

# East Suffolk Council Annual Status Report 2018

## Consultation Results

### Summary of responses to 2018 ASR consultation

	Consultee	Response summary
1	Resident	<p>Encourages air quality improvements even where there is no breach of the objectives. Supports reduction in diesel / petrol vehicles, reduced congestion and increased provision for active travel.</p> <p>Makes the following suggestions to improve air quality:            Modification of the junction of Lime Kiln Quay Road and the Thoroughfare.            Infrastructure changes at the junction of Bredfield Road and Woods Lane and at the junction of Melton Road / A1152.            The introduction of shuttle buses around Woodbridge and Melton.            Increased crossings and improved footpaths for pedestrians and priority boxes for cyclists.</p>
2	Resident	Would like to see initiatives which increase awareness of pollution caused by Idling.
3	Resident (Campsea Ashe)	Would like to see a reduction in HGV / agricultural traffic. Has concerns that development increases traffic in surrounding villages, impacting air quality and safety. States concerns regarding pollution levels near Melton Crossroads.
4	Resident	Would like to see additional monitoring East of the A12 in the Retail Park, to monitor idling traffic, which reduces road space for cyclists.
5	Resident (Lowestoft)	Would like to see wood burning stoves banned particularly in urban areas.
6	Resident (Hacheston)	<p>Impressed with councils initiatives on electric cars and changes at the port. Requested increased monitoring at the following sites where there is currently none: Hacheston, Parham, Framlingham.</p> <p>Suggests that due to HGVs and agricultural vehicles there is increased pollution between A12 and Framlingham.</p> <p>Comments on obstructive parking on Station Road, College Road and Mount Pleasant.</p> <p>Suggested that the council should measure herbicides and pesticides in the environment.</p>
7	Resident (Rushmere St Andrew)	Reports a local impact on air quality due to wood and solid fuel burning, and requested additional monitoring in the Playford road area.
8	Resident (Woodbridge)	<p>Expressed concerns about the increase in traffic in and around Woodbridge, in particular HGVs using the town as a short cut. Questions the accuracy and relevance of the data. Would like to increase monitoring in areas with regular traffic jams.</p> <p>Concerned about increased traffic and idling vehicles around schools at drop off / pick up time. Requests resources at schools to raise awareness of pollution.</p> <p>Suggested increased safe cycle paths and network.</p>

		<p>Would like to see PM<sub>10</sub> measured and an increase in electric charge points in the District.</p> <p>Raised concerns over pollution from building sites.</p>
9	Resident & County Councillor (Woodbridge)	<p>Would like to see enhanced source apportionment information for NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, and additional information around sources of NO<sub>2</sub>. Supports 20 mph zones and the implementation of them in Woodbridge. Expressed objection to future development within the AQMA in Woodbridge. Requested more detail relating to emissions from petrol and diesel cars.</p> <p>Would like to see cycling and walking better supported and encouraged, and also funded by the council.</p> <p>Would like to see the use of buses further supported and the scheduling and network of routes improved.</p>
10	Resident (Wissett)	<p>Concerns that PM<sub>2.5</sub> is not being measured, and also with pollution from local wood burners.</p> <p>Concerns regarding pollution from local agricultural activity, and the economic burden of air pollution on the NHS.</p>
11	Resident	<p>Expressed concerns regarding the use of wood burners and the effect of their use on the onset of asthma and other conditions. Concerns regarding the World Health Organisation values for PM<sub>2.5</sub> not being met.</p> <p>Would like increased fines for idling vehicles particularly outside of schools and a ban on wood burning stoves.</p>
12	Resident	Concerns regarding fumes from diesel engines on the railway.
13	Councillor	Requesting air quality data on Bloodmoor Road near the A146/A12
14	Councillor	Great news that the actions taken have helped reduce the levels of pollutant and I am delighted to see that there is nowhere in Felixstowe that has a problem at the moment! Well done. It is also great news to read the actions taken by the Port to help maintain good air quality in that area.
15	County Council (Public Health)	<p>Clarification question on revoking AQMAs.</p> <p>Request for results of 1 week traffic trial undertaken in July 2017.</p>
16	County Council (Public Health)	Request that any further specific advice from DEFRA, Public Health England as well as any other health consultees should be considered and incorporated where appropriate into the final version of the report.
17	Resident	Request for data from the one week trial to hold traffic back which took place in July 2017.
18	Neighbouring Authority	No comments to make.
19	Resident	Concerns regarding air quality at the bus stop on Gloster Road.
20	Resident	Referring to the Clean Air Strategy announced during the consultation period.

21	Parish Council	Request that Stratford St Andrew and Farnham should continue to be monitored and results published.
22	Resident	Concerns of air quality at Oulton Broad South Station and Normanston Park. Suggest more air quality monitoring near the sea. Concerns that Greater Anglia are still using 50 year old trains on the Norwich to Lowestoft line.

