

## **AIR QUALITY STRATEGY REVIEW CONSULTATION DOCUMENT – REPORT ON STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP 9 JUNE 2006**

1. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), together with the devolved administrations (DAs) for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and the National Society for Clean Air and Environmental Protection, hosted a one-day multi-stakeholder workshop in London on 9 June 2006.
2. The workshop provided stakeholders with further information and clarification on the Consultation Document on the Review of the Air Quality Strategy, published on 5 April, and the opportunity to discuss the proposals ahead of their formal response requested by 11 July 2006. Over 120 delegates attended representing environmental and health groups, industry and transport sectors, local authorities, consultancies and research organisations.
3. The morning session consisted of presentations by John Rea (Defra) on the Scope and Vision of the Review; by John Stedman (National Environmental Technology Centre) and Paro Konar (Defra) on the additional policy measures proposed in the consultation document and the associated cost and benefit assessment; and by Martin Williams (Defra) on the Review of the Strategy's current objectives, new objective for particles and the exposure reduction approach. These were followed by a question and answer session.
4. For the afternoon session, delegates formed into five groups to discuss the key questions in the consultation document. These focussed on methodology used to assess the proposed measures, which measures should be taken forward, if there were other measures which should be looked at, whether to retain the current objectives, adoption of new objectives for protection of ecosystems, a move towards a new exposure reduction approach to control small particulates, the inclusion of an objective for PM2.5 and at what level the new approach should be implemented – UK wide, devolved administration or at local authority level.
5. The key themes and messages from the group sessions and details of each group's discussions are at Annex A.

### **Conclusion**

6. In closing, the chairman considered there was a general feeling among delegates that the event had been a success and provided stakeholders with opportunity to debate the proposals in the Consultation Document and for Defra and the devolved administrations to respond to points of information. Stakeholders were asked to send formal comments by 11 July.

## ANNEX A

### Notes from Breakout groups

Five break out groups were formed, the membership of which is shown in Annex B (although some changes occurred on the day, and some delegates moved between groups). The list of questions to be addressed was split into two, with the first two groups (Blue and Red) addressed the following questions:

1) *Do you agree that*

- *monetary costs and benefits (including impact on public health);*
- *impact on ecosystems and habitats;*
- *impact on exceedences of objectives; and*
- *qualitative assessment*

*are the right criteria to be considering?*

2) *Which of the additional policy measures (assessed in Chapter 3), if any, do you think the UK Government and the devolved administrations should implement or argue for in relevant international fora?*

3) *Are there any areas of innovation or other measures you think the UK Government and the devolved administrations should look at in the longer term?*

Groups 3, 4 and 5, (Yellow, Pink and Green) addressed the remaining questions:

1) *Do you agree we should retain the Strategy's existing objectives?*

2) *Do you agree to the proposed new objectives for oxides of nitrogen, sulphur dioxide and ozone for the protection of ecosystems and vegetation?*

3) *Do you agree that we should begin to move the policy framework to include exposure-reduction type of objectives for non-threshold pollutants such as particles?*

4) *what are your views on including objectives on PM<sub>2.5</sub> as well as PM<sub>10</sub>?*

5) *Should the UK Government and the devolved administrations wait until an exposure reduction objective is agreed in Europe before adopting a new national objective for particles or, should we adopt new exposure reduction and concentration cap objectives for PM<sub>2.5</sub> now and review them after final agreement in Europe?*

6) *If the UK Government and the devolved administrations proceed now with the proposal for new PM<sub>2.5</sub> objectives, do you consider that the proposed values of 15% exposure reduction objective (between 2010 and 2020) and a 25ug.m<sup>-3</sup> concentration cap (12ug.m<sup>-3</sup> for Scotland) are reasonable?*

7) *What do you think the role of the devolved administrations and local authorities should be under this new framework?*

The main points which emerged from the group sessions are set out below, followed by the notes from the facilitators, as submitted.

