

RESPONDENT	CONTENT OF COMMENT	OCC RESPONSE
<p>Wendlebury Parish Council (2nd March 2016) and response from an individual member of the public (13th March 2016)</p>	<p>I am writing to you as Chairman of Wendlebury Parish Council to seek your support for a common sense approach to what is becoming an illogical process driven by artificial timescales. The PC have recently been informed by OCC officers that they are going to recommend route 2, this is the route that joins the A41 close to our village at Wendlebury, to OCC Cabinet member David Nimmo Smith & Rodney Rose, then onward transmission to Cherwell Planners. We understand that this route is required as part of the transport infrastructure and to be 'safeguarded' as part of Cherwell Local Plan, Part 2.</p> <p>Wendlebury Parish Council are extremely concerned about this development and remain, at best, confused as to both the process and rationale for the recommendation.</p> <p>Potential new M40 junction: We understand from the Bicester Garden Town team that they are currently undertaking a feasibility study for the potential new Motorway junction on the M40. It is recognised by OCC that if this scheme was to become part of the area transport strategy, this could have an impact on the exact requirements and subsequent design of the perimeter road, if indeed the SE relief road is required.</p> <p>We are seeking to understand therefore why any decisions need to be taken on the SE route until this study has been complete.</p>	<p>The need to address the future capacity issues on the A41 was evidenced for the Local Plan Part 1. This technical evidence demonstrated that the A41 Boundary Way would see significant congestion in the later parts of the plan period without further improvements beyond the committed junction enhancements. A new link road would resolve this issue. OCC confirmed that with the various improvements planned within the town, the strategic highway network should be capable of accommodating the planned growth to 2031. The Inspector for the Examination reported that it was important to confirm the route to resolve local uncertainty and the wording in SLE4 was amended accordingly.</p> <p>Following the award of 'Garden Town' status to Bicester, a new junction on the M40 south of Junction 9 is being investigated. This has been identified as a potential long term solution for strategic movements between the motorway network and the A41</p> <p>A potential new junction would have implications regarding the need for, and/or function and design of the South East Perimeter Road, however, it is still necessary to establish a preferred route option to be safeguarded through CLP Part 2 as this was a critical scheme to support the Local Plan growth. Unless an alternative approach is confirmed and approved (e.g. a new M40 junction) which replaces or alters the necessity of a new link road, the ability to deliver this scheme should not be removed. If an alignment is not safeguarded through CLP Part 2, the ability to deliver a key strategic link to support housing and employment growth in Bicester could be lost.</p>
	<p>Objections from consultations: The recent public consultations on 3 options drew a number of responses. Of these 145 were local, the balance of 334 were responses from outside the local area and dominated by one interest group, the Wetlands Trust who objected to option 1 as a result of the impact of this route on local wetlands. It should be noted that the 'wetlands' are in fact not natural and are run off from the sewerage works. Unlike the vast swathes of natural meadow and that will be destroyed if route 2 is chosen we have been informed that the views of the Wetlands Trust have carried more weight in the decision making process as they are, apparently, a more powerful lobby in the event of any planning enquiry. Whilst we understand the need to protect wildlife, the amount of countryside and wildlife that will be disrupted from Route 2 is at least equal, if not greater than this. It would therefore appear that the quality of life for our community carries little or no weight. This makes a complete nonsense of the Cherwell Local Plan in its objective to build sustainable communities.</p>	<p>Taking only the 145 respondents from Bicester and the surrounding villages into consideration; 53 per cent of respondents expressed a preference for Option 2, 19 per cent for Option 1b, 18 per cent for Option 1a, 6 per cent expressed no preference, and 4 per cent gave no answer.</p> <p>The 334 respondents referred to include the 145 respondents above in addition to those living in Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Northamptonshire, and Milton Keynes. Taking all 334 respondents into consideration; 78 per cent of respondents expressed a preference for Option 2, 9 per cent for Option 1b, 8 per cent for Option 1a, 3 per cent expressed no preference, and 2 per cent gave no answer.</p> <p>Due consideration has been given to all matters that need to be taken into account in planning for a new road link. The professional advice</p>

