

Subject: Air Pollution. Every day 64 people die in the UK from nitrogen dioxide poisoning.

From: [Denis Browne](#)

To: [Martin Case](#)

The Planner for June 2017 carries an article which says;

64 people in the UK die every day from nitrogen dioxide pollution.

Or 40,000 premature deaths a year.

New strategy after client Earth law case only cheers on progress from side lines.

Govt says it wants LAs to develop "new and creative solutions..."

Govt says it wants to increase no of Clean Air Zones from 6 to 27. Is the A4 a candidate?? But no commitment and no funding

Govt says LAs should exhaust other possibilities before going for CAZs

Client Earth were scathing.

Quote from Prof Jonathan Grigg (Q. Mary University of London) "Given that previous initiatives that have not directly targeted diesel emissions have failed dismally in the past, I am not confident that these proposed local interventions, however innovative, will achieve a step reduction in exposure of vulnerable populations such as young children".

From: [Martin Case](#)

To: [Denis Browne](#)

Thanks Denis,

we are going to develop a set of strategies and then identify projects to fit with those.

We were looking at a proposal for a green wall for Middlesex Court to be funded by the Mayors Crowd Funding scheme and TFL but we're not ready to make the leap just yet in terms of managing that scale of project with third parties involved.

It's encouraging that the proposed office development on the SW corner of the Ealing Rd/GWR roundabout are looking to create a green wall but as I mentioned previously I think the BCC should have some sort of air quality directive with the support of LBH and MP whoever that may be when we talk to developers. They have to be accountable on every level of their activities if we are to improve air quality for now and the future.

Martin

From: [Denis Browne](#)

To: [Martin Case](#)

I think there are a number of ways of approaching the problem of pollution in Brentford..

As we are faced with the almost immediate problem/opportunity of responding to plans for intensive development along the A4 including residential, education and recreation as well as offices and work I think the Review Area has to be the priority. Not only will we be seeing the revised plans for the Review Area In August/September but we must expect planning applications for specific major applications up and down the area from Gillette corner to Chiswick and to Kew Bridge before the Review process is complete.

I understand that the pollution on these sites is not properly measured and that should be a priority.

Then I think we need to understand the increasing pressures on this part of Brentford. Increased development in Brentford is likely to generate more traffic. With Heathrow likely to be extended there will be more air traffic and yet more road traffic to serve it.

With the London population rising from 8.5 to 10 million + in the plan period 2015/2030 there is likely to be an increase in car ownership. Measures to improve PTaL ratings locally by links to Cross Rail may not be up and running within the plan period.

With no national policies to take diesel vehicles off the road a proportion of the increasing no of vehicles will be diesel.

The Mayor has initiated a restricted zone. There are likely to be plans to expand it. If it is expanded to the north/south circular it is likely that diesel vehicles will use the circulars to bypass the restricted area and increase pollution further at say Chiswick roundabout.

The A4 and M4 is the main radial to Heathrow, expanding Reading and other points west. It would seem unlikely that this road will be restricted so that no polluting vehicles use it.

Somehow we need a predictive model which shows the likely increases in the Brentford pollution problem in the period 2015/2030.

We also need a clearer understanding of effective ways to mitigate pollution. These should include measures to seal occupants into buildings and to pump air in

where pollution is less. However, people also want to enjoy real open balconies, to walk or cycle, to use our parks and schools and to meet neighbours so that the problem is to reduce pollution where that is practicable and to ensure that no unsuitable development is permitted close to roads where pollution cannot be effectively reduced.

It would appear that pollution levels cannot be effectively reduced on the north and south circulars and on the A4/M4 corridor so that no unsuitable development should be planned close to these roads.

Additionally when pollution levels are measured and, understood and when anticipated increases can be measured or predicted the effectiveness of mitigation measures can be set against the size of the problem.

In this context extensive tree and roadside bush planting, green walls that can be properly maintained and other measures could have a measurable effect in mitigating the problem where it cannot be avoided by proper planning.

I think we should support any proven measures to improve pollution, but we need to plan so that pollution generation is limited to unavoidable routes and that unsuitable development is built well away from them.

Denis