

Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) consultation questionnaire and responses

An online consultation questionnaire was made available on the SDC website between 25 September and 26 November 2017. The following questions were asked:

Question 1: To help us understand who we have consulted with please indicate which of these best describes your view point in relation to this consultation. Tick all that apply.

I am a local resident and these are my personal views (please now go to question 3)	
I am a non-Selby resident and these are my personal views (please now go to question 3)	
I am responding in a professional / business capacity (please now go to question 2)	

Question 2: If responding in a professional or business capacity please state which type of organisation or industry you represent (tick all that apply)

Local / regional council	
Central government organisation	
Local retailer / trader / service provider	
Bus operator/driver	
Freight operator / haulier	
Taxi operator /driver	
Environmental charity or pressure group	
Health based charity or pressure group	
Healthcare professional	
Industrial process / large scale manufacturing	
Land use planner / planning consultant	
Developer / house builder	
Academic organisation	
Environmental consultant / lawyer	
Low emission vehicle industry / EV infrastructure provider	

Other (please state)

Question 3: What is your postcode?

If responding in a personal capacity provide postcode of home address	
If responding in a professional or business capacity provide postcode of your work address / business premises	

If you do not wish to provide your postcode please leave blank and proceed to Question 4

Question 4: Which of these statements applies to you (tick all that apply)

I live and work / study in Selby	
I commute into Selby daily from outside the district to work / study	
I own / manage a small or medium size business in Selby	
I regularly use the shops and services in Selby town centre	
None of the above applies to me	

Question 5: Before reading the draft air quality action plan how concerned were you about air quality in the Selby area?

Seriously concerned	
Moderately concerned	
Slight concerned	
Not at all concerned	

Question 6: After reading the draft action plan how concerned are you now about air quality in the Selby area?

Seriously concerned	
Moderately concerned	
Slight concerned	
Not at all concerned	

Question 7: The draft air quality action plan has identified traffic emissions as the main cause of the air pollution problem on New Street. Do you agree with this conclusion?

Yes	
No	
Don't know	

If you have answered no to question 7 please indicate here what you consider to be the main cause of the air pollution problem on New Street.

.....

Question 8: The draft Air Quality Action Plan sets out categories of measures that the Council proposes should be the focus of attention to improve air quality in Selby. These have been provisionally prioritised by the Council.

In your view, what importance should be given to these categories?

	High importance	Medium importance	Low importance	Don't know
Access Management study				
Erection of anti-idling signs				
Low emission car club ¹				
Support for local businesses to reduce transport emissions and number of vehicle trips				
Better awareness and enforcement of HGV weight limits				
Development of low emission planning guidance by SDC				
Use of lower emission vehicles by SDC.				
Provision of charging points for electric vehicles				
Procurement of low emission goods and services by SDC				
Setting of emission standards for taxis				
Improve access to air quality advice				
Improve opportunities to cycle in SDC area				
Promote sustainable travel in SDC area				

Question 9: Are there any other measures you feel the council should be taking to improve air quality which are currently not included in the draft air quality action plan?

Question 10: Do you think the proposed measures will improve air quality in Selby?

Yes	
No	
Not Sure	

¹ Membership of a car club provides access to a vehicle when you need one reducing the need for personal car ownership. Membership costs are usually lower than the cost of purchasing, insuring and taxing your own vehicle. They can be particularly good for reducing the need for second car ownership and can also be used by businesses instead of operating private pool vehicles.

Question 11: Which of these measures would you personally consider taking to improve air quality in Selby DC. Please tick all that apply

Walk more	
Cycle more	
Use the bus	
Share a lift	
Use a lower emission vehicle	
Join a car club	
None of the above	

If there is anything which prevents you from doing these things at the moment please provide a brief list here. Please use short statements only, for example 'I can't ride a bike', 'there is no bus route near my house'

Question 12: Do you have any further comments or suggestions relating to the improvement of air quality in Selby?

Consultation Questionnaire Responses

A total of 22 questionnaire responses were received during the consultation period. A summary of the responses is provided below.

Question 1

To help us understand who we have consulted with please indicate which of these best describes your view point in relation to this consultation.

Number of responses to this question: 21

Responses were received from 17 local residents (one resident indicated that their response reflected views both as a resident and in a professional/business capacity) and 4 people responding in a solely business/professional capacity. One respondent did not answer this question.

Question 2

If responding in a professional or business capacity please state which type of organisation or industry you represent (tick all that apply)

Number of responses to this question: 5


Of the 5 respondents that indicated they were responding in a professional / business capacity, 2 were responding on behalf of a local authority, 2 represented local retailers/traders/service providers and 1 was a landlord.



Question 3

What is your postcode?

