

Didcot Technology Park Draft Local Development Order

Summary of Consultation Responses

(9/1/2024)

A draft Didcot Technology Park LDO was subject to a 6-week consultation period which expired on 22 November 2017. A revised draft LDO was then subject to consultation in April and May 2022 with the consultation period expiring on 25 May 2022 and following feedback the draft LDO has been revised again and subject to consultation which expired on 23 June 2023.

Each consultation included over 700 consultee letters being sent out together with advertisements posted near the site and in the local press.

Below is a summary for responses received:

| Consultee | Consultee Comments | Officer Comments |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| Appleford Parish Council | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No comments received.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There should be the prevention of coalescence between Appleford and Didcot and objects to plans bringing development within 1.5 miles of Appleford.• The development area comprises circa 20%-25% of Appleford Parish which is substantial. | <p>1.5 miles is an acceptable separation and the proposals do not result in coalescence.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NPPF seeks to achieve sustainable development in terms not only economic but social and environmental. • The proposal removes the amenity value and affects a PRoW which residents of Appleford have used for hundreds of years • The Environment Agency objects to HIF1 road due to flood risk and biodiversity damage; an up to date assessment is required for this application; the landfill sites and drainage lakes pose a particular risk. • Air quality will be affected as the site is susceptible to odour from landfill and dust from mineral workings. • The data centre and traffic will generate considerable CO₂ emissions. • The statement that the development will or proposes to achieve a net benefit in terms of green infrastructure and habitat creation does not mitigate the increase in CO₂ emissions. • The data centre and battery storage facility will generate heat and use power resources. • An up-to-date report with estimates of CO₂ emissions should be prepared and reconciled to the Vale council's carbon budget. • Retention of the B2 waste recycling use will continue to bring 100 HGV's to the site each day. • No evidence that the LDO secures funding. • Object to infrastructure solely based on road provision. There is no integration with public transport – trains or buses proposed. This contravenes the Vale council's climate objectives. • The traffic modelling does not dovetail with the HIF1 traffic data and a fresh TA is needed and needs to be reconciled | <p>The PRoW is retained. Its visual amenity will be affected with commercial development along approximately 370m of its route.</p> <p>The Environment Agency does not object to the LDO.</p> <p>Any development of the site will result in CO₂ emissions. The proposal seeks to mitigate them in the long term as explained in the main report and this accords with core policy 40 of the LPP1.</p> <p>The waste recycling use has closed.</p> <p>The site is well located for cycling and walking routes into Didcot and the Sustrans trail towards Sutton Courtenay. With the HIF1 road passing through the site a bus service will serve the site.</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>to the independent traffic report conducted for the HIF1 proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the site should be restricted to traffic and car parking should be no more than 50%-60% of permanent employee positions (expected to be 100 or a little more) to encourage workers to use the train or other public transport. • A transport / travel plan for the whole of the site and which discourages car commuting, should be a mandatory requirement before, any development is approved. Individual travel plans should be guided by an overarching policy for the whole development. • The plan should include schemes by employers for car sharing and to support staff non-car commuting by schemes e.g. subsidised electric bike & scooter rental schemes, discount public transport passes for buses and trains. • All vehicle access both HGV and cars should access the site from the south via the A4130 Collett roundabout. This must continue even if the Didcot to Culham River Crossing road is constructed. • HGV traffic serving the development should not be permitted to access from the north via the Culham river Crossing road. This is to reduce the vehicle intrusion of the river crossing road on the community of Appleford. • Road junctions from the river crossing road into the technology park should be designed to allow access to the site only from the south. • If approved, a condition is needed requiring a noise and vibration assessment. The cumulative and individual noise effects of the 5000 m2 of battery storage, 110,000 m2 data centre, 5000m2 of light industrial and 27 emergency | <p>Highway officers are satisfied with the traffic assessment provided.</p> <p>Parking is to be provided in accordance with OCC parking standards as required by core policy 35 of the LPP1.</p> <p>A travel plan is to be secured by condition B4.</p> <p>The Environmental Protection team is satisfied with noise impacts and condition</p> |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>back-up generators together with the traffic on site should be assessed and submitted for approval. These noise sources should be evaluated both as standalone noise sources and in combination with a predicted traffic noise from the proposed Didcot-river crossing road. The assessment should consider both day and night time periods.</p> <p>On the consultation procedure it is considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal should be subject to better publicity and more accessible consultation. • It is noted hundreds of Didcot residents were consulted but only two Appleford Parish households. <p><u>November 2017:</u> No comments received.</p> | <p>B11 controls mechanical and electrical plant noise.</p> <p>More than two Appleford households have been notified of the LDO and site notices posted in the area.</p> |
| <p>Sutton Courtenay Parish Council</p> | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No comments received.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> No objection but refers to its 2017 comments that there should be the prevention of coalescence for Appleford and Didcot.</p> <p><u>November 2017:</u> No objection: Some concerns with the draft LDO in that it goes against the pillars of the Didcot Garden Town proposal and the saved policies of the Local Plan NE9 and NE11. There should be the prevention of coalescence for Appleford and Didcot.</p> | <p>Policies NE9 (Vale landscape) and NE11 (landscape improvement area), were in the former Local Plan and no longer apply.</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>Harwell Parish Council</p> | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No comments received.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> Comments: Concerned about the impact of another large development in the area, which will lead to increased traffic volume on local roads and extra pressure on infrastructure.</p> <p><u>November 2017:</u> No objection: Concerned about the impact of another large development in the area, which will lead to increased traffic volume on local roads and extra pressure on infrastructure.</p> | |
| <p>Didcot Town Council</p> | <p><u>June 2023:</u> Comments: Doubts over the time scales for this scheme in relation to road infrastructure. The traffic mitigation measures in the HIF are essential to avoid congestion on the Northern Perimeter Road, and this application seems out of phase with the planned infrastructure, putting more pressure on the existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Support the comments made by the Forestry Officer regarding insufficient planting in relation to the scale of the buildings. There will be a net loss in the number of trees and would like to see plans to improve biodiversity.</p> <p>Note that the arrangement of the documentation is poor, making it difficult to find the relevant information and amendments, making it hard to follow, which could explain why there has been</p> | |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| | <p>little response shown to the consultation. More publicity and a restructure of the documentation is needed for better clarity.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> Comments: Have doubt over the time scales for this scheme in relation to road infrastructure. The traffic mitigation measures in the HIF are essential to avoid congestion on the Northern Perimeter Road.</p> <p>Support the views of the County Archaeologist that the site needs further field evaluation.</p> <p>Note that there has been little response shown to the consultation and suggest better publicity is needed.</p> <p><u>November 2017:</u> No comments received.</p> | |
| Interested parties | <p><u>June 2023:</u> One response received as follows: Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Didcot is supposed to be a garden town so why build on green space. • Mill Brook Ditch has newts living in it. Will they be protected? • Will the archaeological interest in the land be preserved? • The site is flood plain. With housing developments in the area will flood risks be increased? • Why not build on the former power station site instead? • Increased congestion for the A4130 and the centre of Didcot. | <p>Newt surveys found no great crested newt eDNA on site and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>The site is flood zone 1 according to Environment Agency flood maps and not at risk of fluvial flooding and therefore, suitable for commercial development.</p> |

- Concern local roads will be used by commuters for car parking.
- Lack of infrastructure such as GP and dental surgeries.
- Will a minor injuries unit be provided as part of the development to ease pressure on over stretched services

April/May 2022:

Four responses received as summarised below:

- Hill Farm Cottage appears to be demolished as part of the proposals with the tenant made homeless.
- Insufficient consideration given to screening 21m high buildings from the Ladygrove Estate.
- No modelling has been provided for the VP11 View from the Railway Bridge on the A4130; a model should be provided.
- From the Ecology Strategy plan, the 10 metre depth for ECO7 is too narrow and two linear to screen a 21 metre high building; this area should be made wider - 21 metres from these two viewpoints) and to make it undulate to mimic non-linear natural environment and provide sufficient trees for screening.
- Increased traffic and congestion as local roads are inadequate to accommodate increased traffic.
- Too much development taking place with temporary road works increasing congestion.
- Infrastructure, including roads needs to be in place before building starts.
- Proposals need to support local walking, cycling and community amenities as part of the plans.
- Need to ensure the protection of Green Space between Appleford and Didcot.

Buffer zones have been widened to 15m and 20m on the eastern boundary to accommodate more and taller tree planting.

- Need to minimise disruption to local communities and the environment during building and once operational.
- Plans need to be shared with a wider audience particularly Appleford residents.