### Main Points

#### **General:**

- The finalised document needs to take a more strategic view, differentiating proposed actions (such as the early uptake of Euro standards) and the strategic approach into which this fits (a long term vision).
- The strategy should reflect UK Government actions, not just Defra.
- There needs to be a better treatment of local and regional issues:
  - better explanation of how the strategy relates to the local level;
  - greater recognition of what local action can achieve at the local level;
  - national incentives for local action;

### ***Measures and their assessment:***

- General support for the measures chosen and short listed. However, poor CBA result should not totally relegate a measure from the list (e.g. LEZ).
- Concern over the weighting given to CBA, with reference to the other assessment methods.
- A better understanding is needed for the sensitivity of the CBA assessment to estimated control costs, and how this would effect the RAG status.
- An explanation is needed of the likely implementation routes for the proposed measures.
- The measures also need to be assessed by:
  - timing;
  - practicability;
  - geographical scale of effect (e.g. hotspots or general).
- Specific action on ammonia emissions is needed.
- Traffic reduction/reduced need to travel/incentivised public transport should feature in the strategy.

### ***Objectives***

- General support for keeping the existing set, but an explanation for maintaining objectives which we already meet everywhere is needed.
- General support for a move toward PM<sub>2.5</sub> in addition to PM<sub>10</sub>.
- There was a split on ecosystems objectives, between support for the proposals and a view that they weren't challenging enough (so why have them?).

### ***Exposure Reduction***

- General support for the approach.
- Many local authorities would like to see a local role in the system. The Devolved Administrations also have a role, through spatial development plans.
- If the move is widened, it would effect local land use planning mechanisms, which are strongly influenced by objective/limit value exceedence.
- The cap should either address hotspots, or another mechanism should be found for doing so.
- There was a split on whether the UK should proceed in advance of the EU. The question was raised as to the practicability of introducing emission reduction measures in advance of an EU timetable.

## **ANNEX A: Facilitators Notes (as submitted)**

### **Group 1: Facilitator, Rob Pilling (NSCA)**

Discussions touched on wider issues beyond the questions posed. Key points summarised under the following headings: Scope, Assessment and Measures (as reported to plenary). Flipchart transcript also attached.

#### **Scope**

Final scope should be more strategic, not just a list of measures.

Needs to emphasise aim of good air quality for all, including vulnerable sectors

It should describe activities influencing other departments and sectors (e.g. Transport, agriculture, aviation).

It should provide better treatment/support/ownership by central government for LAQM (e.g. bus deregulation is a central government initiative, which creates barriers at local level).

National incentives required for local action, real power needed for devolution to be effective

Regional dimension also needs more emphasis.

#### **Assessment**

Discussion as to emphasis on PM10 v PM2.5 v ultrafines (relative toxicity, strength of evidence)

Concern over use and dominance of CBA (discounting, timeframe effects, particles driven at expense of everything else, loss of focus on protecting vulnerable sectors, who pays, who gets the benefits?, loss of polluter pays principle? => Need to unpick some of the detail behind the CBA assessment especially for amber measures)

More detailed explanation requested for non-monetary assessments

#### **Measures**

General support for 'supported' measures, but 'less supported' mustn't be discarded either

'amber' measures (e.g. B, K1/K2) likely to become 'green' if technology costs turn out to be cheaper than estimated (historic precedent) and if the most likely time lag (short) is taken into account.

Poorly developed policies/plans for implementation of assessed measures. How practical / realistic are the assumptions?

Important to emphasise that local measures can be important at local level, even if not supported by national analysis

Specific measures:

- Speed management (certainly local, perhaps national as well?)
- LEZ (certainly local, perhaps national also?)
- VOC's => implications for Asthma
- Euro's are key – high intensity (measure B appears attractive – see above)

- Measures needed for agriculture (and need to be assessed in the same AQ framework)
- Road traffic reduction (public transport, eco-centred road pricing)
- Large scale housing projects => implications for introducing lots of new exposure to poor air quality
- Integrated transport provision

## **Transcript of flip chart notes**

### **1. Do you agree that monetary costs and benefits (including impact on public health); impact on ecosystems and habitats; impact on exceedences of objectives; and qualitative assessment are the right criteria to be considering?**

- CBA not the only approach possible – e.g. multi-criteria
- Assessment of relative toxicity/management of PMs required (IGCB is taking this forward?)
- Do we wait for ideal PM metric? (No, but need to keep asking questions)
- External validation of cost benefit? (discounting?, linkage to PM10?)
- Lack of detail in explanation of non monetary assessments
- Vulnerable sectors/people lost in monetary calculations
- Other criteria important (frame of reference of the strategy too narrow, not just technical assessment, wider issues need to be considered)
- At local level AQ = transport. Failure to link strategy to assessment process.
- CBA assumptions must be backed by creation of an environment to stimulate behavioural change (e.g. transport measures / how will they be achieved?)
- Government must own central measures. Local measures important and need central support / ownership too.
- Regional role important – should be in strategy

