevant Proposed Amendment: Changes to the Land Use Parameter Plan to retain hard/soft landscape around Himley Farm.</p> <p>Consultee Comments (English Heritage): The detailed design of the landscaping and the detailing and scale of buildings closest to Himley Farm are key to effective mitigation. A condition was recommended on any planning consent to enable these comments to be taken into account at the reserved matters stage.</p>	The amendments to the Land use Parameter Plan provide further certainty on the landscape buffer around Himley Farm. English Heritage considers that a condition is suitable to ensure that the setting of Himley Farm is considered further at the reserved matters stage, therefore no further information is required at this stage. As such, the effects presented within the Built Heritage Chapter of the 2014 ES are considered to remain accurate and no further assessment has been undertaken.
15	Archaeology (Buried Heritage)	None	There is considered to be no change to the assessment of effects as presented within the Archaeology Chapter of the 2014 ES. No additional assessment is therefore considered to be required.
16	Socio-Economics	Consultee Comments (CDC): Consideration is given to schools and green spaces which are outside	In response to comments received from CDC the open space and schools sections of the Socio Economic

Chapter	Summary of Proposed Amendments and Consultee Comments	Response/Methodology
	of the town and/or are not accessible.	assessment presented in the 2014 ES has been reviewed. The findings are presented in Section 6 of this ES Addendum.
17 Human Health	Relevant Proposed Amendment: The health facility would not be an NHS facility.	Although the health facility within Himley Village would be private, a separate National Health Service doctors' surgery would be provided on land to the east as part of the local centre within the wider NW Bicester EcoTown. This was not considered within the 2014 ES. It is understood that the doctors surgery proposed within land to the east would be sufficient to cater for the Himley Village Development without the need for an additional doctors' surgery on the Himley Village Development itself. On this basis, the Proposed Amendment would not alter the likely significant impacts set out in the the Health Chapter of the 2014 ES.
18 Waste	Consultee Comments (CDC): The PPS seeks a sustainable waste and resources plan, covering both domestic and non domestic waste and suggests this should demonstrate how targets will be achieved monitored and maintained, amongst other things. It is suggested that this approach is followed to show how waste targets will be achieved.	A Sustainable Waste and Resources Plan (SWRP) was provided as part of the 2014 ES. Further clarification of this issue has been provided in Section 7 of this ES Addendum.
19 Cumulative Effects	Consultee Comment (CDC): Cumulative impact is assessed but changes have occurred to through the Modifications to the Local Plan that have now been subject of examination [and subsequently adopted]. This has increased the allocations in relation to Bicester and as a result the conclusions on cumulative impact should be reviewed. Consider the cumulative effects of the NW Bicester Application 2.	The implications of the modifications to the Local Plan and comments received have been considered and are discussed in Section 8.

3.2. On the basis of the above review, further information and / or assessment has been provided in relation to Landscape and Visual Amenity, Ecology, Socio Economics, Waste and Cumulative effects. For clarity, where figures or technical appendices replace those of the 2014 ES, the figure and appendices references remain the same. However, the paragraph numbers and table numbers set out in the Sections below do not relate to those of the 2014 ES. Each section below provides an addendum to the particular technical chapter of the 2-14 ES and does not, unless specifically stated, replace individual elements of each technical chapter.

4. Landscape and Visual Amenity

Introduction

- 4.1. This Section of the ES Addendum addresses whether the landscape and visual impact assessment presented in the 2014 ES has changed as a result of the revised building height parameter plan (Fig 5.4). The revisions are described in Section 2 of this ES Addendum.
- 4.2. In addition, as part of the determination process comments were received from Cherwell District Council Landscape Architect (email 24th February 2015) and these have been considered as part of this section of the ES Addendum.
- 4.3. In response to both comments from Cherwell District Council and changes in the parameter plans, this addendum addresses the following;
 - The historic setting of Bignell Park as a landscape receptor;
 - The residential setting of Lovelynych House as a landscape receptor; and
 - The impact of the revised Height Parameter Plan on the viewpoint assessment.
- 4.4. The cumulative effect of the NW Bicester Application 2 (South of Railway) upon the cumulative viewpoint assessment is presented in Section 8.
- 4.5. The planning policy and assessment methodology sections presented in the Landscape and Visual Amenity Chapter of the 2014 ES remain unchanged and have therefore not been reproduced in this ES Addendum.

