

Divisions Affected – Eynsham & Kidlington South

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE

8 MARCH 2021

CONSTRUCTION OF A PARK & RIDE CAR PARK PROVIDING 850 CAR PARKING SPACES, CYCLE SPACES, MOTORCYCLE SPACES, ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING POINTS, BUS SHELTERS, LANDSCAPING, EXTERNAL LIGHTING, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, TOILETS, SEATING, FENCING, HABITAT CREATION, DRAINAGE FEATURES, NEW ACCESS FROM CUCKOO LANE, NEW ROUNDABOUT WITH ACCESS ONTO A40, AN EASTBOUND BUS LANE APPROXIMATELY 6.5KM IN LENGTH FROM THE PARK & RIDE SITE TO THE A40 BRIDGE OVER THE DUKE'S CUT CANAL, TWO SECTIONS OF WESTBOUND BUS LANE (EACH APPROXIMATELY 500M IN LENGTH), NEW SHARED USE FOOTWAY/CYCLEWAY, WIDENING OF CASSINGTON NEW BRIDGE, JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS, NEW CROSSINGS, NEW FOOTBRIDGE ALONGSIDE CASSINGTON HALT BRIDGE, AND ASSOCIATED WORKS.

Report by Assistant Director for Strategic Infrastructure and Planning

Contact Officer: Emily Catcheside **Tel:** 07867 467 817

Location: Land West of Cuckoo Lane and Adjacent to the A40,
Eynsham, West Oxfordshire OX29 4PU

OCC Application No: R3.0057/19
WODC Application No: 19/01725/CC3REG
Cherwell Application No: 19/01095/ADJ

District Council Areas: West Oxfordshire and Cherwell

Applicant: Oxfordshire County Council

Application Received: 6 June 2019

Consultation Period: 13 June – 15 July 2019
26 November 2020 – 11 January 2021

Contents

Part 1- Facts and Background
Part 2 – Other Viewpoints
Part 3 – Relevant Planning Documents
Part 4 – Assessment and Conclusions

RECOMMENDATION

1. **Subject to the satisfaction of the Assistant Director of Strategic Infrastructure and Planning in consultation with the committee Chairman and Deputy Chairman that following the end of the current consultation period no new material considerations have arisen, it is RECOMMENDED that planning permission for R3.0057/19 be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Assistant Director of Strategic Infrastructure and Planning, to include those set out in Annex 1.**

Executive Summary

2. The report sets out the proposed development for which planning permission has been applied under application no. R3.0057/19. Having considered the report against the development plan and other material considerations including consultation responses and representations received it is recommended that subject to conditions to be determined by the Assistant Director of Strategic Infrastructure and Planning, and subject to no new material considerations arising during the open consultation period, that the application be approved.

PART 1- FACTS AND BACKGROUND

Location (See Plan 1 and Annex)

1. The application site comprises circa 6.5km of the A40 broadly located between Eynsham in the west and the Duke's Cut canal and railway bridges in the east. Additionally, 7.7ha of land to the north west of Eynsham is proposed for a new park and ride (P&R) development. The majority of the application site, including the site for the proposed P&R, lies within the district of West Oxfordshire and the parishes of Eynsham and Cassington. The final circa 2km stretch of the east bound bus lane lies within the district of Cherwell and the parishes of Yarnton and Gosford and Water Eaton.

Site and Setting

Proposed P&R Site

2. The proposed site for the P&R is located towards the western extent of the application site area and extends northwards and westwards from the junction between the A40 and Cuckoo Lane on land that is currently in agricultural use. The proposed P&R site is bound to the east by Cuckoo Lane and to the south by the A40. The application area has an irregular shape to the north and west which cuts through what is currently agricultural fields interspersed with a number of trees and hedgerows. The north east corner of the application site lies immediately adjacent to an existing substation that takes access from Cuckoo Lane.
3. Topographically, the proposed P&R site is gently sloping from 80m AOD in the north, to 70m AOD in south, east and west.

4. The nearest residential properties to the proposed P&R site are Evenlode Farm immediately to the east and on the other side of Cuckoo Lane, Derrymerrye Farm on Old Witney Road, and residential and commercial properties that take access from Elm Place on the other side of the A40, including the Evenlode Pub. Other farms and commercial buildings are located further north on Cuckoo Lane including a commercial premises and Acre Hill Farm.
5. Eynsham Wood, a 5.36ha Woodland Trust Site lies to the east of Cuckoo Lane and extends north and eastward from the junction between Cuckoo Lane and the A40. Eynsham Wood is also designated as Local Green Space in the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan. Vincents Wood, an area of Ancient and Semi Natural Woodland lies circa 900m north west of the proposed P&R site.

A40 Works

6. The application area extends eastwards from the proposed P&R site broadly along the linear route of the A40, with a number of spurs to allow for junction improvement works, ancillary development, and construction compounds.
7. Starting in the west, the planning application boundary incorporates the layby to the west of Eynsham to allow for a new roundabout junction into the proposed P&R and includes within it the A40 junctions with Elm Place, Old Witney Road, Witney Road, and Cuckoo Lane as well as the existing bus stops either side of the A40 at the Evenlode Public House. It continues eastwards past the Esso Garage at Eynsham to the Eynsham Roundabout (A40/B4449) where approach spurs are included to allow for junction improvement works at this location. Further east, the site boundary is extended northwards at the site of Cassington New Bridge to take in land required for proposed widening works before continuing eastwards to the traffic light junction at Cassington and incorporating existing bus laybys in this location. Here the application boundary includes the approach routes from Eynsham Road and Cassington Road to allow for junction improvement works. The application boundary incorporates the junction with Horsemere Lane further east, as well as areas of land to the north and south of the A40 at Cassington Halt Bridge to enable the proposals for a new footbridge at this location. The application boundary continues eastwards, taking in the junctions that allow access to and from Cassington Quarry and Worton Farm Waste Management Complex as well as an existing layby on the south side of the A40 slightly further east. The application boundary then continues in a broadly linear fashion, heading eastwards until the Duke's Cut bridges. Just prior to the bridges, the application boundary incorporates an area of land to the north of the A40. The Duke's Cut bridges mark the eastern extent of the application site area, although the A40 itself continues eastwards until it meets the Wolvercote roundabout.

8. In addition to the existing A40 road, the application area includes existing footway/cycleways that run along the length of the road on both sides. There are also a number of footpaths and bridleways that cross the A40 or other junctions in the vicinity of the development, including:
 - Bridleway 206/11, which begins at Cuckoo Lane and heads northeast along the boundary of Millennium Wood.
 - Bridleway 206/31 which connect Eynsham Village and the Esso Garage to the north of Eynsham via the A40.
 - Bridleway 206/9/10 and footpath 206/10/20 which join together across the A40 at the eastern end of Eynsham.
 - Footpath 152/5 which crosses the A40 between Eynsham and Cassington, providing access to a route along the River Evenlode.
 - Horsemere Lane is currently a restricted byway (152/4/10), which allows right of way for pedestrians, horse riders, cyclists and non-mechanically propelled vehicles. Horsemere Lane connects to the A40 approximately 700m to the east of the Cassington traffic lights junction.
 - Footpath 152/2/10, which connects across the A40 to footpath 420/18/10 to the east of Cassington.
 - Bridleway 420/21/30, which heads north from the A40 at Oxey Mead.
 - A footpath (229/11) at Duke's Cut.
9. There are currently four existing bus stops within the site boundary (at Evenlode Public House in Eynsham and at Cassington).
10. The site boundary includes extensive areas of grass verge, road-side hedgerow, shrubs, trees, and other vegetation. The A40 passes the settlements of Eynsham and Cassington as well as a number of more dispersed residential and commercial properties. Large parts of the site are bounded to the north and south by agricultural fields, however at the eastern end the A40 lies to the south of a series of lakes (former sand and gravel workings) on the approach to Duke's Cut.
11. The City of Oxford Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) was established in 2010 due to exceedances of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) levels. The AQMA is located approximately 500m to the east of the site boundary. The Witney AQMA is circa 3km to the west of the application site and the Botley AQMA is circa 4.5km to the south. Both of these AQMAs were also established due to exceedances of the annual mean NO₂ objective.

12. The site itself does not lie within any statutory environmental designations, however there are a number of key sites within close proximity. Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (also designated as Pixey and Yarnton Meads Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)) lies adjacent to the A40 at the eastern end of the application site. A further six SSSIs are located within 2km of the site, including Cassington Meadows SSSI which is approximately 200m to the south of the proposed bus lane, also lying within Oxford Meadows SAC. These sites are designated as they support Lowland Hay Meadows habitat. The Oxford Meadows SAC is also the only site within the UK to hold Creeping Marshwort.
13. Local designations include the Cassington to Yarnton Gravel Pits Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and East Extension, which lie adjacent to the A40 towards the eastern end of the application site.
14. Eynsham Conservation Area is located approximately 700m to the south of the proposed P&R Site. Eynsham village also contains a number of listed buildings, the closest of which is the Grade II Listed Bartholomew School which is located approximately 460m to the south of the application site. Cassington Conservation Area, which also contains a number of Listed Buildings, is bounded to the south by the A40. The nearest Listed Building to the application site in Cassington is Reynolds Farm, which is sited approximately 110m to the north. The Grade I listed Church of St Peter is located 170m north of the proposed bus lane in Cassington. The Oxford Canal Conservation Area follows the route of the canal beyond the eastern extent of the application boundary. Duke's Cut Lock near the scheme's eastern end is Grade II Listed. There are a number of other listed buildings located to the north and south of the A40. The nearest listed buildings to works outside of the highway boundary are Thames Mead Farmhouse and Bell Cottage, located approximately 390m north east of Cassington Halt Bridge.
15. The proposed site for the P&R is located entirely within Flood Zone 1, the lowest category of flood risk. However, the route of the A40 and proposed works along it are located across all flood zones (Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3).
16. The majority of the proposed A40 bus lane and improvement works lie within the Oxford Green Belt, which starts to the east of Eynsham Village and extends eastwards towards Oxford. The proposed site of the P&R lies to the west of and outside of the Green Belt designation.
17. The proposed P&R is sited within the indicative boundary for the Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village (OCGV) Strategic Location for Growth in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan, which is allocated to accommodate 2,200 homes and 40ha of business land amongst other uses. The West Eynsham Strategic Development Area, allocated in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan for 1,000 homes and supporting infrastructure, is located opposite the proposed P&R site on the south side of the A40.

Planning History

18. There is no planning history on the application site. However, there are currently two major applications pending determination at West Oxfordshire District Council (WODC) that are within close proximity to the proposed P&R site and are material to the application.
19. Application 20/01734/OUT, submitted to WODC on 3rd July 2020, seeks outline permission with means of access for a mixed-use garden village, comprising residential, retail, food and drink, health and community facilities, hotel, class B1, B2 and B8 employment uses, education provision, burial ground, public open space with sports pitches together with ancillary facilities, landscaping and associated infrastructure and works at land north of the A40 between Barnard Gate and the Eynsham Roundabout. The application area borders the northern and western edges of the proposed P&R site and encompasses a large area of land to the north of the A40. This application has not yet been determined by WODC.
20. Application 20/03379/OUT, submitted to WODC on 17th December 2020, seeks outline permission (with all matters reserved) for residential development together with open space, landscaping, parking and all associated infrastructure and engineering works at land west of Derrymerrye Farm, Old Witney Road, Eynsham. The application area includes the A40 and the site area for the proposed P&R roundabout, as well as the existing layby to the west of Eynsham. This application has not yet been determined by WODC.

Details of Proposed Development

Overview

21. The proposal comprises three key elements: A new P&R facility, a new roundabout providing access to the P&R from the A40, and the construction of bus lanes and improvement works to the A40.

Construction of P&R

22. The proposed P&R would comprise the following:
 - A new 3-arm roundabout from the A40 to the south (further details below)
 - Bus circulation routes including a future bus link to Salt Cross Garden Village in the north west corner of the site
 - A secondary vehicular access from Cuckoo Lane with details over whether this access is entry-only or two-way to be confirmed at a later date
 - A network of pedestrian and cycle paths linking the P&R to the A40 east and west, Salt Cross Garden Village site (via three proposed links in the north and west of the site), and Cuckoo Lane in the east
 - Parking for 850 vehicles, comprising 760 standard parking bays, 43 disability spaces, 43 electric charging spaces, and 4 combined disability/electric charging spaces

- 10 motorcycle parking spaces
 - 80 'Sheffield' style bicycle stands
 - 7 bus shelters and bays
 - A toilet block
 - A dedicated pick up/drop off zone
 - Signage, lighting columns, street furniture and CCTV
23. It is proposed to establish two areas of wet woodland in the south western and south eastern corners of the P&R site which it is stated would serve a dual biodiversity/surface water management purpose. The remainder of the P&R site would be landscaped with a mixture of native deciduous woodland, ornamental trees, and perimeter hedgerows to provide visual screening and shade. A series of swales and rain gardens would be installed throughout the P&R to manage surface water.
24. It is anticipated that the development would operate 24 hours a day and would enable the operation of 8-14 bus services per hour in 2021 and 11-18 services per hour by 2031.

P&R Roundabout and Access Arrangements

25. The proposed P&R would be accessed via a new three-arm roundabout located to the south on the A40, with three lane approaches from the east and west. Each approach would have a dedicated lane marked for the P&R and two lanes for traffic continuing past the roundabout in either direction. Buses exiting the P&R site to head eastwards towards Oxford would avoid the P&R roundabout to join the A40 directly via a dedicated bus lane that extends to Duke's Cut. The roundabout would be lit on all approaches and would be planted as a wildflower meadow.
26. A signalised Toucan crossing over the A40 for pedestrians and cyclists is proposed approximately 50m to the west of the Cuckoo Lane junction and would incorporate a central island. Informal crossings over Cuckoo Lane at its junction with the A40 are also proposed. Other works in the immediate vicinity of the proposed P&R include the removal of the eastbound bus stop at Evenlode Public House (which would effectively be replaced by the P&R), the construction of a new bus layby and shelter on both sides of the A40 at the Witney Road junction and the installation of a second signalised pedestrian crossing point approximately 60m to the east of the Witney Road bus stops where the existing bridleway 206/31 meets the A40.

Bus Lane & Junction Improvement Works

27. It is proposed to construct approximately 6.5km of eastbound bus lane from the P&R to the west of Duke's Cut canal and railway bridges on the north side of the existing A40 carriageway. The bus lane would be approximately 3.5m in width. Additionally, a new footway/cycleway and grass verge would be constructed immediately adjacent to the new bus lane within the highway boundary.

28. Two sections of westbound bus lane are also proposed, on the approach to the Cassington signalised junction and on the approach to the Eynsham Roundabout. At these locations existing paths on the south side of the A40 would also be improved.
29. New bus laybys and shelters would be constructed to the west of the Eynsham Roundabout along with a Pegasus crossing to cater for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians, which would have the effect of linking Lower Road and Hanborough Road via the existing bridleway.
30. Further east, the eastbound bus stop and layby at Cassington would be retained, and an additional westbound bus stop would be installed to the west of Cassington Road in front of the Mercedes Benz dealership. The Cassington Signals would also be upgraded and redesigned to accommodate the bus lane. An additional eastbound bus stop would be installed at Horsemere Lane and the lane itself would be closed to motorised vehicles. No westbound bus layby equivalent is proposed in this location.
31. Just west of the Duke's Cut canal, the proposed dedicated bus lane would merge back to join the existing eastbound carriageway of the A40 onwards towards Wolvercote.

Shared Footway/Cycleway Route

32. As mentioned above, a dedicated shared use footway/cycleway route would be constructed alongside the eastbound bus lane extending from the proposed P&R through to Duke's Cut along the length of the A40. The cycleway would be 3.5m in width and would be separated from the bus lane by a 1.5m grass verge. The applicant states the route would be mostly uninterrupted other than at occasional points where vehicles would be required to cross the route to access residential and commercial premises. Such locations would be marked by tactile paving.
33. At the Eynsham Roundabout and other potential points of conflict along the route between pedestrians/cyclists and cars, such as the access to the Cassington Quarry and Worton Farm Waste Management Complex, the applicant proposes to install tactile paving where the footway/cycleway meets the road and to retain the existing central islands.
34. Just west of the Duke's Cut canal, the combined footway/cycleway would merge back to join the existing footpath.

Cassington New Bridge

35. Where the A40 crosses over the River Evenlode via Cassington New Bridge, the applicant proposes to extend the existing bridge structure on its northern side to provide continuation of the combined eastbound cycleway/footway.

Cassington Halt Bridge

36. The applicant states that it would not be possible to provide a cycleway/footway on the northern side of the A40 where it crosses the former railway via Cassington Halt Bridge due to the narrow width of the existing structure. It is therefore proposed to construct a new footbridge that will enable a dedicated route for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the railway 2m to the north of the existing A40 structure.

Construction/Operation

37. It is proposed to locate the main construction compound at the proposed P&R site adjacent to the A40 and Cuckoo Lane. This compound would be circa 2ha in size. A secondary construction compound would be located at Cassington New Bridge. Additionally there would be further 'satellite' compounds and mobile welfare facilities set up along the A40 covering an area of approximately 5.35ha in total.

Environmental Impact Assessment

38. The application is supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and an Environmental Statement (ES) was submitted with the application. This covers the range of potential environmental impacts of the proposal. A summary of the findings can be found in Annex 3.

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening

39. The proposal has been screened in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) to establish whether the development, by itself or in-combination with other plans or projects, would have any significant effects on the protected features of any habitats site, including the Oxford Meadows SAC. In undertaking this assessment, the LPA has consulted with Natural England and has taken into account the representations made by Natural England. The screening assessment concluded that an appropriate assessment was required on the basis that the applicant's HRA noted that without taking mitigation into account for the pathways of air quality, flood risk and water quality a likely significant effect on the SAC could not be dismissed. The County Council concludes that the development would not adversely affect the integrity of the Special Area of Conservation. The screening assessment and appropriate assessment are included at Annex 2.