	<p>We are seeking to understand therefore why this view has been reached.</p>	<p>we have received is that the ecological constraints are significant and the Southern Alignment (Option 2) is the most viable route.</p> <p>However, stakeholder responses and the work undertaken to support the consultation highlighted significant barriers in addition to ecology issues, that mean that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1b is undeliverable (in particular due to the impact on MoD land); and • Option 1a has significant constraints, including ecological and archaeological issues that make deliverability problematic and an uncertain risk. Route 1a would also directly impact Wendlebury Stables' land and adversely impact the adopted Local Plan allocated sites. <p>We have set out work that would be undertaken to establish how the potential impacts on the residents of Wendlebury could be minimised as part of any further development of a Route Option 2 scheme. These are detailed in Annex 7, Service and Community Impact Assessment, on p.61 of the report entitled 'South East Perimeter Road, Bicester - Conclusion of Options Assessment Work.'</p>
	<p>Costs and funding: The recent consultation showed that Route 2 was the most expensive option of all the routes considered. We also understand that there is no available identified budget for any such scheme at this time.</p> <p>Could we please understand how the most expensive route and can be safeguarded, how is the scheme going to be funded.</p>	<p>Whilst the cost of options 1a and 1b has been estimated to be less than option 2, at this early stage the estimation includes construction costs only. There are a number of costs that will be identified in more detail as a scheme is designed up, including relocating/ removing utilities, land acquisition and mitigation.</p> <p>Officers are not seeking to commit funds to progress the scheme further (beyond safeguarding in the Local Plan) at this stage. However, should the scheme be progressed, funding would be secured through developer contributions and central government funding bids.</p>
	<p>Appropriate level of detail: There are many factors that remain unknown and provide grave concern to the well-being of the population of Wendlebury. These included the means of access to and from the village towards Bicester. The effect on increased air and noise pollution from accelerating vehicles at the roundabout. The effect on flooding in the locality from the road infrastructure. In addition we have not seen any detailed junction design solutions for how the route 2 would join the A41 between Bicester and junction 9 lack of this crucial information means that impossible to correctly assess the ability of Route 2 to function.</p> <p>How can a decision be made without these vital factors being considered?</p> <p>In summary, there is a confused and unnecessary rush to safeguard a route that is neither logical, well planned, has any funding and maybe unnecessary</p>	<p>Whilst these concerns are understood they are matters of detail and would be addressed during the design stages. In designing the junctions, considerations that would be taken into account include (but are not limited to): traffic flow, road safety, cost, engineering feasibility, land availability etc. Any impacts resulting from the scheme identified as requiring mitigation will be incorporated into the final scheme design. In the case of option 2, this could potentially include designing the junctions between the Wendlebury Road and the proposed perimeter road in such a way that traffic is deterred from using the Wendlebury Road.</p> <p>Impacts of route options in terms of noise and air quality, were included in Section 6 of the <i>Strategic Route Corridor Options: Initial Sifting Report</i> available here:</p>

	<p>in the light of a new motorway junction. We would urge you to use your influence to support a deferment of any decision on options for the Bicester SE perimeter Road, until such time as the M40 study has been completed</p>	<p>www.cherwell.gov.uk/media/pdf/9/r/Bicester Movement Study February 2013 Part 2 of 4.pdf</p> <p>Table 8 provides a summary of the houses affected by noise; note that Route Option 2 (route nearest to Wendlebury) is represented by Option 3 in the <i>Sifting Report</i>, whilst Route 1 is represented by Option 2C. Maps are provided here: //www.cherwell.gov.uk/media/pdf/3/o/Bicester Movement Study February 2013 Part 3 of 4.pdf)</p> <p>The noise and air quality impacts of traffic will be further assessed in the subsequent design stages and any necessary mitigation measures will be incorporated into the final design of the scheme.</p> <p>To address your concerns about the impact of option 2 on the flood plain; it is recognised that any one of the proposed alignments would require work to mitigate its impact on the flood plain. Additionally, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required as part of a planning application submission. Subsequent design stages will be conducted in consultation with the Environment Agency and the necessary mitigation of any impact on the flood plain will be integral to the proposed scheme. The Environment Agency would not approve any proposals that would reduce the capacity of the existing flood plain or that would increase flood risk elsewhere, either upstream or downstream. For further detail on this, see pages 35, 38, and 40 of the '<i>Preliminary ecological appraisal, planning advice and engineering feasibility</i>' report, which can be found here: www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/PerimeterRoadBicester.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment would also be carried out on the preferred route.</p>
<p>Wendlebury Parish Council (4th March 2016)</p>	<p>Following my recent letter in regard to the South East Relief Road, we have been undertaking some research into the Wetlands as this factor seems to be carrying a very heavy weighting in the considerations, versus the wellbeing of the human population in Wendlebury.</p> <p>It should be noted that the site is not open to the public and is listed, even on the sites own website as,.... "This is a member-only site due to the hazardous nature of the site, heavy moving equipment and hazardous areas."</p> <p>We note the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site does not hold a significant population of British breeding birds. Our research leads us to believe that you usually need 1% to 	<p>Bicester Wetlands is designated as a Local Wildlife Site, whilst this designation does not have the same statutory protection as, for example a SSSI, such sites are still of importance for wildlife. Local Wildlife Site designations are judged against a set of locally agreed criteria one of which includes the presence of birds that are now less widespread in the countryside.</p> <p>Over past decades there has been a significant loss of wetland habitat nationally. The restoration and protection of wetland habitat is therefore a high priority both nationally and locally. The presence of relatively good populations of wetland birds is an indicator of habitat in good condition and it is the conservation of the habitat which is the</p>