**Actions to be taken following the Consultation:**

- Specific elements of Consultation responses which are not within the remit of the Environmental Protection Team have been forwarded to the relevant body (Suffolk County Council and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs – (Defra) in this instance) or the relevant team within the Council (the Planning Department).
- Any Consultation responses which need to be dealt with under alternative legislation by the Environmental Protection Team have been forwarded to the relevant Officer.
- The Council’s diffusion tube monitoring program for nitrogen dioxide is continually reviewed and any new relevant monitoring locations of concern are added to the program each year. Each of the suggestions / sites mentioned in the above Consultation responses has been considered for the 2019 monitoring program and a number of new sites have been added across the district. Defra provide guidance for local authorities with regard to identifying receptor locations for each pollutant of concern - the public must be expected to be situated there over the averaging period of the pollutant. As an example, for the 1-hour nitrogen dioxide objective to apply a member of the public needs to be present at a set location for 1 hour, this would include residential properties and areas such as cafes or shopping areas. Longer term exposure is needed for the annual mean nitrogen dioxide objective to apply and so residential properties are relevant in this instance.
- All relevant planning permissions throughout the district are assessed for air quality impacts by the Environmental Protection team and responses submitted to Planning.
- The air quality pages on the East Suffolk Council website were updated earlier this year to make them more user-friendly and include new information with regard to how the Public can help to reduce emissions including domestic burning. Further promotional work is planned in 2019 with regard to domestic burning, and anti-idling of road vehicles within the district.
- All editorial suggestions will be taken into consideration in the production of the 2019 Annual Status Report. It should be noted that the report is produced using the template and guidance provided by Defra and the contents are those required by Defra. The contents have been scaled down by Defra in recent years in order to reduce the reporting burden on local authorities and free up more officer time to work on air quality issues.
- Air quality initiatives will be held around Clean Air Day on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2019 to raise awareness of pollution. See: <http://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/environment/environmental-protection/air-quality/>
- An assessment of stationary and moving trains at Somerleyton, Oulton Broad and Lowestoft has been undertaken with regard to the LAQM guidance.

Full responses:

	Consultee	Full response
1	Resident	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I would like to respond to the piece on air quality in the monthly update from Suffolk Coastal District Council in Woodbridge Talk for January 2019. While I appreciate that air quality in this area ‘remains generally very good’ and even in the two AQMAs the levels of pollutants are reducing we must still aim for our air to be cleaner especially in these two specific areas in Woodbridge and Stratford St Andrew as no one wants to be exposed to harmful emissions, even at a low level, especially if one lives, works or goes to schools in these areas.</p> <p>I speak from experience as a Traffic Engineer (not in Suffolk) but now retired and living in Melton, Woodbridge.</p> <p>In general the source of pollutants is, as stated in the piece, from traffic emissions. The levels can be reduced by taking the following measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* reducing the number of diesel/petrol vehicles on the roads (until they are replaced by electric vehicles)</li> <li>*keeping traffic moving, reducing congestion</li> <li>*encouraging use of public transport, walking and cycling</li> </ul> <p>I haven’t investigated the situation in Stratford St Andrew but if we apply the above measures to Woodbridge /Melton then I suggest the following changes could be made.</p> <p><b>To reduce the number of vehicles on the roads and keep traffic moving and reduce congestion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- modify the junction of Lime Kiln Quay Road and the Thoroughfare. The traffic lights could be altered to retain only the pedestrian crossing facility and a mini roundabout installed to improve the traffic flow. <i>When roadworks were carried out (2017?) the traffic lights were covered and temporary lights were used to allow pedestrians to cross safely. The traffic flowed freely without the stationary queues of traffic waiting only for the lights to change, as at present. I had the opportunity to speak to a technician installing the temporary lights and he said they did not cause any problems with the flow of traffic at the junction.</i></li> <li>- with the increase in traffic due to developments, the flow of traffic along the A1152 may be improved and therefore emissions reduced if a roundabout is installed at the junction of Bredfield Road and Woods Lane and also the traffic lights at the junction of Melton Road/A1152 replaced by a roundabout. Again there could be lights to allow pedestrians to cross safely.</li> <li>- introduce shuttle buses around Woodbridge and Melton. <i>Apparently some years ago there were bus services W1, W2 and W3 running around this</i></li> </ul>

*area*. Shuttle buses would allow people from around the edges of the town to come into town leaving their cars at home ( if they own cars, and not everyone does) thus reducing the volume of traffic and the demand for parking spaces. Shuttle buses with a minimum fare, less than the cost of parking, would be appreciated by all sectors of the community and encourage people to shop and use the facilities - railway stations, leisure centre, markets, library etc. People would be much more likely to spend their money in local shops rather than go to 'out of town' shopping centres where there is ample free parking.

**To improve provision for pedestrians and cyclists.**

Pedestrian crossings greatly improve the safety of pedestrians and slow the traffic. Sites requested by the general public might be;

- in Melton: to allow safe crossing of the A1152 between the station and Riduna House, Melton village etc; on Melton Road near the Recreation field to allow safe crossing for people wishing to use the playing field and for parents and children going to Melton Primary School who use the Recreation field car park; also on Melton Road at the bottom of Melton Hill near where the Turnpike Lane footpath joins the road.

- in Woodbridge: near the Notcutt's/Framfield House roundabout to allow people walking to the Health Centre, the Garden Centre, Kingston Field and the river to cross the Ipswich Road more safely; near all the schools - at present only Woodbridge Primary School has a pedestrian crossing on Pytches Road and there is a pelican crossing on the A12 not far from Farlingaye school. So crossings on Burkitt Road for St Mary's School, on Peterhouse Crescent for Kyson School, on Grundisburgh Road and Hasketon Road for Farlingaye and Bredfield Road for Woodbridge Primary would make the route to school much safer.

The crossings would bring an additional benefit in that they will deter drivers from driving through Woodbridge rather than using the A12 by-pass.

