

Land East of Newgate Lane East, Fareham



Air Quality Assessment

784-B032118

PRESENTED TO

Miller Homes and Bargate Homes

PRESENTED BY

NALO, Tetra Tech
Executive Park,
Avalon Way,
Anstey,
Leicester,
LE7 7GR

P: +44 (0)116 234 8000
E: NALO.UK@tetratech.com
tetratecheurope.com

DOCUMENT CONTROL

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Document: | Air Quality Assessment |
| Project: | Land East of Newgate Lane East, Fareham |
| Client: | Miller Homes and Bargate Homes |
| Job Number: | 784-B032118 |
| File Origin: | lds-dc-vm-101\Data\Projects |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------------|
| Issue: | 1 | Status: | First Issue |
| Date: | 24 th January 2021 | | |
| Prepared by: Zayn Dubois-Gafar Assistant Environmental Consultant | Checked by: Matthew Smith Principal Environmental Consultant | Approved By: Nigel Mann Director | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------------|
| Issue: | 2 | Status: | Second Issue |
| Date: | 27 th January 2021 | | |
| Prepared by: Zayn Dubois-Gafar Assistant Environmental Consultant | Checked by: Matthew Smith Principal Environmental Consultant | Approved By: Nigel Mann Director | |
| Description of revision: Minor amendments. | | | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Issue: | | Status: | |
| Date: | | | |
| Prepared by: | Checked by: | Approved By: | |
| Description of revision: | | | |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of an air quality assessment undertaken to assess road traffic emission and construction dust impacts in support of a planning application for the construction of a new residential development, on the site of Land East of Newgate Lane East, Fareham.

Construction Phase

The potential effects during the demolition and construction phases include fugitive dust emissions from site activities, such as earthworks, construction and trackout.

During the construction phase, site specific mitigation measures detailed within this assessment will be implemented. With these mitigation measures in place, the effects from the construction phase are not predicted to be significant.

Operational Phase

Detailed dispersion modelling of traffic pollutants has been undertaken for the proposed development. An operational year assessment for 2028 traffic emissions has been undertaken to assess the effects of the Proposed Development. The impacts during the operational phase take into account exhaust emissions from additional road traffic generated due to the proposed development.

The long-term (annual) assessment of the effects associated with the proposed development with respect to Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) is determined to be 'negligible'. With respect to PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} exposure, the effect is determined to be 'negligible' at all identified existing sensitive receptor locations.

All proposed receptor locations are expected to be exposed to air quality below the Air Quality Objectives for NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. No further mitigation is required to protect future occupants.

Odour Impact

The proposed residential development site will mostly be located within an area (Zone C) where the odour impacts on the entire proposed residential development from the waste water treatment works are not significant, as such no mitigation will be required in this area. It is considered that the odour may be potentially detectable at the western corner of the development site (Zone B) on occasions and as such, this portion of the site shall remain undeveloped.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1.0 INTRODUCTION | 8 |
| 1.1 Site Location | 8 |
| 1.2 Context | 8 |
| 1.3 Report Structure | 9 |
| 2.0 POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT | 10 |
| 2.1 Documents Consulted | 10 |
| 2.2 Air Quality Legislative Framework | 11 |
| 2.3 Planning And Policy Guidance | 13 |
| 3.0 ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY | 16 |
| 3.1 Determining Impact Description Of The Air Quality Effects | 16 |
| 4.0 BASELINE CONDITIONS | 18 |
| 4.1 Air Quality Review | 18 |
| 4.2 Meteorology | 20 |
| 4.3 Emission Sources | 21 |
| 4.4 Sensitive Receptors | 22 |
| 4.5 Ecological Receptors | 22 |
| 5.0 ASSESSMENT OF AIR QUALITY IMPACTS - CONSTRUCTION PHASE..... | 25 |
| 5.1 Pollutant Sources | 25 |
| 5.2 Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)..... | 25 |
| 5.3 Dust | 25 |
| 5.4 Methodology..... | 26 |
| 5.5 Assessment Results..... | 26 |
| 6.0 ASSESSMENT OF AIR QUALITY IMPACTS - OPERATIONAL PHASE | 28 |
| 6.1 Existing And Predicted Traffic Flows | 28 |
| 6.2 Background Concentrations..... | 29 |
| 6.3 Model Verification..... | 32 |
| 6.4 ADMS-Roads Model Inputs | 33 |
| 6.5 ADMS Modelling Results | 34 |
| 6.5.1 Traffic Assessment | 34 |
| 6.5.2 Assessment Scenarios | 34 |
| 6.5.3 Operational Traffic Assessment | 34 |
| 6.5.4 Ecological Sensitive Receptor Locations | 42 |
| 7.0 MITIGATION..... | 44 |
| 7.1 Construction Phase..... | 44 |
| 8.0 ODOUR IMPACT BRIEFING | 47 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 8.1 Previous Odour Assessment | 47 |
| 8.2 Identified Odour Effect Zones | 47 |
| 8.3 Odour Impact Briefing summary | 49 |
| 9.0 CONCLUSIONS | 50 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 2-1. Air Quality Standards, Objectives, Limits and Target Values | 12 |
| Table 2-2. Ecological Air Quality Standards, Objectives, Limit and Target Values | 12 |
| Table 3-1. Impact Descriptors for Individual Receptors | 17 |
| Table 4-1. Local Authority AQMA Details..... | 18 |
| Table 4-2. Monitored Annual Mean NO ₂ Concentrations at Automatic Monitoring Locations | 19 |
| Table 4-3. Monitored Annual Mean NO ₂ Concentrations at Diffusion Tubes | 19 |
| Table 4-4. Modelled Sensitive Receptor Locations..... | 22 |
| Table 4-5. Ecological Sensitive Receptor Locations | 23 |
| Table 5-1. Dust Emission Magnitude | 26 |
| Table 5-2. Sensitivity of the Area | 26 |
| Table 5-3. Impact Description of Construction Activities without Mitigation..... | 27 |
| Table 6-1. Traffic Data..... | 28 |
| Table 6-2. Published Background Air Quality Levels (µg/m ³) | 29 |
| Table 6-3. Pollutant Source Apportionment of NO _x (µg/m ³) | 30 |
| Table 6-4. Utilised Background Concentrations (µg/m ³)..... | 31 |
| Table 6-5. Comparison of Roadside Modelling & Monitoring Results for NO ₂ | 32 |
| Table 6-6. Summary of ADMS Roads Model Inputs | 33 |
| Table 6-7. Predicted Annual Average Concentrations of NO ₂ at Receptor Locations..... | 34 |
| Table 6-8. Impact Description of Effects at Key Receptors (NO ₂) | 38 |
| Table 6-9. Predicted Annual Average Concentrations of PM ₁₀ at Receptor Locations | 39 |
| Table 6-10. Impact Description of Effects at Key Receptors (PM ₁₀)..... | 40 |
| Table 6-11. Predicted Annual Average Concentrations of PM _{2.5} at Receptor Locations | 41 |
| Table 6-12. Impact Description of Effects at Key Receptors (PM _{2.5}) | 42 |
| Table 6-13. Predicted Annual Average Concentrations of NO _x at Ecological Receptor Locations | 43 |
| Table 7-1. IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction ‘Highly Recommended’ Mitigation Measures | 44 |
| Table 7-2. IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction ‘Desirable’ Mitigation Measures..... | 45 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1-1. Satellite Image of Site and Surrounding Area | 8 |
| Figure 4-1. Local Authority Monitoring Locations | 20 |
| Figure 4-2. Gosport Fleetlands 2019 Wind Rose | 21 |
| Figure 4-3. Sensitive Receptor Locations..... | 24 |
| Figure 6-1. Annual Average Long-Term Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂) Contribution from Proposed Development (µg/m ³) | 36 |
| Figure 6-2. Total Long Term Annual Average Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂) Concentration Across the Study Area (µg/m ³) | 37 |
| Figure 8-1 Odour Effect Zones | 48 |
| Figure A-1 Air Quality Assessment Area | 53 |

APPENDICES

| | |
|--|----|
| APPENDIX A - FIGURES | 52 |
| APPENDIX B - CONSTRUCTION PHASE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY | 54 |
| APPENDIX C - REPORT TERMS & CONDITIONS | 58 |

ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

| Acronyms/Abbreviations | Definition |
|------------------------|--|
| AADT | Annual Average Daily Traffic |
| ADMS | Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling Software |
| AQAL | the Air Quality Assessment Level |
| AQAP | Air Quality Action Plan |
| AQMA | Air Quality Management Area |
| AQO | Air Quality Objectives |
| AQS | Air Quality Standards |
| CHP | Combined Heat and Power |
| CL | Critical Level |
| CO | Carbon Monoxide |
| DEFRA | Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs |
| EAL | Environmental Assessment Limits |
| EC | European Commission |
| EFT | The Emissions Factors Toolkit |
| EPUK | Environmental Protection UK |
| EU | European Union |
| EPAQS | The Expert Panel on Air Quality Standards |
| IAQM | The Institute of Air Quality Management |
| LA | Local Authority |
| LAQM | Local Air Quality Management |
| NGR | The United Kingdom National Grid Reference |
| NO | Nitric Oxide |
| NO ₂ | Nitrogen Dioxide |
| PC | Process Contribution |
| DLUHC | Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities |
| NPPF | The National Planning Policy Framework |
| OS | the UK Ordnance Survey |
| PEC | Predicted Environment Concentration |
| PPG | Planning Policy Guidance |
| PPS | Planning Policy Statements |
| SAC | Special Areas of Conservation |
| SPA | Special Protection Area |
| SSSI | Sites of Special Scientific Interest |
| VOC | Volatile organic compounds |
| WHO | World Health Organization |
| UK | The United Kingdom |

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of an air quality assessment undertaken to assess road traffic emission and construction dust impacts in support of a planning application for the construction of a new residential development, on the site of Land East of Newgate Lane East, Fareham.

1.1 SITE LOCATION

The central Grid Reference is approximately 457405, 103574. The application site is bounded to the north by fields and football pitches along Newgate Lane, bounded to the east by residential properties on Tukes Avenue, the south by arable land which was recently granted outline planning permission for a development of up to 99 homes, and to the west by open farmland and residential properties on Newgate Lane.

Reference should be made to **Figure 1-1** for a map of the application site and surrounding area.

Figure 1-1. Satellite Image of Site and Surrounding Area



Google Imagery (2021)

1.2 CONTEXT

The primary source of the air quality associated with the proposed scheme includes from vehicle movements, arriving and departing the proposed development. The traffic data generated by the development has been assessed at the surrounding sensitive receptors and proposed sensitive receptors.

The following assessment stages have been undertaken as part of this assessment:

- Baseline evaluation;
- Assessment of potential air quality impacts during the construction phase;
- Assessment of potential air quality impacts during the operational phase;
- Identification of mitigation measures (as required).

The results of the assessment are detailed in the following sections of this report.

The construction phase assessment considers the potential effects of dust and particulate emissions from site activities and materials movement using a qualitative risk assessment method based on the Institute of Air Quality Management's (IAQM) 'Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction' document, published in 2014.

The assessment of the potential air quality impacts that are associated with the operational phase has focused on the predicted impact of changes in ambient nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 10 µm (PM₁₀) and less than 2.5 µm (PM_{2.5}) as a result of the development at key local receptor locations. The changes have been referenced to EU air quality limits and UK air quality objectives and the magnitude and impact description of the changes have been referenced to non-statutory guidance issued by the IAQM and Environmental Protection UK (EPUK).

1.3 REPORT STRUCTURE

Following this introductory section, the remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- Section 2: Policy and Legislative Context
- Section 3: Assessment Methodology
- Section 4: Baseline Conditions
- Section 5: Assessment of Air Quality Impacts – Construction Phase
- Section 6: Assessment of Air Quality Impacts – Operational Phase
- Section 7: Mitigation
- Section 8: Conclusions

All technical Appendices are included at the end of this report for information.

2.0 POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

2.1 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

The following documents were consulted during the undertaking of this assessment:

Legislation and Best Practice Guidance

- National Planning Policy Framework, Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government, Revised July 2021;
- Planning Practice Guidance: Air Quality, Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government, November 2019;
- The Air Quality Standards Regulations (Amendments), 2016;
- The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, Defra, 2007;
- The Environment Act, 1995;
- The Environment Act, 2021;
- Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance LAQM.TG16, Defra, 2021;
- Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1, LA 105 Air quality, Highways England, November 2019;
- Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality, EPUK & IAQM, 2017;
- Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction, IAQM, 2014;
- A Guide to the Assessment of Air Quality Impacts on Designated Nature Conservation Sites (Version 1.0), IAQM, May 2020; and,
- Ecological Assessment of Air Quality Impacts, CIEEM, January 2021.

