

Peveril Securities Ltd

**Environmental Impact
Assessment Compliance
Statement**

**Land north of Bicester Avenue Garden
Centre, Bicester**

by CarneySweeney

Date: August 2023



Contents

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|----|
| 1.0 | Introduction | 2 |
| 2.0 | Environmental Statement Review | 5 |
| 3.0 | Conclusion..... | 10 |



1.0 Introduction

1.0.1 A second Reserved Matters application ('RMA') is being submitted on behalf of Peveril Securities Ltd ('the applicant') pursuant to outline planning permission ref: 17/02534/OUT ('the outline consent') at land north of Bicester Avenue Garden Centre, Oxford Road, Bicester ('the Site'), known as Bicester Arc (Bicester Business Park). The Site has historically been referred to as part of the 'Bicester 4' area including the adjacent Tesco site and is an allocation for B1 employment purposes in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 1).

1.1 The Outline Consent

1.1.1 The outline application was submitted by Scenic Land Developments Ltd and was validated by Cherwell District Council (CDC) on 22nd December 2017. It permits up to 60,000sqm of employment floorspace (Use Class B1(a) and B1(b)). The Site red line boundary covers an area of 13.1ha. The description of development for the outline consent is as follows:

"OUTLINE - The erection of a business park of up to 60,000 sq.m (GEA) of flexible Class B1(a) office / Class B1(b) research & development floorspace; associated vehicle parking, landscaping, highways, infrastructure and earthworks"

1.1.2 The outline consent determined the principle means of access only, with all other details including detailed design layout, appearance, landscaping and scale to be determined through subsequent RMAs. The principle of development, proposed uses and amount of floorspace were all confirmed through the outline consent.

1.1.3 The outline consent application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement (Trium, 2017). Following some minor amendments to the parameters plan, further assessment and consultation comments from CDC, an addendum was submitted in June 2018 (Trium, 2018). These elements are collectively referred to in this report as the 'original ES'.

1.1.4 The outline permission was granted 6th May 2020.

1.2 The Section 73 Application

1.2.1 The applicant acquired the Site from the previous owners in 2020.

1.2.2 A Section 73 application to 17/02534/OUT (ref: 23/01080/OUT) was validated by CDC on 27th April



2023 ('the s73 application'). It seeks to amend Conditions 4, 30 and 34 of the outline consent to allow for an increase in the building height parameters and highway design/road safety audit evolution as part of s278 design development. The s73 application does not seek to alter the description of development or the amount of employment floorspace permitted under the outline consent. The increased height will be brought about through changes to the approved Parameters Plan, Table 4.1 of the Environmental Impact Assessment (Trium, 2017) (EIA) and the Design Principles on page 11 of the submitted Design and Access Statement (dated August 2018). The highway design changes will be brought about through changes to the approved Highways Access Plan, Proposed Highway Arrangement plans and Oxford Road/ Middleton Stoney Mini Roundabout mitigation scheme plan.

1.2.3 Potential changes to the conclusions of the original ES were considered within a Statement of Conformity that formed part of the Planning Statement (CarneySweeney, April 2023) which supported the s73 application. The Statement of Conformity concluded that the proposed amendments have no impact over and above that already assessed and that there would be no effect on significance or harm outside of the original EIA findings.

1.2.4 The s73 application is still being considered by CDC at the time of writing (August 2023).

1.3 Reserved Matters

1.3.1 The outline consent is to be implemented on a phased basis. Each phase or sub-phase will have its own RMA submitted to set out the remaining details to be approved, including detailed design, layout, appearance, landscaping and scale of development, in accordance with the outline consent (and subsequent s73 application).

1.3.2 The proposal subject to this reserved matters application comprises Phase 2 of the scheme and comprises the proposed development of two Class E(g) buildings, plus associated car parking.

1.3.3 This Compliance Statement is submitted alongside the following information in support of the RMA application:

- Planning Application Forms
- Drawing Pack
- Planning Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Indicative BREEAM Pre-Assessment Reports
- Energy and Sustainability Statements
- Drainage Strategy Drawings and Technical Note



- Odour Assessment and Covering Letter
- Ecological Appraisal
- Biodiversity Net Gain, comprising:
 - Ecology Technical Note – Overall Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations;
 - YASA (Zone B) Biodiversity Ecology Statement; and
 - BNG Metrics.