Baseline Conditions

- 4.6. The baseline conditions remain as detailed in the Landscape and Visual Chapter of the 2014 ES. For clarity, the following paragraphs have been included which are relevant to the landscape character of Bignell Park.

Local Landscape Character Assessment

Oxford County Council Wildlife and Landscape Study

- 4.7. The Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study places the Site within the Wooded Estate-land landscape character type. This is a wooded estate landscape characterised by arable farming and small villages with a strong vernacular character.
- 4.8. Within this character type there are a number of Local Character Areas including the land near Bicester classified as 'Middleton Stoney'. The parkland estates of Middleton and Bignell, and the large woodland blocks associated with them, are specifically mentioned as a prominent feature of this character type.

Cherwell District Council Landscape and Sensitivity Assessment

- 4.9. The Landscape and Sensitivity Assessment describes Bignell Park as follows:
 - Bignell Park is a privately owned area of parkland around Bignell House, built in 1866 to the designs of William Wilkinson for a descendant of Sir Francis Drake;
 - The Park is laid out in typical 18th century style with sinuous perimeter belts of trees and clumps and single parkland trees set in grassland; and
 - There is no public access and views into the park are extremely limited.

- 4.10. The Park is of cultural value, although undesignated; the Bignell Chapel and deserted medieval village are both possibly sites of archaeological remains.
- 4.11. The Park consists entirely of land designated as Ecologically Important Landscape primarily for its bat habitat.

Landscape Receptors and Sensitivity to Change

- 4.12. In addition to the landscape receptors identified in the Landscape and Visual Chapter of the 2014 ES, the following have been included in this addendum landscape assessment:
- The historic setting of Bignell Park: This is considered to be of medium sensitivity to change. Bignell Park is a good example of a historic designed landscape and the parkland is a key characteristic forming the landscape character of the site on a local scale. The Park is valued for both cultural and ecological elements albeit undesignated at a national scale; and
 - The residential setting of Lovelynch House: This is considered to be of low sensitivity to change. This isolated farmstead settlement is typical of local farmland characterised locally as Himley Farm Slopes. The property lies within close proximity to the Site however is largely enclosed by successive dense, conifer hedgerows and vegetation.
- 4.13. No other changes to Landscape Receptors or their sensitivity to change would result from the Proposed Amendments.

Viewpoint Study

- 4.14. The viewpoints that inform the visual assessment remain as set out within the 2014 ES. Viewpoints 1 – 6 have been remodelled to reflect changes to the parameter plans and are included in the revised **Appendix 6.2**. Viewpoint 7 remains unchanged and has therefore been excluded from the revised assessment. However, all views have been included in the revised Technical Appendix 6.2 for clarity.

Potential Effects

Demolition and Construction

- 4.15. The landscape and visual effects that would be generated by the demolition and construction works associated with the Himley Village Development would remain unchanged from those described in the Landscape and Visual Chapter of the 2014 ES.
- 4.16. The significance of effects on the additional landscape receptors, Bignell Park and Lovelynch House, are described in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Significance of landscape effects during demolition and construction

Receptors and Changes	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
Receptor: Historic setting of Bignell Park Sensitivity: Medium Anticipated Changes: Noise and visual intrusion from construction traffic, working machinery and temporary lighting would affect the tranquillity and wider setting of Bignell Park in varying degrees, predominantly	Construction phases 1-4 <i>Moderate adverse</i> Size of scale of change: There would be no loss of the landscape elements that form the character setting of Bignell Park. However there would be a temporary loss of tranquillity due to noise from construction work and traffic along Middleton	<i>Minor adverse</i> <i>Temporary at local level</i> There will be no change in the landscape elements that contribute to the character of Bignell Park, for example the perimeter woodland belts. There will be an overall, temporary change in tranquillity

