

6. Summary

6.1. Introduction

- 6.1.1. This chapter forms the summary of the Environmental Statement (“ES”) Addendum 1 accompanying a S73 Application which addresses any likely significant environmental effects as a result of the proposed amendments to the Proposed Development sought through the S73 application. The Proposed Development is on land north of Middleton Stoney Road, Bicester, Oxfordshire (the “Application Site” or “Site”). The Application Site lies within the administrative area of Cherwell District Council (CDC) and the location of the Application Site and application boundary is shown on **Figure 1.1 – Location Plan**.
- 6.1.2. The Proposed Development has a granted outline planning permission (CDC ref.14/O2121/OUT). The Proposed Development was EIA required, and the planning application was supported by an ES dated 2014 (known as ‘ES 2014’) and during determination an ES Addendum was submitted in 2015 (known as ‘ES Addendum 2015’).
- 6.1.3. The Applicant is seeking to alter through the S73 Application the quantum and mix of the commercial uses in the land allocated for ‘Social/Community’ and ‘Other Uses’ (detailed in **Figure 1.4 – Land Use – Parameter Plan 4** (drawing number P22-3093_DE_O13)). This requires amendments to Condition 44 and 45 of the granted outline planning permission (CDC ref.14/O2121/OUT) through a S73 application. Therefore, it has been necessary to consider the implications of the S73 application in the context of the EIA Regulations, and thus this ES Addendum 1 considers any likely significant effects than those already identified and explained within the ES information submitted to date. This ES Addendum 1 has been prepared to demonstrate this compliance.
- 6.1.4. The ES Addendum 1 has been coordinated and managed by Pegasus Group. Pegasus Group is one of the founding members of the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Quality Mark, which is a mark of excellence in EIA co-ordination and management. The consultants who have contributed to the preparation of this ES Addendum 1 are referenced in the Statement of Competence at **Chapter 0– Contents and Statement of Competence** of the ES, along with information demonstrating their “expertise to ensure the completeness and quality of the ES”, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) (amended in 2018).

Availability and Comments

- 6.1.5. This ES Addendum 1 can be viewed online at CDC website and at their office. Additional copies of the Non-Technical Summary (“NTS”) (no charge), Main Text and Technical Appendices (£100 plus postage) are available from Pegasus Group, 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, GL7 1RQ.
- 6.1.6. The ES Addendum 1 can also be obtained in CD or USB format for £10 from the same address. Please quote reference P22-2886 when seeking copies of these documents from Pegasus Group.

Summary

6.2. The Environmental Statement – Scope and Methodology

6.2.1. The Proposed Development falls within Schedule 2 development, which is development likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size, or location under Category 10 (b) “Infrastructure projects” : “Urban development projects, including the construction of shopping centres and car parks, sports stadiums, leisure centres and multiplex cinemas”.

6.2.2. Accordingly, the Proposed Development was considered to be EIA development, and an ES accompanied the outline planning application (ref: 14/O2121/OUT) with permission granted in 2020.

6.2.3. National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) – ‘Flexible Options for Planning Permissions’ section outlines a S73 application is considered to be a new application for planning permission under the EIA Regulations.

“Where an EIA was carried out on the original application, the planning authority will need to consider if further information needs to be added to the original Environmental Statement to satisfy the requirements of the Regulations. Whether changes to the original Environmental Statement are required or not, an Environmental Statement must be submitted with a section 73 application for an EIA development.” Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 17a-017-2023072 (NPPG- Flexible Options for Planning Permissions).

6.2.4. Email correspondence from CDC confirmed that the proposed S73 application would require an ES addendum to consider the effects of the proposed amendments to the Proposed Development and the surrounding environs, and whether the change in the development would result in any different significant effects to those already identified through the ES already submitted to date.

Scoping Opinion

6.2.5. In order to determine the scope of an EIA, the EIA Regulations make provision for, but do not statutorily require, an applicant to request that the LPA provide a written opinion as to the information to be provided within the ES.

6.2.6. The Applicant submitted a formal Scoping Request to CDC, validated on the 18th December 2024 (reference: 24/O3328/SCOP). A Scoping Opinion was received from CDC on 17th January 2025 (**Appendix 1.1**).