Websites Consulted

- Google maps (maps.google.co.uk);
- The UK National Air Quality Archive (www.airquality.co.uk);
- Department for Transport Matrix (www.dft.gov.uk/matrix);
- emapsite.com;
- Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (<http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>);
- Planning Practice Guidance (<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/>); and,
- Fareham Borough Council (<https://www.fareham.gov.uk>)

Site Specific Reference Documents

- Fareham Borough Council 2020 Air Quality Annual Status Report;
- Fareham Borough Council 2008 Air Quality Action Plan;
- Fareham Borough Council 2011 Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy;
- Fareham Borough Council 2015 Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies; and,
- Fareham Borough Council 2015 Local Plan Part 3: The Welbourne Plan.

2.2 AIR QUALITY LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

European Legislation

European air quality legislation is consolidated under Directive 2008/50/EC, which came into force on 11th June 2008. This Directive consolidates previous legislation which was designed to deal with specific pollutants in a consistent manner and provides new air quality objectives for fine particulates. The consolidated Directives include:

- **Directive 1999/30/EC** – the First Air Quality "Daughter" Directive – sets ambient air limit values for NO₂ and oxides of nitrogen, sulphur dioxide, lead and PM₁₀;
- **Directive 2000/69/EC** – the Second Air Quality "Daughter" Directive – sets ambient air limit values for benzene and carbon monoxide; and,
- **Directive 2002/3/EC** – the Third Air Quality "Daughter" Directive – seeks to establish long-term objectives, target values, an alert threshold and an information threshold for concentrations of ozone in ambient air.

The fourth daughter Directive was not included within the consolidation and is described as:

- **Directive 2004/107/EC** – sets health-based limits on polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, cadmium, arsenic, nickel and mercury, for which there is a requirement to reduce exposure to as low as reasonably achievable.

The European Commission (EC) Directive Limits, outlined above, have been transposed in the UK through the Air Quality Standards Regulations. In the UK responsibility for meeting ambient air quality limit values is devolved to the national administrations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

The European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 (EUWA) provides a new framework for the continuity of retained EU law in the UK. EU Directives no longer have to be implemented by the UK except to any extent agreed or decided by the UK unilaterally.

EUWA retains the domestic effect of EU Directives to the extent already implemented in UK law, by preserving the relevant domestic implementing legislation enacted in UK law before 'Implementation Period' completion day. Though the EU Directives are not retained, following the UK's departure from the EU, the EUWA converts the current framework of Air Quality targets, however the role that the EU instructions were party to are lost.

UK Legislation

The Air Quality Standards Regulations (Amendments 2016) seek to simplify air quality regulation and provide a new transposition of the Air Quality Framework Directive, First, Second and Third Daughter Directives and also transpose the Fourth Daughter Directive within the UK. The Air Quality Limit Values are transposed into the updated Regulations as Air Quality Standards, with attainment dates in line with the European Directives. SI 2010 No. 1001, Part 7 Regulation 31 extends powers, under Section 85(5) of the Environment Act (1995), for the Secretary of State to give directions to Local Authorities (LAs) for the implementation of these Directives.

The UK Air Quality Strategy is the method for implementation of the air quality limit values in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and provides a framework for improving air quality and protecting human health

from the effects of pollution.

For each nominated pollutant, the Air Quality Strategy sets clear, measurable, outdoor air quality standards and target dates by which these must be achieved; the combined standard and target date is referred to as the Air Quality Objective (AQO) for that pollutant. Adopted national standards are based on the recommendations of the Expert Panel on Air Quality Standards (EPAQS) and have been translated into a set of Statutory Objectives within the Air Quality (England) Regulations (2000) SI 928, and subsequent amendments. The Environment (Miscellaneous Amendments) (EU Exit) Regulations 2020 amends the AQO for PM_{2.5} outlined within the Air Quality Standards Regulations (2010 & 2016 Amendments).

The AQOs for pollutants included within the Air Quality Strategy and assessed as part of the scope of this report are presented in **Table 2-1** and **Table 2-2** along with European Commission (EC) Directive Limits and World Health Organisation (WHO) Guidelines. The ecological levels are based on WHO and CLRTAP (Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution) guidance.

Table 2-1. Air Quality Standards, Objectives, Limits and Target Values

| Pollutant | Applies | Objective | Concentration Measured as ¹⁰ | Date to be achieved and maintained thereafter | European Obligations | Date to be achieved and maintained thereafter | New or existing |
|-------------------|---------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| PM ₁₀ | UK | 50µg/m ³ by end of 2004 (max 35 exceedances a year) | 24-hour Mean | 1 st January 2005 | 50µg/m ³ by end of 2004 (max 35 exceedances a year) | 1 st January 2005 | Retain Existing |
| | UK | 40µg/m ³ by end of 2004 | Annual Mean | 1 st January 2005 | 40µg/m ³ | 1 st January 2005 | |
| PM _{2.5} | UK | 20µg/m ³ | Annual Mean | 1 st January 2020 | - | - | Retain Existing |
| NO ₂ | UK | 200µg/m ³ not to be exceeded more than 18 times a year | 1-Hour Mean | 31 st December 2005 | 200µg/m ³ not to be exceeded more than 18 times a year | 1 st January 2010 | Retain Existing |
| | UK | 40µg/m ³ | Annual Mean | 31 st December 2005 | 40µg/m ³ | 1 st January 2010 | |

Table 2-2. Ecological Air Quality Standards, Objectives, Limit and Target Values

| Pollutant | Applies | Objective | Concentration Measured as |
|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| NO _x | UK | 30µg/m ³ | Annual Mean |

Within the context of this assessment, the annual mean objectives are those against which facades of residential receptors will be assessed and the short-term objectives apply to all other receptor locations, where people may be exposed over a short duration, both residential and non-residential such as using gardens, balconies, walking along streets, using playgrounds, footpaths or external areas of employment uses.

Local Air Quality Management

Under Section 82 of the Environment Act (1995) (Part IV) Local Authorities (LAs) are required to periodically review and assess air quality within their area of jurisdiction under the system of Local Air Quality Management (LAQM). This review and assessment of air quality involves assessing present and likely future air quality against the AQOs. If it is predicted that levels at the façade of buildings where members of the public are regularly present (normally residential properties) are likely to be exceeded, the LA is required to declare an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

Environment Act 2021

The Environment Act (2021) introduces a commitment to create a legally binding duty on government to reduce the concentrations of fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) in ambient air, and to set a long-term target expected to be 10 µg/m³, a reduction from the current Air Quality objective of 20 µg/m³ set out within the Air Quality Standards Regulations (Amendment 2016). A draft of a statutory instrument (or drafts of statutory instruments) containing regulations setting the PM_{2.5} air quality target must be laid before Parliament on or before 31st October 2022 and is expected to come into force thereafter.

2.3 PLANNING AND POLICY GUIDANCE

National Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), revised July 2021, principally brings together and summarises the suite of Planning Policy Statements (PPS) and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) which previously guided planning policy making. The NPPF states that:

Paragraph 174

“Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans.”

Paragraph 186

“Planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. Opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts should be identified, such as through traffic and travel management, and green infrastructure provision and enhancement. So far as possible these opportunities should be considered at the plan-making stage, to ensure a strategic approach and limit the need for issues to be reconsidered when determining individual applications.

Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones is consistent with the local air quality action plan.”

Paragraph 188

“The focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes). Planning decisions should assume that these regimes will operate effectively. Equally, where a planning decision has been made on a particular development, the planning issues should not be revisited through the permitting regimes operated by pollution control authorities.”

The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) web-based resource was updated by the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities' (DLUHC) on 1st November 2019 to support the National Planning Policy Framework and make it more accessible. A review of PPG: Air Quality identified the following guidance (Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 32-001-20191101):

“The 2008 Ambient Air Quality Directive sets legally binding limits for concentrations in outdoor air of major air pollutants that affect public health such as particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂).

The UK also has national emission reduction commitments for overall UK emissions of 5 damaging air pollutants:

- *fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5});*
- *ammonia (NH₃);*
- *nitrogen oxides (NO_x);*
- *sulphur dioxide (SO₂); and*
- *non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOCs).*

As well as having direct effects on public health, habitats and biodiversity, these pollutants can combine in the atmosphere to form ozone, a harmful air pollutant (and potent greenhouse gas) which can be transported great distances by weather systems. Odour and dust can also be a planning concern, for example, because of the effect on local amenity. “

Local Policy

Following a review of the Fareham Borough Council 2011 Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, the following policy concerning air quality was identified:

“Policy CS7: Development in Fareham

...Development will be permitted within the Fareham settlement boundary where it contributes to one or more of the following:

...development of the Bus Rapid Transit South East Hampshire Harbour Link and improvements to air quality.

...Development will only be permitted where it does not significantly affect the setting and landscape character of the town or diminish the town's, community, historic, biodiversity and cultural resources nor have an adverse impact on air quality."

"Policy CS12: Daedalus Airfield Strategic Development Allocation

...The Daedalus Airfield is allocated for strategic employment development. Development will be permitted where:

...it does not have an adverse impact on air quality."

3.0 ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

There is potential for environmental effects during the operational phase of the proposed development due to emissions from proposed vehicle movements. The significance of potential environmental effects is assessed according to the latest guidance produced by EPUK and IAQM in January 2017 '*Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality*' and May 2020 '*A Guide to the Assessment of Air Quality Impacts on Designated Nature Conservation Sites*'.

The methodology used to determine the potential air quality effects of the construction phase of the proposed development has been derived from the IAQM '*Guidance on the Assessment of the Impacts of Dust from Demolition and Construction*' document and is summarised in Section 5.

3.1 DETERMINING IMPACT DESCRIPTION OF THE AIR QUALITY EFFECTS

The impact description of the effects during the operational phase of the development is based on the latest guidance produced by EPUK and IAQM in January 2017. The guidance provides a basis for a consistent approach that could be used by all parties associated with the planning process to professionally judge the overall impact description of the air quality effects based on severity of air quality impacts.

The following rationale is used in determining the severity of the air quality effects at individual receptors:

1. The change in concentration of air pollutants, air quality effects, are quantified and evaluated in the context of AQOs. The effects are provided as a percentage of the Air Quality Objective (AQO), which may be an AQO, EU limit or target value, or an Environment Agency 'Environmental Assessment Level (EAL)';
2. The absolute concentrations are also considered in terms of the AQO and are divided into categories for long term concentration. The categories are based on the sensitivity of the individual receptor in terms of harm potential. The degree of harm potential to change increases as absolute concentrations are close to or above the AQO;
3. Severity of the effect is described as qualitative descriptors; negligible, slight, moderate or substantial, by taking into account in combination the harm potential and air quality effect. This means that a small increase at a receptor which is already close to or above the AQO will have higher severity compared to a relatively large change at a receptor which is significantly below the AQO;
4. The effects can be adverse when pollutant concentrations increase or beneficial when concentrations decrease as a result of development;
5. The judgement of overall impact description of the effects is then based on severity of effects on all the individual receptors considered; and,
6. Where a development is not resulting in any change in emissions itself, the impact description of effect is based on the effect of surrounding sources on new residents or users of the development, i.e., will they be exposed to levels above the AQO.

Table 3-1. Impact Descriptors for Individual Receptors

| Long term average concentration at receptor in assessment year | % Change in concentration relative to AQO | | | |
|--|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 1 | 2-5 | 6-10 | >10 |
| ≤75% of AQO | Negligible | Negligible | Slight | Moderate |
| 76-94% of AQO | Negligible | Slight | Moderate | Moderate |
| 95-102% of AQO | Slight | Moderate | Moderate | Substantial |
| 103-109 of AQO | Moderate | Moderate | Substantial | Substantial |
| ≥110 of AQO | Moderate | Substantial | Substantial | Substantial |

In accordance with explanation note 2 of Table 6.3 of the EPUK & IAQM guidance, the Table is intended to be used by rounding the change in percentage pollutant concentration to whole numbers, which then makes it clearer which cell the impact falls within. The user is encouraged to treat the numbers with recognition of their likely accuracy and not assume a false level of precision. Changes of 0%, i.e. less than 0.5%, will be described as Negligible.

4.0 BASELINE CONDITIONS

4.1 AIR QUALITY REVIEW

This section provides a review of the existing air quality in the vicinity of the application site in order to provide a benchmark against which to assess potential air quality impacts of the proposed development. Baseline air quality in the vicinity of the application site has been defined from several sources, as described in the following sections.