Receptors and Changes	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
<p>the northern part of the Park along Middleton Stoney Road, throughout the phased construction programme.</p>	<p>Stoney Road that would affect the northern area of Bignell Park. Duration: short term. Geographical Influence: at the level of the immediate setting of the Site.</p>	<p>of varying intensity throughout the phased construction programme. This is likely to only affect the northern setting of the Park along Middleton Stoney Road.</p>
	<p>Construction phases 5-8 <i>Minor adverse</i> Size or scale of change: There would be a progressive reduction in the loss of tranquillity as the phased construction work moves northwards within the Development. The source of noise disturbance along Middleton Stoney Road would gradually change from that of construction traffic to that of a suburban development. Duration: medium term. Geographical Influence: at the level of the immediate setting of the Site.</p>	
<p>Receptor: Residential setting of Lovelynych House Sensitivity: Low Anticipated Changes: Noise and visual intrusion from construction traffic, working machinery and temporary lighting would affect the tranquillity and pastoral setting of Lovelynych House in varying degrees throughout the phasing of works. The immediate residential setting to the farmstead is retained and the property is self-contained as it is largely enclosed by existing mature boundary planting.</p>	<p>Construction phases 1-4 <i>Moderate adverse</i> Size or scale of change: The immediate setting is retained although there will be some temporary, close range intrusion from construction traffic, particularly given the relative proximity to the proposed primary route into the Site. Duration: short term. Geographical Influence: at the level of the immediate setting of the Site.</p>	<p><i>Minor adverse</i> <i>Temporary at local level</i> There would be a noticeable reduction in the perceived tranquillity of the residential setting of Lovelynych House, largely due to its proximity to the boundary of the Site. Disturbance levels will be of varying intensity throughout the phased construction programme and, although temporary in nature, is a marked departure from the baseline condition.</p>
	<p>Construction phases 5-8 <i>Minor adverse</i> Size or scale of change: There would be a progressive reduction in the loss of tranquillity as the phased construction work moves northwards. The buffer planting between Lovelynych House and the Himley Village Development would be established, affording some privacy and noise reduction. There would still be noise disturbance associated with the adjacent suburban development. Duration: medium term. Geographical Influence: at the level of the immediate setting of the Site.</p>	

Completed Development

- 4.17. The design development of Himley Village as an iterative process to minimise potential effects on landscape and visual amenity, remain as described in the Landscape and Visual Amenity Chapter of the 2014 ES.
- 4.18. The assessment of the effects of the Himley Village Development on the landscape and visual receptors has been undertaken considering the mitigation inherent in the scheme, as described in the Landscape and Visual Chapter of the 2014 ES.
- 4.19. An assessment of the effects of the Himley Village Development on the landscape character of the additional landscape receptors identified within the baseline assessment is set out below.

