



## Appendix 3.3

### CDC EIA SCOPING OPINION

---

# Planning and Development

David Peckford, Assistant Director – Planning and Development



## Cherwell

DISTRICT COUNCIL  
NORTH OXFORDSHIRE

Alistair Walker  
Quod  
8-14 Meard Street  
London  
W1F 0EQ

Bodicote House  
Bodicote  
Banbury  
Oxfordshire  
OX15 4AA

[www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk)

---

Please ask for: **Rebekah Morgan**

Direct Dial: **01295 221823**

Email: **[rebekah.morgan@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:rebekah.morgan@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)**

Your Ref: **Q210325.Scoping.C.001.01.EW**

---

29th July 2021

Dear Alistair Walker,

## TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

**Application No.:** 21/02235/SCOP

**Applicant's Name:** Albion Land / Quod

**Proposal:** Scoping Opinion - Environmental Impact Assessment in accordance with Regulation 15 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended)

**Location:** Land north of Junction 10 on the M40, west of the M40 and east and west of the A43 comprising O.S. Parcels 1800, 5680, 5633, 7648, 0068, 5656 and 4300, through Ardley Parish, Ardley, near Bicester

**Parish(es):** Ardley With Fewcott

I write in response to the Scoping Request submitted to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2021 accompanied by an EIA Scoping Report for 'Land at Junction 10, M40', dated 22 June 2021.

The Scoping request relates to two parcels of agricultural arable land on the east and west sides of the A43, immediately north of its junction with the M40 motorway (J10) and Cherwell Valley Services and extending north as far as the B4100, which runs between Aynho village to the northwest and Bicester town to the southeast. The larger western parcel extends to 43.45ha and the smaller eastern parcel extends to 23.18ha.

The land is not allocated for any form of development in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 but instead comprises 'white land'. Development Plan policies relevant to the consideration of these B8-use logistics proposals for circa 280,000m<sup>2</sup> (3,013,895ft<sup>2</sup>) of warehouse distribution floorspace are:

- SLE1 – Employment Development;
- SLE4 – Improved Transport & Connections;
- ESD1 – Mitigating & Adapting to Climate Change;
- ESD2 – Energy Hierarchy & Allowable Solutions;
- ESD3 – Sustainable Construction;
- ESD4 – Decentralised Energy Solutions;

- ESD5 – Renewable Energy;
- ESD6 – Sustainable Flood Risk Management;
- ESD7 – Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS);
- ESD8 – Water Resources;
- ESD10 – Protection & Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment;
- ESD13 – Local Landscape Protection & Enhancement;
- ESD15 – The Character of the Built & Historic Environment;
- ESD17 – Green Infrastructure; and
- INF1 – Infrastructure,

All in the 2015 adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031.

Also, relevant are saved policies in the 1996 Cherwell Local Plan, which still carry some weight:

- EMP4 – Employment Development in Rural Areas;
- TR1 – Transportation Funding;
- TR7 – Minor Roads;
- TR10 – Heavy Goods Vehicles;
- C7 – Landscape Conservation;
- C8 – Sporadic Development & Development near Motorway Junctions;
- C9 – Rural Development; and
- C28 – High Quality Design.

The LPA has reviewed the information provided in order to determine the potential of the proposed development to have significant environmental effects and those aspects of the environment likely to be affected. In doing so, the LPA has had regard to the provisions of Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) (EIA Regulations) as well as the criteria for determining the potential for significant environmental effects as set out in Schedules 3 and 4 of those Regulations.

Regulation 4(2) and Schedule 4 of the Regulations sets out the necessary information required to assess impacts on the natural environment to be included within an Environmental Statement.

In coming to a view, the LPA has also considered the more detailed indicative information published online jointly by applicant Albion Land and their development partners White Commercial and Colliers International, which references the site being developed with four separate B8-use buildings of: 86,645m<sup>2</sup> (932,638ft<sup>2</sup>); 35,860m<sup>2</sup> (385,993ft<sup>2</sup>); 45,000m<sup>2</sup> (484,376ft<sup>2</sup>); and 109,340m<sup>2</sup> (1,176,925ft<sup>2</sup>). The first three buildings are all proposed on the west side of the A43, in the fields alongside the east of the M40 and the larger final unit is proposed on the east side of the A43, just north of the motorway service station. The LPA has consulted with relevant statutory authorities and consultation bodies whose comments are referred to within this Scoping Opinion and are available in full on the Council's website.

