

Air Quality Assessment
Redby Street, Manchester

Client: Create It Studio Architects

Reference: 5606r1

Date: 15th August 2022



Report Issue

Report Title: Air Quality Assessment - Redby Street, Manchester

Report Reference: 5606

Field	Report Version			
	1	2	3	4
Authored by	Amelia Leatherbarrow- Hurst			
Position	Senior Air Quality Consultant			
Reviewed by	Ceri Haines			
Position	Air Quality Consultant			
Authorised by	Jethro Redmore			
Position	Director			
Date of Issue	12 th August 2022			
Comment	-			

Taylor Road, Urmston, Manchester, M41 7JQ

info@red-env.co.uk | 0161 706 0075 | www.red-env.co.uk

This report has been prepared by Redmore Environmental Ltd in accordance with the agreed terms and conditions of appointment. Redmore Environmental Ltd cannot accept any responsibility for any use of or reliance on the contents of this report by any third party.

Executive Summary

Redmore Environmental Ltd was commissioned by Create It Studio Architects to undertake an Air Quality Assessment in support of an educational facility on land off Redby Street, Manchester.

The proposals have the potential to cause air quality impacts as a result of fugitive dust emissions during construction and road traffic exhaust emissions associated with vehicles travelling to and from the site during operation, as well as expose future staff and students to elevated pollution levels. As such, an Air Quality Assessment was required in order to determine baseline conditions, consider site suitability for the proposed end-use and assess potential effects as a result of the scheme.

Potential construction phase air quality impacts from fugitive dust emissions were assessed as a result of earthworks, construction and trackout activities. It is considered that the use of good practice control measures would provide suitable mitigation for a development of this size and nature and reduce potential impacts to an acceptable level.

Potential impacts during the operational phase of the proposals may occur due to road traffic exhaust emissions associated with vehicles travelling to and from the site. Dispersion modelling was therefore undertaken in order to predict pollutant concentrations at sensitive locations as a result of emissions from the local highway network both with and without the development in place. Results were subsequently verified using local monitoring data.

Review of the dispersion modelling results indicated that predicted air quality impacts as a result of traffic generated by the development were not significant at any sensitive location in the vicinity of the site.

The results of the assessment also indicated that pollution levels were below the relevant criteria at all locations across the development. As such, the site is considered suitable for the proposed use from an air quality perspective.

Based on the assessment results, air quality factors are not considered a constraint to planning consent for the development.

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Site Location and Context	1
2.0 LEGISLATION AND POLICY	2
2.1 Legislation	2
2.2 Local Air Quality Management	4
2.3 Dust	4
2.4 National Planning Policy	5
2.5 National Planning Practice Guidance	6
2.6 Local Planning Policy	7
2.6.4 Manchester City Council Air Quality and Planning Technical Guidance	8
3.0 METHODOLOGY	9
3.1 Introduction	9
3.2 Construction Phase Assessment	9
Step 1	10
Step 2	10
Step 3	16
Step 4	16
3.3 Operational Phase Assessment	16
Potential Future Exposure	18
4.0 BASELINE	19
4.1 Introduction	19
4.2 Local Air Quality Management	19
4.3 Air Quality Monitoring	19
4.4 Background Pollutant Concentrations	20
4.5 Sensitive Receptors	21
Construction Phase Sensitive Receptors	21
Operational Phase Sensitive Receptors	23
5.0 ASSESSMENT	25
5.1 Introduction	25
5.2 Construction Phase Assessment	25
Step 1	25
Step 2	25
Step 3	27

Step 4	29
5.3 Operational Phase Assessment	29
Predicted Concentrations	30
Predicted Impacts	33
Potential Future Exposure	35
Overall Impact Significance	36
5.4 Mitigation	37
6.0 CONCLUSION	39
7.0 ABBREVIATIONS	41

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Assessment Input Data

Appendix 2 - Curricula Vitae

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Redmore Environmental Ltd was commissioned by Create It Studio Architects to undertake an Air Quality Assessment in support of an educational facility on land off Redby Street, Manchester.
- 1.1.2 The proposed development has the potential to cause air quality impacts at sensitive locations during the construction and operational phases, as well as expose future staff and students to elevated pollution levels. As such, an Air Quality Assessment was undertaken in order to determine baseline conditions, consider site suitability for the proposed end-use and assess potential effects associated with the scheme.

1.2 Site Location and Context

- 1.2.1 The site is located on land off Redby Street, Manchester, at approximate National Grid Reference (NGR): 387829, 397424. Reference should be made to Figure 1 for a map of the site and surrounding area.
- 1.2.2 The proposals comprise construction of a private independent school consisting of a nursery alongside primary and secondary school provisions and associated infrastructure.
- 1.2.3 The proposals have the potential to cause air quality impacts at sensitive locations. These may include fugitive dust emissions associated with construction works and road traffic exhaust emissions from vehicles travelling to and from the site during the operational phase. There is also the potential for the exposure of future staff and students to any existing air quality issues. An Air Quality Assessment was therefore undertaken in order to determine baseline conditions and consider potential effects as a result of the proposals. This is detailed in the following report.

2.0 LEGISLATION AND POLICY

2.1 Legislation

2.1.1 The Air Quality Standards Regulations (2010) and subsequent amendments include Air Quality Limit Values (AQLVs) for the following pollutants:

- Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂);
- Sulphur dioxide;
- Lead;
- Particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 10µm (PM₁₀);
- Particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 2.5µm (PM_{2.5});
- Benzene; and,
- Carbon monoxide.

2.1.2 Air quality target values were also provided for several additional pollutants. It should be noted that the AQLV for PM_{2.5} stated in the Air Quality Standards Regulations (2010) was amended in the Environment (Miscellaneous Amendments) (EU Exit) Regulations (2020).

2.1.3 The Air Quality Strategy (AQS) was produced by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and published in July 2007¹. The document contains standards, objectives and measures for improving ambient air quality, including a number of Air Quality Objectives (AQOs). These are maximum ambient pollutant concentrations that are not to be exceeded either without exception or with a permitted number of exceedences over a specified timescale. These are generally in line with the AQLVs, although the requirements for the determination of compliance vary.

2.1.4 Table 1 presents the AQOs and AQLVs for pollutants considered within this assessment.

Table 1 Air Quality Objectives/Air Quality Limit Values

Pollutant	Air Quality Objective/Air Quality Limit Value	
	Concentration (µg/m ³)	Averaging Period
NO ₂	40	Annual mean

¹ The AQS for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, DEFRA, 2007.

Pollutant	Air Quality Objective/Air Quality Limit Value	
	Concentration ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Averaging Period
	200	1-hour mean, not to be exceeded on more than 18 occasions per annum
PM ₁₀	40	Annual mean
	50	24-hour mean, not to be exceeded on more than 35 occasions per annum
PM _{2.5}	20	Annual mean

2.1.5 The Environment Act (2021) was published on 9th November 2021 and makes provision for the setting of lower PM_{2.5} targets. The final criteria will be included in legislation to be put before parliament by 31st October 2022. Prior to this time the AQLV outlined in Table 1 remains the adopted air quality standard within the UK.

2.1.6 Table 2 summarises the advice provided in DEFRA guidance² on where the AQOs for pollutants considered within this report apply.

Table 2 Examples of Where the Air Quality Objectives Apply

Averaging Period	Objective Should Apply At	Objective Should Not Apply At
Annual mean	All locations where members of the public might be regularly exposed Building façades of residential properties, schools, hospitals, care homes etc.	Building façades of offices or other places of work where members of the public do not have regular access Hotels, unless people live there as their permanent residence Gardens of residential properties Kerbside sites (as opposed to locations at the building façade), or any other location where public exposure is expected to be short term
24-hour mean	All locations where the annual mean objective would apply, together with hotels Gardens of residential properties	Kerbside sites (as opposed to locations at the building façade), or any other location where public exposure is expected to be short term

² Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (TG16), DEFRA, 2021.

Averaging Period	Objective Should Apply At	Objective Should Not Apply At
1-hour mean	All locations where the annual mean and 24 and 8-hour mean objectives apply. Kerbside sites (for example, pavements of busy shopping streets) Those parts of car parks, bus stations and railway stations etc which are not fully enclosed, where members of the public might reasonably be expected to spend one hour or more Any outdoor locations where members of the public might reasonably be expected to spend one hour or longer	Kerbside sites where the public would not be expected to have regular access

2.2 **Local Air Quality Management**

2.2.1 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 comparing present and likely future pollutant concentrations against the AQOs. If it is predicted that levels at locations of relevant exposure, as summarised in Table 2, are likely to be exceeded, the LA is required to declare an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). For each AQMA the LA is required to produce an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP), the objective of which is to reduce pollutant concentrations in pursuit of the AQOs.

2.3 **Dust**

2.3.1 The main requirements with respect to dust control from industrial or trade premises not regulated under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations (2016) and subsequent amendments, such as construction sites, is that provided in Section 79 of Part III of the Environmental Protection Act (1990). The Act defines nuisance as:

"any dust, steam, smell or other effluvia arising on industrial, trade or business premises and being prejudicial to health or a nuisance."

2.3.2 Enforcement of the Act, in regard to nuisance, is currently under the jurisdiction of the local Environmental Health Department, whose officers are deemed to provide an independent evaluation of nuisance. If the LA is satisfied that a statutory nuisance exists, or is likely to occur or happen again, it must serve an Abatement Notice under Part III of

the Environmental Protection Act (1990). The only defence is to show that the process to which the nuisance has been attributed and its operation are being controlled according to best practicable means.

2.4 National Planning Policy

2.4.1 The revised National Planning Policy Framework³ (NPPF) was published in July 2021 and sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

2.4.2 The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. In order to ensure this, the NPPF recognises three overarching objectives including the following of relevance to air quality:

"c) An environmental objective - to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy."

