

<b>Appendix 2 Respondent</b>	<b>Do you have any general comments to make about the Hafod-yr-ynys AQAP?</b>	<b>Do you have any comments in relation to the options considered?</b>	<b>Is there anything missing from the list of options and measures?</b>
Resident - Gladstone Road, Crumlin	Road safety should be given prominence in deliberations. Turning right out of Gladstone Road onto the A472 borders on being impossible during peak traffic flow. Motorists are forced to pull out to block the flow of traffic up the hill as the chances of the way being clear to both left and right are negligible. It is an accident waiting to happen. A way must be found for motorists to turn right (down the hill) when exiting Gladstone Road.	Taking into account the volume of traffic on this strategic cross valley route, the only option to improve air quality is to demolish all houses on the southern side of the A472 (Woodside Terrace). I would expect residents to be re-homed into buildings of at least equal market value.	
Resident - unknown			Yes, why not put a CPO on all of the houses, wait until the last person has moved out and then knock them down and build a by-pass. Job done.
Resident - Unknown		In the short term the traffic light timing system at the bottom of the hill could be changed slightly so that during peak times fewer vehicles are allowed onto the upward section of the hill. This would reduce emissions from traffic queuing the full length of the hill, particularly from heavy vehicles that emit more as they travel in a stop-start way. My choice long term would be option 4, demolition of the properties affected. Whilst the cost is not insignificant it is a cheaper option than the bypass and would solve the air and noise pollution for residents. As part of this I would like to see vegetation planted which absorbs pollutants.	

<p>Resident – Hillside Road, Crumlin</p>	<p>I currently live in Crumlin a small village at the bottom of Hafod-yr-ynys Hill. The pollution and air quality is very concerning to me as I am a Mum of 3 young children and we have asthma in the family. There is a smell of fumes and other toxins are smelt all around the area. It is a very strong pungent unpleasant smell and it's concerning that we are breathing this in on a daily basis. Any improvements or modifications that will improve the quality of the air and reduce the smell in the area will be greatly appreciated.</p>		
<p>Resident – Woodside Shops Hafod-yr-ynys Road</p>	<p>Lived here about 4 months now and the smells, pollution, traffic noise is horrendous. It never stops day and night, weekend no silence. The long juggernauts make my house shake, the volume of traffic it's like living on the M4. I heard talk about the BBC coming around several months back before I lived here but it seems nothing has been done to stop this flow of traffic and the pollution it causes not only to the people that live along this stretch of road but the air surrounding us. Surely there are other routes the heavy vehicles can take. Is anybody listening to the people around this area who live constantly with coughs, asthma. It gets in your throat even with the windows closed it seeps through the walls. I don't open my windows to let these fumes in. As a new comer lets get some action sorted out, I believe this</p>		

	<p>problem has gone on long enough now. A Resident.</p>		
<p>Resident – Hafod-yr-ynys Road</p>	<p>I have now had initial read of the AQP and my initial reaction is as follows: The realistic options are between some form of by-pass and demolition of the Woodside properties. Managing local traffic conditions seems to be a non-starter given that there remains the expectation of annual Increase in traffic over the medium term which I understand to be approx. 7 per cent p.a. However, I note in particular that no routing for any by-pass is included as part of the document. Previous plans for the area involved the possible demolishing of the Woodside houses although the residents rejected that option. This left the option of building the road in such a way that the Woodside houses would remain on an island between the new road and old road. However, this plan was intended to deal with congestion rather than Air Quality. As the plan previously proposed would not have altered the topography of the area I would imagine that the air quality would not have been improved by its implementation.. Therefore, experience suggests that the most likely routing would also involve the demolition of the Woodside houses given that the alternative would involve moving a mountain. I would note at this point that I am the owner of all</p>		

