NATTRAN/SE/S247/6126 **TVBC/TR/1**

PLANNING PERMISSION REF: 25/01047/FULLN

TEST VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

SECTION 247

PROPOSED STOPPING UP OF HIGHWAY AT WESTERN AVENUE, ANDOVER, HAMPSHIRE

OS GRID REFERENCE [436202, 145700 – 436283, 145515]

PROOF OF EVIDENCE

ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

NOISE AND AIR QUALITY

TIM ROSE, BA(HONS) MCIHT MTPS

REGIONAL DIRECTOR

MEC CONSULTING GROUP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. This proof of evidence is prepared on behalf of the applicant, Test Valley Borough Council ("the Council") and produced in support of an application under section 247 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("TCPA 1990") to stop up highway in the Borough of Test Valley in relation to planning permission reference 25/01047/FULLN.

1.2. Reference to CD/[x] are to documents in the Core Documents.

2. QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE AND SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

Qualifications and Experience

2.1. My name is Tim Rose and I am a Regional Director at MEC Consulting Group with responsibility for running the Pre-Planning teams across multiple office locations including the Noise and Air Quality Teams.

2.2. I have been a Regional Director at MEC Consulting Group ("MEC") since January 2018, with 20 years' experience in the Consulting Engineering industry.

2.3. I hold a BA(Hons) in Environmental Management with Transport Planning from the University of Leeds, I am a Member of the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation and a Member of the Transport Planning Society.

2.4. I have been involved with the Development since March 2024. MEC prepared a number of Technical Documents in support of the planning application including Phase I and II Ground Investigation, Noise Assessment, Air Quality Assessment, Lighting Impact Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy and Underground Utility Detection Surveys. I also attended a meeting with residents of Chantry Lodge and Portland Grove to discuss issues pertaining to Noise and Air Quality matters in March 2025.

Declaration

2.5. The evidence which I have prepared and provide in this proof of evidence is true and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

Scope of Evidence

2.6. This Proof of Evidence should be read in conjunction with the Statement of Case dated 29 May 2026 (CD/9.01) and the proofs of evidence of Phil Brady (Transport) (CD/11.01), David Jowsey (Local Highway Authority) (CD/11.04), Ross Rawlings (Road Safety) (CD/11.02) and Fay Smiles (Planning) (CD/11.05).

2.7. My evidence is made in support of the SUO Application which was submitted by the Council to the Secretary of State for Transport on 28 July 2025 (CD/1.01) and which is to be considered and determined by the Secretary of State for Transport following a Public Inquiry ("Inquiry") beginning on 30 June 2026.

2.8. In my evidence I use the term:-

2.8.1. "SUO Application" to mean the application made pursuant to section 247 TCPA 1990 and submitted by the Council to the Secretary of State for Transport to stop up sections of highway at Western Avenue, Andover to enable the Development to be carried out;

2.8.2. "Development" to mean the development authorised under planning permission reference 25/01047/FULLN for the closure / stopping up and removal of the southbound carriageway of the Western Avenue gyratory and associated changes to the highway network, including West Street and Waterloo Court, to allow for the development of a park with areas of hard and soft landscaping, play areas, lighting, pavilion, river viewing platforms and an off-road cycleway in Andover, Hampshire.

2.9. For a summary of the Development and an explanation of the purpose of the SUO Application, including a description of the site and current highways proposed to be stopped up pursuant to the SUO Application, please refer to the proofs of evidence of Phil Brady (Transport) and Fay Smiles (Planning).

2.10. The purpose of this brief is to provide evidence on air quality and noise issues with regard to the proposed SUO Application. In particular my evidence:

2.10.1. sets out my/my team's involvement with the Development and the SUO Application;

2.10.2. refers to and explains the key air quality and noise assessment evidence which supported the planning application for the Development, including the key methodologies used, assessments undertaken and conclusions reached;

2.10.3. discusses what impacts stopping up the highway will have on air quality and noise and how they are proposed to be mitigated; and

2.10.4. refers to and provides comments on the objections to the proposed SUO Application in relation to air quality and noise.