2.4.3 Chapter 15 of the NPPF details objectives in relation to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. It states that:

"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 [...]."

³ NPPF, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 2021.

- 2.4.4 The NPPF specifically recognises air quality as part of delivering sustainable development and states that:

"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."

- 2.4.5 The implications of the NPPF have been considered throughout this assessment.

2.5 National Planning Practice Guidance

- 2.5.1 The National Planning Practice Guidance⁴ (NPPG) web-based resource was launched by the Department for Communities and Local Government on 6th March 2014 and updated on 1st November 2019 to support the NPPF and make it more accessible. The air quality pages are summarised under the following headings:

1. What air quality considerations does planning need to address?
2. What is the role of plan-making with regard to air quality?
3. Are air quality concerns relevant to neighbourhood planning?
4. What information is available about air quality?
5. When could air quality considerations be relevant to the development management process?
6. What specific issues may need to be considered when assessing air quality impacts?
7. How detailed does an air quality assessment need to be?
8. How can an impact on air quality be mitigated?

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/air-quality--3>.

2.5.2 These were reviewed and the relevant guidance considered as necessary throughout the undertaking of this assessment.

2.6 Local Planning Policy

2.6.1 The Manchester Local Development Framework consists of a series of planning documents of which the Core Strategy⁵ is central. This was adopted by Manchester City Council (MCC) on 11th July 2012 and provides policies which guide the determination of planning applications within the city.

2.6.2 A review of the Core Strategy indicated the following policies of relevance to the assessment:

"Policy EN 16

Air Quality

The Council will seek to improve the air quality within Manchester, and particularly within Air Quality Management Areas, located along Manchester's principal traffic routes and at Manchester Airport. Developers will be expected to take measures to minimise and mitigate the local effect of emissions from traffic generated by the development, as well as emissions created by the use of the development itself, including from Combined Heat and Power and biomass plant.

When assessing the appropriateness of locations for new development the Council will consider the effects on air quality, alongside other plan objectives. This includes cumulative effects, particularly in Air Quality Management Areas."

"Policy DM 1

Development Management

All development should have regard to the following specific issues for which more detailed guidance may be given within a supplementary planning document:-

⁵ Core Strategy, MCC, 2012.

[...]

Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality, odours, litter, vermin, birds, road safety and traffic generation. This could also include proposals which would be sensitive to existing environmental conditions, such as noise."

2.6.3 The implications of the above policies were taken into consideration throughout the undertaking of the assessment.

2.6.4 Manchester City Council Air Quality and Planning Technical Guidance

2.6.5 MCC adopted the Air Quality and Planning Technical Guidance⁶ document in February 2022. This aims to provide help and advice in relation to air quality in a planning context to encourage good practice and mitigation of impacts. The guidance was considered as necessary throughout the assessment.

⁶ Air Quality and Planning Technical Guidance, MCC, 2022.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The proposed development has the potential to cause air quality impacts during the construction and operational phases. These have been assessed in accordance with the following methodology.

3.2 Construction Phase Assessment

3.2.1 There is the potential for fugitive dust emissions to occur as a result of construction phase activities. These have been assessed in accordance with the methodology outlined within the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) document 'Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction V1.1'⁷.

3.2.2 Activities on the proposed construction site have been divided into three types to reflect their different potential impacts. These are:

- Earthworks;
- Construction; and,
- Trackout.

3.2.3 The potential for dust emissions was assessed for each activity that is likely to take place and considered three separate dust effects:

- Annoyance due to dust soiling;
- Harm to ecological receptors; and,
- The risk of health effects due to a significant increase in exposure to PM10.

3.2.4 The assessment steps are detailed below.

⁷ Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction V1.1, IAQM, 2016.

Step 1

- 3.2.5 Step 1 screens the requirement for a more detailed assessment. Should human receptors be identified within 350m from the boundary or 50m from the construction vehicle route up to 500m from the site entrance, then the assessment proceeds to Step 2. Additionally, should ecological receptors be identified within 50m of the site or the construction vehicle route up to 500m from the site entrance, then the assessment also proceeds to Step 2.
- 3.2.6 Should sensitive receptors not be present within the relevant distances then **negligible** impacts would be expected and further assessment is not necessary.

Step 2

- 3.2.7 Step 2 assesses the risk of potential dust impacts. A site is allocated a risk category based on two factors:
- The scale and nature of the works, which determines the magnitude of dust arising as: small, medium or large (Step 2A); and,
 - The sensitivity of the area to dust impacts, which can be defined as low, medium or high sensitivity (Step 2B).
- 3.2.8 The two factors are combined in Step 2C to determine the risk of dust impacts without mitigation applied.
- 3.2.9 Step 2A defines the potential magnitude of dust emission through the construction phase. The relevant criteria are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3 Construction Dust - Magnitude of Emission

Magnitude	Activity	Criteria
Large	Earthworks	• Total site area greater than 10,000m² • Potentially dusty soil type (e.g. clay, which will be prone to suspension when dry due to small particle size) • More than 10 heavy earth moving vehicles active at any one time • Formation of bunds greater than 8m in height • More than 100,000 tonnes of material moved

Magnitude	Activity	Criteria
	Construction	- Total building volume greater than 100,000m³ - On site concrete batching - Sandblasting
	Trackout	- More than 50 Heavy Duty Vehicle (HDV) trips per day - Potentially dusty surface material (e.g. high clay content) - Unpaved road length greater than 100m
Medium	Earthworks	- Total site area 2,500m² to 10,000m² - Moderately dusty soil type (e.g. silt) 5 to 10 heavy earth moving vehicles active at any one time - Formation of bunds 4m to 8m in height - Total material moved 20,000 tonnes to 100,000 tonnes
	Construction	- Total building volume 25,000m³ to 100,000m³ - Potentially dusty construction material (e.g. concrete) - On site concrete batching
	Trackout	10 to 50 HDV trips per day - Moderately dusty surface material (e.g. high clay content) - Unpaved road length 50m to 100m
Small	Earthworks	- Total site area less than 2,500m² - Soil type with large grain size (e.g. sand) - Less than 5 heavy earth moving vehicles active at any one time - Formation of bunds less than 4m in height - Total material moved less than 20,000 tonnes - Earthworks during wetter months
	Construction	- Total building volume less than 25,000m³ - Construction material with low potential for dust release (e.g. metal cladding or timber)
	Trackout	- Less than 10 HDV trips per day - Surface material with low potential for dust release - Unpaved road length less than 50m

3.2.10 Step 2B defines the sensitivity of the area around the development to potential dust impacts. The influencing factors are shown in Table 4.

Table 4 Construction Dust - Examples of Factors Defining Sensitivity of an Area

Receptor Sensitivity	Examples	
	Human Receptors	Ecological Receptors
High	• Users expect high levels of amenity • High aesthetic or value property • People expected to be present continuously for extended periods of time • Locations where members of the public are exposed over a time period relevant to the AQO for PM₁₀. e.g. residential properties, hospitals, schools and residential care homes	• Internationally or nationally designated site e.g. Special Area of Conservation
Medium	• Users would expect to enjoy a reasonable level of amenity • Aesthetics or value of their property could be diminished by soiling • 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 e.g. parks and places of work	• Nationally designated site e.g. Sites of Special Scientific Interest
Low	• Enjoyment of amenity would not reasonably be expected • Property would not be expected to be diminished in appearance • Transient exposure, where people would only be expected to be present for limited periods. e.g. public footpaths, playing fields, shopping streets, farmland, short term car parks and roads	• Locally designated site e.g. Local Nature Reserve

3.2.11 The guidance also provides the following factors to consider when determining the sensitivity of an area to potential dust impacts:

- Any history of dust generating activities in the area;
- The likelihood of concurrent dust generating activity on nearby sites;
- Any pre-existing screening between the source and receptors;
- Any conclusions drawn from analysing local meteorological data which accurately represent the area; and if relevant the season during which works will take place;
- Any conclusions drawn from local topography;
- Duration of the potential impact, as a receptor may become more sensitive over time; and,

- Any known specific receptor sensitivities which go beyond the classifications given in the document.

3.2.12 These factors were considered in the undertaking of this assessment.

3.2.13 The criteria for determining the sensitivity of the area to dust soiling effects on people and property is summarised in Table 5.

Table 5 Construction Dust - Sensitivity of the Area to Dust Soiling Effects on People and Property

Receptor Sensitivity	Number of Receptors	Distance from the Source (m)			
		Less than 20	Less than 50	Less than 100	Less than 350
High	More than 100	High	High	Medium	Low
	10 - 100	High	Medium	Low	Low
	1 - 10	Medium	Low	Low	Low
Medium	More than 1	Medium	Low	Low	Low
Low	More than 1	Low	Low	Low	Low

3.2.14 Table 6 outlines the criteria for determining the sensitivity of the area to human health impacts.

Table 6 Construction Dust - Sensitivity of the Area to Human Health Impacts

Receptor Sensitivity	Background Annual Mean PM ₁₀ Concentration	Number of Receptors	Distance from the Source (m)				
			Less than 20	Less than 50	Less than 100	Less than 200	Less than 350
High	Greater than 32µg/m ³	More than 100	High	High	High	Medium	Low
		10 - 100	High	High	Medium	Low	Low
		1 - 10	High	Medium	Low	Low	Low
	28 - 32µg/m ³	More than 100	High	High	Medium	Low	Low
		10 - 100	High	Medium	Low	Low	Low
		1 - 10	High	Medium	Low	Low	Low

Receptor Sensitivity	Background Annual Mean PM ₁₀ Concentration	Number of Receptors	Distance from the Source (m)				
			Less than 20	Less than 50	Less than 100	Less than 200	Less than 350
	24 - 28µg/m ³	More than 100	High	Medium	Low	Low	Low
		10 - 100	High	Medium	Low	Low	Low
		1 - 10	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Low
	Less than 24µg/m ³	More than 100	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Low
		10 - 100	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
		1 - 10	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
	Medium	Greater than 32µg/m ³	High	Medium	Low	Low	Low
			1 - 10	Medium	Low	Low	Low
	28 - 32µg/m ³	More than 10	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Low
		1 - 10	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
	24 - 28µg/m ³	More than 10	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
		1 - 10	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
	Less than 24µg/m ³	More than 10	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
		1 - 10	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
	Low	-	1 or more	Low	Low	Low	Low

3.2.15 Table 7 outlines the criteria for determining the sensitivity of the area to ecological impacts.

Table 7 Construction Dust - Sensitivity of the Area to Ecological Impacts

Receptor Sensitivity	Distance from the Source (m)	
	Less than 20	Less than 50
High	High	Medium

Receptor Sensitivity	Distance from the Source (m)	
	Less than 20	Less than 50
Medium	Medium	Low
Low	Low	Low

3.2.16 Step 2C combines the dust emission magnitude with the sensitivity of the area to determine the risk of unmitigated impacts.

