

Land-use, transport and vehicle technology futures: An air pollution assessment of policy combinations for the Cambridge Sub-Region of the UK

Hargreaves, Anthony; Namdeo, Anil; Mitchell, Gordon; Goodman, Paul

DOI:

[10.1016/j.cities.2019.03.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.03.004)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Hargreaves, A, Namdeo, A, Mitchell, G & Goodman, P 2019, 'Land-use, transport and vehicle technology futures: An air pollution assessment of policy combinations for the Cambridge Sub-Region of the UK', *Cities*, vol. 89, pp. 296-307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.03.004>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Checked for eligibility: 16/05/2019
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.03.004>

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1 **Land-use, transport and vehicle technology futures:**
2 **An air pollution assessment of policy combinations for the**
3 **Cambridge Sub-Region of the UK**

4
5 Dr Anil Namdeo (corresponding author)
6 Reader in Air Quality Management
7 School of Engineering, Newcastle University, UK, NE1 7RU,
8 Tel: +44 191 208 8486
9 anil.namdeo@ncl.ac.uk

10

11 Dr Paul Goodman
12 Research Associate
13 School of Engineering, Newcastle University, UK, NE1 7RU
14 paul.goodman@ncl.ac.uk

15

16 Dr Gordon Mitchell
17 Associate Professor in Environmental Planning
18 School of Geography, University of Leeds, UK, LS2 9JT
19 g.mitchell@leeds.ac.uk

20

21 Dr Anthony Hargreaves
22 Senior Research Fellow, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Birmingham, UK,
23 B15 2TT
24 a.j.hargreaves@bham.ac.uk

25

26 Prof Marcial Echenique
27 Department of Architecture, University of Cambridge, UK, CB2 1PX
28 ma15@cam.ac.uk

29

30 Keywords: Urban Form, Regional Development, Policy Options, Transport Technology,
31 Transport Emissions, Air Quality

32 Abstract Word Count: 247, Body Text word count: 5825 (exc. References. Figs and Tables).

33

34

Highlights

- Impact on air quality of combinations of urban form and vehicle technology explored;
- Application of integrated model chain addressing land use-transport-interaction, traffic emission and dispersion modelling;
- Urban compaction reduces regional GHG (13%) and local air quality emissions (up to 9%);
- Expansion and Market-led policies increase regional GHG (7%) and air quality emissions (up to 7%);
- Air quality deterioration in urban centres under Compaction occurs but can be offset by technology.

46 **Abstract**

47 This paper reports on an investigation of the impact on air-quality of combinations of urban
48 form development scenarios and vehicle fleet technology changes. The scenarios combine
49 policies affecting urban land-use plans within the Cambridge Sub-Region of the UK,
50 alongside technological changes within the projected vehicle fleet. Broadly, the scenarios
51 consist of the 'Trend' for urban form policy and vehicle technology and the urban form policy
52 options of 'Planned expansion', 'Market-led development' and 'Urban compaction', each
53 combined with form-appropriate technological scenarios addressing the uptake of current,
54 and future, technologies in the vehicle fleet. The framework developed for environmental
55 assessment is described, from land-use transport interaction, through traffic assignment and
56 emissions modelling, through to dispersion calculations.

57 The urban form-vehicle technology combinations have been assessed in terms of overall
58 vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT), greenhouse gas (CO₂) emissions, and local air quality
59 (NO_x, NO₂, PM, HC). Results are presented for 2021 and show that overall network
60 emissions change from -13% (Compaction) to +8% (Market-led) relative to the Trend, but
61 effects on emissions in individual districts (NO_x) may much greater, -40% to +50%. Annual
62 mean concentrations of NO₂ at the street level may vary by -7 to 8 µg/m³. The use of electric
63 vehicles in the 'Urban compaction' scenario aids mitigation of air quality issues in the city
64 centre. The results are discussed with respect to the feasibility of scenario implementation,
65 current approaches to planning, and trends in vehicle technology. Limitations of the
66 modelling framework are also identified, and future developments outlined.

67 **1. Introduction**

68 **1.1 Urban form and air quality**

69 There has been much debate in recent decades over how urban form can impact
70 transportation behaviour and environmental quality. It has been argued that dispersed
71 patterns of living and decentralised employment, enabled by ready access to private
72 transportation, increase vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) (Newman and Kenworthy, 1989;
73 Glaeser and Kahn, 2001), resulting in exacerbation of negative externalities including air
74 pollution (Cervero and Kockelman, 1997; Pourahmad *et al.*, 2007; McCarthy and Kaza,
75 2015). Such reasoning has led to the conclusion that urban compaction offers a solution, by
76 promoting shorter trips and modal shift to public transport (Litman, 2007), reducing overall
77 emissions. For example, Stone *et al.*, (2007) suggested a 10% increase in urban population
78 density would lead to a 3.5% reduction in VKT and emissions. .

79 However, Melia *et al.* (2011) present a counter argument, known as the 'Paradox of
80 Intensification' that arises due to the relationship between population density and vehicle use
81 being rather inelastic, as confirmed by an extensive TRB (2010) review of this relationship

that finds a doubling of urban density reduces VKT, on average, by only 5%. The paradox then arises that urban compaction reduces VKT and so is beneficial in terms of reduction in global pollutant (CO₂) emission, but is detrimental in terms of local pollution (e.g. NO₂, particulates) as traffic intensity increases on capacity-constrained networks in urban centres, often accompanied by localised congestion, and elevated pollution levels that can offset any form-achieved gains.

Understanding the nature of the intensification paradox clearly requires that assessment goes beyond a consideration of emission to address pollutant concentration that is important to exposure and health impact. This is complex to determine, having dependency on specific, local factors such as on-street travel patterns, meteorological conditions and canyon morphology (Borrego *et al.*, 2006; Martins, 2012; Yuan *et al.*, 2014; McCarty and Kaza, 2015). In addition, the paradox is sensitive to geography, as the most problematic pollutants at local level vary (Chen *et al.*, 2011; Fan *et al.*, 2018). Cities in the UK and northern Europe tend to have most issues with compliance to nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) standards (DEFRA, 2018; EEA, 2018), whereas those in Eastern Europe and Asia have greater problems with particulate matter (Tasmin, 2019) due to differences in source types and mixes, fuels and technologies. Furthermore, understanding how air quality varies across the city, where local morphology and density varies is complicated by processes of transboundary pollution movement (Ramaswami *et al.*, 2008), the photochemistry between oxides of nitrogen and ozone (Borrego *et al.*, 2006; Stone, 2008), and formation of secondary particles from nitrates and sulphates. Some of these factors can be addressed via a very dense network of monitoring sites, but this is generally impractical, hence atmospheric dispersion modelling, which is capable of addressing such complexities is required. However, to date such models have been little used in the exploration of urban form effects on air quality.

1.2 Urban form, air quality and technology

Our prior work on sustainability appraisal of urban form within its regional context (Echenique *et al.*, 2012), modelled emissions but not atmospheric concentrations, and revealed a relatively weak influence of urban form on CO₂ emissions, given a context of strong growth pressure and long run social and economic pressures, and hence we argued that:

“Smart growth principles should not unquestioningly promote increasing levels of compaction on the basis of reducing energy consumption without also considering its potential negative consequences”, and that “CO₂ reductions may be better pursued through technological improvements.” Echenique *et al.*, (2012)

The role of technology in delivering a more sustainable city is gaining more widespread attention, and indeed, is changing the perception of what a sustainable urban form might be. For example, in a life-cycle assessment study of the Greater Helsinki region, Heinonen *et al.* (2011) found that the city of Espoo, with a lower density than Helsinki city, was becoming lower carbon emitter (per capita) than its neighbour, due to the greater potential to implement renewable energy technologies (solar capture, heat pumps etc) including those

121 needed to power electric vehicles (a higher consumption of material goods in Helsinki city
122 also partly explained the observations). This contrasts to those prior studies, which do not
123 incorporate technology effects and conclude compaction is most able to deliver low carbon
124 urbanisation (e.g. Glaeser and Khan, 2010).