	<p>get protection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is one of many sites that sits within the Upper Thames Tributaries, like the big RSPB reserve at Otmoor. Therefore it is one of many watering sites in the area for these type of wildfowl to go and it is the reason that they come in the first place. It is not unusual to get those birds listed from this site visiting this area because of the amount of wetlands in the Upper Thames area. • None of the breeding birds are on the red list, some are amber listed for general long term decline in their breeding population. • The site holds the lowest level of designation - i.e.: Local Nature Reserve, I would imagine the meadowlands for Route 2 could equally qualify with a small amount of investigation • There could be quite lot of things that can be done to compensate for installing a road through the site e.g.: extending the wetland in another direction away from the road, into adjoining fields is quite a common mitigation. And there will be other options to mitigate the impact. • Although this is significant disturbance for the reserve, traffic is a constant disturbance and wildlife will fairly quickly become accustomed to it and it is much better than intermittent disturbance <p>I am sure you may wish to consider these factors in your current reviews.</p>	<p>primary concern, though there are also specific legal and habitat management issues around individual bird species.</p> <p>There has been significant investment in wetland habitat creation in Cherwell notably the RSPB reserve at Otmoor and BBOWTs Upper Ray Meadows complex. There is benefit from building a network of nearby habitat areas and Bicester Wetlands can be seen as part of this wider habitat complex.</p> <p>There is still a lack of information about the habitat in the area of land to the south of the study area. There are possible areas of priority habitat indicated in the general vicinity of route 2 and further south, though how these compare with the BWS requires further investigation. It is noted that the BWS is a well-established wildlife reserve and has been managed with this purpose in mind for fifteen years.</p> <p>Opportunities to create additional habitat that would mitigate for impacts on BWS would be dependent upon many factors not least land ownership and hydrology and creating habitat of equal or better value is likely to be challenging.</p> <p>For further details pertaining to the Bicester Wetland Reserve, please refer to the responses in Annex 6 of the report from: Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT), pp.31-34</p> <p>Banbury Ornithological Society, pp.35-36 Natural England, pp.45-46</p> <p>Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), pp.46-47</p>
<p>Wendlebury Parish Council (9th March 2016)</p>	<p>I thought you might like to see some pictures taken this morning showing how the fantastic new drainage is working on the new road, and proposed route of new SE perimeter road is working. You will also see how the site close to A41 where the new roundabout would be is looking.</p> <p>The volume of dirty muddy water coming through the village has increased dramatically since the road has been built. Quite clearly, despite all the promises and engineers, it doesn't work!!</p> <p>As you know we already suffer from residential flooding on a regular basis.</p> <p>I further hope yet more evidence for the 'human' decision to be made!!</p>	<p>Photos are not included in this addendum, but depict high water levels in the drainage system at the junction between Wendlebury Road and the new alignment of Langford Lane. While this issue is not directly related to the decision on safeguarding a route for the south east perimeter road, we appreciate that new infrastructure can raise concerns about impacts on the flood plain.</p> <p>Whilst the photos may suggest a cause for concern, it must be remembered that much of the areas around the main river through Wendlebury is defined as Flood Plain by the Environment Agency and therefore will have an adverse effect on the ordinary watercourses feeding into this main river during periods of exceptional rainfall.</p>