3.2.17 Table 8 outlines the risk category from earthworks and construction activities.

Table 8 Construction Dust - Dust Risk Category from Earthworks and Construction Activities

Receptor Sensitivity	Dust Emission Magnitude		
	Large	Medium	Small
High	High	Medium	Low
Medium	Medium	Medium	Low
Low	Low	Low	Negligible

3.2.18 Table 9 outlines the risk category from trackout activities.

Table 9 Construction Dust - Dust Risk Category from Trackout Activities

Receptor Sensitivity	Dust Emission Magnitude		
	Large	Medium	Small
High	High	Medium	Low
Medium	Medium	Low	Negligible
Low	Low	Low	Negligible

Step 3

3.2.19 Step 3 requires the identification of site specific mitigation measures within the IAQM guidance⁸ to reduce potential dust impacts based upon the relevant risk categories identified in Step 2. For sites with **negligible** risk, mitigation measures beyond those required by legislation are not required. However, additional controls may be applied as part of good practice.

Step 4

3.2.20 Once the risk of dust impacts has been determined and the appropriate mitigation measures identified, the final step is to determine the significance of any residual impacts. For almost all construction activity, the aim should be to control effects through the use of effective mitigation. Experience shows that this is normally possible. Hence the residual effect will normally be **not significant**.

3.2.21 The determination of significance relies on professional judgement and reasoning should be provided as far as practicable. The IAQM guidance suggests the provision of details of the assessor's qualifications and experience. These are provided in Appendix 2.

3.3 Operational Phase Assessment

3.3.1 The development has the potential to affect existing air quality as a result of road traffic exhaust emissions associated with vehicles travelling to and from the site. Potential impacts have therefore been defined by predicting pollutant concentrations at sensitive locations using dispersion modelling for the following scenarios:

- 2019 - Verification;
- Assessment year Do-Minimum (DM) (predicted traffic flows in 2024 should the proposals not proceed); and,
- Assessment year Do-Something (DS) (predicted traffic flows in 2024 should the proposals be completed).

⁸ Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction V1.1, IAQM, 2016.

- 3.3.2 Reference should be made to Appendix 1 for assessment input data and details of the verification process.
- 3.3.3 Locations sensitive to potential changes in off-site pollutant concentrations were identified within 200m of the highway network in accordance with the guidance provided within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)⁹ on the likely limits of pollutant dispersion from road sources. The criteria provided within DEFRA guidance¹⁰ on where the AQOs apply, as summarised in Table 2, was utilised to determine worst-case receptor positions in the vicinity of links likely to be affected by changes in traffic flows as a result of the development.
- 3.3.4 The significance of predicted air quality impacts was determined in accordance with the guidance provided within the IAQM document 'Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality'¹¹. Using this methodology impacts were defined based on the interaction between the predicted pollutant concentration from the DS scenario and the magnitude of change between the DM and DS scenarios, as outlined in Table 10.

Table 10 Significance of Road Vehicle Exhaust Emission Impacts

Concentration at Receptor in Assessment Year	Predicted Concentration Change as Proportion of AQO (%)			
	1	2 - 5	6 - 10	> 10
75% or less 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% or more of AQO	Moderate	Substantial	Substantial	Substantial

- 3.3.5 The matrix shown in Table 10 is intended to be used by rounding the change in percentage pollutant concentration to whole numbers, which makes it clearer which cell the impact falls within. It should be noted that changes of 0%, i.e. less than 0.5%, are described as **negligible**.

⁹ LA 105 Air Quality, Highways England, 2019.

¹⁰ Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (TG16), DEFRA, 2021.

¹¹ Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality, IAQM, 2017.

3.3.6 Following the prediction of impacts at discrete receptor locations, the IAQM document¹² provides guidance on determining the overall air quality impact significance of the operation of a development. The following factors are identified for consideration by the assessor:

- The existing and future air quality in the absence of the development;
- The extent of current and future population exposure to the impacts; and,
- The influence and validity of any assumptions adopted when undertaking the prediction of impacts.

3.3.7 The IAQM guidance states that an assessment must reach a conclusion on the likely significance of the predicted impact. Where the overall effect is **moderate** or **substantial**, the effect is likely to be considered **significant**, whilst if the impact is **slight** or **negligible**, the impact is likely to be considered **not significant**. It should be noted that this is a binary judgement of either it is **significant** or it is **not significant**.

3.3.8 The determination of significance relies on professional judgement and reasoning has been provided as far as practicable. The IAQM guidance¹³ suggests the provision of details of the assessor's qualifications and experience. These are provided in Appendix 2.

Potential Future Exposure

3.3.9 The proposals have the potential to expose future staff and students to any existing air quality issues at the site. Pollutant concentrations were therefore quantified across the development using dispersion modelling. The results were subsequently compared with the relevant AQOs and AQLV to determine the potential for any exceedence.

¹² Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality, IAQM, 2017.

¹³ Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality, IAQM, 2017.

4.0 BASELINE

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 Existing air quality conditions in the vicinity of the proposed development site were identified in order to provide a baseline for assessment. These are detailed in the following Sections.

4.2 Local Air Quality Management

- 4.2.1 As required by the Environment Act (1995), MCC has undertaken Review and Assessment of air quality within their area of jurisdiction. This process has indicated that annual mean concentrations of NO₂ are above the AQO within the city. As such, a number of roads within Manchester have been included within the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) AQMA. This is described as follows:

"This is the part of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority AQMA located within the Manchester City Council area."

- 4.2.2 The development is partly located within the AQMA. As such, there is the potential for vehicles travelling to and from the site to increase pollution levels in this sensitive area. This has been considered throughout the assessment.
- 4.2.3 MCC has concluded that concentrations of all other pollutants considered within the AQS are currently below the relevant AQOs. As such, no further AQMA's have been designated.

4.3 Air Quality Monitoring

- 4.3.1 Monitoring of pollutant levels is undertaken by MCC throughout their area of jurisdiction. Recent annual mean NO₂ concentrations recorded in the vicinity of the site are shown in Table 11.

Table 11 Monitoring Results

Monitoring Site		Monitored NO ₂ Concentration (µg/m ³)		
		2018	2019	2020
MA28NO	Ashton Old Road	37.1	36.1	26.4

4.3.2 As shown in Table 11, annual mean NO₂ concentrations were below the AQO of 40µg/m³ at the MA28NO monitor in recent years. Reference should be made to Figure 2 for a map of the survey position.

4.3.3 Concentrations of NO₂ during 2020 were lower than previous years due to a reduction in traffic and associated emissions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The results should therefore be viewed with caution.

4.3.4 MCC do not undertake PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} monitoring within the vicinity of the development.

4.4 Background Pollutant Concentrations

4.4.1 Predictions of background pollutant concentrations on a 1km by 1km grid basis have been produced by DEFRA for the entire of the UK to assist LAs in their Review and Assessment of air quality. The proposed development site is located in grid square NGR: 387500, 397500. Data for this location was downloaded from the DEFRA website¹⁴ for the purpose of the assessment and is summarised in Table 12.

Table 12 Background Pollutant Concentration Predictions

Pollutant	Predicted Background Pollutant Concentration (µg/m ³)		
	2019	2022	2024
NO ₂	20.49	18.09	16.94
PM ₁₀	12.61	12.13	11.93
PM _{2.5}	8.48	8.14	7.98

¹⁴ <http://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/data/laqm-background-maps?year=2018>.

4.4.2 As shown in Table 12, predicted background NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations are below the relevant AQOs and AQLV at the development site.

4.5 **Sensitive Receptors**

4.5.1 A sensitive receptor is defined as any location which may be affected by changes in air quality as a result of a development. These have been defined for dust and road vehicle exhaust emission impacts in the following Sections.

Construction Phase Sensitive Receptors

4.5.2 Receptors sensitive to potential dust impacts during earthworks and construction were identified from a desk-top study of the area up to 350m from the development boundary. These are summarised in Table 13.

Table 13 Earthworks and Construction Dust Sensitive Receptors

Distance from Site Boundary (m)	Approximate Number of Human Receptors	Approximate Number of Ecological Receptors
Up to 20	10 - 100	0
Up to 50	More than 100	0
Up to 100	More than 100	-
Up to 350	More than 100	-

4.5.3 Receptors sensitive to potential dust impacts from trackout were identified from a desk-top study of the area up to 50m from the road network within 500m of the site access. These are summarised in Table 14.