125 The role of technology in city sustainability has long been of interest to those concerned with
126 urban form (see Brothie *et al.* 1985) yet form-technology combinations are challenging to
127 investigate so relatively under- studied. The internal combustion engine radically altered
128 cities in the past, and we can similarly anticipate that new 'disruptive technologies' will alter
129 forms in the future. In the transport sector technology mediated interests include:
130 electrification of road transport, 'intelligent' mobility (such as 'Mobility as a Service' - MaaS),
131 and automation of the driving task (Manyika *et al.*, 2013). Electrification in the medium to
132 long term may result in on-street air quality benefits, although this appears dependent on
133 how and where that electricity is generated (Yu and Stuart, 2017).

134 In addition to these technological 'game changers', air quality problems have resulted in a
135 European regime of both mandated continual improvements to new internal combustion
136 engine vehicles (the 'Euro standards', ACEA, 2018), as well as developments of retrofit
137 solutions (e.g. particulate filters and de-NO_x catalysts) for existing vehicles. Internationally,
138 these Euro standards have been adopted elsewhere, for example the Bharat stage
139 emissions standards in India (ICCT, 2016), and in the "Jing" standards in the Chinese capital
140 (Transport Policy, 2018). Consumer choice is also turning against light diesel vehicles
141 (SMMT, 2018) due to concerns over NO_x emissions, leading to changes in UK Vehicle
142 Excise Duty (colloquially 'Road Tax') (Gov.uk, 2018), even though such vehicles have
143 historically been more fuel efficient than comparable petrol vehicles. Whilst elements of fleet
144 turnover and on-vehicle technologies are routinely incorporated into air quality studies, their
145 application within urban form appraisal, remains a novel topic for study.

146 Our prior work on sustainable urban form (Echenique *et al.*, 2010; Mitchell *et al.* 2011;
147 Echenique *et al.*, 2012) examined the sustainability of current and proposed spatial planning
148 strategies in the UK. We used Land-Use/Transport Interaction (LUTI) modelling to drive a
149 multi-criteria sustainability appraisal of radical, but realistic, alternative urban forms, with an
150 analysis of three UK regions: London and the Wider South East, Tyne and Wear, and
151 Cambridge Sub-Region. This work indicated the challenge to sustainability posed by rapid
152 urban growth, but indicated the potential for sustainability gains, through appropriate
153 combinations of urban form and technology, that were greater than those possible with urban
154 form policies alone (Echenique *et al.*, 2012). Our analyses addressed global and local
155 emissions but stopped short of addressing implications of form-technology combinations for
156 air quality. Therefore, in this paper we report on work, for Cambridge and its sub-region, that
157 examines the impact of packages of measures comprising of complementary urban forms,
158 transport schemes and vehicle technologies. We assess impacts in terms of VKT, global and
159 local emissions, and local air quality (PM, NO_x, NO₂ and HC).

2. Modelling Methodology

The modelling methodology and framework we employ, builds on the tools and outputs of the SOLUTIONS project (Echenique et al, 2010). Figure 1 outlines the modelling framework, where grey boxes represent elements inherited from SOLUTIONS, whilst blue boxes represent the novel elements discussed in this paper. In brief, the four tools used were: 1) the MENTOR land use/transport interaction model (Echenique *et al.*, 2010); 2) The tactical traffic model SATURN (Simulation and Assignment of Traffic in Urban Road Networks) (Hall *et al.* 1980); 3) The data extraction and emissions calculation tool PITHEM (Platform for Integrated Transport, Health and Environmental Modelling) (Namdeo and Goodman, 2012) and 4) The air-quality dispersion model ADMS-Urban (McHugh *et al.*, 1997). The operation of each of these components is briefly outlined below. ESRI's ArcGIS software (ESRI, 2011) was used to visualise outputs from each.

Figure 1: Modelling framework adopted in the ReVISIONS project

2.1 Land Use/Transport Interaction and Transport Modelling

MENTOR is a windows-based version of the MEPLAN model (Echenique *et. al.*, 2010; Echenique *et. al.*, 2012), and is characterised as a 'spatial-economic LUTI' model (Wegener 2004; Simmonds and Feldman, 2011). It estimates the locations of households and employment in zones across a study region, and the transactions between households and employment that generate transport demand (Hargreaves and Echenique, 2008). It models land and labour markets as being in equilibrium for a given time period. In a period, supply is fixed (i.e. land markets are constrained), whilst prices are adjusted so that demand matches supply (Abraham, 1998). An explanation of the structure of the model, and of the steps undertaken in an iteration are presented in Hargreaves and Echenique (2008). The Cambridge-specific MENTOR model (MENCAM) was specifically designed to test combinations of land use and transport policies at the Cambridgeshire sub-regional scale.

The SATURN traffic-assignment model serves a two-fold purpose: Firstly, it provides an indication of the inter-zonal costs of transportation during an iteration of the MENTOR model (Hargreaves and Echenique, 2008). Secondly, SATURN-derived, link-based flow and speed information drive the emissions calculations of PITHEM (see below). SATURN is a 'mesoscopic' transport model, in that it incorporates two phases: a 'traditional' assignment phase where trips from O-D (Origin-Destination) pairs are assigned network routes, and a simulation phase, in which delays at intersections are calculated (Hall *et al.*, 1980). Iterative assignment using both phases provides a better indication of the effects of congestion on link costs (for MENTOR) and on flow patterns (for PITHEM), than via assignment alone.

Given the modelling platform developed in the SOLUTIONS research, use of the coupled MENTOR and SATURN models for the Cambridgeshire region was axiomatic. However, historically, both models have enjoyed considerable use both within the UK and

197 internationally, e.g. see Echenique *et al.* (1990) regarding the use of MEPLAN in three
198 European cities, or Shepherd *et al.* (2006) regarding SATURN in the UK context.

199 **2.2 Emissions and Dispersion Modelling**

200 Emissions modelling was carried out using the PITHEM tool (Namdeo and Goodman, 2012)
201 which generates a link-based emissions inventory from an imported SATURN network.
202 Inventories may be built from a palette of country, road, vehicle and technology types.
203 Different inventories may be applied to pre-defined, spatial-temporal areas, or routes (e.g.
204 between O-D pairs) making the tool attractive for analysing technology based options. The
205 tool contains a database of over 600 vehicle types (defined by chassis-type, fuel, engine
206 size, weight, Euro class and exhaust treatment technology) for inventory definition.
207 Emissions calculations for a particular vehicle are based on application of polynomial speed-
208 emissions curves (see section 3.4). PITHEM has been used successfully on several UK and
209 EU-based projects (Goodman *et al.*, 2014; 2016).

210 Dispersion modelling used the commercial ADMS-Urban model (McHugh *et al.*, 1997;
211 CERC, 2018), a quasi-Gaussian dispersion model, that takes into account meteorology,
212 atmospheric boundary layer structure, height-dependence of wind speed, turbulence and
213 stability, and NO_x photochemistry, and able to calculate concentrations over spatial scales
214 from street to region (CERC, 2018). ADMS is routinely used in the UK for assessment
215 purposes, though it has also seen use in Europe, the United States and Asia (e.g. to study
216 traffic restriction measures associated with the Beijing Olympic Games (CERC, 2018; Cai
217 and Xie, 2010). Numerous validation studies exist (e.g. Owen *et al.*, 2000; Stocker *et al.*,
218 2012; Hood *et al.*, 2018). ADMS was selected for this study based on its demonstrable
219 utility and accuracy for dispersion modelling, and its appropriateness for modelling at the city
220 scale. Conversion of modelled NO_x to NO₂ concentrations was done via post-processing
221 ADMS outputs using the DEFRA conversion spreadsheet (DEFRA, 2012a), in the absence
222 of detailed background ozone information for the sub-region.