Table 4.2: Significance of landscape effect after completion

Receptors and Changes	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor: Historic setting of Bignell Park Sensitivity: Medium Anticipated Changes: The intrusion on the tranquillity and setting of Bignell Park would be largely reduced once construction is complete. However the source of noise disturbance along Middleton Stoney Road would change to that of a suburban development. The existing hedgerows along Middleton Stoney Road will be ecologically enhanced via ten-metre landscape treatment buffer to both sides, contributing to reducing noise disturbance associated with the completed Development. Boundary planting, along with the careful layout of dwellings and character areas will absorb the change in landscape setting immediately north of Bignell Park.</p>	<p><i>Minor adverse</i> Size of scale of change: No direct change in the immediate setting of Bignell Park however to the northern perimeter there will be a reduction in tranquillity due to noise associated with the completed Development. Duration: long term. Geographical Influence: at the level of the immediate setting of the Site.</p>	<p><i>Minor adverse</i> <i>Permanent at local level</i> There will be a reduction in tranquillity associated with the new Development in addition to distant noise disturbance already present from the nearby M40. The intrusion on tranquillity will be isolated largely to the northern area of Bignell Park and will be mitigated through substantial new planting along Middleton Stoney Road. Taking into account the medium landscape sensitivity and minor magnitude of change the effect is considered to be minor adverse.</p>
<p>Receptor: Residential setting of Lovelynych House Sensitivity: Low Anticipated Changes: The intrusion on the tranquillity and setting of Lovelynych House would be largely reduced once construction is complete. However the source of noise disturbance would change to that of a suburban development. The existing, substantial boundary planting to the property would be ecologically enhanced via a landscape treatment buffer on all boundaries, contributing to reducing noise disturbance</p>	<p><i>Minor adverse</i> Size of scale of change: No change to the immediate setting of Lovelynych House comprised of existing garden and surrounding boundary vegetation. There is a change in the wider setting from agricultural to suburban. There will be a loss of tranquillity from the baseline condition associated with a suburban development. Duration: long term. Geographical Influence: at the level of the immediate setting of the Site.</p>	<p><i>Negligible to Minor adverse</i> <i>Permanent at local level</i> There would be a reduction in the perceived tranquillity of the residential setting of Lovelynych House, largely due to its proximity to the boundary of the Site however the landscape buffer and use-class of adjacent dwellings will afford some privacy and reduction in noise disturbance. Taking into account the low landscape sensitivity and minor magnitude of change the effect is considered to be negligible to minor adverse.</p>

Receptors and Changes	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
<p>associated with the completed Development.</p> <p>The built form immediately adjacent to the north and east elevations of Lovelynch House has been reduced in height and mass to allow for a substantial buffer zone. These buildings are to be developed as C2 uses therefore vehicular traffic and activity would reflect this use type typically being of low noise level.</p> <p>The wider setting of the property as an isolated farmstead is lost however landscape elements such as areas of open landscape and geometric field pattern formed by networks of hedgerows has been retained and enhanced as part of the Development. The immediate residential setting is retained and the property is self-contained as it is largely enclosed by existing mature boundary planting.</p>		

4.20. The visual effects on each viewpoint location after completion have been reassessed on the basis of the revised Height Parameter Plan and summarised below. The significance of the effects remains unchanged from the 2014 ES.

- Viewpoint 1: The maximum building parameters, although visible, dominate proportionally less of the view than in the previous assessment. In turn, more of the Development is filtered from the view of passing road users by existing vegetation. The magnitude of change remains minor adverse as there is still deterioration in the baseline view along Middleton Stoney Road;
- Viewpoint 2: The minimum building parameters would be entirely screened by existing vegetation. Maximum building parameters, although visible, dominate proportionally less of the view than the previous assessment. In turn, more of the Himley Village Development is filtered from the view of passing road users by existing vegetation. The magnitude of change remains minor adverse as there is still deterioration in the baseline view along Middleton Stoney Road;
- Viewpoint 3: Maximum building heights are predominantly visible in the middle ground of the view and are the most apparent elements within the composition of the view; this remains unchanged from the previous assessment. There will be partial screening from existing hedgerows. The magnitude of change remains minor adverse as there is still deterioration in the baseline due to localised loss of hedgerow that forms part of the wider view along Middleton Stoney Road;
- Viewpoint 4: The reduction in building height to the northwest corner is picked up in this view however it remains screened by existing vegetation as per the previous assessment. The magnitude of change remains negligible adverse; the view is partially obscured by vegetation and does not substantially break the skyline;
- Viewpoint 5: There is a partial view of buildings at maximum parameter heights. The reduction in building height to the northwest corner is picked up in this view. This change does not alter the overall composition and visual dominance of the built form within this view from the previous

assessment and the magnitude of change remains negligible adverse and significance of effect unchanged;

- Viewpoint 6: The reduction in building height to the northwest corner is picked up in this view. This change contributes to breaking up the visual dominance of maximum building parameters on this view however does not noticeably reduce the change in composition from the previous assessment. The magnitude of change remains moderate adverse as there is a permanent change to the background composition of the view and the significance of effect is unchanged.