3. MY INVOLVEMENT WITH THE DEVELOPMENT

3.1. MEC became involved in the development in 2024. MEC were instructed to undertake noise and air quality assessments for the planning application relating to the Development to evaluate the effects of the proposed highway reconfiguration and associated greenspace development on the noise and air quality environment. Discussions were undertaken with the Environmental Health Officer ("EHO") at Test Valley Borough Council to agree the scope of works for both reports. The noise assessment dated May 2025 (report reference: 28483-ENV-0401) (CD/5.1.07) ("Noise Assessment") considers the potential effects of changes to the road network on existing residential receptors in the vicinity of Western Avenue and West Street. The Noise Assessment has been undertaken in accordance with:

3.1.1. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, LA 111, May 2020 ("DMRB");

3.1.2. the Noise Insulation Regulations 197 (amended 1988) ("NIR"); and

3.1.3. BS 8233:2014 'Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings.' and BS 4142:2014 +A1:2019 'Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound.'

3.2. The air quality assessment dated March 2025 (report reference: 28483-ENV-0402) (CD/5.1.08) ("Air Quality Assessment") considers the potential effects of changes in road traffic flows associated with the proposed Development on existing receptors located along Western Avenue, West Street and the surrounding road network. The Air Quality Assessment focuses on nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), and particulates (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$).

3.3. I was involved at all stages of the preparation of the documents and I carried out the final checks and approvals for both reports. I also visited Chantry Lodge in March 2025 to present a summary of the noise and air quality matters pertaining to the Development. Residents of Portland Grove were also invited to attend the presentation.

3.4. In preparing this evidence, I confirm I have seen the modified SUO Plan [CD/1.04] which proposes to remove West Street from the area to be stopped up under the SUO Application and this has not changed the evidence or my conclusions based on any of the previous assessments I have carried out for the Development.

4. NOISE AND AIR QUALITY ASSESSMENTS

Noise

4.1. The Noise Assessment considers the potential effects of changes to the road network on existing residential receptors in the vicinity of Western Avenue and West Street. The assessment has been undertaken in accordance with DMRB, NIR, BS 8233 and BS 4142.

Assessment of traffic noise

4.2. Acoustic modelling has been undertaken to predict traffic noise levels for both opening year (2028) and future year (2040) scenarios, with and without the Development. These scenarios allow for a robust assessment of both short-term and long-term noise effects arising from the Development's road layout changes.

4.3. The Noise Assessment demonstrates that the majority of receptors would experience a 'negligible' change in noise levels as a result of the Development. A 'minor' magnitude of change (i.e. between a 1.0 dB to 2.9 dB change in the short term and a 3.0 dB to 4.9 dB change in the long term) is predicted at a small number of receptors located in close proximity to West Street on Portland Grove; however, this change is considered 'Not Significant' when determining final operational significance on noise sensitive buildings in line with Table 3.60 of DMRB LA 111 – Noise and Vibration, 2020. This is due to the fact that the absolute noise levels would fall in the Lowest Adverse Effect Level category for both the short term and long term, the acoustic character of the area would remain the same and the change in sound levels lies closer to the bottom range of the 'Minor' magnitude of change category.

4.4. A summary of the short term and long term noise level changes are included in Tables 1 and 2 below. The magnitude of change for short term and long term impacts are based on Table 3.54a and 3.54b from DMRB LA 111.

Table 1 – Short Term (2028) Sound Level Change and Significance at nearby Receptors

Receptor	Sound Level Change (dB)	Magnitude of Change	Significance
Portland Grove North	+1.6	Minor	Not Significant
Portland Grove South	+0	No change	Not Significant
Chantry Lodge	+0	No change	Not Significant

Table 2 – Long Term (2040) Sound Level Change and Significance at nearby Receptors

Receptor	Sound Level Change (dB)	Magnitude of Change	Significance
Portland Grove North	+3.4	Minor	Not Significant
Portland Grove South	+0.7	Negligible	Not Significant
Chantry Lodge	+2.7	Negligible	Not Significant

4.5. The Noise Assessment also confirms that magnitude of change is not such that compensation is required for any properties under the NIR and that no mitigation measures are required for operational noise.