223 **3. Study Area and Scenario Design**

224 **3.1 Study Area**

225 Figure 2 shows the area addressed in this analysis, which comprises four district councils
226 including the main population centres of Cambridge (2011 pop. ~123k, area: 116km²),
227 Huntingdonshire (~170k pop., 352km²), as well as South and East Cambridgeshire (~150k,
228 348km² and ~84k, 252km² respectively). In terms of form, the area may be described as
229 monocentric, based around Cambridge itself. Figure 3 shows the main transport links in the
230 area, and the extent of local air-quality modelling (blue inset box). The A1/A1(M) represents
231 a primary North-South corridor in the UK, whilst the A14 is a key East-West corridor, carrying
232 goods to the port of Felixstowe in Suffolk. The southbound M11 feeds into London's North
233 Circular road.

Both Cambridge and Huntingdon have declared, central Air-Quality Management Areas (AQMA), and further areas along the A14 between the two settlements. These AQMAs are based on exceedence of annual NO₂ standard (DEFRA, 2018).

Figure 2: Major population centres and baseline extent of urban development in Cambridgeshire

Figure 3: Major transportation routes and corridors in Cambridgeshire

3.2 Scenarios Tested

The scenarios examined in this paper derive from those previously examined in Echenique *et al.* (2012), and may be summarised as:

- A 'Trend' scenario, based on policies from the 2003 Cambridge Structure Plan, and;
- Alternate scenarios based on allocation of households and employment under the principles of 'Compaction', 'Planned expansion' and 'Market led dispersal'.

The scenarios considered in SOLUTIONS are summarised in Table 1 with a brief generic description and specifics for the Cambridge study area. Further information may be found in Echenique *et al.*, 2010 and 2012. Each alternate scenario is considered 'a response to differing views on what should be the priorities for urban development' (Echenique *et al.*, 2010) and 'designed to be as distinct as possible from the trend to show their benefits and disadvantages (Echenique *et al.*, 2012). As with the 'Trend' scenario, the base year is 2001 with a modelled target year for the alternate scenarios of 2021.

Table 1: Urban form scenarios considered (Echenique *et al.*, 2010)

Data driving the LUTI scenarios was sourced from the Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) MENCAM model (Echenique *et al.*, 2012). This was calibrated using 1990's socio-economic data, with some updating using 2001 household and employment data. The SATURN networks were also provided by CCC and used in the second 'Cambridge Futures' study (Echenique and Hargreaves, 2008), as well as in SOLUTIONS.

3.3 Technology Packages

The technology packages selected were tailored to each scenario based on what were considered feasible adoption rates for those technologies (Wright, 2012), but also to highlight distinctions between option. Two compaction options were tested, Compaction and Compaction+, with the latter favouring the uptake of electric vehicles within the centre of Cambridge. Each technology package was applied by building an appropriate emissions inventory in the PITHEM tool, then processing the LUTI/SATURN outputs via PITHEM, into an ADMS-Urban input deck. Required data was drawn from a number of sources. Fleet proportions, based on scrappage of old vehicles and uptake of new vehicles, used for the Trend scenario, and as a basis for the alternate scenarios, were taken from Venfield and Pang (2012). Speed-emissions curves for the inventories were taken from the UK Emissions

270 Factors Toolkit V5.2c (DEFRA, 2013). Modifying (scaling) factors for alternate fuel and
271 hybrid vehicles were derived from Murrells and Pang (2013), and further fuel economy
272 savings for freight and public transport vehicles were adapted from Li *et al.* (2009). Diurnal
273 and seasonal emission scaling factors were from the Department for Transport (DfT, 2013).

274 **Table 2: Vehicle technology options applied to the 2021 urban form scenarios**
275 **(Echenique *et al.*, 2010; Wright, 2012).**

276 **3.4 Dispersion modelling**

277 The ADMS model was run over a 10km x 10km grid, with cell dimensions of approximately
278 125m x 125m, over the blue box area in Figure 2. Additional background (ambient) pollution
279 information, and concentrations arising from non-traffic sources were taken from DEFRA
280 background maps (DEFRA, 2012b). Meteorological information was sourced from the UK
281 Met Office from the Monkswood station, to the north of Cambridge, as the closest available
282 site.

283 **4. Results**

284 **4.1 Vehicle Kilometres Travelled and Emissions**

285 Results from the Trend 2021 scenario were first compared to a baseline 2001 scenario. Total
286 vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) would increase by +11.5%, but technology changes in the
287 fleet resulted in projected CO₂ emissions falling by -16%, PM₁₀ by -37% and NO_x and HC
288 emissions by over -80%. However, primary NO₂ emissions only fell by -9%. Over the same
289 period and region, the SOLUTIONS project (Echenique *et al.*, 2012) showed increases in
290 CO₂ emissions of 16% for the transport and building energy sectors for the Cambridge sub-
291 region. The fall in CO₂ emissions reported here are due to more aggressive assumptions on
292 fuel consumption improvements to light-duty IC vehicles than were present in the EFT
293 emissions figures (DEFRA, 2013) in the light of European Union CO₂ targets, than in the
294 SOLUTIONS modelling.

295 **Table 3: Network performance (absolute values) of alternate planning scenarios**
296 **relative to the Trend scenario**

297 Table 3 provides the results for the 2021 urban form-technology scenarios, with reductions
298 compared to the 2021 Trend scenario shown as negative values. These results are further
299 illustrated in Figure 4 with results for each scenario (dashed lines) plotted relative to the
300 Trend case (solid blue line). Note that the change in pollutant emissions associated with the
301 scenarios falls into a relatively small range (-12.7% to +7.1%), although these variations in
302 emissions are greater than the changes in vehicle kilometres travelled (-4.2% to +4.7%).
303 This indicates that the vehicle technologies have a larger impact on emissions than the
304 changes in urban form alone, consistent with the findings of Echenique *et al.* (2010, 2012),
305 and Mitchell *et al.* (2011). Furthermore, note that the SOLUTIONS modelling for Cambridge

found that, for the 2021 urban form scenarios (with conventional fleet technology), carbon dioxide emissions varied from Trend by only $\pm 4\%$ for the sub-region as a whole, much less than the -13% to $+7\%$ observed here where newer clean technology is represented in the fleet.

Figure 5 presents the spatial distribution of the uCO_2 emissions intensity (emission/area) across the sub-region for the Trend scenario. Cambridge City Centre is clearly visible towards the lower right of the sub-region, as is the town of Huntingdon to the north-west. The junction of the M11 and A14 at Girton (part of the A14 Corridor AQMA) also represents an emission 'hot-spot'.

Figure 5: Intensity of CO_2 emissions across the modelled sub-region

Figure 6 presents the change in total NO_x emission for each scenario relative to Trend. The 'Compaction' and 'Compaction+' options reduce NO_x emission (by up to 40%) in the areas north, east and south of Cambridge and around Huntingdon. Unfortunately, these areas are not Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs), but increases in Cambridge City may be in AQMAs (emissions in West Chesterton and Market wards increases up to $+50\%$). The 'Compaction+' option limits the maximum increase to $+45\%$.

The Dispersal option increases emissions, primarily in wards north of the city (especially those bordering the A14 between Cambridge and Huntingdon) and to the south (in Queen Edith's, Shelfords and Stapleford, Harston and Hauxton wards). The Planned Expansion option gives more marginal changes (-9% to $+17\%$) across the study region, with the greatest increases again along the A14 corridor to the west of Cambridge. Maps for the other pollutants show the same general spatial patterns were observed, though actual percentage changes in each zone differed. Changes in PM and NO_x/NO_2 were more sensitive in those zones carrying a greater relative proportion of heavy duty traffic, whilst larger changes in HCs and overall uCO_2 were observed in areas carrying a greater relative number of light duty vehicles.

Note that the mass-based changes in emissions (Table 3 and Figure 4), plus the spatial analyses in Figures 5 and 6, present only a partial picture of the atmospheric impact of the planning scenarios – concentrations of NO_2 within Cambridge itself are described in the next section.

Figure 6: Spatial changes in NO_x emissions across Cambridgeshire, relative to the 'Trend' scenario (Anti-clockwise from top left: Compaction, Compaction+, Planned Expansion, Market-led Dispersal)

4.2 Spatial changes in air pollutant concentrations

Given that local air-quality problems associated with NO_x/NO_2 that are present in the area, and which are generally limited to within 200m of major roads, it is appropriate to consider how the urban form-vehicle technology combinations also impact upon air quality. This

analysis, not conducted under SOLUTIONS, used ADMS to model changes to near-road pollutant concentrations. Concentrations for 2001 were first modelled, and annual mean NO₂ levels were observed in excess of the prevailing 40µg/m³ annual mean standard, for areas around the city centre, within the inner ring road. Figure 7 illustrates changes to annual mean NO₂ concentrations for Cambridge (see Box area in Figure 2).