This letter should be taken as the formal Scoping Opinion of the LPA under the EIA Regulations.

### **Socio-Economics**

It is agreed that this should be scoped into the Environmental Statement.

It is noted that there will be assessment made of the likely effects of the proposals on the nearby Heyford Park redevelopment at the former Upper Heyford airbase during the period 2022-2025, when the development proposal is anticipated to be complete and operational. However, no reference is made to the proposed Strategic Rail & Freight Interchange proposal also within Ardley with Fewcott Parish and on the opposite of the M40 at Junction 10. As that proposal is coming forward at broadly the same time and proposes a similar form of B8-use logistics development, it ought to be considered as part of this assessment.

Fritwell Parish Council commented that they support the need to assess these proposals alongside the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange proposals and also wished for the impacts on nearby Fritwell village to be also assessed.

### **Traffic & Access**

It is agreed that this should be scoped into the Environmental Statement.

It is noted that there is ongoing correspondence about the scope of the Transport Assessment with OCC and Highways England. OCC have advised that the methodology for assessing traffic impacts should mirror that of the TA, albeit the TA will deal with peak time impact compared to the ES which will take account of daily traffic flows. The Bicester Transport Model does not have daily flows modelled, so an appropriate factoring based on traffic survey data will need to be used to estimate daily flows.

OCC advise that construction traffic must be assessed. It is noted that cumulative impacts will be assessed specifically in respect to other nearby approved developments such as the NW Bicester Eco-town and Heyford Park but no reference has been made to the recently approved Great Wolf Leisure Resort proposal at Chesterton or the Strategic Rail & Freight Interchange proposal between Ardley and Upper Heyford, which should properly be assessed also. The roads and junctions that are to be used for construction access should be included in the list of highway links and highway junctions to be assessed.

### **Air Quality**

It is agreed that this should be scoped into the Environmental Statement.

The Council's Environmental Protection Team have commented that they have no concern with the proposed methodology.

### **Noise and Vibration**

It is agreed that this should be scoped into the Environmental Statement.

The Council's Environmental Protection Team have commented that they have no concern with the proposed methodology. Also, you are advised that if required, reference should be made to BS4142:2014 (Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound) should noise sources be found that require this type of assessment.

### **Archaeology and Heritage Assets**

It is agreed that this should be scoped into the Environmental Statement but expanded to include the setting of nearby heritage assets.

The methodology proposed for archaeological assessment appears sound.

### **Ecology and Biodiversity**

It is agreed that this should be scoped into the Environmental Statement.

The approach to this topic is agreed as this is relatively standard, i.e. CIEEM's Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment version 1.1 (updated September 2019).

The report does not mention ecological enhancements beyond mitigation, and this should be included particularly if compensatory habitats or contributions are likely to be required in order to achieve the required net gains for biodiversity. A Biodiversity Impact Assessment tool should be included and discussed.

The cumulative impact assessment should include consideration of how the green infrastructure and any wildlife corridors will complement those of nearby developments.

### **Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases**

It is agreed that this should be scoped into the Environmental Statement.

The approach to the assessment of this topic is generally agreed.

### **Landscape and Visual Impacts**

It is agreed that this should be scoped into the Environmental Statement.

The Council's Landscape Officer has not yet advised on the proposals. However, any development of the land will be particularly noticeable from the southern end of the A43, from the elevated section of junction 10 on the M40, from the slip road off the M40 to the A43, from the A43 Baynards Green roundabout junction, from sections of the B4100 to the north and east (which are elevated) and from the network of PRow footpaths in the area. The LVIA should include representative viewpoints in respect of the various rural receptors and from the few residential properties near the site around Baynards Green.

### **Cumulative Effects**

It is agreed that it will be necessary to consider cumulative effects on the environment resulting from committed developments in the area.

In addition to the NW Bicester Eco-town and Heyford Park, reference should also be made to the Great Wolf Leisure Resort at Chesterton and the proposed Strategic Rail Freight Interchange between Ardley and Upper Heyford.

### **Non-Significant Topics**

With respect to other issues which have been grouped under the heading of 'Non-Significant Topics' it is not agreed that such topics are non-significant. The impacts of development should be appropriately assessed as part of the ES.

