

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 21: Environmental Quality

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy EQ1 Air Quality	<p>Objection - air quality is a major issue in Fulford because of the very high levels of traffic using the A19. It severely affects the quality of life for many residents, and the vehicle emissions endanger public health. This is recognised by the designation of Main Street as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Air quality in Fulford would become even worse as a result of the Local Plan proposals which would substantially increase traffic levels and congestion on the A19. These proposals include Germany Beck, Whinthorpe and the expansion of Naburn Designer Outlet, including the Park and Ride. Sees Policy EQ1 as a weak response to this issue as it proposes no firm or objective criteria for determining whether impacts on air quality in AQMAs are acceptable or not. Considers that the first paragraph of the policy should be rewritten as follows: 'Development will not be permitted if it would worsen air quality in Air Quality Management Areas after all reasonable mitigation measures have been taken. Elsewhere, development will only be permitted if the impact on air quality is acceptable and mechanisms are in place to mitigate adverse impacts and reduce further exposure to poor air quality...'</p>	62/12717	Fulford Parish Council
	<p>Objection – disappointed with the lack of emphasis on the importance of air quality in rural villages. The density of traffic along the A64 at weekends particularly and stationary traffic.</p>	69/13851	Murton Parish Council
	<p>Objection – suggest that Option 3 be the preferred approach and the provision of detailed, locationally specific criteria in relation to environmental quality.</p>	77/12775	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	<p>Objection – the A1237 is extremely busy throughout the day and evening, with the proposed Clifton Moor development together with the Monks Cross shopping complex road will be busier. Air pollution must be considered and steps taken to reduce risk to all those in the area.</p>	80/12792	Wigginton Parish Council
	<p>Objection - there is a lack of analysis of the impact of on traffic flow and air quality of the proposed increase in the population of York which makes the Plan unsound in light of already illegal air pollution levels in some areas e.g. ST5.</p>	90/12894	Friends of the Earth (York and Ryedale)
	<p>Objection – the Plan would benefit from the deletion of this unnecessary policy.</p>	544/16758	
	<p>Objection – to the policy requirement which requests that all minor and major planning applications are to provide an assessment to identify and assess in detail potential air quality. Policy EQ1 should only apply to specific development proposals which fall within an Air Quality Management Area as referred to in Fig 21.1, not only is it inappropriate to request an assessment for all developments regardless of its location, it is also inappropriate to apply this to all minor and major development given that not all of these will warrant such. Recommend Change: Recommended that policy should</p>	659/15090	Persimmon Homes

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 21: Environmental Quality

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be deleted and a local validation checklist should set out criteria for requiring AQM assessment.		
Policy EQ1 Air Quality Continued	<p>Comment – does this mean that a development may ultimately be refused on air quality grounds? Is the full air quality impact assessment conducted by a third party – i.e. an outside inspector? Otherwise the organisation commissioning the findings – if they were commissioned by the council – and then Local Authority officers assessing them – cannot necessarily be guaranteed impartial. The reference to ‘the exercise of professional judgement’ in this case sounds like a potential get out.</p> <p>Objection – the preferred approach should give more specific reference to greater significance where the location of the development will impact on existing AQMA`s. It should explicitly state that developments adjacent to Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA)s should be set back by at least 10m (in the case of residential) and designed to avoid creating or perpetuating a ‘canyon effect’ that concentrates pollutants in the vicinity of the highway, this is explained in the Mitigation Hierarchy but should be referenced in the policy itself.</p>	1665/12979	York Environment Forum
	<p>Comment – ‘Special Accommodation’ is built into the York Plan – to conserve and add value to the green space & environment to incrementally and significantly decrease environmental pollution and improve the environmental elements significant regarding health and well being.</p>	2358/6545	
	<p>Support – these policies seem appropriate.</p>	2416/6683	
	<p>Comment – whilst told that the air quality on Main Street, Fulford is within limits, do not feel confident that it will remain so with the amount of traffic that Germany Beck will generate.</p>	2935/7672	
	<p>Comment – for health reasons, air quality and impact mitigation measures, should give much weight to the views of statutory consultees. It is not enough to rely on monitoring equipment to decide whether or not limits are likely to be breached, similarly, noise abatement measures.</p>	3356/8594	
	<p>Objection – the green infrastructure and tree strategy should be in mitigation and adaptation to air quality, noise and vibration, pollution and other benefits has not been introduced into key evidence base and into policies.</p>	4819/14305	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	<p>Comment – removing road humps (but leaving speed limits in place) will reduce pollution both in air quality and noise.</p>	5740/13537	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 21: Environmental Quality