Figure 7: Changes in predicted annual mean NO₂ concentrations across the City of Cambridge, relative to the 'Trend' scenario (Anti-clockwise from top-left: Compaction, Compaction Plus, Planned Expansion and Market-led Dispersal)

These results illustrate that compaction delivers significant improvements in air quality at the periphery of the city, but that the central area experiences a significant decline, which we interpret as a congestion effect. Conversely, Dispersal results in an overall increase in emissions and a decline in air quality along a link road around the south of the city that was part of the Dispersal option but not included in the other options, but air quality is much improved throughout the city, relative to Compaction. The Compaction+ option improves city air quality relative to compaction, yet in air quality terms does not compete with dispersal, whilst air quality under Planned Expansion sees no clear pattern, although all changes observed are minor.

The results, as presented are somewhat in conflict with Borrego *et al.* (2006) who reported little variation in NO₂ concentrations between compact and dispersed city forms, and Bechle, Millet and Marshall (2011), who suggested that 'compactness' (defined as urban circularity) was not a significant predictor of NO₂ concentrations, though cities and regions with more contiguous (rather than 'leap-frogged' or dispersed) development could be associated with lower NO₂ concentrations.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

5.1 Limitations

Before considering the results of the analysis more fully, it is appropriate to note a number of methodological limitations. It is recognised that there have been a number of developments in the field of air pollution post-completion of the modelling work, and secondly that the use of available components and data from the decade-old SOLUTIONS project limits the current applicability of results in the strictest sense – rather they need to be viewed as internally consistent, and representative of their respective scenarios.

Considerable attention has been given in the past few years as to why predicted emission and concentration decreases, expected from the implementation of the Euro 5/V and 6/VI classes, and reflected in the type of modelling presented here, have not materialised in the real-world (Carslaw *et al.*, 2011; Hagman, Gjerstaf and Amundsen, 2011; Keuken *et al.*, 2012, Weiss *et al.*, 2012, Hagman and Amundsen, 2013 and 2015). Issues surrounding the

real-world versus drive cycle performance of vehicles have received considerable research and media attention of late, whether this be the under-performance of de-NO_x equipment (Oxely, ApSimon and Valiantis, 2011; Velders, Geilenkirchen and de Lange, 2011; Carslaw and Rhys-Tyler, 2013), increasing primary NO₂ fractions in late-model diesel exhausts post 2000 (Grice *et al.*, 2009; Rhys-Tyler *et al.*, 2011), outright ‘cycle-beating’ by manufacturers (Ekberg *et al.*, 2015), or lack of understanding on deterioration of emissions with vehicle age and mileage (Carslaw, 2018).

Examination of the light vehicle diesel emissions rates between PITHEN/EFT version 5 (DEFRA, 2013b) and EFT version 8 (DEFRA, 2017), for 2021, show that, for uCO₂ factors agree within 1%, for particulate matter generally within 5% (though EFT v8 rates can be up to 12% higher at low (<15kmh) speeds). For NO_x speed-dependent discrepancies are large, reaching +63% at free-flow urban speeds (50-60 km/h), and are still significant, but smaller (+36-54%) at lower and higher speeds. Hence we would expect an update to this work using the latest emissions factors to be detrimental to the NO_x/NO₂ results for the Compaction and Market-Led Dispersal options to a greater extent than the other options examined.

Court action against central government for ongoing exceedences of European annual NO₂ objectives have also lead to Clean Air Zones (CAZs), wherein certain vehicles are restricted, and ‘pollution charges’ being examined in several cities – including Cambridge (GCP, 2017). These developments threaten to overturn the historic dieselification of the vehicle fleet in the UK, as assumed by the Market-led dispersal scenario. A further pledge for a ban on all new petrol and diesel car sales by 2040 also seeks to drive penetration of alternate-fuelled vehicles beyond previously assumed rates, such as those proposed by Wright (2012), and used in the Compaction+ scenario. The current EFT places hybrid and electric VKT at approximately 5.5% of the total in 2021 (DEFRA, 2017), above the 3.3% assumed in the Compaction+ scenario, for example.

There is also on-going discussion within the air-quality community as to whether it is appropriate to use strategic macro- or meso- transport models such as SATURN for local air-quality assessments, or if traffic micro-simulation coupled with a suitable instantaneous emissions model is preferable (Boulter *et al.*, 2007), as these models may be better able to represent congestion effects, such as those that may be expected in the Compaction options. Broadly, we would expect emissions and concentrations under such a modelling scheme to increase substantially in areas of congestion.

Conversely, there is an argument that speed-emission curves, such as those used in the EFT, used in conjunction with assignment models such as SATURN, give a ‘false sense of accuracy’ regarding marginal speed changes in a network. This has led to the adoption of a ‘speed and congestion band’ approach for the appraisal of new road schemes by Highways England, the UK-body responsible for the strategic road network (HE, 2015).

416 Following this idea, the SATURN model used for this study had been calibrated to the traffic
417 conditions and networks of the Base Year (2001) and the Trend scenario. Its main purpose
418 was to provide car travel times and costs for the spatial allocation modelling of the land use
419 activities within the sub-region, rather than air pollution concentration modelling. The
420 Compaction option would greatly increase the population densities within Cambridge
421 compared to the Trend and so forecasts of the traffic speeds, flows and queuing may be less
422 reliable than for the Trend within and around Cambridge.

423 This is unlikely to have had much effect on the findings for the sub-region as a whole, but
424 means that the forecasts of absolute air pollution concentrations within Cambridge may be
425 unreliable, especially for Compaction, because there would be higher volumes of traffic on
426 roads that are already congested. Traffic queues and peak-spreading could have a
427 disproportionate impact on traffic emissions. This is an example of how further, more
428 detailed traffic simulation modelling would be useful in conjunction with other measures to
429 reduce air pollution in a higher density city such as traffic demand management, cleaner
430 fuels and attractive and sustainable alternatives to car use. The models used for this study
431 were calibrated using data that is now somewhat outdated and so may not take into account
432 current choice behaviour and travel options. Note also that the options tested were a
433 combination of land use policies and supportive transport schemes. Therefore, the findings
434 on air quality concentrations are affected by location specific combinations of transport
435 schemes and land use policy. Also, Cambridge is atypical of most small cities in the UK
436 because of its university, historic setting within a rural hinterland and its strong growth of
437 employment within and around the city. Similar research would be useful on the relationship
438 between land use transport planning and vehicle technologies on emission for other cities as
439 a comparison.

440 Likewise, for CO₂ emissions there are discrepancies between values (in terms of g/km rates)
441 calculated via the EFT (versions 5 or 8), and those in the National Transport Model (NTM) (Li
442 *et al.*, 2009) or the Greenhouse gas conversion factor repository (Hill *et al.*, 2013; DEFRA,
443 2013b) used for official reporting of CO₂ emissions. Whilst light vehicle emission (cars, vans,
444 motorcycles) tend to correspond well between data sources, greater discrepancies exist for
445 heavy vehicles (HGVs and buses). These discrepancies increase with time, as the NTM and
446 DEFRA CO₂ values assume improvements in fuel efficiencies (CO₂ emissions are analogous
447 to fuel consumption) of heavy vehicles (by approximately 5% every 5 years), that are not
448 present in the EFT figures. Indeed, the presence of de-NO_x technologies (e.g. Selective
449 Catalytic Reduction) and regenerating particulate traps on modern heavy vehicles (Euro V
450 and VI) is assumed to marginally increase fuel consumption (by approximately 1%) in the
451 EFT dataset. The CO₂ emissions values generated (Table 3) are tank-to-wheels (TTW)
452 values, and further assumptions on the efficiency of fuel production and distribution are
453 required to convert these to well-to-wheels (WTW) values for carbon foot printing (Hill *et al.*,
454 2013), or to accurately calculate displaced emissions from BEVs (i.e. from transport to
455 electricity generation).

