**From:** Sean Gregory   
**Sent:** 24 March 2017 09:16  
**To:** Bernadette Owens  
**Subject:** 16/00533/DISC - Land East of Evenlode Crescent and South of Langford Lane, Kidlington  
**Importance:** High

Bernadette,

I can confirm the proposals below are acceptable for the requirements of condition 14. At least two electric charging points per building is an acceptable approach to go towards the “support the uptake of low emission technologies now and in the future” section required by condition 14.

I trust that this information, along with my previous comments is acceptable for your requirements at this stage.

Best regards,

**Sean Gregory**  
Environmental Protection Officer  
Cherwell District Council and South Northamptonshire Council

Ext: 1622  
Direct Dial: 01295 221622  
[sean.gregory@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:sean.gregory@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk)  
[www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/)  [www.southnorthants.gov.uk](http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/)

Find us on Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](http://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil)

Follow us on Twitter @Cherwellcouncil

Plans are underway to abolish Cherwell District Council and the other district and city councils in Oxfordshire, replacing them with a single unitary authority. Please sign this petition to register your opposition to the proposals: <https://www.change.org/p/stop-plans-for-a-unitary-authority-in-oxfordshire>

Sean,

I am writing following your comments to Bernadette Owens on the 2nd March 2017.

Thank you for your detailed comments on the information prepared by Peter Brett Associates.

With regard to your comments relating to condition 14, I would like to re-iterate points made by Peter Brett Associates with their cost analysis of the bus contribution and cycle path construction. Both of these activities deliver on both aspects of condition 14; “measures to encourage the uptake of low emission transport” and “support the uptake of low emission technologies now and in the future”.

As such the cost analysis conducted by Peter Brett Associates was to facilitate a method of  quantifying  the benefit of these amenities,  in order to understand if the implementation of these facilities helps or achieves the requirements of condition 14. In our view the cost analysis demonstrates the provision of the cycle path and bus contribution is sufficient to satisfy condition 14. We have offered electric charging points at this stage, as we feel it offers a balanced transport package for the park and it’s future occupiers. Until now we have not had a reasonable estimation of what would be required by the park, however at this juncture we feel that offering AT LEAST two electric charging points per building would a sensible way of quantifying our intention here. Can you confirm if this is satisfactory for your requirements?

In addition, could you please confirm if there is any further information you require with regard to condition 12?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Lauren Bates BSc (Hons) MSc DIC



T: 01621 850600

M: 07747 036638

E: [lauren.bates@hillstreetholdings.com](mailto:lauren.bates@hillstreetholdings.com)

**From:** Bernadette Owens [<mailto:Bernadette.Owens@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>]   
**Sent:** 02 March 2017 12:04  
**To:** Lauren Bates  
**Subject:** FW: 16/00533/DISC - Land East of Evenlode Crescent and South of Langford Lane, Kidlington  
**Importance:** High

Hi Lauren

Please see below Environmental Health comments.

I haven’t looked at this in any detail yet but see that they are looking for further commitment on charging points.

Bernadette

**From:** Sean Gregory   
**Sent:** 02 March 2017 12:01  
**To:** Bernadette Owens  
**Subject:** 16/00533/DISC - Land East of Evenlode Crescent and South of Langford Lane, Kidlington  
**Importance:** High

Bernadette,

I have the following comments on the Peter Brett Associates letter (reference 23558/GH/AA, dated 8 February 2017) which aims to address my email comments on their Air Quality Assessment report (reference 23558/1009, dated November 2016) submitted in support of conditions 12 and 14 of 14/02067/out.

“The Bicester 2 site cannot be used for assessing the significance of the development impacts as it is not a location of relevant exposure and concentrations at the facades of the properties on Bicester Road are lower than the measured concentrations due to the increased separation distance from the road. Receptors 12 and 13 are the locations of most relevance for the assessment and these are located close to the Bicester 2 monitoring site.”

In the Cherwell District Council 2016 Annual Status Report, the Bicester 2 site monitoring data has been used to correct for distance to relevant receptor using Defras NO2 fall-off with distance calculation and is showing an exceedence (41.1 μg/m3) of the annual mean objective (40 μg/m3) at the closest relevant receptor. This is contrary to the concentrations predicted in the report at receptors 12 and 13 (38.3 and 37.5 μg/m3).