		<p>In particular, the photo of the downstream headwall of the culvert underneath the new Langford Lane junction shows the water level well over the soffit of the culvert which suggests that the water level downstream was high and therefore the drainage system on Langford Lane had nowhere to go, hence it was backing up in the ditches.</p> <p>Regarding the colour of the water, this was to be expected given the freshly top-soiled verges around the ditches and either side of the new road.</p> <p>This does not suggest the failure of the drainage system on the new Langford Lane road, this is purely a new drainage system which is being held back by river levels in an area defined as Flood Plain.</p> <p>Furthermore, it should be noted that construction of this road is still incomplete and it may therefore be premature to be making judgements of how the new drainage system will function once completed.</p>
<p>Response from an individual member of the public (5th March 2016)</p>	<p>I am deeply disgusted and disappointed that you are “considering” putting the new road at the edge of Wendlebury. I know you are having “consultations”, but this from past experience, means you have made up your minds and only have to do this by law.</p> <p>Why do you want to ruin this village and put increased rat runs through it, as in Islip, when the outskirts of Bicester are ruined anyway, thanks to your disgraceful “planning” – too many houses, Bicester Village allowed to dictate this whole area?</p> <p>One great concern I have, which you do not seem to have taken notice of, is that every morning and afternoon, children walk along the main road from either end to get on the bus at the stop opposite the pub. There are no pavement so street lights – in dark? in winter? You must be insane. A child waiting to be killed.</p> <p>The new road to the stables, also seems to be totally inadequate – winding, narrow, steep – ice? cars coming down the hill onto a new roundabout on ice/snow? where is your common sense? Also, the road out of the village past the hall is too narrow to take more traffic – I guess you believe no one will rat run through? they do now.</p> <p>Surely all decisions should wait till you see if and when there will be a new M40 Jcn?</p> <p>Why does the Wetlands Trust seem to hold more say than villages whose lives will be blighted by traffic?</p>	<p>The views of the public are an important part of the decision-making process and have been considered alongside other factors including archaeological, environmental, and engineering aspects, all of which have a bearing on the feasibility of each option.</p> <p>For full details of the results of the consultation, please refer to pp.17-60 of the report entitled ‘South East Perimeter Road, Bicester - Conclusion of Options Assessment Work.’</p> <p>During the design stages any impacts resulting from the proposed road, identified as requiring mitigation, will be fully assessed and incorporated into the final scheme design. In the case of option 2, this could potentially include designing the junctions between the Wendlebury Road and the proposed perimeter road in such a way that traffic is deterred from using the Wendlebury Road.</p> <p>Evidence within Part 1 of the Local Plan demonstrated that with the various transport schemes planned within the town, the strategic highway network should be capable of accommodating the planned growth to 2031. The perimeter road was identified as a critical piece of infrastructure and the preferred route corridor should be safeguarded so that any proposals for development cannot prejudice an otherwise viable proposal coming forward in the future.</p> <p>Assessment work on the feasibility of a new junction on the M40 is to be undertaken shortly and its impact on the exact requirements and</p>