### **Built Heritage**

The Grade II listed barn at Baynards Green is within 200m of the proposed development sites, close to one of the principal highway access points. There are also several listed buildings and a Conservation Area at nearby Fritwell village, some 750 m to the southwest. Accordingly, this should be scoped into the Environmental Statement.

### **Water Resources and Flood Risk**

Whilst the site lies entirely within Flood Zone 1, the southern part of the western plot proposed for development is subject to medium risk of surface water flooding from the brook to the south. It is also acknowledged that the development proposal would lead to unspecified increases in potable water demand and foul water discharge, which could be potentially significant given the scale of development proposed. Accordingly, it is recommended that this should be scoped into the Environmental Statement.

Thames Water typically advise that the following matters should be considered and covered:

- The development's demand for sewage treatment and network infrastructure, both on and off site and can it be met.
- The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development, both on and off site and can it be met.
- The development's demand for water supply and network infrastructure, both on and off site and can it be met.
- Build out / phasing details to ensure infrastructure can be delivered ahead of occupation.
- Any piling methodology and whether this could adversely affect neighbouring utility services.

The Environment Agency have not yet responded to this scoping request. If and when comments are received, they will be forwarded under separate cover.

### **Matters to be scoped out**

With respect to other matters referenced as Non-Significant, the LPA agree that development impacts are likely to be less than significant, so could be appropriately addressed at a later stage, as referenced in the Quod EIA Scoping Report request.

It is agreed that Agriculture and Soils, Land Contamination, Wind Microclimate, Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing, Lighting (as a standalone chapter), Waste and Accidents and Disasters can be scoped out of the Environmental Statement. Where necessary assessments covering these topics should be submitted with the application.

I trust this information is of assistance to you in the formulation of an Environmental Statement.

Full details of all comments received to this request can be found in full on the Council's website: <https://planningregister.cherwell.gov.uk/Planning/Display/21/02235/SCOP>

If you have any questions or queries regarding the above please contact the Case Officer using the details provided above.

Yours faithfully



David Peckford  
**Assistant Director – Planning and Development**

**Checked by: Andy Bateson**



The countryside charity  
Oxfordshire

Campaigning to protect our rural county

David Peckford  
Assistant Director Planning and Development  
Cherwell District Council  
Bodicote House, Bodicote  
Banbury  
OX15 4AA

23 July 2021

By e-mail

CPRE Cherwell District  
c/o CPRE Oxfordshire  
20 High Street  
Watlington  
Oxfordshire OX49 5PY

Tel: 01491 612079  
[campaign@cpreoxon.org.uk](mailto:campaign@cpreoxon.org.uk)  
[cpreoxon.org.uk](http://cpreoxon.org.uk)

**Ref: 21/02235/SCOP Scoping Opinion - Logistics development, Baynard's Green**

Dear Mr Peckford,

CPRE are concerned regarding several aspects of this scoping report.

The land is not allocated for industrial development in the Cherwell Local Plan. The planning inspector's comments in paras 41 and 42 of his report regarding a request to include land for warehousing as an exception site in the LP are highly relevant:

"41. However, despite the Council's willingness to include a reference to 'examining options for the release of land at motorway junctions in the district for very large scale logistics buildings in the Part 2 LP', it is not necessary or appropriate to include this commitment in the policy. This is because the existence of such a need, specifically in this district, is as yet largely unproven and appears to be essentially reliant on speculative enquiries only at present. Moreover, such schemes would be road based and likely to prove visually intrusive in the open countryside due to the size of buildings, as well as potentially difficult and/or expensive to cater for satisfactorily at the M40 junctions in highway capacity terms.

42. Nor does it take into account the availability of alternative locations, such as at DIRFT III near Daventry, Northamptonshire, not far away from Banbury, where around 345 ha of land for such uses has recently been permitted under the national infrastructure regime, specifically to meet the national and regional need for such major facilities, with the great advantage of rail access availability in sustainability terms. Given that the strategic and other employment sites identified in the plan are sufficient to provide the level of new jobs necessary to deliver the plan's strategy and objectives over the plan period, there is no particular need for policy SLE1 to include this commitment by the Council, not least as it may raise unrealistic expectations and/or unnecessary concerns as to the content of the Part 2 LP. Otherwise, policy SLE 1 is sound." End of quote.



