

planning  
transport  
design  
environment  
infrastructure

Document 3.1 – ES Volume 2

Appendix 5.5: Air Quality – Traffic Impacts

Wheelabrator Kemsley (K3 Generating Station) and Wheelabrator Kemsley North  
(WKN) Waste to Energy Facility DCO

September 2019 -Submission Version

PINS ref: EN010083



# Appendix 5.5: Traffic-Related Emissions

## Methodology

### Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling of Pollutant Concentrations

- 1.1 The ADMS-Roads model has been used in this assessment to predict the air quality impacts from changes in traffic on the local road network. This is a version of the Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System (ADMS), a formally validated model developed in the UK by Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants Ltd (CERC) and widely used in the UK and internationally for regulatory purposes.

### Model Input Data

#### Traffic Flow Data

- 1.2 Traffic data used in the assessment have been provided by the project's transport consultants, RPS. The traffic flow data provided for this assessment are summarised in Tables 5.5.1 to 5.5.5. The modelled road links are illustrated in Figure 5.2.

#### K3 Proposed Development

##### *Construction Phase*

- 1.3 The air quality assessment for the permitted K3 did not quantitatively assess the effects of construction traffic on air quality as construction traffic flows were expected to be lower than operational traffic flows. The operational traffic flows are considered later in this chapter.

##### *Operational Phase*

**Table 5.5.1 Traffic Data Used Within the Assessment – K3 (Operation), 2021**

Road Link Name	Speed (km.hr <sup>-1</sup> )	Daily Two Way Vehicle Flow			
		Without Development		With Development	
		LDV	HDV	LDV	HDV
1 - Swale Way East of B2005 Grovehurst Roundabout	64.07	17044	3037	17091	3427
2 - Barge Way North of Swale Roundabout	44.40	5003	2279	5048	2673
3 - Barge Way, East of Fleet End Roundabout	62.70	2304	915	2353	1308
4 - A249 South of Swale Way Junction	112.65	34547	5107	34594	5493

Road Link Name	Speed (km.hr <sup>-1</sup> )	Daily Two Way Vehicle Flow			
		Without Development		With Development	
		LDV	HDV	LDV	HDV
5 - A249 between the A2 and M2	112.65	49316	6267	49361	6661
6 - M2 West	112.65	62589	7269	62603	7481
7 - M2 East	112.65	58077	5352	58084	5391
8 - Swale Way north of Reams Way Junction	54.07	12876	1111	12876	1124
9 - Swale Way south of Reams Way Junction	54.96	12782	1129	12782	1142
10 - Swale Way south of Ridham Avenue Roundabout	74.19	11921	837	11921	849
11 - A249, North of Swale Way Junction	112.65	33128	2488	33130	2499

*Decommissioning Phase*

- 1.5 The air quality assessment for the permitted K3 did not quantitatively assess the effects of construction traffic on air quality as construction traffic flows were expected to be lower than operational traffic flows. During the decommissioning phase the traffic generated is likely to be the same or lower than during the construction phase and on that basis the effect is expected to be not significant.

The Practical Effect of the K3 Proposed Development.

*Construction Phase*

- 1.6 The practical effect of the consent sought would not result in any additional external physical changes to K3 as permitted and the layout and appearance of the facility will remain as per its consented design. There would be no additional construction work or additional traffic.

*Operational Phase*

- 1.7 The practical effect of the K3 Proposed Development would be an additional 68 HGV movements per day on the A259, Barge Way and part of the Swale Way above that associated with K3 as consented. The indicative criterion of 100 vehicles outside an AQMA is therefore not exceeded.
- 1.8 The traffic flows are expected to be significantly lower on other routes as the traffic redistributes. Therefore, the aforementioned EPUK & IAQM traffic-flow thresholds are not expected to be exceeded for any individual road and the impacts of exhaust emissions associated with the K3 Proposed

Development, compared with the permitted K3, have not been assessed specifically and can be considered to be negligible.