PART 2 – OTHER VIEWPOINTS

40. There were two periods of public consultation, the second of which resulted from the submission of additional information, including environmental information, and amendments to address a number of matters principally flood risk mitigation, connectivity and accessibility to the P&R site, drainage, landscaping, and the mix of parking spaces. The full text of the consultation

responses can be seen on the e-planning website¹, using the reference R3.0057/19. These are also summarised in Annex 4 to this report. Additional information was submitted by the applicant in February 2021, including an updated arboriculture impact assessment and a re-calculated biodiversity metric, therefore at the time the application is presented to the Planning & Regulation Committee a third period of consultation will be underway. Any comments received prior to the meeting will be reported verbally to the Committee.

41. A total of 59 third party representations expressing concern or objection were received during the first round of consultation. These representations were from local residents, interested organisations, councillors, and developers/landowners associated with areas allocated for development to the north and west of Eynsham. During the second round of consultation on amendments to the proposals and additional environmental information, updated/revised comments were received from 8 original responders; 7 of whom maintained their objection, and 1 of whom removed their objection. Two new comments were also received during the second round of consultation from local residents both raising concerns or objections to the proposals. The points raised are summarised in Annex 5.

PART 3 – RELEVANT PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Relevant planning documents and legislation (see Policy Annex to the committee papers)

42. In accordance with Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, planning applications must be decided in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Development Plan Documents

43. The majority of the application site is in West Oxfordshire, including the entirety of the proposed P&R site. However, the eastern part of the A40 affected by the scheme falls within Cherwell District and therefore policies from both District Councils' Local Plans apply. The application is not located within Oxford City, however Policy M1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 is relevant as it is related to access to Oxford City Centre by public transport and cycling. Additionally, the site falls within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and therefore the Minerals and Waste Local Plan also applies as set out below.
44. The Development Plan for this area comprises:
- West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 (WOLP)
 - Cherwell Local Plan 1996 (CLP 1996) (saved policies)
 - Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 (CLP)
 - Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (OMWCS)
 - Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031 (ENP)

¹Click here to view application [R3.0057/19](#)

Other Policy Documents & Material Considerations

45. Other documents that are relevant to determining this application include:
- National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF)
 - National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
 - Oxford Local Plan 2036 (OLP)
 - Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031 (LTP4)
 - A40 Science Transit Stage 2: Options Assessment Report 2017 (A40 Science Transit OAR)

Emerging Policy Documents

46. Cassington Neighbourhood Plan – The Neighbourhood Area for the Cassington Neighbourhood Plan was designated on 8th December 2020 and includes part of the application site within it. No draft/emerging plan document has yet been published therefore the Plan carries no weight in decision-making.
47. The Salt Cross Area Action Plan Pre-Submission Version August 2020 (Salt Cross AAP). This document seeks to provide detailed guidance for the delivery of the Salt Cross Garden Village allocation, which includes the proposed P&R. It was published in August 2020 and subject to a period of public consultation from 28th August to 23rd October 2020. WODC formally submitted the AAP to the Planning Inspectorate on 10th February 2021 for independent examination. Given that the policies within the AAP are at an advanced stage of preparation, they are considered to carry weight in the decision-making process.

Relevant Development Plan Policies

48. The WOLP policies most relevant to the consideration of this application are:
- Policy OS1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 - Policy OS2: Locating development in the right places
 - Policy OS3: Prudent use of Natural Resources
 - Policy OS4: High Quality Design
 - Policy H1: Amount and Distribution of Housing
 - Policy T1: Sustainable Transport
 - Policy T2: Highway Improvement Schemes
 - Policy T3: Public transport, walking and cycling
 - Policy T4: Parking Provision
 - Policy EH2: Landscape Character
 - Policy EH3: Biodiversity and geodiversity
 - Policy EH4: Public realm and green infrastructure
 - Policy EH7: Flood Risk
 - Policy EH8: Environmental Protection
 - Policy EH9: Historic Environment
 - Policy EH10: Conservation Areas
 - Policy EH11: Listed Buildings

- Policy EH13: Historic Landscape Character
 - Policy EH16: Non-designated heritage assets
 - Policy EW1: Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village Strategic Location for Growth (2,200 homes)
 - Policy EW2: West Eynsham Strategic Development Area (1,000 homes)
 - Policy EW10: Eynsham – Woodstock Sub-Area Strategy
49. The CLP 1996 saved policies most relevant to this development are:
- ENV1: Development likely to cause detrimental levels of pollution
50. The CLP policies most relevant to this development are:
- PSD1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
 - SLE4: Improved transport and connections
 - ESD1: Mitigating and adapting to climate change
 - ESD3: Sustainable construction
 - ESD6: Sustainable flood risk management
 - ESD7: Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)
 - ESD8: Water resources
 - ESD9: Protection of Oxford Meadows SAC
 - ESD10: Protection and enhancement of biodiversity and the natural environment
 - ESD13: Local landscape protection and enhancement
 - ESD14: Oxford Green Belt
 - ESD15: The Character of the Built and Historic Environment
 - ESD17: Green Infrastructure
51. The ENP policies most relevant to this development are:
- ENP2: Design
 - ENP4: Green Infrastructure – The Setting of New Developments
 - ENP4(a): Enhancing Biodiversity
 - ENP7: Sustainable Transport
 - ENP8: Connected Place – Integration of New Developments with the Village
 - ENP9: Parking
 - ENP13: Trees
 - ENP14: Sustainable Growth
52. The MWCS policy most relevant to this development is:
- M8: Mineral Safeguarding

Relevant Emerging Policies

53. Relevant emerging policies from the Salt Cross AAP are:
- Policy 13: Movement and Connectivity Key Design Principles
 - Policy 14: Active and Healthy Travel
 - Policy 15: Public Transport
 - Policy 17: Access and Connectivity

PART 4 – ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUSIONS

Comments of the Assistant Director for Strategic Infrastructure and Planning

54. The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 10), which is supported by policy OS1 of the WOLP and PSD1 of the CLP. This means taking a positive approach to development and approving an application which accords with the development plan without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
55. All planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The key planning policies are set out above and discussed below in accordance with the key planning issues.
56. The key planning issues are:
- i. The Principle of the Development
 - ii. Access, Travel & Movement
 - iii. P&R Design & Integration with the Surrounding Area
 - iv. Impact on Trees & Hedgerows
 - v. Landscape & Visual Impacts
 - vi. Biodiversity
 - vii. Air Quality, Noise & Vibration
 - viii. Flood Risk
 - ix. Historic Environment
 - x. Green Belt
 - xi. Mineral Safeguarding

The Principle of the Development

57. The A40 is a major national east-west route connecting London to South West Wales. Locally, the A40 also provides the main route into the centre of Oxford from the western part of the county. The applicant states that there is a significant daily build-up of traffic along the A40, particularly at peak hours, between Oxford and Witney. Stationary or rolling queues can extend for the whole 11km length of the road between Witney and Oxford eastbound in the morning peak and for large lengths of the road in both directions in the evening peak. Additionally, it is noted that significant housing and economic

growth proposed in and around Eynsham Village (as set out in Policy H1 of the WOLP), will place additional pressure on the strategic route.

58. The application site is located predominantly within the Eynsham-Woodstock sub-area of West Oxfordshire District. The planning strategy for the Eynsham-Woodstock sub-area, as set out in Policy EW10 of the WOLP, states that proposals within the sub-area should be consistent with a number of criteria, including:

“seeking to alleviate traffic congestion issues on the A40 including through the provision of a new park and ride site at Eynsham and associated bus priority measures along the A40 as part of the Science Transit project”.

59. Additionally, Policy T2 of the WOLP, which sets out the highway improvement schemes planned for the plan period states that:

“The Council will continue to work in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council in relation to securing improvements to the A40 between Witney and Oxford. This will include the provision of an eastbound bus lane in conjunction with the proposed park and ride at Eynsham to help address congestion in the short to medium term, together with longer term improvements including the provision of a westbound bus lane from Oxford to Eynsham and dualling of the A40 between Witney and Eynsham”.

60. Policy EW1 of the WOLP, which sets the parameters for growth within the Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village, states that the AAP covering the allocation should include provision for a new park and ride site (1,000 spaces) with associated bus priority lane along the A40. The Submission Version of the Salt Cross AAP further includes a series of policies on transport and movement, which collectively require development at Salt Cross to fund, support and integrate with the A40 Corridor Strategy which includes the proposed development as well as additional measures along the A40 (emerging AAP policies 14, 15 and 17). Policy 15 of the AAP notes that this planning application includes an 850-space car park, whilst the Local Plan Policy allows for 1,000 spaces. Policy 15 of the AAP therefore requires consideration to be given through the Salt Cross Garden Village proposals for future expansion of the P&R.

61. The proposed scheme (known as “Science Transit”) forms the first phase of the wider A40 Transport Strategy. The A40 Transport Strategy as a whole supports the measures set out in LTP4 and proposes a number of schemes to bring congestion relief to the A40, including the delivery of further sections of the A40 westbound bus lane, the extension of the A40 dual carriageway from Witney to the proposed P&R, and the provision of a cycle link joining the A40 to National Cycle Network route 5 along the Oxford Canal at Duke’s Cut. The focus of the strategy is to make improvements to public transport service provision to encourage the transfer of trips from private car to bus, thereby reducing congestion levels for all vehicles. The Strategy also expects the improvement to journey times along the A40 to help stimulate areas of economic growth and innovation within Oxford and West Oxfordshire.

62. The current application seeks to alleviate traffic congestion and address the needs of public transport through the delivery of a new P&R site at Eynsham as well as the provision of a dedicated eastbound bus lane between the P&R and Oxford and walking/cycling links. The proposal emerged as the applicant's preferred option as set out in the Science Transit OAR, which also considered other measures including travel planning, greater emphasis on walking/cycling and improvements to the B4044 such as the removal of or improvements to the Swinford Toll Bridge. These options were dismissed due to a combination of land ownership constraints and ineffectiveness at making a substantial difference to the problems on the A40.
63. The application states that longer term measures were also considered and discounted as part of the Science Transit OAR due to a mixture of issues relating to cost-benefit analysis, engineering issues, feasibility and safety. These options included the provision of new bus lanes, tidal flow lanes or bus lanes, re-opening the Witney to Oxford railway line, guided busways, trams, other rapid transit options, upgrading to a dual carriageway, and retaining the single carriageway but making provision of additional traffic lanes. It is stated by the applicant that the preferred option as proposed provides the opportunity to considerably improve efficiency, reliability, frequency and the number of destinations in Oxford that are served by public transport and forms a key part of the A40 Transport Strategy and contributes towards the objectives of LTP4.
64. It is noted that many local residents and interested parties who have commented on the application have raised concerns about the principle of the scheme, including its lack of ambition and value for money. Comments have been received to suggest a more radical and innovative solution is required to address the issues along the A40 rather than relying on what are perceived to be outdated engineering solutions or that the scheme will be ineffective without other supporting measures. Several respondents promoted alternative options, ranging from dualling, rapid transit, and relocating the P&R to other locations amongst other suggestions.
65. However, it is clear that alternative solutions have been considered by the applicant and that the proposal as submitted is strongly supported by the WOLP, LTP4 and A40 Transport Strategy and that both the P&R and the eastbound bus lane elements form a key component of planned growth within the Eynsham-Woodstock sub-area. Therefore, subject to a consideration of the more detailed matters set out below, it is recommended that the application should be supported as a matter of principle.

Access, Travel & Movement

66. Policy T1 of the WOLP expects priority to be given to locating development in areas where the need to travel by private car can be minimised, and where opportunities for walking, cycling and the use of public transport can be maximised. This should apply particularly where it would help to reduce traffic congestion on the routes around Oxford and the AQMA areas including at Witney. Amongst other things, policy T3 of the WOLP supports a mode shift to

sustainable and active modes of travel. It states that WODC will continue to work with partners, including the County Council, to increase the use of bus, rail and community transport, facilities and information including specific schemes identified in the LTP, and to provide safe and convenient travel within and between the network of towns and villages in the District particularly for pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users, and users of public and community transport.

67. Policy T2 of the WOLP states that all development will be required to demonstrate safe access and an acceptable degree of impact on the local highway network. Policy T4 of the WOLP expects development proposals which significantly increase car parking demand to make appropriate public car parking provision that accords with the County Council's adopted parking standards.
68. CLP policy SLE4 states that Cherwell District Council will support the implementation of the Local Transport Plan to deliver connections and support modal shift. Development should facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling. Encouragement will be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. Policy ESD17 also supports measures to improve sustainable connectivity between sites in accordance with policies on supporting modal shift (SLE4).
69. The application site does not fall within Oxford City, however OLP policy M1 is a material consideration. It states that the City Council will work with the County Council to improve the ease and quality of access into and around Oxford by public transport by improving the capacity and attractiveness of park and ride, particularly the development of remote sites close to county towns.
70. ENP policy ENP7 expects all new development to be accessed from existing main roads, including the A40, and not through existing village roads. Amongst other things, the policy also encourages the use of alternatives to the private car. ENP policy ENP8 in part expects new development to provide safe storage for bicycles and, where appropriate, motorised mobility vehicles.
71. Multiple comments were received from interested parties during the consultation process expressing concerns about the impact of the proposal on highway safety, including at junctions, and that the development would not change or would worsen traffic congestion along the route. Objections to the proposal were also received on the basis that the development would not support a mode shift to cycling and walking, would increase safety risk to cyclists, and would encourage car travel to Eynsham.
72. The application has been reviewed by the Highway Authority and it is noted that there are no objections to the proposal from a highway perspective subject to conditions. In terms of traffic flow, the Transport Development Control Officer comments that despite the capacity of junctions typically worsening by 2031 compared to the 2018 base, once the junction enhancements are in place there would be a clear improvement compared to

the same years without enhancements. It is also stated that the modelling shows a worst-case scenario that does not take into account the mode shift from car to P&R and bus or demand management measures being implemented in Oxford. It is concluded that the P&R development would ultimately provide a net benefit to the operation of the A40 between Eynsham and Oxford.

73. The Transport Development Control Officer considers the proposals are likely to increase the use of sustainable transport in future years, with the P&R anticipated to operate 18 services per hour by 2031. However, it is noted that waiting facilities at the P&R and bus stops along the route should be high quality and should provide cycle parking facilities and real time information, details of which should be secured by condition.
74. In terms of the impact on pedestrians and cyclists, the Transport Development Control Officer comments that three additional signalised crossings are proposed between the P&R and Eynsham, two of which will be Pegasus crossings, designed specifically for equestrian use. These crossings are considered to be beneficial to the safety of residents of Eynsham. Two new uncontrolled crossings are also proposed to enable P&R linkages across the A40. Whilst pedestrians would not have priority at these junctions, they maintain good permeability and are deemed acceptable in safety terms, given the safety record for existing uncontrolled crossings on the A40.
75. The proposed shared footway/cycleway along the A40 is off-carriageway and therefore beneficial to users. The Transport Development Control Officer states that the route is in accordance with the County Council's Walking & Cycling Design Standards. The provision of 80 covered cycle parking spaces at the P&R is supported as this is likely to encourage bus users to cycle to the P&R rather than travel by car.
76. The most significant effect on pedestrians and cyclists would occur during the construction period due to the temporary closure of foot/cycleways, however this impact would be limited in duration and could be managed through the provision of alternative temporary routes. In the long term, the risks of severance, fear/intimidation, and accidents to walkers and cyclists that may arise due to the small increase in large vehicles (buses), would be outweighed by improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure through controlled crossing points and widened carriageway facilities.
77. Turning to the P&R element of the proposals, the Transport Development Control Officer supports the proposed layout and circulation arrangements and considers the provision of parking and bus stands to be appropriate. It is noted that there are some longer straight sections of road within the P&R which should be subject to speed management measures and details of these are requested to be submitted for approval via condition. Additionally, it is recommended that the cycle parking provision and internal pedestrian/cycle routes should be delivered in advance of the P&R becoming operational. These are matters that could be controlled through a condition on any planning permission issued.

78. The proposed P&R access has been subject to a road safety audit which demonstrates there should be no impediment to planning permission being granted on highway safety grounds.
79. Overall, the highway authority concludes that the development would provide a benefit to the operation of the A40 and would allow for further improvements in the future. It is stated that the principle of the development is welcomed as a great benefit to the transport network by enabling faster journeys from western parts of Oxfordshire by sustainable modes. The proposed P&R would have the potential to capture single occupancy car journeys being made to Oxford and the bus lane would provide faster and more reliable journey times.
80. The Transport Development Control Officer has requested a number of conditions as outlined in the preceding paragraphs as well as the submission for approval of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) prior to commencement of the development. Subject to the inclusion of these conditions on any planning permission granted, the development is considered to be acceptable in terms of highway impacts and movement by all modes and is therefore in accordance with development plan policies that relate to these matters.

P&R Design and Integration with the Surrounding Area

81. Taken together, policies OS4 of the WOLP, ESD15 of the CLP, and ENP2 of the ENP support high design quality in new developments that respect the historic, architectural and landscape character of the locality, contribute to local distinctiveness and, where possible, enhance the character and quality of the surroundings.
82. Policy EH4 of the WOLP supports the protection of existing areas of public space and green infrastructure and requires developers to consider integrating green infrastructure and areas of open space into developments. Policy ENP4 of the ENP states that all new developments should integrate all aspects of design, connectivity and the natural environment. Consideration should be given to the setting of new development and the relationship between the village and the countryside. This should be achieved through appropriate landscaping and planting, protecting green infrastructure, and providing open space.
83. Policy OS2 of the WOLP sets out that development at Eynsham should be of a proportionate and appropriate scale to its context, complement the existing scale and pattern of development, be compatible with adjoining uses, have safe vehicular access, not be at risk of flooding or likely to increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, conserve the natural and historic environment and protect the local landscape setting of settlements. Policies ENP8 and ENP14 of the ENP taken together expect development to protect the character and community of Eynsham and to ensure the village is connected and integrated with new developments.