Footpaths also need to be provided and maintained to encourage and allow safe walking. For example, the footpaths from the Warwick Road area to Woodbridge Primary School are narrow in some places, difficult for parents with children, pushchairs etc and there are no crossings. Also the surface of the Thoroughfare is poorly maintained and uneven and we are aware of people who have experienced falls there and so avoid coming to Woodbridge to shop for fear of tripping again. And, of course, there is the ongoing issue of traffic using the Thoroughfare when it should be traffic free and this brings dangers, causes confusion and increases harmful emissions in a narrow street. There are other footpaths that would benefit from improved surfaces and/or better lighting.

There is scope for improving cycling facilities in the Woodbridge and Melton area. While it is difficult to make cycle paths in an old town there are places where cycle paths could be created or there could be shared pedestrian/cycle paths. There are junctions with traffic lights at present where a priority box for cyclists could be installed to improve the safety of cyclists.

All the above ideas were investigated in the recent past during the consultations

		<p>for both Melton Neighbourhood Plan and the Woodbridge Neighbourhood Plan and following surveys with the general public on their concerns on 'Getting Around'.</p> <p>I hope these comments will be helpful to those trying to improve the air quality in Suffolk Coastal District and I would be happy if I can be of further assistance.</p> <p>Yours,</p>
2	Resident	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I read with interest the article in Coastline about air quality. I would like to see awareness made of the pollution caused by idling cars. Whilst I appreciate that it would be difficult to enforce measures to stop this I think it would be helpful if traffic wardens could ask people to switch off their engines whilst their car is stationary. I think this could be enforceable where a company vehicle is idling. For example I have noticed that the taxi drivers in Felixstowe regularly leave their cars running whilst waiting for custom.</p> <p>Thank you and Kind regards</p>
3	Resident (Campsea Ashe)	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>We are delighted the council is looking into this matter, as this has been an area of concern to us for several years and we hope that appropriate action results from this.</p> <p>As residents on Ivy Lodge Road, we are subjected to a disproportional amount of HGV traffic as well as at times highly questionable 'agricultural' traffic, that uses the road as a shortcut to and from Bentwaters and further down the peninsula.</p> <p>The increase in approved planning applications seems to totally ignore the environmental impact the increase of traffic has on the surrounding villages, not just with regards to volume on usually wholly unsuitable roads, but also with regards to the associated danger of deteriorating air quality.</p> <p>The enclosed images illustrate the pollution suffered on Ivy Lodge Road; The images show black sud on window cills that had been cleaned 2 days earlier due to painting work to be done.....</p> <p>A pollution survey this year by Greenpeace near Melton Crossroads - with Primary School located next to the traffic lights - has clearly shown an environmental pollution hotspot a dangerously high levels.</p> <p>It is about time the council takes these issues seriously into account when future planning applications are considered.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>

4	Resident (Martlesham)	<p>Thank you for bringing to my attention in 'Coastline' the detailed report of air quality in the district.</p> <p>Having seen the map of monitoring locations within Martlesham can I suggest an additional site East of the A12 in the Retail Park area? During peak hours there is now queuing traffic with idling engines throughout this area. - In fact this evening was the worst I've ever seen with no road space left for my bicycle commute meaning that I had to walk it along the footway in places.</p> <p>Regards</p>
5	Resident (Lowestoft)	<p>Having read the Air Quality Report and associated pages on the East Suffolk District Council website, when will the use of wood-burning stoves be banned, particularly in urban areas?</p> <p>Despite the advice given within the Biomass &amp; Wood Burning section of the website, the use of such stoves is an undoubted risk to health, particularly to people of an asthmatic disposition. There is research evidence available to demonstrate the health risk, for instance from New Zealand. Wood-burning stoves may be attractive to the user, but the smoke can be extremely unpleasant to neighbours.</p> <p>There are also the annoying effects of noise and vibration from chopping and splitting of wood for fuel.</p>
6	Resident (Hacheston)	<p>Dear Environmental,</p> <p>I was impressed with your report on Air Quality.</p> <p>As an electric car driver, it was encouraging to see your initiatives on electric cars, and the part regarding beginning of electrification in the port.</p> <p>Also, the attention to the air pollution from marine vessels, using low grade marine oils, was admirable.</p> <p>I notice that there were no air monitoring sites in Hacheston, Parham, or Framlingham.</p> <p>Due to the heavy construction traffic, agricultural lorries and tractors between the A12 and Framlingham, there is substantial pollution.</p> <p>In Framlingham, the problem is exacerbated by extensive obstructive parking, particularly outside Framlingham DIY in Station Road, as well as College Road, and Mount Pleasant.</p> <p>Please set up monitoring sites in Hacheston, Parham, and Framlingham.</p> <p>Of course East Suffolk follows the parameters set by government, which limits</p>