*Decommissioning Phase*

1.9 The air quality assessment for the permitted K3 did not quantitatively assess the effects of construction traffic on air quality as construction traffic flows were expected to be lower than operational traffic flows. During the decommissioning phase the traffic generated is likely to be the same or lower than during the construction phase and on that basis the effect is expected to be not significant.

1.10 WKN Proposed Development

*Construction Phase*

1.11 The traffic data in the table below relates to the predicted concentrations presented in Tables 5.31, 5.32 and 5.33 in the ES Chapter 5.

**Table 5.5.2 Traffic Data Used Within the Assessment – WKN (Construction), 2021**

Road Link Name	Speed (km.hr <sup>-1</sup> )	Daily Two Way Vehicle Flow			
		Without Development		With Development	
		LDV	HDV	LDV	HDV
1 - Swale Way East of B2005 Grovehurst Roundabout	64.07	17091	3363	17905	3448
2 - Barge Way North of Swale Roundabout	44.40	5048	2608	5861	2694
3 - Barge Way, East of Fleet End Roundabout	62.70	2353	1243	3166	1329
4 - A249 South of Swale Way Junction	112.65	34594	5429	35373	5515
5 - A249 between the A2 and M2	112.65	49361	6596	50105	6679
6 - M2 West	112.65	62603	7440	62828	7492
7 - M2 East	112.65	58084	5378	58195	5384
8 - Swale Way north of Reams Way Junction	54.07	12876	1114	12876	1114
9 - Swale Way south of Reams Way Junction	54.96	12782	1132	12782	1132

Road Link Name	Speed (km.hr <sup>-1</sup> )	Daily Two Way Vehicle Flow			
		Without Development		With Development	
		LDV	HDV	LDV	HDV
10 - Swale Way south of Ridham Avenue Roundabout	74.19	11921	840	11921	840
11 - A249, North of Swale Way Junction	112.65	33130	2490	33130	2490

Notes: (km.hr<sup>-1</sup>) = kilometres per hour

HDV = Heavy Duty Vehicle - vehicles greater than 3.5 t gross vehicle weight including buses

LDV = Light Duty Vehicle

### *Operational Phase*

1.12 The traffic data in the table below relates to the predicted concentrations presented in Tables 5.43, 5.44 and 5.45 in the ES Chapter 5.

**Table 5.5.3 Traffic Data Used Within the Assessment – WKN (Operational), 2024**

Road Link Name	Speed (km.hr <sup>-1</sup> )	Daily Two Way Vehicle Flow			
		Without Development		With Development	
		LDV	HDV	LDV	HDV
1 - Swale Way East of B2005 Grovehurst Roundabout	64.07	17091	3363	17162	3599
2 - Barge Way North of Swale Roundabout	44.40	5048	2608	5119	2846
3 - Barge Way, East of Fleet End Roundabout	62.70	2353	1243	2424	1481
4 - A249 South of Swale Way Junction	112.65	34594	5429	34662	5663
5 - A249 between the A2 and M2	112.65	49361	6596	49425	6833
6 - M2 West	112.65	62603	7440	62622	7565
7 - M2 East	112.65	58084	5378	58094	5400
8 - Swale Way north of Reams Way Junction	54.07	12876	1114	12877	1124
9 - Swale Way south of Reams Way Junction	54.96	12782	1132	12783	1142

Road Link Name	Speed (km.hr <sup>-1</sup> )	Daily Two Way Vehicle Flow			
		Without Development		With Development	
		LDV	HDV	LDV	HDV
10 - Swale Way south of Ridham Avenue Roundabout	74.19	11921	840	11921	849
11 - A249, North of Swale Way Junction	112.65	33130	2490	33132	2499

Notes: (km.hr<sup>-1</sup>) = kilometres per hour

HDV = Heavy Duty Vehicle - vehicles greater than 3.5 t gross vehicle weight including buses

LDV = Light Duty Vehicle

#### *Decommissioning Phase*

- 1.13 During the decommissioning phase the traffic generated is likely to be the same or lower than during the construction phase and on that basis the effect is expected to be not significant.