4.6. It is recognised that despite the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) predicted at the receptor in closest proximity of the western side of the Western Avenue gyratory (NSR2 in the Noise Assessment) with the road adjustments in place, the absolute sound levels at NSR2 for the baseline scenario already fall within the SOAEL (see Table 5.2 and 5.4 of the Noise Assessment). In any event, the actual magnitude of change in both the short and long term resulting from the road network adjustments (calculated to be 0.2dB and 1.3 dB in the short term and long term, see table 5.1 and 5.3 of the Noise Assessment respectively) is considered to be negligible and therefore 'not significant' in accordance with relevant guidance.

4.7. In addition, the proposed road layout is predicted to provide a partial betterment in ambient sound levels within the proposed greenspace area. With the closing of the eastern circulatory of the Western Avenue Gyratory, $L_{Aeq,16hr}$ sound levels are predicted to decrease in the eastern portion of the proposed greenspace, with a larger proportion of the greenspace falling under 60 dB and therefore fall closer in line with the BS 8233's 55 dB private external living area criteria.

Vehicle and HGV Re-routing Assessment

4.8. The Noise Assessment then considered the potential effects associated with the re-routing of vehicles, including Heavy Good Vehicles ("HGV") movements, through the Lidl car park.

4.9. Baseline conditions were established through an environmental sound survey undertaken in accordance with BS 7445, which confirmed that the existing acoustic environment is dominated by road traffic noise from the surrounding transport network.

4.10. An assessment was undertaken in accordance with BS 4142 to determine the potential impact of these changes to the route of vehicles and HGV through the Lidl car park at the nearest residential receptors along Portland Grove. The assessment demonstrates that the resulting rating level associated with these movements is below the measured background sound level (the L_{A90} which refers to the noise level exceeded for 90% of the time over the period. L_{A90} can be considered to be the "average minimum" noise level) at the nearest receptors, indicating a 'low impact' in accordance with BS 4142. The findings also recognise that such vehicle movements are not considered to be out of character with the existing acoustic environment, which is already influenced by road traffic and commercial activity.

4.11. On this basis, the re-routing of vehicles associated with the proposed Development and SUO Application is not considered to give rise to any significant adverse effects in terms of BS 4142.

Air Quality

4.12. The Air Quality Assessment considers the potential effects of changes in road traffic flows associated with the proposed Development on existing receptors located along Western Avenue, West Street and the surrounding road network. The assessment focuses on nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), and particulates (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$), and has been undertaken in accordance with Defra's LAQM [1], and the EPUK[2].

4.13. Dispersion modelling has been undertaken using the ADMS-Roads Air Quality Management System Version 5.1, developed by Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants Ltd (CERC) model, incorporating traffic flow data, vehicle composition, speed, background pollutant concentrations and meteorological data. The model has been verified against local air quality monitoring data to ensure robust predictions.

4.14. The model demonstrates that the baseline scenario (i.e., based on the existing road configuration) all receptors experience values below the relevant Air Quality Objective Levels, as set out within Section 2.0 of the Air Quality Assessment and Table at paragraph 4.3.1 below, which is consistent with the Local Authority air quality review and assessment data, as presented within the council's Annual Status Report (ASR) and discussed within the Air Quality Assessment in Section 3.0.

4.14.1. The Air Quality Objective Levels for the relevant pollutants are set out below.

Table xx: UK Air Quality Objectives for Protection of Human Health

Pollutant	Concentration	Measured as
Nitrogen dioxide	200 $\mu g/m^3$	1 hour mean not to be exceeded more than 18 times per year

[1] Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance 2022

[2] Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) and the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) – Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality 2017

	40 μg/m^3	Annual mean
Particles (PM_{10} gravimetric)		
All authorities	50 μg/m^3	Daily mean not to be exceeded more than 35 times a year
	40 μg/m^3	Annual mean
Particles ($PM_{2.5}$ gravimetric)	20 μg/m^3 (target)	Annual mean
	12 μg/m^3	2028 Interim target[(a)]
	10 μg/m^3	Legally binding target 2040[(a)]
[(a)] The Environmental Targets (Fine Particulate Matter) (England) Regulations 2023		

Nitrogen dioxide

4.15. When the Development's proposed new road configuration is in place, the absolute concentrations of NO_2 will remain below the current Air Quality Objectives, and when compared with the concentration levels before the Development is carried out, the incremental change is small (1 μg/m^3 or less to annual mean concentrations NO_2), which would not have a significant impact upon local air quality. In accordance with LAQM/EPUK guidance, the impact due to development is classed as 'Negligible', the predicted changes are also very small relative to the Air Quality Objective Level (AQOL) and none of the changes exceed 3%.