### **2) Which of the additional policy measures (assessed in Chapter 3), if any, do you think the UK Government and the devolved administrations should implement or argue for in relevant international fora?**

- VOC's – asthma – polluter pays?
- Bus deregulation – causes local problems, but central government responsibility
- Real power needed for devolution to work
- Surprise that LEZ has small impacts/benefits on assessment (need to reassess on wider impacts beyond London)
- Group supports list of supported measures (show of hands)
- Less supported measures – don't discard
- Less supported measures – indoor air quality benefits not captured
- Measure B is amber => but the mean is +ve, so misleading
- Hi tech costs, time lag (short) => suggests B is a good option.
- Which is being supported by HMG?
- Theoretical assumptions not always practical (e.g. poor fuel economy programs - drivers don't use them)
- Who pays, who gets the benefits? Polluter pays?
- Incentives for Euro V/VI standards – what are they? How effective? => policy plan is vague
- Need to include agricultural measures in the programme
- Which other government departments can AEQ influence? The strategy should show what is happening (e.g. aviation)
- Some of the disfavoured mechanisms could be useful at local level (LEZ)
- Dynamic between local and national actions should be emphasised in final strategy
- Require national incentives for local actions
- Shorter term measures disfavoured by CBA => need to unpick and understand

- Measures must be owned/supported centrally for uptake locally.

**3) Are there any areas of innovation or other measures you think the UK Government and the devolved administrations should look at in the longer term?**

- Road Traffic reduction (re-pricing public transport, road pricing)
- What's the problem with road pricing technology – why can't it be done for environment?
- Speed management – favoured locally (AQ hotspots/urban), safety benefits – quantified? Profile could be higher
- Planning control of large housing projects
- Integrate transport provision and transport plans (joined up thinking)

***Outcomes of Group 2 (red) breakout discussion***  
***Sarah Legge, Greater London Authority***

The group was tasked with a number of questions which provoked lengthy discussions, the key points are summarised below.

**Q1. Do you agree that**

- **monetary costs and benefits (including impact on public health);**
- **impact on ecosystems and habitats;**
- **impact on exceedences of objectives; and**
- **qualitative assessment**

**are the right criteria to be considering?**

***Group 2 agreed that:***

- These criteria should be considered, but there are others and there was debate over the balance & weighting given to the different criteria.
- The goal should be to have cleaner, healthier air and meet our legal obligations, in a cost effective way (giving more weight to exceedences vs. cost benefit criteria).
- Doing nothing, because of costs, is not an option.
- Non-monetised benefits can be as, or more, important than monetised benefits.
- Review needs better integration with local measures and the work of local authorities.
- Other criteria should include
  - timing (both implementation and impact),
  - geographical scale (will it address hotspots and focus on exceedences or reduce background concentrations),
  - practicalities,
  - can it be implemented (by UK organisations),
  - social and political acceptability.

***Specific issues***

- Concentration improvements are important, but are converted into monetised health benefits using a relatively rudimentary methodology. It is important to consider concentration improvements directly, to confirm and provide a reality check to the health benefits.
- Measures and scenarios should be assessed in combination, as this can affect the costs and benefits.
- Different cost benefit methods (e.g. cost/benefit ratios or net present values) give different results, which can cause confusion when prioritising measures.
- Are we comparing like with like, e.g. the marine scenario considered costs to UK industry but emissions benefits from all shipping?
- The report needs to consider climate change, including CO<sub>2</sub> impacts, on relevant timescales (e.g. 2010 & 2020), and should be strongly linked with the UK Climate Change Programme and associated data.

