



CHELTENHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Notice of a meeting of
Cabinet**

**Tuesday, 21 January 2020
6.00 pm
Pittville Room - Municipal Offices**

Membership	
Councillors:	Steve Jordan, Flo Clucas, Chris Coleman, Rowena Hay, Alex Hegenbarth, Peter Jeffries and Andrew McKinlay

Agenda

4.	PUBLIC AND MEMBER QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS These must be received no later than 12 noon on the fourth working day before the date of the meeting	(Pages 3 - 6)

Contact Officer: Bev Thomas, Democratic Services Team Leader, 01242 264246
Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

25 March 2019

Public Questions (total)

1.	Question from Tabitha Joy to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	The most recent data shows that town centre pollution, and traffic volumes, are either actually increasing or staying the same. Does the council therefore accept that the AQAP has been ineffective?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	The current AQMA (and resultant action plan) covers the entire borough. Taken across the whole borough, the results do suggest a slow reduction in NO ₂ levels. The area highlighted has seen less improvement, although there is no method of assessing what levels would be without the current AQAP. The revised AQMA, to be followed by a new AQAP, will focus on securing improvements in pollution levels in precisely this area.
2.	Question from Peter Frings to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Is the council aware that a recent dispersion modelling study by another consultancy firm, (Air Quality Consultants, hired by GCC, regarding the proposed Leckhampton School) challenges the results given in the Bureau Veritas report? Given that this highlights how unreliable the modelling process used by both consultants is, how can the council base such a major decision on such dubious methodology?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	There is a degree of uncertainty in all models. The detailed model prepared by Bureau Veritas used data from across the town, rather than a very limited area around a proposed development, and used different source data, so unsurprisingly their results are different. The boundaries of the AQMA are based on modelling and monitoring results obtained over a number of years.
3.	Question from Peter Frings to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	The modelling by Bureau Veritas predicts NO ₂ exceedances at 4 locations. Why is the council proposing that the new AQMA only covers one of these?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	In section 5.1 The Detailed Model predicts exceedance or <i>near exceedance</i> of the NO ₂ limit at 4 locations. Monitoring is being carried out to further define the boundaries of any areas of exceedance. Of the locations identified, the junction of Gloucester Road/Princess Elizabeth Way is of most concern, and where monitoring resources will be concentrated. This approach is in accordance with the recommendations in section 6.3. . If our monitoring indicates failures of any

	limits then further AQMA's will be declared but at this stage due to the relative uncertainty associated with models we do not feel it appropriate to declare AQMA's based on this model alone.
4.	Question from Adrian Becker to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Does the Council accept that in the light of the government's Clean Air Strategy (May 2019), it must include a monitoring programme and action plan for tackling PM _{2.5} particulate pollution in its proposed new AQAP?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	Monitoring of PM _{2.5} is being introduced from January 2020 at 9 locations across the town. Results from this monitoring will be used to inform future actions, which will be included in a new AQAP, and could include declaration of further AQMAs.
5.	Question from Adrian Becker to the Cabinet Member Development and Safety, Councillor Andrew McKinlay
	Initial evidence from monitoring of PM _{2.5} particulate pollution by Leckhampton with Warden Hill Parish Council shows that air quality in Leckhampton is in breach of the WHO guidelines – the WHO guidelines that the DEFRA Clean Air Strategy is committed to achieving. Does the council therefore accept that it makes no sense to restrict the AQMA just to a tiny area of the town centre?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	The boundaries of the revised AQMA are based on data obtained over a number of years from monitoring NO ₂ across the town. The AQMA is focussed on dealing with the area of worst air pollution in the Borough. This approach has received the approval of DEFRA. Monitoring of PM _{2.5} is being introduced from January 2020 and will be used to inform future actions.

Cabinet

21st January 2020

Member Questions (3)

1.	Question from Councillor David Willingham to Cabinet Member Clean & Green Environment, Councillor Chris Coleman
	Q) The Clean Air Act gives the council powers to designate Smoke Control Areas. The council's online mapping suggests that only some parts of the town are covered. Given issues around pollution (in this case PM10 and PM2.5 as well as climate change) can the council consider whether it would be beneficial for all of the urban and proposed urban extension parts of the town to be subject to these controls?
	Response from Cabinet Member Clean & Green Environment
	The government has consulted on repealing the Clean Air Act, as part of a wider review of AQ powers. A final decision has not been made. The Act makes it an offence to emit smoke from a chimney of residential premises, unless using an approved fuel or appliance. To take any formal action you have to see the smoke and know what fuel is being burnt, and on what appliance. There may be other controls that can be applied to new developments through the planning process that are more appropriate.
2.	Question from Councillor David Willingham to Cabinet Member Clean & Green Environment, Councillor Chris Coleman
	Q) I am concerned about the following two locations: B4633 Gloucester Road outside Gloucester Road Primary School and Alstone Lane close to level crossing. If there are monitoring resources, getting a year's worth of data would seem worthwhile. As far as I can establish from the council's Air Quality mapping data, those two locations in St Peter's ward have not had any monitoring in the period 2013-2018. The reason for my concerns are details below for each location: There is frequently queuing traffic heading westbound on Gloucester Road outside Gloucester Road Primary School. These traffic queues feed directly into the proposed shrunken AQMA. I understand that studies have shown that air pollution has a worse effect on children, so prior to the AQMA being shrunk, could I please request that consideration is given to having air quality monitoring equipment installed outside Gloucester Road Primary School?
	Response from Cabinet Member Clean & Green Environment
	There will be monitoring outside Gloucester Road School, starting in early 2020 We will have a NOx tube there from the first changeover of 2020 We will have a Mesh pod installed as soon as they are back from being serviced, updated, and calibrated.
3.	Question from Councillor David Willingham to Cabinet Member Clean & Green Environment, Councillor Chris Coleman
	Q) In light of the considerable traffic queues caused by long barrier down times at the level crossing and idling diesel trains in the sidings, could I request that air quality monitoring is established in close proximity to Alstone Lane level crossing?
	Response from Cabinet Member Clean & Green Environment
	Alstone Lane is not on our plan for 2020. The modelled levels from the Detailed Modelling Assessment we commissioned last year are published here: https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/downloads/file/7829/detailed_modelling_assessment_2019

<p>That shows the nearest modelled NO₂ levels at the junction of Gloucester Rd / St Georges Rd / Alstone Lane as 24.9 & 29.8 ug/m³ at St Georges Gate and The Kings Arms, respectively. These levels are considerably below the annual limit, and levels on approach roads to that junction (even in proximity to the level crossing) will be lower. We only have a limited budget for equipment, which is being deployed to areas of concern where we need more data on pollutant levels.</p>
--