Number of responses to this question: 19

Where respondents indicated their postcode, these are summarised below

Postcode Area		Number of responses	View point
YO8 (Selby)		17	15 x local resident 2 x local retailer

<p>YO10 (S.E York)</p>		<p>1</p>	<p>1 x local authority (York)</p>
<p>DN14 (Whitley, Goole)</p>		<p>1</p>	<p>1 x local resident</p>

Question 4

Which of these statements applies to you (tick all that apply)

Number of responses to this question: 21

<p>I live and work / study in Selby</p>	<p>14 (1 respondent indicated that they were a small/medium size business owner)</p>
<p>I commute into Selby daily from outside the district to work / study</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>I own / manage a small or medium size business in Selby</p>	<p>4 (1 respondent indicated that they 'lived, worked or studied' in Selby)</p>
<p>I regularly use the shops and services in Selby town centre</p>	<p>7 (4 respondents indicated that they 'lived, worked or studied' in Selby)</p>
<p>None of the above applies to me</p>	<p>1 (this was a response from a neighbouring local authority)</p>

Question 5

Before reading the draft air quality action plan how concerned were you about air quality in the Selby area?

Number of responses to this question: 21

Seriously concerned	4 (2 residents with no business interests, 1 resident also with a business interest (landlord), 1 local retailer)
Moderately concerned	10 (8 residents with no business interests, 1 local retailer, 1 person responding in a non-specified professional/business capacity)
Slight concerned	4 (all residents with no business interests)
Not at all concerned	3 (2 residents, 1 local authority)

Question 6

After reading the draft action plan how concerned are you now about air quality in the Selby area?

Number of responses to this question: 21

Seriously concerned	4 (these were the same 4 respondents that indicated they were 'seriously concerned' in question 5)
Moderately concerned	13 (10 of these had not changed their viewpoint from question 5, 2 residents who were only 'slightly concerned' prior to reading the AQAP indicated they were now 'moderated concerned', and a local authority that indicated they were 'not concerned at all' prior to reading the AQAP now indicated they were 'moderately concerned').
Slight concerned	4 (2 respondents had not changed their viewpoint from question 5, 2 residents who were 'not concerned at all' prior to reading the AQAP now indicated that they were 'slightly concerned')
Not at all concerned	No respondents indicated that they were 'not concerned at all'

Question 7

The draft air quality action plan has identified traffic emissions as the main cause of the air pollution problem on New Street. Do you agree with this conclusion?

Number of responses to this question: 21

Yes	20
No	0
Don't know	1 (resident)

If you have answered no to question 7 please indicate here what you consider to be the main cause of the air pollution problem on New Street.

Three of the respondents who answered 'Yes' provided some commentary. Two of these comments were related to traffic and restricted dispersion of pollution. The other respondent suggested that works on the bypass have contributed to the increased traffic in the town and that changes to the traffic light timings may cause more traffic queues outside Barlby School. This respondent also had some concerns about restricting access to HGVs as it was thought that new 'Euro 5' engines in HGVs were less polluting than older diesel cars.

Question 8

The draft Air Quality Action Plan sets out categories of measures that the Council proposes should be the focus of attention to improve air quality in Selby. These have been provisionally prioritised by the Council. In your view, what importance should be given to these categories?

Number of responses to this question: 21

	High importance	Medium importance	Low importance	Don't know
Access Management study	7 (33.3%)	13 (61.9%)	1 (4.8%)	0
Erection of anti-idling signs	8 (38.1%)	7 (33.3%)	6 (28.6%)	0
Low emission car club	3 (14.3%)	9 (42.9%)	6 (28.6%)	3 (14.3%)
Support for local businesses to reduce transport emissions and number of vehicle trips	9 (42.9%)	9 (42.9%)	2 (9.5%)	1 (4.8%)
Better awareness and enforcement of HGV weight limits	20 (95.2%)	0	1 (4.8%)	0
Development of low emission planning guidance by SDC	11 (52.4%)	7 (33.3%)	2 (9.5%)	1 (4.8%)
Use of lower emission vehicles by SDC.	9 (42.9%)	7 (33.3%)	4 (19%)	1 (4.8%)
Provision of charging points for electric vehicles	6 (28.6%)	7 (33.3%)	8 (38.1%)	0
Procurement of low emission goods and services by SDC	8 (38.1%)	8 (38.1%)	5 (23.8%)	0

	High importance	Medium importance	Low importance	Don't know
Setting of emission standards for taxis	7 (33.3%)	14 (66.7%)	0	0
Improve access to air quality advice	8 (38.1%)	10 (47.6%)	3 (14.3%)	0
Improve opportunities to cycle in SDC area	12 (57.1%)	5 (23.8%)	4 (19.0%)	0
Promote sustainable travel in SDC area	13 (61.9%)	5 (23.8%)	3 (14.3%)	0

Question 9

Are there any other measures you feel the council should be taking to improve air quality which are currently not included in the draft air quality action plan?

Number of responses to this question: 11

The responses to this question, together with SDC's viewpoint are summarised and summarised in the table below.

