

Proposed Mixed Use Development Sandlesford Park, Newbury, West Berkshire

APP/27 Proof of Evidence Summary

Nigel Mann, Air Quality

A106825-1

7th April 2021

- 1.01 My name is Nigel Mann. I am currently employed as a Director - Environmental Scientist at Tetra Tech Limited. I have twenty-three years' experience in air quality assessment, management and enforcement.
- 1.02 I have studied and reviewed the documentation submitted in support of the planning application and this appeal. I am familiar with the assessment methodologies and have discussed the site-specific considerations relating to Air Quality at length and I am familiar with the details of the scheme.
- 1.03 The Reason for Refusal number 12 of the Application Decision Notice states that '*the proposal provides insufficient information regarding the likely impacts on air quality of the development proposed*'.
- 1.04 The ecological sites outlined within the reason for refusal have been assessed within a supplementary document (ref. A106825-1 Air Quality Technical Note dated September 2020). This Assessment concludes that whilst NO_x concentrations are predicted to increase at the Ecological Receptor locations cited within the reason for refusal, this increase does not exceed the limit at which 'harm' is determined to have been caused. As such I do not consider this reason for refusal to be valid.
- 1.05 Operational phase mitigation measures are proposed through the implementation of a Travel Plan, to help reduce the potential impacts of road traffic emissions associated with the development. Mitigation will reduce any impact the development is predicted to have on modelled receptor locations. This is therefore in line with the policies set out in the reason for refusal and the application should not have been refused on air quality grounds. As a result of the above conclusions, I consider that the development is acceptable with regards to air quality.
- 1.06 For additional context and completeness, the comments and concerns raised by third parties have been reviewed and responded to. The comments and concerns are considered to have been addressed within the Air Quality Assessment (dated January 2020) and this proof of evidence and I conclude that none of these comments are valid or would have provided evidence to support a reason for refusal of the application on grounds of Air Quality.