Regarding urban topography, taller building forms associated with the compaction options may alter street canyon dimensions, leading to entrapment of pollutants. Such changes may be expressed in general surface roughness properties in Gaussian models such as ADMS-Urban, or application of canyon modelling. More rigorous analysis would require robust simulation e.g. via Computational Fluid Dynamics modelling. Other researchers have taken this approach when studying urban form (e.g. Yuan et al., 2014).

Finally, we note some limitations associated with the specific geography of the case study. The modelled strategic networks do not provide full coverage of the city or region, but are focussed on key routes. The congested assignment part of the SATURN model had a detailed road network for Cambridge and its periphery which approximately corresponded to the area of the blue box in Figure 2. There is uncertainty arising from the background pollution maps and the DEFRA sector removal tools (DEFRA, 2012b), and pollution contributions from minor roads may be misrepresented. Climate information does not reflect changing meteorology relevant to the air quality analysis, though relevant elements of the UKCP09 weather generator data, for example temperature and precipitation predictions, could, in principle, be included (EA, 2018).

5.2 Interpretation and Conclusions

Despite the caveats above, we conclude that the results of the analysis provide a credible *comparative* analysis of the combined role of urban form and vehicle technology on emission and air quality for a small city surrounded by a largely rural sub-region of market-towns and villages. Previous work by the authors (Mitchell *et al.*, 2011; Echenique *et al.*, 2012) evidenced the differential impact of a range of urban spatial planning options on emissions of CO₂, but concluded that such impacts would be modest in the context of underlying growth in emissions over the long-term driven by population growth and socio-economic change. Mitchell *et al.* (2011) reported a maximum 5% CO₂ emissions reduction due to the compaction of urban form over a 30 year period compared to the trend, and hence that technological advancements could thus be a greater driver for emissions abatement. This conclusion was drawn for an analysis of both the transport and building sectors, with the authors noting that prior studies based on analysis of the transport sector alone showed larger elasticities. Echenique *et al.* (2012) summated that “Urban form policies can have important impacts on local environmental quality, economy, crowding, and social equity, but their influence on energy consumption and land use is very modest”.

The results in this study build on the author’s previous work, and are consistent with the previous findings. Whilst this new analysis is based solely on the transport sector, it includes more aggressive assumptions regarding the energy efficiency of motor vehicles over the examined period, and includes electrification of the sector in the compaction scenarios. Under the 2001-2021 Trend scenario, transport CO₂ emissions are projected to decrease by 16%, whilst for the Compaction policy the reduction achieved is 22%. Hence, we argue that,

494 in this paper, we have demonstrated that greater uptake of clean technology vehicles has
495 the potential to further mitigate emissions, but that the rate of reduction remains rather
496 modest. This reflects the limited rate of clean technology uptake represented in our
497 scenarios, which seek to reflect plausible technologies, and which operate over a modest
498 temporal range.

499 With respect to air quality, we observe a deleterious effect of compaction. Intensification
500 increases population density, and whilst per capita car use may be reduced with benefits in
501 terms of CO₂ emission reduction, intensification also increases concentrations of traffic,
502 which results in the observed decline in local air quality. This is the 'paradox of
503 intensification' phenomenon discussed above, and where Melia *et al.*, (2011) concluded that
504 any compromise involving limited intensification would merely act to redistribute problems
505 between local and global objectives. They therefore advocate intensification with more
506 radical vehicle constraint and provision for slow modes and public transport. We observe that
507 air quality benefits may be delivered under a compaction policy accompanied with more
508 aggressive uptake of clean technology ('Compaction+'), although other local traffic
509 externalities such as noise are not addressed.

510 The findings of our earlier SOLUTIONS project suggested that a policy of planned expansion
511 (such as polycentrism) offered a potential compromise between the relative pros and cons of
512 compaction and dispersal, in particular by providing better space (housing) standards than
513 compaction, but without the energy consumption of market led dispersal. The work
514 presented here furthers that conclusion, and indicates that, with respect to environmental
515 objectives a planned expansion policy coupled with clean technology has potential to deliver
516 reductions in CO₂ emission relative to the dispersal option, but without the risk to
517 exceedance of air quality objectives that compaction implies (Figure 7).

518 Further work is required to test this conclusion more thoroughly although this is challenging
519 due to the resource intensive nature of working with such linked-models. Because air quality
520 impacts are so context dependent (e.g. non-compliant air quality may occur in populated
521 town centres, or along sparsely populated main roads) it would also be beneficial to extend
522 the analysis to incorporate population exposure and health impact assessment. For
523 example, Martins (2012) reported that urban sprawl options lead to higher modelled
524 particulate matter and ozone concentrations in the Porto area of Portugal, compared to trend
525 and compaction options, but compaction lead to higher population exposure to particulate
526 matter (though ozone results were less clear).

527 The future work could also consider the environmental justice or equity implications of the
528 scenarios, developing an air quality environmental justice analysis as developed by Mitchell
529 (2005), and applied to Leeds by Namdeo and Stringer (2008), which would further enhance
530 the sustainability appraisal of the urban form-technology scenarios. Likewise, disease
531 burden estimations based on the spatial distribution of populations, exposure-response
532 curves and ADMS pollution concentration maps are being included in the PITHEM software,

based on the methodology outlined in Mitchell *et al.* (2000). The spatial forms may then also be quantified in terms of 'disease-burden reduction' and 'health gains' in local areas.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC research grant EP/F007566/1) and part of the ReVISIONS project. The authors thank Cambridge University's School of Architecture for the provision of SOLUTIONS data as part of the ReVISIONS project, and other members of the ReVISIONS team in Cambridge, Newcastle and Aberdeen Universities.

References

- Abraham, J.E. (1998). *A review of the MEPLAN modelling framework from a perspective of urban economics. Research Report CE98-2*. Department of Civil Engineering, University of Calgary
- ACEA (2018). *Euro Standards*. European Automobile Manufacturers Association. [online] <https://www.acea.be/industry-topics/tag/category/euro-standards> [Accessed: 4/12/18].
- BEIS (2013) *Government emission conversion factors for greenhouse gas company reporting*. Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. [online] <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/government-conversion-factors-for-company-reporting> [Accessed: 19/03/18].
- Bechle, M.J., Millet, D.B., Marshall, J.D. (2011) Effects of Income and Urban Form on Urban NO₂: Global Evidence from Satellites. *Environmental Science and Technology*, **45**(11), 4914-4919.
- Borrego, C., Martins, H., Tchepel, O., Salmim, L., Monteiro, A. and Miranda, A.I. (2006). How urban structure can affect city sustainability from an air quality perspective. *Environmental Modelling and Software* **21** pp.461-467.
- Boulter, P.G., McCrae, I.S. and Barlow, T.J. (2007). *Scoping study on the potential for instantaneous emissions modelling*. Report PPR267 for the UK Department for Transport. Transport Research Laboratory (TRL), Crowthorne, Berkshire.
- Boulter, P.G., Barlow, T. J., and McCrae, I.S. (2009). *Emissions factors 2009: Report 3 – Emissions factors for road vehicles in the UK (Version 6)*. Report PPR356 for the UK Department for Transport. Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne, Berkshire, UK.
- Brotchie, J., Hall, P., Newton, P. and Nijkamp, P. (1985). *The future of urban form: the impact of new technology*. Routledge.
- Carslaw, D.C.C., Beevers, S.D., Tate, J.E., Westmorland, E.J. and Williams, M.L. (2011). Recent evidence concerning higher NO_x emissions from passenger cars and light duty vehicles. *Atmospheric Environment* **45**, 7053-7063.

568 Carslaw, D.C.C. and Rhys-Tyler, G. (2013) New insights from comprehensive on-road
 569 measurements of NO_x, NO₂ and NH₃ from vehicle emission remote sensing in London, UK.
 570 *Atmospheric Environment* **81**, 339-347.

