

Your ref:

Our ref: 23558/GH/AA

08 February 2017

Hill Street Holdings Ltd
Knowles Farm
Wycke Hill
Maldon
Essex
CM9 6SH

Attn: Lauren Bates



Peter Brett Associates LLP
10 Queen Square
Bristol
BS1 4NT
T: +44 (0)117 332 7840
E: bristol@peterbrett.com

Dear Lauren,

RE: OXFORD TECHNOLOGY PARK – AIR QUALITY CONDITIONS 13 AND 14

It is understood that additional information has been requested by Cherwell District Council concerning the report that we prepared (Reference 23588/1009, November 2016) to address planning conditions 13 and 14 for the development of Oxford Technology Park.

Planning Condition 13

There is one monitoring location that has had consistent measured NO₂ concentrations above the annual mean objective, Bicester 2, in Kidlington. This monitoring location was referenced in the Baseline Section of the report and was included in the model verification. As the monitoring location is only approximately 1.5 metres from the kerb of the road this would partially explain the high measured concentrations, and the monitoring location could also be picking up the effect of queuing traffic at the junction to the south. 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.

If the effect significance had been based on current monitored concentrations (i.e. using 2015 vehicle emission factors and background concentrations) then higher concentrations would have been predicted. The predicted concentrations in 2015 are shown in Table 4.3 of the report, with the predicted NO₂ concentrations at R12 and R13 being 38.8 and 37.5 µg/m³ respectively. The development increment would potentially double to 0.6 µg/m³ based on the graphs of NO_x 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. However, as demonstrated in the data in Appendix E, and as accepted in the response, this would be an unrealistic assessment as it would assume that there would be no improvement in vehicle emissions between 2015 and 2025 when the development was complete. Even a small improvement in vehicle emissions would mean that the impact significance at the two receptors would fall to the slight adverse category. As demonstrated by the data in Appendix E, we have taken a precautionary approach to the application of vehicle emission factors to the future development scenario and therefore believe that this is realistic assessment of the likely impact of development traffic on local air quality.

J:\23588 - Oxford Technology Park\AQ\Reports\Full Report\Conditions Letter.docx

Registered Office: Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 8DN. UK. T: +44 (0)118 950 0761 F: +44 (0)118 959 7498
Peter Brett Associates LLP is a limited liability partnership and is registered in England and Wales with registered number OC334398.
A list of members' names is open to inspection at our registered office. Brett Consulting Limited is wholly owned by Peter Brett Associates LLP.
Registered number: 07765026.

www.peterbrett.com



Planning Condition 14

Condition 14 requires measures to promote the uptake of low emissions transport and the proposed cycle lane meets this requirement. As shown in the report, the cost of the cycle lane alone exceeds the calculated damage cost. Together with the bus subsidy, the damage cost is covered 1.9 times by the mitigation to be implemented with the development.

The damage cost approach is becoming increasingly mandated by local authorities in order to determine the appropriate level of mitigation to employ on a scheme, and is especially useful where the direct impacts of development traffic are determined to be not significant and therefore there are no direct effects to mitigate (as is the case here).

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 hope that this further information is adequate to enable the conditions to be discharged, but if you require any further information, please get in touch.

Yours sincerely,



Graham Harker
Senior Associate
For and on behalf of
PETER BRETT ASSOCIATES LLP