

**Our ref:** Q210286/EL  
**Your ref:** 21/03177/F  
**Email:** [emma.lancaster@quod.com](mailto:emma.lancaster@quod.com)  
**Date:** 3 December 2021



Caroline Ford  
Cherwell District Council  
Development Management  
Bodicote House  
Bodicote  
Banbury  
OX15 4AA

By Email

Dear Caroline

## Axis J9, Bicester

I write in connection with the above planning application for employment development at Axis J9.

### Amended Site Plan

Since the submission of the planning application (which sought full planning permission for 16,901sqm of flexible employment floorspace (GIA)) it has come to the Applicant's attention that there was a discrepancy between the quantum of development shown on the submitted plans and the Accommodation Schedule included on the Site Plan (ref. 20019-TP-002 rev. F).

The discrepancy is within the Accommodation Schedule only, which should have given a GIA of 16,942 sqm rather than 16,901sqm. All of the development previously shown/drawn on the plans is correct.

I enclose an updated Site Plan (ref. TP\_002G\_Proposed Site Plan\_20019 rev. G), which includes a corrected accommodation schedule, and request that the application is amended and updated to reflect this submission. I would be grateful if you could confirm by return whether you will be undertaking any reconsultation because of the application being amended in this way and, if so, the date by which responses will be expected to be received.

In recognition of the relationship between the quantum of floorspace proposed and the likely effects of development, the Applicant's team has considered the amendment. The development will give rise to no altered direct impacts to those already considered through the application, other than in respect of transport (specifically trip generation).

The enclosed Transport Update Note concludes that the corrected GIA figure gives rise to an increase equivalent to 1 vehicle a day. This is not considered to be a material change. As a consequence, it is considered that the conclusions set out in the Environmental Statement remain robust and valid in all topic areas.

**Quod** | Capitol Bond Court Leeds LS1 5SP | 0113 245 1243 | [quod.com](http://quod.com)

Quod Limited. Registered England at above No. 7170188





## Response to Consultee Feedback

The Applicant's team has been monitoring consultee feedback on the application via Public Access and responds as below to matters that have been raised by consultees.

### Drainage

Comments were received from CDC Land and Drainage on the 14 October 2021 which set out that a culvert under Howes Lane is partially obstructed and has caused internal flooding to several residential properties locally. It was requested that this obstruction should be removed before further development takes place to avoid risk to the affected properties.

Bailey Johnson Hayes ("BJH") Consulting Engineers have been liaising directly with Tony Brummell in the Council's drainage team, who has confirmed that the pipe/obstruction he refers to in his consultee comment is not the Applicant's responsibility. To this end, we are expecting an updated consultation response to be issued to you shortly.

### Landscape

The landscape and visual assessment narrative requested by the consultee is included in Volume II of the Environmental Statement. Having reviewed the documents published on Public Access, it appears that this document has not been made available (though it was submitted with the application).

A further copy of the ES Volume II is enclosed and I would be grateful if this could be shared with relevant officers and published on Public Access without delay.

### Highways

#### *National Highways*

We note that National Highways have not objected to the application but pass comment about "missing diagrams". For avoidance of doubt, the diagrams referred to are not missing in the sense that the submission refers to them but they are then not included, but the Applicant's transport advisors determined that it was wholly unnecessary to include flow diagrams showing how little site traffic would arrive at M40 Junction 9, because the numbers are so low.

#### *Bicester Bicycle Users Group*

Bicester Bicycle Users Group ("BBUG") are not a statutory consultee but it is noted that they raise a series of points.

In contrast, Oxfordshire County Council ("OCC") are the statutory consultee on transport and highways matters.



We await OCC's formal comments on transport and highways matters but, in the meantime, we note that the majority of the design matters raised have either previously been agreed with OCC or are detailed design matters that would ordinarily be agreed at the discharge of conditions stage.

### **Outstanding Consultee Feedback**

We note that consultee feedback has not yet been received from Oxfordshire County Council or CDC's ecologist or planning policy teams.

We understand from direct discussions with OCC highways team that the OCC response ought to be received imminently but I would be grateful if you could confirm when outstanding responses are expected to be received.

I look forward to catching up with you on this application at our scheduled meeting next week, we are especially keen to understand your views on the principle of development and design of the development, as well as the likely route of/date for determination of the application.

Yours sincerely



Emma Lancaster  
Director

enc. As noted  
cc. Kelvin Pearce, Albion Land