

# PROJECT NAME: M40 J10

## STATUTORY CONSULTATION PROCESS – SCHEDULE OF APPLICANT’S RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

DATE ISSUED: 21 MARCH 2022

<b>COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM:</b> Fritwell Parish Council	<b>FORMAT:</b> Online	<b>DATE RECEIVED:</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b> Various		

ID	ISSUE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1.	General	Fritwell Parish Council strongly objects to these applications	Noted
2.	Precedence	<p>Previous refusal of planning application ref:18/00672/OUT (on appeal) noted that the proposal would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>“...lead to an urbanisation of the site. This is regardless of whether it is deemed large or small in scale”.</li><li>The inspector “consequently disagreed with the LVIA [Landscape Visual Impact Assessment] that the proposal would not have an unacceptable visual impact”. This development is significantly larger and will have higher impact on the vista of the area.</li><li>“Whilst the roads and neighbouring petrol station and drive-thru have eroded the landscape quality of the area, the harm would be compounded by the development in an area that otherwise has an open character with open fields of which the site form a part.</li><li>The impact of the surrounding development does not weigh in favour of the proposal and does not justify further exacerbation of the harm .... the proposal would make a significant contribution in urbanising the junction to an unacceptable degree”.</li></ul>	Albion Land’s applications must be determined on their own merits. The landscape and visual impact; impact on the highway network; various benefits of the proposals and compliance with national and local planning policy are considered in the submission documents.

ID	ISSUE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>“The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area .. It would also conflict with saved Policy C8 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 which resists sporadic development in open countryside, including developments in the vicinity of the motorway or major road junctions”</p>	
3.	Traffic and Congestion	<p>An effective traffic survey has not been completed (per reservations from Highways England), considering the scale of this proposal, this seems to an oversight difficult to reconcile with the investment in this application.</p> <p>The class of these warehouses is B8 designated Storage or Distribution, but in targeting employment for 2,840 to 3,840 jobs, clearly this warehousing is targeted for processing for distribution which would significantly increase traffic movements.</p> <p>The M40 Junction 10 / A43 / Baynards Green junctions is a known accident / traffic snarl-up hotspot (source: SABRE), this development can only increase the problems at this junction. The M40/A34/A43 road system "arc" is a well know area for congestion, increasing travel times and resultant pollution, given the massive increase in Bicester of housing and population, the Great Wolf resort planning refusal overturned, this project will only exacerbate an already untenable traffic problem in this vicinity. There are already issues at Junction 9 of the M40 - "Firm admits M40 works at J9 for Bicester made traffic worse" Source: Oxford Mail, 8th April 2019, and at Junction 10 as previously mentioned, often during peak times, negotiating the Baynards Green roundabout can take upwards of 15- 20 minutes. Citing "Traffic Congestion to Cost the UK Economy More Than £300 Billion Over the Next 16 Years". Building such large structures at this junction will only exacerbate already intractable problems and increase traffic pollution in this area, an area that is essentially rural in nature.</p> <p>While this development is close to a motorway junction, there is no public transport to this site. Reference the documents</p>	<p>A transport assessment was prepared and submitted (as part of the Environmental Statement) with each of the planning applications.</p> <p>The Applicant remains in regular dialogue with the local highway authority and National Highways and is currently commissioning further modelling (Bicester Transport Model and VISSIM model). The results of this modelling will be assessed and reported to CDC in due course.</p> <p>The results of this modelling will inform any future mitigation measures to be provided by the development.</p> <p>The number of car parking spaces to be provided has not been determined and will be confirmed at reserved matters stage. The Applicant is proposing a suite of measures to encourage sustainable and active modes of travel to the sites. These include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision of a bus layby, bus infrastructure and financial contributions towards a new or enhanced regular bus service from Bicester that serves both sites</li> <li>- New cycle lanes connecting the Sites to Bicester. These will be secured through a Section 278 agreement and provided within highway land. The cycle lanes will be designed in accordance with the relevant standards and will be sufficiently lit.</li> <li>- Provision of a significant number of secure cycle parking spaces. The final quantum of cycle parking spaces will be determined at reserved matters stage.</li> <li>- Provision of electric vehicle charging spaces. Ten percent of car parking spaces and ten percent of HGV parking spaces will include active electric charging provision. Fifteen percent of car parking spaces and</li> </ul>