Resident – Ashfield Road Newbridge	<p>This area has suffered greatly for many years with poor air quality and dirty dusty conditions due to the amount of heavy traffic flow. The bottle neck that is Hafod-yr-ynys hill has had traffic jams and slow moving traffic despite road improvements which has failed to have very little impact on the flow of traffic that uses this road. The increased heavy goods vehicles that travel this road can be directly associated with the growth of Pen-y-fan industrial estate and other factory units that have sprung up in recent times but the access to these sites has suffered from limited upgrades due to costs or restriction of areas to improve road conditions.</p>		
Resident – Woodside Terrace	<p>I believe that the only resolution in to this is to compulsory purchase the houses. It's the health implications that concern me the most. After moving to Woodside Terrace, I was diagnosed with Heart problems and the increasing traffic is not making my life any easier. I do believe that there are some residents that do not want to move due to the fact that they do not want to lose money. I do not think that any one should be out of pocket and the residents should be generously compensated for what they have been through over the years. The other thing that concerns me about the bypass or any other amendments to the road is the timing and the disruption that it will bring. It was hell for the residents when the road was being</p>		

	<p>altered and I don't want to go through that again and it's going to take years to build the bypass. Can you really subject us to years of disruption and the fact that it not reduce the emission by enough for the problems to go away? People have also commented on sitting in their Gardens and watching the wildlife but, if there is a bypass built then there will be no Trees or wildlife to look at just Heavy vehicle going past at all times increasing the noise to front and back of the property. I think</p>		
<p>Resident – Woodside Terrace</p>	<p>The daft is well written and goes into detail about the current levels of air pollution, possible plans for improvement and explains possible outcomes for each plan.</p>	<p>Traffic Management: I do NOT believe this would make any impact on the current levels of air pollution, as the volume of traffic (both domestic and industrial) is to high and I can only see the volume of traffic increase in years to come. The road and its position is unsuitable for it's A road status and the number of vehicles on the road. The road is also not wide enough to accommodate residents parking and for two heavy duty vehicles to pass safely, without causing damage to other vehicles. This will also make no improvements to the environment or improve the lives of the residents. Re-routing Traffic (One Way): This will only reduce carbon emissions by a small amount and will essentially surround the 23 affect properties will 2 busy roads, making it impossible to</p>	<p>After reading the daft a few times, I do not feel that anything was missing and everything was explained in detail.</p> <p>I do not see how the Air Quality Action Plan will have any effect on me as an individual because of my age, gender etc. with the exception of children's health and well- being at risk from the toxic fumes blighting our road. As stated in the comments my concerns are about the financial affect this will have on my family as well as potential health issues.</p>

		<p>escape the constant traffic. Properties here do not sell well as it is and this would only make the market worse for us and many residents feel trapped as it. This will also make no improvements to the environment. Re-routing Traffic (Both ways): You have stated that this will divert 25% of traffic, I do not understand why you cannot close the current road and by-pass all traffic!! Unless the council and partners are prepared to do this the situation will not be resolved.</p>	
<p>Resident – Woodside Terrace</p>	<p>I am not happy about the idea of losing my home. I fail to see how knocking down houses is going to help with the pollution in the area, all it is going to do is affect the residents lives. I bought my house in April 2016 with no clue of the AQMA or the plans for the AQAP. I have spent all my money, time and effort on making this house my home, I didn't buy the house to move in a few years, I bought the house to be my forever home, I spent all my money on doing the house up not expecting this to be taken off me to be knocked down. The AQAP is affecting my health, not because of the pollution but because of my depression and anxiety, I have been working for over 2 years to deal with my issues and stop the panic attacks through therapy and mindfulness solutions and now finding out about the prospect of losing my home has caused my panic attacks to re-occur. I live</p>	<p>The option to demolish all the houses by 2020 without any other details is worrying me. I was not expecting to have to lose my first home because the council are unable to deal with the pollution on the road. I am not bothered by the amount of traffic or the noise on the road as this doesn't affect me when I am in my house. What does affect me is becoming homeless because the council have decided as a cheaper option to knock down my house.</p>	<p>There are no options or guidelines of steps to be taken if the council decide to knock down the houses. How will the council decide on the rate to buy the houses? What help will be given if this option is decided? Will the council find residents somewhere to go? Will the buy out cost take into account solicitor fees, moving fees, the amount of work put into the houses? The time frame of this process? demolishing all affected houses by 2020, is this a realistic date to move everyone out? Compensation for the effect on residents lives?</p> <p>The ability to find somewhere the residents to go if the houses are knocked down? I am living as a single person on a single salary mortgage, there are limited options for me to find somewhere else to live taking into account the size of the house. I need a 3 bedroom house</p>