571 Carslaw, D.C.C. (2018). *Emissions deterioration – the Cinderella of vehicle emissions*
 572 *measurement*. [online] [https://ee.ricardo.com/news/emissions-deterioration-%E2%80%93-the-cinderella-of-vehicle](https://ee.ricardo.com/news/emissions-deterioration-%E2%80%93-the-cinderella-of-vehicle-emissions-measurement)
 573 [emissions-measurement](https://ee.ricardo.com/news/emissions-deterioration-%E2%80%93-the-cinderella-of-vehicle-emissions-measurement) [Accessed: 23/03/18].

574 CERC (2018). *ADMS-Urban*. Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants. Cambridge,
 575 UK. [online] <https://www.cerc.co.uk/environmental-software/ADMS-Urban-model.html>
 576 [Accessed: 4/12/18].

577 Cervero, R. and Kockelman, K. (1997). Travel demand and the 3Ds: Density, Diversity and
 578 Design. *Transportation Research D*. **2**(3) (1997) 199-219.

579 Chen, Y., Li, X., Zeng, Y., Guan, Y and Liu, X. (2011). Estimating the relationship between
 580 urban forms and energy consumption: A case study in the Pearl River Delta, 2005–2008.
 581 *Landscape and Urban Planning*, **102**(1) (2011) 33-42.

582 DEFRA. (2012a). *NO_x to NO₂ Calculator. Version 3.2. September 2012*. Department of
 583 Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. [online] Available at:
 584 <http://laqm.defra.gov.uk/documents/NOx-NO2-Calculator-v3.2.xls> [Accessed: 19/03/18].

585 DEFRA. (2012b). *2010-Based background maps for NO_x, NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}*. Department
 586 of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. [online] Available at: [https://uk-](https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/data/laqm-background-home)
 587 [air.defra.gov.uk/data/laqm-background-home](https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/data/laqm-background-home) [Accessed: 19/03/18].

588 DEFRA (2013). *Emissions Factor Toolkit for vehicle emissions*. Version 5.2c (January 2013
 589 update). Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

590 DEFRA (2017). *Emissions Factor Toolkit for vehicle emissions*. Version 8.0.1 (December
 591 2017). Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. [online] Available at:
 592 <https://laqm.defra.gov.uk/review-and-assessment/tools/emissions-factors-toolkit.html>
 593 [Accessed: 19/03/18].

594 DEFRA (2018). *UK AIR – Air Information Resource. Summary AQMA data*. Department for
 595 Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. [online] Available at: [https://uk-](https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/aqma/summary)
 596 [air.defra.gov.uk/aqma/summary](https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/aqma/summary) [Accessed: 3/12/18].

597 DEFRA (2018). *Air Quality Management Areas – Interactive Map*. Department for
 598 Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. [online] <https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/aqma/maps>
 599 [Accessed: 5/12/18].

600 DfT (2013). *Average annual daily flow and temporal traffic distributions (Statistical Table*
 601 *TRA03)*. [online] Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/tra03-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/tra03-motor-vehicle-flow)
 602 [motor-vehicle-flow](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/tra03-motor-vehicle-flow) [Accessed: 19/03/18].

603 Echenique, M.H., Barton, H., Hargreaves, A.J., Mitchell, G., (2010) *SOLUTIONS*
 604 *(Sustainability of Land Use and Transport In Outer Neighbourhoods) Final Report*. [online]

605 Available at: <http://www.suburbansolutions.ac.uk/documents/SOLUTIONSFinalReport.pdf>
606 [Accessed: 19/03/18].

607 Echenique, M.H., Hargreaves, A.J., Mitchell, G. and Namdeo, A.K. (2012) Growing cities
608 sustainably, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, **78**, 121-137.

609 Echenique, M.H., Flowerdew, A., Hunt, J., Mayo, T., Skidmore, I., and Simmonds, D., 1990,
610 The MEPLAN models of Bilbao, Leeds and Dortmund, *Transport Reviews*, **10**, (1990) 309-
611 322.

612 Ekberg, K., Eriksson, L. and Sivertsson, M. (2016). Cycle beating – An analysis of the
613 boundaries during vehicle testing. 8th IFAC Symposium on Advances In Automotive Control
614 AAC 2016. Norrköping, Sweden, 20-23 June 2016. *IFAC-PapersOnLine* **49**(11) 657-664.

615 Emisia.(2009). *Download COPERT (COMputer Program for Emissions from Road Transport)*
616 v4 - [online] Available at: <http://www.emisia.com/copert/> [Accessed: 10/1/13].

617 EA. (2018). *UK Climate Predictions: UKCP09*. [online]
618 <http://ukclimateprojections.metoffice.gov.uk/> [Accessed: 19/03/18].

619 EEA (2018). Air Quality In Europe – 2018.Report. European Environment Agency Report
620 12/2018. Available at: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/air-quality-in-europe-2018>
621 [Accessed: 03/12/18].

622 ESRI (2011). *ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10*. Environmental Systems Research Institute,
623 Redlands, CA, US.

624 Fan, C., Tian, Li., Zhou, L., Hou, D., Song, Y., Qiao, X. and Li, J (2018). Examining the
625 impacts of urban form on air pollutant emissions: Evidence from China. *Journal of*
626 *Environmental Management* **212** (2018) 405-414.

627 GCP (2017). *Clean Air Zone*. Greater Cambridge Partnership. [online]
628 <https://www.greatercambridge.org.uk/transport/transport-projects/city-access/clean-air-zone/>
629 [Accessed: 23/03/18].

630 Glaeser, E. and Kahn, M. (2001). *Decentralized employment and the transformation of the*
631 *American city*. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper no. 8117 (2001).

632 Glaeser, E. and Kahn, M. (2001). The greenness of cities: Carbon dioxide emissions and
633 urban development. *Journal of Urban Economics*, **67**(3) (2010) 404-418.

634 Goodman, P.S., Namdeo, A., Galatioto, F., Bell, M.C., Foster, E. and Shield, C. (2014).
635 Investigation of the emission and air-quality impacts of Low Emission Zone scenarios in
636 Newcastle and Gateshead, UK. *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference within*
637 *Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling for Regulatory Purposes (HARMO 16)*, Varna, Bulgaria
638 (8-14 Sept. 2014).

639 Goodman, P.S., Galatioto, F., Thorpe, N., Namdeo, A.K., Davis, R.J. and Bird, R.N. (2016).
640 Investigating the traffic-related environmental impacts of hydraulic-fracturing (fracking)
641 operations. *Environment International*, **89-90** (2016), 248-260.

Gov.uk (2018). Vehicle tax rates. [online resource]. <https://www.gov.uk/vehicle-tax-rate-tables>. [Accessed: 9/12/18].

Grice, S., Stedman, J., Kent, A., Hobson, M., Norris, A.J., Cooke, S. (2009). Recent trends and projections of primary NO₂ emissions in Europe. *Atmospheric Environment*, **43**, 2154-2167.

Hagman, R, Gjerstad, I.K. and Amundsen, A.H. (2011) *NO2-utslipp fra kjøretøyparken i norske storbyer*. Norwegian Centre for Transport Research, Institute for Transport Economics. TøI report 1168/2011.

Hagman, R. and Amundsen, A.H. (2013). *Exhaust emissions from vehicles with Euro 6/VI technology*. Norwegian Centre for Transport Research, Institute for Transport Economics. TøI report 1259/2013

Hagman, R. and Amundsen, A.H. (2015). *Emission from vehicles with Euro 6/VI technology: Results from the measurement programme EMIROAD 2014*. Norwegian Centre for Transport Research, Institute for Transport Economics. TøI report 1405/2015

Hall, M.D., van Vliet, D. and Willumsen, L.G. (1980). SATURN – A simulation-assignment model for the evaluation of traffic management schemes. *Traffic Engineering and Control*, **4**, 168-176.

Hargreaves A.J. and Echenique M.H., (2008). *Cambridge Futures: forecasting the effect of congestion charging on land use and transport*, in: ed. Richardson H.W. and C.C. Bae, Road Congestion Pricing in Europe; Implications for the United States, Edward Elgar Publishing.

