

Adam Webber***Note on air quality monitoring figures***

FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY COMMENCING ON 10th OCTOBER 2017

SITE

The scheme is located on the Torrington Place / Tavistock Place Corridor, between the junctions with Tottenham Court Road and Judd Street

SUBJECT OF PUBLIC INQUIRY

The Camden (Torrington Place to Tavistock Place) (Prescribed Routes, Waiting and Loading Restrictions and Loading Places) Traffic Order [2017]

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE:

DPI/X5210/17/8

CAMDEN REFERENCE:

SC/2017/04

1 Clarification on figures in Proof of Evidence (Adam Webber)

- 1.1 Paragraph 3.9 in my Proof of Evidence cites an overall reduction in Camden's 2016 NO₂ levels compared to a baseline of 2010 of 4.5%. As the Proof notes, this figure reflects diffusion tube data only. Professor Laxen reworks the data claiming anomalous or missing data. Upon re-examination, this should read 5.5%.
- 1.2 For this original analysis in my Proof, where data was not available for 2010, the oldest data on file was used as a proxy. This method was used for sites CA25 and WITT.
- 1.3 The data used in the analysis in this note and in my Proof of Evidence can be found in Appendix 1 of my main Proof.

2 Monitoring results analysis 2010-2016

- 2.1 As set out in my Proof of Evidence (Table 3), I have taken the Trial area monitoring to consist of monitoring stations CD9, LB, CA10 and CA6. I also noted in 3.8 that CD9 (Euston Road) has data starting in 2011.
- 2.2 In Professor Laxen's note, he suggests a manipulation of the data to exclude two sites (CA21 and CA24) due to anomalous results in their first year. He also excludes three sites (CA25, WITT and CD9) due to a lack of data for 2010. In this analysis I accept Professor Laxen's treatment of CA21 and CA24, and leave these two sites out of this analysis. I use the available data to generate trend lines to establish 2010 figures for CA25, WITT and CD9 (see the graphs in Appendix 1 of this note). This is particularly relevant for the Euston Road (CD9) site given its location within the Trial area and the fact it began collecting data in 2011, only one year after the 2010 baseline.
- 2.3 The results are shown as follows:
 - The Trial area (4 sites): CD9, LB, CA10 and CA6
 - Elsewhere in Camden (CA4, CA7, CA11, CA15, CA16, CA17, CA20, CA23, CA25, WITT, CD1 and CD3)
 - All sites

Area	Mean NO ₂ readings (µg/m ³)		
	2010 mean	2016 mean	% change
Trial sites	66.32	50.25	-24.23
Elsewhere in Camden	69.69	61.48	-11.80
All sites	68.85	58.60	-14.89

Table 1: Trends across three areas in Camden, 2010-16

- 2.4 The results in Table 1 reflect that the updated calculations show that the reduction in NO₂ emissions in the Trial area in 2016 compared to 2010 are higher than the overall NO₂ emissions reduction over the same time period for the rest of the borough.

3 Monitoring results analysis 2014-16

3.1 I have also captured the difference in results from the final full year of data before the Trial was introduced (2014) and the first full year of data with the Trial in place (2016). For this analysis CA21 and CA24 are reintroduced into the dataset as their results for 2014 are not deemed anomalous.

3.2 The results are shown as follows:

- The Trial area (4 sites): CD9, LB, CA10 and CA6
- Elsewhere in Camden (CA4, CA7, CA11, CA15, CA16, CA17, CA20, CA21, CA23, CA24, CA25, WITT, CD1 and CD3)
- All sites

Area	Mean NO ₂ readings (µg/m ³)		
	2014 mean	2016 mean	% change
Trial sites	56.46	50.25	-11.00
Elsewhere in Camden	62.80	60.85	-3.11
All sites	61.40	58.49	-4.74

Table 2 Trends across three areas in Camden, 2014-16

3.3 The results in Table 2 show that when comparing the most recent full years of data before and after the Trial's introduction (2014 and 2016), the Trial area, like in Table 1, show greater reductions in NO₂ levels compared to the rest of the borough.

4 Conclusions

4.1 The analysis that I have presented shows that by comparing the most recent full year's monitoring data (2016) to two different baseline years (2010 and 2016), the area of the Trial has experienced a greater reduction in NO₂ air pollution than the borough as a whole. This is wholly consistent with the conclusions drawn in paragraph 5.6 of my proof of evidence.

APPENDIX 1

Graphs showing the trend lines used to generate 2010 figures for CD9, CA25 and WITT.