84. As set out elsewhere in this report, the siting of a P&R in the location proposed forms part of the overall planning strategy for the Eynsham-Woodstock sub-area and is therefore supported in the proposed location as a matter of principle. The design of the P&R site is functional and characterised by large areas of surface parking, however it has been designed to locate the majority of the built structures (e.g. bus-stands, toilets and seating areas) at the north and centre of the site and most distant from the existing settlement at Eynsham. The applicant states that the scheme would be built out using materials that respond to the local character, including Yorkstone flag and sett paving around toilets and seating areas laid in a traditional pattern. Granite effect concrete would also be utilised in tarmacked areas. It is recommended that details of all proposed built structures including bus shelters and toilet blocks are required to be submitted and approved prior to construction as well as all materials to be used in the built development. This could be achieved through suitably worded conditions on any planning permission granted.
85. Lighting would be focused in the north and centre of the P&R site nearest to buildings, bus stands, and waiting areas as well as at the junction with the A40. The applicant states that lighting for the remainder of the site would be located on the perimeter with lanterns rotated so that light is directed inwards to reduce light spill into surrounding areas. A lux contour plan has been submitted with the application, which shows that light spill from the P&R site would be retained within the development and would not have an impact on the surrounding properties. However, detailed lighting proposals have not been submitted and it is therefore recommended that these are secured through condition to ensure that no adverse effects will be experienced by existing or future occupants.
86. The site would be screened around its perimeter through the planting of woodland and hedgerows, and the overall appearance of the site would be softened through the introduction of swales, wildflower meadows, and ornamental trees. Areas of public realm would be incorporated into the site, connected by shared use footways and cycleways and this approach is generally supported. Once the screening features have become established, it is concluded that the impact of the development on the surrounding area would be reduced as far as possible, whilst enabling the planned development to come forward.
87. It is noted that The Woodland Trust have raised a concern about the introduction of new connections into Eynsham Wood, located on the opposite side of Cuckoo Lane due to the costs associated with managing increased visitors. The development does not propose any new recreational routes into the wood therefore it is not expected that the P&R would generate increased recreation into the Woodland Trust site.

88. During the first round of consultation, concerns were raised through consultation responses and representations that the scheme, as originally submitted, did not provide appropriate access for pedestrians and cyclists from the OCGV site, allocated through policy EW1 of the WOLP, into the P&R. Stagecoach also objected to the proposals on the basis that the scheme did not provide provision for a bus link through to the OCGV, which would enable buses to serve the garden village as well as create the conditions for longer term services towards Hanborough Station.
89. Following these comments, the application was amended to address these concerns. The revised P&R layout now includes provision for a direct two-way bus link between the P&R and the OCGV allocation to the north, as well as perimeter shared-use footway/cycleway links connecting the P&R along anticipated desire lines into the future garden village development. These connections align with the outline planning application for the garden village (application ref. 20/01734/OUT) which is currently pending determination by West Oxfordshire District Council. Following these amendments, it is noted that Stagecoach were able to withdraw their objection and offer support to the proposals.
90. Although the proposals for the garden village are not yet determined, the application demonstrates that connectivity between the P&R and the strategic growth area would be achieved and therefore the development is considered acceptable in this regard.
91. Concerns were also raised during the first round of consultation that the P&R roundabout proposal would prejudice the access strategy for the West Eynsham Strategic Development Area (SDA), allocated through policy EW2 of the WOLP. In particular concerns were raised that the 3-arm roundabout design would not be capable of being upgraded to include a southern fourth arm into the SDA and that non-motorised access between the P&R and the SDA had not been designed into the scheme.
92. In November 2020, the applicant submitted an amended P&R roundabout design along with illustrative drawings and a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit to demonstrate that the development would not prejudice the future delivery of a southern fourth arm into the West Eynsham SDA. The Transport Development Control Officer has confirmed that WODC and Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) jointly commissioned a report on the access strategy for the West Eynsham SDA which concluded that an additional arm from the P&R access roundabout was a viable option subject to further consideration of the impact on the existing layby. The Road Safety Audit submitted by the applicant for this application identified one issue related to the fourth arm which would need to be addressed should this arm be implemented in the future, however the current proposals would not prejudice this matter being addressed at the appropriate time. Accordingly, the proposal is no longer considered to prejudice the access strategy for the West Eynsham SDA and therefore this issue should not be an impediment to planning permission being granted

93. The application has not been amended to include a pedestrian/cyclist crossing over the proposed P&R roundabout to serve the future development at West Eynsham SDA, and some representations continue to comment that this is a missed opportunity. However, the scheme would not prejudice a crossing coming forward at a later date, either as part of the West Eynsham SDA development proposals or as part of the wider A40 Transport Strategy works and therefore members are advised that this issue would not amount to a reason for refusal of the current application.
94. Taking all of the above into account, the development is considered to offer a development that is respectful of its existing and future surroundings, albeit restricted in design terms by its function as a P&R. Accordingly, the proposal is in accordance with the development plan policies set out earlier in this chapter.

Impact on Trees & Hedgerows

95. Policy EH2 of the WOLP requires new development to conserve and enhance the quality, character and distinctiveness of West Oxfordshire's natural and man-made environment, including hedges, woodlands and trees. Proposals that would result in the loss of important features will not be permitted unless the loss can be justified and appropriate mitigation and/or compensatory measures can be secured.
96. Policy ESD13 of the CLP states that opportunities will be sought to secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape, through the restoration, management or enhancement of existing landscapes, features or habitats and where appropriate the creation of new ones, including the planting of woodlands, trees and hedgerows.
97. Policy ENP13 of the ENP states that trees frame the landscape context of the village and development should, as far as practical, preserve or enhance the quality and quantity of tree cover of sites affected by development.
98. The proposed P&R site contains 37 semi-mature/mature tree features, including individual trees, groups of trees and hedgerows. Dominant species are hawthorn, blackthorn and common oak. The majority of the tree features on the site are considered to be of poor quality or with limited amenity or landscape value. The P&R development would result in the loss of ten tree features, which according to the applicant's assessment would include one moderate quality hedgerow along the southern boundary with the A40 and two moderate quality common oak trees in the northern part of the site, amounting to approximately 27% loss. The applicant states that this loss is necessary and would not have a significant arboricultural effect on the site. The applicant proposes to retain and protect all remaining trees on the proposed P&R site and to carry out new tree planting and landscaping works to mitigate the loss of existing features. Replacement planting would include wet woodland in the east of the site, native deciduous woodland around the perimeter of the site and between parking bays, species rich native hedgerow and species rich

wildflowers and grass meadow. Ornamental trees would also be provided in amenity areas.

99. The arboricultural advice provided to the LPA notes that one mature oak that is proposed for removal to facilitate the P&R development (tree T29) has particular landscape and conservation qualities that may merit it being considered as Category A as opposed to the Category B definition used by the applicant. Additionally, an unmapped oak tree, whilst smaller, is equally prominent. It is advised that, through condition, the applicant should consider whether alternative P&R layouts would allow for the retention of these trees and/or further justification provided over their removal.
100. The applicant identifies that the route along the A40 currently comprises up to 329 tree features with potential to be affected by the development, the majority of which are located along the site boundary between the highway and third-party land. A number of trees are located outside of the highway boundary where prior consent would be required prior to works commencing. Most trees currently on the site are semi-mature to mature and in fair to good condition. Dominant species include hawthorn hedgerows with young to semi-mature self-set trees consisting of elm, ash and sycamore. Within these hedgerows there are also mature trees dominated by oak, white poplar, white willow, and hybrid black poplar. The most notable tree on site is a good quality, large mature oak which is situated to the north of Eynsham village on the north side of the A40, which is proposed for retention.
101. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) submitted by the applicant shows that, of the 329 tree features identified along the route, the proposed development would involve the loss of 114. The loss would include 3 individual trees classed as high quality (category A), 51 trees and 4 tree groups classed as moderate quality (category B), 38 trees and 10 tree groups classed as low quality (category C) and 7 trees and 1 tree group classed as very low quality or unsuitable for retention (category U). In addition, 78 tree groups would be partly removed, including 18 classed as moderate quality (category B) and 60 classed as low quality (category C). In total, the applicant's assessment shows that the scheme would result in circa 58% loss or partial loss of trees along the A40 route. 19 of the trees affected are located within the Cassington Conservation Area or the Oxford Canal Conservation Area and are therefore statutorily protected. It is stated by the applicant that the removal of these tree features is necessary to achieve the development and cannot be avoided. All remaining trees features would be retained and protected. Mitigation planting would also be carried out in the form of grassland seeding of embankments and verges, replacement hedgerows where feasible, and linear belts of trees and shrubs to fill gaps. Hedgerow and tree planting would be offset from the cycle path by 1.4-4.5m.
102. Arboricultural advice provided to the council initially raised some concerns about inaccuracies and inconsistencies within the submitted AIA, which led to concerns that the application had underestimated the extent of tree loss both on-site and off-site. In February 2021, the applicant submitted a revised AIA, which addressed some of the errors and omissions previously identified

however some inconsistencies remain, although these are not considered to be material to the decision-making process. The arboriculture advice to the LPA indicates that the tree loss, particularly along the A40, may be significant and may be greater than that indicated in the application documents. The advice also points out that no formal comment has been made by the applicant in respect of the effects of ash dieback, tree removal by landowners outside of the application site, and the indirect off-site tree loss which may be caused through changes to environmental conditions, tree failure, and the removal of the existing 'windfirm' edge along the A40. The advice comments that the loss of off-site trees would likely take place on third party land, and therefore proactive engagement with landowners would be required to manage the effects.

103. In order to manage the impact of the development on trees and hedgerows, it is recommended that a condition is attached to any planning permission issued requiring the submission of updated tree constraints and tree protection plans to correct errors and inconsistencies in the data submitted with the application documents, along with an Arboricultural Method Statement and risk management strategy. Tree loss can be reduced through careful construction and engineering methods, including no-dig solutions within root protection areas of retained trees. It is essential that such measures are employed, and enforced, to prevent unnecessary loss beyond that anticipated by the applicant, and it is suggested in the arboriculture advice that arboricultural site monitoring is secured through condition, including the appointment of an Arboricultural Clerk of Works to supervise the construction process.
104. There is no doubt that, despite replacement planting, the development may result in the loss of a significant number of tree features along the A40, which cannot be avoided if the development is to proceed. Members are advised that, in the worst-case scenario, this may result in a permanent alteration to the current tree-lined corridor. The loss of tree features without sufficient justification would be contrary to development plan policy including Policy EH2 of the WOLP. Members must therefore weigh the impact of the loss of trees and hedgerows against the benefits of the scheme including the opportunity for a mode shift from car to bus, reduced traffic congestion, and improved journey times. Given that the P&R at Eynsham and the eastbound bus lane along the A40 clearly form part of the overall strategy for growth management with the area, and this cannot feasibly be achieved without the loss of trees and hedgerows, the officer advice is that the benefits outweigh the losses in this instance, and that the conditions suggested in the arboricultural advice should be adopted to reduce and manage the effects on trees and hedgerows as far as possible.

Landscape & Visual Impact

105. Policy EH2 of the WOLP requires new development to conserve and enhance the quality, character and distinctiveness of West Oxfordshire's natural and man-made environment, including stone walls, hedges, woodlands, trees, rivers, streams and ponds. Proposals that would result in the loss of important

features will not be permitted unless the loss can be justified and appropriate mitigation and/or compensatory measures can be secured. Policy EH2 also states that development should avoid causing noise or light pollution and should incorporate measures to improve the existing level of tranquillity and dark-sky quality, reversing existing pollution where possible. Special attention should be given to landscape and biodiversity in special landscape policy areas, which includes the Wychwood Project Area.

106. Policy EH13 of the WOLP seeks to protect the historic character of the landscape and townscape within the District. Particular attention should be paid to the age, distinctiveness, rarity, sensitivity and capacity of the landscape affected, the extent to which key historic features will be retained or replicated, and appropriateness of the form and layout of the development
107. Policy ESD13 of the CLP states that opportunities will be sought to secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape, through the restoration, management or enhancement of existing landscapes, features or habitats and where appropriate the creation of new ones, including the planting of woodlands, trees and hedgerows. Development will be expected to respect and enhance local landscape character. Proposals that cause undue visual intrusion or are otherwise harmful to the landscape will be resisted.
108. Policy ENP13 of the ENP states that trees frame the landscape context of the village and development should, as far as practical, preserve or enhance the quality and quantity of tree cover of sites affected by development.
109. The application site falls within the National Character Area 108 Upper Thames Clay Vales 14 (NCA 108). NCA 108 is characterised as an extensive area of low-lying clay-based floodplain, with generally low-lying woodland cover with frequent hedgerows, hedgerow trees, and field trees. At a more local level, the P&R site is characterised in the West Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment (WOLA) as part of Landscape Character Area 11 (LCA 11): Eynsham Vale, which is a low-lying area of rolling farmland and extensive areas of woodland and trees and in the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study (OWLS) as LCT Rolling Clayland and LCA UT/23 South Leigh – both of which are noted for rolling farmland.
110. The P&R site would change the use of land from agricultural fields and therefore would evidently have an impact on landscape character, however it should be noted that the context of the site will also change substantially over the plan period as allocated housing and employment development in the vicinity comes forward. The Landscape Officer comments that, over time, the site would become sub-urban rather than rural in context. The applicant states that the impact of the P&R has been reduced through a number of design measures including the retention of vegetation where possible, siting the main access off the A40 rather than Cuckoo Lane, maintaining a landscaped buffer around the perimeter of the P&R site, and the sensitive siting of built structures within the P&R towards the northern end and furthest from Eynsham. Additionally, it is proposed to undertake a planting and landscaping scheme at the site which would comprise the creation of new woodland

planting, including wetland planting, swales, and ornamental trees. It is noted that the Landscape Officer agrees that a landscape-led approach has been taken to reduce the effects on the landscape and views as far as possible and therefore does not object to the scheme.

111. It is proposed that lighting within the P&R site would be designed to reduce spillage and glare through focusing lighting within the centre of the site and turning perimeter lighting to face inward. Overall, the development is not considered likely to have a significant effect on landscape character in isolation due to its location on or adjacent to the A40 and within close proximity to existing settlements. The Landscape Officer has reviewed the lighting proposals and considers that a balance has been achieved between meeting the operational and legal requirements for lighting with the need to reduce landscape and visual effects. Subject to detailed lighting proposals being submitted for approval, the officer has not objected to the scheme.
112. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment submitted with the ES concludes that there would be significant adverse effects to visual receptors during the construction and early stages of the operational development, from users of the A40 and PRoW and Cuckoo Lane. These effects would arise due to vegetation clearance, changes to landform at the P&R site, construction activity, vegetation removal particularly along the A40, and the initial change in land use and introduction of built development and lighting at the proposed P&R location. In the long term (by year 15 post opening), once screening planting has become established, the impact on the landscape and visual receptors will be reduced to a level that is not considered to be significant in EIA terms.
113. There is no doubt that the extent of vegetation loss along the A40 bus lane route would result in a travel corridor that is more open in character than the current situation, however it is noted that the Landscape Advisor attributes this to the nature of the scheme and site constraints rather than the design approach. Overall, the officer is satisfied that the scheme takes account of the surrounding landscape context by seeking to retain existing vegetation where possible and seeking to mitigate effects through replacement planting.
114. Subject to the imposition of conditions requiring the submission and approval of detailed planting schemes, detailed lighting proposals, and a landscape management and maintenance plan, the development is considered to be in accordance with the development plan policies listed above.

Biodiversity

115. Policy EH3 of the WOLP states that the biodiversity of West Oxfordshire shall be protected and enhanced to achieve an overall net gain in biodiversity. The policy expects impacts to be minimised through a number of measures, including the protection of sites and species of local, national or international importance, avoiding the loss or deterioration of important habitats, ensuring development supports Conservation Target Areas, and the demonstration of biodiversity enhancements and net gain where possible. The policy states that

major applications should demonstrate net gain through the use of a Biodiversity Impact Assessment Calculator based on that described in the DEFRA Biodiversity Offsetting Guidance or a suitably amended version.

116. Policy ENP4(a) of the ENP expects development proposals to demonstrate how a net gain in biodiversity will be achieved, to include measures to ensure that water-courses are protected, to protect best and most versatile agricultural land and to protect the integrity of the Oxford Meadows SAC.
117. CLP policy ESD9 requires developers to demonstrate that there would be no impact on the hydrological regime of the Oxford Meadows SAC. CLP Policy ESD10 seeks to resist harm to biodiversity and protected species, including through resisting the loss of trees, and states that a net gain in biodiversity will be sought.
118. The Environmental Statement submitted with the application includes an assessment of the impact of the development on biodiversity. This assessment comprised a desk top study and Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey (undertaken in 2016), Walkover Surveys and a series of detailed surveys for Great Crested Newts, Bats, Dormice, Otter and Water Vole, Birds, Reptiles and Badger. The ES concluded that there would be no significant effects to internationally and nationally designated sites, however local impacts to habitats and protected species are likely to occur even with mitigation in place, albeit not significant in EIA terms. It is proposed to mitigate this impact through pre-construction checks and surveys, as well as through the controls that would be imposed through a European Protected Species Mitigation License which would be required in addition to planning permission. The Council's Ecologist has recommended that ecological surveys for all species are updated in advance of commencement, to enable the development to take account of changes in habitat composition or condition but has no objections to the proposal in terms of the impact on protected species.
119. Whilst there are no direct impacts to the Oxford Meadows SAC via land-take, concerns have been raised throughout the consultation process about indirect impacts through air quality changes or hydrology. The impacts of the proposed scheme on the SAC have been considered as part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (see Annex 2), which concluded that the interest features of the SAC are unlikely to be adversely affected as a result of the scheme. The Council's Ecologist has reviewed the scheme and is satisfied overall that provided the air quality and hydrological issues have been satisfactorily addressed, there should not be any significant effects on the interest features of the SAC. It is also noted that Natural England agree with the applicant's assessment of impacts and has not raised any objections to the proposals.
120. Turning to the impact of the development on the Cassington to Yarnton Gravel Pits LWS, the Ecology Officer notes that the removal of vegetation along the A40 has the potential for a dual impact on the LWS, as it provides a screening belt between the A40 and the LWS as well as providing habitat for nesting birds in its own right, albeit that some replacement planting is proposed.

