

1. Non-Technical Summary

- 1.1 Following the submission of the Application for the Proposed Development at the Site there have been a number of consultation comments received and subsequent design changes. This Addendum Chapter provides an update to the Non-Technical Summary and should be read in conjunction with the original Chapter 1.
- 1.2 It only addresses those Chapters where new or supplemental material has been submitted. To summarise these are:
- Chapter 6 – Socio Economics
 - Chapter 7 – Transport and Movement
 - Chapter 8 – Ecology
 - Chapter 9 - Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees
 - Chapter 11 - Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy and Earthworks
 - Chapter 16 – Archaeology
 - Chapter 17 - Landscape and Visual Impact
 - Chapter 18 – Health Impact Assessment

Socio-Economics

- 1.3 The Proposed Development at the Site will contribute to new investment and economic development in Yarnton, Kidlington and North Oxford. A significant supply of new homes will be delivered including a number of affordable homes of different types and tenures.
- 1.4 The Addendum has been revised following receipt of an updated Education Strategy and Health Impact Assessment; this has provided further context to the social infrastructure of the Proposed Development and the overall impact this will have.
- 1.5 The assessment of the original Chapter remains valid, however following further consultation on the embedded and mitigation education measures, we consider there is a 'minor positive' impact for social infrastructure, rather than a 'minor adverse' as originally stated.

Transport and Movement / Framework Travel Plan

- 1.6 Vectos have prepared a Technical Note to support their original ES Chapter. The Technical Note addresses comments from OCC and other stakeholders which can be broadly categorised as follows:
- Vehicular access strategy;
 - Sustainable access strategy;
 - Parking strategy
 - Highway impacts
 - Mitigation (Operation Phase)
 - Mitigation (Construction Phase)
- 1.7 The purpose of this note is to provide clarifications on the transport aspects of the Proposed Development, and it should be read in conjunction with the Transport Assessment and the associated ES Chapter already submitted in support of the Application.

- 1.8 It should be emphasised that the evidence provided in the Technical Note does not materially affect the conclusions reached to date from a transport perspective. To this end, it remains Vectos' view that the Proposed Development will:
- Not have a severe residual cumulative impact on the adjacent transport network, from a NPPF perspective.
 - Not introduce a significant road safety issue, from a NPPF perspective.
 - Have a negligible residual effect which would be Negligible and Insignificant, from an ES perspective.
- 1.9 It is Vectos' view that the one remaining element of the Application is the need to secure agreement with both OCC and CDC as to level of financial contributions that the Applicant should provide to secure the elements of the IDP that the Applicant is not delivering directly. Vectos, in partnership with other PR Site transport consultants, are preparing a joint note to appropriately apportion the contributions.

Ecology

- 1.10 The Addendum has been provided following further survey work and in light of comments received on ecology through consultation.
- 1.11 Updated survey work has confirmed the habitats and ecological features of the Site remain unchanged to that surveyed between 2018 and 2020, such that the findings and evaluations, as well as assessment of impacts in respect of habitats, within Chapter 8 of the ES remain valid.
- 1.12 The updated survey work undertaken serves to reinforce the findings and evaluation of the Site in respect of fauna, such that the assessment of impacts within Chapter 8 of the ES remains valid. Accordingly, it is considered the construction/operational phases of the Proposed Development would not result in any significant adverse effects on biodiversity or contribute to any cumulative /in combination adverse effects arising from developments in the local area.
- 1.13 Further information has been provided on BNG and how this is achieved. Using the appropriate metric, it is confirmed that the Proposed Development results in measurable net gains in `habitat units` and `hedgerow units` in accordance with national and local policy, and exceeds the objective of Cherwell District Council to seek 10% net gain from development where possible.

Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees

- 1.14 The revised proposals which now comprise the Application have been progressed based on detailed design review with input from the Applicant's arboricultural advisors.
- 1.15 This updated assessment ensures that all former constraints, relating to irreplaceable habitat trees and woodland, remain within the bounds of the assessment contained within Chapter 9 as originally framed.
- 1.16 Specifically, it is confirmed that the conclusions of the assessment, as set out in respect of the original Application in ES Chapter 9 section 8, remain valid and applicable to the revised Proposed Development proposals.