Local Air Quality Management (LAQM)

As required under section 82 of the Environment Act 1995, Fareham Borough Council (FBC) has undertaken an ongoing exercise to review and assess air quality within its area of jurisdiction. The assessments have indicated that concentrations of NO₂ are above the relevant AQOs at locations of relevant public exposure within the Borough. Therefore, FBC has designated two Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

The assessments have indicated that concentrations of NO₂ are above the relevant AQOs at one location of relevant public exposure within FBC that is shown below.

Table 4-1. Local Authority AQMA Details

| AQMA | Description | Date Declared | Date Amended | Pollutants Declared |
|----------------------|--|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| Portland Street AQMA | An area encompassing residential properties and the Sacred Heart Catholic Church on Portland Street and the southern end of Hartland Road Fareham. | 01/12/2007 | 01/11/2017 | Nitrogen Dioxide NO ₂ |
| Gosport Road AQMA | An area encompassing the junction of Gosport Road, Redlands Lane and Newgate Lane Fareham and the surrounding area up to the Quay Street roundabout Fareham. | 01/04/2006 | 01/11/2017 | Nitrogen Dioxide NO ₂ |

The proposed development site is situated to the 1 km south of the Gosport Road AQMA, therefore existing receptors within the AQMA have been included as part of the modelling assessment.

However, it should be noted that the extent of this AQMA is based on work undertaken in 2007 and therefore potentially out of date. Similarly, it should be noted that both AQMAs were amended in 2017.

As such, the modelling work in this assessment, which is verified to local monitoring, should be considered to be a more precise and up to date assessment of pollutant levels at the site. The assessment considers potential exposure to pollutants by future occupiers rather than simply considering the extent of the AQMA represents a theoretical delineation of harm. It should be also noted that the AQMA is a management area, where pollutant levels should be “managed” by the local authority air quality action plan and should not be considered to be a planning constraint in itself.

Air Quality Monitoring

Monitoring of air quality within FBC has been undertaken through both automatic and non-automatic monitoring methods in 2019. These have been reviewed in order to provide an indication of existing air quality in the area surrounding the application site. The most recent monitoring data within FBC was undertaken during 2019.

Automatic Monitoring

Fareham Borough Council undertook automatic pollution monitoring during 2019 at 3 different locations. The closest monitoring location is FAR1, which is located at Gosport Road, approximately 1.3 km north of the application site. The most recently available data is from 2019 which is presented in **Table 4-2**.

Table 4-2. Monitored Annual Mean NO₂ Concentrations at Automatic Monitoring Locations

| Site ID | Location | Site Type | Distance from Kerb of Nearest Road (m) | Inlet Height (m) | 2019 NO ₂ Annual Mean Concentration (µg/m ³) | 2019 PM ₁₀ Annual Mean Concentration (µg/m ³) |
|----------------------|-----------------|-----------|--|------------------|---|--|
| GOS1 | Tichborne Way | Roadside | 5 | 3 | 20.4 | 17.4 |
| FAR1* | Gosport Road | Roadside | 1.5 | 2 | 28.3 | N/A |
| FAR2 | Portland Street | Roadside | 1.5 | 1.5 | 29.6 | N/A |
| *Located within AQMA | | | | | | |

As outlined in **Table 4-2**, the monitoring locations monitored annual average NO₂ concentrations below the AQO for NO₂ (40 µg/m³ annual mean) during 2019.

Non - Automatic Monitoring

FBC operates a network of 45 passive diffusion tubes. The closest diffusion tube is diffusion tube G2A, which is located on Gosport Road, approximately 1.3 km north of the application site. The most recently available diffusion tube data is from 2019 which is presented in **Table 4-3**.

Table 4-3. Monitored Annual Mean NO₂ Concentrations at Diffusion Tubes


| Site ID | Location | Site Type | Distance from Kerb (m) | Inlet Height (m) | Monitored 2019 Annual Mean NO ₂ Concentration (µg/m ³) |
|---------|--|-----------|------------------------|------------------|---|
| GR/RL* | Corner of Gosport Road and Redlands Lane | Roadside | 1.5 | 2.1 | 21.2 |
| G1A* | 30 Old Gosport Road | Roadside | 10 | 2.3 | 27.0 |
| G2A* | 138 Gosport Road | Other | 9.5 | 1.8 | 26.0 |
| G4* | 122 Gosport Road | Roadside | 6 | 2.5 | 24.0 |
| G6* | 171 Gosport Road | Roadside | 6 | 2.3 | 27.3 |
| G7* | 193 Gosport Road | Roadside | 6.5 | 3.0 | 36.5 |
| G10* | 107 Gosport Road | Roadside | 14 | 2.6 | 31.6 |
| G11* | 2 Earls Road | Roadside | 5 | 2.1 | 22.7 |
| G12* | Two Saints, 101 Gosport Road | Roadside | 15 | 2.6 | 30.5 |
| G14* | Bottom of Beaconsfield Road | Other | 6.9 | 2.5 | 26.8 |

*Located within AQMA

As indicated in **Table 4-3**, all diffusion tubes located within the Air Quality Assessment area monitored annual average NO₂ concentrations below the AQO for NO₂ (40 µg/m³ annual mean) during 2019.

It should be noted that as part of the model verification a review of diffusion tubes locations and monitoring heights was undertaken. As part of this process, the locations and monitoring heights were adjusted following desk-based review using Google Maps.

Figure 4-1. Local Authority Monitoring Locations




4.2 METEOROLOGY

Meteorological conditions have significant influence over air pollutant concentrations and dispersion. Pollutant levels can vary significantly from hour to hour as well as day to day, thus any air quality predictions need to be based on detailed meteorological data. The ADMS (Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System) model calculates the dispersion of pollutants on an hourly basis using a year of local meteorological data.

The 2019 meteorological data used in the assessment is derived from Gosport Fleetlands Meteorological Station. This is the nearest meteorological station, which is considered representative of the application site, with all the complete parameters necessary for the ADMS model. Reference should be made to **Figure 4-2** for an illustration of the prevalent wind conditions at Gosport Fleetlands Meteorological Station site.

Figure 4-2. Gosport Fleetlands 2019 Wind Rose



4.3 EMISSION SOURCES

A desktop assessment has identified that traffic movements are likely to be the most significant local source of pollutants affecting the site and its surroundings. The principal traffic derived pollutants likely to impact local receptors are NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}.

The assessment has therefore modelled all roads within the immediate vicinity of the application site which are considered likely to experience significant changes in traffic flow as a result of the proposed development. Reference should be made to **Figure A-1** for a graphical representation of the traffic data utilised within the ADMS Roads 5.0.0.1 model.

It should be noted that the pollutant contribution of minor roads and rail sources that are not included within the dispersion model is considered to be accounted for via the use of background air quality levels.

4.4 SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

Receptors that are considered as part of the air quality assessment are primarily those existing receptors that are situated along routes predicted to experience significant changes in traffic flow as a result of the proposed development.

The existing receptor locations are summarised in **Table 4-4** and the spatial locations of all of the receptors are illustrated in **Figure 4-3**.

Table 4-4. Modelled Sensitive Receptor Locations

| Existing Sensitive Receptor | | X | Y | Receptor Height (m) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|---------------------|
| R1 | HMS Collingwood | 457243 | 104107 | 1.5 |
| R2 | Tudor Lodge Nursing Home | 457110 | 103802 | 1.5 |
| R3 | 2 Woodcote Lane | 457286 | 103007 | 1.5 |
| R4 | 9 Newgate Lane | 457112 | 102664 | 1.5 |
| R5 | 4 Marks Road | 456970 | 101746 | 1.5 |
| R6 | CEMAST Engineering School | 457627 | 102423 | 1.5 |
| R7 | 1 Staples Reach | 458282 | 101874 | 1.5 |
| R8 | Rowner Health Centre | 459060 | 101681 | 1.5 |
| R9 | Tichborne Way | 459315 | 101784 | 1.5 |
| R10 | Brune Medical Centre | 457546 | 105066 | 1.5 |
| R11* | 1 Geoffrey Crescent | 457516 | 105171 | 1.5 |
| R12* | Youngbridge Court | 457556 | 105299 | 1.5 |
| R13* | Gracewell Care Home | 457592 | 105258 | 1.5 |
| R14 | 112 Gosport Road | 457727 | 105620 | 1.5 |
| R15 | 30 Gosport Road | 457740 | 105721 | 1.5 |
| R16 | 12 Eden Rise | 457955 | 105920 | 1.5 |
| R17 | 25 Gosport Road | 456844 | 104813 | 1.5 |
| R18 | 3 Longfield Avenue | 456261 | 105351 | 1.5 |
| R19 | 132 Longfield Avenue | 456020 | 102746 | 1.5 |
| R20 | 2 Davis Way (Non-Residential) | 457417 | 104658 | 1.5 |
| Proposed Sensitive Receptor | | X | Y | Receptor Height (m) |
| PR1 | Proposed Receptor | 457296 | 103434 | 1.5 |
| PR2 | Proposed Receptor | 457404 | 103738 | 1.5 |
| PR3 | Proposed Receptor | 457582 | 103975 | 1.5 |
| PR4 | Proposed Receptor | 457550 | 103415 | 1.5 |
| PR5 | Proposed Receptor | 457676 | 103923 | 1.5 |

*Located in the AQMA

Five proposed residential and twenty amenity sensitive receptors have been assessed to determine the effect of air quality, associated with the proposed development. The locations of the receptor are identified on **Figure 4-3**.

4.5 ECOLOGICAL RECEPTORS

Air quality impacts associated with the proposed re-development have the potential to impact on receptors of ecological sensitivity within the vicinity of the site. The IAQM guidance on 'Air Quality Impacts on Designated

Nature Conservation Sites' (2020) outlines the types of designated nature sites within 2 km of the proposed development which require air quality assessment. These are inclusive of;

- Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs);
- Special Areas of Conservation (SACs);
- Special Protection Areas (SPAs);
- Ramsar Sites;
- Areas of Special Scientific Interest (ASSIs);
- National Nature Reserves (NNRs);
- Local Nature Reserves (LNRs);
- Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs); and,
- Areas of Ancient Woodland (AW).

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2019) additionally requires competent authorities to review planning applications and consents that have the potential to impact on European designated sites (e.g. Special Protection Areas).


A study was undertaken to identify any statutory designated sites of ecological or nature conservation importance within the extents of the dispersion modelling assessment. This was completed using the Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) web-based interactive mapping service, which draws together information on key environmental schemes and designations. Following a search within a 2 km radius of the site boundary, the following ecological receptors were identified:

Table 4-5. Ecological Sensitive Receptor Locations

| Site ID | Site | Designation | UK NGR (m) | | Distance from Site (km) | Distance from Nearest Affected Road (m) |
|---------|--------------------|------------------|------------|--------|-------------------------|---|
| | | | X | Y | | |
| E1 | Portsmouth Harbour | SSSI / SAC / SPA | 457876 | 104523 | 0.8 | 25 |
| E2 | The Wild Grounds | LNR | 457823 | 101475 | 1.9 | >200 |
| E3 | Tips Copse | AW | 455961 | 103391 | 1.3 | >200 |

It should be noted that the IAQM Guidance only requires the assessment of ecological receptors which are located within 200 m of the affected road network. Therefore, ecological receptors E2 and E3 have been scoped out of this assessment.

Figure 4-3. Sensitive Receptor Locations



5.0 ASSESSMENT OF AIR QUALITY IMPACTS - CONSTRUCTION PHASE

5.1 POLLUTANT SOURCES

The main emissions during construction are likely to be dust and particulate matter generated during earth moving (particularly during dry months) or from construction materials. The main potential effects of dust and particulate matter are:

- Visual - dust plume, reduced visibility, coating and soiling of surfaces leading to annoyance, loss of amenity, the need to clean surfaces;
- Physical and/or chemical contamination and corrosion of artefacts;
- Coating of vegetation and soil contamination; and,
- Health effects due to inhalation e.g. asthma or irritation of the eyes.

A number of other factors such as the amount of precipitation and other meteorological conditions will also greatly influence the amount of particulate matter generated.

Construction activities can give rise to short-term elevated dust/PM₁₀ concentrations in neighbouring areas. This may arise from vehicle movements, soiling of the public highway, demolition or windblown stockpiles.

5.2 PARTICULATE MATTER (PM₁₀)

The UK Air Quality Standards seek to control the health implications of respirable PM₁₀. However, the majority of particles released from construction will be greater than this in size.