Table 14 Trackout Dust Sensitive Receptors

Distance from Site Access Route (m)	Approximate Number of Human Receptors	Approximate Number of Ecological Receptors
Up to 20	More than 100	0
Up to 50	More than 100	0

4.5.4 There are no ecological receptors within 50m of the development boundary or the access route within 500m of the site entrance. As such, ecological impacts have not been assessed further within this report.

4.5.5 A number of additional factors have been considered when determining the sensitivity of the surrounding area. These are summarised in Table 15.

Table 15 Additional Area Sensitivity Factors to Potential Dust Impacts

Guidance	Comment
Whether there is any history of dust generating activities in the area	The baseline study indicated that the Tarmac Ashbury Asphalt and Breedon Manchester (Ashbury) Aggregates Depot & Concrete Plant are located approximately 210m and 240m south of the site, respectively. There are also a number of industrial facilities directly south of the site. It is therefore possible that these may have caused dust generation in recent years
The likelihood of concurrent dust generating activity on nearby sites	A review of the planning portal indicated a number of applications have been submitted within 700m of the site. It is therefore possible that there will be concurrent dust generation should these schemes be granted consent and the construction phases overlap with the proposed development
Pre-existing screening between the source and the receptors	There is no significant screening around the site boundary
Conclusions drawn from analysing local meteorological data which accurately represent the area: and if relevant the season during which works will take place	As shown in Figure 3, the predominant wind direction at the site is from the south. As such, receptors to the north of the boundary are most likely to be affected by dust releases
Conclusions drawn from local topography	There are no significant topographical constraints to dust dispersion
Duration of the potential impact, as a receptor may become more sensitive over time	Currently it is unclear as to the duration of the construction phase. However, it is likely that it will extend over one year. The sensitivity of nearby receptors is unlikely to change during this time
Any known specific receptor sensitivities which go beyond the classifications given in the document	No specific receptor sensitivities identified during the baseline assessment

4.5.6 Based on the criteria shown in Table 4, the sensitivity of the receiving environment to potential dust impacts was determined as a combination of **medium** and **high**. This is

because receptors within the vicinity of the development include a park and school. It should be noted that all receptors were classified as **high** sensitivity to provide a worst case assessment.

- 4.5.7 The sensitivity of the receiving environment to specific potential dust impacts, based on the criteria shown in Section 3.2, is shown in Table 16.

Table 16 Sensitivity of the Surrounding Area to Potential Dust Impacts

Potential Impact	Sensitivity of the Surrounding Area		
	Earthworks	Construction	Trackout
Dust Soiling	High	High	High
Human Health	Low	Low	Medium

Operational Phase Sensitive Receptors

- 4.5.8 Locations sensitive to potential operational phase road vehicle exhaust emission impacts were identified from a desk-top study and are summarised in Table 17. Receptor heights were included in order to take account of less sensitive land uses at ground floor level, such as retail.

Table 17 Operational Phase Road Vehicle Exhaust Emissions Sensitive Receptor Locations

Receptor		NGR (m)		Height (m)
		X	Y	
R1	Residential - Ashton Old Road	388203.4	397427.8	1.5
R2	Residential - Ashton Old Road	388144.0	397439.4	1.5
R3	Residential - Ashton Old Road	387852.3	397459.3	3.0
R4	The Manchester College - Whitworth Street	387683.5	397388.9	1.5
R5	UCEN Manchester Education Centre - Odell Street	387623.9	397457.2	1.5
R6	Residential - Ashton Old Road	387616.5	397494.8	1.5
R7	Residential - Ashton Old Road	387433.0	397512.7	1.5
R8	Residential - Ashton Old Road Junction	387224.7	397541.2	1.5

Receptor		NGR (m)		Height (m)
		X	Y	
R9	Residential - Alan Turing Way	387248.2	397689.9	1.5
R10	Connell Co-op College - Alan Turing Way	387300.3	397921.3	1.5
R11	Bridge College - Pottery Lane	387256.5	397353.2	1.5
R12	Kidspiration Nursery - Pottery Lane	387251.9	397054.8	1.5
R13	Residential - Pottery Lane	387184.8	397038.4	1.5

4.5.9 Reference should be made to Figure 4 for a graphical representation of road vehicle exhaust emission sensitive receptor locations.

5.0 ASSESSMENT

5.1 Introduction

- 5.1.1 There is the potential for air quality impacts as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed development. These are assessed in the following Sections.

5.2 Construction Phase Assessment

Step 1

- 5.2.1 The undertaking of activities such as excavation, ground works, cutting, construction, concrete batching and storage of materials has the potential to result in fugitive dust emissions throughout the construction phase. Vehicle movements both on-site and on the local road network also have the potential to result in the re-suspension of dust from haul roads and highway surfaces.
- 5.2.2 The potential for impacts at sensitive locations depends significantly on local meteorology during the undertaking of dust generating activities, with the most significant effects likely to occur during dry and windy conditions.
- 5.2.3 The desk-study undertaken to inform the baseline identified a number of sensitive receptors within 350m of the site boundary. As such, a detailed assessment of potential dust impacts was required.

Step 2

Earthworks

- 5.2.4 Earthworks will primarily involve excavating material, haulage, tipping and stockpiling, as well as site levelling and landscaping. The proposed development site covers an area between 2,500m² and 10,000m². In accordance with the criteria outlined in Table 3, the magnitude of potential dust emissions from earthworks is therefore **medium**.

5.2.5 Table 16 indicates the sensitivity of the area to dust soiling effects on people and property is **high**. In accordance with the criteria outlined in Table 8 the development is considered to be a **medium** risk site for dust soiling as a result of earthworks.

5.2.6 Table 16 indicates the sensitivity of the area to human health impacts is **low**. In accordance with the criteria outlined in Table 8 the development is considered to be a **low** risk site for human health impacts as a result of earthworks.

Construction

5.2.7 Due to the size of the development, the total building volume is likely to be less than 25,000m³. In accordance with the criteria outlined in Table 3, the magnitude of potential dust emissions from construction is therefore **small**.

5.2.8 Table 16 indicates the sensitivity of the area to dust soiling effects on people and property is **high**. In accordance with the criteria outlined in Table 8, the development is considered to be a **low** risk site for dust soiling as a result of construction activities.

5.2.9 Table 16 indicates the sensitivity of the area to human health impacts is **low**. In accordance with the criteria outlined in Table 8, the development is considered to be a **negligible** risk site for human health impacts as a result of construction activities.

Trackout

5.2.10 Based on the site area, it is anticipated that the unpaved road length is likely to be less than 50m. In accordance with the criteria outlined in Table 3, the magnitude of potential dust emissions from trackout is therefore **small**.

5.2.11 Table 16 indicates the sensitivity of the area to dust soiling effects to people and property is **high**. In accordance with the criteria outlined in Table 9, the development is considered to be a **low** risk site for dust soiling as a result of trackout activities.

5.2.12 Table 16 indicates the sensitivity of the area to human health impacts is **medium**. In accordance with the criteria outlined in Table 9, the development is considered to be a **negligible** risk site for human health impacts as a result of trackout activities.

Summary of the Risk of Dust Effects

5.2.13 A summary of the risk from each dust generating activity is provided in Table 18.

Table 18 Summary of Potential Unmitigated Dust Risks During Construction

Potential Impact	Risk		
	Earthworks	Construction	Trackout
Dust Soiling	Medium	Low	Low
Human Health	Low	Negligible	Negligible

5.2.14 As indicated in Table 18, the potential risk of dust soiling is **medium** from earthworks and **low** from construction and trackout. The potential risk of human health impacts is **low** from earthworks and **negligible** from construction and trackout.

5.2.15 It should be noted that the potential for impacts depends significantly on the distance between the dust generating activity and receptor location. Risk was predicted based on a worst-case scenario of works being undertaken at the site boundary closest to each sensitive area. Therefore, actual risk is likely to be lower than that predicted during the majority of the construction phase.

Step 3

5.2.16 The IAQM guidance¹⁵ provides potential mitigation measures to reduce impacts as a result of fugitive dust emissions during the construction phase. These have been adapted for the development site as summarised in Table 19. These may be reviewed prior to the commencement of construction works and incorporated into a Construction Environmental Management Plan or similar if required by the LA.

¹⁵ Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction V1.1, IAQM, 2016.

Table 19 Fugitive Dust Emission Mitigation Measures

Issue	Control Measure
Communications	• 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 • Develop and implement a Dust Management Plan (DMP), which may include measures to control other emissions, approved by the LA
Site management	• 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 LA upon request • 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
Monitoring	• Undertake daily on-site and off-site inspection to monitor dust, record inspection results, and make the log available to the LA upon request • Carry out regular site inspections to monitor compliance with the DMP, record inspection results, and make an inspection log available to the LA upon request • Increase the frequency of site inspections when activities with a high potential to produce dust are being carried out and during prolonged dry or windy conditions
Site preparation	• Plan site layout so that machinery and dust causing activities are located away from receptors, as far as is possible • Fully enclose site or specific operations where there is a high potential for dust production and they are 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 • Cover, seed or fence stockpiles to prevent wind whipping
Operating vehicle/machinery and sustainable travel	• 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

Issue	Control Measure
Operations	• Only use cutting, grinding or sawing equipment fitted or in conjunction with suitable dust suppression techniques • Ensure an adequate water supply on the site for effective dust suppression, using non-potable water where possible and appropriate • Use enclosed chutes and conveyors and covered skips • Minimise drop heights and use fine water sprays wherever appropriate • Ensure equipment is available to clean any dry spillages, and clean up spillages as soon as reasonably practicable using wet cleaning methods
Waste management	• No bonfires or burning of waste materials
Construction	• Avoid scabbling (roughening of concrete surfaces) if possible • Ensure sand and other aggregates are stored in bunded areas and are not allowed to dry out • For smaller supplies of fine powder materials ensure bags are sealed after use and stored appropriately to prevent dust
Trackout	• Use water-assisted dust sweeper on access and local roads, if required • Avoid dry sweeping of large areas • Ensure vehicles entering and leaving site are covered to prevent escape of materials • Implement a wheel washing system, if required

Step 4

5.2.17 Assuming the relevant mitigation measures outlined in Table 19 are implemented, the residual impacts from all dust generating activities is predicted to be **not significant**, in accordance with the IAQM guidance¹⁶.