The countryside charity  
Oxfordshire

Campaigning to protect our rural county

The proposals are for a major industrial development in open countryside which is currently undeveloped apart from the small complex NE of the Baynard's Green roundabout. The ES should therefore give a detailed justification for the development of such a large employment site far removed from the towns of Bicester and Banbury where development is focussed as a major policy of the LP. The ES must give a robust justification for this major change to Cherwell District. The ES should also answer how these proposals fit with the emerging Oxfordshire 2050 plan.

Regarding the cumulative effects assessment, it is essential that the entire context of wider planning developments and proposals in the area are taken into account such as the Great Wolf development at Chesterton, the expansion of NW Bicester eco-town and Upper Heyford housing developments. In addition, other extensive areas of warehousing have been developed in Bicester and Banbury in recent years and the justification for a new unallocated development of warehousing at Baynards Green should be given.

CPRE feel that it is not acceptable to omit taking into account the proposals for a Strategic Rail-Freight Interchange (SRFI) located immediately south of M40 Junction 10. This will make major changes to the local road system through the construction of bypasses for the villages of Ardley and Middleton Stoney and at least eight new roundabouts as well as major changes to the road layout near Junction 10 of the M40. The SRFI would compete with and affect the Albion Land proposals for all manner of things and the ES should be consider this.

The ES will need to show how the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and, in this respect, not conflict with Policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the CLP and those of the Framework. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development contributes positively to the character of the area and does not cause an undue visual intrusion into the open countryside. Mitigation for the loss of such a large area of good agricultural land should also be considered.

Two large areas of land separated by the A43 and Baynard's Green roundabout are being considered as one application. The two parts of the site fall into different parishes. The Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan (MCNP made May 2019) policies should be referenced with regard to all aspects of the western site including issues such as cultural heritage (see MCNP Heritage and Character Assessment Appendix). The two sites need separate appraisals with regard to vehicular access and the road changes required to facilitate this as well as effects on congestion at the Baynard's Green roundabout.

The Albion Land proposals will have a major impact on the traffic using the B4100 and A43 and the Baynard's Green roundabout. The estimates of traffic should include the effects of the considerable number of employees accessing the site as well as HGVs, since the car parks will apparently cater for 1,400 cars. The environmental effects of this number of cars and employees accessing the sites on local roads should be assessed as a large



The countryside charity  
Oxfordshire

Campaigning to protect our rural county

employment site in this location does not allow for the possibility of active travel since all residential areas will be a considerable distance from the proposed site. The plans are also contrary to the CDC Climate Change Emergency Action Plan as they will increase emissions, reduce air quality and increase congestion in an area that is already heavily congested.

The ES should also provide details of whether there will be an element of manufacturing or goods assembly onsite or whether this could involve additional Use Classes. The report should provide an assessment of the availability and proximity of the types of worker that will be required.

The consideration of landscape and biodiversity are scoped into the report. With warehouse developments that cover large areas of ground with large buildings and parking for HGVs and cars, it is particularly hard to see how the 10% biodiversity net gain required by Cherwell council can be achieved. Therefore it is essential that biodiversity assessments and calculations of loss are given in full in the ES to comply with the industry-standard best practice principles for transparency and sharing of calculations as requested by the CIEEM.<sup>1,2</sup> as well as suitable mitigation of losses.

The baseline biodiversity data did not appear to include a survey of invertebrates which is required especially as the LP Policy ESD10, para 237, requests that surveys of the brown hairstreak butterfly are performed for all developments around the Bicester area.

The ES should explain how Cherwell's ESD policies 1-5 will be adhered to especially with regard to renewable energy generation and sustainable building methods. Given the recent intensification of the effects of climate change, developments such as this one which will have such a huge impact on the environment should demonstrate BREEM 'Excellent' rather than 'Very Good'. The ES should show how the development will contribute to the national requirement for renewable electricity generation by for example installation of solar panels over more than 50% of the roof areas.