Construction works on site have the potential to elevate localised PM₁₀ concentrations in the area. On this basis, mitigation measures should still be taken to minimise these emissions as part of good site practice.

5.3 DUST

Particles greater than 10µm are likely to settle out relatively quickly and may cause annoyance due to their soiling capability. Although there are no formal standards or criteria for nuisance caused by deposited particles, the IAQM 'Guidance on Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites' (October 2018) and the Environment Agency Technical Guidance Note (TGN) M17 states that dust is usually compared with a 'complaints likely' guideline of 200mg/m²/day. Therefore, a deposition rate of 200mg/m²/day is often presented as a threshold for serious nuisance though this is usually only applied to long term exposure as people are generally more tolerant of dust for a short or defined period. Significant nuisance is likely when the dust coverage of surfaces is visible in contrast with adjacent clean areas, especially when it happens regularly. Severe dust nuisance occurs when the dust is perceptible without a clean reference surface.

Construction activities have the potential to suspend dust, which could result in annoyance of residents surrounding the site. Measures will be taken to minimise the emissions of dust as part of good site practice.

Recommended mitigation measures proportionate to the risk associated with the development and based on best practice guidance are discussed in the following sections.

5.4 METHODOLOGY

The construction phase assessment utilises the IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction document published in February 2014.

Four construction processes are considered; these are demolition, earthworks, construction and trackout. For each of these phases, the impact description of the potential dust impacts is derived following the determination of a dust emission magnitude and the distance of activities to the nearest sensitive receptor, therefore assessing worst case impacts. A full explanation of the methodology is contained in Appendix A.

5.5 ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Based on the methodology detailed in Appendix A, the scale of the anticipated works has determined the potential dust emission magnitude for each process, as presented in the **Table 5-1** below.

Table 5-1. Dust Emission Magnitude

| Construction Process | Site Criteria | Dust Emission Magnitude |
|----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Demolition | No demolition required | N/A |
| Earthworks | Total Site Area: >10,000 m ² | Large |
| Construction | Total Building Volume >100,000 m ³ | Large |
| Trackout | Assumed 10 - 50 HDV outward movements in any one day | Medium |

The sensitivity of the surrounding area to each construction process has been determined following stage 2B of the IAQM guidance. The assessment has determined the area sensitivities as shown in the **Table 5-2**.

The sensitivity of the ecological receptors is considered not applicable within the construction phase assessment due to the distance from the application site which is greater than 500m. This is in accordance with Table 4 of the IAQM Guidance.

Table 5-2. Sensitivity of the Area

| Source | Area Sensitivity | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|------------|--|
| | Dust Soiling | Site Sensitivity Criteria | Health Effects of PM ₁₀ | Site Sensitivity Criteria | Ecological | Site Sensitivity Criteria |
| Demolition | N/A | No demolition required | N/A | No demolition required | N/A | No demolition required |
| Earthworks | Medium | 10-100 Highly Sensitive Receptors within 50m | Low | Annual Mean of <24 ug/m ³ for PM ₁₀ 10-100 Highly Sensitive Receptors within 50m | N/A | >50 m from site boundary |
| Construction | Medium | | Low | | N/A | |
| Trackout | Medium | 10-100 Highly Sensitive Receptors within 50m of roads within 500m of site | Low | Annual Mean of <24 ug/m ³ for PM ₁₀ 10-100 Highly Sensitive Receptors within 50m of roads within 500m of site | N/A | >50 m from roads within 500 m from site boundary |

The dust emission magnitude determined in **Table 5-1** has been combined with the sensitivity of the area determined in **Table 5-2**, to determine the risk of impacts prior to the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures. The potential impact significance of dust emissions associated with the development, without mitigation, is presented in **Table 5-3**.

Table 5-3. Impact Description of Construction Activities without Mitigation

| Source | Summary Risk of Impacts Prior to Mitigation | | |
|--------------|---|------------------------------------|------------|
| | Dust Soiling | Health Effects of PM ₁₀ | Ecological |
| Demolition | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Earthworks | Medium | Low | N/A |
| Construction | Medium | Low | N/A |
| Trackout | Low | Low | N/A |

Appropriate mitigation measures are detailed and presented in Section 7. Following the adoption of these measures, the subsequent impact significance of the construction phase is not predicted to be significant.

6.0 ASSESSMENT OF AIR QUALITY IMPACTS - OPERATIONAL PHASE

In the context of the proposed development, road traffic is identified as the dominant emission source that is likely to cause potential risk of exposure of air pollutants at receptors.

The operational phase assessment therefore consists of the quantified predictions of the change in NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} for the operational phase of the development due to changes in traffic movement. Predictions of air quality at the site have been undertaken for the operational phase of the development using ADMS Roads.

In accordance with the provided traffic data, the operational phase assessment has been undertaken with an assumed operational opening year of 2028. The assessment scenarios are therefore:

- 2019 Baseline = Existing Baseline Conditions (2019);
- 2028 “Do Minimum” = Baseline Conditions + Committed Development Flows + Unconsented Development Sensitivity Test (Included within traffic data at request of local authority); and,
- 2028 “Do Something” = Baseline Conditions + Committed Development + Sensitivity Test + Proposed Development.

6.1 EXISTING AND PREDICTED TRAFFIC FLOWS

Baseline 2019 traffic data, projected 2028 ‘Do Minimum’ and ‘Do Something’ traffic data, and average vehicle speeds have been obtained for the operational phase assessment in the form of Annual Average Daily Traffic figures (AADT).

Traffic data for all scenarios, inclusive of HGV numbers and average speeds have been provided by i-Transport LLP for all road links.

To calculate the 2028 ‘Do Something’ operational year traffic flows, the proposed development traffic flows have been distributed across the model area and have been added onto the 2028 ‘Do Minimum’ scenario flows.

Emission factors for the 2019 baseline and 2028 projected ‘Do Minimum’ and ‘Do Something’ scenarios have been calculated using the Emission Factor Toolkit (EFT) Version 11.0 (November 2021).

It is assumed the average vehicle speeds on the local road network in an opening year of 2028 will be broadly the same as the ones in 2019. A 50 m 20 km/hr slow down phase is included on each link at every junction and roundabout within the assessment. All of the roads within the dispersion model are illustrated in **Figure A-1**. Detailed traffic figures are provided in the **Table 6-1**.

Table 6-1. Traffic Data

| Link | Speed (km/h) | 2019 Baseline | | 2028 Do Minimum | | 2028 Do Something | |
|--|--------------|---------------|-------|-----------------|------|-------------------|------|
| | | AADT | HGV % | AADT | %HGV | AADT | %HGV |
| B3385 Newgate Lane East (North of Site) | 63 | 32,696 | 2.93 | 31,189 | 2.63 | 32,220 | 2.55 |
| B3385 Newgate Lane East (South of Longfield Ave) | 63 | 36,541 | 2.85 | 35,131 | 2.80 | 36,161 | 2.72 |
| B3385 Newgate Lane East (North of Longfield Ave) | 48 | 28,585 | 3.17 | 31,835 | 2.99 | 32,496 | 2.93 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|
| A32 Gosport Road (North of Gosport Roundabout) | 48 | 61,966 | 4.00 | 66,454 | 3.88 | 67,114 | 3.84 |
| A32 Gosport Road (South of A27) | 48 | 59,347 | 4.19 | 63,706 | 4.06 | 64,367 | 4.02 |
| B3385 Newgate Lane East (South of Site) | 63 | 32,689 | 2.91 | 31,266 | 2.60 | 32,879 | 2.47 |
| B3334 Gosport Road (West) | 48 | 15,747 | 1.49 | 31,828 | 1.40 | 32,489 | 1.37 |
| B3334 Rowner Road (East) | 48 | 25,956 | 2.47 | 26,229 | 1.70 | 27,022 | 1.65 |
| B3385 Broom Way | 48 | 22,453 | 2.46 | 31,055 | 1.74 | 31,213 | 1.73 |
| Longfield Avenue | 48 | 15,583 | 2.42 | 10,605 | 2.45 | 10,975 | 2.37 |
| Site Access | 20 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 2,643 | 0.00 |

6.2 BACKGROUND CONCENTRATIONS

The use of background concentrations within the modelling process ensures that pollutant sources other than traffic are represented appropriately. Background sources of pollutants include industrial, domestic and rail emissions within the vicinity of the study site. Several sources have been used to obtain representative background levels as discussed below.

The background concentrations used within the assessment have been determined with reference to the IAQM Guidance and Technical Guidance (TG) (16).

The IAQM Guidance states:

“A matter of judgement should take into account the background and future background air quality and whether it is likely to approach or exceed the value of the AQO.”

Additionally, TG (16) states:

“Typically, only the process contributions from local sources are represented within an output by the dispersion model. In these circumstances, it is necessary to add an appropriate background concentration(s) to the modelled source contributions to derive the total pollutant concentrations.”

Defra Published Background Concentrations for 2019

The background concentrations shown in **Table 6-2** were referenced from the UK National Air Quality Information Archive database based on the National Grid Co-ordinates of 1 x 1 km grid squares nearest to the application site. In August 2020, Defra issued revised 2018 based background maps for nitrogen oxide (NO_x), NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}.

Table 6-2. Published Background Air Quality Levels (µg/m³)

| Receptor Location | | 2019 | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | | NO _x | NO ₂ | PM ₁₀ | PM _{2.5} |
| Proposed Site | | | | | |
| 457404 | 103738 | 18.08 | 13.29 | 14.95 | 10.19 |
| Local Authority Monitoring | | | | | |
| FAR1 | | 23.34 | 16.72 | 15.47 | 10.93 |
| G7 | | 23.34 | 16.72 | 15.47 | 10.93 |
| G10 | | 23.34 | 16.72 | 15.47 | 10.93 |
| Existing Sensitive Receptors | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| R1 | 23.22 | 16.52 | 14.33 | 10.03 |
| R2 | 18.08 | 13.29 | 14.95 | 10.19 |
| R3 | 18.08 | 13.29 | 14.95 | 10.19 |
| R4 | 18.94 | 13.85 | 14.12 | 10.00 |
| R5 | 16.53 | 12.26 | 13.20 | 9.34 |
| R6 | 18.94 | 13.85 | 14.12 | 10.00 |
| R7 | 17.78 | 13.10 | 14.57 | 10.33 |
| R8 | 20.40 | 14.80 | 15.15 | 10.80 |
| R9 | 20.40 | 14.80 | 15.15 | 10.80 |
| R10 | 23.34 | 16.72 | 15.47 | 10.93 |
| R11* | 23.34 | 16.72 | 15.47 | 10.93 |
| R12* | 23.34 | 16.72 | 15.47 | 10.93 |
| R13* | 23.34 | 16.72 | 15.47 | 10.93 |
| R14 | 23.34 | 16.72 | 15.47 | 10.93 |
| R15 | 23.34 | 16.72 | 15.47 | 10.93 |
| R16 | 23.34 | 16.72 | 15.47 | 10.93 |
| R17 | 17.19 | 12.70 | 14.53 | 9.71 |
| R18 | 18.68 | 13.70 | 14.95 | 10.53 |
| R19 | 17.17 | 12.68 | 13.55 | 9.46 |
| R20 | 23.22 | 16.52 | 14.33 | 10.03 |
| Proposed Sensitive Receptors | | | | |
| PR1 – PR5 | 18.08 | 13.29 | 14.95 | 10.19 |
| Ecological Sensitive Receptors | | | | |
| E1 | 23.34 | 16.72 | 15.47 | 10.93 |

*Located in the AQMA

All the Defra background concentrations detailed in **Table 6-2** for 2019, show that the background levels are predicted to be below the relevant AQO within the study area.

A breakdown of the background source apportionment of NO_x concentrations at each monitoring location and receptor is shown in **Table 6-3**.