Flood Risk and Drainage

- 1.17 Following the original submission, additional supporting evidence has been prepared in relation to flood risk and drainage. This has been prepared to address consultee comments which highlighted the local flood risk and queried what mitigation measures would be put in place to protect the area.
- 1.18 A number of additional site walkovers and consultation with key stakeholders have been undertaken. Further supplementary information has also been made available which provides additional knowledge with regards to the baseline Site conditions.
- 1.19 Infiltration testing was undertaken at four locations across the Site in November 2021 in accordance with BRE Digest 365 Soakaway Design Guidance. The results of this testing identified that an infiltration-led strategy is not a viable means of managing surface water from the Proposed Development as all falling head tests failed to provide positive results. Groundwater levels were not identified within the depth of trial pipes during the infiltration testing described above.
- 1.20 No additional likely significant effects have been identified since the submission of Chapter 11 of the ES Chapter and the sensitivity of each receptors, magnitude of each impact and significance of each effect remains the same throughout the report.
- 1.21 The key changes to the drainage strategy include:
 - Removed reliance on infiltration to manage surface water flows in the south of the Site
 - Changes to the drainage strategy
 - Refinements to the foul drainage strategy

Archaeology

- 1.22 In summary the originally submitted ES Chapter suggested that there was no indication that the Site was likely to contain deposits as to represent significant constraints to the proposed scheme but suggested that it had a general potential to contain hitherto undetected deposits and recommended, as part of the mitigation exercise for the Site, that a programme of archaeological field evaluation should be carried out in order to clarify the archaeological potential of the Site.
- 1.23 Subsequent to the submission of the ES the suggested evaluation was carried out, with the on-site works being carried out in November and December 2021, with the report being produced in January 2022.
- 1.24 The results of the evaluation indicate two main phases of archaeological activity on the Site, consisting of a likely prehistoric phase characterised by dispersed charcoal filled pits, thought to be of Iron Age date, and by a later phase of medieval to post-medieval agricultural activity. The prehistoric activity is likely to be of local significance, while the later agricultural activity is of negligible significance. The results correlate well with those of the geophysical survey in terms of both negative areas and anomalies.
- 1.25 In summary therefore, the results of the evaluation can be considered to have both validated and further clarified the conclusions of the ES.

Landscape and Visual Impact

- 1.26 An updated LVIA has been prepared to reflect the design changes incorporated into the Proposed Development following submission in October 2021 and as a result of consultation feedback. The design changes are detailed in ES Chapter 4. Two additional receptors have been assessed at the request of the Council – these two additional receptors being: Dolton Lane Bridleway and Begbroke Ancient Woodland.
- 1.27 Having reviewed the updated parameter plans and the amendments set out in ES Chapter 4, alongside the previous judgements of magnitude of change and overall effect, it is concluded that the level of change and overall effect experienced by the originally assessed receptors would not change. No alterations are therefore made to the LVIA on the basis of the amendments set out above.

Dolton Lane Bridleway

- 1.28 It is judged that Dolton Lane is a High value landscape receptor and a Medium susceptibility to the type of development proposed. The overall sensitivity of Dolton Lane as a landscape receptor is judged to be Medium-High. Mitigation includes retaining Dolton Lane in its current form, set within public open space and retaining much of the existing hedgerow and trees.
- 1.29 The overall effect of the Slight magnitude of change experienced by this Medium-High landscape receptor will be Minor Adverse at all stages. The cumulative baseline would have no change.

Begbroke Ancient Woodland

- 1.30 Begbroke Ancient Woodland is judged to be a High value landscape receptor and it is judged that the area of woodland has a High susceptibility to change. Overall the receptor is judged to have a High sensitivity.
- 1.31 Begbroke Wood falls outside the Site red line boundary and there would be no direct impacts on it as a result of the proposed development. The Yarnton Development Brief notes that Government guidance requires an offset of at least 15 metres between Ancient Woodland and development. The offset between Begbroke Wood and proposed development comfortably falls beyond the required 15 metre offset. As set out in the GI Parameter Plan and the Green Infrastructure Plan (Figure 10 of the original LVIA), an area of additional woodland is proposed to provide a buffer between the proposed development and Begbroke Wood. It is therefore judged that there will be no change to this landscape receptor. There are no direct impacts as a result of the Proposed Development.
- 1.32 The overall effect that results from this High sensitivity receptor experiencing a Negligible magnitude of change is judged to be Negligible at all stages. The cumulative baseline would have no change.

Health Impact Assessment

- 1.33 The HIA has been updated to reflect comments received by OCC, namely to include additional Assessment of Health (referring to local data from Oxfordshire's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment) and further information on Stakeholder Engagement.

Assessment of Health – the updated report looks at the Oxfordshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (2022) to determine local health trends with regards to the scheme.

Stakeholder Engagement – the updated report details the stakeholder engagement undertaken prior to the submission and following the submission.

1.34 The conclusions of the HIA have not changed.

Summary of Residual Effects

1.35 The Summary of Residual Effects summarises any appropriate changes to the impacts of each chapter, and confirms where no changes were considered appropriate to the assessment.

1.36 The Chapter also looks at the intra scheme impacts of the Proposed Development.