		<p>air pollution control to NO2 and particulates.</p> <p>There is nothing to stop East Suffolk taking responsibility for identifying other major air pollution problems, that are particular to country environments, and which may escape the full attention of national government.</p> <p>Our area has a big problem with the spraying of herbicides (glyphosate) and pesticides, as well as their petroleum based solvents - most of which are cancer-causing.</p> <p>Measurement of such pollution would form a useful basis for minimisation strategies.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
7	Resident (Rushmere St Andrew)	<p>The report mentions wood and solid fuel burning, but does not suggest additional monitoring. I live in Rushmere St Andrew (Playford Road), and the air quality last winter was appalling. In the evenings, particularly if the air was still, the smell of sulphur from coal and the smoke from wood fires was so bad, I found it difficult the breath at times. I expect it will be just the same this winter, I have already noticed it on a few occasions, even though the weather has been mostly mild. We need additional monitors during winter months, that can be moved to problem areas as the need arises.</p>
8	Resident (Woodbridge)	<p>Thank you for inviting comments on the Air Pollution ASR 2018.</p> <p>As a parent of a young child I am very worried about the increase in the volume of traffic in and around Woodbridge, where we live. This is increasing annually, particularly the number of lorries and HGV's that come charging through town as a short cut.</p> <p>Having read your report, I would question the accuracy and relevance of the air quality data in Woodbridge, I also wonder why there are no measuring points on the Ipswich Road as there are regular traffic jams around Nottcuts, The Cherry Tree, the Deben Leisure Centre, along past the train station, and all the way to the Red Lion pub and to Melton School and surrounding traffic lights. Also around the small Co-op shops on Barrack Road and near Farlingaye where traffic is frequently standstill and must be causing significant emissions.</p> <p>The traffic around schools at collection and pick up time is also increasing, with vehicles often left on while parents, who have found somewhere to park, sit there with their heating on until collection time, I feel sorry for the residents that live nearby and believe schools should be given the tools to make their children and parents aware of the dangers of air pollution in and around cars and what they can do about it.</p> <p>Surely if cycle paths were increased and networks created that are safe for children and adults, this element of air pollution could be massively reduced, but alas, cycling with young children is very dangerous and risky in Woodbridge as safe spaces for them to cycle and specified cycle routes are negligible. More</p>

		<p>of these would be very welcome and I believe are essential.</p> <p>I also question why Particulate Matter, PM10's especially, are not measured anywhere as these are the bits that are going to damage our children and elderly the most. I think this should be of utmost priority, particularly in the fight to dissuade HGV's from using shortcuts that are so close to town.</p> <p>I also question why there are so few electric car charging points throughout the entire Suffolk Coastal. This would attract tourists especially as Suffolk is so lacking charge points (for all types of EV), if we want to attract people here they are a necessity.</p> <p>The question of particulate matter and dust from building sites also worries me - not just emissions from delivery vehicles but from the actual building itself. Is this recorded at all? With so many houses being built locally, my lungs certainly tell me that the air is not healthier than a few years ago, as your report suggests.</p> <p>Many thanks for your time reading these comments.</p>
9	Resident & County Councillor (Woodbridge)	<p>To whom it may Concern</p> <p>I am offering some comments as County Councillor of Woodbridge in response to East Suffolk Consultation on Air Quality. Some of my remarks are general, and some specifically concern my division</p> <p>May I start by saying how pleased I am that this issue is being brought to public attention.</p> <p>I would like to make the following four points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In your <b>Health and Air Quality</b> section you mention that <i>"elevated levels and/or long term exposure to air pollution can lead to more serious symptoms and conditions affecting human health. This mainly affects the respiratory and inflammatory systems, but is also recognised as a contributing factor in the onset of heart disease and cancer."</i> While you say that <i>"The main air pollutants within East Suffolk are nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>)"</i> and conscientiously link PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> to biomass and wood burning as well as diesel, you do not give the percentage of each source responsible for this pollution. I think we need to have greater detail as to whether diesel predominates, and how big is the contribution of the other sources. We also need to know what the sources of the diesel emanations are, in the same way as we are told about the wood-burning stoves. This is essential.</li> </ol> <p>You also do not give the source of NO<sub>2</sub> at all. I am sure the people of Suffolk would wish to know how much is background, how much vehicular?</p> <p>(I recognise you have elsewhere stated the central premise that <i>"the main sources of the pollutants in the East Suffolk district are emissions</i></p>

from road traffic, industrial processes, biomass combustion, construction sites and significant local commercial operations such as the Port of Felixstowe.”)

Additionally, you add “air pollution particularly affects the most vulnerable in society: children and older people, and those with heart and lung conditions. There is also often a strong correlation with equalities issues, because areas with poor air quality are also often the less affluent areas. “

In Woodbridge, a town with a very high demographic of elderly people, and a large number of schools, air pollution is a significant issue. An issue for everyone, as the main routes through the town pass both schools and sheltered housing, and housing at all levels of affluence. It is particularly important therefore to identify how much of the NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions are attributable to which cause. You provide the NO<sub>2</sub> measures for the Woodbridge AQMA in **Woodbridge Air Quality Plan - 2017**, but there are no measures for particulates – even though this AQMA is near to a large primary school (Woodbridge CP) and abuts sheltered housing.

Some solution to risks caused by vehicular emissions were addressed in my own **Proposal for 20mph zones and associated calming in Woodbridge** <http://carolinepage.blog.suffolk.libdems.org/20mph-woodbridge/> - a proposal supported by the town - which I took to SCC’s Speed Panel. It was passed by this panel in Feb 2017. This proposal is mentioned in **Woodbridge Air Quality Action Plan measures Table 5.1 no 7** – I note, where SCDC is named as lead authority (as funder? Certainly not as originator)! Although I was for many years on the Steering Committee for the Action Plan I have never seen this Appendix. I notice it significantly underestimates the benefits of the Woodbridge 20mph scheme as “*Marginal benefits in terms of emission reductions*”. As the declared purpose of the scheme was to discourage the high percentage of through traffic that rat run through Woodbridge instead of taking the A12, I find this to be a strangely dismissive remark.