“The development increment would potentially double to 0.6 μg/m3 based on the graphs of NOx emissions in Appendix E, and therefore the total concentration would still be below the objective although the level of significance would be moderate adverse at these two locations.”

As referred to above, the predicted concentrations vary between ours and those predicted by this model (either side of the annual mean objective). It is worth noting that a moderate adverse impact is a step above negligible and slight adverse impact, not a “moderate” impact. Its worth noting this may also remain an Air Quality Management Area for longer as a result of this development.

“Even a small improvement in vehicle emissions would mean that the impact significance at the two receptors would fall to the slight adverse category.”

This is accepted and my email refers to this being based on uptake of lower emission vehicles over time. This is an accepted best practise approach to predict emissions. It is worth bearing in mind that this has previously been used as a case to predict future emissions which would secure compliance with the annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide over 10 years ago. This has clearly not delivered as predicted so I suggest an approach which encourages ultra low emission vehicle use as part of this development i.e. electric vehicles, is likely to aid this prediction to be realised.

“As we discussed, it is anticipated that the Technology Park will install electric vehicle charging points in the future depending on how the development proceeds, but the requirements of the condition are met by the level of mitigation identified in the report.”

I would like firmer commitment to the installation of electric vehicle charging points or low emission technology uptake than this so it is carried through the development process. It is noted that condition 14 includes “measures to encourage the uptake of low emission transport” and “support the uptake of low emission technologies now and in the future.” These are not met by the proposals so far.

I trust this is satisfactory for your requirements,

Best regards,

**Sean Gregory**  
Environmental Protection Officer  
Cherwell District Council and South Northamptonshire Council

Ext: 1622  
Direct Dial: 01295 221622  
[sean.gregory@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:sean.gregory@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk)  
[www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/)  [www.southnorthants.gov.uk](http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/)

Find us on Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](http://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil)

Follow us on Twitter @Cherwellcouncil

**From:** Sean Gregory   
**Sent:** 01 February 2017 17:24  
**To:** Bernadette Owens  
**Subject:** 16/00533/DISC - Land East of Evenlode Crescent and South of Langford Lane, Kidlington  
**Importance:** High

Bernadette,

I’ve reviewed the Peter Brett Associates Air Quality Assessment report for Oxford Technology Park (ref 23588, dated November 2016). This assessment has been undertaken in line with current air quality assessment guidance.

The report concluded that the air quality effects of the road traffic generated from the development are not significant and there are no predicted exceedences of the air quality objectives. Whilst the model verification has been undertaken in line with best practise and the current modelled concentration is below the objective, actual monitoring undertaken by us indicates this isn’t the case in the Bicester Rd, Kidlington Air Quality Management Area. This is mentioned in appendix C of the report but isn’t included in the main body of the report. By factoring the current levels as monitored, rather than modelled, this may alter the significance assessment. There is an element of professional judgement applied when interpreting these results and models. I would have liked to see more reference to this result / significance in the main body of the text. It is noted that this modelled receptor is 2.6 km from the site.

Nitrogen dioxide concentrations are predicted to be significantly lower by 2025 as a result of vehicle emissions improving as anticipated by government. This is an accepted approach but I would like to see mitigation proposed which assists in improving vehicle fleet emissions e.g. electric vehicle encouragement measures, emission standards set for heavy duty vehicles accessing the site e.g. public service / delivery vehicles. The report includes a calculation of the damage costs attributable to the air quality impact of changes in the particulate and nitrogen dioxide concentrations (£376,521 over 5 years). The estimated cost of the bus provision and new cycle way associated with this development is given as £718,960 over 5 years referring to this figure being above the estimated damage costs. The report also mentions the potential for the provision of electric vehicle charging points within the development at 10% of the car parking spaces. I would like to see these proposals provided in support of condition 14.

I trust this is satisfactory for your requirements,

Best regards,

**Sean Gregory**  
Environmental Protection Officer  
Cherwell District Council and South Northamptonshire Council

Ext: 1622  
Direct Dial: 01295 221622  
[sean.gregory@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:sean.gregory@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk)  
[www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/)  [www.southnorthants.gov.uk](http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/)

Find us on Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](http://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil)

Follow us on Twitter @Cherwellcouncil

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action.