

DRAFT.

Notes of Joint Environment meeting held on the 30th November 2023.

1. Present; Cllr Anna Dunn; Cllr and chair of the CPC, George Dunn, Cllr Vanessa McAra, Ben Jones (DC Acting Environmental Officer), Darren Lorraine DC Team manager.
2. Apologies; Janet Moore. Environmental Service manager.
3. Actions from the last meeting.

It was agreed by the meeting that Cllr George Dunn would Chair the meeting, and that we would proceed by going through the agreed actions of the last meeting.

- DC to consider inviting other partners such as NH, to this meeting. *DC responded by stating that this has not been progressed and it was recognised that there have been recent changes in personnel within national Highways, with Jonny Hill taking over.*
- DC to provide AQ mesh pods for Chideock, when they become available. *DC responded by sharing that the projects the pods are currently being used for will cease at the end of the year and become available to be used elsewhere in January 2024. The two sites they have been identified for are Boot Hill in Weymouth and Chideock. A location needs to be identified within Chideock that can support the Pod and there will need to be a discussion about signage regarding getting permissions. DC will have to fund the maintenance of the pods into the future.*
- Cllr Anna Dunn raised the fact that based on the current evidence that the Parish council have from the work completed by Bristol university, that it would be helpful to have two pods located within the village in order to further measure PM2.5 and PM10. One pod to be located near the bus stop and the other on Chideock hill. This proposal was supported by both Cllr McAra and Cllr George Dunn. *The DC response was that this proposal would have to be considered by Janet, the Service manager. In addition, DC thought it would be helpful if the Parish council could begin to possibly identify suitable sites for the PODs.*
- **DC website** – *Darren stated on behalf of DC that the website has recently changed regarding ASR pollution levels and feedback is being sought.*
- **Bristol University research.** Cllr Anna Dunn shared that she understands that the final report has now been completed and it is hoped to be able to share this within the next six months.
- **30 miles an hour limit and the TPO.** DC reported that is about to be advertised as part of the public consultation within the next few weeks. It will be advertised in the London Gazette and in the local Dorset newspaper.
- **WRAG.** It was raised by the chair that that it was understood by the action group that Jane Williams the team manager, has stated that DC are not responsible for the watercourse or the river known as the river Winniford. The question was raised as to whether DCs environment department have an interest in pollution in the local rivers and that Cllr Christopher was involved.

Actions.

- Identify Locations for the Pods within the village and report back to DC. (needs to be able to hold 15 kilos).
- Agreed to organise a Teams meeting for February 2024.
- Follow up with Bristol University to be able to share the research with DC.
- Follow up re DC and the responsibility for pollution re the Water course/river.

Appendices ; Responses to the questions raised provided by Darren Naraine, Environmental Protection Team leader, Dorset Council .

Questions raised:

1. BIAS - Tony admits to finding the information on bias confusing.

1. *It refers to using Somerset County Council - Is this as the source of tubes or as a source of bias data?*

Somerset County Council is the source (provider) of the tubes. There are different bias adjustment factors for different providers. The bias adjustment factors are given to us by DEFRA in approximately March each year to apply to our results from the previous calendar year.

2. *The data should come from Defra and it is not clear whether this is the average bias for the area, or for the whole of UK, or for the variety of the tubes or the laboratory testing them.*

The bias adjustment factor is applied to the variety of tube. Different LAs carry out studies using continuous analysers: six studies contributed to SCC's bias adjustment figure. We don't have a continuous analyser in Dorset.

3. *There is a reference on the Gradko giving a bias figure - But should we be using this, as the Defra help desk is usually responsible for issuing this.*

As explained above our tubes are from Somerset County Council (SCC) and therefore we apply this bias adjustment factor to all our tubes.

In previous years we have used Gradko tubes, hence the inclusion of its figure for reference to 2018-2020 data. In 2020 we switched from Gradko to SYAQS, hence that figure's inclusion too. In 2024 we will continue with SCC tubes.

4. *Diffusion tubes are recognised as being quite inaccurate i.e. plus or minus 20%. Therefore, why do you always publish the minus figure and not the plus. Several years ago, the bias was determined by the analyser until it became broken in 2016. There is a list of bias for some years which showed that it was often on the plus side ie at 1.2 and not at 0.82? Therefore, it would seem wrong to always use the negative bias figure.*

The bias adjustment is calculated annual by DEFRA for each tube type. For more information in the bias adjustment calculation. Full details on page 142 of this guidance <https://laqm.defra.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/LAQM-TG22-August-22-v1.0.pdf>

5. *On checking a couple of readings comparing The HE (H) positions and the DC (W) these were at W36 and H4 the Village Hall. Same position but different readings. In 2021 there was a 28% difference but in 2022 it was a 46.5 %. Is this an anomaly, or is there some explanation? Especially as they appear to be in similar positions.*

In 2022 W36 was 32.7 annualised and adjusted; H4 was 34. (46% difference?) This is a 3.8% difference.

1. *The difference between DC / HE monitoring at the same positions This is all now DC monitoring – H tube notation is only due to legacy notation. Tony checked the calculation for W39(Chideock Hill Cottage) and disagrees with your figure making it 80.23 not 78.6 before bias. There were only 10 out of 12 readings. There is a reduction for distance as the reading is at the roadside and should be on the façade of the building.*

There are 11 readings not 10 – the calculation is correct.

The roadside / façade reading was explained by Ben during the meeting.

80.2 refers to the 2019 average for W39. Calculation checked and correct using an average of 11 monthly readings.

Distance correction is carried out for W39 as mean is over objective, and nearest receptor is not at roadside (as no pavement), therefore distance correction of 4.5m applied (as with H7)

3. *The reduction in traffic since say 2018 (1.25 million people left work during and after Covid); the difference that newer vehicles are making and also the 30mph possible reduction.*

DC are trying to infer that the reduced speed limit to 30mph has made difference. But no detailed proof is provided.

DC recognise that it is a culmination of factors (number of vehicles, types of vehicles and speed reduction) that have made a difference. The report does not suggest that it is speed reduction alone that has resulted in this difference. Speed reduction is something DC can influence, whereas number of vehicles and types of vehicles we have little influence over)

4. *Tony expressed disappointment at the number of annualizations due to the readings being less than 75%. He says that this was improved previously when he raised it as an issue last time and then one of your team actually took the readings.*

Only three tubes required annualization in 2022, only one of which was for Chideock. Eighteen had to be annualised in 2021, eleven in 2020 – therefore this is a significant improvement.