Table 6-3. Pollutant Source Apportionment of NO_x (µg/m³)

| Receptor Location | 2019 | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | Total NO _x | % of NO _x from Road Sources | % of NO _x from Industrial Sources | % of NO _x from Domestic Sources | % of NO _x from Aircraft Sources | % of NO _x from Rail Sources | % of NO _x from Other Sources |
| Local Authority Monitoring | | | | | | | |
| FAR1 | 23.34 | 37.83 | 4.03 | 8.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 49.70 |
| G7 | 23.34 | 37.83 | 4.03 | 8.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 49.70 |
| G10 | 23.34 | 37.83 | 4.03 | 8.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 49.70 |
| Existing Sensitive Receptors | | | | | | | |
| R1 | 23.22 | 25.37 | 5.92 | 7.60 | 0.02 | 0.18 | 60.92 |
| R2 | 18.08 | 22.47 | 5.04 | 8.80 | 0.02 | 0.16 | 63.51 |
| R3 | 18.08 | 22.47 | 5.04 | 8.80 | 0.02 | 0.16 | 63.51 |
| R4 | 18.94 | 22.11 | 5.13 | 8.59 | 0.02 | 0.15 | 64.00 |
| R5 | 16.53 | 19.34 | 4.28 | 7.02 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 69.22 |
| R6 | 18.94 | 22.11 | 5.13 | 8.59 | 0.02 | 0.15 | 64.00 |
| R7 | 17.78 | 22.18 | 4.05 | 9.16 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 64.48 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| R8 | 20.40 | 26.48 | 3.41 | 9.19 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 60.81 |
| R9 | 20.40 | 26.48 | 3.41 | 9.19 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 60.81 |
| R10 | 23.34 | 37.83 | 4.03 | 8.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 49.70 |
| R11* | 23.34 | 37.83 | 4.03 | 8.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 49.70 |
| R12* | 23.34 | 37.83 | 4.03 | 8.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 49.70 |
| R13* | 23.34 | 37.83 | 4.03 | 8.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 49.70 |
| R14 | 23.34 | 37.83 | 4.03 | 8.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 49.70 |
| R15 | 23.34 | 37.83 | 4.03 | 8.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 49.70 |
| R16 | 23.34 | 37.83 | 4.03 | 8.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 49.70 |
| R17 | 17.19 | 20.92 | 5.14 | 8.36 | 0.02 | 0.23 | 65.33 |
| R18 | 18.68 | 25.33 | 4.64 | 9.63 | 0.02 | 0.37 | 59.99 |
| R19 | 17.17 | 17.99 | 4.70 | 7.43 | 0.02 | 0.16 | 69.70 |
| R20 | 23.22 | 25.37 | 5.92 | 7.60 | 0.02 | 0.18 | 60.92 |
| Proposed Sensitive Receptors | | | | | | | |
| PR1 – PR5 | 18.08 | 22.47 | 5.04 | 8.80 | 0.02 | 0.16 | 63.51 |
| Ecological Sensitive Receptors | | | | | | | |
| E1 | 23.34 | 37.83 | 4.03 | 8.03 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 49.70 |

*Located in the AQMA

Table 6-3 shows that the major background source of NO_x at the monitoring, sensitive receptor locations where sources have been identified are mainly comprised of road sources.

A review of the Defra background site has determined that they are in line with the Local Authority monitoring within FBC.

Table 6-4 shows the background concentrations utilised within the assessment.

Table 6-4. Utilised Background Concentrations (µg/m³)

| Receptor Location | 2019 | | Source |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| | NO _x | NO ₂ | |
| Local Authority Monitoring | | | |
| FAR1 | 23.34 | 16.72 | Defra Background Maps |
| G7 | 23.34 | 16.72 | |
| G10 | 23.34 | 16.72 | |
| Existing Sensitive Receptors | | | |
| R1 | 23.22 | 16.52 | Defra Background Maps |
| R2 | 18.08 | 13.29 | |
| R3 | 18.08 | 13.29 | |
| R4 | 18.94 | 13.85 | |
| R5 | 16.53 | 12.26 | |
| R6 | 18.94 | 13.85 | |
| R7 | 17.78 | 13.10 | |
| R8 | 20.40 | 14.80 | |
| R9 | 20.40 | 14.80 | |
| R10 | 23.34 | 16.72 | |
| R11* | 23.34 | 16.72 | |
| R12* | 23.34 | 16.72 | |
| R13* | 23.34 | 16.72 | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------|
| R14 | 23.34 | 16.72 | |
| R15 | 23.34 | 16.72 | |
| R16 | 23.34 | 16.72 | |
| R17 | 17.19 | 12.70 | |
| R18 | 18.68 | 13.70 | |
| R19 | 17.17 | 12.68 | |
| R20 | 23.22 | 16.52 | |
| Proposed Sensitive Receptors | | | |
| PR1 – PR5 | 18.08 | 13.29 | Defra Background Maps |
| Ecological Sensitive Receptors | | | |
| E1 | 25.07 | - | APIS |

*Located in the AQMA

6.3 MODEL VERIFICATION

Model verification involves the comparison of modelled data to monitored data in order to gain the best possible representation of current pollutant concentrations for the assessment years. The verification process is in general accordance with that contained in Section 7 of the TG16 guidance note and uses the most recently available diffusion tube monitoring data to best represent this.

The verification process consists of using the monitoring data and the published background air quality data in the UK National Air Quality Information Archive to calculate the road traffic contribution of NO_x at the monitoring locations. Outputs from the ADMS Roads model are provided as predicted road traffic contribution NO_x emissions. These are converted into predicted roadside contribution NO₂ exposure at the relevant receptor locations based on the updated approach to deriving NO₂ from NO_x for road traffic sources published in Local Air Quality Management TG16. The calculation was derived using the NO_x to NO₂ worksheet in the online LAQM tools website hosted by Defra. **Table 6-5** summarises the final model/monitored data correlation following the application of the model correction factor.

Table 6-5. Comparison of Roadside Modelling & Monitoring Results for NO₂

| Monitoring Site | NO ₂ µg/m ³ | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | Monitored NO ₂ | Modelled NO ₂ | Difference (%) |
| FAR1 | 29.30 | 36.32 | 23.96 |
| G7 | 36.50 | 29.25 | -19.85 |
| G10 | 31.60 | 27.08 | -14.30 |

*Located in the AQMA

The final model produced data at the monitoring locations to within 25% of the monitoring results at all of the verification points, as required by TG16 guidance.

The final verification model correlation coefficient (representing the model uncertainty) is 1.49. This was achieved by applying a model correction factor of 1.00 to roadside predicted NO_x concentrations before converting to NO₂. This figure demonstrates that the model predictions were in line with the road traffic emissions at the monitoring locations.

It should be noted that TG (16) states that in the absence of any Particulate Matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) monitoring data for verification, it may be appropriate to apply the NO_x-NO₂ adjustment factor to the modelled Particulate Matter.

TG(16) also states that care needs to be taken when applying model adjustment based on one monitoring site only as the adjustment may not be representative of other locations.

As there is no suitable PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} monitoring data within the study area, it is not possible to perform a model verification for these pollutants. As such, the NO₂ adjustment factor has also been applied to the PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} modelled results, in accordance with LAQM.TG(16).

6.4 ADMS-ROADS MODEL INPUTS

Table 6-6. Summary of ADMS Roads Model Inputs

| Parameter | Description | Input Value |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| Chemistry | A facility within ADMS-Roads to calculate the chemical reactions in the atmosphere between Nitric Oxide (NO), NO ₂ , Ozone (O ₃) and Volatile organic compounds (VOCs). | No atmospheric chemistry parameters included |
| Meteorology | Representative meteorological data from a local source | Gosport Fleetlands 2019 Meteorological Station , hourly sequential data |
| Surface Roughness | A setting to define the surface roughness of the model area based upon its location. | 0.5m representing a typical surface roughness for Parkland Open Suburbia was used for the Site and for the meteorological measurement site. |
| Latitude | Allows the location of the model area to be set | United Kingdom = 50.8 |
| Monin-Obukhov Length | This allows a measure of the stability of the atmosphere within the model area to be specified depending upon its character. | Cities and Large Towns= 30m was used for the Site Cities and Large Towns = 30m was used for the met. Measurement site. |
| Elevation of Road | Allows the height of the road link above ground level to be specified. | All other road links were set at ground level = 0m . |
| Road Width | Allows the width of the road link to be specified. | Road width used depended on data obtained from OS map data for the specific road link |
| Topography | This enables complex terrain data to be included within the model in order to account for turbulence and plume spread effects of topography | No topographical information used |
| Time Varied Emissions | This enables daily, weekly or monthly variations in emissions to be applied to road sources | No time varied emissions used |
| Road Type | Allows the effect of different types of roads to be assessed. | Urban (Not London) settings were used for the relevant links |
| Road Speeds | Enables individual road speeds to be added for each road link | Based on national speed limits |
| Canyon Height | Allows the model to take account turbulent flow patterns occurring inside a street with relatively tall buildings on both sides, known as a "street canyon". | No canyons used within the model |
| Road Source Emissions | Road source emission rates are calculated from traffic flow data using the in-built EFT database of traffic emission factors. | The EFT Version 11.0 (2021) dataset was used. |
| Year | Predicted EFT emissions rates depend on the year of emission. | 2019 data for verification and baseline Operational Phase Assessment. 2028 data for the Operational Phase Traffic Assessment. |

6.5 ADMS MODELLING RESULTS

6.5.1 Traffic Assessment

The ADMS Model has predicted concentrations of NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} at relevant receptor locations adjacent to roads likely to be affected by the development, as summarised in the following tables. Only receptors close to roads where there is predicted to be a change in emissions have been assessed.

6.5.2 Assessment Scenarios

For the operational year of 2028, assessment of the effects of emissions from the proposed traffic associated with the scheme, has been undertaken using the Emissions Factor Toolkit (EFT) 2028 emissions rates which take into account of the rate of reduction in emission from road vehicles into the future with the following factors:

- 2019 Baseline = Existing Baseline Conditions (2019);
- 2028 “Do Minimum” = Baseline Conditions + Committed Development Flows + Unconsented Development Sensitivity Test (Included within traffic data at request of local authority); and,
- 2028 “Do Something” = Baseline Conditions + Committed Development + Sensitivity Test + Proposed Development.

6.5.3 Operational Traffic Assessment

Nitrogen Dioxide

Table 6-7 presents a summary of the predicted change in NO₂ concentrations at relevant receptor locations, due to changes in traffic flow associated with the proposed development, based on modelled ‘Do Minimum’ and ‘Do Something’ scenarios.

Table 6-7. Predicted Annual Average Concentrations of NO₂ at Receptor Locations

| Receptor | NO ₂ (µg/m ³) | | | | |
|----------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------------|------|
| | 2019 Baseline | 2028 Do Minimum | 2028 Do Something | Development Contribution | |
| R1 | HMS Collingwood | 20.83 | 18.06 | 18.11 | 0.05 |
| R2 | Tudor Lodge Nursing Home | 14.98 | 13.92 | 13.94 | 0.02 |
| R3 | 2 Woodcote Lane | 19.39 | 15.56 | 15.67 | 0.11 |
| R4 | 9 Newgate Lane | 18.96 | 16.17 | 16.25 | 0.08 |
| R5 | 4 Marks Road | 16.14 | 14.28 | 14.30 | 0.02 |
| R6 | CEMAST Engineering School | 21.23 | 16.74 | 16.83 | 0.09 |
| R7 | 1 Staples Reach | 22.61 | 16.75 | 16.85 | 0.10 |
| R8 | Rowner Health Centre | 24.60 | 18.56 | 18.66 | 0.10 |
| R9 | Tichborne Way | 21.13 | 17.24 | 17.31 | 0.07 |
| R10 | Brune Medical Centre | 23.85 | 19.68 | 19.73 | 0.05 |
| R11* | 1 Geoffrey Crescent | 23.73 | 19.49 | 19.51 | 0.02 |
| R12* | Youngbridge Court | 25.96 | 20.41 | 20.44 | 0.03 |
| R13* | Gracewell Care Home | 38.32 | 25.78 | 25.84 | 0.06 |
| R14 | 112 Gosport Road | 43.21 | 27.96 | 28.05 | 0.09 |
| R15 | 30 Gosport Road | 34.44 | 23.85 | 23.92 | 0.07 |
| R16 | 12 Eden Rise | 33.24 | 23.38 | 23.44 | 0.06 |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| R17 | 25 Gosport Road | 16.47 | 13.74 | 13.77 | 0.03 |
| R18 | 3 Longfield Avenue | 19.68 | 15.29 | 15.34 | 0.05 |
| R19 | 132 Longfield Avenue | 16.54 | 15.67 | 15.73 | 0.06 |
| R20 | 2 Davis Way (Non-Residential) | 34.16 | 23.28 | 23.45 | 0.17 |
| PR1 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 14.83 | - |
| PR2 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 13.82 | - |
| PR3 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 13.73 | - |
| PR4 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 13.73 | - |
| PR5 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 13.65 | - |
| Annual Mean AQO | | 40 µg/m³ | | | |
| *Located in the AQMA | | | | | |

All modelled existing receptors are predicted to be below the AQO for NO₂ in both the 'Do Minimum' and 'Do Something' scenarios.

