

## ***Recommendations***

### ***1 - Detail on how the LVIA has informed the design of the built development in terms of siting, orientation/arrangement, height, massing, architectural detail and materials/colours.***

The findings of EDP's early and ongoing field appraisals were fed into the design proposals in order to ensure that the masterplan is 'landscape led'. Refer to Section 5 of Technical Appendix 9.1: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) baseline assessment -EDP.

Throughout the design process, the design in terms of layout, built form height, orientation, Green Infrastructure strategy and biodiversity enhancements has been informed by the LVIA in order to mitigate potential impacts. This included the production of photomontages to enable the consideration of the effects arising from the proposals in terms of scale and colour and the relationship with the immediate and wider landscape context. At a more detailed Site level, the design of external spaces, particularly species selection within the planting palette, has drawn on the local landscape character of the Oxfordshire countryside.

### ***2 - Clarification on what points (location and height) the ZTV has been modelled on.***

Utilising Environmental Agency Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data at 2m resolution within a Geographical Information System, the proposed development parameters were modelled at 13m in order to inform an initial and broad area of search. The ZTV was then visited by walking and driving (as appropriate) local roads, rights of way and other publicly accessible viewpoints by a Chartered Landscape Architect, with the scope of the study area and the selection of viewpoints being informed by this field exercise (therefore, not relying on desk-based information). Through this exercise the main visual receptors predicted to have actual visibility to the Application Site were identified, the location of viewpoint selected, and the Zone of Primary Visibility (ZPV) was established.

### ***3 - How lighting proposals would affect landscape and visual receptors during the construction and operational phases (this should cross-refer to relevant parts of the Dunwoody External Lighting Assessment).***

Alteration to existing night-time views, from additional lighting that would form part of the proposed development, is considered within the Dunwoody Lighting Design (refer to Technical Appendix 9.8).

The external lighting installations serving the Siemens Healthineers building have been designed in accordance with British Standards, CIBSE Codes and ILP Guidance Note 08/18 to limit the light pollution impact to the area and in particular the spill at the boundary of the A41 has been limited by luminaire shielding to 1.0 Lux so as not to impact on a potential Bat feeding corridor. Only luminaire with zero upward light output will be specified and careful consideration will be given to photometric distribution to limit glare from secondary surface and impact on night time skies.

The effects on the landscape and visual resource after dark is based on professional judgement, with effects being considered by a Chartered Landscape Architect in the field.

Professional judgement is based on design inputs from a lighting engineer. Importantly, as set out within the Dunwoody Report 005.01, *"All luminaires will be selected to have a zero*

*upward light output ratio with shielding to limit light spill to surrounding areas and have a photometric distribution to control illumination of vertical surfaces and secondary reflected lighting pollution.” As such, the conclusion of the lighting assessment found that “there is no significant environmental spillage or impact to residential amenity or other environmental concerns as a result of the lighting installation either during construction or in operational phases.”*

***4 - Assumptions on the growth rate of proposed planting (and heights assumed at Year 15), as assessed within the LVIA and shown on the visualisations.***

The planting heights shown within the visualisations are based on the species set out within the Detailed Landscape plans (Technical Appendix 9.4: Detailed Landscape Proposals). The mature planting height of the landscape proposals will vary depending on species and ground conditions. However, the height of planting within the visuals is shown at maturity only, with tree planting being 9-18m, and shrub planting being 3-5m.

***5 - Which aspects of the development have been modelled into the wirelines and full renders (and what is not shown in each), e.g. access road, proposed fencing, built detail, and proposed vegetation – and whether any of these aspects would be visible in any of the viewpoints.***

The wireline views and montages have modelled the massing and rendering of the proposed development. Given the distances from the site, and intervening landscape features, areas of hardstanding and fencing have not been included. In assessing the proposed development, the assessor considered all elements of the proposed development, including built form, areas of hard standing and earthworks, fencing, lighting and new landscaping.

***6 - Whether Cumulative Site 17 has been considered as part of the cumulative assessment (e.g. for receptors travelling along the M40), as it is not included in Table 9.7 or Figure 3.1.***

The cumulative assessment included at Technical Appendix 9.3: Cumulative Assessment includes the consideration of effects arising from Cumulative Site 17. This is referred to within Table 9.7 with a map reference as ‘n/a’ as it is not shown on the map.

***7 - Whether reference to ‘Cumulative Site 1’ at Paragraph 9.8.7 and viewpoints 6 are typographical errors (and if so what cumulative sites these references should refer to).***

The site reference at Paragraph 9.8.7 should refer to Cumulative Site 17, as discussed at Technical Appendix 9.3. Paragraph to be updated as follows:

*‘9.8.7 The cumulative assessment (See Technical Appendix 9.43) has identified that some cumulative effects are predicted, predominantly in views from the north of the site where relatively short-distance views of the proposed development are possible with Cumulative Site 17. However, overall, cumulative effects were not considered to give rise to additional significant effects to those outlined within the main assessment above.’*

***8 - Which vegetation will be in front of the development and which will be removed or behind the building for viewpoints 6 and 11.***

The montage views provide an indication of vegetation that would sit in front of the development in the view. This can be seen on screen when viewing each viewpoint (increased scale when viewing may assist).

***9 - Whether the bunds will be softened to appear ‘natural’ (the bunds shown on the detailed landscape proposals in Appendix 9.4 look very ‘angular’).***

The landscape proposals have been based on detailed levels provided by engineers. The level of the bunds has been landscape-led, limiting the profile of the bunds to no steeper than 1 in 3 in order to reduce the likelihood of there being an engineered appearance. Each bund has been planted with native trees and shrubs that reflect the local context throughout the scheme to maintain a buffer to the wider setting.