#### Cumulative Effects

*With and Without the WKN Proposed Development construction traffic and K3 Proposed Development in the opening year of the K3 Proposed Development, 2021.*

- 1.14 The traffic data in the table below relates to the predicted concentrations presented in Tables 5.51, 5.52 and 5.53 in the ES Chapter 5.

**Table 5.5.4 Traffic Data Used Within the Assessment – WKN (Construction Phase) + K3 + Cumulative Developments, 2021**

Road Link Name	Speed (km.hr <sup>-1</sup> )	Daily Two Way Vehicle Flow			
		Without Development		With Development	
		LDV	HDV	LDV	HDV
1 - Swale Way East of B2005 Grovehurst Roundabout	64.07	17044	3037	18260	3594
2 - Barge Way North of Swale Roundabout	44.40	5003	2279	5861	2833
3 - Barge Way, East of Fleet End Roundabout	62.70	2304	915	3166	1468
4 - A249 South of Swale Way Junction	112.65	34547	5107	35714	5659
5 - A249 between the A2 and M2	112.65	49316	6267	50431	6824
6 - M2 West	112.65	62589	7269	62926	7581

Road Link Name	Speed (km.hr <sup>-1</sup> )	Daily Two Way Vehicle Flow			
		Without Development		With Development	
		LDV	HDV	LDV	HDV
7 - M2 East	112.65	58077	5352	58244	5403
8 - Swale Way north of Reams Way Junction	54.07	12876	1111	13233	1131
9 - Swale Way south of Reams Way Junction	54.96	12782	1129	13139	1149
10 - Swale Way south of Ridham Avenue Roundabout	74.19	11921	837	11940	857
11 - A249, North of Swale Way Junction	112.65	33128	2488	33131	2500

Notes: (km.hr<sup>-1</sup>) = kilometres per hour

HDV = Heavy Duty Vehicle - vehicles greater than 3.5 t gross vehicle weight including buses

LDV = Light Duty Vehicle

*With and Without the WKN and K3 Proposed Development traffic in the opening year of WKN, 2024.*

1.15 The traffic data in the table below relates to the predicted concentrations presented in Tables 5.54, 5.55 and 5.56 in the ES Chapter 5.

**Table 5.5.5 Traffic Data Used Within the Assessment – WKN (Operational) + K3 (Operational) + Cumulative Developments, 2024**

Road Link Name	Speed (km.hr <sup>-1</sup> )	Daily Two Way Vehicle Flow			
		Without Development		With Development	
		LDV	HDV	LDV	HDV
1 - Swale Way East of B2005 Grovehurst Roundabout	64.07	17044	3037	17235	3672
2 - Barge Way North of Swale Roundabout	44.40	5003	2279	5119	2911
3 - Barge Way, East of Fleet End Roundabout	62.70	2304	915	2424	1546
4 - A249 South of Swale Way Junction	112.65	34547	5107	36043	5792

Road Link Name	Speed (km.hr <sup>-1</sup> )	Daily Two Way Vehicle Flow			
		Without Development		With Development	
		LDV	HDV	LDV	HDV
5 - A249 between the A2 and M2	112.65	49316	6267	52088	6980
6 - M2 West	112.65	62589	7269	63307	7641
7 - M2 East	112.65	58077	5352	58271	5440
8 - Swale Way north of Reams Way Junction	54.07	12876	1111	12949	1143
9 - Swale Way south of Reams Way Junction	54.96	12782	1129	12855	1161
10 - Swale Way south of Ridham Avenue Roundabout	74.19	11921	837	11994	868
11 - A249, North of Swale Way Junction	112.65	33128	2488	33637	2509

Notes: (km.hr<sup>-1</sup>) = kilometres per hour

HDV = Heavy Duty Vehicle - vehicles greater than 3.5 t gross vehicle weight including buses

LDV = Light Duty Vehicle

- 1.16 The average speed on each road has been reduced by 10 km.hr<sup>-1</sup> to take into account the possibility of slow moving traffic near junctions and at roundabouts in accordance with LAQM.TG16.

#### **Vehicle Emission Factors**

- 1.17 The modelling has been undertaken using Defra's 2019 emission factor toolkit (version 9.0) which draws on emissions generated by the European Environment Agency (EEA) COPERT 5 emission calculation tool.