ID	ISSUE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>“Environmental Statement: Non-Technical Summary” September 2021. Section 17.4 cites a mitigation measure: “Travel Plan – to encourage sustainable modes of travel by future Site users”, which is clearly not in plan with provision for 1.450 car parking spaces that along with heavy vehicle freight traffic, will exacerbate traffic issues at a very busy junction.</p>	<p>fifteen percent of HGV spaces will include passive electric charging provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementation of a Staff Travel Plan – This will include various other measures to promote active and sustainable modes of travel to and from the Site.</li> </ul>
4.	Loss of agricultural land	<p>This land has not been designated in the Local Plan and has been assessed as moderate to good agricultural land, aesthetically, large warehousing would irreparably damage and despoil natural countryside. FPC opines that far too much local green field land has been absorbed in development recently and to remove land from agricultural use when there are many brownfield sites (per CPRE in 2020, 21,000 sites at around 25,000 Hectares) available for development, why not on these sites obviating the need to develop new infrastructure, as would be needed here. FPC opts for the “Do Nothing” scenario preserving the land for agricultural use, this is what farmland is for!</p>	<p>The proposed development will help address a substantial and growing demand for logistics floorspace at a local, regional and national level. The current level of demand is unprecedented and has been exacerbated by the Covid-19 pandemic and Brexit; meanwhile, the availability of logistics floorspace is at a record low. This has resulted in a ‘tipping point’ where demand significantly outweighs supply.</p> <p>It is imperative that planning decisions are cognisant of this urgent requirement for logistics floorspace and the need to facilitate economic recovery at a local, regional and national level. Albion Land’s sites are located immediately adjacent to the strategic highway network (a fundamental requirement of logistics operators) and are ideally placed to address the substantial and growing demand for logistics floorspace. Critically, these sites are available for development now and are capable of accommodating a range of unit sizes (of which there is clear demand for).</p> <p>The submitted Logistics Market Assessment and Land Availability report demonstrates that there are no other sites capable of accommodating development of the nature proposed or that are as well-located to the strategic highway network. Nearly all of the employment sites allocated within the Cherwell Local Plan 2015 have been built out / benefit from planning permission or are not suitable for logistics use of the scale required and proposed.</p>
5.	Pollution	<p>Noise, light and Air pollution are of significant concern during the construction and operation of these warehouses, particularly the cumulative effect that would surround the village of Fritwell with the Heyford development to the Southwest, the potential for the Rail Freight Terminal in the South and this development to the East. Fritwell Parish are deeply concerned about noise attenuation resulting from this facility operating 24/7. Fritwell is Class 3/Class 4 on the Bortle</p>	<p>The impact of the proposed development (during construction and operational phases) is considered in the submitted Environmental Statement. The Environmental Impact Assessment concludes that cumulative effects on air quality would not be significant and identifies potential noise mitigation measures that will be implemented to minimise the noise impacts of the development. Lighting will be sensitively designed to minimise impacts within and outside of the site.</p> <p>A suite of measures will be implemented (secured by condition) to minimise the</p>

ID	ISSUE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>Scale for Night Sky Brightness, this would be compromised by additional light pollution from this planned facility. We enjoy reasonable air quality in Fritwell despite the proximity of the motorway, increased traffic in this area would reduce air quality.</p>	<p>impact of the proposed development on local amenity.</p>
6.	Flooding	<p>The environment agency may well have identified this area as Flood Zone 1, but local experience in Fritwell indicates that 1. This area has a very high water table with groundworks finding water during dry seasons about 60 cms below the ground in some areas, and; 2. Fritwell experiences annual flooding, varying in severity, with 2020 being a particularly bad year with several properties being inundated, 3. Maintenance of an increasingly ageing drainage system is minimal, with the council this year unable to clear gully's because of "budget issues", we are very cynical that this would be sustained over the years of operation.</p> <p>We know that water runoff from a large built area such as this will increase substantially (despite "SUDS"), and even though swales and infiltration basins are suggested, these may work for a while but when "budgets" for maintenance prevent this from happening to retain the efficiency of these measures, we are quite certain that with nowhere else to go, the local villages will suffer.</p>	<p>The planning application documents include a flood risk assessment, which assesses the impact of the proposed development on flood risk (on-site and off-site). The application documents also set out the sustainable drainage measures to be implemented on both sites. These will ensure that the development does not increase flood risk.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Risk Authority have not objected to the proposed development. The proposals are therefore acceptable in flood risk terms.</p>