Comment/Suggestion	Type of Respondent	Issue summary and SDC Comment
<i>"Now we have a bypass. Ban traffic except taxis & buses from the old toll bridge to Scott road traffic lights. Motorists can still access all the car parks & residential areas using the bypass. Deliveries could be made using back doors to the various businesses along the affected route. Others who do not have back doors would have to apply for permission to deliver"</i>	Resident	Issue raised: Restrict access to buses and taxis, with deliveries to businesses via back door routes Comment: will be considered as part of access management study, already included as a measure in AQAP (Measure 1)
<i>"Control on busses in particular. They always seem to have a plume of black smoke at the rear. Similarly with HGV's but the Council really needs to regulate and ENFORCE limited access"</i>	Resident	Issue raised: Bus emissions and enforcement of HGV restriction Comment: HGV restriction enforcement already included in AQAP (Measure 5).

		<p>With respect to buses, it has been found that only a small number of buses operate through New Street (see origin destination study). The majority of these are services that operate between Selby and York and will be subject to the Clean Air Zone controls planned for York. It is considered that this will be sufficient to ensure future emission improvement for buses using New Street and no further action is needed at a local level.</p>
<p><i>“BOCM make BOCM land in to a car park and have park and ride problem solved no traffic on new street only buses. car share the amount of cars in the school car parks is a big concern”</i></p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>Issue raised: Use of BOCM land as P&R site/ school travel</p> <p>Comment: School travel plans already considered as part of Measure 13. Bus based P&R has been considered (see AQAP Appendix B) and is not considered viable at this time. The origin destination study undertake to support the development of the AQAP has shown that many of the car based commuter, shopping and social trips into Selby town centre</p>

		<p>originate very close to the town centre and would be unlikely to be impacted upon by the provision of a bus based Park and Ride service.</p>
<p><i>"There should be a Selby wide 20mph limit. A general speed reduction across the town will improve air quality, reduce noise pollution and make it safer for other road users"</i></p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>Issue raised: Selby wide 20mph speed limit</p> <p>Comment: Traffic flow through the New Street AQMA is already very slow due to the presence of the junction and traffic lights. Any measure to reduce the speed limit on New Street is unlikely to result in any air quality improvement. Wider speed restrictions may be considered as part of access management study, already included as a measure in AQAP (Measure 1)</p>
<p><i>"All measures to date are designed to clog up traffic in the centre of Selby It appears the planners philosophy is to slow down and stop traffic moving in Gowthorpe town centre seeing HGVs in Gowthorpe defies belief . Selby desperately needs a new road layout to keep traffic moving and to attract new shops and shoppers. New Street lacks commercial viability as it is too narrow and footpaths are unsafe to use"</i></p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>Issue raised: HGV access restrictions and road layout</p> <p>Comment: HGV restriction enforcement already included in AQAP (Measure 5). Access management already considered as part of AQAP (Measure 1)</p>

<p><i>“The cycle lanes into Selby are old and narrow or none existent these could be vastly improved”</i></p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>Issue raised: Cycle lane improvement</p> <p>Comment: Improvements to the cycle network will already be considered as part of AQAP (Measure 12)</p>
<p><i>“Park & Ride and parking payments, this would mean I can park outside my own home and reduce the pressure from people coming in to Selby for work”</i></p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>Issue raised: Park and Ride and residents parking</p> <p>Comment: Bus and rail based P&R have been considered and are not considered viable at this time.</p> <p>Parking for employees is to be considered as part of AQAP (Measure 4) There are currently no plans to introduce permit parking in Selby</p>
<p><i>“Close New Street to all traffic - Join the Park to the Abbey. Make Station Road and New Millagte/Scott Road one-way. Improve access to Ousegate from Station Road”</i></p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>Issue raised: Access management issues</p> <p>Comment: will be considered as part of access management study, already included as a measure in AQAP (Measure 1)</p>
<p><i>“Watching traffic in New St today I have seen at least 5 vehicles of more than 7.5ton using New St. There is a sign on the A19 coming into Selby from York saying there is a weight limit on New St but a stranger wouldn't know which street that is. The traffic lights on the cross road at the toll bridge want seriously looking in to. Come and watch the traffic from my shop for a few days and you will see what I</i></p>	<p>Local Retailer</p>	<p>Issue raised: HGV access restrictions / access management</p> <p>Comment: will be considered as part of access management study, already included</p>

