

Oxford to Bletchley Group – Meeting notes

Meeting #1 – Details

Date: 14/01/2025

Time: 18:00

Type of meeting: Virtual (Teams)

Key discussion points and outcomes

- 1 **Introductions, workshop overview, and housekeeping**
 - 1.1 Sarah Jacobs (SJ) welcomed attendees to the meeting, introduced the EWR Co team members and ran through the housekeeping and agenda for the meeting.
 - 1.2 SJ explained that the purpose of the workshops is to talk about the non-statutory consultation and answer any questions the attendees may have. It provides an early opportunity for attendees to give feedback which will be captured and input into the design change process.
 - 1.3 The workshops are taking place during the consultation period and therefore it's important that attendees also give formal feedback through the consultation which ends on Friday 24 January 2025. EWR Co are only seeking feedback on the design and optionality set out within the non-statutory consultation, not anything outside of scope or historic engagement.
 - 1.4 Roger Slevin (RS) explained that Winslow Parish Council submitted an open form written response as the council found the online consultation feedback not suitable and asked if that was acceptable. SJ confirmed that it was.
- 2 **Update on the project**
 - 2.1 Siobhan Adeleke (SA) explained that the project is at non-statutory consultation and stressed the importance of engagement with councillors on the design as this feedback will help shape the designs for the next round of consultation, ahead of final Development Consent Order (DCO) application submission.
 - 2.2 Mark Conway (MCon) added that the previous construction work carried out by Connection Stage 1 for the new Oxford to Milton Keynes railway is not part of the DCO process. Instead the DCO process for the Oxford to Bletchley route section is applicable to Connection Stage 3 which is the running of EWR services between Oxford and Cambridge.

- 2.3 SA gave a summary of the non-statutory consultation so far and noted that both the in-person and online events have been well attended. As of mid-January, EWR Co have received nearly 3000 responses to the consultation.

3 **Introduction to the workshops**

- 3.1 SA explained that EWR Co are running these sessions as an opportunity for attendees to share their initial thoughts and suggestions about the designs and for EWR Co to answer their questions. It was reiterated that it is important to also provide feedback via the [official channels](#).

Design workshops with local authorities

- 3.2 SA explained that EWR Co have held similar sessions with local authorities. On Friday 10 January 2025, EWR Co met with representatives from Oxfordshire County Council, Cherwell District Council and Oxford City Council. Key topics discussed included consideration of proposed solutions for London Road level crossing, impact on traffic in Bicester town centre, and active travel. EWR Co also met with Milton Keynes City Council in December 2024.

4 **Update on proposals**

Non-statutory consultation proposals: Route section 8

- 4.1 MCon provided an overview of the Oxford to Bletchley route highlighting that there had been a lot of work over the last few years on Connection Stage 1 (CS1) which is the route from Oxford to Bletchley/Milton Keynes. Passenger services are currently forecast to start on this part of the line later this year and MCon explained that he wanted to take the opportunity to explain why more construction work along a route may potentially happen given the CS1 section is about to open. He explained, in part it was due to more train services being introduced for the proposed Oxford to Cambridge route.
- 4.2 MCon ran through a summary of the proposed CS3 work between Oxford and Bletchley. This includes:
 - Upgrades to the Oxford, Oxford Parkway, Bicester Village, Winslow and Bletchley stations to help manage future demand, such as improving gate barriers and entranceways.
 - The closure of London Road level crossing due to increased barrier downtime.
 - Proposed diversions and potential highway improvements.
 - Two proposed passing loops near Islip and Middle Claydon, which are similar to lay-bys and enables faster passenger trains to overtake slower trains, for example passenger trains overtaking freight trains.

- Works to enable the full or discontinuous electrification of the railway including the installation of overhead lines, substations and grid connections.