**2 Improving Air Quality in Suffolk Coastal.** A certain amount of this section– and the bit on which I am most qualified to comment - deals with the updated **Air Quality Action Plan for Woodbridge AQMA**. I note the report states: “*Production and consultation on the updated Action Plan for Woodbridge – a draft plan is currently with DEFRA for comments.*” It further states:

- a) “*There have been some differences of opinion regarding the wording of the Planning measure and this delayed production of the final draft for Defra.*”

I am aware that one difference was crucial to the subject of air quality. A last minute (supposedly ‘minor’) amendment was made to wording of one of the Key Performance Indicators for Planning: “No new housing or conversions to residential development to be introduced into the area of exceedance”). This changed a *complete ban on development in*

*the area of exceedance to SCDC allowing development in the area of exceedance "if mitigation measures are put in place to offset impacts."*

This completely altered the meaning and intention of the paragraph.

As County Councillor for Woodbridge, I could not be persuaded that this alteration of words and intentions was 'minor'. It seemed to me to be an extraordinarily major change to make, considering so many people had spent so many years failing to solve the current air quality situation at the current level of development in the area in question. The Woodbridge AQMA situation is a so far insoluble unintended consequence of past development. How can future development be permitted, when we have failed in any way to mitigate the problems caused by past development? Furthermore, future unintended consequences at this AQMA cannot possibly be predicted let alone addressed by "mitigation measures to offset impacts," because nobody can know what they might be!

This wording appears to run contra to **Woodbridge Air Quality Plan - 2017 (3.2)** *"That new developments do not create additional problems to air quality within Woodbridge."*

2. *"Difficulty in obtaining final signatures from Suffolk County Council on the draft Updated Action Plan for Woodbridge."* On account of the above concern, I said I was unable to sign off this plan. However I was told that it would go ahead despite my objections. (I stressed that if it went ahead it would have to be without my signature. This was agreed.).
3. *"Measure 37 – 20mph zone implementation in Woodbridge. The 20mph zone must be self-enforcing and an initial study is required to outline the physical measures needed for this to happen before costings can be drawn up for the scheme. Funding for the initial study has proven difficult to obtain."* I am astonished by this statement as this is not the case. No study was required: just plans for physical measures for an already agreed scheme. These plans were drawn up in July 2018 and are with the County Council Highways department. Woodbridge Town Council tasked itself with applying for funding, but (apparently, having failed to mention air quality in its application) was unsuccessful. A new application is being made by a local environmental group, hopefully with greater success.

3) **Biomass and Woodburning** section. Whilst I welcome the detail provided in this, I am surprised there is no equivalent section on petrol/diesel vehicles. People need to be equally well-informed about the consequences of their actions, whether it is burning wood or driving cars. This is particularly the case when we read that over 50% of the NO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the Woodbridge AQMA are shown to be due to cars (**Air Quality Action Plan for Woodbridge AQMA Table 3.2**).

4) **Get Involved (Doing Your Bit)**. I note that the information in this section

		<p>states “Cycling and walking are much cleaner, cheaper and healthier forms of travel, so there are a number of positive benefits.” It fails however to discuss how little these forms of travel are supported or encouraged in East Suffolk as alternative forms of transport to the car.</p> <p>Although Suffolk County Council supported a motion put forward by the SCC LDGI group in 2018 to support an integrated cycle network, the administration refused to allocate any funding for this out of its highways budget. Is SCDC offering any, or is the idea of cycling an aspiration?</p> <p>Similarly, it seems that walking in our rural district is supported purely as a leisure activity rather than as a means of getting from a to b. If so, it will do little to alleviate air pollution.</p> <p>Turning to other forms of transport, buses replace many single occupancy cars, and contributed only 8% to the NO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the Woodbridge AQMA. It would be nice to see the use of them mentioned and supported. Yet in recent years the number of scheduled bus services between Ipswich and Woodbridge have reduced from 4 an hour to 2 an hour. There are few or none to other important tourist destinations, or indeed to Suffolk Coastals new offices (which I can testify were also designed without any cycle parking for visitors- a surprising omission).</p> <p>The two scheduled bus services from Woodbridge to Ipswich are available over a much shorter timescale than in the past (one over many fewer hours than the other) and no longer come at regular intervals. Evening services finish at 19.30. This can only encourage young people to start driving early. Timetable information about these two services is not available on a single timetable sheet - and indeed, if Suffolk County Council’s 2019-20 budget intentions are enforced, there will no longer be physical timetables or any scheduled buses. The 800 bus does not even show a map ON the bus that one of its buses an hour goes beyond the Park and Ride through Woodbridge to Rendlesham. This is anarchy.</p> <p>In conclusion, while I am pleased to see this information and advice on air quality in our district, I think it needs more work if it is indeed going to do what it is intended to do and provide information and support to improve air quality in East Suffolk.</p>
10	Resident (Wissett)	<p>Dear East Suffolk Environment,</p> <p>I am responding to your call for Public Opinion on air quality in Suffolk. As someone who is Diabetic and has a complex Lung Condition in which worsening air quality has been proven to speed up the progression toward end of life I am extremely concerned that you are only measuring Nitrogen Dioxide levels. Of course if you only have measuring equipment for Nitrogen Dioxide due to the cost of the equipment air quality in Suffolk will appear to be much better than it really is. It is absolutely vital that in 2019 you invest in monitors that measure PM2.5's The monitors that measure PM2.5's have come down in cost and are much more easily affordable for Councils that might be cash strapped. Many other rural areas in the UK are measuring PM2.5's in villages and small towns</p>