	<p>What is your objection to the road coming out near the vendee Drive roundabout?</p>	<p>subsequent design/ function of the perimeter road needs to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Taking only the 145 respondents from Bicester and the surrounding villages into consideration; 53 per cent of respondents expressed a preference for Option 2, 19 per cent for Option 1b, 18 per cent for Option 1a, 6 per cent expressed no preference, and 4 per cent gave no answer.</p> <p>The 334 respondents referred to include the 145 respondents above in addition to those living in Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Northamptonshire, and Milton Keynes. Taking all 334 respondents into consideration; 78 per cent of respondents expressed a preference for Option 2, 9 per cent for Option 1b, 8 per cent for Option 1a, 3 per cent expressed no preference, and 2 per cent gave no answer.</p>
<p>Response from an individual member of the public (7th March 2016)</p>	<p>We would like to add our support to the position taken by Wendlebury Parish Council in its extreme concern about the above relief road. The fact gathering exercise and the conclusion it seems to have reached does appear confused and hasty. It would appear to need someone to stand back and take a long term view given the possibility of a future M40 junction. At all times, we would urge you to recognise the flood risk in Wendlebury and to try to minimise it in any future development.</p>	<p>Please see the responses provided to Wendlebury Parish Council's comments above.</p>
<p>Response from two members of the public (13th March 2016)</p>	<p>We are writing to you as very concerned longstanding residents of Wendlebury village to seek your support for a common sense approach to what is becoming an ill founded process with confused rationale, which takes little or no account of residents wishes in Wendlebury and how it will affect their lives, village life and the community in general. We have been informed that the recommend route 2 is now the preferred option which is the route that joins the A41 close to our village at Wendlebury. This route we are advised is required as part of the transport infrastructure and to be 'safeguarded' as part of Cherwell Local Plan, Part 2.</p> <p>Potential new M40 junction: We understand from the Bicester Garden Town team that they are currently undertaking a feasibility study for the potential new Motorway junction on the M40. It is recognised by OCC that if this scheme was to become part of the area transport strategy, this could have an impact on the exact requirements and subsequent design of the perimeter road, if indeed the SE relief road is required.</p> <p>We are seeking to understand therefore why any decisions need be taken on the SE route until this study has been complete. As to proceed without this information is just yet another step in the disjointed approach to Bicester's highway planning and traffic management.</p>	<p>Mitigation for congestion problems on the A41 Boundary Way was identified as a necessity within Local Plan Part 1. A south east perimeter road was identified as the solution. It was evidenced, that with the various transport improvements throughout the town in place the highway network should be able to cope with the level of growth planned.</p> <p>As a critical part of that transport strategy, it is important for the County Council to seek to safeguard the corridor from development so that a viable solution is not lost for the town. Unless an alternative approach is confirmed and approved (e.g. a new M40 junction) which replaces or alters the necessity of a new link road, the ability to deliver this scheme should not be removed. The motorway junction is at a very early stage with assessments yet to be carried out.</p> <p>If an alignment for the perimeter road is not safeguarded through CLP Part 2, the ability to deliver a key strategic link to support housing and employment growth in Bicester could be lost.</p>

Objections from consultations: The recent public consultations on 3 options drew a number of responses. Of these 145 were local, the balance of 334 were responses from **outside** the local area and dominated by one interest group, the Wetlands Trust who objected to option1 as a result of the impact of this route on local wetlands. It should be noted that the 'wetlands' are in fact not natural and are run off from the sewerage works. Unlike the vast swathes of natural meadow that will be destroyed if route 2 is chosen We have been informed that the views of the Wetlands Trust have carried more weight in the decision making process as they are, apparently, a more powerful lobby in the event of any planning enquiry. Whilst we understand the need to protect wildlife, the amount of countryside and wildlife that will be disrupted from Route 2 is at least equal, if not greater than this.

It would therefore appear that the quality of life for our community carries little or no weight. This totally counter to the Cherwell Local Plan in its objective to build sustainable communities.

Therefore we need to understand why this view has been reached over the local views submitted.

Costs and funding: The recent consultation showed that Route 2 was the most expensive option of all the routes considered. We also understand that there is no available identified budget for any such scheme at this time.

How then can a more expensive route be the preferred option in this time of austerity, cut backs and how is the scheme going to be funded.

Appropriate level of detail: There are many factors that remain unknown and provide grave concern for the well-being of the population of Wendlebury. These included the means of access to and from the village towards Bicester, the effect on increased air and noise pollution from accelerating vehicles at the roundabout and the effect on increased flooding in the locality from the road infrastructure. In addition we have not seen any detailed junction design solutions for how the route 2 would join the A41 between Bicester and junction 9. Lack of this crucial information means that it is impossible to correctly assess the ability of Route 2 to function and its impact on the village.

How can a decision be made without these vital factors being considered?

In summary, there is at best a confused and unnecessary rush to safeguard a route that is neither logical, well planned, has any funding and may well be unnecessary in the light of a new motorway junction being considered. We would urge you to use your influence to support a deferment of any decision on options for the Bicester SE perimeter Road, until such time as the M40 study has been completed.

Bicester Wetlands is designated as a Local Wildlife Site, whilst this designation does not have the same statutory protection as, for example a SSSI, such sites are still of importance for wildlife.