As indicated in **Table 6-7**, the maximum predicted increase in annual average exposure to NO₂ at any existing receptor, due to changes in traffic movements associated with the proposed development is likely to be 0.17 µg/m³ at 2 Davis Way (R20).

The maximum predicted annual average exposure to NO₂ at any proposed receptor at the ground floor is 14.83 µg/m³. All modelled proposed residential receptors are predicted to be below the annual average AQO for NO₂.

The predicted long-term NO₂ concentrations at all proposed and existing receptors are well below 60 µg/m³ in all scenarios. Therefore, it is unlikely there will be any exceedances for the short-term NO₂ AQO at all modelled receptors as outlined in LAQM TG16 technical guidance.

Figure 6-1 and **Figure 6-2** below, illustrate the Total Long Term Annual Average Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) Contribution and Concentration at the Proposed Development (µg/m³).

Figure 6-1. Annual Average Long-Term Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) Contribution from Proposed Development (µg/m³)





Figure 6-2. Total Long Term Annual Average Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) Concentration Across the Study Area (µg/m³)



The impact description of changes in traffic flow associated with the proposed development with respect to annual mean NO₂ exposure has been assessed with reference to the criteria in Section 3. The outcomes of the assessment are summarised in **Table 6-8**.

Table 6-8. Impact Description of Effects at Key Receptors (NO₂)

| Impact Description of NO ₂ Effects at Key Receptors | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| Receptor | Change Due to Development (DS-DM) (µg/m ³) | Change due to Development (% of AQO) | % Change in Concentration Relative to AQO | % Annual Mean Concentration in Assessment Year | Impact Description |
| R1 | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R2 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R3 | 0.11 | 0.28 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R4 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R5 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R6 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R7 | 0.10 | 0.25 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R8 | 0.10 | 0.25 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R9 | 0.07 | 0.18 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R10 | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R11* | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R12* | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R13* | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R14 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R15 | 0.07 | 0.18 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R16 | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R17 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R18 | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R19 | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R20 | 0.17 | 0.43 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |

+0% means a change of <0.5% as per explanatory note 2 of table 6.3 of the EPUK IAQM Guidance.

*Located in the AQMA

The impact description of the effects of changes in traffic flow as a result of the proposed development, with respect to NO₂ exposure for existing receptors, is determined to be 'negligible' at all modelled receptors. This is based on the methodology outlined in section 3. Given the quantitative nature of the assessment and the verification of the air quality dispersion model, the level of accuracy of the assessment results is considered to be 'high'.

Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)

Table 6-9 presents a summary of the predicted change in annual mean PM₁₀ concentrations at relevant receptor locations, due to changes in traffic flow associated with the proposed development, based on modelled 'Do Minimum' and 'Do Something' scenarios.

Table 6-9. Predicted Annual Average Concentrations of PM₁₀ at Receptor Locations

| Receptor | | PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| | | 2019 Baseline | 2028 Do Minimum | 2028 Do Something | Development Contribution |
| R1 | HMS Collingwood | 15.07 | 14.98 | 15.00 | 0.02 |
| R2 | Tudor Lodge Nursing Home | 15.30 | 15.27 | 15.28 | 0.01 |
| R3 | 2 Woodcote Lane | 16.25 | 16.14 | 16.18 | 0.05 |
| R4 | 9 Newgate Lane | 15.03 | 15.13 | 15.17 | 0.04 |
| R5 | 4 Marks Road | 14.01 | 14.22 | 14.23 | 0.01 |
| R6 | CEMAST Engineering School | 15.72 | 15.63 | 15.68 | 0.05 |
| R7 | 1 Staples Reach | 16.19 | 16.06 | 16.10 | 0.04 |
| R8 | Rowner Health Centre | 16.80 | 16.67 | 16.71 | 0.04 |
| R9 | Tichborne Way | 16.40 | 16.32 | 16.35 | 0.03 |
| R10 | Brune Medical Centre | 16.88 | 16.92 | 16.94 | 0.02 |
| R11* | 1 Geoffrey Crescent | 16.76 | 16.73 | 16.74 | 0.01 |
| R12* | Youngbridge Court | 17.26 | 17.22 | 17.24 | 0.01 |
| R13* | Gracewell Care Home | 19.74 | 19.76 | 19.79 | 0.03 |
| R14 | 112 Gosport Road | 20.40 | 20.37 | 20.43 | 0.05 |
| R15 | 30 Gosport Road | 18.48 | 18.37 | 18.41 | 0.04 |
| R16 | 12 Eden Rise | 18.54 | 18.46 | 18.51 | 0.05 |
| R17 | 25 Gosport Road | 15.28 | 15.04 | 15.05 | 0.02 |
| R18 | 3 Longfield Avenue | 16.15 | 15.73 | 15.75 | 0.02 |
| R19 | 132 Longfield Avenue | 14.31 | 14.98 | 15.02 | 0.04 |
| R20 | 2 Davis Way (Non-Residential) | 17.52 | 17.21 | 17.28 | 0.08 |
| PR1 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 15.74 | - |
| PR2 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 15.21 | - |
| PR3 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 15.15 | - |
| PR4 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 15.17 | - |
| PR5 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 15.12 | - |
| Annual Mean AQO | | 40 µg/m³ | | | |
| *Located in the AQMA | | | | | |

All modelled existing receptors are predicted to be below the AQO for PM₁₀ in both the 'Do Minimum' and 'Do Something' scenarios.

As indicated in **Table 6-9**, the maximum predicted increase in annual average exposure to PM₁₀ at any existing receptor, due to changes in traffic movements associated with the proposed development is 0.08 µg/m³ at 2 Davis Way (R20).

The maximum predicted annual average exposure to PM₁₀ at any proposed receptor at the ground floor is 15.74 µg/m³. All modelled proposed residential receptors are predicted to be below the annual average AQO for PM₁₀.

The impact description of changes in traffic flow associated with the proposed development with respect to annual mean PM₁₀ exposure has been assessed with reference to the criteria in Section 3. The outcomes of the assessment are summarised in **Table 6-10**.

Table 6-10. Impact Description of Effects at Key Receptors (PM₁₀)

| Impact Description of PM ₁₀ Effects at Key Receptors | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| Receptor | Change Due to Development (DS-DM) (µg/m ³) | Change due to Development (% of AQO) | % Change in Concentration Relative to AQO | % Annual Mean Concentration in Assessment Year | Impact Description |
| R1 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R2 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R3 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R4 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R5 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R6 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R7 | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R8 | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R9 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R10 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R11* | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R12* | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R13* | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R14 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R15 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R16 | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R17 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R18 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R19 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R20 | 0.08 | 0.19 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |

+0% means a change of <0.5% as per explanatory note 2 of table 6.3 of the EPUK IAQM Guidance.

*Located in the AQMA

The impact description of the effects of changes in traffic as a result of the proposed development, with respect to annual mean PM₁₀ exposure for existing receptors is determined to be 'negligible' based on the methodology outlined in section 3. Given the quantitative nature of the assessment and the verification of the air quality dispersion model, the level of accuracy of the assessment results is considered to be 'high'.

Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5})

Table 6-11 presents a summary of the predicted change in annual mean PM_{2.5} concentrations at relevant receptor locations, due to changes in traffic flow associated with the proposed development, based on modelled 'Do Minimum' and 'Do Something' scenarios.

Table 6-11. Predicted Annual Average Concentrations of PM_{2.5} at Receptor Locations

| Receptor | | PM _{2.5} (µg/m ³) | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| | | 2019 Baseline | 2028 Do Minimum | 2028 Do Something | Development Contribution |
| R1 | HMS Collingwood | 10.47 | 10.39 | 10.40 | 0.01 |
| R2 | Tudor Lodge Nursing Home | 10.39 | 10.37 | 10.37 | 0.01 |
| R3 | 2 Woodcote Lane | 10.94 | 10.84 | 10.87 | 0.03 |
| R4 | 9 Newgate Lane | 10.53 | 10.56 | 10.58 | 0.02 |
| R5 | 4 Marks Road | 9.80 | 9.90 | 9.90 | 0.00 |
| R6 | CEMAST Engineering School | 10.92 | 10.83 | 10.85 | 0.02 |
| R7 | 1 Staples Reach | 11.27 | 11.15 | 11.18 | 0.02 |
| R8 | Rowner Health Centre | 11.77 | 11.65 | 11.67 | 0.03 |
| R9 | Tichborne Way | 11.53 | 11.45 | 11.47 | 0.02 |
| R10 | Brune Medical Centre | 11.75 | 11.73 | 11.75 | 0.01 |
| R11* | 1 Geoffrey Crescent | 11.68 | 11.63 | 11.63 | 0.01 |
| R12* | Youngbridge Court | 11.97 | 11.90 | 11.91 | 0.01 |
| R13* | Gracewell Care Home | 13.43 | 13.30 | 13.32 | 0.02 |
| R14 | 112 Gosport Road | 13.83 | 13.66 | 13.69 | 0.03 |
| R15 | 30 Gosport Road | 12.71 | 12.55 | 12.57 | 0.02 |
| R16 | 12 Eden Rise | 12.73 | 12.59 | 12.61 | 0.02 |
| R17 | 25 Gosport Road | 10.14 | 9.99 | 10.00 | 0.01 |
| R18 | 3 Longfield Avenue | 11.22 | 10.96 | 10.97 | 0.01 |
| R19 | 132 Longfield Avenue | 9.91 | 10.26 | 10.28 | 0.02 |
| R20 | 2 Davis Way (Non-Residential) | 11.90 | 11.63 | 11.68 | 0.04 |
| PR1 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 10.63 | - |
| PR2 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 10.34 | - |
| PR3 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 10.30 | - |
| PR4 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 10.31 | - |
| PR5 | Proposed Receptor | - | - | 10.28 | - |
| Annual Mean AQO | | 20 µg/m³ | | | |
| *Located in the AQMA | | | | | |

All modelled existing receptors are predicted to be below the AQO for PM_{2.5} in both the 'Do Minimum' and 'Do Something' scenarios.

As indicated in **Table 6-11**, the maximum predicted increase in annual average exposure to PM_{2.5} at any existing receptor, due to changes in traffic movements associated with the proposed development is 0.04 µg/m³ at 2 Davis Way (R20).

The maximum predicted annual average exposure to NO₂ at any proposed receptor at the ground floor is 10.63 µg/m³. All modelled proposed residential receptors are predicted to be below the annual average AQO for PM_{2.5}.

The impact description of changes in traffic flow associated with the proposed development with respect to annual mean PM_{2.5} exposure has been assessed with reference to the criteria in Section 3. The outcomes of the assessment are summarised in **Table 6-12**.

Table 6-12. Impact Description of Effects at Key Receptors (PM_{2.5})

| Impact Description of PM _{2.5} Effects at Key Receptors | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| Receptor | Change Due to Development (DS-DM) (µg/m ³) | Change due to Development (% of AQO) | % Change in Concentration Relative to AQO | % Annual Mean Concentration in Assessment Year | Impact Description |
| R1 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R2 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R3 | 0.03 | 0.15 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R4 | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R5 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R6 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R7 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R8 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R9 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R10 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R11* | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R12* | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R13* | 0.02 | 0.10 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R14 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R15 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R16 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R17 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R18 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R19 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |
| R20 | 0.04 | 0.21 | 0% | ≤75% of AQO | Negligible |

+0% means a change of <0.5% as per explanatory note 2 of table 6.3 of the EPUK IAQM Guidance.

*Located in the AQMA

The impact description of the effects of changes in traffic as a result of the proposed development, with respect to annual mean PM₁₀ exposure for existing receptors is determined to be ‘negligible’ based on the methodology outlined in section 3. Given the quantitative nature of the assessment and the verification of the air quality dispersion model, the level of accuracy of the assessment results is considered to be ‘high’.

6.5.4 Ecological Sensitive Receptor Locations

Background concentrations at each of the ecologically sensitive sites were determined through a review of the NO_x pollutants published on the APIS website.

The below assessment has been undertaken in accordance with A Guide to the Assessment of Air Quality Impacts in Designated Nature Conservation Sites (IAQM, 2020).

Nitrogen Oxide

Table 6-13 presents a summary of the predicted change in NO_x concentrations at relevant receptor locations, due to changes in traffic flow associated with the development, based on modelled ‘Do Minimum’ and ‘Do Something’ scenarios.