Mitigation

Demolition and Construction

The Historic Setting of Bignell Park and Residential Setting of Lovelynych House

- 4.21. The significance of effects on landscape and visual receptors and proposed mitigation remains unchanged as set out in the 2014 ES. There would be a temporary, minor adverse effect on the perceived tranquillity of Bignell Park and Lovelynych House associated with the construction process. This would include noise and visual intrusion from construction traffic and temporary lighting. This is unavoidable in order to facilitate construction works and allow the Himley Village Development. There would be no impact on the landscape elements, for example perimeter tree belts to Bignell Park, and the noise disturbance would gradually diminish as the construction programme progresses. As set out in the 2014 ES, these potential temporary effects are common as a consequence of building activity and there is no practical way of avoiding it. Best practice construction techniques would be implemented in order to reduce effects where possible. This would comprise part of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) as described in more detail in the 2014 ES.

Completed Development

- 4.22. The significance of effects on landscape and visual receptors assessed in the 2014 ES remains as set out in the 2014 ES. The effects on the historic setting of Bignell Park and Lovelynych House would be permanent minor adverse and negligible to permanent minor adverse respectively.
- 4.23. The mitigation measures that would need to be implemented in order to reduce the effects remain as set out in the 2014 ES including Scale and Massing of Built Form and establishment of Green Infrastructure, are detailed in the original assessment.

Residual Effects

Demolition and Construction

The Historic Setting of Bignell Park

- 4.24. The significance of this effect will remain **temporary** and **minor adverse** following mitigation. Appropriate, and best practice construction methods will assist in reducing the intrusion from close range construction works along Middleton Stoney Road.

The Residential Setting of Lovelynych House

- 4.25. The significance of this effect will remain **temporary** and **minor adverse** following mitigation. Appropriate, and best practice construction methods will assist in reducing the intrusion from close range construction works within the Site boundary and wider context of Lovelynych House.

Viewpoint Assessment

- 4.26. The significance of effects remains unchanged from those of the 2014 ES.

Completed Development

The Historic Setting of Bignell Park

- 4.27. There would be a permanent, minor adverse effect on the setting of Bignell Park. The proposals would result in a change to the perceived tranquillity of the Park as a result of the noise disturbance associated with the change in landscape character from an agricultural setting to planned suburban development which remains an adverse change from the baseline condition. The gradual establishment of green infrastructure, particularly along Middleton Stoney Road would absorb some of the noise disturbance associated with the new Development.

The Residential Setting of Lovelynych House

- 4.28. The revised parameter plans carefully consider the setting to Lovelynych House. Notably the provision of a considerable landscape buffer along the boundary and reduced scale and massing of adjacent built form. However, there would be a permanent, negligible to minor adverse residual effect on the residential setting of Lovelynych House. The proposals would result in a change to the perceived tranquillity on the residential setting of Lovelynych House largely due to its proximity to the boundary of the Development. Existing and proposed buffer planting along the Site boundary and the use-class of adjacent proposed dwellings (i.e. C2 use class) will afford Lovelynych House with some privacy.

Viewpoint Assessment

- 4.29. The significance of effects remains unchanged as set out in the 2014 ES.

Landscape Benefits

- 4.30. There are a number of benefits that will occur as a result of the proposed Development and these are described in further detail as part of the 2014 ES.

Summary and Conclusion

- 4.31. The revised parameters have resulted in a reduction in height in some areas and considered further the boundary treatment to Lovelynych House. However, given that the Himley Village Development would result in a large scale development rather than agricultural land, the significance of effects remains unchanged from those set out in the 2014 ES. The effects on the new landscape receptors are described below.