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy EQ1 Air Quality Continued	Comment –cannot expect an historic city such as York to expand so dramatically and absorb the effect of increased traffic without air quality suffering to some degree.	6516/16342	City Of York Council Liberal Democrat Group
	Comment – should give more specific reference to greater significance where the location of development will impact on existing Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA)s – The production of an emissions statement should not simply be a matter of calculating likely emissions and potential mitigation, it should explicitly state that developments adjacent to AQMA`s should be set back by at least 10m (in the case of residential) and designed to avoid creating or perpetuating a `canyon effect` that concentrates pollutants in the vicinity of the highway. This should be explained in the Mitigation Hierarchy but should be referenced in the policy itself. Reference should also be made to the shading and air purifying benefits of appropriate tree planting as part of a development.	6518/16431	York Green Party
Para 21.03 & 21.05	Comment – reference to charging points and low emission vehicles should also include car club spaces/Boris bike stations and secure cycle parking provision as equally valuable measures to mitigate against transport pollution.	1665/12980	York Environment Forum
	Comment – reference to charging points and low emission vehicles should also include car club spaces/Boris bike stations and secure cycle parking provision as equally valuable measures to mitigate against transport pollution.	6518/16432	York Green Party
Para 21.04	Comment – opening sentence change `are likely to be required` to `will normally be required` are strongly supported.	1665/12981	York Environment Forum
	Comment - request further details of agricultural operations that may introduce new exposure to air pollution.	1742/2114	NFU
	Comment – should be a specific requirement that developments over a certain size include contribution towards a strategy to actually reduce traffic pollution through the provision of low emission public transport or sustainable transport measures and services (pump priming if required). All developers of major sites adjacent to AQMA)s should be made consultees in the preparation of the annual air quality assessment and the introduction of measures in the low emission strategy.	6518/16433	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 21: Environmental Quality Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy EQ2 Managing Environmental Quality	Comment – water quality is not specifically referred to.	295/14165	Yorkshire Water Services Ltd
	Support – strongly support limits to light pollution, reference should be made to the relevant industry standard required for compliance and specific requirement that security lighting should not spill beyond the property boundary, should not cause glare to adjacent rights of way, should be the minimum required and use movement sensors and timers to limit the periods of illumination.	1665/12982	York Environment Forum
	Support – this policy seem appropriate.	2416/6684	
	Comment – preferred options are 2 or 3, the preferred approach and providing detailed, locationally specific criteria in relation to environmental quality.	2846/7573	
	Comment – for health reasons, air quality and impact mitigation measures, should give much weight to the views of statutory consultees. It is not enough to rely on monitoring equipment to decide whether or not limits are likely to be breached, similarly, noise abatement measures.	3356/8595	
	Objection – the strategy should take a more strongly focussed and worded strategic approach at an appropriate place along the lines of: ‘all developments will be required to ensure that lighting levels are appropriate to the need, lights aimed where required, are suited to the circumstances and do not result in light pollution or nuisance through light spillage. Developers will be expected to ensure that lighting installations are fully shrouded’.	4413/11432	Carstairs Countryside Trust
	Objection – the green infrastructure and tree strategy should be in mitigation and adaptation to air quality, noise and vibration, pollution and other benefits has not been introduced into key evidence base and into policies.	4819/14306	York Environment Forum (Natural Environment Sub Group) & Treemendous York
	Objection – add: Sources of electromagnetic radiation from electricity distribution networks. Following the precautionary principle, and in the interests of amenity, there should be a presumption against residential development underneath high voltage power lines (within 25m either side) and immediately next to (within 15m of) electricity substations. Comment – add section on local food here. Existing and potential allotment sites should be protected. According to the Soil Association, ‘Local planning priorities should ensure that agricultural grade land is protected from development and is made available for sustainable commercial or community food production’. They should also ‘consider the provision of the infrastructure needed to provide local food systems such as abattoirs, bakeries, independent retailers and community food hubs’. All major	6518/16437	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 21: Environmental Quality Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	housing developments should consider provision of areas for allotments retention and protection of top soil for gardens, orientation to maximise useable growing spaces etc. as design considerations.		
Para 21.12	Comment – reference should also be made to school grounds and church bells.	6518/16434	York Green Party
Para 21.13	Comment – odour and Fumes; Reference should be made to agricultural activities, waste plants and waste water treatment facilities.	1665/12983	York Environment Forum
	Comment - reference should be made to agricultural activities, waste plans and waste water treatment facilities.	6518/16435	York Green Party
Para 21.16	Comment - reference should be made to the relevant industry standard required for compliance and specific requirement that security lighting should not spill beyond the property boundary, should not cause glare to adjacent rights of way, should be the minimum required and use movement sensors and timers to limit the periods of illumination.	6518/16436	York Green Party