Yours Sincerely,

Pamela Roberts

Vice-Chair Cherwell District CPRE

e-mail: [jnandpm.roberts@gmail.com](mailto:jnandpm.roberts@gmail.com)

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Biodiversity-Net-Gain-Principles.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/C776a-Biodiversity-net-gain.-Good-practice-principles-for-development.-A-practical-guide-web.pdf>





The countryside charity  
Oxfordshire

Campaigning to protect our rural county

## Lynne Baldwin

---

**From:** Neil Whitton  
**Sent:** 14 July 2021 16:51  
**To:** Rebekah Morgan  
**Cc:** DC Support  
**Subject:** 21/02235/SCOP - Part Of M40 In OS Parcels 1800 5680 5633 7648 0068 5656 And 4300 Part Of M40 Through Ardley Parish Ardley

Environmental Protection has the following response to this application as presented:

Noise: I agree that this should form part of the EIA and am happy with the proposed methodology

Contaminated Land: I agree that this should not be part of the scope of the ES but we would like to see information provided at the planning application stage to confirm the status of the site with regards to potential ground contamination.

Air Quality: I agree this should form part of the EIA and am happy with the proposed methodology. A reminder at this time that we expect all new developments to contain EV charge points and ducting to allow for easy expansion of the EV charging network.

Odour: No comments

Light: Whilst I agree that light should not be part of the EIA we would expect to see and agree the lighting scheme at the application stage.

If you wish to deviate from the suggested conditions then this should be discussed with the officer making these comments to ensure the meaning of the condition remains and that the condition is enforceable and reasonable.

NB: Please note my new working pattern below, I will only respond on the days appropriate to the email content  
Mon – Weds: Environmental Protection, Thurs – Fri: Health Protection and Compliance

Kind Regards

Neil Whitton BSC, MCIEH  
Environmental Health Officer  
Environmental Health and Licensing  
Cherwell District Council  
Tel - 01295 221623  
Email - Neil.Whitton@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

<http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/>  
Find us on Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](http://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil)

Follow us on Twitter @Cherwellcouncil

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail (and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action.

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail (and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..

## **Comments from Fritwell Parish Council on 21/02235/SCOP: Development of land at Baynards Green.**

Comments referenced as in the EIA Scoping Report:-

1.2: 280,000sq m of warehousing floorspace is proposed. In the light of warehousing also proposed at the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI), currently being considered for the immediate vicinity, Fritwell Parish Council (FPC) wishes to ensure that there is robust evidence to suggest that this vast amount of new warehousing infrastructure is genuinely needed in this region. Currently there seems to be no end usage defined or statements examining the needs that would be met by this development.

- 2.1: The M40.A34/A43 road system "arc" is a well know area for congestion, increasing travel times and resultant pollution. Given the massive increase of housing and population in Bicester and Heyford Park, additional warehousing and industrial units on the outskirts of Bicester and Banbury, plus the Great Wolf resort and possible SRFI, this project will only exacerbate an already untenable traffic problem. FPC wishes to ensure that a full and comprehensive account is taken of the increased traffic flows when this application is considered.

2.9: It would be helpful to the consultation process to identify at an early stage exactly where access to this scheme for the B4100 is intended to be.

4.5: FPC are pleased to note that the Environmental Statement (ES) will examine 'reasonable alternatives'.

4.29: FPC are reassured that many local infrastructure and development projects currently at the planning stage or underway will be taken into account within the ES but are very concerned that the SRFI will not be included.

5.2: FPC is very concerned that the ES will consider only the socio-economic conditions prevailing in the Heyfords and Fringford Ward. In view of the proximity of the proposal to Fritwell village, which is situated in the neighbouring Deddington Ward, it is hoped that the conditions in Deddington Ward would also be considered.

10.7: It is noted that the proposal falls with the IRZ (Impact Risk Zone) of Ardley Cutting and Quarry SSSI for Discharges Water Supply.

10.14 – 10.17: FPC notes with dismay and concern the likely disturbance to valuable habitats for a number of protected species.

10.19: It would be reassuring to be provided with further details of how and where in the locality the habitat loss will be compensated for by habitat creation and enhancement.

12.12: The list of Policy documents does not include the Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan (MCNP), of which Ardley and Fritwell are members. It is hoped that due regard will be taken of this additional document, which complements other local planning guidelines and regulations.

12.20: It is noted that visual receptors will comprise both users of the public rights of way east of Fritwell and residents of local villages.

12.27: It is noted with great concern that this development, together with that at Heyford Park, will have a cumulative effect on character and views for the residents of Fritwell.