6.2.7. It is not considered all environmental topics scoped into the original ES as part of the granted outline planning permission (ref: 14/O2121/OUT) are likely to result in 'significant impacts' and therefore these are 'scoped out' of the ES Addendum 1. Environmental Statements should be proportionate and not be any longer than is necessary to assess properly those effects. The Scoping Opinion received from CDC (**Appendix 1.1**) confirmed the scope to assess only Transport and Access and Socio-Economics in the ES addendum.

6.2.8. Details of the scoping exercise carried out with regards to the Proposed Development is set out in **Chapter 3: EIA Methodology and Scope**.

ES Addendum 1 Contents

6.2.9. Accordingly, this ES Addendum 1 has addressed those environmental issues which are considered pertinent and that could potentially result in “likely significant effects” as required by the EIA Regulations. The following technical chapters are included: Transport and Socio-Economics.

6.2.10. These chapters have considered ‘likely significant effects’ using a pre-determined assessment criteria which often, but not always, reflects the relationship between the magnitude or severity of an effect; and the sensitivity, importance or value of the resource or receptor.

6.2.11. The ES is structured as follows:

- **Environmental Statement Addendum 1: Main Text and Figures (Volume 1)** – Comprises the main volume of the ES, including chapters and associated figures that describe the EIA context, the Development Site, the Proposed Development, and set out the scope of the ES. This is followed by the ‘technical chapters’ for each environmental discipline relevant to the proposals. The volume concludes with a summary.
- **Environmental Statement Addendum 1: Technical Appendices (Volume 2)** – Comprises the associated technical appendices which support each environmental topic within Volume 1.
- **Environmental Statement Addendum 1: Non-Technical Summary (NTS)** – This provides a concise summary of the ES identifying the likely significant environmental effects and the measures proposed to mitigate, or to avoid the adverse effects of the Proposed Development.

6.2.12. Accordingly, the environmental themes scoped into this ES Addendum 1 assess and consider any potentially significant environmental issues brought about through the amendments sought to the Proposed Development through the S73 application are as follows:

- Chapter 0 – Contents and Statement of Competence;
- Chapter 1 – Introduction;
- Chapter 2 – Proposed Development & Amendments;
- Chapter 3 – EIA Assessment Methodology & Scope;
- Chapter 4 – Transport;
- Chapter 5 – Socio-Economics;
- Chapter 6– Summary; and
- Non- Technical Summary.

Cumulative and In-Combination Effects

6.2.13. The ES Addendum 1 responds to the requirement in the EIA Regulations to assess the cumulative effects of the Proposed Development.

Inter-Project Effects

6.2.14. Within EIA, inter-project cumulative effects are generally considered to arise from the combination of effects from the Proposed Development and from other proposed or permitted schemes in the vicinity, acting together to generate elevated levels of effects. The EIA Regulations state that

Summary

consideration should be given to “*other existing and/or approved projects*” in relation to cumulative effects, i.e. schemes built or under construction or with a planning permission.

- 6.2.15. An assessment was undertaken to identify relevant large-scale cumulative schemes within the local vicinity (3km of the Application Site boundary). 10 schemes are identified to be considered through the technical chapters, although noting the extent to which schemes need to be considered within each environmental discipline will inevitably vary.
- 6.2.16. As such, the authors of the technical chapters have considered cumulative effects in terms of inter-project cumulative effect further and detailed within the technical chapters.

Intra-project effects

- 6.2.17. Intra- project effects, or ‘In-combination’ effects result from the different types of effects generated by the Proposed Development having a combined effect on the same receptors. Intra-project effects occur when receptors are subject to residual effects under more than one environmental topic. In light of the comprehensive range of embedded design measures, effect interactions have only been considered where residual adverse or beneficial effects of at least minor in at least one receptor group have been identified.
- 6.2.18. The assessment determined no significant intra-project cumulative effects are anticipated with the Proposed Development and identified receptors.