- **Q2. Which of the additional policy measures (assessed in Chapter 3), if any, do you think the UK Government and the devolved administrations should implement or argue for in relevant international fora?**

**Group 2 agreed that:**

- The options and prioritisation in the Review are irrelevant without financial backing and political will from central Government to implement them.
- For example, several favoured options in defra's Review looked at incentivising or encouraging cleaner vehicles, however DfT announced the withdrawal of the grants for cleaner vehicles just two days before defra's stakeholder event. There is a strong need for joined up thinking in Government on air quality action.
- A long term vision for air quality and associated measures is needed, to allow long term planning and innovation.
- The Review needs to clarify the role of local authorities, who will have to implement the measures at a local level.
- The Review should include local measures in much more detail, e.g. the role of planning, control of emissions from construction sites, Air Quality Action Plans, Low Emission Zones.
- There are issues around pollutant prioritisation and pollutant interaction which need to be addressed, and the policy position clarified.
- The Review should address emissions and impacts from aviation and associated activities.
- Trains should also be considered in the Review.
- Several issues and policy measures, including ozone, are proposed to be taken forward at European & international forums. This lobbying needs to be in parallel with action at a national, local or regional level.

**Specific issues**

- Review should include an equivalent table to Table 3.2 which considers common or potentially significant local measures.
- Withdrawing funds (and focus) from one sector can put pressure on other sectors to deliver emissions benefits.
- Review needs to tackle ammonia emissions.
- Review needs to consider how to reduce emissions from foreign vehicles in UK.
- 2-3 years assured notice on grants and incentives is not long enough to ensure stability in the marketplace to pump prime cleaner vehicles and technologies.
- Zero notice changes, such as DfT's suspension then cancellation of the EST grants, is very destructive and can discourage the market from trying cleaner options in the future.

**Q3. Are there any areas of innovation or other measures you think the UK Government and the devolved administrations should look at in the longer term?**

**Group 2 agreed that:**

- Government needs to start managing and reducing the demand for transport.
- Behavioural changes are needed.
- Cleaner and more sustainable travel options need to be aspirational, as research shows that informing people that their ethical/environmental beliefs and lifestyle are inconsistent is more likely to make them change their beliefs than their lifestyle.
- Need to increase use of public transport, it needs to
  - accessible
  - safe
  - affordable
- All departments and levels of government need to use spatial planning to reduce the need to travel, through the development of sustainable communities.
- Review needs to include measures to encourage and facilitate action and innovation by local authorities.
- The long term version set out in Chapter 6 is good but DEFRA must come up with measures to deliver this.
- Government needs to lobby for and set more stringent standard to drive air quality action and innovation.
- Government needs to make measures big enough to be effective, for example the variable VED makes SUV drivers pay £250 more than the best cars. However, these are people who've just spent over thirty thousand pounds on the vehicle and are unlikely to be influenced by a £250 incentive.

**Specific issues**

- The Review needs to address all sources of emissions, not just transport.
- More funding for local measures are needed e.g. car clubs.
- More cycle routes are needed.

## Flip chart record for Breakout Group 3 (Yellow).

Facilitator: Tim Williamson, Defra

Recorder: Janet Dixon, Defra

This is a direct transcript from the flip charts written on the day. Facilitator's explanatory text in *italics*. An initial "vote" on all of the questions was taken first, to gauge areas of agreement/conflict. These views were returned to at the end, and modified where appropriate.

### Summary

Q1: Generally agree to retain existing objectives (most/all)

Q2: Generally agree, but some disagree

Q3: Generally agree, but some disagree

Q4: Most agree

Q5: 40% wait for EU, 60% go for E-R before EU

Q6: 20% not a reasonable approach, 80% not sure

Q7: DAs – 20% think they have role (*rose to 80% after discussion, mainly due to regional planning role*). LAs – 50% think they have a role.

### Question 1: Do you agree we should retain the Strategy's existing objectives?

- When *objectives* are already met, *are they* still needed?
- No mechanism to remove objectives if met
- Should we tighten those already met, if *we* have evidence to do so?
- \*\* use objectives as change control *mechanism (i.e. providing a concentration cap to manage land use change, etc.)*
- Beware of monitoring as the end result
- Be aware of redundant objectives
- Consider tightening objectives very carefully – moving goal posts.

### Question 2: Do you agree to the proposed new objectives for oxides of nitrogen, sulphur dioxide and ozone for the protection of ecosystems and vegetation?

- *There is* purpose behind the objectives, but not driving policy
- Not just a box ticking exercise
- Provide indication of Government priorities
- Allows consideration in the planning process

### Question 3: Do you agree that we should begin to move the policy framework to include exposure-reduction type of objectives for non-threshold pollutants such as particles?

- Concern *about* creating more work but not necessarily more benefit
  - ? move from E-R to emission reduction
- Some LAs don't have problem in moving to E-R, but makes arguments more difficult where no "limit"
  - Planning departments can't cope without objectives

- *Limits* make easy decision processes
- Hard to get planning dept.s to engage on AQ. *They* tend to work on basis of do something (*allow development*) unless guidance says “no”.

