

## Rachel Tibbetts

---

**From:** George Smith  
**Sent:** 28 June 2021 12:00  
**To:** DC Support  
**Subject:** FW: Wroxton MX: 21/00517/F: Identified Risk of Environmental Incident  
**Attachments:** abstraction 1.JPG; Ban MX FB page 1spraying.jpg; Ban MX FB page 11 February 2021 6.jpg; Ban MX FB page 11 February 2021 9.jpg; extraction1.jpg; IMG\_6060 - Copy.JPG; IMG\_6110.JPG

---

**From:** cllr.woodcock@hornton.org.uk <cllr.woodcock@hornton.org.uk>  
**Sent:** 28 June 2021 10:17  
**To:** George Smith <George.Smith@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Nathanael Stock <Nathanael.Stock@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Jane Law <Jane.Law@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** Charlotte Watkins <Charlotte.Watkins@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Phil Chapman <CouncillorPhil.Chapman@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; pc.chair@hornton.org.uk  
**Subject:** Wroxton MX: 21/00517/F: Identified Risk of Environmental Incident

Please take this further concern, from Hornton Parish Council, into consideration regarding the conditions of use for this site, currently being further consulted on until a resolution is found to all outstanding issues and conditions.

This submission from Sarah Green at the Environment Agency - in full below, at the base of this email - went onto the Cherwell Planning Portal only last Thursday, 24 June 2021.

In addition to the very serious concerns about the presence of Great Crested Newts on this site - actually inside the giant engineered circuit contours - there is now this identified high risk of an environmental incident due to sediment getting into the channel. Surely, this is an even greater reason for halting MX activity at this site for the foreseeable future? This is even more the case when set alongside the Drainage and Surface Water Management requirements, from Sujeenthan Jeevarangan, LLFA Planning Engineer, posted on the portal on 22 June. He said:

*"...surface water management must be considered from the beginning of the development planning process and throughout - influencing site layout and design. The proposed drainage solution should not be limited by the proposed site layout and design. Wherever possible, runoff must be managed at source (i.e. close to where it falls) with residual flows then conveyed downstream to further storage or treatment components, where required. The proposed drainage should mimic the existing drainage regime of the site. Therefore, we will expect existing drainage features on the site to be retained and they should be utilised and enhanced wherever possible. Although we acknowledge it will be hard to determine all the detail of source control attenuation and conveyance features at concept stage, we will expect the Surface Water Management Strategy to set parameters for each parcel/phase to ensure these are included when these parcels/phases come forward. Space must be made for shallow conveyance features throughout the site and by also retaining existing drainage features and flood flow routes, this will ensure that the existing drainage regime is maintained, and flood risk can be managed appropriately."*

Let's not forget, in addition, these factors: the track operator has, in the last three years, without permission, re-routed the watercourse at the side of the track site (not even belonging to the landowner) and dammed it. This is in order that they can abstract sufficient water from it, without a licence, and their enlarged ponds to damp down the course from huge tractor-drawn bowsers before events. Please see

attached photographic evidence.

This seems to be a very complex area to manage correctly:

- management of sediment flow into the channel,
- alongside wider management of surface water, flood risk and drainage,
- plus the operator's frequent water abstraction and drainage back into ponds and stream,
- plus the presence of a highly protected rare species (GCN).

Can a safe and secure solution be found to answer these officers clear objections and concerns? If so, how would it be inspected and enforced?

We would be grateful if you would answer these questions directly to Hornton PC, along with the other concerns we have raised, on many aspects, before and since the meeting on 17 June.

Yours sincerely

Cllr S Woodcock  
On behalf of Hornton Parish Council

**Submission from Sarah Green:**

From: Planning\_THM

Sent: 24 June 2021 12:20

To: George Smith Subject: RE: 21/00517/F - Wroxton MX

Dear George, My apologies for the delay in responding and this may be too late to be of any use. I asked one of our ecologists and they have said that it sounds like the applicant has put together a strategy for managing silt runoff as they mention settlement ponds. If the ponds and other systems look good enough, then the usual way is for a watching brief and taking action if there looks to be any sediment getting into the channel. No sediment should get to the channel - it doesn't matter if they believe the existing set up isn't as good as what they are proposing! If the allow sediment to get into the watercourse then it could be considered an environmental incident. Our ecologist may be able to offer more advice if needed but strictly speaking this isn't something we would comment on under our statutory role.

Kind regards, Sarah

Sarah Green Planning Advisor, Thames Sustainable Places Team Environment Agency, Red Kite House, Wallingford, OX10 8BD

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..