November 2017:

Four responses received from or on behalf of local residents and businesses including a business use on site. The objections may be summarised as follows:

- Land is safeguarded for the Thames crossing road and this affects not just the small safeguarded area shown
- Increased HGV movements – the landfill site has another 15-20 years and permission recently applied for at the gravel pits for a bulk bagging operation
- Odour impact for occupants of the potential units
- Flooding from the Ladygrove Brook
- Increased pollution
- Speed limit needs to be reduced on the A4130 past the site
- Would impact on a business using the Didcot Enterprise Centre leading them to finding alternative premises with adequate parking
- A protected waste management business operates from part of the site and it seems the developer's intention is to give them notice to quit the site and not accommodate them in the scheme or elsewhere. This is contrary to the NPPF and policy W11 of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy
- In accordance with policy W11 the waste management business use on site should be retained unless:
 - I. The LDO accords with the development plan

The waste management business has since vacated the site (according to Companies House records, the business has dissolved), but the LDO makes provision for it to return to the site and consequently there is no conflict with policy W11.

| | | |
|--------------|--|--|
| | <p>II. Equivalent waste management capacity can be appropriately and sustainably provided elsewhere</p> <p>III. The site is no longer required for waste management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the three criteria have been met. The LDO is not development plan compliant, the waste management business is required to continue. No suitable replacement site has been found • Specific provision for the waste management business should be provided on site or other suitable land made available for them. | |
| Sustrans | <p>Comments:</p> <p>Welcome the proposal to provide a connection to National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 5. However, any link and/or infrastructure connecting to the route must be compliant with national planning policy and guidance and Cycle Infrastructure Design Guidance LTN1/20. This will ensure infrastructure provided is accessible for everyone wishing to walk, cycle and wheel.</p> <p>Any new walking and cycling infrastructure such as that designed as part of this LDO is informed by the nine Sustrans Design Principles for the NCN. We refer in particular to the principle which states: Be fully accessible to all legitimate users. All routes should accommodate a cycle design vehicle of 2.8 metres long and 1.2 metres wide. Any barriers should have a clear width of 1.5 metres. Gradients should be minimised and as gentle as possible. The surface should be maintained in a condition that makes it passable by all users.</p> | |
| Network Rail | <p><u>June 2023:</u> <u>Impact on Network Rail Infrastructure</u></p> | <p>Many of the issues raised by Network Rail relate to construction works which are outside the scope of planning and this</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant must ensure the development considers any potential impact on the nearby level crossing at Appleford as there is likely to be an increase traffic volumes on the adjacent B4016. • The applicant should also ensure there is no encroachment of the NR boundary which may impede either future electrification of the DCLs or a potential expansion of Didcot N Junction (brief 3-track alignment). • Consideration should be given to ensure that the construction and subsequent maintenance can be carried out without adversely affecting the safety of, or encroaching upon Network Rail’s adjacent land. In addition, security of the railway boundary will require to be maintained at all times. In any event you must contact Network Rail’s Asset Protection Engineers as soon as possible. <p><u>Drainage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network Rail are to review any future drainage plans for acceptance of our drainage team prior to approval by the LPA. • Soakaways / attenuation ponds / septic tanks etc, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 5 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property/infrastructure. Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains. • Network Rail’s drainage system(s) are not to be compromised by any work(s). Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network | <p>LDO. The LDO also responds to Network Rail comments and includes an informative that development, lighting including vehicle lights must not interfere with railway signals (there do not appear to be any signals on the stretch of railway past the site).</p> <p>Full drainage details are reserved by conditions. However, the principles for draining the site propose drainage to existing ponds in the north of the site and not to neighbouring land or Network Rail land.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Rail's property / infrastructure. Ground levels – if altered, to be such that water flows away from the railway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage does not show up on buried service checks. <p><u>Level Crossings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You are also obliged to consult with H.M. Railway Inspectorate at the Office of Rail and Road on the application (in accordance with the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 2010, SI:2010 No.2184 and Paragraph 13, Appendix B of Department of Environment Circular 9/95). • As there is a level crossing in the vicinity then no part of the development shall cause any existing level crossing road signs or traffic signals or the crossing itself to be obscured. Clear sighting of the crossing must be maintained for the construction/operational period and as a permanent arrangement. • The same conditions apply to the rail approaches to the level crossing, this stipulation also includes the parking of vehicles, caravans, equipment and materials etc, which again must not cause rail and road approach sight lines of the crossing to be obstructed. • At no point during construction on site or after completion of works should there be any deterioration of the ability of pedestrians and vehicles to see the level crossing and its signage. • There must be no reduction in the distance that pedestrians and vehicles have sight of the warning signs and the crossing itself. • Network Rail reserves the right to provide and maintain existing railway signals/signs (whistle boards etc) and level crossing equipment along any part of its railway. | <p>Out of date legislation is quoted. Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires consultation with <i>"the operator of the network which includes or consists of the railway in question, and the Secretary of State for Transport"</i> both of which have been consulted.</p> <p>The development is not near the level crossing and will not obscure signals. Should HIF1 proceed there will be no vehicular access to the level crossing from the site and only pedestrian access is permitted at present via the bridleway leading north from the site.</p> |
|--|---|--|

Lighting

- Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling arrangements on the railway

April/May 2022:

Comments:

Landscaping

- The buffer zone next to the railway is planted with species that minimise leaf fall problems as fallen leaves on railway track cause adhesion problems for trains braking and accelerating.
- Where trees/shrubs are to be planted adjacent to the railway boundary these shrubs should be positioned at a minimum distance greater than their predicted mature height from the boundary. Certain broad leaf deciduous species should not be planted adjacent to the railway boundary. We would wish to be involved in the approval of any landscaping scheme adjacent to the railway. Where landscaping is proposed as part of an application adjacent to the railway it will be necessary for details of the landscaping to be known and approved to ensure it does not impact upon the railway infrastructure. Any hedge planted adjacent to Network Rail's boundary fencing for screening purposes should be so placed that when fully grown it does not damage the fencing or provide a means of scaling it. No hedge should prevent Network Rail from maintaining its boundary fence. Lists of trees that are permitted and those that are not are provided below and

these should be added to any tree planting conditions:
Permitted: Birch (Betula), Crab Apple (Malus Sylvestris), Field Maple (Acer Campestre), Bird Cherry (Prunus Padius), Wild Pear (Pyrs Communis), Fir Trees – Pines (Pinus), Hawthorne (Cretaegus), Mountain Ash – Whitebeams (Sorbus), False Acacia (Robinia), Willow Shrubs (Shrubby Salix), Thuja Plicatat “Zebrina” Not Permitted: Alder (Alnus Glutinosa), Aspen – Popular (Populus), Beech (Fagus Sylvatica), Wild Cherry (Prunus Avium), Hornbeam (Carpinus Betulus), Small-leaved Lime (Tilia Cordata), Oak (Quercus), Willows (Salix Willow), Sycamore – Norway Maple (Acer), Horse Chestnut (Aesculus Hippocastanum), Sweet Chestnut (Castanea Sativa), London Plane (Platanus Hispanica).

Drainage

- Soakaways / attenuation ponds / septic tanks etc, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed near/within 5 metres of Network Rail’s boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail’s property/infrastructure. Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail’s property or into Network Rail’s culverts or drains. Network Rail’s drainage system(s) are not to be compromised by any work(s). Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail’s property / infrastructure. Ground levels – if altered, to be such that water flows away from the railway. Drainage is not to show up on Buried service checks. The developers should be made aware that Network Rail needs to be consulted on any alterations to ground levels.

These tree species are stipulated in condition A3.

No excavations should be carried out near railway embankments, retaining walls or bridges.

Foundations

- Network Rail offers no right of support to the development. Where foundation works penetrate Network Rail's support zone or ground displacement techniques are used the works will require specific approval and careful monitoring by Network Rail. There should be no additional loading placed on the cutting and no deep continuous excavations parallel to the boundary without prior approval.

Ground Disturbance

- Any works involving disturbing the ground on or adjacent to Network Rail's land is likely/possible that the Network Rail and the utility companies have buried services in the area in which there is a need to excavate. Network Rail's ground disturbance regulations applies. The developer should seek specific advice from Network Rail on any significant raising or lowering of the levels of the site.

Site Layout

- It is recommended that all buildings be situated at least 2 metres from the boundary fence, to allow construction and any future maintenance work to be carried out without involving entry onto Network Rail's infrastructure. Where trees exist on Network Rail land the design of foundations close to the boundary must take into account the effects of root penetration in accordance with the Building Research Establishment's guidelines.

Piling

Buildings are proposed at least 15m from the eastern boundary.