HE (2015). *Updated traffic, air quality and noise advice on the assessment of link speeds and generation of vehicle data into 'speed-bands' for users of DMRB Volume 11, Section 3, Part 1 'Air Quality and Volume 11, Section 3. Part 7 Noise'*. Highways England. Interim Advice Note 185/15, [online]

<http://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/ha/standards/ians/pdfs/ian185.pdf> [Accessed: 23/03/18].

Hill, N., Venfield, H., Dun, C. and James, K. (2013). *2013 Government Greenhouse Gas (GHG) conversion factors for company reporting: Methodology paper for emissions factors*. Report by Ricardo-AEA and WRAP for the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and the Department for Energy and Climate Change.

Hood, C., MacKenzie, I., Stocker, J., Johnson, K., Carruthers D., Vieno, M. and Doherty, R. (2018). Air quality simulations for London using a coupled regional-to-local modelling system. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, **18** (2018) 11221-11245.

ICCT (2016). *India Bharat Stage VI Emission Standards*. International Council on Clean Transportation. [online]

<https://www.theicct.org/sites/default/files/publications/India%20BS%20VI%20Policy%20Update%20vF.pdf> [Accessed: 05/12/18].

Keuken, M.P., Roemer, M.G.M., Zandveld, P., Verbeek, R.P. and Velders, G.J.M. (2012). Trends in primary NO₂ and exhaust PM emissions from road traffic for the period 2000-2020

and implications for air quality and health in the Netherlands. *Atmospheric Environment*, **54** (2012) 313-319.

Li, Y., Pearson, B. and Murrells, T. (2009). *Updated vehicle emissions curves for use in the National Transport Model*. Report by AEA Technology for the Department of Transport. AEA/ED47666. AEA Technology, Didcot, Oxfordshire, UK.

Litman, T. (2007). *Land use impacts on transport: How land use factors affect travel behaviour*. Victoria Transport Policy Institute.

Martins, H. (2012). Urban compaction or dispersion? An air quality modelling study. *Atmospheric Environment* **54** (2012) 60-72.

McCarty, J. and Kaza, N. (2015). Urban form and air quality in the United States. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 139 (2015) 168-179.

Mitchell, G. (2005). Forecasting Environmental Equity: Air Quality Responses to Road User Charging in Leeds. *Journal of Environmental Management*, **77**(3) pp. 212-226.

Mitchell, G., Namdeo, A.K. and Kay, D. (2000). A new disease-burden method for estimating the impact of outdoor air quality on human health. *The Science of the Total Environment*, **246** (2-3) 153-163.

Mitchell, G., Hargreaves, A.J., Namdeo, A.K. and Echenique, M.H. (2011). Land use, transport and carbon futures: The impact of spatial form strategies in three UK urban regions. *Environment and Planning A*, **43**, 2143-2163

Melia, S., Parkhurst, G. and Barton, H. (2011). The paradox of intensification, *Transport Policy*, **18**(1) 46-52.

Manyika, J., Chui, M., Bughin, J., Dobbs, R., Bisson, P. and Marrs, A. (2013). Disruptive technologies: Advances that will transform, life, business and the global economy. McKinsey Global Institute.

Murrells, T. and Pang, Y. (2013). *Emissions factors for alternative vehicle technologies*. Ricardo-AEA report as part of the National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory (NAEI). Document reference ED57423001, Ricardo-AEA, Didcot, Oxfordshire, UK.

Namdeo, A. and Goodman, P. (2012). Platform for integrated traffic, health and environmental modelling (PITHEM). *Proceedings of the Better Air Quality Conference*, Hong Kong. (2012, December 5-6).

Namdeo, A. and Stringer, C. (2008) Investigating the relationship between air pollution, health and social deprivation in Leeds, UK. *Environment International*, **34**(5) (2008) 585-591.

Ntziachristos, L. and Samaras, Z. (2013). *EMEP/EEA Emissions Inventory Guidebook 2013 – sectoral guidance 1.A.3.b. Exhaust emissions from road transport*. EEA. Copenhagen, Denmark.

Owen, B., Edmunds, H.A., Carruthers, D.J. and Singles, R.J. (2000). Prediction of total xides of nitrogen and nitrogen dioxide concentrations in a large urban area using a new generaton

718 urban scale dispersion model with integral chemistry model. *Atmospheric Environment*, **34**(3)
719 (2000)

720 Oxley, T., ApSimon, H. and Valiantis M. (2011). Modelling national air quality strategy
721 scenarios with UKIAM: uncertainties emerging from the integration of multiple spatial scales
722 *International Journal of Environment and Pollution (IJEP)*, Vol. 44, No. 1/2/3/4, 2011

723 Pourahmad, A., Baghvand, A., Zangenehe Shahraki, S. and Givvehchi S. (2007). The impact
724 of urban sprawl up on air pollution. *International Journal of Environmental Research*, **1**(3)
725 (2007) 252-257.

726 Ramaswami, A., Hillman, T., Janson, B., Reiner, M. and Thomas, G. (2008). A demand-
727 centred, hybrid life-cycle methodology for city-scale greenhouse gas inventories.
728 *Environmental Science and Technology*, **42** (2008) 6455-6461.

729 Rhys-Tyler, G.A., Legassick, W. and Bell, M.C. (2011). The significance of vehicle emissions
730 standards for levels of exhaust pollution from light vehicles in an urban area. *Atmospheric*
731 *Environment*, **45**(18) 3286-3293.

732 Shepherd, S.P., Timms, P.M. and May, A.D. (2006). Modelling requirements for local
733 transport plans in the UK. *Transport Policy*, **13** (2006) 307-317.

734 Simmonds, D. and Feldman, O. (2011). Alternative approaches to spatial modelling.
735 *Research in Transportation Economics*, **31**(1) (2011) 2-11.

736 SMMT (2018). SMMT urges government to back new-tech diesel as uncertainty continues to
737 impact new car market. UK Society for Motor Manufacturers and Traders. [online]
738 [https://www.smmt.co.uk/2018/07/smmt-urges-government-to-back-new-tech-diesel-as-](https://www.smmt.co.uk/2018/07/smmt-urges-government-to-back-new-tech-diesel-as-uncertainty-continues-to-impact-new-car-market/)
739 [uncertainty-continues-to-impact-new-car-market/](https://www.smmt.co.uk/2018/07/smmt-urges-government-to-back-new-tech-diesel-as-uncertainty-continues-to-impact-new-car-market/) [Accessed: 4/12/18].

740 Stocker, J., Hood, C., Carruthers, D. and McHugh, C. (2012). ADMS-Urban: Developments
741 in modelling dispersion from the city scale to the local scale. *International Journal of*
742 *Environment and Pollution*, **50**(1/2/3/4), 308-316.

743 Stone, B., Mendick, A.C., Holloway, T. and Spak, S.N. (2007) Is compact growth good for air
744 quality? *Journal of the American Planning Association*, **73**, 404-418.

745 Stone, B. (2008). Urban sprawl and air quality in large US cities. *Journal of Environmental*
746 *Management*, **86**(4) (2008) 688-698.

747 Tasmin, S. (2019), Air pollution and children's health: Living in urban areas in developing
748 countries. Article in *Health and Ecological Perspectives in the Anthropocene*, eds.
749 Watanabe, T. and Watanabe C. Springer Nature Singapore.

750 Transport Policy (2018). *Beijing: Light-Duty Emissions*. TransportPolicy.net [online]
751 <https://www.transportpolicy.net/standard/beijing-light-duty-emissions/> [Accessed: 5/12/18].

752 Velders, G.J.M., Geilenkirchen, G.P., de Lange, R. (2011). Higher than expected NO_x
753 emission from trucks may affect attainability of NO₂ limit values in the Netherlands.
754 *Atmospheric Environment*, **45**(18) 3025-3033.

755 Venfield, H. and Pang, Y. (2012). *New vehicle fleet composition projections (Base 2011)*.
756 National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory (NAEI). Department for Environment, Food and
757 Rural Affairs. NAEI Reference: ED57422004. 31st July 2012.