#### **Long-Term Pollutant Predictions**

- 1.18 Annual-mean NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations have been predicted at representative sensitive receptors using ADMS-Roads, then added to relevant background concentrations. Primary NO in the NO<sub>x</sub> emissions is converted to NO<sub>2</sub> to a degree determined by the availability of atmospheric oxidants locally and the strength of sunlight. For road traffic sources, annual-mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations have



been derived from the modelled road-related annual-mean NO<sub>x</sub> concentration using Defra's calculator [1].

### **Short-Term Pollutant Predictions**

- 1.19 In order to predict the likelihood of exceedances of the hourly-mean AQS objectives for NO<sub>2</sub> and the daily-mean AQS objective for PM<sub>10</sub>, the following relationships between the short-term and the annual-mean values at each receptor have been considered.

#### **Hourly-Mean AQS Objective for NO<sub>2</sub>**

- 1.20 Research undertaken in support of LAQM.TG16 has indicated that the hourly-mean limit value and objective for NO<sub>2</sub> is unlikely to be exceeded at a roadside location where the annual-mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentration is less than 60 µg.m<sup>-3</sup>. The threshold of 60 µg.m<sup>-3</sup> NO<sub>2</sub> has been used the guideline for considering a likely exceedance of the hourly-mean nitrogen dioxide objective.

#### **Daily-Mean AQS Objective for PM<sub>10</sub>**

- 1.21 The number of exceedances of the daily-mean AQS objective for PM<sub>10</sub> of 50 µg.m<sup>-3</sup> may be estimated using the relationship set out in LAQM.TG16:

*Number of Exceedances of Daily Mean of 50 µg.m<sup>-3</sup> = -18.5 + 0.00145 \* (Predicted Annual-mean PM<sub>10</sub>)<sup>3</sup> + 206 / (Predicted Annual-mean PM<sub>10</sub> Concentration)*

- 1.22 This relationship indicates that the daily-mean AQS objective for PM<sub>10</sub> is likely to be met if the predicted annual-mean PM<sub>10</sub> concentration is 31.8 µg.m<sup>-3</sup> or less.
- 1.23 The daily mean objective is therefore not considered further within this assessment if the annual-mean PM<sub>10</sub> concentration is predicted to be less than 31.5 µg.m<sup>-3</sup>.

### **Fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> Emissions**

- 1.24 Transport PM<sub>10</sub> emissions arise from both the tailpipe exhausts and from fugitive sources such as brake and tyre wear and re-suspended road dust. Improvements in vehicle technologies are reducing PM<sub>10</sub> exhaust emissions; therefore, the relative importance of fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> emissions is increasing. Current official vehicle emission factors for particulate matter include brake dust and tyre wear which studies suggest may account for approximately one-third of the total particulate emissions from road transport; but not re-suspended road dust (which remains unquantified.)

### **Significance Criteria for Development Impacts on the Local Area**

- 1.25 The EPUK & IAQM Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning For Air Quality document [Error! Bookmark not defined.] advises that:

*"The significance of the effects arising from the impacts on air quality will depend on a number of factors and will need to be considered alongside the benefits of the development in question. Development under current planning policy is required to be sustainable and the definition of this includes social and economic dimensions, as well as environmental. Development brings opportunities*

*for reducing emissions at a wider level through the use of more efficient technologies and better designed buildings, which could well displace emissions elsewhere, even if they increase at the development site. Conversely, development can also have adverse consequences for air quality at a wider level through its effects on trip generation.”*

- 1.26 When describing the air quality impact at a sensitive receptor, the change in magnitude of the concentration should be considered in the context of the absolute concentration at the sensitive receptor. Table 5.5.5 provides the EPUK & IAQM approach for describing the long-term air quality impacts at sensitive human-health receptors in the surrounding area.