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement. <p><u>Excavations/Earthworks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All excavations / earthworks carried out in the vicinity of Network Rail's property / structures must be designed and executed such that no interference with the integrity of that property / structure can occur. If temporary compounds are to be located adjacent to the operational railway, these should be included in a method statement for approval by Network Rail. Prior to commencement of works, full details of excavations and earthworks to be carried out near the railway undertaker's boundary fence should be submitted for approval of the Local Planning Authority acting in consultation with the railway undertaker and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Where development may affect the railway, consultation with the Asset Protection Engineer should be undertaken. <p><u>Lighting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling arrangements on the railway. | <p>Piling is addressed by condition B20 with Network Rail to be consulted should piling be proposed.</p> |
|--|---|--|

Signalling

- The proposal must not interfere with or obscure any signals that may be in the area

November 2017:

Object as follows:

- Potential for increased unauthorised use of the Appleford User Worked level crossing which is likely to result in potential safety and operations risk, increased unauthorised traffic detrimental to authorised users, residents of Crossing Cottage and Appleford
- Need more information about the pond extensions to ensure the works are carried out correctly from a point of view of temporary and permanent works and not too close to adversely affect the railway
- To remove the objection it will need to be demonstrated that unauthorised use of the crossing will not increase especially as there are PRowS and public highways leading up to but not over the crossing point. Alternatively, the developer can discuss mitigation with Network Rail.

Further comments include:

Level Crossings

- The council is required to consult with HM Railway Inspectorate
- No development shall obscure any existing level crossing or traffic signs and no construction or development shall result in deterioration of the ability or distance for rail, pedestrians and vehicles to see the level crossing or signage

Fencing

- The developer must provide a trespass proof fence at least 1.8m high adjacent to Network Rail's boundary
- Network rails existing fencing must not be removed
- Vegetation on Network Rail's land should not be disturbed

Drainage

- Additional surface water must not be discharged on to Network Rail land or into their culvert or drains
- Soakaway/attenuation ponds must not be constructed within 20m of Network Rail's boundary
- Surface water must drain away from the railway boundary

Safety

- No work shall endanger the safe operation of the railway or stability of its infrastructure and land
- Any demolition should accord with an agreed method statement
- No debris should fall on Network Rail land

Site Layout

- All buildings should be a minimum of 2m from the boundary fence
- Foundations must consider tree root penetration

Open Spaces

- Play areas, open spaces and amenity areas must be protected by secure fencing with a minimum 2m height and not able to be climbed

Piling

- Where vibro-compaction/piling plant is to be used detail and a method statement should be submitted to Network Rail for approval

Excavations/Earthworks

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to commencement of works full details of excavations and earthworks to be carried out near the railway boundary fence should be approved by the LPA in consultation with the railway undertaker <p><u>Signalling</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development must not interfere with or obstruct signals <p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No trees should be planted closer than 1.5 times their mature height to the boundary fence. • The developer should adhere to Network Rail’s guide on acceptable tree/plant species <p><u>Plant, Scaffolding & Cranes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any scaffolding erected must ensure poles and cranes do not over-sail or fall onto the railway. It must be positioned so that in the event of failure it does not fall on railway land <p><u>Lighting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting including vehicle lights must not interfere with signals or train driver vision • Location and colour of lights must not give rise to potential confusion with railway signals <p><u>Safety Barrier</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where roads, turning spaces and parking are adjacent to the railway which is at or below the level of the development, suitable crash barriers or high kerbs should be provided <p><u>Access Points</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network Rail access points need to be maintained | |
| National Grid | No objection | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| National Grid Assets protection | No objection | |
| SGN Plant Protection Team | <p><u>Electricity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the location entered into the system for assessment the area has been found to be within the High Risk zone from National Grid Electricity Transmission plc's apparatus and Must Not Proceed without further assessment by Asset Protection. <p><u>Gas</u></p> <p>Holding objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Grid exercises its right to place a Holding Objection to the above proposal which will cross our High Pressure Gas Pipeline – Feeder We would draw your attention to the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992, the Land Use Planning rules and PADHI (Planning Advise for Developments near Hazardous Installations) guidance published by the HSE, which may affect this development. No buildings should encroach within the Easement strip of the pipeline No demolition shall be allowed within 150 metres of a pipeline without an assessment of the vibration levels at the pipeline. Expert advice may need to be sought which can be arranged through National Grid. National Grid has a Deed of Easement for each pipeline which prevents change to existing ground levels, storage of materials. It also prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings, or structures. If necessary National grid will take action to legally enforce the terms of the easement. | No development is proposed across the gas pipeline with its route which crosses east/west beneath the site, safeguarded. |

- National Grid will also need to ensure that our pipelines access is maintained during and after construction.
- Our pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a National Grid representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased.
- If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of National Grid High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a National Grid representative. A safe working method must be agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.
- Excavation works may take place unsupervised no closer than 3 metres from the pipeline once the actual depth and position has been confirmed on site under the supervision of a National Grid representative. Similarly, excavation with hand held power tools is not permitted within 1.5 metres from our apparatus and the work is undertaken with NG supervision and guidance.

Pipeline Crossings

- Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at locations agreed with a National Grid engineer.
- All crossing points will be fenced on both sides with a post and wire fence and with the fence returned along the easement for a distance of 6 metres.

- The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the National Grid pipeline without the prior permission of National Grid. National Grid will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protective measure. The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to National Grid.
- Please be aware that written permission from National Grid is required before any works commence within the National Grid easement strip.
- A National Grid representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline to comply with National Grid specification T/SP/SSW22.
- A Deed of Indemnity is required for any crossing of the easement including cables.

Cables Crossing

- Cables may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees.
- A National Grid representative shall supervise any cable crossing of a pipeline.
- An impact protection slab should be laid between the cable and pipeline if the cable crossing is above the pipeline.
- Where a new service is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service must cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres.

| | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Environment Agency | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No objection: No detailed comments to make and overall the relevant environmental considerations are covered.</p> <p>Note that reference is made to Environment Agency model procedures for the management of contaminated land CLR 11 in condition A12. This guidance has been superseded and replaced with Land contamination risk management guidance (LCRM) 2020.</p> <p>Reiterate comments submitted in response to the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping for this site, that occupiers of the site may experience amenity issues (e.g. dust, odour and noise) from the existing adjacent landfill site. As long as the operator of the landfill site can demonstrate that they have taken all reasonable measures to reduce these impacts, we would be very unlikely to revoke their permit to operate the site. We are pleased to see that the draft LDO contains remediation conditions, which includes incorporation of gas measures, which will be important to ensure that the risks from landfill gas are minimised across the development site, although this is a matter for your Environmental Health team.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022</u> No comments received.</p> <p><u>November 2017:</u> No objection but comment: Occupiers of the site may experience amenity issues (e.g. dust, odour and noise) from the existing adjacent landfill site. As long as the operator of the landfill site can demonstrate that they have</p> | |
|--------------------|--|--|

| | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | <p>taken all reasonable measures to reduce these impacts, we would be very unlikely to revoke their permit to operate the site.</p> <p>Pleased to see that the draft LDO contains remediation conditions, which includes incorporation of gas measures, which will be important to ensure that the risks from landfill gas are minimised across the development site.</p> | |
| <p>Thames Water</p> | <p><u>June 2023:</u> <i>Waste Comments:</i> No objection. Recognise this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection.</p> <p>Note surface water will not be discharged to the public network and as such Thames Water has no objection.</p> <p>With regard to waste water network and sewage treatment works infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection.</p> <p><i>Water Comments:</i> No objection. On the basis of information provided, with regard to water network infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> <i>Waste Comments:</i> Thames Water consider the following issues should be considered and covered in either an EIA or planning application submission:</p> | |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>1. The developments demand for Sewage Treatment and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met 2. The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met. 3. Build – out/ phasing details to ensure infrastructure can be delivered ahead of occupation. 4. Any piling methodology and will it adversely affect neighbouring utility services.</p> <p><u>November 2017:</u> No comments received.</p> | <p>Conditions A1, B7, B20, B22 address the need for a phasing plan, surface water drainage, piling details and foul water drainage.</p> |
| <p>Vale Drainage Engineer</p> | <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> No objection subject to conditions:</p> <p><u>Surface Water Drainage</u> The surface water drainage strategy provides several options for drainage of strategic infrastructure and individual plots. As individual plots will be reliant on draining through strategic infrastructure, separate conditions should be requested covering this and proposed Conditions A7 and B6 would appear suitable for this with the addition of “<i>A compliance report to demonstrate how the scheme complies with the “Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage on Major Development in Oxfordshire”</i>”; incorporated within the list of requirements for each condition.</p> <p><u>Foul Drainage</u> Conditions should be included covering foul drainage</p> <p><u>Conditions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>SUDS compliance report needed</i> | <p>Condition A8 requires a SUDS compliance report to be submitted. (Condition B6 is now B7 – flood risk and surface water drainage strategy).</p> |