Wintering birds at this LWS are subject to existing levels of disturbance due to the proximity to the A40 and the LWS is large enough to enable the temporary displacement of birds elsewhere within the gravel pit complex whilst new planting becomes established. However, as set out earlier in this report, concerns have been raised in the Council's arboricultural advice that tree loss along the A40 may have been under-estimated and, if this is the case, the information submitted with the application documents may not demonstrate the true impact that the opening of the A40 corridor may have on the LWS. Accordingly, the Ecology Officer has stated that insufficient information is currently available to guarantee that the LWS would not be harmed as a result of the scheme.

121. The NPPF states, at paragraph 175a that planning applications should be refused if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for. As noted above, whilst the tree-loss along the A40 may be under-estimated in the application documents, the scheme would be unable to go ahead should that tree loss be considered unacceptable. Accordingly, it is recommended that the extent of tree loss is reduced as far as possible and managed through a series of conditions on any planning permission issued. Members will need to take account of the fact that the loss of trees may have direct and indirect effects on the LWS and will need to weigh that effect against the benefits of the scheme as set out elsewhere in this report.
122. The proposed site for the P&R is currently comprised of improved and amenity grassland, species-poor hedgerows across the site, and species-rich hedgerow at the southern boundary of the site, adjacent to the A40. The development would result in the permanent loss of 7.72ha of improved grassland, 980m of species poor hedgerow including 10 mature trees from within the site and along its southern boundary with the A40, and 10m of species rich hedgerow to allow for the proposed secondary access from Cuckoo Lane. The applicant proposes to undertake an extensive landscaping scheme at the proposed P&R site, which would comprise the creation of a range of habitats including tree planting and grassland. In time and with quality maintenance, it is stated that the landscaping would become established as lowland meadow mixed deciduous woodland which would provide a habitat of principal importance. Accordingly, the P&R development when considered in isolation would result in biodiversity net gain.
123. The proposed works along the route of the A40 would take place on areas of land currently containing a mix of grassland, scrub and ruderal habitats as well as hedgerows and trees. The hedgerows and trees are identified as a Habitat of Principal Importance under Section 41 of the NERC Act (2006) and are an Oxfordshire BAP Priority Habitat. The development would result in the permanent loss of:
 - 2.07ha semi improved grassland
 - 0.58ha broadleaved plantation
 - 0.61ha dense scrub

- Up to 114 mature and semi-mature trees
 - 1.9km species-poor hedgerow and 320m linear length trees
124. The loss of hedgerows of principal importance would be caused primarily through the need to create embankments along the route of the proposed bus lane, which would not be possible without impinging on the hedgerows. There would be further losses of 3-4 mature trees to enable works access to Cassington New Bridge as well as the loss of habitats required to create the proposed construction compounds. Whilst replacement planting is proposed, it is not possible to fully mitigate the loss on-site due to the lack of space within land under the control of the applicant.
125. Overall, the applicant states that the proposal would result in a net loss of 7.69 habitat units (equivalent to -15.18%) and 7.95 hedgerow units (equivalent to -53.56%). However, members are advised that the updated ecological and arboricultural surveys may lead to this loss being re-calculated upwards. Left unmitigated, this loss would be contrary to local and national planning policy, including policies EH3 of the WOLP, ENP4 of the ENP, and ES10 of the CLP. Given the nature of the scheme and available space, is it acknowledged that it would not be possible to achieve a biodiversity net-gain on-site and therefore off-site offsetting would be required.
126. To overcome this potential policy conflict, the applicant has committed to achieving a 5% biodiversity net gain through off-site opportunities, including through the use of an off-setting provider or the utilisation of land within the applicant's control. It is stated in the application documents that discussions have taken place with the Trust for Oxfordshire's Environment (TOE) and that a suitable land parcel has been identified with approximate costs allowed within the scheme budget, although no further details have been provided at this stage. The national Planning Practice Guidance states that planning conditions can, in appropriate circumstances, be used to require that a planning permission provides for works that will measurably increase biodiversity including where these works are entirely off-site. It is therefore recommended that a condition is imposed on any planning permission issued requiring the submission and approval of a detailed scheme for the achievement of 5% biodiversity net gain via off-setting. Subject to this condition, the scheme will achieve a net gain in biodiversity and would thereby bring the proposal in-line with development plan policies.
127. In addition to the conditions related to the achievement of biodiversity net gain, and notwithstanding the concerns raised particularly in relation to the impact on the LWS, the Ecologist has also suggested a suite of conditions are imposed on any planning permission issued to secure a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), updated ecological surveys prior to commencement, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), and lighting scheme. The Environment Agency has also recommended conditions are imposed to protect water habitats, including a sensitively designed lighting scheme and provision for an otter pass/ledge and fencing at Cassington New Bridge. Subject to these conditions being incorporated into the decision and taking into account the benefits of the scheme in terms of delivering a modal

shift to sustainable travel modes, reducing congestion, and improving journey times, the development is considered to be acceptable in terms of the impact on biodiversity.

Flood Risk

128. Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk. Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Paragraph 157 states that all plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development – taking into account the current and future impacts of climate change – so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property. They should do this, and manage any residual risk, by a number of measures, including applying the sequential test and then, if necessary, the exception test.
129. Paragraph 158 of the NPPF explains that the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding. Development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available sites in areas with a lower risk of flooding.
130. If it is not possible for development to be located in zones with a lower risk of flooding, paragraph 159 of the NPPF, states that the exception test may have to be applied. The need for the exception test will depend on the potential vulnerability of the site and the development proposed in line with the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification set out in national planning practice guidance. Paragraph 160 of the NPPF further states that the application of the exception test should be informed by a strategic or site-specific flood risk assessment.
131. When determining planning applications, the NPPF sets out at paragraph 163 that LPAs should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Development should only be permitted in areas at risk of flooding where it can be demonstrated that the most vulnerable development is located in areas at lowest flood risk, the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient, it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, any residual risk can be appropriately managed, and safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate.
132. Policies EH7 of the WOLP and ESD6 of the CLP support the sequential, risk-based approach to assessing flood risk, set out in the NPPF. Policy ESD7 of the WOLP states that all development will be required to use sustainable drainage systems for the management of surface water run-off. Policy ESD8 of the WOLP states that water quality will be maintained and enhanced by avoiding adverse effects of development on the water environment. Taken together, policies OS3 of the WOLP and ESD1 and ESD3 of the CLP also expect all development proposals to show consideration of the efficient and prudent use of natural resources, including through measures such as reducing the need to travel, minimising energy demands and the use of non-

renewable resources, maximising resource efficiency and reducing waste, and minimising flood risk.

The Sequential Test

133. The proposed site for the P&R is located entirely within Flood Zone 1, which has the lowest risk of flooding. However, the route of the A40 and proposed works along it are located across all flood zones (Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3) and includes areas within Zone 3b which is functional flood plain. The A40, including the proposed bus lane and cycle path, is categorised as “essential infrastructure” in the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification included in national planning practice guidance, which has to cross the area at risk. As it is not possible to relocate the development to an area at lower risk of flooding, the sequential test is deemed to be passed. Essential infrastructure may be considered appropriate in areas at risk of flooding provided the exception test is also passed.

The Exception Test

134. The exception test is a method to demonstrate and help ensure that flood risk to people and property will be managed satisfactorily, whilst allowing necessary development to go ahead in situations where suitable sites at lower risk of flooding are not available. There are two parts to the exception test, as follows:
- a) The development must show that it will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk; and
 - b) The development must be safe for its lifetime.
135. The proposed development is considered to pass test a) as it would enable a shift from private car use to more sustainable transport and active modes and would bring with it a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. The development would also bring wider benefits through the reduction in traffic congestion with associated benefits to air quality.
136. The Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the application addresses test b). It states that the flood volume compensation provided indicates a decrease in fluvial flood risk and therefore an overall betterment to the existing floodplain. Although flood depths would be marginally increased as a result of the development, it is stated that the highway authority would close the A40 corridor during a severe storm event and divert users to alternative routes, mitigating the risk to vehicle users, cyclists and pedestrians. This would ensure that the highway can be made safe during times of flood. The Area Operations Team for the A40 has confirmed that this would be the case.
137. The Environment Agency initially objected to the proposals on the basis that the development would not pass the exception test. This was because the development would result in a loss of floodplain storage due to the widening of the carriageway into floodplain. As a result of amendments to the scheme and

a revised FRA being submitted, the Environment Agency has removed its objection to the proposal and has now stated that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the revised FRA including incorporated mitigation measures.

138. The development includes proposals for sustainable drainage systems at the P&R site and along the A40 and it is noted that the LLFA is satisfied with the outline strategy. Subject to conditions requiring the submission of detailed drainage strategies prior to commencement, as well as the submission of a post-development verification report as requested by the LLFA, the development is considered to be in accordance with national policy and development plan policies concerning flood and climate change.

Noise, Pollution & Amenity Effects

139. Policy EH8 of the WOLP states that proposals which are likely to cause or result in exposure to pollution will only be permitted if measures can be implemented to minimise pollution and risk to a level that provides a high standard of protection for health, environmental quality and amenity. Particular consideration should be given to air quality, contaminated land, hazardous substances, artificial light, noise, water resources and waste. WOLP policy OS2 states that new development shall not have a harmful impact on the amenity of existing occupants and policy OS4 states that new development should not harm the use or enjoyment of land and buildings nearby including living conditions in residential properties. Saved policy ENV1 of the CLP 1996 states that development which is likely to cause materially detrimental levels of noise, vibration, smell, smoke, fumes or other type of environmental pollution will not normally be permitted.
140. The Environmental Statement submitted with the application assesses the air quality effects of the development, including on local residents, SSSIs within the vicinity of the site (including Pixey and Yarnton SSSI, Wytham Woods SSSI (which contains mesotrophic oak woodland priority habitat), Cassington Meadows SSSI, Oxford Meadows SAC (which contains lowland hay meadow priority habitat) and Eynsham Woods LWS. Additionally, the impact on the City of Oxford AQMA, Witney AQMA, and Botley AQMA were assessed, each of which has been designated due to exceedances of annual mean NO₂ above the 40µg/m³ objective. The Air Quality Assessment concludes that there are unlikely to be any significant effects on air quality once the development is operational, therefore no specific mitigation measures are required or proposed. During the construction period, the development has the potential to create adverse environmental effects through dust emissions, however it is proposed that these effects could be reduced through the implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which could be secured through condition.
141. The Noise & Vibration Assessment submitted with the Environmental Statement identifies that, on operation, there are likely to be some small increases in noise to residents and other sensitive receptors in Eynsham, Cassington and along the A40, however these increases are likely to be less

than 3dB and therefore are predicted to be imperceptible. During the construction process there is potential for temporary and transitory moderate to major adverse noise effects. These effects will be reduced as far as possible through measures to be set out in a proposed CEMP, which would include communication and engagement strategies, hours and duration of works, details of plant and noise barriers, and noise monitoring.

142. The Environmental Health Officers at both West Oxfordshire District Council and Cherwell District Council were consulted on the application and it is noted that no objections on environmental health grounds have been received. It is recommended that conditions are imposed on any planning permission granted requiring the submission and approval of a CEMP prior to commencement along with details of noise monitoring and remedial measures during the construction process. Additionally, whilst there is no evidence to suggest that contaminated land would be disturbed as a result of the development, a condition should be attached to any planning permission issued requiring details of how unsuspected contamination would be dealt with should it be discovered. Subject to these conditions, the development is considered to be acceptable on amenity and pollution grounds and in accordance with relevant development plan policies.

Historic Environment

143. Policy EH9 of the WOLP expects all development proposals to conserve and/or enhance the special character, appearance and distinctiveness of West Oxfordshire's historic environment. When considering proposals that affect the significance of a non-designated asset, a balanced judgement will be had with regard to the scale of harm or loss, the significance of the heritage assets, and the public benefits of the development. This is supported by Policy EH16 of the WOLP which states that when considering proposals that affect non-designated heritage assets, including archaeological remains, the presumption will be in favour of avoiding harm or loss.
144. Given the distance to the nearest Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas as well as the lack of inter-visibility, the proposed development is unlikely to have an impact on any designated heritage features or their settings. However, the Environmental Statement submitted with the application identifies that the proposed P&R is likely to have a direct and permanent impact on a number of non-designated archaeological assets through land intrusion during the construction process. In particular, an identified area of Ridge and Furrow cultivation and evidence of post-medieval agricultural activity and iron age settlement is likely to be affected.
145. The County Council's archaeologist has noted this conclusion and has advised that there is no indication that the findings are of such significance that they should preclude the principle of the development. It is recommended that further archaeological investigation is undertaken prior to commencement and therefore a condition should be attached to any consent issued requiring the implementation of a programme of archaeological work to be undertaken.

146. Subject to the suggested condition being imposed on the development, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the development plan in respect of designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Green Belt

147. The proposed site for the P&R does not lie within the Oxford Green Belt, however the majority of the proposed A40 bus lane and improvement works do fall within the designation where there is a general presumption against inappropriate development.
148. The NPPF states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF sets out the five purposes of the Green Belt, which are:
- a) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
 - b) To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
 - c) To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
 - d) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
 - e) To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
149. Paragraphs 143 and 144 of the NPPF state that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
150. Paragraph 146 lists some forms of development that are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These include c) local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location.
151. WOLP policy OS2 states that development proposals within the Green Belt shall comply with national policies for the Green Belt. CLP policy ESD14 sets out the reasons for the designation of the Oxford Green Belt and states that proposals within the Green Belt shall only be permitted if it maintains openness and does not conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt or harm its visual amenities.
152. As stated above, paragraph 146 of the NPPF allows for local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location to be treated as not inappropriate. However, this is on the condition that it would preserve openness and would not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The eastbound bus lane and cycle paths would be constructed alongside the existing A40 and clearly form a fundamental component of planned growth in West Oxfordshire as set out in the WOLP,

LTP4 and A40 Corridor Strategy. On this basis, it is considered the case that the development does comprise local transport infrastructure that can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location. Taking into account the purpose of the scheme to encourage a change in travel behaviour along an existing route into Oxford rather than to deliver new growth, the development is also not considered to conflict with any of the five purposes listed in paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

153. Turning to the condition of openness, there are areas of the scheme that would be subject to junction improvement works, additional bus stops, and pedestrian crossings which would alter or add new structures to the existing development along the A40. The works to Cassington New Bridge would be undertaken within the existing masonry wall structure, although the parapet height would be increased from 1m to 1.4m and would involve the addition of new pedestrian guard rails. Additionally, the proposed works at Cassington Halt Bridge would introduce a new structure through the provision of a footbridge, with its detailed design yet to be determined.
154. Although the development would involve the alteration and addition of new structures, these are considered to be minor in nature given that they would take place largely within the existing highway boundary or adjacent to existing highway structures, and they are unlikely to have a material effect on openness within the Green Belt. Taken together, it is concluded that the development would preserve the openness of the Green Belt along the A40 corridor at this location.
155. As the development falls within the list of developments that are not inappropriate as set out in paragraph 146 of the NPPF, and the development would preserve openness and would not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, the development is considered to be in accordance with Green Belt policy at both the national and local levels.

Mineral Safeguarding

156. Part of the planning application boundary incorporating the proposed A40 bus lane lies within the sharp sand and gravel Strategic Resource Area 6: Thames, Lower Windrush and Evenlode Valleys – Standlake to Yarnton as defined by the OMWCS, and therefore falls within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA).
157. Policy M8 of the OMWCS states that development that would prevent or otherwise hinder the possible future working of the mineral within a MSA will not be permitted unless it can be shown that (a) the site has been allocated in an adopted local plan or neighbourhood plan; or (b) the need for the development outweighs the economic and sustainability considerations relating to the mineral resource; or (c) that the mineral will be extracted prior to the development taking place.

158. The proposed development forms part and parcel of planned growth in the Eynsham-Woodstock sub-area of West Oxfordshire, and is specifically referenced as such in policies EW1, EW2, EW10, and T2 of the WOLP. The development forms a central component of the A40 Transport Strategy and LTP4 and is therefore considered to be of strategic importance to Oxfordshire county and beyond. Accordingly, it is concluded that the development falls within the list of exceptions to Policy M8 of the OMWCS and should not be refused on the basis of its location within the MSA.

Financial Implications

159. Not applicable as the financial interests of the County Council are not relevant to the determination of planning applications.

Legal Implications

160. Legal comments and advice have been incorporated into the report.

Equality & Inclusion Implications

161. In writing this report due regard has been taken of the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different groups. It is not however considered that any issues with regard thereto are raised in relation to consideration of this application.

Conclusions

162. Subject to the conditions outlined above, the development is considered to be in accordance with the development plan. It is therefore recommended that planning permission is granted.

RECOMMENDATION

Subject to the satisfaction of the Assistant Director of Strategic Infrastructure and Planning in consultation with the committee Chairman and Deputy Chairman that following the end of the current consultation period no new material considerations have arisen, it is RECOMMENDED that planning permission for R3.0057/19 be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Assistant Director of Strategic Infrastructure and Planning, to include those set out in Annex 1.

