

Land South of Grange Park, Quinton Road, Northampton.

Application for up to 300 dwellings & Primary School

Ref: Application Number: S/2019/0856/MAO

Appellant's Name: Manor Oak Homes

Appeal reference: APP/Z2830/W/20/3251622

PRESENTATION SPEECH AGAINST APPEAL - 20th October 2020

Sir, firstly I thank you for allowing me the time to speak.

My name is Robert Atkinson.

I am currently the elected Member for Hackleton Ward and I represent both the parishes of Hackleton and Quinton. Hackleton Ward with Quinton are adjacent to the appeal site.

I am speaking as a Third Party on behalf of the future residents of the appeal site.

In summary, my objection is that of the Noise and Air Quality associated with the site and the high risks faced by possible future residents.

I do not purport to be a qualified person in Noise & Air Quality so my statements as follows are based on Common-Sense and experience relating to both of the issues.

I and my immediate neighbours live on the edge of Hackleton approximately 1kilometre (as the crow fly's) from the Northampton International Raceway Stadium which is noted in **(Appendix-1)** and indicated in red ink.

The stadium has frequent stock car events, especially during the Summer months.

When the wind blows from the prevailing south-westerly direction, the sound and exhaust fumes from the Stadium are blown away from our properties, but if the wind is coming from the north-east the noise is truly horrendous (you would think the race track to be in the back garden) and the smell of the exhaust fumes are most noticeable due to the high octane fuel used.

For information I have attached another map noted in **(Appendix-1A)**

this shows the appeal site in relationship to Hackleton village which is 4 kilometres away and on a prevailing windy day you can hear the distant roar of the M1 Motorway traffic.

If we now translate this analogy to the proposed application, when the 6 lane M1 Motorway which is bad enough becomes one of 8 Lanes and even worse (due for completion 2022 to 2023) there will be an increased level in both noise and air quality issues over the proposed site. It can be said that the Appellant did not model for an 8 Lane Motorway, consequently, these current figures can be considered irrelevant as they will change in 2023, but unfortunately they won't be considered anyway.

Resource and Environmental Consultants Limited were commissioned by Manor Oak Homes to undertake an **Air Quality Assessment, dated March 2019 noted as AQ104969r2** in support of the proposed residential development.

An extract from the assessment report headed "**Executive Summary**" reads as follows and noted in **(Appendix-2)**

"The proposals comprise the development of the site to provide up to 330 **(now 300 and a Primary School)** residential dwellings with associated infrastructure. The proposed development is located in close proximity to the M1, which is considered a significant source of road vehicle exhaust emissions and as such, there is potential for the development to introduce future site users to poor air quality.

Due to the scale and location of the proposed works, the development has the potential to cause adverse impacts to existing pollution levels at **nearby sensitive receptors** during the construction and operational phases. An Air Quality Assessment is therefore required in order to define baseline conditions, assess site suitability for the proposed end-use and consider effects as a result of the development".

These so-called nearby Sensitive Receptor Locations are shown as being along the Wootton/Quinton Road and further afield.

These can be seen in the plan drawing **noted as Figure 10, ADMS- Roads Input. Project Number AQ104969** - noted in **(Appendix- 3)**

I see no reference to any receptors being placed within the site and only references to modelling. The Plan shows the nearest Receptors to be more than double the distance away from the proposed development and the Diffusion Tube Monitoring Locations are several kilometres away and in no way can they give any true on-site figures at the proposed location.

The prevailing winds blow from the south-west to north-east and the atmospheric conditions over and around motorways especially during a 'High Pressure Weather Event' are a dreadful experience, you can see the ever expanding tunnel of contamination from thousands of lorry and car exhaust systems pushing out pollution over the motorway and beyond. The pollution would contaminate all the proposed properties and the primary school.

To my way of thinking, the positioning of High Sensitive Receptors should be spaced along the line of the proposed first row of properties, a second row midway across the site and a row to the rear of the site. If positioned there for at least 6 to 9 months, they would give more credence to any air quality and noise emission figures instead of the modelling, assumptions, assessments and predictions etc. quoted within the above mentioned report by REC Ltd.

I would especially request that several High Sensitive Receptors are positioned around the proposed Primary school area, because as a recent article in a well-known newspaper showed, children who breathe in traffic fumes from birth may suffer brain changes linked to the development of various physical and mental processes. It is also well known that 1 in 11 people die early due to diseases associated with toxic traffic (Nitrogen Dioxide NO₂ and Particulate Matter PM_{2.5/10}) emissions. Current evidence indicates that air pollution is also associated with cardiovascular disease, asthma and strokes. Air pollution disproportionately affects the young, the old and those with cardiopulmonary conditions and the most deprived in our communities.