Over past decades there has been a significant loss of wetland habitat nationally. The restoration and protection of wetland habitat is therefore a high priority both nationally and locally. The presence of relatively good populations of wetland birds is an indicator of habitat in good condition and it is the conservation of the habitat which is the primary concern, though there are also specific legal and habitat management issues around individual bird species.

Ecological considerations are a key part in determining the most suitable route alignment, but stakeholder responses including archaeology were also important considerations as well as the consultation results.

At this early stage option 2 was identified as the most expensive in terms of construction costs. There are a number of costs that will be identified in more detail as a scheme is designed up, including utilities, land acquisition and mitigation. The scheme would be funded through developer contributions and central government funding bids.

Whilst these concerns are understood they are matters of detail and would be addressed during the design stages. In designing the junctions, considerations that would be taken into account include (but are not limited to): traffic flow, road safety, cost, engineering feasibility, land availability etc. Any impacts resulting from the scheme identified as requiring mitigation will be incorporated into the final scheme design. In the case of option 2, this could potentially include designing the junctions between the Wendlebury Road and the proposed perimeter road in such a way that traffic is deterred from using the Wendlebury Road.

Response from an individual member of the public (12th March 2016)

I am writing to you as a resident of the village of Wendlebury to express my views in regards to the proposed Bicester South East Relief Road which forms part of Bicester's continued expansion and development. I hope this letter will obtain your support in rejecting this proposal and bring to your attention the effect this road would have upon the community of Wendlebury.

This development causes me great concern as a resident of a village which is increasingly becoming surrounded from all sides by major roads and railway infrastructure. I would like to make clear that I have been very impressed with how Bicester has developed over the last few years with improved transport links and increased local facilities including schools. There can be no doubt that as residents of Wendlebury we have benefitted in many ways from these improvements however there are of course negative consequences and Wendlebury is being disproportionately exposed to many of these negative consequences.

Our village is situated next to Junction 9 M40 which is situated to the north west of the village, the M40 and the A34 run to our west with the A41 dual carriageway to the north. The new upgraded Bicester to Oxford railway is situated to the south of the village. All these roads and railways are major transport routes and are within a 1 miles radius of the village itself, effectively surrounding us on 3 sides. The South East Relief Road route 2 would effectively 'box' the village in on all sides creating the following consequences for the village.

Increased traffic

Junction 9 is already regarded as inefficient and overused as it struggles to deal with the M40, A34 and A41 traffic despite a recent upgrade. These routes are increasingly busy and traffic flow is increasing as Bicester grows. As a result the village is often used as 'rat run' as traffic tries to avoid the queues for Junction 9. The proposed relief road will increase pressure and traffic onto the A41 and subsequently onto Junction 9 bringing an increase in vehicles cutting through the village. The village has a narrow main street and a weight restricted bridge and traffic needs to be reduced through the village not increased. I am also concerned about access to and from the village towards Bicester.

Flooding

Wendlebury is located in a flood plain and has been flooded in the past including in 2012. My property was flooded and damaged on that occasion. Now every time we experience heavy rain we experience great anxiety that we will have more flooding. The village will be placed in further risk of flooding as the relief road will remove fields adjacent to the village which are relied upon for flooding relief, also the road will cause increased water runoff into the area surrounding the village again increasing the risk of flooding

Noise and pollution

Being situated next to the A41 and M40 the village already deals with high levels of traffic noise and pollution, the upgraded railway line from Bicester to Oxford has further increased this with the running of regular diesel trains.

The 'boxing in' issue is very much understood. The proposed alignment suggests moving the junction onto the A41 (north of junction 9) slightly further away from Wendlebury than the corridor being considered back in 2012. However, the route is constrained by the scheduled ancient monument and Roman parade ground to the north.

The concerns over traffic routeing through the village have been expressed in discussions with the parish council. Clearly these are very important concerns for the village and would need due consideration as the road was designed up. This matter is addressed in Annex 7 to the report, Service and Community Impact Assessment, on p.61 of the report entitled 'South East Perimeter Road, Bicester - Conclusion of Options Assessment Work.' As indicated, any emerging scheme will need to balance the needs for villagers to access Bicester against the need to deter unnecessary traffic.