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Site wide foul drainage scheme to be submitted and approved</i> • <i>Detailed scheme of foul drainage for each plot to be submitted and approved.</i> | |
| Natural England | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No objection: No specific comments to make on the amendment to the LDO.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> No objection. The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this consultation request.</p> <p><u>November 2017:</u> No comments received.</p> | |
| Highways England | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No comments received.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> Comments: In the case of this development proposal, our interest is in the A34.</p> <p>The projected trip generation of the development proposals is of an order that suggests relatively limited impact on Milton Interchange and the A34. We welcome further dialogue with Oxfordshire County Council to establish if this is the case.</p> <p><u>November 2017:</u> Comments:</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assessment of additional traffic on to the A34 is provided. Additional traffic may add to congestion • It is essential that proposals are supported by detailed transport modelling to inform the level of growth that can be accommodated on the A34 and local roads. • Impacts for the Strategic Road Network must be identified and mitigated • Proposals that consider sustainable measures which manage down demand and reduce the need to travel will be supported • New growth will need to be considered in the context of cumulative impacts from proposed development • Pleas a Travel Plan is to be agreed and implemented | |
| <p>Oxfordshire County Council – Highways Officer</p> | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No objection: <i>Summary</i> The proposed LDO will result in additional trips onto the local highway network. It is acknowledged such trips are predicted to be low in number and will be restricted by limiting the new floor space until the delivery of Didcot Garden Town Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) scheme. This has been accepted by the applicant and is to be imposed by condition or within the S106 Agreement to accompany this proposal.</p> <p>As part of the LDO mitigation package land is to be safeguarded, transferred / dedicated to OCC for the construction and delivery of the Didcot to Culham River Crossing works, and a future pedestrian and cycle bridge over the railway line at the eastern boundary of the site.</p> | |

Financial contributions towards the delivery of the Didcot to Culham River Crossing works, public transport services (and infrastructure) improvements to existing pedestrian / cycle connections to the site, and a Travel Plan monitoring fee are to be secured by legal agreement.

Access Arrangements

The LDO proposal proposes to use the current vehicle access to the site via an existing arm off the A4130 / Collett roundabout junction. This access arrangement is to lead to a pair of priority junctions within the site providing access to secondary roads serving the build zones of the LDO.

The design of the main access to serve the LDO site continues to be dependent on the site's delivery programme and the delivery of the Didcot Garden Town Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) scheme(s). From ongoing discussions between council officers and the LDO site promoter, it is likely LDO proposal will commence, once permitted, after the delivery of HIF.

If the LDO proposal is to come forward ahead of the delivery of HIF, the details of the access works described within the 'Access and Wayleaves section of the previously submitted transport statement are to be secured by a S106 agreement. To enable this element of the highway works to be included within a future S106 agreement it is requested that a separate scaled drawing of the highway works is provided with an accompanying Road Safety Audit.

Traffic Generation & Impact

The traffic data that has been used within the transport submission for the LDO proposal has been sourced from the

TRICS database for B2 General Industry land use and a permitted B8 Data Centre land use (ref P18/V2277/FUL) that used first principles traffic data collection. The proposed battery storage (sui generis use) has also used a first principles approach to estimate its traffic generation. The use of such traffic data is considered appropriate to support the LDO proposal and assess its potential impact on the highway network.

Within the previous highway response clarification was sought on two aspects of the submitted traffic generation information. Specifically, it was requested that similar sites of operation (with battery storage facilities) that were used by the applicant were provided to ensure the information referenced was available for review; and confirmation what the actual existing traffic movements are to / from the development site. This information is presented within the highway response note accompanying the LDO. Having reviewed the information, the traffic generation / impact element of the LDO has been assessed to an acceptable level.

While new traffic movements are considered acceptable, the site promoter has given a commitment they will accept a condition on the LDO restricting the volume of traffic movements that can be generated by the site during the commuter peak hours in Didcot, until the Didcot to Culham River Crossing has been fully constructed and is open for use by the public (paragraph 4.18 of the submitted transport statement (TS)).

This commitment remains acceptable to OCC and is to be condition by the local planning authority (or included as an obligation within the S106 Agreement). This mechanism will restrict the level of traffic movements generated by the LDO site

for the new land use types proposed and their associated gross floor areas rather than the number of traffic movements generated. If the LDO wishes to increase its gross floor area (with appropriate mitigation measures) in the future an updated transport submission in accordance with the County Council's Local Transport Connectivity Plan will be required for assessment.

As previously acknowledged before, no junction assessments have been submitted as part of the transport submission for the LDO to specifically assess the impact of the LDO on the A4130 / Collett roundabout junction or any nearby local junctions. It is however accepted that the number of vehicles movements expected to be generated by the land uses proposed at the LDO site will be low. Meaning a junction assessment for this proposal is not considered fundamental in this case.

This unchanged position has been formulated by considering two key factors. One, a junction assessment for the A4130 / Collet junction roundabout has been undertaken by the County Council to support the HIF planning application (Appendix D of TS). This assessment shows that the roundabout junction will have capacity to accommodate the LDO proposal once HIF has been delivered. Two, the LDO, if permitted will be subject to a restriction on the number of traffic movements associated with the land uses proposed and gross floor area of the LDO site; until the Didcot to Culham River Crossing has been fully constructed and is open for use.

If the restriction on the amount of floor area for the LDO and associated traffic numbers are not accepted as pre-HIF condition,

then OCC will review this position and require further transport assessment work to be undertaken by the site promoter.

HIF / strategic contributions

Land has been safeguarded through the LDO site in the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 2 (Appendix B: Land for Safeguarding for Future Transport Scheme) to ensure the delivery of the Thames River crossing. The illustrative LDO site layout provided confirms the provision of such a southern road corridor through the site. Further work on identifying the land to be secured (including working areas) within the S106 Agreement is ongoing, but the principle remains agreed.

The submitted draft LDO document confirms that the promoter of the site is to offer, at no cost to the council, the land required to allow the delivery of the southern section of the Thames crossing road through the site. Land is also to be provided to enhance the existing roundabout junction on A4130. The applicant has also confirmed that no Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) in respect of this land will be required. It is understood this position remains unchanged.

In addition to the land being provided to OCC to deliver the Didcot to Culham River Crossing, it is OCC's position that a financial contribution towards delivering this section of the HIF scheme is to be sought from the LDO proposal. Further discussions on this element of the S106 mitigation package is required between officers and the site promoter.

Land remains required to be safeguard for the future delivery of pedestrian / cycle bridge over the railway line to the east of the site during the 'LDO period' (1st January 2042). When OCC is

ready to progress a future scheme, the council will call upon this land during the LDO period to be permanently dedicated / transferred over to the County Council to enable the delivery of such a scheme. Licenced land from the LDO site may also be required on a temporary basis to assist with the construction of such a scheme at that time. Such site obligations are to be secured within the S106 Agreement associated with the LDO proposal.

Pedestrian and Cycle Connections

On-site pedestrian and cycle connections (and improvements) to the existing public highway (including connection to Sustrans Route 5) are to be provided prior to the first occupation of the LDO site. All such infrastructure is to be designed in accordance with LTN 1/20 design standards as shown on LDO Plan 5. A detailed master plan of the LDO site will be required showing all such routes ensuring they are both direct and safe to use and could be secured by way of a condition imposed by the local planning authority. OCC is content with such an approach.

Parking Provisions

The LDO proposal will be required to promote sustainable and active travel behaviour by encouraging employees to travel to their work destination by non-car modes and reduce the number of car trips on the highway network. Such an approach is emphasised within OCC's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan which supports sustainable travel measures and seeks to reduce the availability of car parking at employment sites. The parking provisions to be provided on site must be provided to a level that supports OCC's objective to reduce 25% of car trips by 2030, and 33% by 2040.

Therefore, at the appropriate time (master planning stage) the LDO site must undertake a site-specific assessment and seek to balance its operational needs and space requirements to satisfactorily demonstrate that efforts to reduce car trips have been appropriately explored. Such considerations will include:

- The development's land use.
- Trip rate associated with the development (including base and forecast mode share.
- Oxfordshire County Council car trip and local cycling targets; and
- The user group of employees / visitors of the site (including shift patterns).

Active' charging points for all electric vehicles for the LDO site proposal are required to be provided at a minimum level of 25% for all parking spaces with ducting provided at all remaining spaces (where practical) to be 'future proofed'. Enabling such spaces to be upgraded in the future.

Confirmation has been provided (paragraph 7.17) that the location of parking spaces for impaired mobility people (Blue Badge Holders will be provided within 50m of a building's entrance (Blue Badge Holder range) and have level provisions to the main pedestrian access (part of future master plan of the LDO site).

Cycle parking is to be provided to a high standard and be provided to the council's adopted parking standards.

Public Transport

As stated previously, a pair of bus stops and associated infrastructure (shelters, hard standings, poles, flags, RTI etc) are

to be provided within the site as part the HIF works. If HIF doesn't come forward, then the site still requires public transport infrastructure to be provided. Further discussions with council officers are required regarding an alternative location and type of stops e.g. layby, half layby, on carriageway etc in case this option is required in the future. Such works would be by direct delivery via a S278 Agreement with OCC. This potential work options will need to be included with the S106 Agreement for the LDO site.