Particulate PM_{10}

4.16. With the proposed road configuration in place, the absolute concentrations of PM_{10} will remain below the current air quality objectives, and when compared with the concentration levels before the Development is carried out, the incremental change is small (0.42 μg/m^3 or less to annual mean concentrations of PM_{10}), which would not have a significant impact upon local air quality. In accordance with LAQM/EPUK guidance, the impact due to development is classed as 'Negligible', and the predicted changes are also very small relative to the AQOL, none of the changes exceed 1%.

Particulate $PM_{2.5}$

4.17. With the proposed road configuration in place, the absolute concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ will remain below the current Air Quality Objectives, and when compared with the concentration levels before the Development is carried out. The incremental change is small (0.22 μg/m^3 or less to annual mean concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$), which would not have a significant impact upon local air quality.

4.18. With a % change relevant to the AQOL of up to 2%, this would represent 'Negligible' to 'Slight' impacts in accordance with the LAQM/EPUK guidance.

4.19. However, where 'Slight' impacts are predicted, it is important to recognise that absolute concentrations of between 7.72 μg/m^3 and 8.07 μg/m^3 continue to lie below the target level of 10 μg/m^3 (in accordance with the Air Quality Objectives).

4.20. It is also important to note that the predicted impacts above represent a worst-case scenario, with the model using 2040 traffic flow data, together with 2025 background and emissions data, to account for current uncertainty in future year projections. Background pollutant concentrations and vehicle emission factors are predicted to decline over time, reflecting the continued introduction of more stringent emission standards and ongoing turnover of the UK vehicle fleet.

4.21. Using 2025 data therefore provides a conservative case for the 2040 scenario. In reality, pollutant concentrations are likely to be lower.

4.22. The Air Quality Assessment indicates that there will be an increase in NO_2, and particulates (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5)}$, however despite the increase, the annual Air Quality Objectives will still be

met at the most exposed receptor locations, and on that basis it can be concluded that re-configuration of the road will not lead to a significant adverse impact upon existing air quality.

Summary of Air Quality Assessment and Noise Assessment

4.23. In summary, the Air Quality Assessment and Noise Assessment demonstrates that the proposed reconfiguration of the highway network as a result of the Development would not result in any significant adverse environmental effects during operation.

4.24. Changes in air pollutant concentrations are predicted to be 'Negligible' for the majority of receptors, with only slight impacts noted at select receptor locations along Portland Grove. Nevertheless, absolute levels will continue to lie below relevant objectives for all assessed receptors.

4.25. Similarly, with regard to noise, changes in road traffic noise are predominantly negligible, with only minor effects identified at a limited number of receptors.

4.26. Additional consideration of vehicle re-routing in accordance with BS 4142 confirms that the changes to the HGV route would give rise to a 'low impact'.

4.27. Overall, the findings indicate that the impact on noise and air quality from the proposed Development are acceptable from a planning perspective and that no mitigation is required in respect of operational air quality or noise. The assessments are considered robust and no further updates are necessary in relation to the SUO Application.

5. COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED SUO

5.1. I understand that 35 objections have been made to the SUO Application and these will be considered by an Inspector as part of the Inquiry. I also understand that the Council has responded to the common themes in those objections and a copy of the Council's response can be found at (CD/7.01).

5.2. I have however considered these objections and provide the following comments:

5.2.1. A number of objections have been raised in relation to potential impacts associated with noise, air quality and vibration arising from both the operational and construction phases of the proposed development. These primarily relate to concerns regarding increased traffic movements along West Street, perceived increases in noise and air pollution, and disturbance during construction works.