Approach to the Environment

- 4.3 Heidi Hutchins (HH) explained that a fundamental part of EWR Co's decision making is to protect the environment and deliver a sustainable railway, by focusing design choices which avoid, minimise and mitigate environmental impacts. EWR Co's environmental strategy consists of six environmental pillars including biodiversity net gain and enabling net zero.
- 4.4 Further consideration of the environmental impacts of the proposals and potential mitigation techniques are described in the [Environmental Update Report](#) that is available as part of the non-statutory consultation and online on EWR Co's website.
- 4.5 EWR Co will produce a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) for the statutory consultation as well as producing an Environmental Statement (ES) which will be submitted as part of the application for development consent alongside further design development.
- 4.6 Environmental Considerations HH explained that ongoing design development will take various constraints into consideration to reduce impacts on key areas along the route. For example, this section of the route will experience a change in noise levels due to the introduction of EWR services and new infrastructure such as the passing loops.
- 4.7 The project would also require the permanent acquisition and temporary use of certain land and property, particularly in the vicinity of London Road level crossing and the golf course near Oxford Parkway.
- 4.8 There are a number of protected and designated sites along the route to consider, notably Oxford Meadows, Port Meadow, and the Trap Grounds. Also protected sites in Ancient Woodland are found in a triangle just south of the railway near Calvert.
- 4.9 There are also a number of other locally important ecological sites and priority habitats, as well as Scheduled Monuments at Rouly Abbey, the scheduled Roman site of Alchester just South of Bicester, and a number of listed buildings such as the Islip Mill Station House in Bicester.

5 **Design Feedback Session**

London Road level crossing

- 5.1 MCon ran through the London Road level crossing proposals. MCon explained that, with the increased number of trains running through Bicester, barrier downtimes would exceed 32 minutes per hour, having a great impact on traffic to the North and South of the Crossing. Therefore, EWR Co is proposing closure of the level crossing at London Road.

- 5.2 MCon shared the first option following closure of the level crossing, which is a footbridge. Myles Hudson (MH) explained that the advantage of a footbridge (Option 1a) is that it is above ground and therefore has greater visibility, while the advantage of an underpass (Option 1b) is that it is a relatively shorter route for walking. Feedback from the previous non-statutory consultation indicated that people did not want to see another railway cutback style footbridge. Therefore, EWR Co opted for designs with a shallow gradient, that are accessible, while making them longer, so it can also be used by push bikes. MH showed the two concepts for the footbridge option (open ramp concept and looped ramp concept) as well as the underpass option.
- 5.3 RS asked if a lift is planned at each end. MH responded by explaining that these were not planned in the designs, and that issues regarding maintenance and need for wheelchair access informed the choice of gradients. MCon added that attendees should feel free to again provide feedback formally as these are not the final designs.
- 5.4 Mike Chapman (MChap) clarified that the silence and a lack of questions should not be taken as happiness with the proposals and further reiterated the need for local knowledge. MCon acknowledged the importance of local feedback. MCon pointed out that EWR Co cover a large geographic area and due to the scale of the attendee's local knowledge, encouraged people to share their views, particularly in the Bicester area.
- 5.5 Paul Wheatley (PW) mentioned that a Bicester Town Council meeting took place on Monday 13 January and vehicle access at London Road level crossing was an agenda item. MCon acknowledged the importance for a discussion around vehicle access and confirmed that the subject will be picked up in this meeting.
- 5.6 MH outlined the underpass option and the utilisation of London Road where the crossing will be closed. The designs have considered both accessibility and safety, with the underpass providing as much space as possible and banked sides to help with visibility. Features such as planting could also be added to create architectural appeal. MH mentioned that, as the ramp would need to be brought around on to station approach to achieve the accessible gradients, it was not possible to continue this up to Market Square. There would also be stairs to offer a more direct route for those that are able to use the steps.
- 5.7 MCon added that EWR Co are looking at other future design options, so these are not necessarily the final proposals, and they are being constantly considered and refined.
- 5.8 Ben Nicholass (BN) gave an outline of the transport modelling. He explained that EWR Co have developed a series of transport and traffic models, which use 'current road conditions' collected via data recorded through 2023 and early 2024. This creates a model that replicates current road conditions in Bicester. BN noted that Bicester is already extremely busy, with local roads facing capacity challenges and

road users experiencing delays. EWR Co have created additional models up to 2034, a representation for when EWR becomes operational. EWR Co have spoken to the local authority about their local plan and planning applications that are approved or nearing approval, to help understand and take note of future growth. It is likely that by 2034, congestion will be worse due to new developments. EWR Co then forecasted up to 2049, which is when EWR is anticipated to be operating at full capacity. BN explained that when EWR Co consider mitigation measures, it is to mitigate the impacts of EWR only. BN noted that the outputs of these transport and traffic models are in the documents produced for the non-statutory consultation. The [Transport Update Report](#) demonstrates which roads are already over capacity area-by-area, and those that will be due to EWR.