Rachel Wileman

Assistant Director for Strategic Infrastructure and Planning

Annex: Annex 1: Conditions
 Annex 2: Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening & Appropriate
 Assessment
 Annex 3: Environmental Statement
 Annex 4: Consultation Responses Summary
 Annex 5: Representations Summary
 Annex 6: European Protected Species
 Plan 1: Site Location Plan

Background papers: Nil

Other Documents: West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031
 Cherwell Local Plan 1996 (Saved Policies)
 Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1
 Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 1: Core
 Strategy
 Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan
 National Planning Policy Framework
 Oxford City Local Plan 2036
 Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031 (LTP4)
 A40 Science Transit Stage 2: Options Assessment Report
 (2017)
 Salt Cross Area Action Plan Pre-Submission Version (August
 2020)

Annex 1 – Conditions

1. Time limit for commencement.
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with approved drawings.
3. Layout of P&R to be reviewed prior to commencement of the P&R development to allow consideration for retention of tree T29 and other important tree features.
4. Elevation drawings and floor plans of P&R buildings including amenity block, bus shelters, and toilet facilities to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of construction of each facility.
5. Details of materials to be used within the P&R development including building materials and hard surfaced areas to be submitted and approved prior to the use of each material.
6. P&R facility not to be used until parking, access and manoeuvring areas are laid out in accordance with approved drawings.
7. Details of works to Cassington New Bridge to be provided prior to commencement of those works.
8. Details of the new footbridge, including elevations and materials, at Cassington Halt Bridge to be provided prior to commencement of construction of the footbridge.
9. Submission and approval of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) for the P&R development prior to commencement of the P&R.
10. Submission and approval of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) for the A40 development prior to commencement of the A40 works.
11. Pedestrian and cycle routes within the P&R to be practically completed prior to opening of connections to Salt Cross Garden Village.
12. Speed reduction measures within the P&R to be implemented in accordance with details first approved prior to first use of the P&R.
13. The pedestrian/cycle connection between the signalised crossing and Old Witney Road to be practically completed prior to first use of the P&R.
14. Cycle parking within the P&R to be provided in accordance with details first approved prior to first use of the P&R.
15. Cycle parking to be provided at bus stops along the A40 in accordance with details first approved prior to the bus lane first coming into use.
16. Submission and approval of noise monitoring and mitigation scheme for the P&R development prior to commencement of the P&R.
17. Submission and approval of noise monitoring and mitigation scheme for the A40 works prior to commencement of the A40 works.
18. Submission and approval of dust monitoring and mitigation scheme for the P&R development prior to commencement of the P&R.
19. Submission and approval of dust monitoring and mitigation scheme for the A40 works prior to commencement of the A40 works.
20. Cessation of works in the event that unsuspected land contamination is identified. Submission of investigation and risk assessment with mitigation measures.
21. Submission and approval of a written scheme of archaeological investigation prior to commencement of the P&R development.

22. Programme of archaeological works to be carried out prior to commencement of the P&R development.
23. Submission and approval of a detailed surface water drainage strategy for the P&R development prior to commencement of the P&R development.
24. Submission and approval of a detailed surface water drainage strategy for the A40 works prior to commencement of the A40 works.
25. Verification of SuDS and drainage details for the P&R development to be submitted for approval prior to occupation of the P&R development.
26. Verification of SuDS and drainage details for the A40 works to be submitted for approval prior to occupation of the A40 works.
27. Submission and approval of updated tree constraints plan and tree protection plan for the P&R development prior to commencement of the P&R development.
28. Submission and approval of updated tree constraints plan and tree protection plan for the A40 works prior to commencement of the A40 works.
29. Submission and approval of arboricultural method statement for the P&R prior to commencement of the P&R development.
30. Submission and approval of arboricultural method statement for the A40 works, to include a risk management strategy prior to commencement of the A40 works.
31. Submission and approval of strategy for arboricultural monitoring and mitigation prior to commencement of the A40 works, to include the appointment of an Arboricultural Clerk of Works.
32. Submission and approval of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for the P&R development prior to commencement of the P&R development.
33. Submission and approval of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for the A40 works prior to commencement of the A40 works.
34. Updated ecological surveys and mitigation strategies to be submitted and approved prior to commencement.
35. Submission and approval of a scheme for biodiversity offsetting prior to commencement .
36. Lighting details to be submitted and approved prior to installation of any lighting to take into account impact on amenity, biodiversity, and watercourses.
37. Submission and approval of a Landscape and Ecological Management & Maintenance Plan for the P&R.
38. Submission and approval of a Landscape and Ecological Management & Maintenance Plan for the A40.
39. Submission of a detailed landscaping scheme for the P&R.
40. Submission of a detailed landscaping scheme for the A40 works.
41. The development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted FRA including mitigation measures.
42. No development at Cassington New Bridge until a scheme to provide otter pass/ledge and fencing has been submitted to and approved in writing.

Compliance with National Planning Policy Framework

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the NPPF Oxfordshire County Council takes a positive and creative approach and to this end seeks to work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. We seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible. We work with applicants in a positive and creative manner by;

- offering a pre-application advice service, as was the case with this application, and
- updating applicants and agents of issues that have arisen in the processing of their application, for example in this case the applicant was invited to submit amended drawings and additional information to overcome material objections and policy conflict in relation to arboriculture, ecology, landscape, lighting, and flood impacts amongst other matters.

Annex 2 – Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening

Oxfordshire County Council

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

Planning ref:	R3.0057/19
Location:	Land West of Cuckoo lane and adjacent to the A40, Eynsham, West Oxfordshire, OX29 4PU
Details:	Construction of a park & ride car park providing 850 car parking spaces, cycle spaces, motorcycle spaces, electric vehicle charging points, bus shelters, landscaping, external lighting, public open space, toilets, seating, fencing, habitat creation, drainage features, new access from Cuckoo Lane, new roundabout with access onto A40, an eastbound bus lane approximately 6.5km in length from the park & ride site to the A40 bridge over the Dukes Cut canal, two sections of westbound bus lane (each approximately 500m in length), new shared use footway/cycleway, widening of Cassington New Bridge, junction improvements, new crossings, new footbridge alongside Cassington Halt Bridge, and associated works
Proximity to SAC:	The south side of carriageway is less than 10 metres from the SAC, north side is around 30 metres from the SAC. The scheme runs parallel to the SAC for over 2km.
Reason for SAC Designation:	Annex 1 Habitat 6510. Lowland hay meadows (<i>Alopecurus pratensis</i> , <i>Sanguisorba officinalis</i>) Annex II Species 1614. <i>Helosciadium (Apium) repens</i> ; Creeping marshwort
Date:	23 rd February 2021
Protective marking:	OCC Use

NOTE: Undertaking the Habitat Regulations Assessment process (HRA) is the responsibility of the decision maker as the Competent Authority for the purpose of the Habitats Regulations, however, it is the responsibility of the applicant to provide the Competent Authority with the information that they require for this purpose.

STEP 1) - Scoping - Details of the Plan or Project

European site potentially impacted by planning application, plan or project

Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation

Is the planning application, project or plan directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site?

No

Are there any other projects or plans that together with the planning application/project being assessed could affect the site?

Yes

Mixed use and residential developments at Wolvercote Paper Mill and Land North of Roger Dudman Way

Further plans and projects that are taken into account in modelling that informs the application are identified in Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement and the November 2020 Environmental Statement Addendum

STEP 2)- HRA Stage 1, Screening Assessment, (likely significant effect?)

Test 1: the significance test – The Applicant is to provide evidence so that a judgement can be made as to whether there could be any potential significant impacts of the development on the integrity of the SAC.

The applicant has provided evidence including:

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report dated Jan 2019
Environmental Statement Vol II, Appendix 6-J Habitat Regulations Assessment, May 2019
A40 Park and Ride and Bus Lane Scheme Environmental Statement Addendum Nov 2020

Further evidence and information have been received in the form of

- a consultation response from the Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust, August 2019
- consultation responses from the Environment Agency
- preliminary advice and subsequent consultation responses from Natural England.

Does the evidence show that the development, if approved, could result in a negative impact to a SAC

In the early stage of scheme development the applicant sought preliminary advice from Natural England which highlighted potential risks to the Oxford Meadows SAC.

The applicant's scoping report notes that the proposed bus lane would be adjacent to the Oxford Meadows SAC at its eastern end as the A40 approaches the junction with the A34.

The applicant's HRA notes that without taking mitigation into account, for the pathways of air quality, flood risk and water quality that a likely significant effect could not be dismissed. The applicant further notes in the HRA that "Although the

scheme's water quality protection measures and dust control measures are being introduced as standard practice to protect the environment generally rather than Oxford Meadows SAC specifically, they are carried forward to appropriate assessment as a precaution in the light of the People over Wind ruling", i.e. the mitigating effects of these standard practice measures are not considered in the preliminary assessment of likely significant effects.

The County Council's screening of likely significant effects concludes that an Appropriate Assessment is required for the project.

STEP 3, PART 1) - HRA Stage 2, Appropriate Assessment (integrity test), Information Provided by the Applicant and Details of Proportional Mitigation
Appropriate Assessment under Regulation 63(1) - the integrity test - if there are any potential significant impacts, the applicant must provide evidence showing avoidance and/or mitigation measures to allow an Assessment to be made. The Applicant must also provide details which demonstrate any long-term management, maintenance and funding of any solution.

The applicant's scoping report notes in respect of the Appropriate Assessment that "This will consider whether any direct effects (e.g. surface water runoff) might arise on the SAC but will particularly consider the air quality implications for the SAC in line with Natural England's recently released internal guidance. The air quality analysis will determine whether the use of the proposed bus lane will result in an increase in NO_x concentrations or nitrogen deposition rates and, if so, whether that increase will exceed 1% of the critical level/load either alone or 'in combination' with other plans and projects."

Evidence has been provided of the potential effects of the scheme on:

- a) air quality including nitrogen deposition and dust
- b) flood risk and water quality

The scheme includes water quality and dust control measures as good practice, rather than specific mitigation for potential effects at Oxford Meadows. However, these have been considered as part of the appropriate assessment process as a precaution.

STEP 3, PART 2)– Appropriate Assessment, Conclusion of the Competent Authority (LPA)

Air Quality

Evidence is provided in:
Environmental Statement Appendix 6-I: Air Quality and Ecology Assessment Methodology, Chapter 5 – Air Quality and,

Environmental Statement Vol II, Appendix 6-J: Habitats Regulation Assessment.

These reports are themselves informed by traffic modelling of the scheme. The data provided indicates in respect of the SAC that whilst the 'in combination' change exceeds 1% of the critical level for nitrous oxides, the implementation of the scheme results in either a neutral or a small positive change (i.e. reduction) in levels of nitrous oxides, compared with the base year.

Sections 4.5 and 4.6 of the HRA deal with dust control during construction, including potential in combination effects with mixed use and residential developments at Wolvercote Paper Mill and Land North of Roger Dudman Way, concluding that standard good practice will keep dust to a minimum. The nature of the site and materials also indicate that dust production will be minimal. No adverse effects on integrity of the SAC are therefore predicted.

The Environmental Statement addendum notes that the proposed opening date is now 2024 not 2021 and the air quality assessment has been revisited. The assessment concludes that "no material changes to the conclusions concerning air quality impacts from road traffic emissions as reported in the May 2019 ES are expected due to the change in opening year."

Hydrology and Water Quality

Assessments of flood risk, flood modelling and relevant information are contained in various documents in particular:

- Environmental Statement (Volume I) - Road Drainage and the Water Environment
- Additional Information 24/11/2020-Revised Bus Lane Preliminary Drainage Strategy
- Additional Information 24/11/2020-Revised P&R Preliminary Drainage Strategy
- Environmental Statement (Volume II) - Appendix 13-B: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)
- A40 Science Transit Phase 2 Flood Risk Assessment, November 2020
- Additional Information 24/11/2020 - Revised SuDS Maintenance and Management Plan

The applicant has provided a drainage strategy and concludes that the flow of water leaving the scheme will meet existing brownfield rates, will comply with the NPPF requirements and will ensure surface water flood risk is not increased as a result of the scheme. With regard to the Bus Lane specifically the assessment concludes that the proposed drainage scheme is a betterment on the currently unrestricted and un-attenuated system serving the existing A40.

Assessment has been made on the impact of potential pollutants contained in run-off including fine sediment, heavy metals, chemical spillages and de-icing salts during construction and operation. A range of measures are proposed within the design that together will mitigate the effects of operational impacts from changes in the flow of drainage water and the substances carried in this water. These measures include

swales, filter drains, gullies and catch drains. Together these form part of an integrated sustainable drainage system (SuDS). A preliminary SuDS maintenance and management plan is provided. The assessment concludes that the quality of the water leaving the scheme will be improved over the existing conditions as a result of the new design measures and the rectification of maintenance defects and identifies no adverse impacts upon the SAC.

Paragraph 4.2 of Appendix 6-J: Habitat Regulations Assessment deals with potential pollution during the construction phase. It notes that existing drainage measures will remain in place during construction with any “..temporary diversions being managed through appropriately designed solutions..”. Site management practice and protocols e.g. the use of spill kits, informed by drainage design and a Construction Environmental Management Plan will be used to manage construction impacts and the appropriate assessment predicts no adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC as a result.

On completion the new road and Park and Ride will be included within Oxfordshire County Council’s ongoing maintenance programmes.

The County Council have reviewed the evidence provided by the applicant and accepts the conclusions subject to detailed design of drainage and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

The County Council conclude that the scheme will not adversely affect the integrity of the Special Area of Conservation.

Natural England Comments and Further Advice:

Natural England have provided two sets of formal comments dated 02 July 2019 and 18 December 2020

In July 2019 Natural England summarised their advice as

“Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on internationally/nationally designated sites and has no objection.”

In reaching their conclusion Natural referred to the following:

Air quality

“We have reviewed section 3 of this document and, based the on the data presented, agree with the conclusion in paragraph 3.5 [of the HRA] that since the effect of the scheme is positive in terms of air pollution at Oxford Meadows SAC, no likely significant effects will arise alone, or in combination with other plans or projects.”

Natural England note that should further assessments be made the traffic model (OSM) would need to be updated to reflect additional projects.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Natural England advise caution in giving too much weight to the role of existing drainage water channels to mitigate water quality, which is referenced in the applicant's HRA. However they note that further details in the Environmental Statement and Drainage Strategy – which includes the use of engineered solutions to improve water quality before water enters these channels – does indicate that appropriate mitigation is available.

Natural England conclude in their comments in respect of the hydrology of the bus lane component:

“We consider the information in the Drainage Strategy to be consistent with the conclusion that there will not be an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC arising from impacts on hydrology. In particular, this conclusion relates to the fact that the SuDs scheme will maintain current brownfield rates of run-off, as well as improving water quality at outfall.”

Natural England conclude in their comments in respect of water quality:

“We consider the information in this Chapter [Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement], which assesses risk of pollutant release, chemical spillage, de-icing, road outfalls, ditch diversion and widening of Cassington New Bridge, to be consistent with the conclusion that there will not be an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC arising from impacts on hydrology or water quality.”

Finally, Natural England conclude in respect of Cassington Meadows, Pixey and Yarnton Meads, Wytham Woods Sites of Special Scientific Interest, of which some form part of the SAC

“Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not damage or destroy the interest features for which these sites have been notified and has no objection.”

In December 2020 Natural England provided further comments in relation to the updated information provided in response the Schedule 25 request. They conclude in their advice with regard to the SAC:

“The advice in our letter of 2nd July 2019 still applies. We understand from the Regulation 25 response that the new proposed drainage scheme will maintain the existing brownfield discharge rates and improve attenuation and water quality compared to existing, and that allowances for climate change and increased rainfall intensity have also been made.”

Natural England re-confirm in this summary their advice that that “the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on internationally/nationally designated sites and has no objection.”

Annex 3 - Environmental Statement

1. An Environmental Statement (ES) was submitted with the original planning application in 2019. Further environmental and other information was submitted in November 2020 following a request under Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. A summary of the contents of the ES and other environmental information submitted with the application is set out below.

Chapter 1: Introduction

2. This chapter explains the structure of the ES and provides details of the project team and legislative framework.

Chapter 2: Methodology

3. Chapter 2 provides details about the general approach taken to methodology across all technical chapters, including scoping, assessment of effects, determining significance, and limitations and assumptions.

Chapter 3: Alternatives & Design Evolution

4. This chapter explains the vision for the development and how the scheme has evolved as a result of public consultation and analysis of alternative options. This part of the ES sets out how environmental effects were taken into account in determining the final scheme submitted for approval.

Chapter 4: The Proposed Development

5. Chapter 4 describes the proposed development as well as the site and surroundings including designated areas and construction processes.

Chapter 5: Air Quality

6. The fifth chapter of the ES contains an assessment of air quality effects. It concludes that during the construction phase, there is a potential for the proposed development to generate adverse impacts arising from dust emissions at sensitive receptors located within 200m of construction works. Through the implementation of dust management measures, the impacts would be minimised and are unlikely to be significant. Vehicle movements are likely to increase during the construction phase, however HGV movements are anticipated to be well below 200 movements per day, which is the threshold above which significant changes in air quality are considered likely. The development is not expected to result in any exceedance of the air quality objective values for nitrogen dioxide or particulates.

Chapter 6: Biodiversity

7. The biodiversity assessment of the ES is contained at chapter 6 and updated through the ES Addendum submitted in November 2020. It concludes that no significant effects are expected to occur at designated sites or to protected species during construction or on operation although there would be a net loss in biodiversity.
8. No significant effects are expected to occur in relation to ecology following completion of the proposed development. Lighting generated from the development has the potential to disrupt commuting routes and limit the foraging area within the local area. However, the implementation of a sensitive lighting design will act to minimise the potential for light spill on retained and created habitats that represent suitable foraging and/or commuting habitat for bats. As a consequence, the impact on disturbance on the local bat population during operation is not considered to be significant.
9. The effect of nitrogen deposition on the Oxford Meadows SAC and other sensitive habitats was considered. The ES concludes that there will be no significant effects on the Oxford Meadows SAC due to the potential for reduced traffic flows and an improving trend in vehicle emissions technology. The nitrogen deposition at Oxford Meadows SAC and SSSIs is likely to reduce.

Chapter 7: Climate

10. Chapter 7 of the ES includes an assessment of the impact of the development on climate. The chapter sets out that the total greenhouse gas emissions from the construction phase of the development are estimated to be around 21,700 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalents and would arise from the embodied carbon in materials, transportation of materials, and the fuel and energy consumption during the construction process. Greenhouse gas emissions from the construction phase would be limited to the 15 months when construction activities would be taking place.
11. The total greenhouse gas emissions from the operational phase of the development are estimated to be in the order of 3,700 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalents per year. Once the development is completed, the majority of greenhouse gas emissions would be associated with bus journeys to and from the site.

Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage

12. The Cultural Heritage chapter of the ES assesses the impact of the development on designated and non-designated heritage assets. The effects of construction of the P&R on cultural heritage were found to be moderate to major adverse, because intrusive construction groundworks would destroy the areas of archaeological potential identified. This significant effect would be mitigated by a programme of archaeological monitoring and recording during the construction phase. The construction process was not considered to affect the significance of any designate heritage assets surrounding the site.

Chapter 9: Geology and Soils

13. Chapter 9 of the ES contains an assessment of the impact of the development on geology and soils. It found that permanent construction effects would relate primarily to the loss of 1.5ha of high-quality agricultural land, however this was not considered to be a significant effect. During the construction phase, control measures would be implemented to ensure that soils are handled carefully and to reduce the risk of long-term damage or loss of soils. As the permanent removal of land from agriculture would occur during the construction phase, no further effects on agricultural land would occur during the operation of the development.

Chapter 10: Landscape & Visual

14. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is contained at chapter 10 of the ES. It states that there are no statutory landscape designations within the vicinity of the application site. The construction activity at the P&R would be visible for receptors on the A40, Cuckoo Lane and from PRow to the south of the A40, as land to the north of the A40 is slightly elevated. The bus lane works would similarly be visible at close range along the A40 and from PRow adjacent to the A40. The visible aspects of the construction activity would include the excavation, machinery and compounds, which would represent a change compared to the settled state of the existing site. The visual impacts of the construction activity are likely to be significant.
15. The reduction in hedgerows along the bus lane represents a permanent effect during construction and operation of the proposed development. Other potential adverse impacts are related to the change of land use and introduction of structures, hardstanding and lighting adjacent to Eynsham, on the north side of the A40, as well as the increased extent of highways infrastructure via new road junctions along the A40 and an extension to Cassington New Bridge and Cassington Halt Bridge.
16. Potential beneficial impacts for the operational P&R include increased provision of woodland and tree cover within the P&R site and an increased level of green infrastructure and biodiversity value. The initial visual impacts of the P&R are anticipated to decrease over time as new planting becomes established.

Chapter 11: Noise & Vibration

17. Chapter 11 of the ES contains an assessment of the impact of the development on noise levels and vibration. Construction noise and vibration effects are considered to be temporary and not significant with the implementation of appropriate construction environmental management measures. Vehicle movements are likely to increase during the construction phase, however, the volume of construction traffic movements required is unlikely to generate significant noise and vibration effects on nearby noise sensitive receptors. It is expected that the majority of noise sensitive receptors will experience very low

increases in noise as a result of the proposed development, and in some locations very low reductions in noise levels are predicted.

Chapter 12: People & Communities

18. Chapter 12 of the ES assesses the impact of the development on people and communities. It notes that sections of the shared use footway/cycleway on the eastbound and westbound carriageways of the A40 would be temporarily closed during construction of the bus lane, but that with appropriate diversions in place, the impact is not considered to be significant. Construction may also temporarily impact the amenity of occupiers of local residential properties close to the development, although these impacts would be reduced through good construction practices.
19. It is stated that the shared footway/cycleway on the eastbound carriageway of the A40 would be replaced with a new shared footway/cycleway, which would be constructed in parallel to the bus lane along the entire length of the A40 in the study area, which is considered to be a beneficial amenity effect. In addition, there will be three new signalised crossings over the A40 and the currently uncontrolled crossing near to the entry/exit link to the Esso Garage will be upgraded to a signalised crossing. The addition of a signalised crossing to the west of the A40/B4449/Lower Road junction will enable users of the bridleways to cross the A40.
20. There are no residential or commercial properties, community facilities or open space which would experience impacts on their amenity arising from the operation of the proposed development.

Chapter 13: Road Drainage & The Water Environment

21. Chapter 13 identifies that potential effects during the construction phase on water resources may arise from an increase in sediment loads caused by site run-off containing suspended sediment; the accidental release of hydrocarbons and oils from spillages; and accidental leaks and use of hazardous materials, particularly concrete and cement products. However, with the implementation of good construction practices, the effects of any incidents are considered to be negligible
22. The potential effects of the proposed development on water resources once operational include impacts on surface water quality from 'routine run-off'. This refers to the water from the road surface and the pollutants contained within this, typically including sediments, hydrocarbons and metals. Surface water management proposals would reduce the amount of these substances that reaches surface waters. With SuDS in place, impacts to surface waters during the operation of the development are not considered to be significant.

Chapter 14: Traffic & Transport

23. The impact of the development on traffic and transport is assessed in chapter 14 of the ES. It concludes that the forecast traffic flow during the construction

period and potential reduction in speed limit during highway works would not be anticipated to result in a significant change to driver stress. It is expected that construction vehicles would be routed to avoid local towns and villages and therefore impacts on the surrounding area would be limited.

24. Once operational, the change in traffic flow is not likely to result in a significant increase in traffic flows. The reconfiguration of junctions is anticipated to result in a minor beneficial effect.

Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects

25. Chapter 15 of the ES presents an assessment of the in-combination effects and the cumulative effects of the proposed development. During the construction phase, neighbouring properties in Eynsham and Cassington are predicted to experience significant visual effects. Although the individual air quality and noise effects are not considered significant, the potential exists for a combined impact during construction due to the effects occurring at the same time. There is also potential for significant visual effects with other nearby schemes, should those schemes be constructed at the same time as the proposed development. These potential combined and cumulative effects will be temporary and limited to the construction phase.
26. No potentially significant in-combination or cumulative effects are predicted once the development is operational.

Chapter 16: Residual Effects & Mitigation

27. Chapter 16 of the ES summarises the likely residual effects outlined in the preceding chapters.

Annex 4 – Consultation Responses Summary

West Oxfordshire District Council

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

1. No response received

Initial Response July 2019

2. Welcomes the fact that OCC are progressing the scheme, however the current proposal fails to integrate vehicle, pedestrian and cycle links with the Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village site (OGCV) and connectivity in and around the site. Flexibility should allow for bus services to move between the P&R and OGCV. The proposal also fails to appropriately consider the access strategy for all modes to the West Eynsham SDA. WODC is concerned that the P&R roundabout design would prejudice the delivery of a future southern arm into the SDA. Concerns are raised about the scope and content of the Traffic & Transport Chapter of the TA. Further information is requested on the impact of the development on trees, landscaping & planting proposals/compensation, and lighting and public realm/place-making proposals at the P&R. No objections are made in terms of environmental health or contaminated land however conditions are requested to secure noise mitigation and the control of unexpected contamination.

Cherwell District Council

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

3. No response received

Initial Response July 2019

4. The proposed scheme forms a key component of the Local Transport Strategy. The County Council must fully assess the environmental impacts of this development and give these due weight alongside the consideration of economic and social benefits. Mitigation or compensation should be secured for ecological impacts where necessary. It is noted that the scheme would result in a net loss in biodiversity and converting this to a net gain through off-site enhancements is encouraged. The County Council should consider the extent of tree/hedgerow removal and secure mitigation to minimise visual impacts. Measures should also be secured to mitigate amenity impacts including noise, vibration and air quality the construction environmental measures and routing of HGVs during construction.

Oxford City Council

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

5. No response received.

Initial Response July 2019

6. No Objection, but the applicant is encouraged to lengthen the westbound bus lane.
7. The County Council and City Council recognise that for Oxford to function effectively there must be a radical shift away from people relying on the use of the private car towards more sustainable modes as reflected in the emerging Oxford Local Plan. The application would support these objectives. The new 'remote' P&R would part of an overall package of measures in the city including the 'inner' P&R car parks, which would encourage car users to public transport to travel into the city.
8. The Council has concerns about the westbound bus lane that it is not continuous. A continuous bus lane would give assurance to commuters that their return journey will not be delayed and would encourage bus travel.
9. The proposed A40 improvements are to the west side of Duke's Cut. An application currently being determined by the City Council at Northern Gateway (18/02065/OUTFUL) also proposes improvements to the A40 from the east side of the A34 to Wolvercote Roundabout. Overall these infrastructure improvements to the A40 would support the development of the strategic Northern Gateway within the City Council boundary.

Eynsham Parish Council

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

10. Strongly Objects for the following reasons:
 - Design & Access – The scheme does not address the needs of the existing community. The stretch of the A40 around Eynsham should replicate a community-feel such as at North Way/Sunderland Avenue and the speed limit should be reduced to 30mph. The new roundabout should be Dutch-style to give priority to pedestrians/cyclists. P_{RoW} around Eynsham are inaccurately represented in the ES and the value and extent of the P_{RoW} is undervalued. P_{RoW} to the north of the A40 will be closed for a long time, which is of concern to the local community. Bollards should be installed to the A40 end of footpath 206/31 to prevent vehicles accessing the bridleway.
 - Location – The P&R should be located at Shores Green, Witney to reduce time travelled to the P&R on congested roads. The scheme should also be providing 1,000 car parking spaces as required by policy. In its current location the P&R may be underutilised and fail to reduce traffic on the A40.
 - Bus Lane Design – The design of the P&R roundabout has improved but it is not clear if will obviate accidents. The retention of the A40 layby, the issues of traffic flow, emergence and rat running will not be addressed. The bus land from Witney to Eynsham should be delivered before the P&R.
 - Community Involvement – Insufficient public consultation has been undertaken. The application contains conflicting information and details still to be confirmed.

- Air Quality – Air quality, including to AQMAs, SSSIs and the Oxford Meadows SAC will be compromised despite the conclusions of the ES. Air quality monitoring and mitigation measures proposed are unacceptable and will not outweigh the adverse effects.
 - Biodiversity – It is unacceptable for the County Council to obtain approval for an application without agreed options for creating a net gain in biodiversity. Hedgerows should be retained and the P&R redesigned to work within existing constraints and more planting should be included. Mitigation measures are not proportionate to the level of harm incurred.
 - Landscape & Visual – The development would result in significant adverse effects to the landscape character
 - Lighting – The scheme would result in unnecessary light pollution.
 - Climate Change & Flooding – There is concern that the works in Eynsham Parish on the road and P&R site will increase localised flood risk. The Preliminary Drainage Strategy for the P&R should be rigorously assessed by the Environment Agency.
 - Green Belt – The development is inappropriate in the Green Belt.
11. The Council also seeks clarification about the funding of the project and the status of the originally proposed café at the P&R.
12. In the event the application is approved, the Parish Council requests the installation of vehicle cleaning systems prior to commencements, the provision of a monthly update report from the project team, consultation on a Construction Traffic Management Plan, and S106 funding towards Eynsham's Gateway Improvement Project, the B4044 Eynsham-Botley Community Path, a safe cycle route at Lower Road B4449, Eynsham-Hanborough, and other local sustainable transport options.

Initial Response July 2019

13. Strong objection for reasons associated with the inappropriateness of the location to support sustainable transport, bus lane design, inadequate community involvement, air quality effects, impacts on biodiversity, landscape and visual effects, the impact of lighting, climate change and flooding, and the development would be inappropriate in the Green Belt. Clarification is also sought over a number of identified errors in the application documents.

Cassington Parish Council

14. No response received to either round of consultation.

Freeland Parish Council

Regulation 25 Response July 2021

15. Objection. The Parish Council remains extremely concerned and frustrated regarding key aspects of the proposed development. This scheme remains unacceptable to the local community in relation to landscape, visual, biodiversity, traffic and lighting impacts. Specific comments made are:

- **Landscape & Visual:** The importance of the P&R site's location within the Wychwood Project Area is marginalised, contrary to WOLP Policy EH2. It would cause significant, long term and unnecessary harm to the landscape character, visual amenity, and biodiversity of the Wychwood Project Area and the local rural landscape. Proposed screen woodland would be ineffective particularly during the winter months
- **Internal Landscape Mitigation:** Internal planting within the P&R site remains minimal and should be extended.
- **Lighting:** Light pollution will be contrary to policy and the Salt Cross Area Action plan core objective 13. Low crime rates locally are attributed to the absence of street lighting as this deters loitering. Proposed lighting will severely impact nocturnal wildlife including deer, badgers, hedgehogs, owls and bats. The proposed light columns will impact on rural amenity and health of existing and new local residents.
- **Traffic Generation:** A number of traffic measures are required to prevent rat running in Freeland village. This should include a re-engineered priority junction from Cuckoo Lane and Wroslyn Road, village threshold features, traffic calming measures, and a 20mph speed limit. A coordinated and committed funding package is required from OCC and the developers of Salt Cross as both developments will increase traffic movements on the local road network resulting in more rat running and speeding through Freeland village.

First Response July 2019

16. Objection. On their own, the proposals will be minor benefit to bus users but they are supported as they are understood to be the first phase of a larger plan to provide eastwards and westwards bus lanes right into Oxford which would encourage people to travel by bus rather than car.
17. The Parish Council is concerned about the P&R design which would result in landscape, visual, traffic and lighting impacts that are unacceptable. The Council therefore objects due to the inadequacy of screening measures, the loss of hedgerows, trees and natural landform as well as the over-engineered approach, light pollution, and the inadequacy of proposed measures to reduce rat running through Freeland Village.

Yarnton Parish Council

18. No comments received to either round of consultation.

Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council

19. No comments received to either round of consultation.

Councillors Mathew & Billington

20. No response received to either round of consultation.

Eynsham Society

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

21. The revisions do not address the concerns or objections raised in the Society's original response submitted in July 2019.

Initial Response July 2019

22. The Society is broadly supportive of the construction of the eastbound bus lane and partial westbound bus lane but does not believe the measures proposed will reduce congestion on their own. There is also concern that there may be adverse impacts to the south-side cycle path.
23. The Society strongly opposes the P&R at Eynsham on the grounds that it makes no sense to site it there.
24. The Society is sceptical that the proposals will encourage a modal shift to cycling as a means of commuting to Oxford.
25. It is regretted that the application does not include an eastbound spur from the A40 to Peartree Junction, which would be the single most effective means of reducing congestion by removing most through traffic from the Wolvercote roundabout.

Eynsham Planning Improvement Campaign

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

26. No response received

Initial Response July 2019

27. Objection. The proposals are inadequate to deal with existing and future traffic problems. A radical and imaginative solution is needed, rather than tinkering with existing infrastructure. Longer term solutions should be considered that harness new technologies such as driverless cars, trams, light railway or other mass transit systems. The proposals do not take into account future growth in the area, including the Garden Village and West Eynsham SDA. The proposals represent old thinking when new solutions are required.

Natural England

Regulation 25 Response December 2020

28. No Objection – Comments from July 2019 are repeated.

Initial Comments July 2019

29. No objection. The proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on internationally/nationally designated sites, including the Oxford Meadows SAC, Cassington Meadows, Pixey & Yarnton Meads, and Wytham Woods SSSIs. To meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, the LPA is advised to record its decision that adverse effects to the Oxford Meadows SAC can be ruled out using suggested justification in the detailed response

letter. The scheme will have direct effects on the proposed extension to the Cassington Gravel Pits LWS through the construction of a site compound as well as indirect effects from the removal of vegetation. Advice should be sought from BBOWT on this issue. The scheme would result in the net loss of biodiversity (-12.33 units) mainly through loss of hedgerows, grassland and verge habitats. The commitment to achieving a biodiversity net gain is welcomed and could be achieved through off-site enhancements within the Oxford Meadows to Farmoor CTA. Further general advice is provided in respect of protected species and other environmental issues.

Historic England

Regulation 25 Response November 2020

30. Response received – No comments made.

Initial Comments June 2019

31. Response received – No comments made.

Highways England

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

32. No objection. Construction phasing should be carefully managed in the context of the significant levels of development being delivered in the vicinity of already congested junctions close to the A34.

Initial Response June 2019

33. No objection.

Environment Agency

Regulation 25 Response February 2021

34. We have reviewed the updated FRA and consider that it satisfactorily addresses our earlier concerns. The proposed development will be acceptable if the following conditions are included on the planning permission:

- The development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted FRA including mitigation measures
- No development at Cassington New Bridge until a scheme to provide otter pass/ledge and fencing has been submitted to and approved in writing
- Lighting on bridges across watercourses to be designed to reduce light spill onto the watercourses and in accordance with best practice

Initial Response August 2019

35. Objects due to inadequate Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).

36. The FRA has assessed the site based on the highest vulnerable classification for the proposed development – essential infrastructure. Essential infrastructure is considered appropriate in all flood zones however within 3b the development

also should remain safe and operational, result in no loss of floodplain storage and not impede water flows or increased flood risk elsewhere. The P&R site lies entirely within flood zone 1 with the bus lane scheme crossing multiple main rivers and encroaching into all three flood zones. The bus lane scheme will therefore cause a loss of floodplain storage due to the widening of the existing carriageway into the floodplain.

37. The FRA does not comply with national policy and guidance and therefore does not provide a suitable basis for assessment of flood risk. In particular the FRA fails to:

- Provide an appropriate assessment of the potential increased flood risk as a result of the development
- Demonstrate that the loss of floodplain storage within the 1% AEP flood extent with an appropriate allowance for climate change caused by the proposed development can be mitigated for
- Provide details on main river crossing and the potential impact on flood risk.

38. The objection can be overcome through the submission of a FRA that covers these deficiencies.

BBOWT

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

39. No response received.

Initial Response August 2019

40. BBOWT does not object in principle to the concept of the bus lanes/P&R proposals however significant concerns exist about the potential impact on biodiversity and therefore BBOWT objects for the following reasons:

- Potential adverse impact on Cassington to Yarnton Gravel Pits LWS and on priority bird species through the direct and indirect effects of the removal of vegetation along the eastbound carriageway of the A40. The hedgerow currently has biodiversity value in itself but also provides screening between the LWS and A40.
- Potential adverse impact on Cassington to Yarnton Gravel Pits East Extension LWS through the siting of construction compound 9 within its boundary.
- Potential adverse impact on Oxford Meadows SAC – insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate there would be no impact on water quality or quantity. A hydrological report should be provided.
- Potential adverse impact on wild bird habitat contrary to Conservation of Habitats and Species legislation due to the impact on breeding and wintering birds at the Cassington to Yarnton Gravel Pits LWS as well as lack of compensation for the loss of hedgerows.
- Potential adverse impact on priority habitats through the loss of hedgerows along the A40.