5.3 Operational Phase Assessment

5.3.1 Vehicle movements associated with the operation of the proposal will generate exhaust emissions on the local and regional road networks. An assessment was therefore undertaken using dispersion modelling in order to quantify potential changes in pollutant concentrations at sensitive locations in the vicinity of the site.

5.3.2 The assessment considered the following scenarios:

¹⁶ Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction V1.1, IAQM, 2016.

- 2019 - Verification;
- 2024 - DM; and,
- 2024 - DS.

5.3.3 The DM scenario (i.e. without development) included baseline traffic data, inclusive of anticipated growth, for the relevant assessment year. The DS scenario (i.e. with development) included baseline traffic data, inclusive of anticipated growth, in addition to predicted vehicle trips associated with the operation of the proposals.

5.3.4 Reference should be made to Appendix 1 for full assessment input details.

Predicted Concentrations

5.3.5 Annual mean NO₂ concentrations were predicted at the sensitive receptor locations for the DM and DS scenarios. These are summarised in Table 20.

Table 20 Predicted Annual Mean NO₂ Concentrations

Receptor		Predicted Annual Mean NO ₂ Concentration (µg/m ³)		
		DM	DS	Change
R1	Residential - Ashton Old Road	34.49	34.78	0.29
R2	Residential - Ashton Old Road	29.51	29.70	0.19
R3	Residential - Ashton Old Road	30.17	30.41	0.24
R4	The Manchester College - Whitworth Street	22.70	22.79	0.09
R5	UCEN Manchester Education Centre - Odell Street	28.58	28.88	0.30
R6	Residential - Ashton Old Road	27.99	28.18	0.19
R7	Residential - Ashton Old Road	27.41	27.55	0.14
R8	Residential - Ashton Old Road Junction	32.37	32.57	0.20
R9	Residential - Alan Turing Way	27.51	27.56	0.05
R10	Connell Co-op College - Alan Turing Way	24.52	24.55	0.03
R11	Bridge College - Pottery Lane	23.51	23.54	0.03
R12	Kidspiration Nursery - Pottery Lane	34.49	34.78	0.29

Receptor		Predicted Annual Mean NO ₂ Concentration (µg/m ³)		
		DM	DS	Change
R13	Residential - Pottery Lane	29.51	29.70	0.19

5.3.6 As indicated in Table 20, predicted annual mean NO₂ concentrations were below the relevant AQO at all sensitive receptor locations in both the DM and DS scenarios.

Reference should be made to Figures 5 and 6 for graphical representations of annual mean NO₂ concentrations across the assessment area for the DM and DS scenarios, respectively.

5.3.7 Annual mean PM₁₀ concentrations were predicted at the sensitive receptor locations for the DM and DS scenarios. These are summarised in Table 21.

Table 21 Predicted Annual Mean PM₁₀ Concentrations

Receptor		Predicted Annual Mean PM ₁₀ Concentration (µg/m ³)		
		DM	DS	Change
R1	Residential - Ashton Old Road	16.14	16.22	0.08
R2	Residential - Ashton Old Road	15.07	15.12	0.06
R3	Residential - Ashton Old Road	15.51	15.59	0.07
R4	The Manchester College - Whitworth Street	13.21	13.23	0.02
R5	UCEN Manchester Education Centre - Odell Street	14.92	15.00	0.08
R6	Residential - Ashton Old Road	14.87	14.93	0.06
R7	Residential - Ashton Old Road	14.63	14.67	0.04
R8	Residential - Ashton Old Road Junction	15.65	15.70	0.05
R9	Residential - Alan Turing Way	14.71	14.73	0.02
R10	Connell Co-op College - Alan Turing Way	13.82	13.83	0.01
R11	Bridge College - Pottery Lane	13.51	13.52	0.01
R12	Kidspiration Nursery - Pottery Lane	13.29	13.30	0.00
R13	Residential - Pottery Lane	15.62	15.64	0.02

5.3.8 As indicated in Table 21, predicted annual mean PM₁₀ concentrations were below the relevant AQO at all sensitive receptors in both the DM and DS scenarios. Reference should be made to Figures 7 and 8 for graphical representations of annual mean PM₁₀ concentrations across the assessment area for the DM and DS scenarios, respectively.

5.3.9 Annual mean PM_{2.5} concentrations were predicted at the sensitive receptor locations for the DM and DS scenarios. These are summarised in Table 22.

Table 22 Predicted Annual Mean PM_{2.5} Concentrations

Receptor		Predicted Annual Mean PM _{2.5} Concentration (µg/m ³)		
		DM	DS	Change
R1	Residential - Ashton Old Road	10.49	10.53	0.04
R2	Residential - Ashton Old Road	9.87	9.90	0.03
R3	Residential - Ashton Old Road	10.11	10.15	0.04
R4	The Manchester College - Whitworth Street	8.82	8.83	0.01
R5	UCEN Manchester Education Centre - Odell Street	9.78	9.82	0.05
R6	Residential - Ashton Old Road	9.75	9.78	0.03
R7	Residential - Ashton Old Road	9.61	9.64	0.02
R8	Residential - Ashton Old Road Junction	10.20	10.23	0.03
R9	Residential - Alan Turing Way	9.66	9.67	0.01
R10	Connell Co-op College - Alan Turing Way	9.16	9.16	0.00
R11	Bridge College - Pottery Lane	8.98	8.99	0.00
R12	Kidspiration Nursery - Pottery Lane	10.49	10.53	0.04
R13	Residential - Pottery Lane	9.87	9.90	0.03

5.3.10 As indicated in Table 22, predicted annual mean PM_{2.5} concentrations were below the relevant AQLV at all sensitive receptors in both the DM and DS scenarios. Reference should be made to Figures 9 and 10 for graphical representations of annual mean PM_{2.5} concentrations across the assessment area for the DM and DS scenarios, respectively.

Predicted Impacts

5.3.11 Predicted impacts on annual mean NO₂ concentrations at the sensitive receptor locations are summarised in Table 23.

Table 23 Predicted Impacts - NO₂

Receptor		Predicted Annual Mean NO ₂ Concentration	Predicted Concentration Change as Proportion of AQO (%)	Impact Significance
R1	Residential - Ashton Old Road	76 - 94% of AQO	1	Negligible
R2	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R3	Residential - Ashton Old Road	76 - 94% of AQO	1	Negligible
R4	The Manchester College - Whitworth Street	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R5	UCEN Manchester Education Centre - Odell Street	Below 75% of AQO	1	Negligible
R6	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R7	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R8	Residential - Ashton Old Road Junction	76 - 94% of AQO	1	Negligible
R9	Residential - Alan Turing Way	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R10	Connell Co-op College - Alan Turing Way	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R11	Bridge College - Pottery Lane	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R12	Kidspiration Nursery - Pottery Lane	76 - 94% of AQO	1	Negligible
R13	Residential - Pottery Lane	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible

5.3.12 As indicated in Table 23, impacts on annual mean NO₂ concentrations as a result of the proposed development were predicted to be **negligible** at all receptor locations.

5.3.13 Predicted impacts on annual mean PM₁₀ concentrations at the sensitive receptor locations are summarised in Table 24.

Table 24 Predicted Impacts - PM₁₀

Receptor		Predicted Annual Mean PM ₁₀ Concentration	Predicted Concentration Change as Proportion of AQO (%)	Impact Significance
R1	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R2	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R3	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R4	The Manchester College - Whitworth Street	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R5	UCEN Manchester Education Centre - Odell Street	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R6	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R7	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R8	Residential - Ashton Old Road Junction	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R9	Residential - Alan Turing Way	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R10	Connell Co-op College - Alan Turing Way	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R11	Bridge College - Pottery Lane	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R12	Kidspiration Nursery - Pottery Lane	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible
R13	Residential - Pottery Lane	Below 75% of AQO	0	Negligible

5.3.14 As indicated in Table 24, impacts on annual mean PM₁₀ concentrations as a result of the proposed development were predicted to be **negligible** at all receptor locations.

5.3.15 Predicted impacts on annual mean PM_{2.5} concentrations at the sensitive receptor locations are summarised in Table 25.

Table 25 Predicted Impacts - PM_{2.5}

Receptor		Predicted Annual Mean PM _{2.5} Concentration	Predicted Concentration Change as Proportion of AQLV (%)	Impact Significance
R1	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible

Receptor		Predicted Annual Mean PM _{2.5} Concentration	Predicted Concentration Change as Proportion of AQLV (%)	Impact Significance
R2	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible
R3	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible
R4	The Manchester College - Whitworth Street	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible
R5	UCEN Manchester Education Centre - Odell Street	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible
R6	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible
R7	Residential - Ashton Old Road	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible
R8	Residential - Ashton Old Road Junction	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible
R9	Residential - Alan Turing Way	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible
R10	Connell Co-op College - Alan Turing Way	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible
R11	Bridge College - Pottery Lane	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible
R12	Kidspiration Nursery - Pottery Lane	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible
R13	Residential - Pottery Lane	Below 75% of AQLV	0	Negligible

5.3.16 As indicated in Table 25, impacts on annual mean PM_{2.5} concentrations as a result of the proposed development were predicted to be **negligible** at all receptor locations.