Assessment of the Effects of the Amendments Sought on the findings of the ES submissions to date

- 6.2.19. The ES chapters originally assessed within the submitted 2014 ES have been reviewed in light of the amendments sought through the S73 application. The following chapters of the 2014 ES can be relied upon as the amendments sought through the S73 application do not results in changes to the assessed significance of effect set out in the 2014 ES:
- Chapter 1 – Introduction
 - Chapter 2 – EIA Methodology
 - Chapter 3 – Existing Land Uses
 - Chapter 4 – Alternatives and Design Evolution
 - Chapter 5 – Proposed Development
 - Chapter 6 – Landscape and Visual Amenity
 - Chapter 7- Ecology
 - Chapter 9 – Air Quality
 - Chapter 10 – Noise and Vibration
 - Chapter 11 – Water Management
 - Chapter 12 – Ground Conditions and Contamination

- Chapter 13 – Agriculture and Soils
- Chapter 14 – Built Heritage,
- Chapter 15 – Archaeology and Soils
- Chapter 17- Human Health
- Chapter 18 – Waste
- Chapter 19- Cumulative Effects
- Chapter 20- Summary of Mitigation and Residual Effects
- Non – Technical Summary

6.2.20. Details of the consideration of the amendments sought through the S73 application on the ES Addendum 1 submission to date is set out in **Chapter 3: EIA Methodology and Scope**.

Summary

6.3. The Proposed Development and Amendments

6.3.1. The Proposed Development sought outline planning permission for a proposed:

6.3.2. *“Development to provide up to 1,700 residential dwellings (Class C3), a retirement village (Class C2), flexible commercial floorspace (Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1, C1 and D1), social and community facilities (Class D1), land to accommodate one energy centre and land to accommodate one new primary school (up to 2FE) (Class D1). Such development to include provision of strategic landscape, provision of new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access routes, infrastructure and other operations (including demolition of farm buildings on Middleton Stoney Road)”.*

6.3.3. The submitted 2014 ES and its associated 2015 ES Addendum assessed and identified the likely significant effects of the outline Proposed Development proposal. The assessed parameters in summary were as follows:

Table 6.1 – 2014 ES and 2015 ES Addendum Assessment Parameters (ref: 14/O2121/OUT)

Land Use	GIA (m ²)	Parameter Plan
Residential Uses	156,395	Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K)
Hotel	2,600	Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K)
Veterinary Surgery	2,000	Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K)
School	2,750	Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K)
Retirement Village	9,000	Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K)
Pub/Community Space	400	Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K)
Retail	700	Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K)
Health Facility	1,500	Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K)
Office	1,000	Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K)

Nursery	100	Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K)
Energy Centre	375	Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K)
Water Treatment Plant	450	Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K)
Access and movement – Primary, secondary and tertiary streets, and 3 access points.	N/A	Movement and Access – Parameter Plan 7 (drawing number 1665/75/04)
Landscape, open space and public realm – A minimum of 40% of the Site area.	N/A	Landscape – Parameter Plan 3 (drawing number 592-PL-106 Rev H);
Foul and surface water drainage – primary swales	N/A	SUDs – Parameter Plan 8 (drawing number 1665/75/05 Rev B)

6.3.4. All building heights and densities within the Proposed Development are subject to compliance with Parameter Plan 5 – Building Heights (drawing number 592-PL-104 Rev H) and Parameter Plan 6 – Density (drawing number 592-PL-105 Rev H).

Amendments Sought subject of ES Addendum 1

6.3.5. The Applicant is seeking to alter the quantum and mix of the commercial uses through a S73 application. This will only effect land allocated for ‘Social/Community’ and ‘Other Uses’ on the Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K).

6.3.6. An NMA application in relation to the granted outline planning permission (LPA ref.14/O2121/OUT) for the Proposed Development to alter the description of development to remove references to former use classes and replace these with the appropriate current use classes, and therefore also alter the approved the Land Use – Parameter Plan 4 (drawing number 592-PL-103 Rev K) to remove references to former use classes and replace these with the appropriate current use classes (ref: 24/O1671/NMA). This application remains undetermined with CDC (correct at the time of writing, January 2025).

6.3.7. The amendments sought are set out in the table below with additional commentary on whether there are any proposed amendments to each previously assessed land use as part of this S73 application:

Summary

Table 6.2- ES Addendum 1 Assessment Parameters comparison table with 2014 ES and 2015 ES Addendum Assessment Parameters (ref: 14/02121/OUT)