Table 6-13. Predicted Annual Average Concentrations of NO_x at Ecological Receptor Locations

| Ecological Receptor | | Predicted Maximum Annual Mean Concentration (µg/m ³) | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|------------|
| | | Do Minimum 2028 NO _x | Do Something 2028 NO _x | Process Contribution (PC) | PC as %age of AQO | Background |
| E1 | Portsmouth Harbour | 33.67 | 33.75 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 25.07 |
| Annual Mean AQO/Critical Level (CL) | | 30 µg/m³ | | | | |

As indicated in **Table 6-13**, the maximum predicted increase in the annual average exposure to NO_x at any ecological receptor, due to changes in traffic movements associated with the development, is 0.09 µg/m³ at Portsmouth Harbour (SSSI / SAC / SPA) (E1).

Section 5.5.4.1 of *A Guide to the Assessment of Air Quality Impacts in Designated Nature Conservation Sites*, IAQM 2020 states:

Where the assessment indicates that changes in annual mean NO_x concentrations within a designated site cannot be dismissed as imperceptible (i.e. an increase of over 0.4 µg/m³) and the NO_x critical level is exceeded, then changes in nutrient nitrogen deposition should be calculated as supporting information to further assist in the evaluation of significance.

The maximum predicted increase in the annual average exposure to NO_x at the identified ecological receptor, due to changes in traffic movements associated with the development, is 0.09 µg/m³ at Portsmouth Harbour (SSSI / SAC / SPA) (E1) which is below the 0.40 µg/m³ development contribution stated within the guidance of *'A Guide to the Assessment of Air Quality Impacts in Designated Nature Conservation Sites'*, IAQM 2020.

As a result, no further assessment is required and the impact at Portsmouth Harbour (SSSI / SAC / SPA) (E1) as this is considered to be negligible.

7.0 MITIGATION

7.1 CONSTRUCTION PHASE

The dust risk categories have been determined in Section 5 for each of the construction activities. The assessment has determined that the potential impact description of dust emissions associated with the construction phase of the proposed development is 'medium risk' at the worst affected receptors.

Using the methodology described in Appendix A, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures associated with the determined level of risk can be found in Section 8.2 of the 'IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction'.

The mitigation measures have been divided into general measures applicable to all sites and measures applicable specifically to earthworks, construction and trackout. They are categorised into 'highly recommended' and 'desirable' measures.

The mitigation measures for the proposed development are detailed in **Table 7-1** and **Table 7-2**.

Table 7-1. IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction 'Highly Recommended' Mitigation Measures

| Communications |
|---|
| Develop and implement a stakeholder communications plan that includes community engagement before work commences on site. |
| Display the name and contact details of person(s) accountable for air quality and dust issues on the site boundary. This may be the environment manager/engineer or the site manager. |
| Display the head or regional office contact information. |
| Dust Management |
| Develop and implement a Dust Management Plan (DMP), which may include measures to control other emissions, approved by the Local Authority. The level of detail will depend on the risk, and should include as a minimum the highly recommended measures in this document. The desirable measures should be included as appropriate for the site. The DMP may include monitoring of dust deposition, dust flux, real time PM ₁₀ continuous monitoring and/or visual inspections. |
| Record all dust and air quality complaints, identify cause(s), take appropriate measures to reduce emissions in a timely manner, and record the measures taken. |
| Make the complaints log available to the local authority when asked. |
| Record any exceptional incidents that cause dust and/or air emissions, either on- or offsite, and the action taken to resolve the situation in the log book. |
| Carry out regular site inspections to monitor compliance with the DMP, record inspection results, and make an inspection log available to the local authority when asked. |
| Increase the frequency of site inspections by the person accountable for air quality and dust issues on site when activities with a high potential to produce dust are being carried out and during prolonged dry or windy conditions. |
| Plan site layout so that machinery and dust causing activities are located away from receptors, as far as is possible. |
| Erect solid screens or barriers around dusty activities or the site boundary that are at least as high as any stockpiles on site. |
| Fully enclose site or specific operations where there is a high potential for dust production and the site is active for an extensive period. |
| Avoid site runoff of water or mud. |
| Keep site fencing, barriers and scaffolding clean using wet methods. |
| Remove materials that have a potential to produce dust from site as soon as possible, unless being re-used on site. If they are being re-used on-site cover as described below. |

Cover, seed or fence stockpiles to prevent wind whipping.

Ensure all vehicles switch off engines when stationary - no idling vehicles.

Avoid the use of diesel- or petrol-powered generators and use mains electricity or battery powered equipment where practicable.

Produce a Construction Logistics Plan to manage the sustainable delivery of goods and materials.

Only use cutting, grinding or sawing equipment fitted or in conjunction with suitable dust suppression techniques such as water sprays or local extraction, e.g. suitable local exhaust ventilation systems.

Ensure an adequate water supply on the site for effective dust/particulate matter suppression/mitigation, using non-potable water where possible and appropriate.

Use enclosed chutes and conveyors and covered skips.

Minimise drop heights from conveyors, loading shovels, hoppers and other loading or handling equipment and use fine water sprays on such equipment wherever appropriate.

Ensure equipment is readily available on site to clean any dry spillages, and clean up spillages as soon as reasonably practicable after the event using wet cleaning methods.

Avoid bonfires and burning of waste materials.

Earthworks

No Action Required.

Construction

Ensure sand and other aggregates are stored in bunded areas and are not allowed to dry out, unless this is required for a particular process, in which case ensure that appropriate additional control measures are in place.

Trackout

Use water-assisted dust sweeper(s) on the access and local roads, to remove, as necessary, any material tracked out of the site. This may require the sweeper being continuously in use.

Avoid dry sweeping of large areas.

Ensure vehicles entering and leaving sites are covered to prevent escape of materials during transport.

Inspect on-site haul routes for integrity and instigate necessary repairs to the surface as soon as reasonably practicable.

Record all inspections of haul routes and any subsequent action in a site log book.

Install hard surfaced haul routes, which are regularly damped down with fixed or mobile sprinkler systems, or mobile water bowsers and regularly cleaned.

Implement a wheel washing system (with rumble grids to dislodge accumulated dust and mud prior to leaving the site where reasonably practicable).

Ensure there is an adequate area of hard surfaced road between the wheel wash facility and the site exit, wherever site size and layout permits.

Access gates to be located at least 10m from receptors where possible.

Table 7-2. IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction ‘Desirable’ Mitigation Measures

Communications

No Action Required.

Dust Management

Undertake daily on-site and off-site inspection, where receptors (including roads) are nearby, to monitor dust, record inspection results, and make the log available to the local authority when asked. This should include regular dust soiling checks of surfaces such as street furniture, cars and window sills within 100m of site boundary, with cleaning to be provided if necessary.

Impose and signpost a maximum-speed-limit of 15 mph on surfaced and 10 mph on un-surfaced haul roads and work areas (if long haul routes are required these speeds may be increased with suitable additional control measures provided, subject to the approval of the nominated undertaker and with the agreement of the local authority, where appropriate).

Implement a Travel Plan that supports and encourages sustainable travel (public transport, cycling, walking, and car-sharing).

Earthworks

Re-vegetate earthworks and exposed areas/soil stockpiles to stabilise surfaces as soon as practicable.

Use Hessian, mulches or trackifiers where it is not possible to re-vegetate or cover with topsoil, as soon as practicable.

Only remove the cover in small areas during work and not all at once.

Construction

Avoid scabbling (roughening of concrete surfaces) if possible.

Ensure bulk cement and other fine powder materials are delivered in enclosed tankers and stored in silos with suitable emission control systems to prevent escape of material and overfilling during delivery.

For smaller supplies of fine power materials ensure bags are sealed after use and stored appropriately to prevent dust.

Trackout

No Action Required.

Following the implementation of the mitigation measures detailed in the tables above, the impact description of the construction phase is not considered to be significant

8.0 ODOUR IMPACT BRIEFING

8.1 PREVIOUS ODOUR ASSESSMENT

The proposed development is located approximately 500m east of the closest point of a Southern Water's waste water treatment works (WwTW).

Tetra Tech have undertaken an odour assessment in support of the planning application for a proposed residential development at land at Newgate Lane, Fareham, PO14 1TR in 2018. An odour assessment report was titled as "Miller Homes and Bargate Homes, Land at Newgate Lane, Fareham, PO14 1TR, Odour Survey and Odour Assessment", Report Reference: A097690, dated 9th July 2018.

2018 odour assessment studied the potential magnitude and significance of potential odour impact from the waste water treatment works on sensitive receptor locations at the proposed development site.

The major scopes of the 2018 odour assessment included:

- Completed 4 field odour sniffing surveys between 14th June 2018 and 2nd July 2018;
- Analysed the odour sniffing results in the identification of any significant odour impact from the waste water treatment works on the proposed residential development; and
- Identified odour effect zones.

8.2 IDENTIFIED ODOUR EFFECT ZONES

2018 odour assessment has identified following odour effect zones and presented in **Figure 8-1**.

Odour Effect Zone A (Salmon)

Given the results of the survey, it is considered that odour nuisance is likely to occur over a limited area surrounding the sewage works. In Zone A the odour nuisance impacts may occur 1 – 4 times per week by odour from sewage works operations.


Odour Effect Zone B (Yellow)

Zone B is only likely to experience odour from time to time, depending on weather conditions and operations at the sewage work. In Zone B, there remains a risk of odour being detected but the risk is minimal.

Odour Effect Zone C (Green)

The assessment concluded that the proposed residential development site will be mostly located within Zone C, the majority of which is unlikely to experience odour from the waste water treatment works. Whilst it is considered that the odour may be potentially detectable at the south corner of the development site on occasions, the odour impacts on the entire proposed residential development from the waste water treatment works are not significant, as such no mitigation will be required in this area.

Figure 8-1 Odour Effect Zones



8.3 ODOUR IMPACT BRIEFING SUMMARY

Tetra Tech has reviewed 2018 odour assessment and it is confirmed that the odour zone remains the same, assuming that there are no major operation changes on the waste water treatment works since.

Therefore, the proposed residential development site will mostly be located within an identified odour effect of Zone C and the majority area is unlikely to experience odour from the waste water treatment works. It is considered that the odour may be potentially detectable at the western corner of the development site (Zone B) on occasions and as such, no built development is proposed in Odour Zone B.

9.0 CONCLUSIONS

This report presents the findings of an air quality assessment undertaken to assess road traffic emission and construction dust impacts in support of a planning application for the construction of a new residential development, on the site of Land East of Newgate Lane East, Fareham.

Construction Phase

Prior to the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, the potential impact description of dust emissions associated with the construction phase of the proposed development is 'medium risk' at the worst affected receptors without mitigation. However, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures have been proposed based on Section 8.2 of the IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition, Earthworks, Construction and Trackout. It is anticipated that with these appropriate mitigation measures in place, the risk of adverse effects due to dust emissions from the construction phase will not be significant.

Operational Assessment

The 2028 assessment of the effect of emissions from traffic associated with the scheme, has determined that the maximum predicted increase in the annual average exposure to NO₂ at any existing receptor is likely to be 0.17 µg/m³ 2 Davis Way (R20).

The maximum predicted annual average exposure to NO₂ at any proposed receptor at the ground floor is 14.83 µg/m³. All modelled proposed residential receptors are predicted to be below the annual average AQO for NO₂.

For PM₁₀, the maximum predicted increase in the annual average exposure is likely to be 0.08 µg/m³ at 2 Davis Way (R20). For PM_{2.5}, the maximum predicted increase in the annual average exposure is likely to be 0.04 µg/m³ at 2 Davis Way (R20).

The impact description of the effects of changes in traffic flow as a result of the proposed development, with respect to NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} exposure, is determined to be 'negligible' at all existing receptors.

At any proposed sensitive receptors, there is not predicted to be any exceedances of the NO₂, PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} pollutant concentrations and therefore, mitigation is not required at the proposed development.

Operational Assessment – Ecology

The maximum predicted increase in the annual average exposure to NO_x at the identified ecological receptor, due to changes in traffic movements associated with the development, is 0.09 µg/m³ at Portsmouth Harbour (SSSI / SAC / SPA) (E1) which is below the 0.40 µg/m³ development contribution stated within the guidance of 'A Guide to the Assessment of Air Quality Impacts in Designated Nature Conservation Sites', IAQM 2020. As a result, no further assessment is required and the impact at Portsmouth Harbour (SSSI / SAC / SPA) (E1) as this is considered to be negligible.

Given the quantitative nature of the assessment and the verification of the air quality dispersion model, the level of accuracy of the assessment results is considered to be 'high'.

Odour Impact Briefing

It is concluded that the proposed residential development site will mostly be located within an area (Zone C)

where the odour impacts on the entire proposed residential development from the waste water treatment works are not significant, as such no mitigation will be required in this area. It is considered that the odour may be potentially detectable at the western corner of the development site (Zone B) on occasions and as such, no built development is proposed in Odour Zone B.