**Table 5.5.6 Impact Descriptors for Individual Sensitive Receptors**

Long term average concentration at receptor in assessment year	% Change in concentration relative to Air Quality Assessment Level			
	1	2-5	6-10	>10
75 % or less of AQAL	Negligible	Negligible	Slight	Moderate
76 -94 % of AQAL	Negligible	Slight	Moderate	Moderate
95 - 102 % of AQAL	Slight	Moderate	Moderate	Substantial
103 – 109 % of AQAL	Moderate	Moderate	Substantial	Substantial
110 % or more than AQAL	Moderate	Substantial	Substantial	Substantial

1. AQAL = Air Quality Assessment Level, which may be an air quality objective, EU limit or target value, or an Environment Agency 'Environmental Assessment Level (EAL)'.

2. The table is intended to be used by rounding the change in percentage pollutant concentration to whole numbers, which then makes it clearer which cell the impact falls within. The user is encouraged to treat the numbers with recognition of their likely accuracy and not assume a false level of precision. Changes of 0%, i.e. less than 0.5% will be described as negligible.

3. The table is only designed to be used with annual mean concentrations.

4. Descriptors for individual receptors only; the overall significance is determined using professional judgement. For example, a 'moderate' adverse impact at one receptor may not mean that the overall impact has a significant effect. Other factors need to be considered.

5. When defining the concentration as a percentage of the AQAL, use the 'without scheme' concentration where there is a decrease in pollutant concentration and the 'with scheme;' concentration for an increase.

6. The total concentration categories reflect the degree of potential harm by reference to the AQAL value. At exposure less than 75% of this value, i.e. well below, the degree of harm is likely to be small. As the exposure approaches and exceeds the AQAL, the degree of harm increases. This change naturally becomes more important when the result is an exposure that is approximately equal to, or greater than the AQAL.

7. It is unwise to ascribe too much accuracy to incremental changes or background concentrations, and this is especially important when total concentrations are close to the AQAL. For a given year in the future, it is impossible to define the new total concentration without recognising the inherent uncertainty, which is why there is a category that has a range around the AQAL, rather than being exactly equal to it.

- 1.27 The human-health impact descriptors above apply at individual receptors. The EPUK & IAQM guidance states that the impact descriptors *“are not, of themselves, a clear and unambiguous guide to reaching a conclusion on significance. These impact descriptors are intended for application at a series of individual receptors. Whilst it maybe that there are 'slight', 'moderate' or 'substantial' impacts at one or more receptors, the overall effect may not necessarily be judged as being significant in some circumstances.”*

- 1.28 Professional judgement by a competent, suitably qualified professional is required to establish the significance associated with the consequence of the impacts. This judgement is likely to take into account the extent of the current and future population exposure to the impacts and the influence and/or validity of any assumptions adopted during the assessment process.

### **Uncertainty**

- 1.29 All air quality assessment tools, whether models or monitoring measurements, have a degree of uncertainty associated with the results. The choices that the practitioner makes in setting-up the model, choosing the input data, and selecting the baseline monitoring data will decide whether the final predicted impact should be considered a central estimate, or an estimate tending towards the upper bounds of the uncertainty range (i.e. tending towards worst-case).
- 1.30 The atmospheric dispersion model itself contributes some of this uncertainty, due to it being a simplified version of the real situation: it uses a sophisticated set of mathematical equations to approximate the complex physical and chemical atmospheric processes taking place as a pollutant is released and as it travels to a receptor. The predictive ability of even the best model is limited by how well the turbulent nature of the atmosphere can be represented.
- 1.31 Each of the data inputs for the model, listed earlier, will also have some uncertainty associated with them. Where it has been necessary to make assumptions, these have mainly been made towards the upper end of the uncertainty range informed by an analysis of relevant, available data.
- 1.32 The atmospheric dispersion model used for this assessment, ADMS Roads, has been validated by its supplier and is widely used by professionals in the UK and overseas. A site-specific verification (calibration) provides additional certainty and is particularly important when air quality levels are close to exceeding the objectives/limit values.
- 1.33 LAQM.TG16 requires that local authorities verify the results of any detailed modelling undertaken for the purposes of fulfilling their R&A duties. Model verification refers to the checks that are carried out on model performance at a local level. Modelled concentrations are compared with the results of monitoring. Where there is a disparity between modelled and monitored concentrations, the first step is to review the appropriateness of the data inputs to determine whether the performance of the model can be improved. Once reasonable efforts have been made to reduce the uncertainties in the data inputs, an adjustment may be established and applied to reduce any remaining disparity between modelled and monitored concentrations. No adjustment factor is deemed necessary where the modelled concentrations are within 25% of the monitored concentrations.
- 1.34 For the verification and adjustment of NO<sub>x</sub>/NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations for R&A purposes, it is recommended that the comparison involves a combination of automatic and diffusion monitoring, rather than a single automatic monitor. This is to ensure any adjustment factor derived is representative of all locations modelled and not unduly weighted towards the characteristics at a single site. Where only diffusion tubes are used for the model verification, the study should consider a broad spread of monitoring