Question 4: What are your views on including objectives on PM<sub>2.5</sub> as well as PM<sub>10</sub>

*This question was not discussed as the group were unanimously in favour of the inclusion of PM<sub>2.5</sub> objectives in addition to those for PM<sub>10</sub>, provided it doesn't simply become a monitoring exercise.*

Question 5: Should the UK Government and the devolved administrations wait until an exposure reduction objective is agreed in Europe before adopting a new national objective for particles or, should we adopt new exposure reduction and concentration cap objectives for PM<sub>2.5</sub> now and review them after final agreement in Europe?

- Don't want to change objective again in few years which may require difficult policies (which may conflict)
- Many of *implementation* policies are on EU timetables, e.g. *vehicle manufacturers are developing emission control technologies according to the timescales for Euro standard introduction, and are unlikely to speed up for “local” regulations.*
- Don't have to wait for technology changes to change way of thinking (i.e. Exposure Reduction).

Question 6: If the UK Government and the devolved administrations proceed now with the proposal for new PM<sub>2.5</sub> objectives, do you consider that the proposed values of 15% exposure reduction objective (between 2010 and 2020) and a 25ug.m<sup>-3</sup> concentration cap (12ug.m<sup>-3</sup> for Scotland) are reasonable?

- Unsure – don't have enough information to make judgement (*group members were uncomfortable making a judgement on the 15% E-R target, not knowing how challenging this is, or whether small changes in percentage points made a significant difference*)
- 25 µg.m<sup>-3</sup>
  - Not challenging enough
  - Think should be a driver or need something to address hotspots
  - Need to drive technology changes
- Need case for E-R *and* concentration cap presented more clearly

Question 7: What do you think the role of the devolved administrations and local authorities should be under this new framework?

*Local Authorities:*

- LAs best placed to identify hotspots
- LAs will be put under a lot of pressure with E-R even if concentrations are already low

- E-R gives LAs tool to control developments in areas already meeting objectives
- Run E-R and Conc Cap together

*Devolved Administrations*

- AQ devolved matter – able to set own objectives if necessary/appropriate
- ? regional planning role (guidance etc.)
  
- How can AQ strategy deal with philosophical aspects?

**Outcomes of Group 4 (pink) breakout discussion**  
**Clare Beattie, Air Quality Consultant Ltd**

The group was tasked with a number of questions which are summarised below, following on from a lengthy discussion which is summarised following.

1. Do you agree that we should retain the Strategy's existing objectives?

Majority yes, couple of members of the group were unsure. Some opinion about why keep the objectives that we are already achieving?

2. Do you agree to the proposed new objectives for oxides of nitrogen, sulphur dioxide and ozone for the protection of ecosystems and vegetation?

Group was unsure and thought it was better to know what the UK could do in practice rather than setting more objectives. There were some specific queries regarding exclusion zones, how do we monitor ecosystems objectives and cost benefit being particularly difficult for ecosystems. These points are covered in the general discussion.

3. Do you agree that we should begin to move the policy framework to include exposure-reduction type of objectives for non-threshold pollutants such as particles?

Generally yes for the concept, but unsure how it will work in practice, particularly from a local authority perspective. LAs are unlikely to embrace exposure reduction if already below PM objectives. There was also some opinion that we should be looking directly at health rather than concentrations of pollutants in relation to exposure. The rest of the group felt this was not objective enough.

4. What are your views on including objectives on PM<sub>2.5</sub> as well as PM<sub>10</sub>?

Some members of the group thought that we should do both, particularly as they are such different metrics and proportions of the two elements could change over time. Others thought it was too onerous (particularly for local authorities) to have objectives for both PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Assessing objectives is difficult in practice for PM<sub>2.5</sub> as no correction factors for gravimetric from TEOM and a lack of data generally.

5. Should the UK Government and the devolved administrations wait until an exposure reduction objective is agreed in Europe before adopting a new national objective for particles or, should we adopt a new exposure reduction and concentration cap objectives for PM<sub>2.5</sub> now and review them after the final agreement in Europe?

The group were split about whether to wait or go ahead. There was no time to discuss this question in detail.