		<p>with populations of 1000. This should be happening in Suffolk.</p> <p>The Village I live in would appear to have good air quality if only measuring Nitrogen Dioxide levels. However if you were to measure dangerous PM2.5's I think you would get an entirely different result. This is because almost every house in the Village has a Wood burner. Most people are using them as their main source of heat and have them polluting the air for all or part of the day. People in the Village are not following your recommendations on Burning Well. They are choosing to use scavenged wood and are burning it wet. One or two are burning intelligently. My neighbour cooks on a wood stove and heats their water all the year round.</p> <p>This situation is unbearable for me as I am unable to open my windows on hot summer nights (Essential for Health) and have subsequently worsening Lung and Diabetic Health in what should be a Happy time of year. This Christmas I spent the day in the midst of a Respiratory virus that is in circulation at the moment. In addition to feeling lousy I had the added concern of trying to find a place in the house that was free of the smell of wood fumes coming from other peoples houses. This was with all my windows closed and my bedroom window covered in plastic sheeting.</p> <p>You have agreed to come out when this happens but for someone who has been through that process with a noise situation in a previous house I can safely say that to be ringing a stranger at night on numerous occasions is not to be recommended. However if you were able to do regular air quality monitoring of PM2.5's you would reduce the need for these out of hours visits and would be doing the right thing in making sure people cannot ignore all the evidence on burning Wood and Coal.</p> <p>I was part of a European Respiratory Society Conference when the Royal Society of Physicians launched its Clean Air Campaign. Headed by the likes of Dr Gary Fuller much has been done to treat air pollution as a Public Health Emergency. Primarily the focus was on Vehicle emissions however the Campaign has now advanced its focus onto the dangers of Domestic Burning. PM25.s are incredibly dangerous and should have never been left out of the equation in the advancement of Clean Air. Please buy a copy of Dr Fuller's new book 'The Invisible Killer. An Urgent Unseeable Threat of Air Pollution'. Even better seek advice from his Department at Kings College London.</p> <p>Pollution coming from Agricultural activities also needs urgent attention. In my area farmers will Spray when the wind is blowing directly on to the Village. They will do the same thing when they are burning hedges. I have also had to deal with Trailers spilling Nitrogen all over the road in front of my house as they were driving too fast. On this occasion I had my upstairs windows open! The general lack of awareness on air pollution in Suffolk is putting a huge burden on the NHS.</p> <p>Best regards</p>
11	Resident	<p>Thank you so much for opening up the debate on air quality.</p> <p>I feel really strongly about this issue. Having not had asthma for over 40 years just recently I have felt tightness in my chest and a constant tickly cough, particularly since the wood burners have all been fired up. This happened the same time last year.</p>

We need to act now to improve our air quality for the benefit of both young and old.

Having done lots of research, below I have listed some quotes re wood burning stoves in particular and the organisations they have been taken from.

Asthma UK

<https://www.asthma.org.uk/advice/triggers/pollution/#Bonfires>

Pollution: what's the risk to people with asthma?

When pollution levels are high we all breathe in harmful substances, but if you have asthma, you're more likely to feel the effects. Pollution is more of a risk for people with asthma because:

- pollutants, for example in traffic fumes, or wood smoke, can quickly irritate your airways and trigger asthma symptoms
- the particles found in dust, soot, smoke, and diesel fumes are small enough to get right into your lungs, making your airways inflamed and swollen and bringing on asthma symptoms

BONFIRES, WOOD-BURNING STOVES AND FIREWORKS

Even when people are [using stoves or fires to heat their homes inside](#), the smoke particles escape into the air outside and we know that some people with asthma notice this irritates their airways and brings on their asthma symptoms.

Email from British Lung Foundation

*Burning wood and coal in a stove or on an open fire releases particulate matter (PM), which has shown a range of adverse health impacts, including decreased lung development and function, exacerbation of asthma, allergy, COPD, pulmonary fibrosis, and increased risk of lung cancer. Studies in Vancouver linked wood burning and exposure to PM released by burning wood or coal to an increase in emergency hospital visits.*

Clean air day

Save the wood-burning stove for the bleak winter

Wood-burning stoves look great and they're so cosy. But burning wood produces a lot of air pollutants. To minimise your contribution to air pollution buy a [Defra-approved stove](#), use authorised fuel, and only light it when you really really have to.

Norwich Green Party

Both PM2.5s and NO2 are well established by medical experts to contribute together to over 40,000 premature deaths from pollution in the UK each

year. Both are produced from road transport, and a significant proportion of particulates is also produced in winter from wood burning stoves (4).

The Sun

Do they cause pollution?

[Burning wood and coal at home](#) contributes 38 per cent of UK emissions of damaging particulate matter, officials argued.

The clean air strategy contains other targets and rules that will [cut the cost of air pollution by £1billion](#) a year by 2020, and £2.5billion a year by 2030.

A recent study suggested stoves could give off up to [six times as much cancer-causing pollution as diesel trucks](#).

Researchers found they emit tiny particles, known as PM2.5, which is the most harmful type of air pollution and is linked to heart attacks, strokes, cancer and dementia.

Gary Fuller, a leading pollution scientist at King's College London, has now said action must take place "urgently" to cut down on the craze as "lives are at risk.