14.6: FPC are dismayed to note that the potential for light pollution is listed under Non-Significant Topics. The proximity to Fritwell Village would suggest that this is likely to have a significant impact on the village, especially as operation of the completed site is likely to be 24/7.

14.8: Light pollution mitigation is being actively pursued in relation to Heyford Park, in part due to the importance given to it in the MCNP. It is hoped that similar and consistent measures could be implemented in relation to this proposal.

14.37: It is appreciated that a Flood Risk Assessment and a Surface Water Drainage Strategy will be required. Flooding is an ongoing problem for Fritwell residents.

**General Questions to be answered:**

- What are noise predictions at the site (in increased decibels) and range of noise attenuation to what localities? What will be the operational hours (is it 24/7?) of this terminal affecting residents in Ardley, Baynards Green, Fewcott, Fritwell and the new homes at Heyford Park?
- What is the predicted increase in pollution (CO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>, particulates etc.) because of the increased road movements consequential to this scheme? We believe we are in Category 1 area for pollution, would this scheme move our area into a higher pollution category?
- Will there be hazardous materials of a flammable, explosive, chemical, radioactive nature stored at these warehouses? If yes, what are the safety measures to be considered?
- In the case of a catastrophic event such as a fire, what would the predicted area of damage/contamination be locally? Can we see the safety case to make our own assessment, as Fritwell will be the largest conurbation in proximity to this proposed development?

**Fritwell Parish Council July 2021**

Polly Foster

Chair of Fritwell Parish Council

86, East St. Fritwell. OX27 7QF

Tel. 01869 345296



**Lynne Baldwin**

---

**From:** Planning  
**Sent:** 02 July 2021 11:01  
**To:** DC Support  
**Subject:** FW: 3rd Party Planning Application - 21/02235/SCOP

-----Original Message-----

**From:** BCTAdmin@thameswater.co.uk <BCTAdmin@thameswater.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 02 July 2021 10:36  
**To:** Planning <Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** 3rd Party Planning Application - 21/02235/SCOP

Cherwell District Council  
Planning & Development Services  
Bodicote House  
Bodicote, Banbury  
Oxon  
OX15 4AA

Our DTS Ref: 70035  
Your Ref: 21/02235/SCOP

2 July 2021

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: PART OF M40 IN OS PARCELS 1800, LAND OFF JUNCTION 10 M40 (A43), BAYNARDS GREEN, BICESTER, OXFORDSHIRE , OX27

Waste Comments

With regard to sewerage and sewage treatment, this comes within the area covered by Anglian Water PLC. For your information the address to write to is Anglian Water PLC, Anglian House, Ambury Road, Huntingdon, Cambs PE18 6NZ Tel:- (01480) 433400

Water Comments

Thank you for giving Thames Water the opportunity to comment on the above application. Thames Water are the statutory water undertaker for the area and would like to make the following comments: The EIA Regulations 2017 set out in Schedule 4 that water and wastewater issues may need to be covered in an EIA. Thames Water consider the following issues should be considered and covered in either the EIA or planning application submission: 1. The developments demand for water supply and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met. 2. Build - out/ phasing details to ensure infrastructure can be delivered ahead of occupation. 3. Any piling methodology and will it adversely affect neighbouring utility services. The developer can obtain information to support the EIA by visiting the Thames Water website <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development>.

Yours faithfully  
Development Planning Department

Development Planning,  
Thames Water,  
Maple Lodge STW,  
Denham Way,  
Rickmansworth,  
WD3 9SQ  
Tel:020 3577 9998  
Email: devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk

This is an automated email, please do not reply to the sender. If you wish to reply to this email, send to devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk Visit us online [www.thameswater.co.uk](http://www.thameswater.co.uk) , follow us on twitter [www.twitter.com/thameswater](http://www.twitter.com/thameswater) or find us on [www.facebook.com/thameswater](http://www.facebook.com/thameswater). We're happy to help you 24/7.

Thames Water Limited (company number 2366623) and Thames Water Utilities Limited (company number 2366661) are companies registered in England and Wales, both are registered at Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, Berkshire RG1 8DB. This email is confidential and is intended only for the use of the person it was sent to. Any views or opinions in this email are those of the author and don't necessarily represent those of Thames Water Limited or its subsidiaries. If you aren't the intended recipient of this email, please don't copy, use, forward or disclose its contents to any other person – please destroy and delete the message and any attachments from your system.

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..