1.4 Purpose of Environmental Impact Assessment Compliance Statement

1.4.1 The purpose of this Environmental Impact Assessment Compliance Statement ('Compliance Statement') is to identify the extent to which the details proposed within this RMA may result in changes to the outcomes of the original ES and confirm that the conclusions within the original ES remain the case for the RMA. Whilst producing this report, the Statement of Conformity undertaken to support the s73 application has been considered.

1.4.2 This report forms an Environmental Impact Assessment Compliance Statement ('Compliance Statement'), which demonstrates that the suite of environmental information submitted to CDC as part of the consented scheme remains valid and is adequate to assess the potential environmental effects of this RMA.



2.0 Environmental Statement Review

2.0.1 The proposals covered by this RMA are in accordance with the scale and quantum of development proposed and assessed at the s73 application stage and do not materially deviate from the parameters defined by the s73 consent.

2.0.2 Paragraphs 30 – 33, along with Table 1 and Figure 6 of the Non-Technical Summary of the original ES detail the development that was assessed. In terms of the description of development, this stated *“The construction of a business park of up to 60,000m² (GEA) of Class B19(a)/(b) office floorspace; parking for up to 2,000 cars; and associated highways, infrastructure and earthworks”*. The s73 application made no change to the development description.

2.0.3 Paragraph 32 of the Non-Technical Summary states that:

“There is one main parameter plan along with a site red line boundary drawing submitted as part of this outline planning application for which planning approval is being sought. The parameter plan identifies a series of six development zones (A-F) covering the majority of the site, within which more detailed proposals will come forward as part of future reserved matters submissions. The zones indicate the maximum floor area and height for future buildings as well as an indication of the upper limits for the height of proposed buildings within the zones.”

2.0.4 The s73 application updated the approved parameters plan and the maximum building heights, with those now approved being (as listed in Condition 4):

- Dwg No. 05935-5PA-MP-00-DR-A-9010 (Parameters Plan)
- The Maximum building heights set out in Table A of the Planning Statement dated April 2023

2.0.5 In the Parameters Plan (Dwg No. 05935-5PA-MP-00-DR-A-9010), the proposal are located within Zone B where, referring to Table A (of the Planning Statement, April 2023), the maximum building height is 21.0m and the maximum AOD height is 88.75m.

2.0.6 The proposed development is within these parameters.

2.0.7 It is therefore not considered necessary to update any of the chapters within the original ES as the conclusions reached are unlikely to change as a result. A chapter by chapter summary is provided below to outline any potential changes to the original ES.



Chapter 1 Introduction

2.0.8 Chapter 1 covers details of the site, planning history, planning policy context and location of information within the ES. These elements are unaffected.

Chapter 2 EIA Methodology

2.0.9 Chapter 2 sets out the methodology for the EIA; this remains unchanged.

Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution

2.0.10 Chapter 3 describes the background to the development and details the site opportunities, constraints and considerations that influences the scheme. It provides an illustration of the evolution of the design leading to the outline approval proposals. The principles of this chapter remain unchanged.

Chapter 4 The Proposed Development

2.0.11 Chapter 4 detailed the proposed development. The s73 application represented a further stage of the design evolution, whereby detailed design requirements necessitated an increase in floor heights, resulting in an increase in overall building height parameters. There is no impact on floorspace parameters. Table 4.1 of Chapter 4 stated:

| Table 4.1 – Maximum Building Heights | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|
| | M AOD (Top of Roof Level) | Metres above Ground | Storeys | Maximum Floorspace (m2 GEA) |
| Zone A | 85.75 | 20 | (4 storeys) | 5,460 |
| Zone B | 83.0 | 16 | (3 storeys) | 7,740 |
| Zone C | 82.50 | 16 | (3 storeys) | 7,740 |
| Zone D | 85.50 | 16-20m | (3-4 storeys) | 14,390 |
| Zone E | 82.00 | 16m | (3 storeys) | 11,610 |
| Zone F | 85.00 | 20m | (4 storeys) | 13,060 |