Land Use	Original GIA (m ²) subject of 2014 ES and 2015 ES Addendum supporting (ref: 14/02121/OUT)	Proposed Amendments as part of this S73 Application (m ²)	Parameter Plan subject of Proposed Amendments as part of this S73 Application
Residential Uses	156,395	No changes	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)
Hotel (Class C1)	2,600	Reduction to 2,000	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)
Veterinary Surgery (Class E(e))	2,000	Reduction to 300	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)
School	2,750	No changes (2,750)	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)
Retirement Village	9,000	No changes (9,000)	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)
Pub/Community (Classes Sui Generis/F.2)	400	Increase to 500	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)
Retail, Restaurants and Cafés, Financial and Professional Services, Drinking Establishments and Hot Food Takeaways (Classes E(a)(b)(c) and (Sui Generis))	700	Reduction to 300	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)
Health Facility (Class E(e))	1,500	Reduction to 500	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)
Office (Class E(g)(i))	1,000	No changes	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)

		(1,000)	
Nursery (Class E(f))	100	Increase to 500	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)
Energy Centre	375	No changes (375)	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)
Water Treatment Plant (Sui Generis)	450	No changes (450)	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)
Discount Food Store (Class E(a))	N/A	Addition of 2,500	Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013)
Access and movement - Primary, secondary and tertiary streets, and 3 access points.	N/A	No changes	Movement and Access - Parameter Plan 7 (drawing number 1665/75/04)
Landscape, open space and public realm - A minimum of 40% of the Site area.	N/A	No changes	Landscape - Parameter Plan 3 (drawing number 592-PL-106 Rev H);
Foul and surface water drainage - primary swales	N/A	No changes	SUDs - Parameter Plan 8 (drawing number 1665/75/05 Rev B)

6.3.8. No further changes are being proposed.

6.3.9. The above amendments are reflected in the following revised parameter plan accompanying the S73 application:

- Land Use - Parameter Plan 4 (P22-3093_DE_013) included as **Figure 1.4** of this ES Addendum 1.

Summary

6.4. Transport

6.4.1. This chapter has been prepared by DTA Transportation. The aim of this chapter is to consider the potential traffic and transportation effects that are likely to arise with the proposed development.

Baseline Conditions

6.4.2. The Site is located to the west of the A4095 Howes Lane and is bound to the south by Middleton Stoney Road. The Site is situated to the west of existing residential areas of Bicester, namely Highfield and west Bicester and is approximately 5km from the town centre (measured to the Himley Farm buildings enclosed within the red line boundary).

6.4.3. Bicester lies approximately 24km to the north east of Oxford and 28km to the south east of Banbury. The M40 is located 2km to the west, with access to the town from Junction 9 via the A41. The Site can also be accessed via Junction 10 of the M40 Motorway, which is located approximately 8km to the north-west. The Site comprises agricultural land and Himley Farm with Grade II listed farm buildings. The village of Bucknell is located to the north of the Site and Middleton Stoney to the west.

Pedestrian and Cycle Provision

6.4.4. A shared footway/ cycleway is provided along the B4030 from Empire Road to the B4030/ Vendee Drive/ Howes Lanes/ Middleton Stoney Road roundabout connecting into existing footway provision. There is no footway/ cycleway provision on Howes Lane.

6.4.5. The majority of Bicester is located within 5km of the Site and therefore accessible by cyclists.

6.4.6. National Cycle Network Route 51 passes through Bicester in a south west to north east alignment, linking Launton village, Gavray Drive, Tubbs Crossing, Sheep Street, Bicester Village and Wendlebury. A combination of on-road routes and off-road traffic free route sections form the route passing through Bicester via the town centre and both stations (Bicester North and Bicester Town).

Bus Services

6.4.7. There are bus stops located on the B4030 comprising a flag with timetable information. The bus stops are served by bus route 25 which routes from Lower Heyford to Bicester. The service operates on an hourly basis Monday to Saturday.

6.4.8. There is a further bus stop on Wensum Crescent to the east of the site. It is served by bus route 21 which is the Bicester town service and operates a 30-minute service Monday to Saturday.

Rail Services

6.4.9. Bicester benefits from two railway stations in the town; Bicester North and Bicester Village. These stations are situated approximately 3.1km and 3.7km from the proposed site respectively.

6.4.10. Bicester North station provides an hourly service to Birmingham Snow Hill and to Banbury, and trains up to 3 times an hour to London Marylebone. Bicester North station has a ticket office and machines, refreshment facilities, toilets, car parking (530 spaces) and cycle parking (65 spaces).

- 6.4.11. Trains from Bicester Village are every 30 minutes between Oxford and London Marylebone. Bicester Village station has a ticket office and machines, refreshment facilities, toilets, waiting rooms, car parking (223 spaces) and cycle parking (50 spaces).