6. If the UK Government and the devolved administrations proceed now with the proposal for new objectives, do you consider that the proposed values of 15% exposure reduction objective (between 2010 and 2020) and a 25 µg/m<sup>3</sup> concentration cap (12 µg/m<sup>3</sup> for Scotland) are reasonable?

There was general agreement that the concentration cap was not stringent enough. 15% reduction in PM<sub>2.5</sub> seemed challenging, but not enough technical knowledge.

7. What do you think the role of the devolved administrations and local authorities should be under the new framework?

Although this question was not discussed specifically (due to lack of time) this is probably the issue which was most discussed throughout the discussions of the afternoon. It was felt that local authorities would tackle the new framework through transport and planning regimes, which will be difficult without a clear steer from Government (clear objective to enable delivery needed). There was a suggestion that the national strategy could be adopted at local level through local air quality strategies.

### ***Summary of general discussions***

- Communication with planners and transport planners needs to be flagged. It was suggested that there should be more of a government push for integration within documents such as the Review of the Air Quality Strategy
- Regarding the objectives, there was some concern that in terms of industry any objectives need to be clear whether they are mandatory. At the moment it was felt that it was dependent on the regulatory authority.
- Concern that emphasis of LAQM has been on NO<sub>2</sub>, and was there any direct health impacts. Although a dose response relationship is difficult, there is still WHO evidence that the objective is justified in terms of health. Majority (all?) of the cost benefit calculations within the review are based on PM<sub>10</sub>, whereas for the majority of LAs, NO<sub>2</sub> is the issue. NO<sub>2</sub> tends to be the main LAQM driver outside of London and major urban areas.
- Other issues regarding how to change behaviour (which it was felt wasn't emphasised enough in the document). Use of land use planning system (at an early stage) is required to reduce the need to travel.
- In terms of exposure reduction, central London is already working at this level as they are not going to achieve the objectives (i.e. they are already working at a borough level to generally reduce emissions).
- It is difficult to see how the reductions required for exposure reduction will actually be met. It was recognised that it would be through technology as well as measures to decrease the need to travel. It was also difficult to see how exposure reduction could be implemented locally (goes back to earlier comments about the planning system). It was suggested that the role of central government was in technology, and role of local government in terms of local transport initiatives etc.
- Suggestion that there should be a section in the strategy on work that has been done by local authorities, academic work on local air quality plus any work derived from LAQM (e.g. reports based on R&A outcomes such as NO<sub>2</sub> drop off relating to distance from road) (add to section 2?). It was felt that even some central Government recognition of LAQM would provide support for local authorities which are struggling for resources for air quality within their organisations.
- It was flagged up that there was a potential for air pollution to increase in certain locations following large new developments
- In terms of PM<sub>2.5</sub> objectives, the 25 µg/m<sup>3</sup> was not thought to be challenging enough. It was pointed out that the 15% reduction in concentrations was designed to be the driver, and not the 25 µg/m<sup>3</sup> cap. Query as to whether this new 2010 objective was more stringent than the current 2004 objective (general consensus was that the concentration cap wasn't more stringent than current objectives).

- Some discussion on ecosystems including a query on how this objective was going to be monitored (nationally?). There were some reservations that the exclusion zones were too large and that perhaps maps should be included to make clear where the ecosystems objectives apply. There should be more interaction with the other processes, in particular the Habitats Directive. There was also some concern that it is difficult (impossible?) to apply cost-benefit methodology to ecosystems and that there is too much emphasis on cost. It was flagged up that in Cornwall, local authorities have a lot of expertise in terms of ecosystems which Defra could potentially tap into.

**Outcomes of Group 5 (Green) breakout discussion  
Steve Moorcroft, Air Quality Consultants Ltd**

The group was tasked with a number of questions which are summarised below. A decision was taken at the start of the session to give priority to some of the questions in order to allow a more detailed discussion.

**8. Do you agree that we should retain the Strategy's existing objectives?**

Not discussed.

**9. Do you agree to the proposed new objectives for oxides of nitrogen, sulphur dioxide and ozone for the protection of ecosystems and vegetation?**

Group was unable to reach a consensus decision. There was a general agreement that objectives based on deposition (i.e. critical levels) would provide a better metric, but there were opinions expressed that N and S deposition was primarily a transboundary issue, and that for the more sensitive habitats, deposition is effectively controlled under the Habitats Directive. It was generally agreed that it would not be sensible or practicable to introduce deposition objectives at this stage. Some concerns were expressed that the proposed new objectives are expected to be met without any additional effort, and are therefore not challenging.