In your article published in the Coastline flyer you state 'The Annual Status Report confirms that air quality within both districts remains generally good.' and goes on to say there are just two very specific areas of concern... Well not according to the British Lung Foundation who has an interactive map on their website and I have listed just six out of many many more where WHO annual limits are exceeded. The map can be found at <https://www.blf.org.uk/air-quality>.

Felixstowe Community Hospital

Recorded levels of PM2.5: 10.08

Howard House Surgery, 31 Orwell Road, Felixstowe, Suffolk

Recorded levels of PM2.5: 10.08

Walton Surgery, 301 High Street, Walton, Felixstowe, Suffolk

Recorded levels of PM2.5: 11.40

Haven Health, Grange Farm Avenue, Felixstowe, Suffolk

Recorded levels of PM2.5: 11.70

Stowhealth, Violet House, Violet Hill Road, Stowmarket, Suffolk

Recorded levels of PM2.5: 10.61

		<p>Address: Ravenswood Health Centre, 24 Hening Avenue, Ipswich, Suffolk</p> <p>Recorded levels of PM2.5: 10.65</p> <p><i>This site is in an area that has levels of fine particulate matter (PM2.5) above the World Health Organisation's limit (10 µg/m<sup>3</sup> for the annual average). The model used to work this out looks at background levels. It doesn't take into account road-side concentrations and represents an annual average. As such, this site can experience higher levels than what is indicated on the map.</i></p> <p>Obviously this isn't all down to wood burning stoves but they certainly don't help!!</p> <p>As we all know (???) Norwich council is going to fine taxi drivers who sit with their engines idling. This should be done everywhere, particularly outside schools. It doesn't even need a new law.</p> <p>RAC</p> <p>Can I get a fine for idling?</p> <p>The issue of engines not being switched off when vehicles are parked is, unbeknownst to many, already an offence.</p> <p>Rule 123 of The Highway Code looks at 'The Driver and the Environment', stating that drivers must not leave a parked vehicle unattended with the engine running or leave a vehicle engine running unnecessarily while that vehicle is stationary on a public road.</p> <p>Local authorities have the power to issue £20 <a href="#">fixed penalties</a> for emission offences and stationary idling under The Road Traffic (Vehicle Emissions) (Fixed Penalty) (England) Regulations 2002.</p> <p>However, it is important to note that this is imposed only if a motorist refuses to switch off their engine off when asked to do so by an authorised person.</p> <p>So we need to enforce this law and ban wood burning stoves as they have done in other parts of the world:</p> <p>Montreal ban on wood burning stoves</p> <p><a href="https://montreal.ctvnews.ca/ban-on-wood-burning-stoves-comes-into-effect-in-on-october-1-1.4115457">https://montreal.ctvnews.ca/ban-on-wood-burning-stoves-comes-into-effect-in-on-october-1-1.4115457</a></p> <p>The city of Montreal says burning wood causing 40 percent of fine particle emissions in the city, something Montreal Public Health says can lead to serious health problems.</p> <p>"Fine particles are known by the World Health Organization to cause lung</p>
--	--	---

		<p>cancer,” said Karine Price of Montreal Public Health.</p> <p>Price says fine particles also cause smog and she expects those suffering from cardiac or respiratory diseases such as asthma to see the most benefit from the new bylaw.</p> <p>Those who don't comply with the new rules will face hefty fines that run between \$100 and \$500 for a first offence.</p> <p>The Times</p> <p>Town halls could be handed powers to stop residents having bonfires or using wood-burning stoves as part of a clean- air strategy that would shift responsibility on to local authorities.</p> <p>The environment department is due to reveal today that Michael Gove is considering giving councils powers to issue “non-burn notices”, a policy that is used in the US. This would let them ban the burning of dirty fuels on days when pollution exceeded a certain level.</p> <p>In the American state of Utah, the health department in Salt Lake County prohibits burning solid fuel in fireplaces or wood-burning stoves and bans outdoor fires on “no burn” days.</p> <p>The centrepiece of today’s strategy is the goal that by 2025 the UK will halve the number of people...</p> <p>In Felixstowe the air quality has deteriorated in the past five years with the massive uptake of wood burning stoves. You can walk the streets and see black smoke coming out of chimneys but you can smell them even if you can’t see the smoke where people are burning more responsibly. Our neighbours told us they burn pallets as the guy gets them free from his warehouse. Another close neighbour, last year, had a huge van of scaffold boards delivered for his wood burning stove. Despite people being asked to burn DEFRA approved wood, they don’t care, there needs to be an outright ban. Even following your article you can still see and smell the wood burners in action.</p> <p>I have written to your transport department many times re the NORSE drivers leaving their engines running while stationary. It is still happening!</p> <p>So my request for the future of everybody’s health is to ban wood burning stoves and do it sooner rather than later before more pollution is caused and more people spend their money having them installed.</p>
12	Resident	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>We wish to complain about the amount of diesel fumes that are being emitted when the two enormous diesel engines (one at the front and one at the rear) that haul the rail carriages between Lowestoft and Norwich on a regular basis. They are often left running for some considerable time and creating hazardous</p>