To promote sustainable and active travel to / from the LDO site a financial contribution of £163,348.68 index linked has been agreed between the applicant and OCC officers. This contribution will be secured within the S106 Agreement for the LDO site. This contribution would be used towards improvements to the bus services between the LDO site, including but not limited to improved services to Cowley, Berinsfield, Abingdon and Didcot.

Travel Plan

The drafted condition within the LDO submission, numbered as B4, is considered acceptable and will require an updated monitoring fee of £3,110.00 (index linked to April 2023 prices) to be secured as part of the S106 Agreement between OCC and the applicant.

Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)

It has been agreed that a CTMP will be secured by condition to ensure the construction phase of the LDO development mitigates its impact on the highway network.

April/May 2022:

Comments:

Summary

The proposed LDO will result in additional trips onto the local highway network. However, it is acknowledged such trips are predicted to be low in number and will also be restricted by limiting the new floor space until the delivery of Didcot Garden Town Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) scheme. This has been accepted by the applicant and is to be imposed within the S106 Agreement to accompany this proposal.

As part of the LDO mitigation package land is to be safeguarded, transferred / dedicated to OCC for the construction and delivery of the Didcot to Culham River Crossing works, and a future pedestrian and cycle bridge over the railway line at the eastern boundary of the site.

Financial contributions towards the delivery of the Didcot to Culham River Crossing works, public transport services (and infrastructure) improvements to existing pedestrian / cycle connections to the site, and a Travel Plan monitoring fee are to be secured by legal agreement.

For completeness, it is requested that the similar sites of operation with battery storage facilities that were reviewed by the applicant are provided to ensure the information referenced to is available for review. Clarification on the number of existing traffic movements the site currently generates is also required.

Access Arrangements

The LDO proposal proposes to use the current vehicle access to the site via an existing arm off the A4130 / Collett roundabout junction. This access arrangement is to lead to a pair of priority junctions within the site providing access to secondary roads serving the build zones of the LDO.

The design of the main access to serve the LDO site is dependent on the site's delivery programme and the delivery of the Didcot Garden Town Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) scheme(s). From initial discussions between council officers and the LDO site promoter, it is currently programmed that the LDO proposal will commence, once permitted, after the delivery of HIF and the access works described within the submitted TS will not be required.

However, if the LDO proposal was to come forward ahead of the delivery of HIF, the details of the access works described within the 'Access and Wayleaves section of the TS must be provided (and approved) on a scaled drawing and this is to be secured by a S106 agreement accompanying the LDO. Providing and agreeing this design detail now will ensure all potential access options are covered, ensuring there is no delay in delivering an acceptable access to the site ahead of HIF. It is requested that a scaled drawing of these highway works is provided for assessment with an accompanying Road Safety Audit.

The pre-HIF access works, if triggered, would be delivered via a S278 Agreement with OCC as the Local Highway Authority through a S106 obligation from the LDO proposal. While it is expected HIF will be delivered prior to the LDO site coming forward it is recommended this approach is taken by the district council to ensure that the LDO site is provided with an acceptable access arrangement in the short term (prior to HIF being delivered) as a fall-back position.

While the main access will be taken via the A4130 / Collett roundabout junction, it is important to note that the proposed

internal access arrangements will provide a link to the Appleford Railway Crossing to the north. While such a link is necessary to enable access to the site, the submitted TS confirms (paragraph 3.8) that it is not intended that the crossing will be used as a means of access to the LDO site. In recognition of this, it is requested the district council considers imposing a condition (or an obligation within the S106 Agreement is provided) on the LDO site to ensure this remains the case. It is recognised that in the long term this access arrangement will only be in place until the delivery of the Didcot to Culham River Crossing works once it has been constructed as part of the overall Didcot Garden Town Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) scheme(s).

A significant section of the Didcot to Culham River Crossing is to be delivered through the LDO site and the land to deliver this scheme (on a permanent and temporary basis) must be secured via a legal agreement if this LDO proposal is to be approved by the district council. Such a requirement is supported and considered to be in accordance with Core Policies 17 and 18 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 1. It is essential that the LDO proposal, if approved, does not delay, impede, or interfere with the construction and delivery of Didcot to Culham River Crossing works. Such an obligation from the site promoter will be required in the S106 Agreement for this proposal.

Notwithstanding the above, if the LDO site comes forward ahead of the delivery of HIF, the submitted TS, confirms the section of road between the A4130 / Collett roundabout junction and Hill Farm would be constructed and offered to the Local Highway Authority for adoption via an appropriate legal agreement. However, beyond Hill Farm, only existing rights would remain i.e.

as a bridleway and any other private rights wayleaves which exist. This means there would be no public right of vehicular access beyond Hill Farm as there are no current rights that would allow for an increase in vehicular traffic. This position would change once the HIF infrastructure is constructed and available for use to the public.

Traffic Generation & Impact

The traffic data that has been used within the transport submission for the LDO proposal has been sourced from the TRICS database for B2 General Industry land use and a permitted B8 Data Centre land use (ref P18/V2277/FUL) that used first principles traffic data collection. The proposed battery storage has also used a first principles approach to estimate its traffic generation due to the unusual nature of this land use. The use of such traffic data is considered appropriate to use to support the LDO proposal and assess its potential impact on the highway network.

Paragraphs 4.1 to 4.3 provides evidence of the potential traffic movements that could be generated for a B2 General Industrial proposal for up to 5,000 sq m of floor area. Table 2 of the TS confirms that in the AM peak hour (08:00 to 09:00) there is a total of 15 two-way vehicle movements and a total of 10 two-way movements in the PM peak (17:00 to 18:00).

Paragraphs 4.4 to 4.6 provides evidence of the potential traffic movements that could be generated by the proposed B8 Data Centre (110,000 sq m of floor area). Table 6 of the TS confirms that in the AM peak hour (08:00 to 09:00) there is a total of 18 two-way vehicle movements for this land use and a total of 23 two-way movements in the PM peak (17:00 to 18:00).

The TRICS data base doesn't currently hold data specifically for battery storage facility land uses. On this basis a first principles approach has been used by the site promoter from contacting operators of similar operations. Due to the nature of the operation of such facilities, it is expected that a minimal level on site personnel will be on site at any one time. Thus, only generating a modest number of traffic movements throughout the day. As such an assumption has been made (paragraph 4.7 of TS), that 15 two-way traffic movements are estimated to take place per day; with 5 two-way movements accounted for in the AM and PM peak hours. Such a first principles approach to estimating the traffic generation movements associated with this land use is considered appropriate. For completeness, it is requested that the similar sites of operation with battery storage facilities that were reviewed by the applicant are provided to ensure the information referenced to is available for review.

In addition to the battery storage information requested above, there appears to be no traffic data provided confirming what the existing traffic movements are to / from the development site. It is requested this outstanding information is provided for as an addendum to the TS for assessment.

In regard to the overall new traffic movements to be generated by the proposed LDO, Table 8 provides this estimation, 32 two-way vehicle movements in the AM peak hour and 34 two-way vehicle movements in the PM peak hour. Such movements are considered acceptable on the highway network in comparison to the larger LDO proposal initially promoted which would have had more significant impacts on the highway network of Didcot. While such new traffic movements are considered acceptable, a

commitment by the site promoter has been given that they will accept a condition on the LDO restricting the volume of traffic movements that can be generated by the site during the commuter peak hours in Didcot, until the Didcot to Culham River Crossing has been fully constructed and is open for use by the public (TS paragraph 4.18).

Such an obligation from the applicant has been accepted in principle by OCC officers to ensure the highway network will operate at a satisfactory level until the delivery of the Didcot Garden Town Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) scheme. Any such condition (or an obligation within the S106 Agreement) to restrict the level of traffic movements generated by the site will need to be imposed on the new land use types proposed at the LDO site and associated gross floor areas of those land uses rather than the number of traffic movements generated. If the LDO wishes to increase its gross floor area (with appropriate mitigation measures) in the future an updated transport submission in accordance with the County Council's Local Transport Connectivity Plan will be required for assessment.

No junction assessments have been submitted as part of the transport submission for the LDO to specifically assess the impact of the LDO on the A4130 / Collett roundabout junction or any nearby local junctions. It is however accepted that the number of vehicles movements expected to be generated by the land uses proposed at the LDO site will be low. Meaning a junction assessment for this proposal is not considered fundamental to this application.

This position has been formulated by considering two key factors.

1. Junction assessment for the A4130 / Collett junction roundabout has been undertaken by the County Council to support the HIF planning application (Appendix D of TS). This assessment shows that the roundabout junction will have capacity to accommodate the LDO proposal once HIF has been delivered.
2. The LDO, if permitted will be subject to a restriction on the number of traffic movements associated with the land uses proposed and gross floor area of the LDO site; until the Didcot to Culham River Crossing has been fully constructed and is open for use.