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 21: Environmental Quality Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Policy EQ3 Land Contamination	Objection – the Plan would benefit from the deletion of this unnecessary policy.	544/16759	
	Support – these policies seem appropriate.	2416/6685	
	Comment – give full consideration to potentially contaminated sites.	5674/13372	
Para 21.21	Comment – asking too much of developers, government must be pressed to indemnify land owners and underwrite cost of remediation. This would help enormously with housing crisis.	1109/17214	

York Local Plan Preferred Options – Summary Of Responses
Section 21: Environmental Quality Continued

April 2014

Policy, Site, Table, Figure, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Question 21.01	<p>Objection – water efficient buildings are loosely covered within the Local Plan but there is no real commitment towards promoting water efficient fixtures and fittings. Local Plan does not make adequate provision for or policies aimed at protection of the water environment. In particular the plan does not make reference to the Water Framework Directive and obligation. Directive River Water Basin Management plans have been produced setting out plans for the protection, improvement and sustainable use of the water environment. Given the importance of the WFD legislation it is necessary that the York core strategy reflects measures outlined in the Humber RBMP. These include the promotion of sustainable drainage systems, tackling drainage issues in areas without mains drainage. Strongly recommend that another policy specific to water environment is included in this section which considers rivers and water resources separate to flooding. Please note that other local authorities in Yorkshire and Humber have successfully integrated specific water policies into their Local Plans. Local Plan does not adequately address the management and protection of water environment, including rivers and groundwater and include the WFD requires that all surface water bodies and groundwater bodies achieve `good` status in terms of water quality and to prevent any deterioration of current quality and ecological status. Comment – City of York is situated on top of Sherwood Sandstone which is classified by the EA as a principal aquifer. Developers proposing schemes that pose a risk to groundwater resources, quality or abstractions must provide an acceptable hydro-geological risk assessment (HRA) to the EA and local planning authority.</p>	3/11633	Environment Agency
	Support – the preferred approach is suitable for environmental quality.	943/16969	
	Comment – lots of good ideas that must be adhered to.	1109/17215	
	Objection – disagree with preferred approach, considered that option 3 should be taken, providing detailed locationally specific criteria in relation to environmental quality.	5228/12538	
	Support – agree with preferred approach.	6508/17686	City Of York Council Conservative Group