



Public Health
England

CRCE/NSIP Consultations
Chilton
Didcot
Oxfordshire OX11 0RQ

T +44 (0) 1235 825278
F +44 (0) 1235 822614
www.gov.uk/phe

Peter Robottom
Lead Member of the Panel of Examining Inspectors
The Planning Inspectorate
3D Eagle
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

14 November 2016

Dear Peter Robottom

**Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
Proposed Silvertown Tunnel
Rule 8 letter**

Thank you for the questions addressed to Public Health England as part of the Rule 8 letter on the 18th October 2016. We have copied the questions below for information along with the PHE response.

Question AQ9

“Are the LPAs, No to Silvertown, PHE and other IPs (who have responded on air quality matters) satisfied with the mitigation proposed by the Applicant in relation to locations and sensitive receptors where there would be a significant impact in terms of predicted air quality changes arising from the development? If not, why not?”

PHE response

Following discussion with TfL it is apparent that TfL have considered a wide range of air quality mitigation measures for the scheme and also more specifically at certain sensitive receptors such as the Hoola building. PHE note that there is the potential for the scheme to implement landscaping / urban greening in the vicinity of the Hoola building. Despite there being limited evidence for urban greening improving air quality at pollution hotspots there are potential additional benefits to residents from a wider health and well-being perspective. There is significant and growing evidence on the health benefits of access to good quality green spaces¹. The benefits include better self-rated health; lower body mass index, overweight and obesity levels; improved mental health and wellbeing; increased longevity.

In summary, despite an extensive range of mitigation measures being investigated the current modelling indicates that there is still the potential for residents of the Hoola building to be exposed to significantly increased concentrations of both NO₂ and particulate matter (PM₁₀). PHE understand TfL are planning to undertake

further modelling at the Hoola building to take into account additional factors (e.g. the use of new emission factors for Euro VI buses) and look forward to seeing the outcomes of this in due course. It would be helpful for TfL to confirm their proposals/approach to urban greening in areas surrounding the Hoola building.

Question NV28

NPPF Paragraph 123 requires planning policies and decisions to aim to avoid noise from giving significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development.

(a) Please can the Applicant explain how the proposed development would meet this aspect of the NPPF?

(b) Are IPs satisfied that if the Order was made, the development would meet this aspect of the NPPF? If not, why not?

PHE response

PHE is a statutory consultee for applications which fall under the provisions of the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Planning (NSIP) regime. Our statutory remit in these consultations covers applications which could potentially cause harm to people and are likely to significantly affect public health. However due to limited resources, PHE will not be able to provide comments on aspects of the application relating to noise exposure/mitigation.

Should you have any questions or concerns please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely

nsipconsultations@phe.gov.uk

Please mark any correspondence for the attention of National Infrastructure Planning Administration.

Cc: Neil Chester, Transport for London

Amanda Pownall, Transport for London

ⁱ Balfour R, Allen J. Local action on health inequalities: improving access to green spaces. London: Institute of Health Equity, 2014