<p><i>mean”</i></p>		<p>as a measure in AQAP (Measure 1). AQAP Measure 5 covers active enforcement of HGV weight limit.</p>
<p><i>“Work with NYCC to ensure that bus companies that serve Selby from commuter areas such as Cawood, Thorpe, Drax etc have to provide sufficient services to allow commuters to arrive in town for a 9am start and for a 5, 5:30 and 6 pm finish”</i></p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>Issue raised: Bus service provision and frequency Comment: NYCC are unable to directly control the timing or frequency of bus services but will provide feedback to bus operators on this issue.</p>
<p><i>“The AQAP is very comprehensive and needs the resources to deliver. Some of these (e.g. EV charging) can be delivered through adopting low emission planning policies. York and other councils are adopting low emission taxi policies - these would be beneficial in Selby as 40% of NO₂ emissions are from diesel cars. More emphasis on safe walking and cycling, preferably away from polluted areas. Selby ideally suited to electric vehicles”</i></p>	<p>Neighbouring Local Authority</p>	<p>Issue raised: Low emission taxi policy, electric vehicles, cycling and walking Comment: Low emission taxi incentives will be considered as part of AQAP (Measure 10), but taxi licensing conditions have only recently been reviewed and a further review is unlikely to take place within the lifetime of the AQAP. SDC will continue to monitor progress with taxi licensing and if an opportunity arises to influence emissions from the taxi fleet using this mechanism it will be added to the AQAP</p>

		measures at a later date. Cycling and sustainable travel are already considered (see Measures 12 and 13)
--	--	--

Question 10

Do you think the proposed measures will improve air quality in Selby?

Number of responses to this question: 21

Yes	10 (47.6%)
No	2 (9.5%)
Not Sure	9 (42.9%)

Question 11

Which of these measures would you personally consider taking to improve air quality in Selby DC.

Please tick all that apply

Number of responses to this question: 21

Walk more	10
Cycle more	5
Use the bus	1
Share a lift	1
Use a lower emission vehicle	7
Join a car club	2
None of the above	3

If there is anything which prevents you from doing these things at the moment please provide a brief list here. Please use short statements only, for example 'I can't ride a bike', 'there is no bus route near my house'

The comments received are summarised in the table below:

Response to question 11	Respondent type	Comment
None of the above	Resident	<i>"Yes I am an OAP with a disability badge and have walking problems"</i>
Walk more	Resident	<i>"N/A (my wife and I walk in to town)"</i>

Cycle more	Resident	<i>"Fear of cars and lorries on the road - Doncaster Road near crossing"</i>
No response given	Resident	<i>"Business where people travel into work from many surrounding areas so car share is not wholly feasible"</i>
None of the above	Resident	<i>"Unsafe on cycle , walking is unsafe in today's traffic aggressive drivers"</i>
Use a lower emission vehicle	Resident	<i>"Q11 only allows one answer, think most are important. Cost of new vehicle would be prohibitive"</i>
Cycle more	Resident	<i>"Dangerous roads"</i>
Walk more	Resident	<i>"Need to be more cycle and pedestrian friendly. Too car/traffic focused design"</i>
None of the above	Resident	<i>"I already walk everywhere so no"</i>
Cycle more	Resident	<i>"Lack of safe cycle routes"</i>
Walk more	Resident	<i>"Disabilities"</i>
Cycle more / use a lower emission vehicle	Resident	<i>"Lack of safe cycle routes"</i>
Walk more, cycle more, use the bus, use a lower emission vehicle, join a car club	Resident	<i>"This doesn't prevent me doing some of the above, but just to note, I already have a hybrid car"</i>

A common theme in the feedback to this question was the lack of safe pedestrian and cycle routes in Selby.

Question 12

Do you have any further comments or suggestions relating to the improvement of air quality in Selby?

Number of responses to this question: 16 respondents provided comments

Suggestion	SDC Response
<i>"I am sure my proposals in Q9 would make Selby a more pleasant town to visit (it works in Goole)" Comment provided at Q9</i>	Comments provided at question 9 related to traffic and access management. These issues will be considered as part of the access management study, already included as a measure in the draft AQAP (see Measure 1)
<i>"No, I think you have identified the major problem with HGV's and buses As a matter of interest I have a Motorbility diesel car but it has ECO start. When I stop the engine stops so there is no idling pollution I do not think you have differentiated enough about people who live in Selby and those who live in the small villages. Many of these people never go into Selby"</i>	Comments provided relate to HGVs and bus movements which have already been considered as part of the AQAP
<i>"The mothers might try walking there kids to school cutting out car journeys the school leaving times are horrendous in Selby"</i>	Comments relate to school travel plans which are already covered by in the draft AQAP (see Measure 13)

<p><i>"This questionnaire has a slight programming fault and does not allow multiple selection where that is requested - I have therefore chosen the option which is most important to me. I am happy with the proposals in the report but do not think it goes far enough – one area of the poorest air quality does need action but there are wider issues that should be addressed at the same time. I'm sceptical about car share schemes and electric charging points having anything but minimal impact. Instead I favour a reduction in congestion by a more dramatic one way system coupled with traffic calming to ensure that speeds do not rise. With this is the need for a 20mph limit throughout the town - going virtually entirely to the town boundaries. For example we have a 20mph limit on Baffam Lane passed the school but not the High School or outside the doctors or the hospital. A limit should be in place all the way from the existing into town and on other arterial roads. I know drivers will exceed this but the average speed will fall from the existing 30 limit which is generally exceeded. This would reduce pollution across the entire town to include noise pollution from tyres and make the roads significantly safer and mean I would cycle to town instead of driving. I don't see anything in this survey for contact - I am <<email address provided>> - if you wish for any further views from me"</i></p>	<p>Comments relate to access management, including a town wide 20mph limit. These issues will be considered as part of access management study, already included as a measure in the draft AQAP (see Measure 1). It should be noted, however, that traffic moving through the New Street AQMA is already very slow moving due to the presence of the junction and the traffic lights. Measures to reduce the speed limit on New Street is unlikely to result in air quality improvement. This issue has previously been considered (see AQAP Annex B)</p>
<p><i>"There is a sign on the A19 stating a 7.5 T Limit in New Street .How does a stranger know where New Street is? There should be a sign on the gable end of the hairdresser stating this. If parking on Ousegate (From toll Bridge to Church Hill) was abolished traffic would not</i></p>	<p>Comments relate to HGV restriction enforcement, already included in AQAP (see Measure 5).</p>