In conclusion, the development is not considered to be contrary to any of the national and local planning policies regarding air quality.

APPENDIX A - FIGURES

Figure A-1 Air Quality Assessment Area



APPENDIX B - CONSTRUCTION PHASE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The following information sets out the adopted approach to the construction phase impact assessment in accordance with the aforementioned IAQM guidance¹.

Step 1 – Screen the Requirement for a more Detailed Assessment

An assessment is required if there are sensitive receptors within 350m of the site boundary, within 50m of the route(s) used by construction vehicles on the surrounding road network, or within 500m from the site entrance. A detailed assessment is also required if there is an ecological receptor within 50m of the site boundary.

Step 2A – Define the Potential Dust Emission Magnitude

Demolition

The dust emission magnitude for the demolition phase has been determined based on the below criteria:

- *Large:* Total building volume >50 000m³, potentially dusty construction (e.g. concrete), on-site crushing and screening, demolition activities >20m above ground level;
- *Medium:* Total building volume 20 000m³ – 50 000m³, potentially dusty construction material, demolition activities 10-20m above ground level; and,
- *Small:* Total building volume <20 000m³, construction material with low potential for dust release (e.g. metal cladding or timber), demolition activities <10m above ground, demolition during wetter months.

Earthworks

The dust emission magnitude for the planned earthworks has been determined based on the below criteria:

- *Large:* Total site area >10 000m², potentially dusty soil type (e.g. clay, which will be prone to suspension when dry due to small particle size), > 10 heavy earth moving vehicles active at any one time, formation of bunds >8m in height, total material moved >100 000 tonnes;
- *Medium:* Total site area 2 500m² – 10 000m², moderately dusty soil type (e.g. silt), 5-10 heavy earth moving vehicles active at any one time, formation of bunds 4m-8m in height, total material moved 20 000 tonnes – 100 000 tonnes; and
- *Small:* Total site area <2 500 m², soil type with large grain size (e.g. sand), <5 heavy earth moving vehicles active at any one time, formation of bunds <4 m in height, total material moved <10 000 tonnes, earthworks during wetter months.

Construction

The dust emission magnitude for the construction phase has been determined based on the below criteria:

- *Large:* Total building volume >100 000m³, on site concrete batching; sandblasting
- *Medium:* Total building volume 25 000m³ – 100 000m³, potentially dusty construction material (e.g. concrete), on site concrete batching; and,
- *Small:* Total building volume <25 000m³, construction material with low potential for dust release (e.g. metal cladding or timber).

Trackout

The dust emission magnitude for trackout has been determined based on the below criteria:

- *Large:* >50 HGV (>3.5t) outward movements in any one day, potentially dusty surface material (e.g. high clay content), unpaved road length >100m;
- *Medium:* 10-50 HGV (>3.5t) outward movements in any one day, moderately dusty surface material (e.g. high clay content), unpaved road length 50m – 100m; and,
- *Small:* <10 HGV (>3.5t) outward movements in any one day, surface material with low potential for dust release, unpaved road length <50m.

Step 2B - Defining the Sensitivity of the Area

Sensitivities of People to Dust Soiling Effects

- *High:*
 - * Users can reasonably expect an enjoyment of a high level of amenity;
 - * The appearance, aesthetics or value of their property would be diminished by soiling; and the people or property would reasonably expect to be present continuously, or at least regularly for extended periods, as part of the normal pattern of use of the land; and,
 - * Indicative examples include dwellings, museums and other culturally important collections, medium- and long-term car parks

¹ Institute of Air Quality Management 2014. *Guidance on the Assessment of dust from demolition and construction.*

and car showrooms.

- **Medium:**
 - * Users can reasonably expect to enjoy a reasonable level of amenity, but would not reasonably expect to enjoy the same level of amenity as in their home;
 - * The appearance, aesthetics or value of their property could be diminished by soiling;
 - * The people or property wouldn't reasonably be expected to be present here continuously or regularly for extended periods as part of the normal pattern of use of the land; and,
 - * Indicative examples include parks and places of work.
- **Low:**
 - * The enjoyment of amenity would not reasonably be expected;
 - * Property would not reasonably be expected to be diminished in appearance, aesthetics or value by soiling;
 - * There is transient exposure, where the people or property would reasonably be expected to be present only for limited periods of time as part of the normal pattern of use of the land; and,
 - * Indicative examples include playing fields, farmland (unless commercially sensitive horticultural), footpaths, short term car parks and roads.

The sensitivity of the area should be derived for each of the four activities: demolition, construction, earthworks and trackout, using the following table:

Table B-1. Sensitivity of the Area to Dust Soiling Effects on People and Property

| Receptor Sensitivity | Number of Receptors | Distance from the Source (m) | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------|--------|------|
| | | <20 | <50 | <100 | <350 |
| High | >100 | High | High | Medium | Low |
| | 10-100 | High | Medium | Low | Low |
| | 1-10 | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| Medium | >1 | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| Low | >1 | Low | Low | Low | Low |

Note - The likely routes the construction traffic will use should also be included to enable the presence of trackout receptors to be included in the assessment. As a general guidance, without site-specific mitigation, trackout may occur along the public highway up to 500 m from large sites (as defined in step 2A), 200 m from medium sites and 50 m from small sites, as measured from the site exit.

Sensitivities of People to the Health Effects of PM₁₀

- **High:**
 - * Locations where members of the public are exposed over a time period relevant to the air quality objective for PM₁₀ (in the case of the 24-hour objectives, a relevant location would be one where individuals may be exposed for eight hours or more in a day);
 - * Indicative examples include residential properties. Hospitals, schools and residential care homes should also be considered as having equal sensitivity to residential areas for the purposes of this assessment.
- **Medium:**
 - * Locations where the people exposed are workers, and exposure is over a time period relevant to the air quality objective for PM₁₀ (in the case of the 24-hour objectives, a relevant location would be one where individuals may be exposed for eight hours or more in a day); and,
 - * Indicative examples include office and shop workers, but will generally not include workers occupationally exposed to PM₁₀, as protection is covered by Health and Safety at Work legislation.
- **Low:**
 - * Locations where human exposure is transient; and,
 - * Indicative examples include public footpaths, playing fields, parks and shopping streets.

The sensitivity of the area should be derived for each of the four activities: demolition, construction, earthworks and trackout, using the following table:

Table B-2. Sensitivity of the Area to Human Health Impacts

| Receptor Sensitivity | Annual Mean PM ₁₀ Concentration | Number of Receptors | Distance from the Source (m) | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------------|------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| | | | <20 | <50 | <100 | <200 | <350 |
| High | >32 µg/m ³ | >100 | High | High | High | Medium | Low |
| | | 10-100 | High | High | Medium | Low | Low |
| | | 1-10 | High | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| | 28 - 32 µg/m ³ | >100 | High | High | Medium | Low | Low |
| | | 10-100 | High | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| | | 1-10 | High | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| | 24 – 28 µg/m ³ | >100 | High | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| | | 10-100 | High | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| | | 1-10 | Medium | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| | <24 µg/m ³ | >100 | Medium | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| | | 10-100 | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| | | 1-10 | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Medium | - | >10 | High | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| | - | 1-10 | Medium | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Low | - | >1 | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low |

Note - The likely routes the construction traffic will use should also be included to enable the presence of trackout receptors to be included in the assessment. As a general guidance, without site-specific mitigation, trackout may occur along the public highway up to 500 m from large sites (as defined in step 2A), 200 m from medium sites and 50 m from small sites, as measured from the site exit.

Sensitivities of Receptors to Ecological Effects

- *High:*
 - * Locations with an international or national designation and the designated features may be affected by dust soiling;
 - * Locations where there is a community of a particularly dust sensitive species such as vascular species included in the Red Data List for Great Britain; and,
 - * Indicative examples include a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) designated for acid heathlands or a local site designated for lichens adjacent to the demolition of a large site containing concrete (alkali) buildings.
- *Medium:*
 - * Locations where there is a particularly important plant species, where its dust sensitivity is uncertain or unknown;
 - * Locations with a national designation where the features may be affected by dust deposition; and,
 - * Indicative example is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) with dust sensitive features.
- *Low:*
 - * Locations with a local designation where the features may be affected by dust deposition; and,
 - * Indicative example is a local Nature Reserve with dust sensitive features.

The sensitivity of the area should be derived for each of the four activities: demolition, construction, earthworks and trackout, using the following table:

Table B-3. Sensitivity of the Area to Ecological Impacts

| Receptor Sensitivity | Distance from Source (m) | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------|
| | <20 | <50 |
| High | High | Medium |
| Medium | Medium | Low |
| Low | Low | Low |

Note - The likely routes the construction traffic will use should also be included to enable the presence of trackout receptors to be included in the assessment. As a general guidance, without site-specific mitigation, trackout may occur along the public highway up to 500 m from large sites (as defined in step 2A), 200 m from medium sites and 50 m from small sites, as measured from the site exit.

Step 2C - Defining the Risk of Impacts

The risk of impacts with no mitigation is determined by combining the dust emission magnitude determined in Step 2A and the sensitivity of the area determined in Step 2B.

The following tables provide a method of assigning the level of risk for each activity.

Demolition

Table B-4. Risk of Dust Impacts, Demolition

| Sensitivity of Area | Dust Emission Magnitude | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Large | Medium | Small |
| High | High Risk | Medium Risk | Medium Risk |
| Medium | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low Risk |
| Low | Medium Risk | Low Risk | Negligible |

Earthworks

Table B-5. Risk of Dust Impacts, Earthworks

| Sensitivity of Area | Dust Emission Magnitude | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|
| | Large | Medium | Small |
| High | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low Risk |
| Medium | Medium Risk | Medium Risk | Low Risk |
| Low | Low Risk | Low Risk | Negligible |

Construction

Table B-6. Risk of Dust Impacts, Construction

| Sensitivity of Area | Dust Emission Magnitude | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|
| | Large | Medium | Small |
| High | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low Risk |
| Medium | Medium Risk | Medium Risk | Low Risk |
| Low | Low Risk | Low Risk | Negligible |

Trackout

Table B-7. Risk of Dust Impacts, Trackout

| Sensitivity of Area | Dust Emission Magnitude | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|
| | Large | Medium | Small |
| High | High Risk | Medium Risk | Low Risk |
| Medium | Medium Risk | Low Risk | Negligible |
| Low | Low Risk | Low Risk | Negligible |

Step 3 – Site Specific Mitigation

The dust risk categories for each of the four activities determined in Step 2C should be used to define the appropriate, site-specific mitigation measures to be adopted.

These mitigation measures are contained within section 8.2 of the IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction.

APPENDIX C - REPORT TERMS & CONDITIONS

This Report has been prepared using reasonable skill and care for the sole benefit of Miller Homes and Bargate Homes (“the Client”) for the proposed uses stated in the report by [Tetra Tech Limited] (“Tetra Tech”). Tetra Tech exclude all liability for any other uses and to any other party. The report must not be relied on or reproduced in whole or in part by any other party without the copyright holder’s permission.

No liability is accepted, or warranty given for; unconfirmed data, third party documents and information supplied to Tetra Tech or for the performance, reliability, standing etc. of any products, services, organisations or companies referred to in this report. Tetra Tech does not purport to provide specialist legal, tax or accounting advice.

The report refers, within the limitations stated, to the environment of the site in the context of the surrounding area at the time of the inspections. Environmental conditions can vary, and no warranty is given as to the possibility of changes in the environment of the site and surrounding area at differing times. No investigative method can eliminate the possibility of obtaining partially imprecise, incomplete or not fully representative information. Any monitoring or survey work undertaken as part of the commission will have been subject to limitations, including for example timescale, seasonal and weather-related conditions. Actual environmental conditions are typically more complex and variable than the investigative, predictive and modelling approaches indicate in practice, and the output of such approaches cannot be relied upon as a comprehensive or accurate indicator of future conditions. The “shelf life” of the Report will be determined by a number of factors including; its original purpose, the Client’s instructions, passage of time, advances in technology and techniques, changes in legislation etc. and therefore may require future re-assessment.

The whole of the report must be read as other sections of the report may contain information which puts into context the findings in any executive summary.

The performance of environmental protection measures and of buildings and other structures in relation to acoustics, vibration, noise mitigation and other environmental issues is influenced to a large extent by the degree to which the relevant environmental considerations are incorporated into the final design and specifications and the quality of workmanship and compliance with the specifications on site during construction. Tetra Tech accept no liability for issues with performance arising from such factors.