locations across the study area to provide sufficient information relating to the spatial variation in pollutant concentrations.

- 1.35 Local Authorities generally implement a broad spread of monitoring, particularly in areas that are known to be sensitive to changes in air quality. Consequently, Local Authorities are usually able to verify the models they use for R&A purposes; however for individual developments, there is less likely to be a broad range of monitoring locations within the relevant study area. Notwithstanding this, a small number of monitoring locations have been identified within the study area and a model verification study has been undertaken for the proposed development and is included in the section below.
- 1.36 The analysis of the component uncertainties indicates that, overall, the predicted total concentration is likely to be towards the top of the uncertainty range rather than being a central estimate. The actual concentrations that will be found when the development is operational are unlikely to be higher than those presented within this report and are more likely to be lower.

## Model Verification

- 1.37 For the verification and adjustment of NO<sub>x</sub>/NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, the LAQM.TG16 guidance recommends that the comparison considers a broad spread of automatic and diffusion monitoring. Swale Borough Council monitors roadside NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations passively using diffusion tubes at 14 locations in the vicinity of the Application Site.
- 1.38 The concentrations monitored over recent years are provided in Table 5.5.7.

**Table 5.5.7 Measured Annual-mean NO<sub>2</sub> Concentrations (µg.m<sup>-3</sup>)**

Site Code	Site Name	Annual Mean NO <sub>2</sub> Concentration				
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
ZW6	Newington (3)	28.5	30.4	34.8	32.9	29.7
SW76	155 Canterbury Road	37.9	40.7	33.8	30.7	31.6
SW75	109 Canterbury Road	26.7	26.9	24.6	22.4	21.0
SW90	Jncn Canterbury Road/ Goodnestone Road	ND	ND	31.6	29.1	30.7
SW56	126 East Street	46.5	39.8	42.8	42.5	38.7
SW58	Dover Street Filling Station	36.8	31.1	28.6	39.8	33.5
SW53	114 East Street. Sittingbourne	38.8	41	33.6	34.5	33.9
SW87	Canterbury Road	ND	36	33.2	31.7	33.8
SW62	Key Street	46.5	47.5	39.9	37.1	37.2
SW66	96/94 High Street	45	39.2	40.9	42.6	36.2
SW45	64 High Street	44.4	42	40.4	41.3	39.6
SW38	15a High Street	35.4	34.7	36.4	33.4	31.4
SW37	32 High Street	40.7	41.5	36.5	36.7	31.4

SW20	Newington Co-Op	37.3	34.2	33.4	35.3	31.2
------	-----------------	------	------	------	------	------

ND= No data


1.39 The monitored annual-mean NO<sub>x</sub> road contributions have been derived from the monitored annual-mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations using the LAQM.TG16 calculator. The monitored annual-mean NO<sub>x</sub> road contributions have then been compared with the modelled annual-mean NO<sub>x</sub> road contributions. This comparison is provided in Table 5.5.8 below.

