Schedule 5 - GLA response to ExA's second written questions (ExQ2)

ExQ2	Question	Applicant Comment	GLA comment
2.1.2	Please will the GLA, to the extent that this is not already in hand for Deadline 5, provide comments on the submission from the Applicant received at Deadline 4, titled 'Applicants response to the GLA at Deadline 3 submission' [REP4-014].	Please refer to the GLA's Schedule 1, titled GLA response to Applicant document 8.02.35, "Applicant Response to the GLA's Deadline 3 Submissions" which was submitted for Deadline 5.	
2.1.3	Please will the GLA comment on the Applicant's additional clarification provided in REP4-014 on modelled concentrations of NO2 at James Watt Way	In REP4-014 the Applicant's response to written question Q2.0.4 is at Table D8 on Row 2 it states: "the GLA has not quoted which is the "most affected receptor on the transport network", however the Applicant has assumed, based on a comment in the GLA's Written Representation (see REP2-071), that the GLA is referring to the residential property on the east side of the A206 Queens Road at its junction with James Watt Way. In order to assess the potential impact of road traffic at this location modelling of the impact of road traffic emissions has been undertaken. A receptor location at the ground floor level of 16-72, James Watt Way has been used. The ADMS Roads model has been updated to include this receptor (grid reference 551496.6, 177717.5) and the additional road links within 200m as follows:	1. The ExA has specifically asked for comment on this section of the Applicant's response in ExQ2 section 2.1.3: 2. The receptor chosen is an appropriate choice to represent the worst case on this section of road. 3. The figures for the impact on local air quality presented in the table are higher than the impact predicted at receptors 24 and 25 in the original ES. 4. The underlined section to the left states that the HGV numbers used in this supplementary assessment were capped in line with the draft DCO requirement. However, the original ES used uncapped vehicle movements to represent 100% delivery by road.

		• Queens Road north and south of James Watt Way; • James Watt Way; • Erith High Street; Manor Road. In order to simulate queuing traffic at the junction, vehicle speeds were reduced for 50m either side of the junction on the A206 and for the complete length of James Watt Way to the roundabout. This is likely to overpredict concentrations as queuing traffic is unlikely to be continuously present on all links to this extent. The modelled NO2 concentration at this receptor has been determined using the same approach as presented in the ES (i.e. same Emission Factor Toolkit and verification process) <u>assuming that operational HGV movements are capped as per the requirement in the draft DCO.</u> The predicted 2024 'Do Something' NO2 concentration at the additional receptor location is 42.0 µg/m3 with an increase of 0.1 µg/m3 (0.25% of the objective) when compared to the 2024 'Do Minimum' scenario. The impact at this receptor is therefore described as 'negligible' in accordance with Table 7.21 of Chapter 7- Air Quality of the ES (6.1, REP2-019)."	5. It therefore appears that this supplementary figure may have been calculated on a different basis. This is particularly important in light of the ExA question Q2.0.4 which considers construction movements: as the daily number of construction movements are predicted to be less than the 100% delivery by road case used for the original ES modelling the GLA had previously been content to accept that the impact of construction journeys would be acceptable if operational movements were considered acceptable. 6. If the revised figures presented in the table are on a different basis then this assumption does not hold. 7. For the avoidance of doubt, and to enable the applicant to describe more clearly how the modelling has been updated we would recommend that a revised ES chapter, with the additional receptor and new assumptions about queueing included, is submitted.