

**APPENDIX 7.5**  
**CONSULTATION RESPONSE**



## APPENDIX 7.5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

**Job Name:** Nestle Site  
**Job No:** 37205  
**Note No:** 1  
**Date:** 15<sup>th</sup> June 2016  
**Prepared By:** Kiri Heal  
**Subject:** Air Quality Assessment

Item	Subject
1.	Ian Thynne Principal Sustainability Officer 01895 558326 <a href="mailto:ithynne@hillingdon.gov.uk">ithynne@hillingdon.gov.uk</a>
2.	Spoke to Ian regarding scoping opinion (13 <sup>th</sup> May 2016)
3.	LBH are very concerned about the air quality at this location.
4.	<u>Traffic</u>  Discussed baseline scenario - we will model the traffic currently associated with the site, i.e. zero traffic. The difference with the scheme will therefore be larger than the transport assessment. Transport consultants are assuming a baseline based on previous site use. IT agreed we should be assuming no traffic currently generated at site.
5.	<u>Impact Assessment</u>  The scoping opinion states ' <i>The Scoping Report does not set out the methodology for assessing (or 'scoring') the air quality impacts and determining the effects.</i> ' Inquired about 'scoring' system and discussed IAQM and EPUK guidance (Land-use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality).  IT is aware of the IAQM/EPUK guidance but in this area they will class any impact on air quality as significant. We can use the guidance, however we also have to discuss this location, planning policy, action plan. They are trying to improve air quality in the borough and therefore anything which effects air quality will have a significant effect on their efforts (policy, action plan).  The Council considers that any increase in air pollution should be described as high and therefore a significant effect, therefore any development in the area which increases vehicles by any amount is significant. IT is aware the development will lead to an increase in traffic and therefore will be significant.  Scoping opinion noted (and IT reiterated) ' <i>It is important to note that a significant environmental effect should not automatically result in a refusal. It should be a matter for identifying mitigation that is appropriate and tailored to the effect identified.</i> ' He would like us to use the significant impact to approach mitigation.  Agreed we would carry out an assessment based on IAQM/EPUK as usual and then include a discussion of the impacts in relation to the Council's views/polices/action plan.

Deleted: ES2017  
February  
2017

6.	<p><u>Emission Factors</u></p> <p>Discussed emission factors. Explained we would take into account by applying emission factors for an early year. For example, if the opening year is 2018 we will use 2015, if the opening year is 2025 we will use an earlier year such as 2020 etc.</p> <p>IT happy with this approach. Discuss the approach in report.</p>
7.	<p><u>Monitoring</u></p> <p>We will verify using 2015 data. Contact Val Beale to obtain data. <a href="mailto:VBeale@hillington.gov.uk">VBeale@hillington.gov.uk</a></p>

Deleted: ES2017  
February  
2017