**Table 5.5.8 Comparison of Monitored and Modelled Annual-mean Road NO<sub>x</sub> Contribution (µg.m<sup>-3</sup>)**

Site Code	Site Name	Annual-mean Road NO <sub>x</sub> Contribution (µg.m <sup>-3</sup> )	
		Monitored	Modelled
ZW6	Newington (3)	34.6	8.1
SW76	155 Canterbury Road	38.8	7.6
SW75	109 Canterbury Road	16.4	9.6
SW90	Jcn Canterbury Road/ Goodnestone Road	36.8	9.0
SW56	126 East Street	55.2	5.9
SW58	Dover Street Filling Station	43.1	21.5
SW53	114 East Street. Sittingbourne	44.0	5.3
SW87	Canterbury Road	43.8	8.2
SW62	Key Street	51.7	23.2
SW66	96/94 High Street	49.3	10.4
SW45	64 High Street	57.4	6.0
SW38	15a High Street	38.4	10.9
SW37	32 High Street	38.4	5.3
SW20	Newington Co-Op	37.9	8.6


1.40 It should be borne in mind that the monitored concentrations are themselves only estimates to the true concentrations at each point; the EU Directive on air quality designates passive NO<sub>2</sub> samplers indicative measures with a potential uncertainty of +/-30 %. Ignoring any uncertainty errors in the monitoring results, Table 5.5.7 above indicates that the model is under-predicting at all monitoring locations.

1.41 The modelled annual-mean NO<sub>x</sub> road contributions for the 14 concentrations have been plotted against the monitored annual-mean NO<sub>x</sub> road contributions in Graph 1.



1.42 The modelled NO<sub>x</sub> contributions have been multiplied by the gradient of the trend line (3.3009) to determine the corrected NO<sub>x</sub> contributions.

1.43 Modelled annual-mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations have been derived from the corrected modelled annual-mean NO<sub>x</sub> road contributions. The corrected modelled annual-mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations have been plotted against the monitored annual-mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in Graph 2.



1.44 The majority of the corrected modelled annual-mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations are within 25% of the monitored annual-mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. The correction factor therefore improves the modelled concentrations and has been applied to all predictions used within the assessment.

1.45 The fractional bias can also be used to determine whether the corrected model has a tendency to over or under-predict. The fractional bias is calculated as:

$$\frac{(\text{Average Monitored NO}_x \text{ Concentration} - \text{Average Predicted NO}_x \text{ Concentration})}{0.5 \times (\text{Average Monitored NO}_x + \text{Average Predicted NO}_x \text{ Concentration})}$$

1.46 Fractional bias values vary between +2 and -2 and has an ideal value of zero. A negative value suggests a model over-prediction and a positive value suggests a model under-prediction.

1.47 Table 5.5.9 sets out the average monitored concentration and the average predicted concentration.

**Table 5.5.9 Comparison of Monitored and Adjusted Modelled Annual-mean Road NO<sub>x</sub> Contribution (µg.m<sup>-3</sup>)**

Site Code	Site Code	Annual-mean Road NO <sub>x</sub> Contribution (µg.m <sup>-3</sup> )	
		Monitored	Corrected Modelled
ZW6	Newington (3)	34.6	26.8
SW76	155 Canterbury Road	38.8	25.2
SW75	109 Canterbury Road	16.4	31.8
SW90	Jcn Canterbury Road/ Goodnestone Road	36.8	29.6
SW56	126 East Street	55.2	19.5

Site Code	Site Code	Annual-mean Road NO <sub>x</sub> Contribution (µg.m <sup>-3</sup> )	
		Monitored	Corrected Modelled
SW58	Dover Street Filling Station	43.1	70.8
SW53	114 East Street. Sittingbourne	44.0	17.6
SW87	Canterbury Road	43.8	26.9
SW62	Key Street	51.7	76.6
SW66	96/94 High Street	49.3	34.4
SW45	64 High Street	57.4	19.7
SW38	15a High Street	38.4	35.9
SW37	32 High Street	38.4	17.4
SW20	Newington Co-Op	37.9	28.3
<b>Average</b>		<b>41.8</b>	<b>32.9</b>

1.48 The fractional bias for this study is therefore  $(41.8 - 32.9) / (0.5 \times (41.8 + 32.9)) = 0.24$ . As the fractional bias is close to zero, the model is performing well.



## References

- 1 <http://laqm.defra.gov.uk/review-and-assessment/tools/tools.html>