<p><i>queue. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO COME AND WATCH FROM MY SHOP I AM SURE YOU WOULD SOON SEE WHAT I AM TALKING ABOUT. WHO WOULD POLICE THESE CHANGES?"</i></p>	
<p><i>"A simple measure would be to pedestrianise from the town hall to the abbey traffic lights and possibly even include The Crescent. This would have a number of effects 1. Practically eliminate air pollution in the centre of the town 2. Enhance the shopping experience in the centre of town 3. Probably bring new and better shops to the town centre 4. Provide an opportunity to enhance the image of the abbey as per York Minster This is all easily 'do-able' if anyone can be bothered"</i></p>	<p>Comments relate to pedestrianisation</p> <p>SDC is concerned regarding the impact of moving the traffic from the town centre on to those around the centre which have many domestic properties. This could cause further air quality issues but will be considered as part of the traffic management study.</p>
<p><i>"Q11 will not allow more than one choice. I would consider walking, lift share and car club options"</i></p>	<p>General comments to supplement response provided at Qu.11.</p>
<p><i>"Close Selby to through traffic , build mini roundabouts at the Abbey Junction and Gowthorpe Doncaster Road Scott Road Junction . Stop vehicles using the loading only bays in Gowthorpe which obstructs traffic queuing to turn left into Doncaster Road"</i></p>	<p>These issues will be considered as part of the access management study, already included as a measure in the draft AQAP (see Measure 1)</p>
<p><i>"As I spend 6 days a week in a shop with the door open I breath the Selby town air and its quality should be the best possible"</i></p>	<p>General comment – noted.</p>

<p><i>“My main concern is that in trying to reduce emissions in New Street traffic will be diverted into more densely populated areas increasing the air pollution in those areas”</i></p>	<p>Diversion of traffic and potential air quality implications for other areas will be considered as part of the access management study, already included as a measure in the draft AQAP (see Measure 1)</p>
<p><i>“We live on a new development and I can't see any evidence of cycling or walking being promoted”</i></p>	<p>Comments relate to promotion of sustainable travel initiatives across the district in conjunction with NYCC. This will be addressed through continued promotion of sustainable travel in Selby (see Measures 12 and 13). Development of low emission planning guidance (see Measure 6) will also pick up the issue of requiring low emission travel plans as part of new development proposals.</p>
<p><i>“A park and ride with electric buses”</i></p>	<p>Comments relate to P&R with electric buses. This option has been considered as part of the draft AQAP is not considered feasible at this time (see Appendix B, table B.1 for reasoning)</p>
<p><i>“30mph limit on Bawtry road. Don't build the new Lidl with the new junction/roundabout which will create more stop/start traffic”</i></p>	<p>Speed limits will be considered as part of the access management study, already included as a measure in the draft AQAP (see Measure 1). Comments also raised in relation to a specific named development. The air quality implications of any development in the district will be considered on a case by case basis.</p>
<p><i>“Scrap all the signs which are used now and turn off the traffic lights because no one takes any notice, especially drivers with personalised number plates. They have a law to themselves”</i></p>	<p>General comment in relation disregard for traffic lights. Not relevant to AQAP development.</p>

<p><i>"Given that large lorries have to access Westmill, that bus services have use New St to come into the bus station and that diverting via Ousegate or Water Lane is impossible (Rail bridge, Masonic Lodge), it would not be possible to put a 'gate' to stop to large vehicles on Barlby Road, and vehicles can't be diverted to left or right. Thus the New Street problem seems insoluble outside of large and presumably impossible solutions such as ...demolition of the properties on the left hand (not Abbey) side of New St, or ...assisted relocation of Westmill to an out-of town site or ...construction of a new bus depot on part of the former BOCM site for large York bus services to start/finish, with the journey into/out from Selby completed on green/electric vehicles (as run in York)"</i></p>	<p>Comments raised in relation to 'gating' of larger vehicles and low emission bus services. Access management issues will be considered as part of the access management study, already included as a measure in the draft AQAP (see Measure 1)</p>
<p><i>"In the case of New Street which is the main problem area - A one way system which could be reversed in case of bypass problems is the only answer"</i></p>	<p>Access management issues will be considered as part of the access management study, already included as a measure in the draft AQAP (see Measure 1)</p>