- 5.9 BN explained that EWR Co has worked closely with Bicester Town Council to explore options for London Road level crossing due to safety concerns around keeping the level crossing open. People have been observed jumping the lights when barriers are about to go down, and the operation of EWR services will see barrier down time increase. This is the rationale behind the closure of the level crossing. BN outlined that transport modelling with the level crossing closed, and with the absence of a road bridge, has shown that the majority of traffic reroutes to local roads. In this scenario the majority of trips reroute via Loughton Road and Charbridge Lane, with some going via Queens Avenue at Kings End and the A41. BN acknowledged that EWR Co knows the roads are busy, but said that there is capacity, and that EWR Co are considering the creation of network enhancements to alleviate the additional congestion from the traffic that would have to be rerouted. EWR Co looked at establishing local junction modelling which would focus specifically on the junction where the road will be re-routed. EWR Co are exploring palatable design solutions with the local highways authority to enhance capacity and efficiency of the local road network. BN explained that these enhancements and interventions will be shared at the statutory consultation.
- 5.10 BN mentioned that at the in-person consultation event in Bicester, there was opposition to the current approach with many people requesting information on the interventions. BN acknowledged that more work is required on the interventions and their impacts and mitigations.
- 5.11 BN said the delivery of bridges and underpasses is complex, and that he was aware of the recent Bicester Town Council consultation on the closure of Market Square. BN said that EWR Co need to understand the local aspirations and the impact of an overbridge on the pedestrianised area and the impact of traffic on an enclosed area, which would need to be rerouted anyway. BN said that many issues feed into the assessment factors, and it is not just based on cognisance of how the local network operates, but also aligning to other factors, including the local authority's aspirations.

- 5.12 PW raised the issue of Market Square being closed and mentioned that he is a member of the town centre task force led by Cherwell District Council, who are leading the Market Square renovation. PW explained that the closure of Market Square is now off the table, leaving the District Council with two options, two-way traffic on the south side of Market Square, or to leave traffic circulating as it currently does. PW iterated that there is a 'co-design workshop' to take place on Monday 27 January 2025, with local councillors (three tiers) being invited.
- 5.13 BN explained that any outputs from the co-design workshop and any solution put forward by EWR Co has to support the aspirations for the Town of Bicester and cannot be delivered in isolation. A lot of work is going on within Bicester and this cannot entirely be an EWR solution. The decision must be able to support the growth of Bicester over the next century. This is the type of feedback EWR Co welcome in consultation responses and from the local authority.
- 5.14 BN explained the need to inform EWR Co of any pinch points or areas believed to be unsuitable, as this will help shape the design.
- 5.15 MCon explained that EWR Co are working closely with local councils and the importance of aligning and sharing plans where feasible that are being developed. Ongoing meetings with the councils are planned.
- 5.16 MH said that proposed layouts will be provided as part of the statutory consultation, and explained individual engagement will be taking place with district councils as plans develop.

Oxford Station

- 5.17 RS expressed a degree of frustration that the scheme was designed, pared back, and now EWR Co are effectively saying that the pared back solution may not be suitable for 2049 without explaining what will be inadequate.
- 5.18 RS suggested that the frequency of train services should be priority rather than train lengths, as this would deliver greater capacity and reduce pressure on barriers, lifts etc. RS also mentioned the problem of capacity at Oxford Station, suggesting that there could be a strategic advantage of working with Network Rail and include a stop at Didcot, not Oxford, to free up capacity at Oxford Station. This would provide an onward journey from the western end of this route which has always been missing.
- 5.19 MH showed planning profile pictures to give context. MH explained that EWR Co do not have detailed layouts of each station just yet. However, there are other services running through Oxford, and EWR Co are working closely with Network Rail and other operators to understand what the collective demand is, and how this can be approached. MH noted that Oxford Station is already quite congested. MCon added that this information is available on the [website](#) for those who wished to view the maps outside the session and that more detail is to come at statutory consultation. MH stated that the graphs can be downloaded as a PDF or viewed online.

