

# Comment for planning application 23/02098/OUT

<b>Application Number</b>	23/02098/OUT
<b>Location</b>	Begbroke Science Park Begbroke Hill Begbroke OX5 1PF
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>Outline application, with all matters reserved, for a multi-phased (severable), comprehensive residential-led mixed use development comprising: Up to 215,000 square metres gross external area of residential floorspace (or c.1,800 homes which depending on the housing mix could result in a higher or lower number of housing units) within Use Class C3/C4 and large houses of multiple occupation (Sui Generis); Supporting social infrastructure including secondary school/primary school(s) (Use Class F1); health, indoor sport and recreation, emergency and nursery facilities (Class E(d)-(f)). Supporting retail, leisure and community uses, including retail (Class E(a)), cafes and restaurants (Class E(b)), commercial and professional services (Class E(c)), a hotel (Use Class C1), local community uses (Class F2), and other local centre uses within a Sui Generis use including public houses, bars and drinking establishments (including with expanded food provision), hot food takeaways, venues for live music performance, theatre, and cinema. Up to 155,000 net additional square metres (gross external area) of flexible employment uses including research and development, office and workspace and associated uses (Use E(g)), industrial (Use Class B2) and storage (Use Class B8) in connection with the expansion of Begbroke Science Park; Highway works, including new vehicular, cyclist and pedestrian roads and paths, improvements to the existing Sandy Lane and Begbroke Hill road, a bridge over the Oxford Canal, safeguarded land for a rail halt, and car and cycle parking with associated electric vehicle charging infrastructure; Landscape and public realm, including areas for sustainable urban drainage systems, allotments, biodiversity areas, outdoor play and sports facilities (Use Class F2(c)); Utility, energy, water, and waste water facilities and infrastructure; together with enabling, site clearance, demolition and associated works, including temporary meanwhile uses. The Proposed Development affects the setting of a listed building and includes potential alterations to public rights of way. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement</p>
<b>Case Officer</b>	Andrew Thompson
<b>Organisation Name</b>	
<b>Address</b>	Chris Dicks
<b>Type of Comment</b>	65 Lock Crescent, Kidlington, OX5 1HF
<b>Type</b>	Objection
<b>Comments</b>	neighbour
	<p>I wish to raise an objection to the Framework Lighting Assessment, which I consider wrongly categorises the environmental zones for the new development. The assessment is stated as being based on GN01/21 (The ILP Guidance Notes for the Prevention of Obtrusive Light 2021). However, in Section 5.2, the zoning map indicates that the entire new development would be classified as Zone E3, "Medium district brightness Small town centres or suburban locations". This zoning would seem to be correct for the areas being developed to the west of the railway line. However, the areas to the east of the railway line are identified in both the development proposals and Cherwell District Council's own development policy documents as being retained open space for nature and recreation. The lighting report itself in Section 2.4 identifies the important dark corridors required along the canal, and on page 16 recognises these spaces should "have the qualities of countryside living". The lighting strategy in 6.1 confirms no lighting is to be provided east of the railway other than along part of Sandy Lane.</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecology Report in Section 3.3 (items 56/57) rightly recognises the importance of preserving a dark and natural environment for bats and other ecology. The Oxford Canal itself is already a defined conservation area by Cherwell District Council. Within the CDC 2012 appraisal (<a href="https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/directory-record/1820/oxford-canal---part-3">https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/directory-record/1820/oxford-canal---part-3</a>), the landscape between the canal and railway line is defined both as an important open space, and a "positive vista" (route assessment areas 17 &amp; 18). The Management Plan in Section 8 of this confirms any development adjoining it must not impact its setting, and this would include light spill and sky glow. This is also a key requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 for natural spaces, as cited in GN01/21.</p> <p>For these reasons I do not see that the proposed Zone E3 classification for this space east of the railway line adjoining the canal can be justified. The report should be amended to</p>

classify this space as Zone E1 ("relatively uninhabited rural areas") in character. It will then be compatible with the actual lighting strategy it is proposing in other sections, and compatible with the Ecology Report and the Oxford Canal Conservation Area. It will maintain an important area of dark skies between Kidlington and the new development. If it is left as Zone E3, future developments on the site could erode this with permissible light spill exceeding what is appropriate.

Other comments on the Framework Lighting Assessment include:

There are several minor errors and typos in the report, including a copy-paste error in Section 3.5 where the landscape architects are listed as EDP (rather than the team listed in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan). Section 3.6 lists an out of date versions of GN01 and the SLL Code for Lighting. Can we be confident none of the technical content in the proposals has similarly been copy-pasted or is reliant on superseded standards?

The eastern access route to the east of the railway line in Figure 5.4 is proposed to have neutral white 3000K 4 metre high columns. These are not consistent with best practice for lighting in areas with wildlife and defined bat corridors. Lower level lighting of a warmer colour temperature below 2700K would be preferable.

Section 4.1.3 lists various control technologies to reduce energy consumption and light pollution, but makes no commitment at all that these will actually be required to be used by the developer. Such technologies are often omitted during "Value Engineering" stages if not mandated.

**Received Date**

13/09/2023 18:12:19

**Attachments**