If the restriction on the amount of floor area for the LDO and associated traffic numbers are not accepted as pre-HIF condition, then OCC will review this position and require further transport assessment work by the site promoter to be undertaken. HIF / strategic contributions.

Land has been safeguarded through the LDO site in the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 2 (Appendix B: Land for Safeguarding for Future Transport Scheme) to ensure the delivery of the Thames river crossing. The illustrative LDO site layout provided confirms the provision of such a southern road corridor through the site, which is welcomed and required.

The corridor width of the Didcot to Culham River Crossing works that is shown (which consists of a two-lane road, cycle and footways and retention of the bridleway) on LDO Plan 5 (dated 09/07/2021) with a width up to 54m. Such a width is considered acceptable in principle by OCC but will also require a temporary (10m) working area corridor around it, as per the HIF planning application boundary plan.

The submitted draft LDO document (ref V7.01) confirms that the promoter of the site is to offer, at no cost to the council, the land required to allow the delivery of the southern section of the Thames crossing road through the site. Land is also to be provided to enhance the existing roundabout junction on A4130. The applicant has also confirmed that no Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) in respect of this land will be required.

In addition to the land being provided to OCC to deliver the Didcot to Culham River Crossing, a financial contribution towards delivering this section of the HIF scheme is to be sought from the LDO proposal. Further discussions on this element of LDO mitigation package is required between officers and the site promoter.

Land is also required to be safeguard for the future delivery of pedestrian / cycle bridge over the railway line to the east of the site during the 'LDO period' (1st January 2042). When OCC is ready to progress a future scheme, OCC will call upon this land during the LDO period to be permanently dedicated / transferred over to the County Council to enable the delivery of such a scheme. Licenced land from the LDO site may also be required on a temporary basis to assist with the construction of such a scheme at that time.

Below is an extract from LDO Plan 5 showing the red hatched land to be safeguarded within the LDO site. A similar section of land is also to be safeguard on the other side of the bridge. A scaled drawing showing a hatched area on both sides of the railway line is required to be included within the legal agreement to accompany the LDO proposal.

To ensure the above HIF package is secured, a legal agreement (S106) will be required between the applicant and OCC. For clarity, this agreement will be expected to secure the permanent and temporary land required to deliver the Didcot to Culham River Crossing works, land for a future bridge over the railway line, a financial contribution towards HIF and an obligation to enter into S278 and S38 for the identified road / access works with associated commuted sums if the LDO proposal comes forward ahead of the delivery of HIF. The requirement for the applicant to enter into this agreement is requested to be imposed by the Vale of White Horse District Council prior to the approval of the LDO.

Pedestrian and Cycle Connections

On-site pedestrian and cycle connections (and improvements) to the existing public highway (including connection to Sustrans Route 5) are to be provided prior to the first occupation of the LDO site. All such infrastructure is to be designed in accordance with LTN 1/20 design standards as shown on LDO Plan 5. A detailed master plan of the LDO site will be required showing all such routes ensuring they are both direct and safe to use.

Parking Provisions

The LDO proposal will be required to promote sustainable and active travel behaviour by encouraging employees to travel to their work destination by non-car modes and reduce the number of car trips on the highway network. Such an approach is emphasised within OCC's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) which supports sustainable travel measures and seeks to reduce the availability of car parking at employment sites. With this in mind, the parking provisions to be provided on site must

be provided to a level that supports OCC's objective to reduce 25% of car trips by 2030, and 33% by 2040.

Therefore, LDO site must undertake a site-specific assessment and seek to balance its operational needs and space requirements to satisfactorily demonstrate that efforts to reduce car trips have been appropriately explored. Such considerations will include:

- The development's land use.
- Trip rate associated with the development (including base and forecast mode share).
- Oxfordshire County Council car trip and local cycling targets; and The user group of employees / visitors of the site (including shift patterns).
- The number of spaces for Light Goods Vehicles (LGV) and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) may also be calculated using a similar methodology or compared to vehicle operating licences for similar buildings / operations.

'Active' charging points for all electric vehicles for the LDO site proposal are required to be provided at a minimum level of 25% for all parking spaces with ducting provided at all remaining spaces (where practical) to 'future proof' such spaces to be upgraded in the future. Such requirements ensure development proposals will accord with OCC's (LTCP) objective to deliver a transport network that contributes to a climate positive future by 2050 and Oxfordshire's Electrical Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy.

Consideration must be given to the future layout design of the LDO site for the provision and location of spaces for impaired mobility people (Blue Badge Holders). Generally, such spaces should be provided within 50m of a building's entrance (Blue

Badge Holder range) and have level access to the main pedestrian access.

Cycle parking is to be provided to a high standard and provided to a minimum level in accordance with emerging revised cycle parking standards.

All cycling parking is to be provided in a convenient location close to building entrances and bus stop locations within the LDO site. Such parking provisions are to be covered and in the style of a Sheffield or similar type stand, which are individually installed permanently into the floor material. Double decked or vertical cycle parking should not be used unless agreed by OCC in specific circumstances. The spacing of stands should be provided in accordance with Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20. If raised on a kerb, dropped kerbs must be provided in suitable locations. Cycle parking should cater for non-standard cycles e.g. cargo bikes. Charging infrastructure for E-bikes is also to be provided for.

The LDO site will be required to promote inclusive cycling, provision for cycles for disabled people and other needs (such as tricycles, cargo bikes, tandems, and adapted bicycles). Such parking facilities are required to be provided in accordance with LTN 1/20 standards.

Public Transport

A pair of bus stops and associated infrastructure (shelters, hard standings, poles, flags, RTI etc) are to be provided within the site as part the HIF works. If HIF doesn't come forward, then the site still requires public transport infrastructure to be provided. Further discussions with council officers are required regarding an

alternative location and type of stops e.g. layby, half layby, on carriageway etc in case this option is required in the future. Such works would be by direct delivery via a S278 Agreement with OCC.

To promote sustainable and active travel to / from the LDO site a financial contribution of £163,348.68 index linked will be required. This contribution would be used towards improvements to the bus services between the LDO site, including but not limited to improved services to Cowley, Berinsfield, Abingdon and Didcot.

Travel Plan

The drafted condition within the LDO submission, numbered as B4, is considered acceptable and will require a monitoring fee of £2,563.00 (index linked to December 2021 prices) to be secured as part of the S106 Agreement between OCC and the applicant.

Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)

Construction traffic and its impact on both the local and strategic network is expected during the build out of the LDO. How this is managed with issues such as construction traffic management plans and routeing / delivery restrictions will require careful consideration and is to be included in a site wide CTMP. The contents of this document will need to be agreed and approved by OCC and secured by a pre-commencement condition.

November 2017:

Support in principle as the site is in the Enterprise Zone.

However an objection is raised:

- The traffic impacts for the local road network are unknown. A robust transport assessment is needed

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site straddles a potential alignment of the Didcot-Culham river crossing route that is to be safeguarded and which is beneficial to the proposal • Need comfort on the priorities for the business rates returns and when these will be forthcoming | |
| Oxfordshire County Council – Minerals and Waste Team | <p>Comments</p> <p>It is not considered there is sufficient justification for the sand and gravel deposits within the site area to be safeguarded.</p> <p>The site contains a waste management facility that is safeguarded under policy W11 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. The proposal should demonstrate that equivalent waste management capacity can be appropriately and sustainably provided elsewhere or it should be demonstrated the site is no longer required for waste management.</p> | As explained above the waste management facility is no longer on site but the LDO makes provision for a waste management facility to return to the site. |
| Oxfordshire County Council – Archaeologist | <p><u>June 2023:</u></p> <p>No objection:</p> <p>A report for the archaeological evaluation we requested has now been submitted with the draft LDO. The archaeological evaluation (where implemented) has clearly demonstrated substantive archaeological remains to be present across the western area of the proposal site. These remains as documented would not be considered to be of such a significance that would preclude proposed development, however they will require further investigation and mitigation in advance of development.</p> <p>We would, therefore, recommend that, should the LDO be granted, the applicant should be responsible for ensuring the implementation of a programme of archaeological investigation to be maintained during the period of construction. This can be</p> | |

ensured through the attachment of suitable negative conditions as specified above. These recommended conditions should replace those previously proposed as A14 and A15 set out in Table C: Planning Conditions of the submitted draft LDO which are now outdated.

Conditions:

- *Prior to any demolition and the commencement of the development a professional archaeological organisation acceptable to the Local Planning Authority shall prepare an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation, relating to the application site area, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

Reason - To safeguard the recording of archaeological matters within the site in accordance with the NPPF.

Following the approval of the Written Scheme of Investigation referred to in condition 1, and prior to any demolition on the site and the commencement of the development (other than in accordance with the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation), a programme of archaeological investigation and mitigation shall be carried out by the commissioned archaeological organisation in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation. The programme of work shall include all processing, research and analysis necessary to produce an accessible and useable archive and a full report for publication which shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within two years of the completion of the archaeological fieldwork.