Oxford Parkway Station

- 5.20 MH gave an overview of Oxford Parkway Station. The initial demands indicate a need for more parking at the station, however looking at updated demand figures, this level of capacity is not needed. Anthony O'Dea (AO) added that EWR Co have spoken to Oxford City Council about the possibility of double decking an area of the car parks rather than taking up more fields, if demand does increase, containing it within the existing boundary of the station and carpark. This was confirmed by MH.
- 5.21 MH added that EWR Co are considering demand at every station in case platforms need an extension, but he confirmed that platform extensions are not needed at Oxford Parkway.
- 5.22 MH moved onto Islip and said there were no plans to do anything at Islip station, but there are some works around Islip for discussion.
- 5.23 Nicola Richardson (NR) asked about the traction power compound and turning loop proposed near Islip and raised concerns about the location of the compound. NR mentioned that this compound is to be 15m long by 4m wide and 4m tall and positioned in a field on the edge of a beautiful spot in the village, and a much-walked area next to houses, along an extremely narrow lane. NR asked if there was an alternative location. NR highlighted the narrow access to it, and with Islip's current issues with traffic, construction would be difficult in this location. NR proposed that a site on the opposite side of the rail line, down a long straight road off a main road would be a better location, although noted that she is unsure who the land belongs to.
- 5.24 AO believed a recent discussion took place with local residents. This site would have been selected due to it being Network Rail land but added that there may be a bit of freedom to move it 1km in any direction and there may potentially be a future onsite meeting with Network Rail. EWR Co will consider any responses in relation to the location of the compound as part of the ongoing design development.
- 5.25 NR discussed the passing loop, and queried what it would involve, how big it would be or where exactly it would be placed. AO clarified that a passing loop allows faster moving trains to pass slower moving trains and should be about 800 or 900m long. MH confirmed this is on the south side of the line.
- 5.26 MH explained that when this option was conceived, he believed that the area shown is Network Rail land, however this may not be the case, and this is being investigated further.
- 5.27 MCon added that there is a second passing loop towards Middle Clay and could be covered later in the meeting.

Bicester Station

- 5.28 MH explained that EWR Co are still looking into the demands are for Bicester station. This is linked to the footbridge or underpass solution, and whichever is chosen will

have an impact on number of carparking spaces taken up and therefore the amount that will also need to be replaced.

- 5.29 MH confirmed that the next stage through to early summer is to develop a holistic design for the footbridge or underpass, and how they work with the station. While a detailed station layout is not available, it will be sympathetic to the London Road level crossing and active travel provisions.

Winslow Station

- 5.30 MH confirmed that the platforms at Winslow Station are currently long enough for a four-car train, however there may be future provision to lengthen those platforms to support eight-car long trains should EWR Co want to increase capacity. MH confirmed that more information on Winslow Station will be provided at statutory consultation.

Bletchley Station

- 5.31 MH discussed the proposed work at Bletchley Station to improve capacity, as this will become a major interchange station when EWR services becomes operational, with passengers changing from the Midland Main Line (MML) onto EWR services. MH outlined the addition of a proposed new platform which will require significant works inside the station.
- 5.32 MCon added that though an eastern entrance to the station is not currently part of the project's scope, EWR Co are working closely with Milton Keynes City Council on its potential feasibility and a strategic case around having one, as there is currently only a western entrance at the station.
- 5.33 MH concluded the summary of the stations and emphasised that the more detailed layouts are to come.

Compounds

- 5.34 MChap asked if there are any plans for Network Rail's existing storage on Waddon Road in Newton Longville Parish.
- 5.35 MH explained that because there is still the possibility for electrification along the whole route, storage will be required for the equipment. Compounds would therefore need to be allocated every five kilometres. EWR Co are trying to reuse previous compounds to avoid using any additional land for this purpose. EWR Co are aware that only part of the compound is being used by Network Rail for access, and therefore the footprint would likely be much smaller.
- 5.36 MChap then questioned if the intention is for EWR Co to revert back to the original size of compound B6. This would have implications for them in terms of road closures and HGV movements, particularly if this compound is going to be used as a working depot during this phase of construction. It would have significant issues for a

property, which is immediately to the south of the compound. The occupants are unhappy with the working arrangements in that storage area as they get woken in the middle of the night with noise and vehicle headlights and work lights shining into the bungalow. They still have flooding issues from the original EWR Alliance works. If the proposal is for the compound to be restored to its original size, then they would want to be involved in the conversations.

- 5.37 AO explained that CS1 needed a much larger space in order to build the new railway. AO continued to explain that the compound would be smaller, and the red line boundary shown at this stage of the design is for the potential inclusion of electrification and not for the building of a railway. AO noted that EWR Co have to wait for the release of the traction power strategy. He also noted that only relevant compounds were highlighted for future use to mitigate the need for new land.
- 5.38 MChap noted that compound B5 has not been selected for use by EWR Co. AO explained that EWR Co probably won't need compound B5 and noted that they cannot include any compound within the red line boundary as they have to be able to demonstrate that it is needed for works as part of the DCO application.
- 5.39 AO added that he believes there is a route wide construction compound review underway by the EWR Co Technical Partner at the moment. MH confirmed that the work was to reduce the compounds in size or remove them if not needed, with this compound having been reduced in size, but retained as an access point, making it strategically useful if EWR Co need to access the railway to electrify it.