5.2.2. With respect to operational effects, the detailed Noise Assessment and Air Quality Assessments were undertaken and submitted to the Council with the application for the Planning Permission. These assessments demonstrate that the existing environment is already influenced by road traffic and that the proposed changes would result in negligible to slight changes in air pollutant concentrations and negligible to minor changes in noise levels. All predicted air quality concentrations remain well below relevant objectives, and no significant adverse noise effects have been identified.

5.2.3. In relation to construction, a Noise, Vibration and Dust Management Plan will be prepared. This will outline potential temporary impacts and outline various Best Practicable Means, in order to minimise noise, vibration and dust emanating from the construction process.

5.3. Overall, the detailed Noise Assessment demonstrates that noise effects are Not Significant in accordance with the relevant guidance. Subsequently, it is considered that the Site is suitable for the proposed greenspace and associated road network alterations from an acoustics perspective.

5.4. The detailed Air Quality Assessment demonstrates that the effects on pollutant concentrations are Not Significant, with predicted impacts classified as negligible to slight. Small increases in

pollutant concentration levels of NO2, PM10 and PM2.5 are identified, however all predicted pollutant concentrations remain below the relevant air quality objective levels. On this basis, it is considered that the Site is suitable, from an air quality perspective, for the proposed greenspace and associated road network alterations.

6. COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF CASE RECEIVED FROM OBJECTORS

6.1. I can confirm I have reviewed the Statements of Case received from the objectors that were received by 29th May 2026. The Statements of Case raise no additional points of objection that have not already been responded to, however I do have the following comments to add in response to the statement of Mrs Ann Truss.

6.2. Within Mrs Ann Truss' Statement of Case, at paragraph 9 there is reference to the Noise Assessment not considering right turning vehicles into LIDL, however, these vehicle movements are included within the traffic flow datasets used in the assessment for vehicle flow on West Street (for all vehicles turning into and out of LIDL). In paragraphs 3 and 13 there is reference to Air Quality levels being above WHO recommended levels, however, the WHO recommended levels are "desirable" levels and they do not represent national objectives, or criteria to be met, which for the UK, are set out by Defra, the Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) and the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM). In respect to national guidance, assessment shows that relevant objective levels are comfortably satisfied for all assessed pollutants. It should also be noted that for the most part, WHO guidelines are also satisfied, albeit PM2.5 shows exceedances, though this is also the case for the baseline scenario.

7. CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

7.1. MEC were instructed to undertake noise and air quality assessments for the planning application relating to the Development to evaluate the effects of the proposed highway reconfiguration and associated greenspace development on the noise and air quality environment.

7.2. MEC prepared the Noise Assessment which considers the potential effects of changes to the road network on existing residential receptors in the vicinity of Western Avenue and West Street, and the Air Quality Assessment which considers the potential effects of changes in road traffic flows associated with the proposed Development on existing receptors located along Western Avenue, West Street and the surrounding road network.

7.3. The Noise Assessment demonstrates that the majority of receptors would experience a 'negligible' change in noise levels as a result of the Development. The Noise Assessment also confirms that magnitude of change is not such that compensation is required for any properties under the NIR and that no mitigation measures are required for operational noise. The Noise Assessment also considered HGV movements and concluded the re-routing of vehicles associated with the proposed Development and SUO Application is not considered to give rise to any significant adverse effects in terms.

7.4. The Air Quality Assessment indicates that there will be an increase in NO_2, and particulates (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5)}$, however despite the increase, the annual Air Quality Objectives will still be met at the most exposed receptor locations, and on that basis it can be concluded that re-configuration of the road will not lead to a significant adverse impact upon existing air quality.

7.5. Overall, the findings indicate that the impact on noise and air quality from the proposed Development are acceptable from a planning perspective and that no mitigation is required in respect of operational air quality or noise. The assessments are considered robust and no further updates are necessary in relation to the SUO Application.

8. STATEMENT OF TRUTH

8.1. I confirm that insofar as the facts stated in this Statement are within my own knowledge I have made clear which they are and I believe them to be true, and that the opinions I have expressed represent my true and complete professional opinion.

8.2. I confirm that my statement includes all facts which I regard as being relevant to the opinions which I have expressed and that attention has been drawn to any matter which would affect the validity of those opinions.

Signed:  ..

Name: Tim Rose

Date: 9 June 2026