**10. Do you agree that we should begin to move the policy framework to include exposure-reduction type of objectives for non-threshold pollutants such as particles?**

General agreement that this would be a good idea.

**11. What are your views on including objectives on PM<sub>2.5</sub> as well as PM<sub>10</sub>?**

General agreement that objectives for PM<sub>2.5</sub> should be introduced. There were some concerns expressed about the current paucity of PM<sub>2.5</sub> data on which to establish objectives, and how PM<sub>2.5</sub> would be measured.

**12. Should the UK Government and the devolved administrations wait until an exposure reduction objective is agreed in Europe before adopting a new national objective for particles or, should we adopt a new exposure reduction and concentration cap objectives for PM<sub>2.5</sub> now and review them after the final agreement in Europe?**

Not discussed.

**13. If the UK Government and the devolved administrations proceed now with the proposal for new objectives, do you consider that the proposed values of 15% exposure reduction objective (between 2010 and 2020) and a 25 µg/m<sup>3</sup> concentration cap (12 µg/m<sup>3</sup> for Scotland) are reasonable?**

Discussion focussed upon the exposure reduction objective. General agreement that a 15% reduction would prove a challenging target. Concerns were raised as to what form this objective might take – i.e. would it be a binding commitment upon Government so that additional measures are introduced if the reduction falls short – or will it be an “ambition objective”? Also concerns raised as to whether it may

disadvantage deprived populations – i.e. the target is achieved by large reductions in prosperous areas, with little or no reduction in others. Comments that much firmer measures could be taken, i.e. a commitment to the introduction of CNG buses within the UK, etc.

**14. What do you think the role of the devolved administrations and local authorities should be under the new framework?**

Discussion focussed upon the role of local authorities. Generally accepted that exposure reduction objectives would not be applicable for direct introduction under the LAQM regime – but a strong feeling from LA representatives within the Group that they did not wish to be completely excluded. The potential to include PM exposure reduction within the planning regime was discussed. Possible routes would be a requirement to include PM mitigation for all development schemes that caused any PM emissions increase, regardless of whether the existing objectives and limit values were exceeded. Some responsibilities may also be given to regional assemblies for strategic planning.

In order for this to be successful, the AQS needs to be considerably strengthened in this area, setting out the basis for the mechanisms, and potentially identifying revisions to existing planning guidance, such as PPS23. There were strong feelings that if this is not done then it will be impossible to get planning authorities to take any actions.

## **ANNEX B: Breakout Group Membership**

<b>GROUP 1</b>	<b>Rutherford Theatre</b>
NSCA	Rob Pilling (Facilitator)
AEAT	John Stedman
Corus UK plc	Dr Jenny Hodges
Parson Brinkerhoff Ltd	Ben Suter
Health Protection Agency	Richard Mohan
Met Office	Paul Agnew
Defra	Colin McMullen
WS Atkins	Ella Yerushalmi
Imperial College	Linda Davies
Cornwall College	Jo Barnes
R W E npower plc	Ian Rodgers
University West of England	Tim Chatterton
Royal Society of Chemistry	Jeff Hardy
DfT	Lalla Nott
Defra	Matthew Gilbert
DTI	David Williams
DTI	Preetum Domah
Assoc Electricity Producers	Andy Limbrick
GL 2006 Europe Ltd	Robin Baker
LACORS	Severine Trouillet
Oxford City Council	Roger Pitman
Sheffield City Council	Steve Simmons
Sussex Air Quality Steering Group	Nigel Jenkins
Islington LB	Aled Griffiths
Dudley MBC	Glyn Hodgkiss
Thurrock BC	Dheshee Nadar
Brent LB	Jennifer Barrett

<b>GROUP 2</b>	<b>Philips Room 5<sup>th</sup> Floor</b>
Defra	John Rea
GLA	Sarah Legge (Facilitator)
AEAT	Susannah Grice
Assoc. London Gvnt	Jared Boow
KleenAir Ltd	Karl Grimston
Defra	Kay Sadanand
Defra	James Davey
E. ON UK plc	Jenny Lines
DfT	Becky Wood
Defra	Paro Konar
SMMT	Simon Barnes
Bureau Veritas	Lucy Park
British Sugar	Paul Hardy
BP	Suzie Baverstock
Alcan Primary Metal Europe	John Clarkson