Additional consultation responses received

Issues raised on draft AQAP by Public Health Registrar (North Yorkshire County Council)

- Made reference to DPH guidance on air quality that states that local authorities should lead by example if they expect the public to do the same (in relation to use of LEVs)
- Suggests that there is focus on electric vehicles as a longer term measure but suggests plan is lacking in the sense of moving away from diesel as a fuel
- Suggests greater emphasis is needed on the use of public transport rather than private transport
- Raised the issue of park and walk, and more conveniently located car parks.
- Suggests that the AQAP should empower the community (via use of community air quality groups) to take a more active role to ensure they take some ownership of the problem
- Appendix B states that there is no parking permit system in Selby but it is not said why (financial, logistical, unnecessary)

Also raised:

- There are no comments around media engagement, which should be considered as part of wider comms strategy and public engagement.
- It is not stated very clearly what the acceptable level of NO₂ is and what the local level is.
- It would be helpful for context to include the number of residences situated within the AQMA area

Issues raised on draft AQAP by DEFRA (via Air Quality Helpdesk)

- There are no details provided of the current status of air quality in the AQMA or a map of the AQMA within the draft Action Plan.
- The management of queuing traffic and monitoring engine switch-off should be considered as key priorities within the developing action plan.
- Commented that most measures remain to be fully developed and are waiting the outcome of surveys or studies, and may also be waiting for funding streams to enable measures to be taken forward.
- DEFRA commented that the cost screening exercise does not fulfil the ambitions detailed within the latest technical guidance (i.e. prioritising measures on the basis of their ability to provide the required levels of emission reduction to achieve the air

quality objectives within specified timescales). SDC is advised to consider the guidance further to provide clear prioritisation of effective measures to address the pollution hotspot on New Street.

- Air pollution emissions reduction targets should underpin the further development of the action plan, based on required emissions reduction across the AQMA.

The latest Technical Guidance LAQM TG(16), para 2.69 makes clear, as a minimum AQAP's should include the following:

Quantification of source contributions (e.g. HGVs, buses, taxis, other transport, industrial or domestic sources etc.) responsible for the exceedance of the relevant objective; knowing the source of the problem will allow the AQAP measures to be effectively targeted;

Quantification of impacts of proposed measures including, where feasible, expected emission and concentration reductions (either locally obtained and/or via national monitoring/modelling statistics). It is important that the local authority shows how it intends to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the plan;

- DEFRA state that there is a requirement to undertake measures selection and impact assessment. There is no evidence to date that this process has been followed [TG(16) para2.36-2.42]
- DEFRA state that for every AQMA it is expected that there will be an assessment of how the individual measures contribute to the emission reduction targets identified within the source apportionments, and when the measures within the AQAP can expect to deliver the objectives. These are expected to be reflected within future ASR reports.

Summary and recommendations

Scope of consultation (Questions 1 to 4)

Only a small number of responses were received to the consultation but these were representative of both residents and businesses within Selby. Responses were also received from outside the district and from other public bodies. This indicates that the consultation was accessible to a range of targeted audiences but either awareness of the consultation was low or people were not concerned enough about the issue to respond.

It is notable that there was no direct response to the consultation from local transport providers, hauliers or developers. As all these sectors could be significantly impacted on by measures proposed in the AQAP it is important that any further consultation on the AQAP measures is directly targeted at these sectors.

The majority of the respondents stated that they live / work within Selby district. None of the responses were from people who regularly commute into Selby from outside the district. As some of the measures proposed in the AQAP could impact on commuters any further consultation should consider how the views of these people can be captured.

Recommended actions:

Further consultation on the AQAP development (or implementation of proposed AQAP measures) could be more widely advertised via local media / social media to try and improve response rates from the general population.

Consultation on measures with direct implications for transport operators, hauliers or developers should be directly targeted at these sectors.

Consideration should be given as to how commuters from outside Selby can be better consulted on the AQAP measures. For example it may be worth contacting media organisations in surrounding council areas e.g. York, East Yorkshire, Doncaster, Wakefield or providing posters / leaflets in local work places.

Level of concern about air quality (Questions 5 and 6)

Before reading the AQAP the range of concern about air quality amongst the consultation respondents ranged from not at all concerned to seriously concerned, with moderately concerned being the most common response. This indicates that the majority of the respondents to the consultation already had some level of knowledge and pre-existing interest in air quality issues.

Three of the respondents stated that they had no concerns about air quality before reading the AQAP. After reading the document the levels of concern of these respondents was increased to 'slight' or moderate'. None of the respondents stated

that their level of concern about air quality issues had dropped after reading the document. This suggests that at present there may be a lack of knowledge amongst some of the population about current air quality in Selby and the potential health impacts of this.