Potential Future Exposure

5.3.17 The proposed development includes sensitive land use. As such, annual mean pollutant concentrations were predicted across the site in order to identify any potential exposure of future staff and students to exceedences of the relevant AQOs. Reference should be made to Figures 6, 8 and 10 for graphical representations of the results.

5.3.18 As shown in Figure 6, annual mean NO₂ concentrations were predicted to be below the AQO of 40µg/m³ across the site. The maximum level at the boundary was 31.71µg/m³.

- 5.3.19 As shown in Figure 8, annual mean PM₁₀ concentrations were predicted to be below the AQO of 40µg/m³ across the site. The maximum level at the boundary was 15.86µg/m³.
- 5.3.20 As shown in Figure 10, annual mean PM_{2.5} concentrations were predicted to be below the AQLV of 20µg/m³ across the site. The maximum level at the boundary was 10.39µg/m³.
- 5.3.21 Based on the assessment results, future staff and students are not predicted to be exposed to pollutant concentrations above the relevant AQOs and AQLV. The site is therefore considered suitable for the proposed use from an air quality perspective.

Overall Impact Significance

- 5.3.22 The overall significance of operational phase road traffic emission impacts was determined as **negligible**. This was based on the overall predicted impacts at discrete receptor locations and the considerations outlined previously. Further justification is provided in Table 26.

Table 26 Overall Impact Significance of Road Vehicle Exhaust Emission Impacts

Guidance	Comment
The existing and future air quality in the absence of the development	Predicted annual mean NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations were below the relevant AQOs and AQLV at all locations in the DM scenario It is considered unlikely that future air quality conditions will change significantly in the absence of the development given the relatively established nature of the area
The extent of current and future population exposure to the impacts	The development is not predicted to affect the population exposed to exceedences of the AQOs
The influence and validity of any assumptions adopted when undertaking the prediction of impacts	It was assumed that background pollutant levels will not reduce in future years. This is likely to provide an overestimation of concentrations during the operation of the proposals and is therefore considered to provide a robust assessment

- 5.3.23 The IAQM guidance¹⁷ states that only if the impact is greater than **slight**, the effect is considered significant. Given that the overall impact of operational phase road traffic

¹⁷ Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality, IAQM, 2017.

emissions was concluded to be **negligible**, the effect of the proposals is considered to be **not significant**.

5.4 Mitigation

- 5.4.1 As air quality impacts associated with the proposals were predicted to be **not significant** further mitigation to control effects is not considered necessary. However, a number of additional measures have been included within the scheme in accordance with the requirements of the IAQM document 'Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality'¹⁸ to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes, manage vehicle and reduce pollution around the site. Table 27 describes the good practice design principles detailed in the IAQM guidance along with how each has been addressed with regards to the proposals.

Table 27 Good Practice Design Principles

Phase	Principle	Action
Design Phase	New developments should not contravene the Councils AQAP, or render any of the measures unworkable	It is confirmed that the proposals will not contravene MCC's AQAP or render any of the measures unworkable
	Wherever possible, new developments should not create a new "street canyon", or a building configuration that inhibits effective pollution dispersion	The proposals will not lead to the generation of a street canyon
	Delivering sustainable development should be the key theme of any application	The proposals have been designed to encourage sustainable behaviours, such as active or public transport, due to its close proximity to local bus routes
Operational Phase	The provision of at least 1 Electric Vehicle (EV) "rapid charge" point per 10 residential dwellings and/or 1,000m ² of commercial floor space. Where on-site parking is provided for residential dwellings, EV charging points for each parking space should be made	EV charging may be included as part of the scheme if required by the LA

¹⁸ Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality, IAQM, 2017.

Phase	Principle	Action
	Where development generates significant traffic, provision of a detailed Travel Plan (with provision to measure its implementation and effect) which sets out measures to encourage sustainable means of transport (public, cycling and walking) via subsidised or free ticketing, improvised links to bus stops, improved infrastructure and layouts to improve accessibility and safety	A Travel Plan will be produced in support of the scheme if required by the LA
	All gas fired boilers to meet a minimum standard of <40mgNO_x/kWh All gas-fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plant to meet a minimum emissions standard of: • Spark ignition engine: 250mgNO_x/Nm³; • Compression ignition engine: 400mgNO_x/Nm³; • Gas turbine: 50mgNO_x/Nm³ A presumption should be to use natural gas-fired installations. Where biomass is proposed within an urban area it is to meet minimum emission standards of: • Solid biomass boiler: 275mgNO_x/Nm³ and 25mgPM/Nm³	Any boilers included in the development will be provisioned in accordance with the relevant requirements

5.4.2 It is considered the above methods would further reduce potential impacts associated with the proposals. Specific mitigation suited to the proposals may be stipulated as a planning condition if deemed necessary by the LA.

6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1.1 Redmore Environmental Ltd was commissioned by Create It Studio Architects to undertake an Air Quality Assessment in support of an educational facility on land off Redby Street, Manchester.
- 6.1.2 The proposals have the potential to cause air quality impacts as a result of fugitive dust emissions during construction and road traffic exhaust emissions associated with vehicles travelling to and from the site during operation, as well as expose future staff and students to elevated pollution levels. As such, an Air Quality Assessment was required in order to determine baseline conditions, consider site suitability for the proposed end-use and assess potential effects as a result of the scheme.
- 6.1.3 During the construction phase of the development there is the potential for air quality impacts as a result of fugitive dust emissions from the site. These were assessed in accordance with the IAQM methodology. Assuming good practice dust control measures are implemented, the residual significance of potential air quality impacts from dust generated by earthworks, construction and trackout activities was predicted to be **not significant**.
- 6.1.4 The proposed development has the potential to expose future staff and students to elevated pollution levels and impact existing air quality in the vicinity of the site during operation. Dispersion modelling was therefore undertaken using ADMS-Roads in order to predict pollutant concentrations as a result of emissions from the local highway network. Results were subsequently verified using local monitoring data.
- 6.1.5 Review of the dispersion modelling results indicated that impacts on annual mean NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations as a result of traffic generated by the development were predicted to be **negligible** at all sensitive receptor locations.
- 6.1.6 The results of the dispersion modelling assessment also indicated that NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations were predicted to be below the relevant AQOs and AQLV across the development. As such, the site is considered suitable for the proposed use from an air quality perspective.

6.1.7 Following consideration of the relevant issues, air quality impacts as a result of the operation of the development were considered to be **not significant**, in accordance with the IAQM guidance.


6.1.8 Based on the assessment results, air quality factors are not considered a constraint to planning consent for the development.


7.0 **ABBREVIATIONS**


AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
ADM	Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling
AQAP	Air Quality Action Plan
AQLV	Air Quality Limit Value
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
AQO	Air Quality Objective
AQS	Air Quality Strategy
CERC	Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DfT	Department for Transport
DM	Do-Minimum
DMP	Dust Management Plan
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
DS	Do-Something
EB	Eastbound
EFT	Emission Factor Toolkit
EV	Electric Vehicle
GMCA	Greater Manchester Combined Authority
HDV	Heavy Duty Vehicle
IAQM	Institute of Air Quality Management
LA	Local Authority
LAQM	Local Air Quality Management
MCC	Manchester City Council
NB	Northbound
NGR	National Grid Reference
NO ₂	Nitrogen dioxide
NO _x	Oxides of nitrogen
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Policy Guidance
SB	Southbound
SP	Slow Phase
PM ₁₀	Particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 10µm
PM _{2.5}	Particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 2.5µm
WB	Westbound

Z0	Roughness length
----	------------------

Figures








Legend


Title
Figure 3 - Wind Rose of 2019
Manchester Airport Meteorological
Data


Project
Air Quality Assessment
Redby Road, Manchester


Project Reference
5606


Client
Create It Studio Architects



















Appendix 1 - Assessment Input Data

Introduction

The proposed development has the potential to cause air quality impacts as a result of vehicles travelling to and from the site, as well as expose future staff and students to elevated pollution levels. In order to assess NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations at sensitive locations, detailed dispersion modelling was undertaken in accordance with the following methodology.

Dispersion Model

Dispersion modelling was undertaken using the ADMS-Roads dispersion model (version 5.0.1.3). ADMS-Roads is developed by Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants (CERC) and is routinely used throughout the world for the prediction of pollutant dispersion from road sources. Modelling predictions from this software package are accepted within the UK by the Environment Agency and DEFRA.

The model requires input data that details the following parameters:

- Assessment area;
- Traffic flow data;
- Vehicle emission factors;
- Spatial co-ordinates of emissions;
- Street width;
- Meteorological data;
- Roughness length (z_0); and,
- Monin-Obukhov length.

The relevant inputs are detailed in the following Sections.

Assessment Area

Ambient concentrations were predicted over the area NGR: 387130, 397000 to 388220, 398090. One Cartesian grid was used within the model to produce data suitable for contour plotting using the Surfer software package.

Receptors sensitive to potential changes in pollutant concentrations were included in the assessment as outlined in the main report text.

Reference should be made to Figure 11 for a graphical representation of the assessment grid extents.

Traffic Flow Data

Traffic data for use in the assessment, including 24-hour Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) flows and fleet composition, was obtained from the Department for Transport (DfT)¹⁹. The DfT web tool enables the user to view and download traffic flows on every link of the 'A' road and motorway network, as well as the selected minor roads, in Great Britain for the years 1999 to 2020. It should be noted that the DfT web tool is reference in DEFRA guidance²⁰ as being a suitable source of data for air quality assessment and it is therefore considered to provide a reasonable estimate of traffic flows in the vicinity of the site.

Baseline traffic data was converted to the site opening year utilising a factor obtained from TEMPro (version 7.2). This software package has been developed by the DfT to calculate future traffic growth throughout the UK.