758 Wegener M., 2004. Overview of land use transport models, in Hensher D.A., Button K. J.,
759 Haynes K. E., Stopher P. R. (Ed.) *Handbook of transport geography and spatial systems*,
760 127–146

761 Weiss, M., Bonnel, P., Külwein, J., Provenza, A., Lambrbrecht, U., Alessandrin,i S., Carriero,
762 M., Colombo, R., Forni, F., Laneppe, G., Le Lijour, P., Manfredi, U., Montigny, F. and Sculati,
763 M. (2012). Will Euro 6 reduce the NO_x emissions of new diesel cars – Insights from on-road
764 tests with Portable Emissions Measurement Systems (PEMS). *Atmospheric Environment*,
765 **62**, 657-665.

766 Wright, S.D. (2012). *ReVISIONS Transport Options Design Report*. Part of ReVISIONS
767 Project Workpackage 14. The Centre for Transport Research, School of Geosciences,
768 University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland.

769 Cai, H. and Xie, S.D. (2010) A modelling study of air quality impact of odd-even day traffic
770 restriction scheme before, during and after the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games. *Atmospheric*
771 *Chemistry and Physics Discussions*, **10** (2010), 5135-5184.

772 Yu, H. and Stuart, A.L. (2017). Impacts of compact growth and electric vehicles on future air
773 quality and exposures may be mixed. *Science of the Total Environment*, **576**, 148-158.

774 Yuan, C., Ng, E., Norford, L.K. (2014). Improving air quality in high-density cities by
775 understanding the relationship between air pollutant dispersion and urban morphologies.
776 *Building and Environment*, **71**, 245-258.

777

Table 1: Urban form scenarios considered (Echenique et al., 2010)

Name	Description
Trend (21_Trend)	The Trend scenario was based on the 2003 Structure Plan for Cambridgeshire, with most new dwellings to be built within and around Cambridge and in the A14 corridor, plus a high rate of growth in East Cambridgeshire, particularly around Ely and a new settlement called Northstowe to the NW of Cambridge in South Cambridgeshire. Much of the new housing was allocated to sites within and around the edge of Cambridge where there are the greatest employment opportunities. This included some relaxation of the green belt constraints and thereby reduced the need to travel compared to the preceding planning policy that had allocated almost all development beyond the green belt. The increase in business and retail floorspace follows a similar pattern to the dwellings but with lower growth in East Cambridgeshire. The transport schemes included in the Structure Plan to 2016 were part of the Trend scenario (and were also included in the other urban form scenarios). The Trend scenario includes some additional schemes to represent investment from 2016 to 2021 including a guided bus extension to the east of Cambridge and a highway link from the east of the city to the A14,. This scenario reflects that the UK planning policy constrained suburban expansion and prioritised development to brownfield land and areas with good public transport. .
Compaction (21_Comp)	The Compaction option involves high density development within the existing urban footprint, and is public transport oriented. It attempts 'to reduce travel and resources use, and increase social cohesion and vitality'. In this scenario for compaction the Cambridgeshire region develops an extra 19,000 dwellings within Cambridge itself (30% more than under the 'Trend') and correspondingly fewer in the periphery. There would be a tunnel for guided buses under the city centre via the bus station and railway station but no new link road to the east of Cambridge.
Market-led Dispersal (21_Disp)	The Market-led Dispersal option involves lower density private transport oriented development. This option diminishes the intensity of urban land use, reflecting people's choice for space at affordable prices, and involves some land take from previously open land in areas where there would be strongest demand for development. This would be subject to local planning constraints to achieve densities of at least 20 dwellings per hectare to avoid sprawl. In the scenario, growth is primarily around the fringes of Cambridge, in settlements to the north of the city, and along transport corridors (A10, A14 and M11). The transport schemes would be similar to the Trend option.
Planned Expansion (21_Plex)	The Planned Expansion option comprises new settlements with mixed density in good transport corridors and a mix of private and public transport. It represents an attempt to mitigate against the perceived disadvantages of the above options, to give 'balanced communities' and protect open landscape via development as edge expansion, along defined corridors or as new satellite communities. In this scenario new dwellings are concentrated in areas where there is economic growth and good road and public transport connections. This includes the eastern edge of Cambridge, the A14/guided bus transport corridor, and the M11 corridor south of Cambridge. The areas would be polycentric new settlements clustered around the public transport stations. The transport schemes would be similar to the Trend option.

781 **Table 2: Vehicle technology options applied to the 2021 urban form scenarios for**
782 **emissions and dispersion modelling**

Name	Description
Trend (21_Trend)	Fleet projections from the National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory (NAEI) Venfield and Pang (2012) are used.
Compaction (21_Comp)	The historic pattern of uptake of diesel vehicles is reversed within the Cambridge City boundaries, with small, petrol engine 'city cars' becoming more prevalent, making ≈60% of trips within the city by 2021. There would be additional provision of public transport within the city at park-and-ride sites
Compaction Plus+ (21_Comp+)	As above, but there is additional uptake of Battery Electric Vehicles (BEVs) for private transport within 30km of Cambridge centre. Uptake of private BEVs is assumed to be <0.01% in 2012, rising at 0.1% per year to 2015, then at 0.5% per year beyond 2015. This equates to ≈3.3% of trips being made by BEVs in 2021. Hybrid electric buses are used for public transport within city boundaries.
Market-led Dispersal (21_Disps)	The historic pattern towards dieselification of the private fleet is continued, and compounded by a further trend towards larger-engine (2+ litre) vehicles, both within the city, and in the hinterlands, resulting in ~23% of trips being made by these vehicles, compared to ~13% in the Trend. Little investment in public transport
Planned Expansion (21_Plex)	Increased demand for bus/park-and-ride facilities and expansion of existing guided bus routes. All buses are assumed to be either 'Euro V+' hybrid buses, or 'clean', low NO _x buses, based on 'Euro VI/de-NO _x ' technologies. The increase in public transport patronage leads to a commensurate reduction in passenger car usage from the fringes and hinterlands of the city.

783 **Table 3: Network performance (absolute values) of alternate planning scenarios**
784 **relative to the Trend scenario.**

Parameter	21_Trend	21_Comp	21_Comp+	21_Disps	21_Plex	Units
VKT	6320.7	-262.5 (-4.2%)	-262.5 (-4.2%)	+297.6 (+4.7%)	-129.4 (-2%)	m.km.
uCO₂	1018.9	-101.3 (-9.9%)	-129.2 (-12.7%)	+71.2 (+7%)	+37.4 (+3.7%)	kT
HC	236.8	-11.9 (-5%)	-21.3 (-9%)	+16.7 (+7.1%)	-1.9 (-0.8%)	T
NO_x	1361.7	-63 (-4.6%)	-102.5 (-7.5%)	+74 (+5.4%)	+39.4 (+2.9%)	T
pNO₂	445.2	-17.1 (-3.8%)	-30.9 (-6.9%)	+22.4 (+5%)	-5.2 (-1.2%)	T
PM₁₀	224.2	-8.3 (-3.7%)	-15.5 (-6.9%)	+10.8 (+4.8%)	+2.4 (+1.1%)	T
PM_{2.5}	127.6	-4.4 (-3.4%)	-8.6 (-6.7%)	+6.2 (+4.9%)	+1.7 (+1.3%)	T




Figure 1: The modelling framework adopted in the ReVISIONS project. Grey boxes denote elements undertaken as part of the previous SOLUTIONS project.




Figure 2: Major population centres and baseline extent of urban development in Cambridgeshire.




Figure 3: Major transportation routes and corridors in Cambridgeshire and area of detailed air quality study.




Figure 4: Radar plot of network performance relative to the Trend scenario (Baseline performance = '1')




Figure 5: Intensity of CO₂ emissions across the modelled sub-region





Figure 6: Spatial changes in NO_x emissions across Cambridgeshire, relative to the 'Trend' scenario (Anti-clockwise from top left: Compaction, Compaction+, Planned Expansion, Market-led Dispersal)

813



814

815

816

817

Figure 7: Changes in predicted annual mean NO_2 concentrations across the City of Cambridge, relative to the 'Trend' scenario (Anti-clockwise from top-left: Compaction, Compaction Plus, Planned Expansion and Market-led Dispersal)