

Appeal by Taylor Wimpey and Homes England: Pickering’s Farm Site, Flag Lane, Penwortham

(PINS Appeal refs: APP/F2360/W/22/3295498, APP/F2360/W/22/3295502)

Reason for Refusal 8. Air Quality SOCG – Scott Schedule (Agreed 12th July 2022)

Table A: Common Ground (i.e. Matters Agreed)

Matter	The Agreed Position
AQ Assessment Method	<p>The ENSAFE technical assessment (ES Chapter and Appendices) submitted with the Planning Application(s) has been undertaken in line with the Councils low emissions strategy methodology: <i>‘Planning Advisory Note (PAN) – Low Emissions and Air Quality’</i>.</p> <p>[This has been confirmed in Environmental Health response to Development Management, Dated 16th November 2021.]</p>
AQ Assessment Findings	<p>The air quality report methodology and conclusion are acceptable, subject to traffic numbers (i.e. model inputs) being accurate, see ‘matters not agreed’ below.</p> <p>[This has been confirmed in Environmental Health response to Development Management, Dated 16th November 2021.]</p>
AQ Damage Costs: Calculation	<p>The method for calculation of AQ damage costs is acceptable. The damage cost on air quality for the development amounts to £252,046.</p> <p>[This has been confirmed in Environmental Health response to Development Management, Dated 16th November 2021.]</p>
AQ Damage Costs: Mechanisms for Investment	<p>SRBC’s ‘Planning Advisory Note (PAN) – Low Emissions and Air Quality’ paragraph 3.6 allows for both targeted measures and also a financial contribution towards wider compensatory measures, typically including investment in local fleets, road networks or low emission infrastructure. Any monies should be ringfenced for spend on the Council identified AQ measures within the wider area of the development.</p> <p>[confirmed in N. Martin SRBC Environmental Health response to M. Stoling, Dated 31st May 2022]</p>

S.106 agreement	<p>The provision of a S.106 agreement allowing the total damage cost sum to be payable to the Council at an agreed instalment rate based on the development progress would be acceptable as a way of dealing with the damage / mitigation measures for the air quality issue. Any monies would be ringfenced for spend on the Council identified AQ measures within the wider area of the development.</p> <p>[confirmed in N. Martin SRBC Environmental Health response to M. Stoling, Dated 31st May 2022]</p>
-----------------	---

Table B: Matters Not Agreed

Matter	The Appellant's Case	The Council's Case
Inputs: Traffic Data	<p>That the traffic input data used in the air quality assessment is appropriate for purposes of the air quality assessment.</p> <p>[Note: this is a matter for the Appellant's Highways Witness]</p>	<p>That the traffic input data used in the air quality assessment is not appropriate for purposes of the air quality assessment.</p> <p>[Note: this is a matter for the Lancashire Council / SRBC Highways Witness]</p>

Signed 
Neil Martin
Senior Environmental Health Officer

Date: 12/07/22

On behalf of South Ribble Borough Council

Signed 
Matthew Stoling
Director, Isopleth Ltd.

Date: 12/07/22

On behalf of the Appellants