Conditions updated with the exception of demolition as buildings on site have limited heritage interest.

Reason – To safeguard the identification, recording, analysis and archiving of heritage assets before they are lost and to advance understanding of the heritage assets in their wider context through publication and dissemination of the evidence in accordance with the NPPF.

April/May 2022:

Objection:

- The results of a trenched evaluation will need to be submitted in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), paragraph 194, prior to the determination of the proposed LDO for the application site.
- The application site occupies an area of identified archaeological interest and potential as recognised in the submitted Heritage Assets Assessment (Orion Heritage Ltd 2016/2017). The application site is identified to contain recorded cropmark features, these consisting of a probable trackway and series of rectangular enclosures, these likely relating to former settlement and associated activity dating to the prehistoric and/or Roman-British period on the basis of previously recorded evidence at Appleford Sidings to the north. Geophysical survey conducted across parts of the application site (Bartlett-Clark Consultancy 2017) has confirmed the presence of these previously noted cropmarks, the survey identifying two main rectilinear enclosures located between parallel north-south aligned trackways, these interspersed by a series of further discrete magnetic anomalies likely representing associated pits and other features relating to settlement.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A high potential for the application site to contain archaeological remains of interest can therefore accordingly be identified. Whilst asserted, assessment undertaken to date does not provide for a fully informed understanding as to the significance that can be attached to any such remains or the impacts of proposed development on that significance. In this regard, we do not consider the currently proposed conditioned approach as set out in the submitted draft LDO to be appropriate given the high potential recognised for archaeological remains to be present on the site and the need for an appropriate level of information to be provided, in line with the NPPF and local plan policy, as to their date, extent, character, complexity and state of preservation to sufficiently understand the significance that can be attached to any archaeological heritage assets that would be affected by proposed development. • In view of the recognised archaeological potential of the site and to ensure that the significance of any archaeological heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals is understood as set out in the NPPF, an archaeological field evaluation will be required. | |
| <p>Oxfordshire County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority</p> | <p><u>June 2023:</u> Holding objection: The submitted flood risk assessment is fine in principle but it is preliminary. It will therefore be necessary to have conditions on each development parcel.</p> <p>It is also noted that the area used for the calculation of the run-off rate is the total site area. This is incorrect; it should be the</p> | <p>Condition B7 requires a flood risk assessment to be approved before commencement of development on each plot and conditions A8 and B8 address surface water drainage and a compliance report. The holding objection is addressed.</p> |

impermeable area of the developments which will be considerably less. The FRA requires up-dating/correcting.

Conditions:

- *Construction shall not begin until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall include:*
- *A compliance report to demonstrate how the scheme complies with the “Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage on Major Development in Oxfordshire;”*
- *Full drainage calculations for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change and 10% urban creep (Note: the Cv values should be set to 0.95 for roofs and 0.90 for paved areas and MADD should be 0.0);*
- *A Flood Exceedance Conveyance Plan;*
- *Comprehensive infiltration testing across the site to BRE DG 365 (to include three tests at each location and using the full depth of the trial pit);*
- *Detailed design drainage layout drawings of the SuDS proposals including cross-section details;*
- *Detailed maintenance management plan in accordance with Section 32 of CIRIA C753 including maintenance schedules for each drainage element;*
- *Details of how water quality will be managed during construction and post development in perpetuity; and*
- *Consent for any connections into third party drainage systems.*

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | <p><i>Reason: To ensure there is no flooding due to the site drainage and that the water environment is protected.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to first occupation, a record of the installed SuDS and site wide drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for deposit with the Lead Local Flood Authority Asset Register. The details shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As built plans in both .pdf and .shp file format; ○ Photographs to document each stage of the drainage system on site; ○ Photographs of the completed installation of the drainage structures on site; ○ The name and contact details of any appointed management company. <p>Reason: In accordance with section 21 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.</p> | |
| <p>Vale Planning Policy</p> | <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> Comments: The principle of commercial development on this site is supported.</p> <p>The site is not allocated in the Local Plan and Core Policy 28 'New Employment Development on Unallocated Sites' therefore applies. Whilst the site is not allocated, a large proportion comprises land safeguarded for the Science Vale Thames Crossing (LPP1 Appendix E and LPP2 Appendix B: Land for Safeguarding for future transport schemes): a new strategic road connection between the A415 east of Abingdon on-Thames and</p> | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>the A4130 north of Didcot, including a new crossing of the River Thames. LPP1 Core Policy 18 therefore applies and consultation with OCC is recommended.</p> | |
| <p>Vale Enterprise Zone Team</p> | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No additional comments to make.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> Support in principle The Didcot Technology Park site is an Enterprise Zone site. Enterprise Zone status means that the Vale of White Horse District Council will retain 100% of the business rates growth income from the site until 2041. The retained income will be available to be reinvested in the local area.</p> <p>The adoption of a LDO will create certainty for businesses wanting to relocate to the site as they will know exactly what kind of development is permitted on the site. They will also be able to relocate more quickly as there will no need to wait until an outline or full planning application has been determined. However, LDO parameters and conditions mean that development on the site will still be controlled.</p> <p>The proposed LDO is principally for the development of data centres. As the use of the Internet and in particular online meetings continually increases, there is an increasing need for additional data capacity. Data centres on the site will create a number of skilled employment opportunities. Whilst employment on the site will have an impact on local traffic, the impact will be less than the impact that would result if the site were developed for office or other uses.</p> | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Equality and Inclusivity Officer | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No comments.</p> | |
| Vale landscape architect | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No objection in principle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDO needs updating to reference updated guidance such as the Joint Design Guide, 2021 NPPF, current plans rather than former draft versions of the LDP. • The LDO Plan 2 Land Use proposes the development areas of the site to extend close to the site boundaries with predominately a 10m offset. However, the change in the type of development on site with data storage buildings, the LDO Plan 4 Landscape Strategy Plan and other plans within supporting documents indicates much wider areas of boundary landscape being proposed. Is there any scope for the land use plan to create more generous boundary offsets to more closely reflect the Landscape Strategy Plan. • The LDO has been amended to change the scale and height of development, it also proposes to introduce swales on the eastern side of the site. Therefore, it would be better if the 20m offset from the eastern site boundary proposed for the northern side of the site was continued down the eastern site boundary. This would help provide more space for screening planting to be implemented to soften the built form and space to also accommodate the proposed swale and respect the sensitivity of planting close to a railway, giving additional width to planting away from the railway boundary. • The site relies on the mature vegetation along the A4130 to provide screening to the development. However, the proposals for the new road result in the loss of vegetation | <p>It has been updated.</p> <p>Offsets have increased to 15m and 20m on the eastern side of the site.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>along the A4130 which is not currently mitigated for in the road scheme with space for replacement planting. It may be that additional space is required on the southern site boundary to provide vegetation to mitigate the proposed LDO scheme, rather than relying on the offsite highway vegetation. LDO Plan 1 indicates a temporary access onto the A4130 and again this will result in the loss of vegetation along the A4130 but this does not seem to be assessed in the LDO documentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the Gas mains route is shown on LDO Plan 1, the route and associated easement has not been taken into account fully on other plans. With tree planting proposed over the gas pipe route. Similar issues are likely to be present with regards to tree planting under the retained overhead electric cable. • There have been no changes to the proposed LUX levels of the car park. The average LUX levels are proposed to be 20 LUX, this is the expected lighting levels in a heavily used car park of 500 plus parking places, for the LDO, the car parks are much smaller scale with a medium to light use therefore 10 to 5 LUX level would be more appropriate except where operational requirements require higher levels such as service yards. • Permitted development rights covers the installation of security infrastructure and fencing, gatehouses and site facilities. The majority of these details should be covered in the plot application. I would not like to see additional security fencing being implemented without being covered by an LDO notification. • Page 13 of the Design Guide although a 10m Buffer Zone is indicated on the plans, this area is not 10m width of planting but also includes items such the perimeter path. | <p>Landscaping is to be secured by planning condition .</p> <p>Lighting details are secured by condition A17.</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| | <p>The perimeter path is illustrated at 5m wide, assuming that no clear run off zones are required for the path, then there is less than 5m width of vegetation. A 10m wide width is illustrated on the Ecology Strategy Plan which is at odds to the design of the buffer areas. Design Guide 2.14 – Paladin fencing rather than palisade fencing should be used, if possible, where security fencing is required</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> No comments received.</p> <p><u>November 2017:</u> Comments: The proposed quantum of land that could be required for strategic highways works along the road frontage with the A4130 could put at risk the broad-leaved semi-mature woodland along the A4130 which is proposed to be retained and a key mitigation feature to the site. The LDO needs to reflect this risk and safeguard additional land for replacement planting for any proposed loss of vegetation adjacent to the A4130. Although the proposed strategic highways work land is safeguarded, additional land adjacent to this land is also required to be safeguarded to allow for additional landscape mitigation.</p> <p>Section 2.12 text doesn't reflect the proposed conditions that the strategy landscape/ buffer zones along the perimeters of the site will be delivered up front of plot development.</p> | <p>This is increased to 15m allowing for at least 10m of landscaping.</p> |
| Urban Design Officer | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No objection:</p> | |