Assessment of Likely Significant Effects

- 6.4.12. The assessment of (direct) environmental effects arising from the proposed development, as a result of construction and operational traffic generated by the proposed development has been undertaken in line with IEMA Guidelines for the assessment of environmental effects arising from road traffic, specifically severance and increase in fear and intimidation, pedestrian amenity, pedestrian delay, and increases in driver delay.
- 6.4.13. The change in development flows is -23 trips in the AM peak and -20 trips in the PM peak and therefore lower than the originally assessed traffic generation of the Site. This would not change the conclusion of the significance of effect on severance and fear and intimidation, pedestrian amenity, pedestrian delay and driver delay.

Mitigation and Enhancement

- 6.4.14. Mitigation is set out in the original Transport chapter of the Environmental Statement (2014). Given the conclusions have not changed in respect of the significance of effects, it is therefore not necessary to revisit the mitigation measures originally proposed.

Conclusion

- 6.4.15. Overall, the amendments sought through the S73 application on the Proposed Development do not materially change the assessment of effects identified in the 2014 transport assessment work. Residual effects in the construction and operation phase of the Proposed Development remain as not significant in EIA terms. The amendments sought through the S73 application can be accommodated with no change in conclusion of effects in the transport assessment work provided to date.

Summary

6.5. Socio-Economics

6.5.1. This chapter has assessed the socio-economic impacts of developing up to 8,000 sq. m. of the 'social/community' and 'other uses' floorspace.

Baseline Conditions

6.5.2. A baseline review of Cherwell's socio-economic context reveals the following:

- Between 2013 and 2023, Cherwell's population has grown faster than the rate seen at a regional and national level. In relative terms, those aged 65+ grew at the fastest rate over this timeframe. This trend is projected to continue between 2018 and 2038.
- Cherwell has a lower proportion of its resident working age population with a degree or equivalent when compared to the regional comparator, but slightly higher than at national level and a lower proportion with no qualifications than at national level.
- The LSOAs within which the application site falls, Cherwell O16A and Cherwell O11B, fall within the top 40% least and top 50% most deprived LSOAs in England.
- Employment growth in Cherwell was higher than regional and national comparators with growth in the Bicester Wider Area ward significantly higher than all three areas between 2015 and 2023.
- The proportion of people aged 16–64 in Cherwell claiming benefits is below the rate in the South East and England.

Assessment of Likely Significant Effects

6.5.3. In respect of the operational phase, the assessment indicates that the Proposed Development will have the following permanent effects:

- Once operational, the Proposed Development could generate up to 207 gross full-time equivalent jobs (FTEs).
- Around £11.2million of gross value added per annum is estimated to be generated per annum once operational, or £96.4million over a 10-year period (present value).

6.5.4. In EIA terms, overall these impacts are considered to have a significant beneficial effect in the long-term, with no significant adverse effects on existing community infrastructure.

Mitigation and Enhancement

6.5.5. There are no significant adverse effects identified as a result of the Proposed Development. As such, no additional mitigation is deemed to be necessary. No enhancements are expected to be proposed specific to socioeconomics beyond those already referred to in the impacts section relevant to other topics.

Conclusion

- 6.5.6. Overall, the Proposed Development is considered to provide beneficial effects during the construction phase in relation to employment and economic contribution. Once operational, significant beneficial effects are expected in relation to wider economic effects.
- 6.5.7. Adverse but not significant effects are predicted in relation to disturbance to neighbourhood amenity during the construction phase, but this will be managed by best practice measures through CEMP and relation management tools.

Summary

6.6. Conclusions

- 6.6.1. The aim of this ES Addendum 1 has been to assess the 'likely significant effects' of the proposed amendments to the Proposed Development sought through the S73 application in accordance with the Town and Country Planning EIA Regulations 2017. Detailed assessments with respect to pertinent environmental topics have therefore been undertaken in accordance with definitive standards and legislation where available.
- 6.6.2. In conclusion, this ES Addendum 1 demonstrates that the amendments sought do not give rise to any different likely significant effects than those already identified and explained within the ES information submitted to date. This ES Addendum 1 has been prepared to demonstrate this compliance. This ES Addendum 1 demonstrates that there are no overriding environmental constraints which would preclude the Proposed Development.