Daily traffic movements generated as a result of the development were provided by AMNI Transportation Ltd, the Transport Consultants for the project. These were added to the relevant links to establish the DS flows.

Road widths and vehicle speeds were estimated from aerial photography and UK highway design standards. A summary of the traffic data used in the assessment is provided in Table A1.1.

Table A1.1 Traffic Data

Link		24-hour AADT Flow			HDV Prop. of Fleet (%)	Road Width (m)	Average Vehicle Speed (km/h)
		Verif.	2024 DM	2024 DS			
L1	Ashton Old Road, East of Whitworth Street East	21,159	23,085	23,593	4.24	11.9	40
L2	Ashton Old Road Junction with Whitworth Street East - Slow Phase (SP)	21,159	23,085	23,593	4.24	11.8	20

¹⁹ <https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/#14/53.3690/-2.7272/basemap-countpoints>.

²⁰ Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (TG16), DEFRA, 2021.

Link		24-hour AADT Flow			HDV Prop. of Fleet (%)	Road Width (m)	Average Vehicle Speed (km/h)
		Verif.	2024 DM	2024 DS			
L3	Ashton Old Road, between Welcomb Street and Whitworth Street East	21,159	23,085	23,593	4.24	11.8	40
L4	Ashton Old Road, East of Welcomb Street - SP	21,159	23,085	23,593	4.24	11.6	15
L5	Ashton Old Road, West of Welcomb Street - SP	21,159	23,085	23,593	4.24	10.7	15
L6	Ashton Old Road, West of Clayton Lane South	21,159	23,085	23,593	4.24	12.8	35
L7	Ashton Old Road, East of Junction with Pottery Lane, Westbound (WB) - SP	10,950	11,943	12,197	4.35	10.2	20
L8	Ashton Old Road, East of Junction with Pottery Lane, WB - SP	13,411	14,540	14,624	4.55	6.9	40
L9	Ashton Old Road, West of Junction with Pottery Lane, Eastbound (EB) - SP	13,745	14,901	14,985	4.29	9.9	40
L10	Ashton Old Road, Junction with Pottery Lane, EB - SP	8,168	8,868	8,953	4.11	10.9	20
L11	Ashton Old Road, East of Junction with Pottery Lane, EB - SP	10,210	11,143	11,397	4.11	7.2	20
L12	Alan Turing Way, Southbound (SB)	13,694	14,846	14,930	3.92	6.2	40
L13	Alan Turing Way, SB - SP	10,955	11,850	11,850	3.92	8.9	20
L14	Alan Turing Way Junction with Ashton Old Road, SB - SP	10,955	11,850	11,850	3.92	8.3	20
L15	Pottery Lane SB - SP	10,955	11,850	11,850	3.92	7.1	20
L16	Pottery Lane SB	14,838	16,083	16,168	3.34	7.6	40
L17	Pottery Lane Northbound (NB)	11,814	12,812	12,897	4.07	12.7	40
L18	Pottery Lane NB - SP	11,977	12,988	13,073	3.42	8.7	20
L19	Pottery Lane Junction with Ashton Old Road, NB - SP	11,977	12,988	13,073	3.42	9.1	20
L20	Alan Turing Way, NB - SP	11,977	12,988	13,073	3.42	8.2	20
L21	Alan Turing Way, NB	14,971	16,227	16,312	3.42	7.2	40
L22	Alan Turing Way slip road onto Ashton Old Road - SP	2,739	2,995	3,080	3.92	5.5	20

Link		24-hour AADT Flow			HDV Prop. of Fleet (%)	Road Width (m)	Average Vehicle Speed (km/h)
		Verif.	2024 DM	2024 DS			
L23	Ashton Old Road Junction with Pottery Lane, EB - SP	8,760	9,509	9,847	4.35	10.9	20
L24	Ashton Old Road slip road onto Pottery Lane, SB - SP	2,968	3,243	3,327	3.34	6.1	20
L25	Pottery Lane slip road onto Ashton Old Road, WB - SP	2,363	2,556	2,556	4.07	5.9	20
L26	Ashton Old Road slip road onto Pottery Lane, NB - SP	2,042	2,209	2,209	4.11	5.7	20
L27	Ashton Old Road Junction with Pottery Lane, EB - SP	8,168	8,868	9,207	4.11	10.9	20
L28	Ashton Old Road Junction with Pottery Lane, WB - SP	8,760	9,509	9,593	4.35	10.9	20
L29	Ashton Old Road, East of Odell Street	21,159	23,085	23,593	4.24	11.6	40
L30	Ashton Old Road, East of Odell Street	21,159	22,888	23,396	4.24	10.5	40
L31	Odell Street, South of Ashton Old Road - SP	7,001	7,573	8,081	2.13	7.0	20
L32	Whitworth Street, West of Redby Street	7,001	7,573	8,081	2.13	6.5	25
L33	Whitworth Street, East of Redby Street	7,001	7,573	8,081	2.13	6.6	25
L34	Welcomb Street, South of Ashton Old Road - SP	7,001	7,573	8,081	2.13	6.4	20

Reference should be made to Figure 11 for a graphical representation of the road link locations.

Emission Factors

Emission factors for each link were calculated using the relevant traffic flows and the Emissions Factor Toolkit (EFT) (version 11.0). This has been produced by DEFRA and incorporates COPERT 5.3 vehicle emission factors and fleet information.

Meteorological Data

Meteorological data used in the assessment was taken from Manchester Airport meteorological station over the period 1st January 2019 to 31st December 2019 (inclusive). Manchester Airport is

located at NGR: 381792, 384116, which is approximately 14.7km south-west of the development. It is anticipated that conditions would be reasonably similar over a distance of this magnitude. The data was therefore considered suitable for an assessment of this nature.

All meteorological records used in the assessment were provided by Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling (ADM) Ltd, which is an established distributor of data within the UK. Reference should be made to Figure 3 for a wind rose of utilised meteorological data.

Roughness Length

The z_0 is a modelling parameter applied to allow consideration of surface height roughness elements. A z_0 of 0.5m was used to describe the modelling extents. This value is considered appropriate for the morphology of the area and is suggested within ADMS-Roads as being suitable for 'parkland, open suburbia'.

A z_0 of 0.2m was used to describe the meteorological site. This value is considered appropriate for the morphology of the area and is suggested within ADMS-Roads as being suitable for 'agricultural areas (min)'.

Monin-Obukhov Length

The Monin-Obukhov length provides a measure of the stability of the atmosphere. A minimum Monin-Obukhov length of 30m was used to describe both the modelling extents and the meteorological site. This value is considered appropriate for the nature of both areas and is suggested within ADMS-Roads as being suitable for 'cities and large towns'.

Background Concentrations

Annual mean NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} background concentrations for use in the assessment were obtained from the DEFRA mapping study for the grid square containing the development site, as shown in Table 12.

Background concentrations from 2019 were utilised in preference to the development opening year. This provided a robust assessment and is likely to overestimate pollutant concentrations during the operation of the proposal.

NO_x to NO₂ Conversion

Predicted annual mean NO_x concentrations were converted to NO₂ concentrations using the spreadsheet (version 8.1) provided by DEFRA, which is the method detailed within DEFRA guidance²¹.

Verification

The predicted results from a dispersion model may differ from measured concentrations for a large number of reasons, including:

- Estimates of background concentrations;
- Uncertainties in source activity data such as traffic flows and emission factors;
- Variations in meteorological conditions;
- Overall model limitations; and,
- Uncertainties associated with monitoring data, including locations.

Model verification is the process by which these and other uncertainties are investigated and where possible minimised. In reality, the differences between modelled and monitored results are likely to be a combination of all of these aspects.

For the purpose of the assessment, model verification was undertaken for 2019 using traffic data, meteorological data and monitoring results from this year. The choice of 2019 as the verification year aligns with the IAQM position statement 'Use of 2020 and 2021 Monitoring Datasets'²², which states:

"If you are carrying out an air quality study that includes validation against monitoring data, use 2019 monitoring data as the last typical year"

MCC undertook monitoring of NO₂ concentrations at one location within the vicinity of roads included within the model during 2019. The result was obtained and the road contribution to total NO_x concentration calculated following the methodology contained within DEFRA guidance²³.

²¹ Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (TG16), DEFRA, 2021.

²² Use of 2020 and 2021 Monitoring Datasets, IAQM, 2021.

²³ Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (TG16), DEFRA, 2021.

The monitored annual mean NO₂ concentration and calculated road NO_x concentration is summarised in Table A1.2.

Table A1.2 NO_x Verification - Monitoring Result

Monitoring Location		Monitored NO ₂ Concentration (µg/m ³)	Calculated Road NO _x Concentration (µg/m ³)
MA28NO	Ashton Old Road	31.6	31.50

The annual mean road NO_x concentration predicted from the dispersion model and the 2019 road NO_x concentration calculated from the monitoring result is summarised in Table A1.3.

Table A1.3 NO_x Verification - Modelling Result

Monitoring Location		Calculated Road NO _x Concentration (µg/m ³)	Modelled Road NO _x Concentration (µg/m ³)
MA28NO	Ashton Old Road	31.50	16.46

The monitored and modelled road NO_x concentrations were compared to calculate the associated ratio. This indicated a verification factor of 1.9142 was required to be applied to all modelling results.

Monitoring of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations is not undertaken within the assessment extents. The NO_x verification factor was therefore used to adjust PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} model predictions in lieu of more accurate data in accordance with DEFRA guidance²⁴.

²⁴ Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (TG16), DEFRA, 2021.