Environment Agency	Stuart Stearn
Non Ferrous Alliance	Anelli Gilbert
UKPIA	Malcolm Watson
Lubrizol Ltd	Bob Cawdell
University College London	John Murlis
Drax Power Ltd	Nigel Burdett
Bristol City Council	David Muir
Hounslow LB	Anderson Ramdeen
Westminster City Council	Steve Neville
Bexley LB	Jon Fox
Greenwich LB	John Paterson
Kensington & Chelsea LB	Rebecca Brown
Wandsworth LB	David Kennett

<b>GROUP 3</b>	<b>Cater Room (lower ground floor)</b>
Defra	Tim Williamson (Facilitator)
Defra	Janet Dixon
AEAT	Melanie Hobson
DOE Northern Ireland	Dan Kennedy
University Leeds	Mike Pilling
Terence O'Rourke Ltd	Chris Thomson
Pesticide Action Network	Alison Craig
Centre for Ecology Bangor	Laurence Jones
D&D Holmes	David Holmes
Entec UK Ltd	Andriana Stavrakaki
Quarry Products Ltd	Sarah Baldry
Environment Agency	Adrian Young
Casella Measurement	James Moore
Haskoning UK Ltd	Alice Dagg
Health Protection Agency	Heather Walton
DfT	Michael Rossell
Transport Research Laboratory	Peter Fleming
Defra	Karl Nsiah
RPS	Melaine Smith
Corus UK plc	Marie-Jo Schofield
Sheffield City Council	Mark Daly
Windsor & Maidenhead Royal Borgh.	Philip Turner
Newham LB	Robin Whitehouse
Mendip DC	Curtis Larkin
Leeds City Council	Jon Tubby
Milton Keynes Council	David Parish
Westminster City Council	Bridie Gunn

<b>GROUP 4</b>	<b>Ada Lovelace room 2<sup>nd</sup> floor</b>
Defra	Martin Williams
University West of England	Claire Beattie (Facilitator)
KleenAir Sytems Ltd	Peter Newell
LACORS	Karen Lawrence
Scottish Environment Protection Agency	Anna Douglas
DoH	Louise Newport
Defra	Noel Nelson
Capita Symonds Group Ltd	Xiangyu Sheng
Cornwall College	Leo Salter
David Shillito Associates	David Shillito
Scottish Executive	Andrew Taylor
Mott MacDonald Ltd	Gordon Clamp
National Farmers Union	Diane Mitchell
DTI	Robert Falk
GLA	Lorraine Tulloch
Environmental Management Publish	Jack Pease
Environment Agency	Bernard Fisher
Ove Arup & Partners	Rachel Conti
Cambridge City Council	Anita Lewis
Rugby Borough Council	David Burrows
Hertsmere Borough Council	Sarah Hoggett
Newport City Council	Vaughan Wilton
Southwark LB	Bill Legassick
City of London	Ruth Calderwood
Slough BC	Monica Wilsch
Hackney LB	Lillian Galable
Kensington & Chelsea	Kyri Eleftheriou-Vaus

<b>GROUP 5</b>	
Air Quality Consultants Ltd	Steve Moorcroft (Facilitator)
Environmental Research Group	Stephen Hedley
R W E npower	Alan Webb
Martin Eversfield	Martin Eversfield
University West of England	Enda Hayes
Bureau Veritas	Lakhumal Luhana
DfT	Natasha Robinson
FOE Cymru	Max Wallis
National Assembly for Wales	Ross Hunter
Enviros Consulting	Mark Broomfield
Environment Agency	Jim Story
LACORS	Neil Talbot
CERC	Stephanie Park
Individual	R C Goodhew
Golders Associates UK Ltd	Samantha Arnold

Vale of Glamorgan Council	Candido Choo-Yin
Neath Port Talbot County BC	Graham Raikes
Neath Port Talbot County BC	Martin Hooper
Hillingdon LB	Val Beale
Bristol City Council	Steve Crawshaw
Sefton MBC	Gary Mahoney
Middlesborough BC	Paul MacGregor
Newcastle upon Tyne City Council	Ed Foster
Greenwich LB	Colin Perryman
Barnet LB	Ralph Haynes
Basildon DC	Graham Banister
Camden LB	Gloria Esposito