2.0.12 The s73 application updated the table as follows (renamed as Table A):

| Table A – Maximum Building Heights |
|---|
|---|



| | <i>Building Height (metres)</i> | <i>Height AOD (metres)</i> |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Zone A | 21.00 | 87.80 |
| Zone B (Previously Zones B & C under 17/02534/OUT) | 21.00 | 88.75 |
| Zone D | 21.00 | 87.40 |
| Zone E | 21.00 | 87.50 |
| Zone F | 21.00 | 87.80 |

2.0.13 The proposed development is within these parameters, as discussed above.

Chapter 5 Construction

2.0.14 Chapter 5 describes the proposed construction programme and key activities for construction works. This remains unchanged. The identified mitigation measure of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) remains as per the original assessment. This document is being prepared to discharge Condition 18.

Chapter 6 Socio-Economics

2.0.15 The reserved matters development sits within the two scenarios (Option A and Option B) assessed in this Chapter and the beneficial effects identified are unaffected.

Chapter 7 Transport and Access

2.0.16 The reserved matters development will not affect the assessment undertaken. The suggested mitigation measures, including the completion of a CEMP, remain as per the original assessment. This document is being prepared to discharge Condition 18.

Chapter 8 Noise and Vibration

2.0.17 This Chapter assessed noise to surrounding sensitive receptors from construction activities and construction traffic and increased noise from road traffic during operation. As detailed above, there is no change to construction activities and the identified mitigation will remain (CEMP). The recommended measure of imposition of a condition to control noise, was not found to be necessary (with no such condition imposed). This remains unchanged.



Chapter 9 Air Quality

- 2.0.18 The reserved matters development will not change construction activities and the identified mitigation will remain (CEMP). Operational effects were identified to be assessed by planning condition or any future applications for a centralised energy plant. This remains unchanged, with no planning conditions on air quality to be complied with.

Chapter 10 Buried Heritage (Archaeology) Built Heritage

- 2.0.19 The reserved matters development will not change the potential for previously unrecorded finds and deposits. The identified mitigation measures are secured via condition (Conditions 22 and 23), with the Written Scheme of Investigation being prepared for submission.

Chapter 11 Ecology

- 2.0.20 The site was found to not be of sufficient value to warrant whole scale protection from development, but was found to support nesting birds and to be used by commuting and foraging bats. The reserved matters application does not change this position. Mitigation measures for construction were to be secured via the CEMP (as discussed above). The proposed mitigation measures for the operational phase are unaffected by the reserved matters development; the site layout features are unaffected and the ecological enhancement scheme is secured by Condition 25 (with a scheme prepared for submission).

Chapter 12 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

- 2.0.21 The s73 application identified that the proposed s73 amendments did not alter the overall findings of the original ES assessment. As the reserved matters proposals are within the parameters assessed, the conclusions of this Chapter remains unchanged.

Chapter 13 Water Resources and Flood Risk

- 2.0.22 The reserved matters development will not affect the assessment undertaken. The suggested mitigation measures, including the completion of a CEMP, remain as per the original assessment, as discussed above.

Chapter 14 Effects Interactions

- 2.0.23 As the effects identified in the preceding Chapters remain unchanged and the reserved matters development has no impact on the approved quantum, use and scale of development, the conclusions on this Chapter remain unchanged.



Chapter 15 Residual Effects and Conclusion

- 2.0.24 As the effects identified in the preceding Chapters remain unchanged and the reserved matters development has no impact on the approved quantum, use and scale of development, the conclusions on this Chapter remain unchanged.



3.0 Conclusion

- 3.0.1 A review of the RMA proposals has been undertaken in the context of the original ES and the Statement of Conformity.
- 3.0.2 It concludes that the development, as assessed in the original ES, represent an accurate assessment of the likely significant effects associated with the construction and operation of the RMA proposals. As such, no further environmental information or subsequent assessment is considered necessary.
- 3.0.3 Mitigation measures proposed in the original ES are controlled through either planning conditions or the s106 agreement, which continue to apply to the proposed development.