		<p>fumes. They are heavy and VERY pollutive. The multiple diesel units are not quite as bad. We wrote over a YEAR ago to Greater Anglia stating how much this affected our breathing as the fumes were coming into the carriages as the train was travelling. They said they hoped to dispense with these enormous engines soon, but travelling yesterday we were very distressed to find them still in use. The fumes from these are MUCH more troublesome than from the cars and buses.</p> <p>Please investigate this problem, and notify us of your findings as soon as possible,</p> <p>Regards</p>
13	Councillor	<p>Thank you for the information below.</p> <p>Are you able to say when the air quality on Bloodmoor Road near the A146/A12 roundabout was last tested?</p> <p>I look forward to receiving your response.</p>
14	Councillor	<p>These annual reports seem to roll around very quickly! I haven't read all of the document – but the first part giving a summary of the situations at Stratford St. Andrew and Woodbridge. Great news that the actions taken have helped reduce the levels of pollutant and I am delighted to see that there is nowhere in Felixstowe that has a problem at the moment! Well done. It is also great news to read the actions taken by the Port to help maintain good air quality in that area.</p> <p>No further comment – apart from well done to you and Rebecca for an excellent document.</p>
15	County Council	<p>I hope you are well. Many thanks for the report. I have read through &amp; I just have a couple of quick questions that you might be able to help me with;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Woodbridge AQMA, if the levels have fallen to 37, why is it still an AQMA? Is it because there was no material changes made or is it more linked to the closure of the offices, but with redevelopment of the area, it was felt to keep it as an AQMA until this has been completed?</li> <li>2. On page "iv" in relation to the docks, you state that there will be "2 more to be converted in July 2018". Do you know if this has happened &amp; are they on track/completed the other improvements for 2018 as stated in the report</li> <li>3. On page "v" The report mentions that a 1 week traffic trial was undertaken in July 2017 &amp; you are waiting for the results. Have you had these? Do you know why it has taken so long for the results?</li> <li>4. On Page 8, the report mentions that obtaining final signatures from SCC. Do you know who this is/dept or why you have not had them?</li> <li>5. On Page 27, the report references newly appointed DPH. I wanted to make sure that you mean Abdul &amp; not myself? I'm just a lowly Health Protection Manager!</li> </ol> <p>I have only read through the report &amp; not the other associated documents just yet, but I wanted to send over the questions I had. I am sure that these are</p>

		<p>more about my own lack of knowledge, being five months in post, but if you could let me know that would be great. Also if there is anything that I can do with regards points 3 &amp; 4 above, then do please let me know. I am not the SCC lead for AQ &amp; I only have the PH remit but I am keen to do anything I can to help get things moving.</p>
16	County Council	<p>Thank you for a copy of the report for consultation. I had originally sent a number of queries to Denise Lavender on 02/11/2018 about the report &amp; these were responded to. I have also read through the DEFRA comments on the report dated September 2018. My main comments are below &amp; I have left in two questions from my original email:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Woodbridge AQMA, if the levels have fallen to 37, why is it still an AQMA? Is it because there was no material changes made or is it more linked to the closure of the offices, but with redevelopment of the area, it was felt to keep it as an AQMA until this has been completed?</li> <li>2. On page "iv" in relation to the docks, you state that there will be "2 more to be converted in July 2018". Do you know if this has happened &amp; are they on track/completed the other improvements for 2018 as stated in the report?</li> <li>3. From a Public Health view, we would consider that any further specific advice from DEFRA, Public Health England as well as any other health consultees should be considered and incorporated where appropriate into the final version of the report.</li> </ol> <p>Once again many thanks in allowing Public Health Suffolk to comment on the report. I look forward to continuing to work closely together moving forward.</p>
17	Resident	<p>Having just read the 2018 report on Air Quality, I am appalled that the Council is still awaiting the results from the one week trial to hold traffic back which took place in July 2017. It is now over 15 months since the trial took place. I understand that the County Council is involved in this, but surely it needs to be chased up as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>What is the problem?</p>
18	Neighbouring Authority	<p>Thank you for your consultation email</p> <p>I have read the documents from a Great Yarmouth perspective and have no comments to make.</p>
19	Resident	<p>I took the bus (First route 66) to/from work at Adastral Park, Martlesham Heath for couple of days the other week and noticed whilst waiting at the First stop outside the site on Gloster Road, that due to the amount of traffic sat idling the air quality was exceedingly poor. I could feel it in my throat and suffered some wheeziness in my chest afterwards. My concern is for the health of employees who wait for a bus every day, as long term exposure to these fumes as we all know is bad news.</p> <p>I was wondering what would you can do to improve things as this is a very busy bust stop. Would you be able to perform an air quality survey here to see if the pollution is within recommended limits?</p> <p>If you'd like to meet to discuss this further please let me know.</p>

20	Resident	<p>Today you may have noticed on BBC News the announcement that the government has published its Clean Air Strategy: - <a href="https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-46823440">https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-46823440</a></p> <p>One hopes that East Suffolk District Council will digest the contents of this strategy and implement its policies.</p>
21	Parish Council	<p>I think that all the parish council would want to say at this point is that the situation in Stratford St Andrew and Farnham should continue to be monitored and results published.</p>
22	Resident	<p>Just a few comments about air quality in our area. I recently spent a week in London, thinking my breathing would be really bad. Amazingly it was perfect. Arriving back at Oulton Broad South Station, by the time I reached my home I was wheezing quite badly. I do believe most of our air quality meters are near the sea which do not give an accurate reading. Normanston Park would be an ideal place as air quality is bad in that area. Especially near the river.</p> <p>Also Greater Anglia are still using 50 year old trains on the Norwich to Lowestoft line. The smell and smoke given off is horrific. I believe all trains should be made to slow down when passing residential towns and villages as they all contribute to poor air quality. Hope some of these comments are helpful.</p>