Date: 15th August 2022

Ref: 5606

Appendix 2 - Curricula Vitae

KEY EXPERIENCE:

Jethro is a Chartered Environmentalist and Director of Redmore Environmental with specialist experience in the air quality and odour sectors. His key capabilities include:

- Production and management of Air Quality, Dust and Odour Assessments for a wide-range of clients from the retail, residential, infrastructure, commercial and industrial sectors.
- Production and co-ordination of Environmental Permit applications for a variety of industrial sectors.
- Detailed dispersion modelling of road vehicle and industrial emissions using ADMS-Roads, ADMS-5, AERMOD-PRIME and BREEZE-ROADS. Studies have included impact assessment of ground level pollutant and odour concentrations and assessment of suitability of development sites for proposed end-use.
- Project management and co-ordination of Environmental Impact Assessments and scoping reports for developments throughout the UK.
- Provision of expert witness services at Planning Inquiries.
- Design and project management of pollutant monitoring campaigns.
- Co-ordination and management of large-scale multi-disciplinary projects and submissions.
- Provision of expert advice to local government and international environmental bodies, as well as involvement in production of industry guidance.

SELECT PROJECTS SUMMARY:

Industrial

Shanks Waste Management - Odour Assessments of two waste management facilities to support Environmental Permit Applications.

Tatweer Petroleum - dispersion modelling of Bahrain oil field.

Doha South Sewage Treatment Works - AQA for works extension in Qatar.

IRIS Environmental Appraisal Report Reviews, Isle of Man Government - odour assessment reviews.

Lankem, Greater Manchester - Environmental Permit Application for chemical manufacturing plant.

Newport Docks Bulk Drying, Pelleting and CHP Facility - air quality EIA for gas CHP.

Springshades, Leicester - Environmental Permit Variation Application for textile manufacturing plant.

Valspar, Chester - Odour Assessment and production of Odour Management Plan for a paint manufacturing plant in response to neighbour complaints.

Agrivert - dispersion modelling of odour and CHP emissions from numerous AD plants.

James Cropper Paper Mill, Cumbria - air quality EIA, Environmental Permit Variation and Human Health Risk Assessment for new biomass boiler adjacent to SSSI.

Rigg Approach, Leyton - Air Quality Assessment in support of waste transfer site.

Lynchford Lane Waste Transfer Station - biomass facility energy recovery plant.

Barnes Wallis Heat and Power, Cobham - biomass facility adjacent to AQMA.

Residential

Wood St Mill, Bury - residential development adjacent to scrap metal yard.

Hyams Lane, Holbrook - Odour Assessment to support residential development adjacent to sewage works.

North Wharf Gardens, London - peer review of EIA undertaken for large residential development.

Loxford Road, Alford - Air Quality EIA for residential development, included consideration of impacts from associated package sewage works

Elephant and Castle Leisure Centre - baseline AQA for redevelopment.

Carr Lodge, Doncaster - EIA for large residential development.

Queensland Road, Highbury - residential scheme including CHP.

Bicester Ecotown - dispersion modelling of energy centre.

Castleford Growth Delivery Plan - baseline air quality constraints assessment for town redevelopment.

York St, Bury - residential development adjacent to AQMA.

Temple Point Leeds - residential development adjacent to M1.

Commercial and Retail

Etihad Stadium - Air Quality EIA for the extension to the capacity of the Etihad Stadium, Manchester.

Wakefield College - redevelopment of city centre campus in AQMA.

Manchester Airport Cargo Shed - commercial development.

Manchester Airport Apron Extension - EIA including aircraft emission modelling.

National Youth Theatre, Islington - redevelopment to provide new arts space and accommodation.

KEY EXPERIENCE:

Amelia is an Environmental Consultant with specialist experience in the air quality sector. Her key capabilities include:

- Production of Air Quality Assessments in accordance with Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) methodologies for a range of residential, commercial and industrial sectors.
- Detailed dispersion modelling of road vehicle exhaust emissions using ADMS-Roads. Studies have included assessment of road traffic exhaust emissions on sensitive receptors and exposure of new residents to poor air quality.
- Advanced canyon modelling to evaluate the impact of altered urban topography on air quality in built up areas.
- Assessment of construction dust impacts from a range of development sizes.
- Definition of baseline air quality and identification of sensitive areas across the UK.
- Production of air quality mitigation strategies specifically tailored to address issues at individual sites.
- Air quality monitoring at industrial sites to quantify pollutant concentrations
- Odour surveys to assess amenity and suitability of sites for potential future development for residential use.

SELECT PROJECTS SUMMARY:

Eagle House, South Ruislip

Air Quality Assessment for the change of use from an office block to a hotel in an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Concerns were raised regarding the exposure of future occupants to poor air quality due to road traffic emissions. Detailed dispersion modelling was undertaken using ADMS-roads to assess PM₁₀ and NO₂ concentrations across the site as well as an Air Quality Neutral Assessment in accordance with the London Plan requirements. Results revealed that pollution levels were below the air quality standards across the development.

Parr Bridge, Tyldesley

Air Quality Assessment to support a residential development of 154 units. Dispersion modelling was undertaken due to the proximity of the site to an AQMA. Using sensitive receptors located in areas where increased road traffic may affect NO₂ levels, a comparison was made between concentrations with and without the development in place. Results indicated the impacts were not significant.

St James's Street, Westminster

Air Quality Assessment in support of a mixed-use development in an AQMA. Dispersion modelling was undertaken at several different heights reflective of residential units within the development. Predicted concentrations of NO₂ were found to exceed air quality criteria from ground to third floor level. As such, mitigation was specified for the affected units to ensure future residents would not be exposed to poor air quality.

Rookery Avenue, Whiteley, Farnborough

Odour Impact Assessment in support of a hot food takeaway with a drive thru facility in Whiteley. The assessment considered a number of factors, including the scale and nature of potential emissions, the location of nearest receptors and the proposed cooking type in accordance with the relevant DEFRA guidance. An appropriate ventilation system was identified and described on the basis of the assessment results.

Hoole Way, Chester

Air Quality Assessment in support of an eight-storey student accommodation block to provide circa 373 units on land off Hoole Way, Chester. Concerns had been raised in relation to the potential exposure of future occupants to elevated pollution concentrations. An assessment was therefore undertaken using dispersion modelling in order to quantify air quality conditions across the site. The results revealed that the use of good practice control measures would provide suitable mitigation for the development.

St James Place, Liverpool

Air Quality Assessment in support of a residential-led development located across three different sites in an AQMA on land off St James Place, Liverpool. Detailed dispersion modelling was undertaken with the inclusion of advanced canyon modelling to evaluate the impact of the urban topography within the locality on the dispersion of traffic related pollutants. The results revealed pollutant concentrations were below the relevant standards across the site.

KEY EXPERIENCE:

Ceri is an Environmental Consultant with specialist experience in the air quality sector. Her key capabilities include:

- Production of Air Quality Assessments in accordance with DEFRA methodologies for a range of residential, commercial and industrial sectors.
- Detailed dispersion modelling of road vehicle exhaust emissions using ADMS-Roads. Studies have included assessment of road traffic exhaust emissions on sensitive receptors and exposure of new residents to poor air quality.
- Advanced Canyon Modelling to evaluate the impact of altered urban topography on air quality in built up areas.
- Assessment of construction dust impacts from a range of development sizes.
- Definition of baseline air quality and identification of sensitive areas across the UK.
- Odour surveys to assess amenity and suitability of sites for potential future development for residential use.

SELECT PROJECTS SUMMARY:

Warren Street, Stockport

Air Quality Assessment in support of a residential-led development comprising 553 apartments and two commercial units located in an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The development had the potential to expose future occupants to poor air quality and cause impacts at sensitive locations. Detailed dispersion modelling and a construction dust assessment indicated air quality factors were not a constraint to the development.

Belgrave Gate, Leicester

Air Quality Assessment in support of the conversion of an existing building to provide three residential units on Belgrave Gate, Leicester. The scheme was located in an AQMA, alongside a bus station. As such, the development had potential to expose future residents to elevated pollution levels and adverse air quality effects. Results of detailed dispersion modelling utilising advanced canyons and a volume source to represent the bus station indicated air quality issues were not a constraint to planning consent for the development.

Kings Arms Hotel, Stansted

Odour Assessment in support of a Discharge of Condition application for a consented development on land to the rear of the Kings Arms Hotel, Stansted. The site was located in close proximity to several fast food restaurants which have the potential to cause odour emissions during normal operation. A mitigation scheme was therefore identified to protect future residents from loss of amenity. Subject to the inclusion of the specified mitigation, overall effects of odour were considered to be not significant at the development.

Manchester Road West, Little Hulton

Odour Assessment in support of construction of 152 residences on land off Manchester Road West, Little Hulton. The development was located in the vicinity of several waste management facilities which may form a source of odour emissions and cause loss of amenity for future residents. A two stage Odour Assessment was undertaken to assess baseline conditions across the site and consider the risk of reduced amenity. Results of the assessment indicated odour effects at the site did not represent a constraint to planning consent.

Gravel Pit Farm, Sand Hutton

Odour Assessment in support of the conversion of existing buildings into two residential dwellings on land at Gravel Pit Farm, Sand Hutton. The development was located in the vicinity of the Sand Hutton Anaerobic Digestion Plant, which may form a source of odour emissions and cause loss of amenity for future residents. Results of a two stage Odour Assessment indicated odour effects at the site were not significant. As such, odour was not considered to represent a constraint to planning consent.

A1 Trunk Road, Long Bennington

Odour Assessment in support of a residential development on land off the A1 Trunk Road, Long Bennington. The development was located in the vicinity of a maggot farm growing bait for fishermen. Results of a two stage Odour Assessment indicated that at the location of the proposed dwellings, impacts were not at a level considered to cause loss of amenity as a result of emissions. As such, odour was not considered to represent a constraint to planning consent.