The written consultation from the Public Health Registrar (North Yorkshire County Council) suggests that the AQAP should empower the community (via use of community air quality groups) to take a more active role to ensure they take some ownership of the problem. It also makes reference to the need for improved media engagement and a wider air quality communications strategy.

Recommended actions:

Consider giving greater priority within the AQAP to better engagement with the public on air quality issues. Consider the possibility of setting up an air quality community group around New Street and provide more detail within the AQAP of the measures to be taken to raise awareness and understanding of air quality and health issues in Selby.

At present the plan states that it will 'Improve public access to air quality information and advice' but this is not listed as one of the priority measures (section 3.6).

Cause of the air quality problem in Selby (Question 6)

The technical source apportionment work presented within the AQAP indicates that traffic is the main source of air pollution on New Street. Of the 21 responses to the consultation received, 20 agreed with this conclusion and 1 person said they didn't know. The responses to the consultation confirm the findings of the technical source apportionment work and provide no reason to suspect that any other sources of pollution are having a major impact on air quality within the AQMA.

Prioritisation of measures (Question 8)

Based on the 21 responses received to the questionnaire the three measures most people wanted to see as high priority were:

- Better awareness and enforcement of HGV limits
- Promotion of sustainable travel in SDC area
- Improve opportunities to cycle in SDC area

The next most popular measures were:

- Development of low emission planning guidance
- Support for local businesses to reduce transport emissions and vehicle trips

- Use of lower emission vehicles by Selby DC

Provision of public EV charging points was considered the lowest priority amongst the consultation respondents.

This list of public priorities suggests that HGVs are the major source of concern for local residents and businesses and that there is a general feeling that more could be done to promote safe walking and cycling in the town. There also appears to be a recognition that further development will add to the existing problems and that low emission planning guidance could assist with this.

The respondents to the questionnaire appear to have limited interest in provision of public EV charging points but would like to see uptake of cleaner vehicles by the council. One respondent has cited later in the questionnaire that the cost of electric vehicles is a hurdle to ownership. Concerns about the cost of electric vehicles may be one of the reasons why EV charging provision is not highlighted as a priority amongst the questionnaire respondents.

The undertaking of an access management study has not been highlighted as a high priority by local residents / businesses. This may be due to personal concerns about changes to their own access rights. Some of the respondents have made suggestions as to how traffic could be reduced on New Street and these will need to be considered in more detail. Although not a popular choice amongst residents some form of improved traffic management is likely to be needed for delivery of a successful AQAP.

The response from DEFRA on the AQAP states that management of queuing traffic and monitoring engine switch-off should be considered as key priorities within the developing action plan. DEFRA have also requested that further work is undertaken to assess the emission impact of the proposed measures and to use this as a basis for prioritisation of measures, including the setting of emission reduction targets.

Recommended actions:

Further to the consultation responses it is recommended that the following action is taken:

a) Clarification is sought from DEFRA about what detail of emission reduction calculation is required prior to completion and publication of the AQAP. As detailed in the draft AQAP a number of the measures (such as possible access management solution) require the undertaking of detailed feasibility studies to establish what might be practicably possible before detailed emission reduction assessments can be undertaken. Other measures (such as improving access to air quality advice) are very difficult to quantify in terms of potential emission reduction. It may be possible to complete a basic emission reduction assessment by making some broad brush assumptions about what percentage and type of traffic

movements might be possible from the various measures proposed. Possible options for completing this aspect of the work will need to be agreed with DEFRA.

b) The questionnaire responses clearly indicate that there is a general feeling that more needs to be done to promote the use of sustainable transport measures in Selby and maintain the existing facilities to a good standard. At present the AQAP is relatively weak in this area as NYCC have previously indicated that they do not have any further resources to invest in Selby. As a result of the questionnaire responses it is recommended that public opinion on this issue is brought to the attention on NYCC and that a further discussion is held regarding NYCC support for the Selby AQAP delivery. If improving sustainable transport opportunities is considered a priority for the Selby AQAP that can not currently be delivered then this should be brought to the attention of DEFRA and steps taken to try and improve the funding situation.

c) At present aspirations for EV ownership in Selby appear to be low. Further information and awareness raising on this issue may need to be given greater priority within the AQAP if uptake of these vehicle types amongst members of the public is to be improved and encouraged. The local authority should also look to lead by example by integrating low emission vehicles into its own fleet.

d) DEFRA are expecting that management of queuing traffic and monitoring engine switch-off should be considered as key priorities within the developing action plan. Selby DC needs to give further consideration as to how this expectation will be managed during finalisation of the AQAP.

Other ideas for inclusion in AQAP3

A number of specific ideas have been raised by the questionnaire respondents for improving air quality within the current AQMA and the wider Selby district. These can be broadly grouped as:

- Specific recommendations for traffic management e.g. suggested road closures, one way systems, removal of certain vehicle types
- Improved emission limits for buses
- Park and Ride on the BOCM site
- 20mph zone
- Improvement to cycle infrastructure
- Improvements to bus service frequency
- Improvements to taxi emission limits

All these suggestions (with the exception of the bus service frequency) have already been looked at as part of the current AQAP development process or can be incorporated into the planned review of access control / traffic management measures.