Passing loops

- 5.40 MCon moved the discussion on to the passing loop at Middle Claydon and SJ asked if anyone present was from Middle Claydon.
- 5.41 AO added that the passing loop at Middle Claydon would be similar to that at Islip, 800 metres long and there to allow slow moving trains to pull off the MML and let faster moving passenger trains overtake.

Electrification

- 5.42 RS raised the topic of electrification.
- 5.43 MCon explained that EWR CO are looking at two options for electrification: fully electrifying the line and discontinuous electrification. With discontinuous electrification, overhead lines would be installed along some sections of the route. In sections where there would be no overhead lines, the trains would use onboard batteries for power. MCon clarified that EWR Co are continuing to review the traction power strategy, although EWR Co's preference is for discontinuous electrification.
- 5.44 MH confirmed that the current assumption is that the full Network Rail ownership boundary will have masts and wiring installed that fit within the corridor. MH added

that the areas where traction compounds are needed is labelled on drawings. The drawings also include options for feeder stations where EWR Co need to feed from the grid.

- 5.45 MH confirmed two options are being shown for routes where EWR Co would connect to the National Grid to scale down, 400kV down to the 25kV needed for the railway.
- 5.46 RS asked about the reservations put out on the high-voltage lines over the railway, and whether many of the reservations will not be required by the time EWR arrives at DCO submission stage and if they will be released into unprotected status in planning terms. MH clarified that if there is a discontinuous area without overhead wiring, then there is a case for not requiring these reservations. However, if there is a benefit to widening the electrification beyond discontinuous, a case will be made at statutory consultation. EWR Co will then be able to say which utility diversions are required.
- 5.47 RS asked if the protections are in place because it is known that the headroom between the electrification cables and the overhead lines are too close. RS also asked if EWR Co has carried out calculations or spoken to National Grid or the utility provider. MH clarified that engagement is happening with all utility providers to determine wire heights, and carry out surveys if their heights are not known.
- 5.48 SJ referred to the [factsheet](#) on website and consultation materials for more information on electrification. MCon added that the last consultation event for this section is tomorrow, Wednesday 15 January 2024 in Bletchley.

Additional Q&A

- 5.49 MChap asked whether the line would still be opening for new services in 2025, as there has been no formal announcement of a date. MCon confirmed the line from Oxford to Bletchley/Milton Keynes (CS1) will be opening in 2025.
- 5.50 MChap raised the issue of franchise, which has not been announced, but people believe it to be Chiltern Railways. MCon responded that this is with the Department for Transport and it is ultimately up to them to decide and announce, so lies outside of EWR Co's scope.
- 5.51 MChap mentioned a rail tour operator advertising a tour transiting the line from Bletchley to Oxford in mid-February, which presumably will not happen. MCon stated that this is being discussed with Network Rail as they manage this route now.
- 5.52 MChap mentioned discussion in the rail trade press about Great Western Railway (GWR). He explained that GWR put one of their Intercity Express train units along the line during the trial before Christmas, because the line would potentially be used as a diversion route for trains which would otherwise go into Paddington, as there is work going on at Paddington which will restrict capacity. MCon understood that GWR and Chiltern had helped Network Rail with test trains for getting the infrastructure ready, which is why they were on the route.