It is recognised that any one of the proposed alignments would require work to mitigate its impact on the flood plain. Additionally, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required as part of a planning application submission. Subsequent design stages will be conducted in consultation with the Environment Agency and the necessary mitigation of any impact on the flood plain will be integral to the proposed scheme. The Environment Agency would not approve any proposals that would reduce the capacity of the existing flood plain or that would increase flood risk elsewhere, either upstream or downstream. For further detail on this, see pages 35, 38, and 40 of the 'Preliminary ecological appraisal, planning advice and engineering feasibility' report, which can be found here:

www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/PerimeterRoadBicester.

Impacts of route options in terms of noise and air quality, were included in Section 6 of the *Strategic Route Corridor Options: Initial Sifting Report* available here:

[www.cherwell.gov.uk/media/pdf/9/r/Bicester Movement Study February 2013 Part 2 of 4.pdf](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/media/pdf/9/r/Bicester_Movement_Study_February_2013_Part_2_of_4.pdf)

Table 8 provides a summary of the houses affected by noise; note that Route Option 2 (route nearest to Wendlebury) is represented by Option 3 in the *Sifting Report*, whilst Route 1 is represented by Option 2C.

Maps are provided here:

[//www.cherwell.gov.uk/media/pdf/3/o/Bicester Movement Study February 2013 Part 3 of 4.pdf](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/media/pdf/3/o/Bicester_Movement_Study_February_2013_Part_3_of_4.pdf)

Having the relief road and related junction onto the A41 will further increase noise and pollution from increased traffic and vehicles accelerating and decelerating. My property backs onto the A41 and noise and pollution levels are already high, a new road and junction would have a significant effect on our quality of life.

Green belt

The village recently lost a large chunk of its ever decreasing green belt with the recently constructed solar farm which is located between the village and the M40. The relief road would further remove surrounding fields and destroy natural meadows and wildlife. I understand that the Wetlands Trust have made representations in regards to option 1 however it appears that a disproportionate amount of weight has been placed upon the Wetlands Trust views and that the wetlands they are seeking to protect are in fact a run off from the local sewerage works and that a greater amount of wildlife and nature would be disrupted with the construction of the option 2 relief road. I am also concerned that the Wetlands Trust carries too much influence and that the quality of life and views of our village and its residents appear to be held in low regard.

Potential new M40 junction, public consultations and budgets

The parish council has stated that the Bicester Garden Town team are undertaking feasibility studies in regards to a potential new junction for the M40. This may affect the design of any relief road and may even negate the need for the relief road at all. This option appears to be being ignored in a rush towards the relief road. During recent public consultations 334 responses were received in regards to the relief road options. Only 145 of these were local (43%). The other responses were dominated by views from outside the local area and in particular by one interest group, namely the Wetlands Trust. Again it appears that the views of the people who will actually be affected by the consequences of this relief road are being ignored and unconsidered. The proposed route 2 is also shown to be the most expensive which is at odds with it being safeguarded as I understand there is no current budget set for the project. Also if the relief road route was constructed the village would require investment as a result in regards to traffic control and flood prevention to deal with the consequences highlighted above. Would this be budgeted for or ignored!

In conclusion there appears to be an illogical rush to safeguard relief road route 2 despite related studies still being ongoing and no allocated budgets. It appears that the views of the residents of Wendlebury are an irrelevance and the village could be railroaded into suffering the consequences of this route despite accommodating many infrastructure projects over the last few years which caused great disruption to the village. I fully support the views of Wendlebury parish council and urge you to use your influence to defer the decisions around the proposed options until studies around a new M40 junction are complete and the views of the residents of the village are properly represented.

The noise and air quality impacts of traffic will be further assessed in the subsequent design stages and any necessary mitigation measures will be incorporated into the final design of the scheme.

Bicester Wetlands is designated as a Local Wildlife Site, whilst this designation does not have the same statutory protection as, for example a SSSI, such sites are still of importance for wildlife. The restoration and protection of wetland habitat is a high priority both nationally and locally. The presence of relatively good populations of wetland birds is an indicator of habitat in good condition and it is the conservation of the habitat which is the primary concern, though there are also specific legal and habitat management issues around individual bird species. Ecological considerations are a key part in determining the most suitable route alignment, but stakeholder responses including archaeology were also important considerations as well as the consultation results.