I would now like to turn to the Noise issues.

The Noise Assessment Report was undertaken by Resource & Environmental Consultants (R.E.C.) Dated 29th August 2019 Ref. AC104966-3r0

Firstly with reference to the **Appellant's Statement of Case** by **Armstrong Rigg Planning ref: 00618/s0004 and dated April 2020** under Appendix 3 – Committee Report.

9.97- Noise Assessment Report informs us as to where the main sources of noise are situated as being the M1 and surrounding areas.

9.98 - informs us of the proposed developer's mitigation methods which include...

- An earth bund 2m tall with a 2m tall acoustic fence along the top, running along the site's boundary with the M1.
- High specification glazing on certain elevations facing the M1 to reduce noise penetration into dwellings.
- Alternative ventilation for certain elevation to both reduce the need to open windows (which can increase noise exposure) and reduce noise penetration through the ventilation itself.

The 1st Bullet point infers that the acoustic fence will prevent noise. This is totally incorrect, it only helps to reduce it. Noise will still be heard, especially at night, also noise will be leaking over onto the site beyond the acoustic fencing carried by the prevailing wind.

The 2nd Bullet point admits that noise from the M1 would have to be mitigated by using high-spec glazing on certain elevations. I would have thought that all of the dwellings on the site should be fitted out with this type of glazing. In the height of Summer it's nice to have the windows open and let the fresh air in, to air-out the house, but of course by doing that, residents would only be letting in contaminated air emissions and noise.

Taking the 3rd Bullet point into consideration, relating to alternative ventilation, I feel that the developer has generally ignored the problems and chosen to make every dwelling a fortress with double-glazing and high fencing, which may partly work acoustically, but won't stop Nitrogen Dioxide and Particulate emissions from entering the gardens and housing spaces.

Noise Survey Results - Road Traffic Sound Survey – M1

R.E.C. Ltd conducted a Road Traffic Noise Survey in order to measure the level of noise generated by vehicles using the M1 Motorway. **Survey dated 29th August 2019 Ref:AC104966-3r0.** The time period 10:00 Thursday 25th January 2018 to 10:00 26th January 2018 was used for the survey in accordance with the measurement procedure as noted in **(Appendix - 4)**

R.E.C states “The following noise measurement position was chosen for the Road Traffic Noise Survey:

Noise Measurement Position 1 (NMP1): Located on the western boundary of the Site approximately 4m from the nearside carriageway edge of the M1.

The microphone was located 1.5m above ground level and in free-field conditions.

Noise sources at this location consisted predominantly of vehicle pass-bys on the M1.

A summary of the measured sound pressure levels from the Road Traffic Noise Survey are presented in Tables and can be viewed within the R.E.C. Report”.

The Results Table confirmed (as can be expected) that the decibel readings were well above the desired 50 decibel range. The Table shows a recorded range of approximately 60 to 81.9 decibels over a 20 hour period. These results though do not indicate which way the wind was blowing at the time, if it wasn't the prevailing south-westerly the figures would be worse.

Sir, can I respectfully suggest that when you and others visit the site, you stand and face the Motorway and consider the wind direction – if it is blowing into your faces then that is the prevailing wind with the noise and smells, but also please take into consideration, that the noise will be quieter and the emissions will be smaller due to the current 50mph speed restrictions which are in place while the extra 2 lanes are constructed and as stated earlier will be due for completion in 2022-23.

To Conclude, the two issues I have covered in this Statement – “Air Quality” and “Noise” can both effect the mental and physical well-being of any future residents, which are serious considerations. I do have to say that I find the statement within the Appellants Statement of Case quite arrogant in the extreme, in that on page 24 they make a statement at 6.26 and noted in **(Appendix – 5)**

Quote - “Ultimately it will be concluded that noise levels and air quality levels across the site are entirely acceptable and conducive to safe living. In which case it will be demonstrated that the appeal application is entirely in accordance with paragraph 170(e) of the NPPF.” Unquote.

To my way of thinking the Appellant is more in contravention of paragraph 170 (e) and 180 to 182 within the National Planning Policy Framework. The statement goes against all that the policies stand for, namely that a site being so close to such a source of pollution, would place future residents and schoolchildren at risk of exposure to high levels of poor air quality and noise and not as indicated in the appellants above statement - as noted in **(Appendix-6).**

Page 4.

Sir, for the reasons stated, I would therefore like to request that the appeal be **refused**.

Thank you.

Robert G. Atkinson.

*Robert G. Atkinson-Councillor for Hackleton Ward
South Northamptonshire Council
E-mail SNC: Bob.Atkinson@southnorthants.gov.uk*

.....