The Historic Setting of Bignell Park

- 4.32. The addendum assessment has identified a permanent, minor adverse residual effect on the historic setting of Bignell Park. There will be a change in tranquillity on the setting of Bignell Park as a result of the noise disturbance associated with the change in landscape character from arable to planned suburban development which remains an adverse change from the baseline condition.

The Residential Setting of Lovelynych House

- 4.33. This addendum assessment has identified a permanent, negligible to minor adverse residual effect on the residential setting of Lovelynych House. The wider setting of the property as an isolated

farmstead is lost however elements such as areas of open landscape and geometric field patterns are retained and enhanced through the landscape green infrastructure proposals and buffer zone to the boundary of Lovelynch House.

5. Ecology

Introduction

- 5.1. The Ecology Chapter (Chapter 7) of the 2014 ES, written by Gary Grant, made an assessment of the likely significant ecological effects of the proposed Himley Village Development.
- 5.2. The Site consists of a farm with improved grassland fields, an arable field, species-rich hedgerows, trees, native broad-leaved woodland plantation, scattered trees and two ponds. The most important habitats are the broadleaved woodland plantations, hedges and ponds, which are of local value. The ponds support a population of great crested newts. Other legally protected species, which occur on Site, include bats and breeding and overwintering birds. There are likely to be reptiles on Site and badgers may visit on occasion. Without mitigation, it is possible that the Himley Village Development could affect ground water, ponds and associated wildlife. Nearby Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Nature Reserves will not be affected by the Himley Village Development.
- 5.3. At that time it was recommended that prior to demolition and construction work, appropriate surveys would need to be repeated to enable mitigation strategies for protected species to be prepared. These strategies were predicted to include translocation of great crested newt, reptiles and other amphibians and relocation of bat roosts, should a roost be found in a structure to be demolished. It was recommended that construction works be undertaken in accordance with a Construction Environmental Management Plan, which would set out safeguards designed to protect wildlife. It was predicted that implementation of these measures would result in a **negligible** residual effect on protected species as a result of demolition and construction.
- 5.4. Other ecological effects identified as part of the 2014 EIA, included the loss of most of the fields and a few sections of hedgerow. However, it was predicted that new hedges, trees and ponds would ensure that there would be a net gain in the quality of habitats for wildlife known to be present in the area, including bats, amphibians, reptiles and most species of birds. It was predicted that the creation of a sustainable drainage system would minimise the potential for pollution of groundwater or off-site watercourses (watercourses are some distance from the Site in any case). It was noted that a management company, the Himley Farm Land Trust, would be given the responsibility to ensure that the network of wildlife habitats created would continue to be managed well.
- 5.5. The Ecology Chapter of the 2014 ES concluded that the Himley Village Development would result in negligible ecological effects or some cases minor improvements. The only adverse ecological effect identified was as a result of pets, and in particular cats, which may kill and disturb local wildlife. Information to reduce this effect would be provided to future residents, but the effect would remain moderate adverse and long-term.
- 5.6. Since preparation of the 2014 ES, changes have been made to the Parameter Plans as set out in Section 2 of this ES Addendum. The Proposed Amendments, which have the potential to affect the Ecology Assessment are modifications to the Landscape Parameter Plan (Drawings: 592-PL-106C Landscape 3 and 592 Himley Village Green Infrastructure Areas 150902 Rev E). These changes would result in modest increases in the areas of hedgerow, woodland and swales (sustainable drainage features) within the Site, upon completion. The potential effects of these Proposed Amendments to the findings within the Ecology Chapter have been reviewed by Gary Grant and are discussed below.
- 5.7. In addition to the Proposed Amendments, CDC, Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust and Bioregional requested further information to demonstrate a net biodiversity gain is achieved on the Site through use of a Biodiversity Impact Assessment (Defra) metric. In addition, given that it has been suggested that some species of