Recommended actions:

- *Before commencing any review of traffic management / access controls review the consultation responses and ensure any specific ideas are given due consideration in developing the scope for any future study.*
- *Review the current provision of bus services from commuter villages and include a question regarding staff access to bus services when consulting with local businesses on possible improvement measures.*

Public confidence in the AQAP measures (Question 10)

Of the 21 responses received 9 respondents indicated that they were unsure if the AQAP would deliver the required level of air quality improvement and 2 said it would not. The remaining 10 felt it would adequately address the issue. This indicates that currently there is insufficient information in the AQAP to convince people that it will be effective.

DEFRA have indicated that more information is needed in the AQAP about the required level of emission reduction and the level of emission reduction likely to be delivered from the different types of improvement measures.

Recommended actions:

As detailed above estimating emission reduction potential of the different measures is currently quite difficult, especially where there are a number of different traffic management solutions that could be instigated or where the overall impact of a measure is difficult to quantify. Some broadbrush estimates of the emission reduction potential of different measures (in consultation with DEFRA) would provide a starting point for further discussion on prioritisation of measures and probably increase public confidence in the likely effectiveness of the plan. This work should be completed prior to final publication of the AQAP (subject to the response from DEFRA on next steps to be taken).

Opportunities for behaviour change (Question 11)

During the public consultation an opportunity has been taken to explore the likelihood of instigating behaviour change amongst the Selby population. This has identified that amongst the respondents most would be willing to make some change to their current behaviour to help improve air quality. The most likely behaviour changes identified were:

- Walk more

- Cycle more
- Use a lower emission vehicle

People were least likely to share a lift or use the bus.

Three respondents did not feel able to make any of these changes. Some stated this was due to physical disabilities.

The response to this question (and others) indicates that there is currently a potential to shift more trips in Selby to more sustainable modes such as walking, cycling or public transport. As already highlighted above the sustainable travel aspects of the current draft plan are currently quite weak and could be improved if NYCC were able to invest more into this area of work.

The response to this question also seems to indicate a lack of enthusiasm for bus travel which requires further investigation.

n.b. Some of the responses to question 11 (and 12) seem to indicate that some people may have struggled to provide more than one answer to question 11. This may have influenced the scope of the answers given.

Recommended actions:

1. As already recommended above the lack of investment in sustainable travel measures in Selby needs to be raised again with NYCC and if necessary referred back to DEFRA as a funding gap issue for the AQAP.

2. The reasons for lack of enthusiasm in bus travel require further investigation to determine if it is the coverage of services, the quality of services, the cost of services or any other issue which is the main barrier to bus travel in Selby.

3. If possible the respondents who only provided one option for question 11 should be contacted to determine which (if any) of the other options they would have ticked if the questionnaire had operated as planned.

Additional comments (Question 12)

Question 12 provided the respondents to make any final comments regarding the AQAP.

The majority of these comments were generally supportive of the draft AQAP and did not raise any issues which had not already been addressed to some extent in the draft plan. The majority of the answers given to question 12 related to detailed individual ideas for potential traffic management schemes. These included suggested road closures, one way systems and restriction of loading bays to reduce congestion. One respondent was concerned about the potential to move the air quality problem to other parts of Selby.

Another respondent suggested that part of the HGV problem related to drivers not understanding where the restriction was in place due to lack of local knowledge.

The responses to question 12 also highlighted a potential issue with the functionality of some parts of the questionnaire.

Recommended actions:

- 1. When developing the scope for any future traffic management study the traffic management ideas provided in response to question 12 should be given due consideration.*
- 2. Any new signage relating to the HGV access restriction takes account of the fact that drivers from outside the area may not know where New Street is located.*
- 3. Where possible respondents should be re-contacted to ensure their response is fully representative of their views.*

Summary

The consultation on the draft AQAP indicates that the respondents agree that traffic is the main source of air pollution within the AQMA and that a traffic based solution is needed. Selby residents have some useful ideas about potential traffic management improvements and these should be taken on board and fully considered as the AQAP is further developed. There also appears to be a feeling locally that not enough is currently being done to promote and maintain sustainable transport measures in Selby and this needs to be re-examined in terms of priorities for the AQAP (recognising that NYCC have highlighted that no additional funding is currently available for Selby).

The main outcome of the consultation is that further work is needed to try and assess the emission reduction needed in the AQMA, and the level of emission reduction likely to be provided by the measures currently being suggested. Priorities for delivery should be based around this work. It is recommended that Selby DC contact DEFRA to discuss their exact requirements prior to the final publication of the AQAP, recognising that detailed emission reduction calculations can not be undertaken until more detailed traffic management proposals have been drawn up and subjected to a detailed feasibility study.