- Potential adverse impact on ecological networks, the Oxford Meadows and Farmoor CTA
- The application does not demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity. Proposals for biodiversity offsetting should be worked out and supplied prior to the determination of the application. Concerns are also raised about the metric calculations provided.

41. BBOWT also comments that lighting proposals should be in a form that minimises the potential impact on bats, invertebrates, birds and other species. New buses should also be electric powered.

Stagecoach

Regulation 25 Response November 2020

42. Objection withdrawn and in-principle support established for the proposals. The important matters raised in the letter of objection lodged in July 2019 have been appropriately addressed to the extent that the application is now capable of being satisfactorily implemented without prejudicing other important elements of the adopted transport and planning strategies for the immediate locality and District. Some minor details of design within the P&R site remain, but these can be picked up at the detailed design and construction stage and are immaterial to the planning case and balance.
43. The only element of the original objection not addressed relates to the provision for non-motorised users to cross the A40 to the south to reach the West Eynsham SDA. However, this is proposed to be dealt with as part of a more strategic approach to the A40 and connectivity across it will emerge as part of proposals for the A40 Barnard Gate to Duke's Cut scheme which proposes dualling of the A40 to the west of the application site and uninterrupted westbound bus lanes between Duke's Cut and the P&R site.

Initial Response July 2019

44. Strong in-principle support, but detailed objection for the following reasons:
- The P&R scheme has been designed in isolation, with no regard given to the committed development adjacent to and opposite the through site allocations. Walking, cycling and bus route between the P&R and these developments should be significantly improved.
 - The P&R roundabout design appear to hinder if not preclude the creation of a fourth southern arm into the West Eynsham SDA. Infrastructure planning should take full account of the plan led development that is will serve. The roundabout design does not demonstrate previously anticipated entrance geometry which may cause traffic delays.

CPRE

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

45. No response received.

Initial Response July 2019

46. Objection. CPRE is fully supportive of improving public transport to limit increases in traffic demand from new development, to aid the local economy and reduce air pollution. There is agreement with the principle of using bus lanes particularly in the short to medium term. However, the proposal caters for bus journeys to Oxford City and does not take into account the fact that most journeys use the A34 to other destinations that are not well served by public transport and employment growth locations are located outside of the centre. If a P&R facility is required, it would be better sited nearer Witney to intercept traffic at an earlier point.

Woodland Trust

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

47. Objects due to lack of clarity around connectivity between the P&R site to Eynsham Wood. There should be no direct visitor access or signage to Eynsham wood from the eastern boundary of the P&R, and therefore the access to Cuckoo Lane should be for access only and not egress. The eastern boundary of the P&R against Cuckoo Lane should be planted with a 15m wide native broadleaf woodland buffer backed up with a secure wire mesh fence. In the absence of a sealed boundary with Cuckoo Lane, financial contributions are sought towards increased maintenance costs to Eynsham Wood due to increased visitor usage direct from the P&R site.
48. The Trust is also concerned about disturbance during both the operational and construction phases on the semi-natural habitat of Eynsham Wood as well as its value as a recreational asset. Additional concerns are raised about the potential for the introduction of contaminants from the P&R into the local hydrological network as well as the extent of habitat and species loss within the P&R development, particularly in relation to trees and hedgerows. All mitigation planting should be native broadleaf grown and sourced UK stock. Concerns are also raised about the impacts of walking and cycling paths adjacent to SSSIs and Ancient Woodland.
49. Non-native species within the P&R site should form part of a site management plan to prevent colonisation within Eynsham Wood.

Initial Response July 2019

50. No comments received (NB. Woodland Trust states it did not receive the notification sent by the County Council in June 2019).

Lead Local Flood Authority

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

51. Objection removed. The previous advice about culverting, swale/filter drain incorporation and minimising of culverting of ditch lines have been addressed, and a SuDS Maintenance and Management Plan has been submitted which is acceptable. As the designs are preliminary, a pre-commencement condition

should be included to require the submission of a details SuDS Strategy as well as a further condition securing the submission of as-built details.

Initial Response July 2019

52. Objection due to a lack of key documentation to enable a full technical audit or drainage/flooding/SuDS for the proposal.

OCC Archaeology

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

53. No comments received.

Initial Response July 2019

54. The application has identified an area of Iron Age activity that is indicative of a small unenclosed farmstead. There is no indication that this is of such significance as to preclude the principle of the development. Whilst there is no further requirement for predetermination investigation, this specific area will require further investigation in advance of development. If any development works take place before archaeological mitigation has been undertaken then the area to be subject to archaeological investigation should be fenced to avoid any tracking across it. It is recommended that the applicant should be responsible for implementing a programme of archaeological work which can be secured through conditions.

OCC Countryside Access

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

55. No comments received.

Initial Response July 2019

56. The application reflects discussions held between Countryside Access and project teams as well as the vision and aims of the adopted Rights of Way Management Plan 2015-2025 and will do much to protect and improve access in the area. The application is therefore supported.

Arboriculture Advice

February 2021

57. An arboricultural survey and impact assessment have been provided for the A40 Bus Lane and P&R schemes. These have provided information on 406 individual trees, groups and hedges (features). Some of the group features contain large but unquantified numbers of trees, others very few. The AIA acknowledges that the location of some trees has been estimated not topographically surveyed. A number of errors have been identified during review of the data; most are not considered material. The omission of a prominent oak tree just outside the northern boundary of the P&R and a missing tree protection area should both be picked up in a review of data should the scheme be approved.

58. For both sites combined, 124 features are proposed for complete removal to enable development. 78 groups are identified for partial removal, all of them along the A40 bus lane. 78 features, mostly individual trees along the A40, are proposed to be retained but are at risk from encroachment by construction into tree root protection areas. The location of these features and the extent of overlap with root protection areas are mapped. Proposals are made in outline as to what tree protection measures will be used. Tree protection fencing is proposed to be used extensively.
59. A number of arboricultural issues have been identified that need to be considered. The proposed loss of a prominent mature oak tree T29 in the north of the P&R is a concern as we consider the landscape value and cultural potential of the tree has been underestimated. The applicant should explain what options were considered to retain this tree and to examine whether the layout in this area could be adjusted to allow its retention. It is considered likely that some of the trees proposed for retention will, as construction proceeds, require removal either for reasons for long-term tree safety or to enable the works. This cannot be quantified from the available information but the likelihood of additional losses should be taken into account in the planning decision. The removal of trees along the highway edge may leave adjacent trees both within and outside the highway boundary susceptible to failure due to wind or increased environmental stress. The highway boundary will be closer to the tree edge and so the probability of tree failures becoming a hazard to road users will increase. This may also result in an increased rate of removal of trees that would otherwise be retained. This cannot be quantified from the available information but the likelihood of additional losses should be taken into account in the planning decision.
60. An initial assessment has been made by the applicant of the level of known canopy loss as a result of the development. This indicates that at least 4.8ha of canopy of trees, groups and hedges will be lost. It is likely that this is a minimum figure for reasons identified above. The P&R will introduce extensive new tree planting. This will help to mitigate overall canopy loss over time, though the functionality of that canopy cover will differ particularly in respect of trees along the A40. Ash dieback disease is likely to result in the death and removal of much of the ash component along the A40 corridor over a number of years. An indicative assessment has been made of the impact of this loss. This concludes that between 2.5ha and 3.2ha of additional canopy may be lost to ash dieback over time. This is not a specific planning issue but there are links to the future operation of the highway.
61. A number of measures are proposed to further mitigate the impact on trees, which should be secured through conditions:
- Prior to construction an updated tree survey including the topographic location of trees that are currently located approximately should be undertaken
 - A detailed AMS for both the P&R and A40 should be prepared including detailed consideration of tree protection measures as part of the pre-

construction design. Full arboricultural clerk of works supervision must be provided to oversee construction around trees.

- A detailed tree risk management strategy should be prepared for the A40 corridor, to include consideration of tree planting outside of the application boundary with landowner permission
- Full consultation and agreement with owners of off-site trees is required before works commence to privately owned trees
- It is recommended that CAVAT analysis is undertaken of any trees that are proposed to be retained but for which removal is required during works. An appropriate compensation amount would be allocated to future tree planting and maintenance.
- Further consideration should be given to the use of tree root cells and structural soils to improve future tree survival and growth on the P&R site.

62. In conclusion, implementation of the scheme to create a Park & Ride and widen the A40 Bus Lane corridor will result in the loss of individual tree, group and hedge features. Measures are proposed to retain features where possible and mitigate loss through new planting. I consider it likely that additional tree loss above that reported will take place as a direct and indirect result of the scheme. The extent of additional loss cannot be accurately quantified at this stage. In addition, there will be changes to the tree population, particularly along the A40 corridor, as a result of natural forces such as ash dieback disease and, management of trees by private landowners. Cumulatively this will result in a still greater change in extent and character of the tree cover over a relatively short period. In time, new planting on the Park & Ride site, along the A40 Bus Lane corridor and natural regeneration will contribute to rebuilding and perhaps expanding overall tree cover, though in different locations and with different functions.

OCC Landscape

Regulation 25 Response February 2021

63. No objection subject to conditions. In addition to the additional information submitted and alterations to the scheme, more information is now available with regard to the Salt Cross Garden Village development, and the ES Addendum provides an update on cumulative and in-combination effects. Whilst it concludes that the amendments to the scheme would not result in any additional significant environmental effects, it recognises that additional cumulative and in-combination effects will arise from the garden village development. I consider the changing landscape context an important point to keep in mind when considering the landscape and visual impacts of the P&R and A40 widening. The garden village development will significantly change the site's context with regard to both landscape character including lighting and views. This will have a mitigating effect on the P&R development in the long-term so far as the context of the site will change from rural to more sub-urban.

64. LVIA: I consider the LVIA acceptable and agree that the adverse effects will largely be localised. However, some adverse effects might be greater than stated.
65. P&R: The quantum of development is less than required by policy which is welcomed in landscape terms. The latest revisions indicate increased connectivity with the garden village development. As the garden village development is still evolving, the exact locations of development should be kept under review. The development would result in the loss of hedgerows and trees, including two mature oak trees which are important features in the landscape. The AIA shows the P&R will result in the removal of internal hedgerows and boundary hedgerows, including mature hedgerows along the A40 and Cuckoo Lane as well as a small number of trees. I consider the vegetation loss to have a significant adverse effect on landscape character at a local level and in the short to medium term. A landscape-led approach has been adopted that seeks to integrate the car park into the landscape. This is to be achieved by a combination of retaining existing boundary vegetation where possible and introducing boundary hedgerows, woodland areas, individual trees and swales to provide screening, break up areas of hardstanding and offer ecological benefits to soften views. The landscaping scheme provides a good overview of the proposed landscape strategy but are illustrative and more detail is required if the development is approved, including to take account of the drainage requirements. I believe this has the potential to be effective in the long-term subject to appropriate management.
66. Notwithstanding that the development will cause a change in local landscape character and views, I am satisfied that a design approach has been adopted that takes into account the surrounding landscape character and views. I consider the development to be in line with planning policy requirements. A detailed landscaping scheme and a Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan are required but can be conditioned.
67. Lighting: Proposed lighting will have to balance the operational and legal requirements of lighting against its impacts on the surrounding landscape. The development will introduce lighting into a currently relatively dark area and as such it will adversely affect the landscape character and views in the locality, especially in the short and medium-term. I am satisfied that the lighting seeks to take account of the sensitivities of the site and its context whilst meeting the necessary standards and requirements. A detailed lighting scheme is required but can be conditioned.
68. A40: Much of the A40 is lined with mature trees and hedgerows in this section and the development will require the full or partial removal of sections of this hedgerow. The vegetation loss is of concern in landscape and visual terms. Mature trees and hedgerows along the A40 are key characteristics in the local landscape and the loss of mature vegetation has the potential to substantially affect the landscape character and views. As landscape impacts are closely related to arboricultural issues on this site, I am guided by the recommendations and conditions put forward by the arboricultural advice. Replacement planting proposals give a good indication of the type of planting proposed but more

detail will be required in the form of detailed design drawings, planting plans and planting details. New planting will take time to establish and may be difficult to achieve in some situations due to the narrow width of the verge and the cycle path use. Mindful of this, I encourage that thought is given to whether off-site hedgerow or tree planting could also be secured on off-site land in collaboration with adjacent landowners to create more substantial buffers.

69. I expect the development to result in a change in landscape character from a road corridor framed by mature trees and hedgerows to a more open corridor. I attribute this to the nature of the development and the constraint of the application site rather than the design approach. Overall, I am satisfied that the scheme takes account of the surrounding landscape context by seeking to retain existing vegetation as much as possible and by seeking to mitigate effects through replacement planting. As such I consider the scheme in line with policy.

Initial Response July 2019

70. Further information is required to enable an assessment of the landscape and visual effects of the development, in relation to the LVIA, photomontages, details of lighting proposals and impact, and further information to identify vegetation removal, the impact on trees and hedgerows, and landscaping/planting proposals.

OCC Transport Development Control

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

71. No objection subject to conditions to cover the following:
- A Construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to commencement;
 - Internal circulatory routes for pedestrians and cyclists within the P&R to be constructed prior to the opening of connections to Salt Cross Garden Village;
 - Details of speed reduction measures on internal roads within the P&R to be submitted to the LPA for approval prior to first use;
 - The proposed pedestrian/cycle crossing of the A40 at Old Witney Road to be completed in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved by the LPA;
 - Cycle parking provision within the P&R to be provided prior to the first use of the P&R;
 - Cycle parking to be provided at eastbound A40 bus stops in accordance with details first submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to completion of the bus lane.
72. A number of changes have been made to the proposals since the previous submission including minor changes to the footway/cycleway widths. The changes to access to and within the P&R site are more significant in highway terms as the proposals for developments surrounding the site have progressed and these changes allow for better integration of the P&R facility with future developments.

73. A significant inclusion is the potential for a fourth arm to be provided on the access roundabout (to the south) which would provide access to the West Eynsham SDA. WODC and OCC jointly commissioned a report on the access strategy for the West Eynsham SDA and it concluded that an additional arm from the P&R access roundabout was a viable option subject to further consideration of the impact on the existing layby. The Road Safety Audit identified one issue related to the fourth arm which would need to be addressed should this arm be implemented and therefore is not for this application to address at this time.
74. A Road Safety Audit for the proposed three-arm roundabout has been provided as requested previously. The concerns raised can be addressed through minor changes at the detailed design stage. In this scenario, the existing layby has been adjusted to allow vehicles wishing to travel east to turn left and U-turn at the roundabout rather than attempt to turn right across the additional lanes of traffic.
75. The updated drawings provide for connectivity between the P&R site and the future Salt Cross Garden Village development to the north. There are two pedestrian/cycle connections in the north west of the site along with one on the northern boundary which will connect to the employment area of the future development and one at the north east joining Cuckoo Lane which will provide an important future connection towards the Salt Cross village centre. These connections are shown as 3m wide shared use however consideration should be given to providing segregated foot and cycle facilities in this area as there are likely to be groups of people disembarking buses and heading to Salt Cross rather than a steady flow of users as would be more typical elsewhere. These need to be developed alongside proposals for the adjacent land and so it is recommended that this is covered by a planning condition.
76. At the north west of the site there is also a bus link which will allow access to the Salt Cross spine road and will therefore provide the necessary condition for a bus service serving the garden village and SDA developments.
77. The circulatory road which allows for cars to circulate within the site is generally 5m wide and it is unclear why this level of width is required. This is likely to lead to higher vehicle speeds and potentially lead to misuse of the one-way systems and it is recommended that these be reduced in width for the final design.
78. The TA addendum has reviewed the modelling previously undertaken for the opening year of 2021 to consider any changes that occur with the new opening year of 2024. Based on the current evidence available there is forecast to be a small increase in background traffic between 2021 and 2024 however this could be considered a worst case scenario and does not account for demand management measures in Oxford that are currently being developed and implemented. For the new access junction there would only be very small increased traffic flow of 36 vehicles in the AM peak with a maximum increase of 15 for one movement. In the PM peak the overall increase is 60 vehicles with a maximum of 27 for the ahead movement across the lanes. There are similar

small increases on the other junctions that have been reviews and these would not materially change the results or conclusions from those previously considered. The modelling has limited ability to demonstrate the mode shift that will occur and the P&R development will ultimately provide a net benefit to the operation of the A40 between Eynsham and Oxford.

79. In the previous response, it was requested that all road users be considered through the ES and specifically that IEMA guidance be used to do so. This has now been undertaken and included in Appendix G to the ES Addendum. The most significant effects on non-motorised users are likely to come from closures of the foot/cycleways during the construction process. This impact can be managed and limited within the construction programme to ensure that alternative temporary facilities are provided with appropriate crossing points and would be short term. In the long term with the scheme operational, the small increase in large vehicle movements (buses) would be outweighed in terms of severance, fear and intimidation and accidents and safety by the improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure that will be delivered by the development in terms of controlled crossing points and widened off carriageway features.
80. Overall, the updated information has addressed the concerns raised previously and the updated have allowed the site to be better integrated with proposed local developments that have evolved in the intermediate time. The development as a whole will provide a benefit to the operation of the A40 and allow for further improvements in the future.

