Hi Gary

Stuart and I have some comments for Chestnut Lodge regarding noise and air quality. Stuarts noise and AQ comments are below and I have some additional AQ comments in this email. **There will be further comments in due course which I will aim to have with you once I've discussed with Neil.** We feel that it is important both AQ and noise are considered alongside one another as it's likely a ventilation system will need to be designed to address both issues.

The following comments are based on an Air Quality Assessment produced by Assessments for Chestnut Lodge, Eastleigh.
Document Number: J0143/1/F1
Date: May 2017

The use of the CURED emissions factors incorporated into the model is welcomed as a worst case scenario. The concentrations from table 5 (NO_2 CURED V2A) provide the basis for my comments.

- The impact assessment based on IAQM Guidance on land-use planning and development control: Planning for air quality January 2017 (v1.2) section 7.13 determines that the impact on sensitive users is significant.
  "Where the air quality is such that an air quality objective at the building façade is not met, the effect on residents or occupants will be judged as significant, unless provision is made to reduce their exposure by some means"
- Therefore the Air Quality Assessment suggests a mitigation strategy of mechanically ventilated air drawn from the roof. In principal a mechanical ventilation system drawing air from a clean air source may sufficiently mitigate poor air quality, however there is no further detail given to the mitigation strategy in terms of system specification, how it will be incorporated into the design of the development, how it will effectively reduce exposure of the sensitive end users to the significant air quality impact and how continued maintenance of all aspects of the system can be achieved.
- The proposed development section 1.1.3 explains that a three storey block of 12 apartments will be constructed (Design and Access Statement 794-005), however there are also 2 storey buildings forming part of the application on the Chestnut Avenue facing façade. The conclusion to draw air from the roofs of the buildings where concentrations are between 21.5ugm^{-3} and 23.4ugm^{-3} at 10m is not correct for the two storey section of the development, which, based on Drawing 794-d-206 is less than 10m in height. A view on the impact of drawing air from a lower level from the author would have been beneficial.
- The layout of the proposed development 794-D-201 shows the new development encroaching closer to the source of poor air quality at Southampton Road and Chestnut Avenue.
- I note that there is considerable uncertainty in the model, such that a factor of 5.6 was required for adjustment.

Thanks

Rob

Robert Gloyns
Scientific Officer
Housing and Environmental Health
Ext: 8339