- 5.53 MChap maintained that a potential diversionary route to move some of GWR traffic was discussed in the rail trade press. MChap expressed that a lot of pain was felt with the original construction/reconstruction of the line with the expectation that by now, an announcement would be seen regarding trains being scheduled and bookable, but that at this point it seemed to be a case of 'later this year'. Also noted discussion of further upgrade work before the new services would be open.
- 5.54 MChap and RS sought confirmation on whether any on the work discussed today (such as electrification and the passing loop) would impact the running of the EWR services due to open in 2025.
- 5.55 AO responded that in their previous experience, electrification would be done while trains are still running. However, there may be some targeted blockades or possessions over weekends and bank holidays, such as with a bus rail replacement service, as this is how London-Cardiff was electrified.
- 5.56 MChap asked if that means EWR Co would not expect delays in the implementation of services between Bletchley and Oxford, and that the work discussed during the meeting will be slotted in where and when required. AO responded that when CS1 trains come into service is out of their control. However, AO confirmed that when they do come into service, and the decision is made to electrify the railway, there are ways this could be done while keeping trains running.
- 5.57 MChap maintained that this is not just about electrification, but also passing loops and station revamps, and closure of London Road. MChap said this means there is a significant amount of work to do, which MChap would have thought Network Rail would by choice have said this would be done prior the beginning of services. AO suggested that, for example, work on the footbridge installation would require a weekend closure to recover the level crossing, and to therefore do the signal data change and put in foundations for the bridge over two weekends.
- 5.58 RS expressed concerns about consent being dependent on the granting of a DCO, as it could take another year or two before things appear on the ground, taking this work into the next decade. MChap added that apparently freight operators are desperate for the line to open due to bottlenecks around London. RS stated that his understanding is that the line is in Network Rail's possession and therefore they can permit other operators use now, should a case be made for doing so. SJ responded that the DCO application is quite a way off, so there is some breathing space.
- 5.59 MCon added that funding approval is still needed for the CS3 work, and government funding for the delivery of the scheme up to Cambridge has not been confirmed yet.
- 5.60 PW asked how long it would take to create an underpass for the London Road level crossing. AO explained why building a bridge and underpass are different, noted that as soon as excavation commences, the risk profile increases.

- 5.61 SJ stated that these questions are anticipated more as EWR Co get closer to submitting the DCO, and EWR Co will be able to come back and talk in more detail about those points once insight has been gathered by people on other projects.
- 5.62 SJ gave contact details for the project and her own email and concluded the meeting.
- 6 **Teams chat summary**
- 6.1 JC asked whether, due to changes at Bletchley Station, including access direct from Bletchley Town Centre, will there a new bridge across the dual carriage way. AO explained that there is no bridge across the dual carriage way in the scope.
- 6.2 JC enquired when the statutory consultation would take place. SJ responded that it is expected to commence 12 months from the end of the non-statutory consultation but it was to be confirmed.
- 6.3 MCon provided a [link](#) to non-statutory route section plans.

Feedback Log:

Issue	Description
1.	The need for local feedback was emphasised.
2.	Train service frequency should be a priority rather than train lengths, as this would deliver greater capacity and reduce pressure on barriers, lifts etc.
3.	Suggestion to work with Network Rail to include a stop at Didcot, not Oxford, to free up capacity at Oxford Station. This would provide an onward journey from the western end of this route that is missing.
4.	Concerns were raised about the location of the traction power compound at Islip. This compound is to be 15 metres long by 4 metres wide and 4 metres tall in a field on the edge of a beautiful spot in the village, and a much-walked area next to houses, along an extremely narrow lane. Request for an alternative location to be considered. Alternative site solution on the opposite side of the rail line, down a long straight road off a main road.
5.	Concerns were raised that should the compound located off Wadden Road within Newton Longville Parish be used by EWR Co this may have the potential to cause disruption to local residents due to increased activity.

Summary of actions

- **No actions required**

Attendees:

EWR Co attendees

- Sarah Jacobs – Senior Engagement Manager
- Siobhan Adeleke – DCO Statutory Engagement Manager
- Mark Conway – Development Programme Manager
- Heidi Hutchings – Environment and Sustainability Manager
- Ben Nicholass – Traffic, Transport Planning and Modelling Senior Manager
- Anthony O’Dea – Engineering Manager
- Myles Hudson – Design Lead

Parish council representatives

- Cllr Damien Maguire – Bicester Town Council
- Cllr Paul Wheatley – Bicester Town Council
- Cllr Nicola Richardson – Islip Parish Council
- Cllr Andrew Kane – Little Horwood Parish Council
- Cllr Andrew Jones – Mursley Parish Council
- Cllr Mike Chapman, Vice Chair – Newton Longville Parish Council
- Cllr John Collinge – Newton Longville Parish Council
- Judith Priest, Clerk – West Bletchley Parish Council
- Cllr Roger Slevin – Winslow Town Council

Apologies

- Addington Parish Council
- Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Parish Council
- Calvert Green Parish Council
- Charlton-on-Otmoor Parish Council
- Charndon Parish Council
- Chesterton Parish Council P
- East Claydon Parish Council
- Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council
- Grendon Underwood Parish Council
- Kidlington Parish Council
- Launton Parish Council
- Marsh Gibbon Parish Council
- Merton Parish Council
- Middle Claydon Parish Council
- Oddington Parish Council

- Poundon Parish Council
- Quainton Parish Council
- Steeple Claydon Parish Council
- Swanbourne Parish Council
- Twyford Parish Council
- Wendlebury Parish Council