The need to seek to safeguard the road corridor is governed by the timing of the Local Plan Part 2 process. If an alignment is not safeguarded through CLP Part 2, the ability to deliver a key strategic link to support housing and employment growth in Bicester could be lost. However, it is recommended that progress with any design work is put on hold while the motorway junction is assessed.

At this early stage option 2 was identified as the most expensive in terms of construction costs. There are a number of costs that will be identified in more detail as a scheme is designed up, including utilities, land acquisition and mitigation. Mitigation would include measures for Wendlebury and any measures necessary for the flood plain. The scheme would be funded through developer contributions and central government funding bids.

Response from two members of the public (16th March 2016)

I am writing to you as a resident of Wendlebury to seek your support for a common-sense approach to what has become an illogical process driven by artificial time scales. The Parish Council have recently be informed that OCC are going to recommend route 2 which comes perilously close to my village. At the consultation stage held in the local pub it was explained to me by councillors that this would be the most expensive of the options. I am extremely concerned about this development and remain confused as to the rational for this recommendation.

I understand also there may be a new M40 junction which if built will negate the urgent requirement for a SE relief road, so surely that issue should be investigated first before blighting Wendlebury houses with yet another dual carriageway.

Also I am informed the recent public consultation on 3 options drew responses from 145 local residents and 334 from residents outside the local area and dominated by one interest group, The Wetlands Trust who objected to option 1 because it would impact on local wetlands. Please note these are not natural wetlands but overflow from a sewage treatment works. I would also like to hope that we as residents in this area have a somewhat greater importance to OCC than a few migrant birds and butterflies. They will always find a home somewhere else whereas I cannot as my village will have motorways on all three side and my house valueless!

Whilst I understand the need to protect wildlife the amount of countryside and wildlife that will be disrupted by route 2 will be at least if not larger than route 1.

The recent consultation also stated that route 2 was the most expensive so why the haste to lock it into the local plan.

There are many factors that are unknown to Wendlebury residents and provide grave concern to us all. How are we going to access Bicester, the M40, the A43, and already we are a recognised rat-run from the A43 to A34 missing junction 9 of the M40. What else will happen to our infrastructure. We have no paths, no lights and it is effectively a single track road through the village. School children and the old, daily have to dodge traffic which shouldn't be there and it will not be long before a fatality occurs. It can only get worse with even more major roads near to us. Residents thought the logical place to join the A43 would be the new roundabout at Vendee Drive. At least this would give us breathing space.

In summary in my opinion there is not a case for route 2 to be built and any further consultation must be with the new M40 junction in mind.

At this early stage option 2 was identified as the most expensive in terms of construction costs. There are a number of costs that will be identified in more detail as a scheme is designed up, including utilities, land acquisition and mitigation. The scheme would be funded through developer contributions and central government funding bids.

It is being recommended that design work on the perimeter road should be put on hold while the motorway junction is investigated, however if an alignment is not safeguarded through CLP Part 2, the ability to deliver a key strategic link to support housing and employment growth in Bicester could be lost.

Bicester Wetlands is designated as a Local Wildlife Site, whilst this designation does not have the same statutory protection as, for example a SSSI, such sites are still of importance for wildlife. The restoration and protection of wetland habitat is a high priority both nationally and locally. The recommendation has had to take into account a range of considerations over the years, including the issues for Wendlebury, ecology, archaeology, flood plain and many other matters as explained in the *Preliminary ecological appraisal, planning advice and engineering feasibility*

At this early stage option 2 was identified as the most expensive in terms of construction costs. There are a number of costs that will be identified in more detail as a scheme is designed up, including utilities, land acquisition and mitigation. If an alignment is not safeguarded through CLP Part 2, the ability to deliver a key strategic link to support housing and employment growth in Bicester could be lost.

Whilst these concerns are understood they are matters of detail and would be addressed during the design stages. In designing the junctions, considerations that would be taken into account include (but are not limited to): traffic flow, road safety, cost, engineering feasibility, land availability etc. Any impacts resulting from the scheme identified as requiring mitigation will be incorporated into the final scheme design. In the case of option 2, this could potentially include designing the junctions between the Wendlebury Road and the proposed perimeter road in such a way that traffic is deterred from using the Wendlebury Road.