| | | |
|----------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| | <p>Support based on the information submitted from a master planning and urban design perspective.</p> <p>The scheme limits any impact based on the scale and massing of development within the LDO by limiting its height to 21m and below.</p> <p>Landscaping overall responds to the key constraints of the gas mains easement and overhead HV cables whilst providing a buffer to the site at key points. This also ensures sufficient areas within the scheme for high-quality landscaping alongside built form.</p> <p>The intended character and vernacular and intended architecture across the LDO are to be simple in form and contemporary.</p> <p>Strongly support the LDO in pursuing and achieving a high level of sustainability. Under Table C: Planning conditions as set out in the draft LDO, it states an initial BREEAM assessment is to be undertaken for any development. The expected level of BREEAM is expected to achieve “Excellent” as a level of certification.</p> | |
| Vale Ecologist | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No objection: Recommended conditions: Biodiversity Net Gain Management and Monitoring Plan or delivering a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>A plan for the achieving the zone specific Biodiversity Net Gain targets (that contribute to the total target) shall be submitted to and approved in writing.</p> | Included - conditions A13, B5 and B6. |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>A construction environmental management plan for biodiversity shall be submitted to and approved.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> No comments received.</p> <p><u>November 2017:</u> No objection: The submitted draft LDO incorporates the results of the pre-application discussions and the appropriate conditions have been included in the draft document.</p> | |
| <p>Vale forestry officer</p> | <p><u>June 2023:</u> Comments: No additional concerns regarding the existing tree scape and the implications of the LDO.</p> <p>Note the planting buffers illustrated around the eastern, western and southern boundaries are still limited considering the scale of the proposed buildings for the southern section of the site, (up to 21m high). To reflect the scale of the buildings larger perimeter buffer planting areas will be needed to secure a depth of tree and understory planting that would provide meaningful year-round screening.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> Comments: Although the tree data is well out of date (2016) it's still sufficient in that it adequately identifies the tree constraints impacting the site, and that is reflected in the proposed developable area.</p> <p>Condition A6 within Table C is also fit for purpose.</p> | <p>Buffers have been increased to 15m and 20m.</p> |

The Landscape officer will comment on the proposed landscaping strategy, however, just to note the extent of proposed space around the perimeter's of the area would appear to be limited in size. This then limits the amount of future tree and understory planting that could be accommodated to help screen the scale of development being proposed, questioning compliance with core policies 44 & 45 of the Local Plan and section 131 of the NPPF.

November 2017:

Comments:

The draft LDO acknowledges the need to consider the impact on existing trees within forthcoming planning applications by requiring the presentation of an arboricultural method statement as a condition (A5). The wording of the condition is acceptable.

The opportunity to control future landscaping is taken with the requirement to submit a landscape scheme for on plot applications as a condition (B7) and to ensure its implementation meets industry standards (B8). There does not appear to be a condition that would control how the landscaping is to be managed once it is established, thereby losing the ability to ensure retention and continuity of the landscaping as the site matures.

The potential future strategic highway improvement zone is positioned across the site gateway and the road frontage zone. The use of the land for highway improvements will result in the loss of most of the only established trees on the site. It is not clear if the extent of the indicated highway improvement zone is sufficient to include structural landscaping as replacement for that which will be lost. It is acknowledged throughout the design

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>strategy that the southern boundary trees are important and provision for their satisfactory replacement will need to be enshrined at this stage so that, in the event the land is used for highway improvements, mitigation landscaping is considered simultaneously. Clarification on this point, along with a need for inserting a condition controlling a subsequent requirement for submission of landscape scheme, implementation details and future management, should be sought, along with advice from the council's landscape officer.</p> | |
| Vale conservation officer | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No further comments to make.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> No comments received.</p> <p><u>November 2017:</u> Support in principle: Any built form of this size will have an impact on the rural setting of the north of Didcot and local distinctive landscape character. The siting, scale, form and materials for this development will need particular care to be assimilated as sympathetically as possible into the rural landscape and northern extension of Didcot.</p> | |
| Historic England | <p><u>June 2023:</u> No comments:</p> <p>Suggest this council seeks advice from the council's specialist conservation and archaeological advisers.</p> <p><u>April/May 2022:</u></p> | |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>In this case we do not offer advice. This should not be interpreted as comment on the merits of the application. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers.</p> <p><u>November 2017:</u> No comments received.</p> | |
| <p>Vale waste management officer</p> | <p>No comments</p> | |
| <p>Environmental protection team - noise</p> | <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> No objection: While the acoustic report does date from 2016 it is still relevant for two reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A major contributor to the ambient soundscape here is road noise. There was a dramatic fall in road traffic during the Covid 19 pandemic, which has only recently returned to pre-pandemic levels. This has resulted in a reduced growth in road traffic since the survey was carried out. 2. If the report does underestimate noise from road traffic by a small margin, then this will effectively make condition B9 marginally more restrictive than it would otherwise be. In other words it would not have a negative impact on amenity. <p>Satisfied with conditions B9, B11 and B12 as they currently stand.</p> <p><u>November 2017:</u> Comment: The proposed noise condition should read:</p> | <p>Now B11 (noise levels), B13 (construction hours) and B14 (operating hours for a waste management facility activities and operations).</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| | <p><i>“The noise rating level from site activities and M&E plant shall not exceed LAeq 48 dB during the day and LAeq 46 dB during the night when measured or calculated at the closest noise sensitive receptor as set out within the Environmental Noise Survey Report by Sandy Brown Consultants Ref. 16349-R01-A dated 24 February 2017. For the avoidance of doubt, the rating level shall include any relevant correction factors for tonal, impulsive or other factors.”</i></p> | |
| Air Quality Officer | No comments received. | |
| Contaminated Land Officer | <p><u>April/May 2022:</u> No objection: The LDO should be subject to conditions including the following updated conditions and informative with the requirement for submission of a phase one preliminary risk assessment (which has been addressed in the submitted LDO reports).</p> <p><i>Conditions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to the commencement of the development a phased risk assessment shall be carried out by a competent person in accordance with current government and Environment Agency Guidance and Approved Codes of Practice such as Land Contamination: Risk Management 2020 and BS10175:2011 +A2:2017 Investigation of potentially contaminated sites. Each phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Phase 2 shall include a comprehensive intrusive investigation in order to characterise the type, nature and extent of contamination present, the risks to receptors and | <p>Conditions A9, A10 and A11 in the LDO.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>if significant contamination is identified to inform the remediation strategy.</p> <p>Phase 3 requires that a remediation strategy be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA to ensure the site will be rendered suitable for its proposed use.</p> <p>Reason- To ensure that any ground, water and associated gas contamination is identified and adequately addressed to ensure the safety of the development, the environment and to ensure the site is suitable for the proposed use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The development shall not be occupied until any previously approved remediation strategy has been carried out in full and a validation report confirming completion of these works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. <p>Reason- To ensure that any ground, water and associated gas contamination is identified and adequately addressed to ensure the safety of the development, the environment and to ensure the site is suitable for the proposed use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The developer shall confirm in writing to the Local Planning Authority the presence of any unsuspected contamination encountered during the development. In the event of any contamination to the land and/or water being encountered, no development shall continue until a programme of investigation and/or remedial works to include methods of monitoring and certification of such works undertaken. Where land contamination investigation/remedial works are required, this must be carried out by a competent person in accordance with | |
|--|--|--|

current government and Environment Agency Guidance and Approved Codes of Practice such as Land Contamination: Risk Management 2020 and BS10175:2011 +A2:2017 'Investigation of potentially contaminated sites' and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure that any ground, water and associated gas contamination is identified and adequately addressed to ensure the safety of the development, the environment and to ensure the site is suitable for the proposed use.

Informative:

- The chosen building control body should be consulted if contamination is identified at the development site or if the development is being designed to be resistant to contamination. This would enable the building control body to take account of the risks to the development from contamination and to undertake any necessary inspections. To help ensure developers submit information to the standard expected, a document entitled "Dealing with Land Contamination During Development: A Guide for Developers" is available as a download on the following websites:
- <https://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/vale-of-white-horse-district-council/environment-and-neighbourhood-issues/environmental-advice/contaminated-land/>
- <https://www.southoxon.gov.uk/south-oxfordshire-district-council/environment-and-neighbourhood-issues/environmental-advice/contaminated-land/>