Initial Response July 2019

81. Objection - The Transport chapter of the ES does not provide sufficient information or follow required guidance and therefore further information is required.
82. The proposals will greatly improve journey times for sustainable modes along the A40. Despite the junction modelling showing an impact on certain junctions at peak times, the overall benefit of the scheme and predicted future modal shift is deemed to be positive. There are a number of proposed crossings across the A40, three of which are signalised. These are beneficial to bus users as well as existing residents at Eynsham and Cassington wanting to access the bus stops in either direction. However, as the proposed speed limit is 50mph, there are potential safety risks associated and road safety audits are required prior to construction.
83. A new eastbound bus stop is proposed east of Cassington which is deemed beneficial to residents especially on the east side of the village who will now have a closer stop. However, a westbound bus stop is not being provided and as the existing stops are moved further west, this will add approximately 27m. Although this is not ideal for residents of Cassington, the overall benefit of the scheme will mitigate the impact of this. It is understood the feasibility of creating an additional bus stop on the south side of the A40 will be explored when the next stage of the A40 improvement scheme is undertaken.

84. If planning permission is granted, conditions are requested to cover the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan, Road Safety Audit, cycle parking details, the design of internal roads, and bus stop and interchange waiting facilities.

OCC Protected Species Officer

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

85. Additional information has been submitted by the applicant and the scheme overall has undergone a number of design changes, however concerns remain over biodiversity loss.

Cassington to Yarnton Gravel Pits LWS – At this stage there is insufficient information to guarantee that the LWS will not be harmed as a result of the scheme. If, on balance, the scheme is approved, a series of pre-commencement conditions will be required to ensure the interest features of the LWS are not harmed

86. Part of the A40 lies directly adjacent to the LWS, which is a complex of gravel pits, lakes, reedbeds, and other wetland habitats. The LWS is notable for its assemblages of wintering birds, particularly waders and wildfowl, and other species such as grass snake. The proposed widening of the A40 would require removal of vegetation alongside the LWS. This vegetation plays a key role in screening the LWS from the A40 as well as offering habitat to other species such as nesting birds. Plans have now been updated to ensure that vegetation is replaced wherever practicable along this route which will help to restore screening and make the impacts temporary rather than permanent. It is acknowledged that some areas will be unsuitable for new planting due to steep embankments.
87. The Officer was satisfied from site visit that the location of the works is sufficiently buffered from the wetland complexes by woody vegetation to have low impacts on wintering wildfowl. Birds at this LWS are subject to existing levels of disturbance due to proximity to the road and other operations and it is not anticipated that the scheme would result in significant permanent impacts to these species. Temporary displacement of birds to other parts of the gravel pits complex may occur, however measures could be incorporated to provide supplementary screening during construction.
88. Arboricultural advice has been sought which highlights a number of concerns and indicates that tree loss has likely been underestimated. It is suggested that further tree loss, either within the site boundary or beyond may occur as a result of windblow or changes in ground conditions in the newly opened canopy of trees. This cannot be quantified at this stage based on available information. If tree losses have not been accurately assessed, this raises concerns over the true impacts that opening of this corridor would have on the LWS. Without this information I cannot at this stage say with certainty that there will be no negative impacts on the interest features of the LWS.

89. If, when balanced with other planning priorities the application is approved, a series of conditions will be required, including the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be required to include noise and pollution controls as well as wildlife buffers. The long term management of the replacement planting will need to be outlined in a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) to ensure the long-term viability of new planting.

Cassington to Yarnton Gravel Pits LWS Proposed Extension – No Objection subject to Conditions

90. Construction Compound 9 is located within the LWS Proposed Extension. Whilst this is regrettable, it is noted that efforts have now been taken to ensure the compound would be located within the least diverse area of grassland covering as small an area as practicable. A CEMP will ensure the remainder of the LWS is protected during construction. The grassland would be restored and enhanced following construction. The impacts will be temporary and the re-instatement of better quality grassland would ensure long term benefit to the LWS. Long term management will need to be address in a LEMP.

Oxford Meadows SAC – No Objection subject to Conditions

91. The scheme is located adjacent to the Oxford Meadows SAC. The SAC supports the Annex 1 habitat lowland hay meadow and holds the only population of Creeping Marshwort in the UK. Whilst no direct impacts such as land take are proposed, concerns have been raised over the potential indirect effects on the interest features of the SAC. The impacts on the SAC were considered in the Habitats Regulation Assessment for European Sites, which identified the two key pathways of impact as air pollution from nitrogenous compounds and hydrological changes due to surface water run-off. The HRA concluded the interest features of the SAC would not be adversely affected by the proposals. Overall, the officer is satisfied that provided the air and hydrological issues have been satisfactorily resolved, no likely significant impacts on the interest features of the SAC will result from the development. Natural England has also confirmed they do not object to the scheme. A CEMP is required to prevent harm during the construction period.

Protected Species – No Objection subject to Conditions

92. The application documents identified key features of note as Great Crested Newts, bats and badger. A European Protected Species Mitigation License will be required due to the potential of harm to terrestrial habitats of Great Crested Newt at the proposed P&R site. Loss of trees and hedgerow has the potential to disturb bat commuting and foraging corridors, however replacement planting will develop over time therefore this impact is temporary. An outlier badger sett was identified within the zone of influence of the propose development.
93. Updated protected species surveys will be needed prior to commencement of construction to ensure current site conditions are evaluated. Should any changes in habitat composition or condition be identified, an updated metric must be provided.

Biodiversity Net Gain – Further information required

94. A Biodiversity Metric has been provided using the Defra 2.0 calculator. Previous calculations had been provided however the Defra 2.0 metric was requested following withdrawal of the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre (TVERC) calculator. An updated metric was received in February 2021 which confirmed a deficit of -7.69 habitat units and -7.95 hedgerow units, equivalent to -15-18% and -53.36% respectively. Left unmitigated, such loss would be contrary to the requirements of local and national planning policy in respect of biodiversity.
95. Given the nature of the scheme and available space, it is acknowledged that achieving a net gain in biodiversity within the scheme boundary could not be realised, therefore off-site offsetting will be required. A commitment has been made by the applicant to ensure a minimum of 5% net gain in biodiversity units will be achieved through either an offsetting provider or, if possible, utilising existing County Council owned land for enhancement. However, as noted above, concerns have been raised about the accuracy and implications of the assessment of tree loss. Updated arboricultural and ecological surveys are needed which will alter the final biodiversity unit calculations and at this stage I cannot be certain of the final loss of units overall. If unmitigated, the scheme would likely alter the ecological value and character of a significant area of habitat however at this stage this cannot be fully quantified without further information.
96. If, on balance, planning permission is to be granted, a series of pre-commencement conditions will be required to ensure a net gain in biodiversity is achieved overall as a result of the scheme.

Initial Response July 2019

97. Further information is required to enable an assessment of the impact of the development on biodiversity, including details of vegetation removal along the A40 in particular along the Cassington to Yarnton Gravel Pits LWS, the necessity of Site Compound 9 being located within the Eastern Extension to the Cassington to Yarnton Gravel Pits LWS, the options available to achieve biodiversity net gain on or off the site, hydrological impacts to Oxford Meadows SAC and the Yarnton Gravel Pits LWS, and the impact of lighting on bats and breeding birds.

OCC Mineral Planning Authority*Regulation 25 Response January 2021*

98. Part of the new road goes through a Strategic Resource Area 6 Thames, Lower Windrush and Evenlode Valleys – Standlake to Yarnton (Sharp sand and gravel).
99. The relevant planning policy of the Oxfordshire Mineral and Waste Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2017) is Policy M8 which says that minerals in the Strategic Resource Areas should be safeguarded for future use and that any

development that would hinder the possible working of the mineral would not be permitted unless it can be shown that (a) the site has been allocated in an adopted local plan or neighbourhood plan; or (b) the need for the development outweighs the economic and sustainability considerations relating to the mineral resource; or the mineral will be extracted prior to the development taking place.

100. The proposed development is mentioned in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan and especially under Policy T2 which refers to highway improvements. The project is part of the A40 Corridor scheme and is funded by the Local Growth Fund that is supported by Department for Transport. Due to this, the need for the development outweighs the economic and sustainability considerations relating to the mineral resource. However, we would still encourage that the mineral would be taken out where the road crosses the Strategic Resource Area prior to any road construction. Please check with policies C1- C12 for compliancy.

Initial Response July 2019

101. No comments received.

River Thames Society

102. No comments received to either round of consultation.

Open Spaces Society

103. No comments received to either round of consultation.

Ramblers Association

104. No comments received to either round of consultation.

Thames Water

105. No comments received to either round of consultation.

Annex 5 – Representations Summary

1. During the first round of consultation, 3 letters of objection or comment were received from representatives of landowners/developers with an interest in planned development to the north and west of Eynsham. Those comments are summarised as follows:

Pandora Properties and Goldfield Estates Ltd (Jansons Property) – Owners of Land within the West Eynsham SDA

Regulation 25 Response January 2021

2. The principle of the P&R continues to be supported. The following comments are also made:
 - Demonstration that access for future development at the West Eynsham SDA is safeguarded is welcomed. The detailed design stages for the roundabout should continue to ensure that the delivery of a fourth arm would not be prejudiced. Jansons would welcome further engagement with the applicant around the alignment of delivery of the roundabout and the fourth arm.
 - The P&R roundabout proposal does not include a pedestrian crossing facility between the P&R and the West Eynsham SDA, despite this being feasible across the eastern arm. It is requested that future design work includes such a crossing as its omission is an oversight and a failing of the P&R roundabout design.
 - The internal network of shared use footways/cycleways within the P&R site focus on the desire lines from Salt Cross Garden Village and Eynsham and fail to take into account the West Eynsham SDA. It is requested that a direct route is provided, crossing the eastern arm of the roundabout and connecting to bus laybys and cycle parking points. This should be secured through condition.
 - Cycle parking provision is insufficient within the P&R. Secure, high quality covered cycle parking should be provided in close proximity to bus terminals to include charging points for cycles, bike pumps and repair facilities. This should be secured through condition.
 - The conclusions drawn within the Transport Assessment Addendum are consistent with the findings of the technical transport work undertaken on behalf of Jansons and are therefore agreed.

Initial Response July 2019

3. The principle of the P&R is supported, however strong objection is raised to the design of the P&R roundabout. Specific concerns detailed are:
 - The roundabout fails to consider the need for an integrated access strategy for both motorised and non-motorised users from the West Eynsham SDA as the design prejudices the future ability to create a southern fourth arm to access the West Eynsham SDA

- The roundabout design does not optimise the use of the P&R facility in the provision of direct and seamless bus routes from the West Eynsham SDA and beyond.
- The application has no regard or explanation for adopting a design which prevents a southern arm in future. It is fundamentally different from that presented in the final consultation event prior to submission and fails to reflect the position understood in previous discussions.
- The ES is not fit for purpose and fails to assess the impact of the scheme on freight layby and neighbouring land uses to the south.
- The TA is deficient. It contains unsubstantiated data or traffic patronage and bus services; and
- For infrastructure planning to ignore plan led development located to take advantage of accessibility to Oxford is bad planning.

Berkeley Strategic

4. Berkeley Strategic responded to the first round of consultation. It was stated that the organisation is supportive of the proposals for the P&R and recognises that successful delivery of this infrastructure provides support for the planned growth at Eynsham. However, the proposals have not addressed the need to provide a considered solution to ped/cycle crossing facilities on the A40. Greater consideration should have been given to the increase in foot traffic to and from the P&R from the proposed strategic allocations to encourage greater use of the improved bus services and journey times to Oxford. Berkeley would welcome ongoing engagement about whether a footbridge or other means of crossing should be incorporated into the wider A40 strategy to help integrate the West Eynsham SDA with the OCGV and P&R. No further comments were received during the second round of consultation.

Grosvenor Developments Ltd (Promoters of the Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village development)

5. Grosvenor Developments Ltd responded to the first round of consultation. It was stated that there was support in principle of the A40 improvements, measures to improve walking and cycling and bus travel, and investment in bus services. However, there is a need to ensure convenient and legible pedestrian and cycle links into the OCGV site to the north. The P&R should be delivered with flexibility to allow for bus services to extend into the OCGV and A40 crossing points should also be coordinated with planning for the OCGV. No further comments were received during the second round of consultation.

Local Residents, representatives and community/interest groups

6. A joint response was received to the first round of consultation from **Councillors James, Rylett and Levy (District Councillors for Eynsham and Cassington)**. The comments state that public opinion is that the scheme is unlikely to be effective, a waste of money and a missed opportunity to take a better approach. The scheme needs to be considered holistically with growth in the wider area. It is unclear if more radical solutions have been considered and

the Business Case for the scheme should be published to allow for public scrutiny. Specific concerns raised were:

- The status of the closure of Horsemere lane Cassington. Plans are not clear.
 - The bus lane only reaches as far as Duke's Cut therefore time savings will be minimal and will diminish the incentive to switch mode
 - The scheme needs a continuous westbound bus lane. It does not currently address evening peak congestion.
 - A high proportion of traffic on the A40 is through traffic heading for the M40, A44 and A34. This has not been taken into account.
 - Bikes are not prioritised at junctions which is contrary to LTP4 and fails to encourage active travel
 - Bus routes are needed to destinations other than central Oxford e.g. Oxford Parkway Station
 - Cycling and walking links are needed into the P&R including from the OCGV site as well as charging docks for e-bikes and bike hire
 - The scheme is likely to undermine opportunities for rapid transport systems between Witney and Oxfordshire County Council
 - There is an unnecessary loss of biodiversity. The scheme should result in net gain
 - More clarity is needed on measures to reduce light pollution
 - More clarity is needed on the time it will take for screening planting to establish
 - There is a risk of flooding SE of the P&R site
 - The application should be determined by the District Council not the County Council.
7. A comment was received during the first round of consultation from **West Oxfordshire District Councillor Thomas Ashby**, stating that the scheme will not make any difference to the A40, does not promote active travel or provide an alternative for those travelling to Peartree. The scheme lacks vision.
8. A comment was received from **CycloX** during the first round of consultation objecting to the proposals. It was stated that whilst the straight-ahead provisions for cyclists are likely to be adequate along with other off-road provisions, the proposals at junctions and roundabouts are inadequate without exception and in some cases lethal (e.g. at the Eynsham roundabout). The proposals do not conform to DMRB guidance or the Interim Advice Note for Cycling. The proposals follow an engineering approach, focused on bus travel at 50mph and do not support a modal shift to cycling. No further comments were received during the second round of consultation
9. A further 53 letters of objection have been received from local residents, and community groups. The points raised are summarised as follow:
- The proposals are inadequate to deal with existing traffic problems and congestion along the A40, are ill-conceived, and a waste of public money.

- The proposals do not consider the impact of or cater for future growth along the A40
- A more imaginative and radical response is required rather than small changes to existing infrastructure based on old fashioned ideas
- Alternatives options should be taken forward including dualling of the A40, mass transit (trams, railway), harnessing new technology (driverless vehicles), car clubs, tidal flow, congestion charging, a slipway to Oxford.
- The scheme will fail as it stops at Duke's Cut where buses will meet the bottleneck at Wolvercote roundabout. Additional traffic including buses will make this bottleneck worse not better.
- The majority of traffic travelling along the A40 is not heading to Oxford, but travels towards the A34 or other destinations at the Wolvercote roundabout. There is no effort to address the impact of through traffic. A direct route to the commuter sites to the East of Oxford is needed.
- Many road users cannot use buses e.g. commercial vehicles, tradespeople, those carrying out the weekly shop, or those with a disability.
- The cost of bus travel is prohibitive, and it is cheaper to drive.
- The proposals will discourage a modal shift. Cycle lanes are inadequate, fragmented, and dangerous.
- The addition of junctions and crossing points will create new/exacerbated pinch points at Eynsham and Cassington. Cassington traffic lights are likely to fail.
- The environmental impacts of the development have been underplayed, including in relation to flood risk, impact on agricultural land, biodiversity, lighting and landscape impacts, and the impact on traffic congestion.
- The benefits of the scheme have been overstated
- No consideration has been given to the proposed mineral extraction site at Eynsham
- The proposals will result in biodiversity net loss which is unacceptable.
- Proposals for biodiversity are vague and non-committal therefore cannot be relied upon
- Eynsham is the wrong location of the proposed P&R. It should be located further west at Witney.
- The P&R falls short of the policy requirement as it only provides for 850 parking spaces, not the required 1000 spaces.
- Buses should travel through Eynsham to avoid residents travelling to the P&R. Connections to the P&R are needed from the south.
- The development goes against the climate change agenda and does not respond to the climate emergency.
- There should be PV panels installed on all buildings within the P&R
- The scheme will not result in a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions or would improve air quality
- Spaces should be increased for car club and electric vehicles
- Traffic flow should not be prioritised over environmental considerations
- The loss of green space and habitats is unacceptable
- A link should be provided to Long Hanborough Station.

PN7

- There has been insufficient consideration of the linkages to the OCGV and West Eynsham SDA. These developments should be halted until the issues on the A40 have been addressed.
- The proposals for the closure of Horsemere Lane at Cassington are not clear. The lane should be closed before works commence on the A40.
- People will travel to the P&R for free parking, increasing traffic on the A40
- The westwards footway/cycleway past Hanborough Close in Eynsham will affect the existing blocked culvert and will cause visual intrusion to properties in this location. Screening should be provided.
- Increased pollution at the Wolvercote bottleneck will impact on the Oxford Meadows SAC and SSSIs.
- Rat-running through local villages and the A40 layby at Eynsham will increase
- There are safety concerns associated with the A40 layby at Eynsham entry/egress and conflict points with the nursery entrance and Cuckoo Lane
- The P&R is not future proofed.

Annex 6 – European Protected Species

The Local Planning Authority in exercising any of their functions, have a legal duty to have regard to the requirements of the Conservation of Species & Habitats Regulations 2017 which identifies 4 main offences for development affecting European Protected Species (EPS).

1. Deliberate capture or killing or injuring of an EPS
2. Deliberate taking or destroying of EPS eggs
3. Deliberate disturbance of a EPS including in particular any disturbance which is likely
 - a) to impair their ability –
 - i) to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young, or
 - ii) in the case of animals of a hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or
 - b) to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong.
4. Damage or destruction of an EPS breeding site or resting place.

Our records, survey results and consideration of the habitats within the site area indicate that, with appropriate mitigation, European Protected Species are unlikely to be harmed as a result of the proposals.