	alone and bought this house on a single salary mortgage, the possibility of me finding another house around the same size and increasing a mortgage is not an option for me		as I have my younger siblings over in the school holidays, the options for me to find another 3 bedroom house for this size on a single salary mortgage is very limited.
Resident – Pant farm Close Newbridge	May I say out the outset that any UK council that has such a shocking pollution statistic within its borough should be absolutely ashamed.	I believe the possibility of demolishing the existing homes is a rather odd option - the houses are not causing the pollution. I understand that a number of HGV's use the route to avoid Severn crossing road tolls - why not consider banning all HGV's from this route? Install a number of speed camera's along the route, both ascending and descending. Surely the proposal of a bypass will again, solve absolutely nothing. Statistics show that traffic increases rather than decreases following such construction. Would this increased traffic then cause congestion problems either end of Hafodyrynys, due to road capacity/size and local topography? We cannot continue to consider the construction of bypasses and demolition of houses - the problem will not disappear with either option. Cycling - how many people have you seen cycling this route? How many people would cycle this steep valley even with designated cycle provision? Would not the same pollution still exist?	
Resident – Hafod-yr-ynys Road	I believe that the only feasible option would be a by-pass, as the proposals do not seem to	I believe that removing Woodfield terrace and widening the road will only cause	

	<p>take into account the difficulties that would ensue, should widening of the existing road go ahead.</p>	<p>further grief for the remaining residents along Hafodyrynys Road. Since the bottom of the road has been widened, the noise and potential air pollution has increased immensely (continual car horns, acceleration of vehicles, vehicles racing to slot in before the 2 lanes become 1). The road is so dangerous already, and having to cross 5 lanes of traffic, coming out of the Viaduct Terrace junction, is an accident waiting to happen. With increased lanes and speed of traffic, it would be nigh on impossible to get out. The same would apply to Gladstone terrace junction. Whoever thinks up these ideas obviously don't live on these streets! The residents of Woodfield terrace however, deserve a happy and healthy life, and if compulsory purchasing the row of houses is the only/best option then so be it. But please give some thought to every other home owner/road user in the immediate vicinity.</p>	
<p>Resident – Woodside Terrace</p>	<p>Crumlin, Newport The relocation of bus stops will not improve traffic flow or emissions it would however impact local residents who would have to walk longer to catch the bus, of which most are either elderly or have mobility issues.</p>	<p>Implementation of speed cameras would in effect stop speeding, however this would have no impact on amount of daily traffic and the congestion from high traffic numbers in the am and pm. A bypass would not work as your study predicted only a 12.5% traffic reduction for 1 way route and only 25% for a 2 way.</p>	<p>True data of pollutants up to 2020 are just surmised, the level of traffic is increasing annually, so there would be a greater level of pollution by 2020. There was no data on the structural damage to the houses due to constant high levels of traffic. I have noticed an increase of my house shaking due to large loads throughout the day and night. I have</p>

		<p>This means that the flow and level of traffic and emissions would still be high and impact residents. The introduction of low emission buses would not have a great impact on the pollution as buses make up 0.5% of the traffic. Alternative routes for HGVS are all good and well, however businesses will not use this if it adds to extra time and fuel costs. Cycle routes and walking routes will have no impact on emissions has the traffic is using Road for commuting to and from work, going long distances, so car sharing would also not be feasible. Pollutant signage may make some motorists turn their engines off but the likelihood of any emission benefit would be tangible.</p>	<p>also noticed cracking on my walls and ceilings.</p> <p>Responsibility for the health and well-being of my 6 year old daughter. She was adopted 13 months age and in that time she has had sore throats, colds and chest infections. Her sleep is disturbed most nights due to large hgvs speeding past our house, this shakes the house.</p>
<p>Resident – Woodside Terrace</p>	<p>I have read the consultation report in depth and I am very concerned how the report is persuasive towards Option 1. Although the benefits and constraints/ issues have been clearly identified and evaluated for options 2 and 3, I do not believe this is the case for Option 1. The impact to the residents with regards to reduced housing values as a consequence/ significant inconvenience to residents and the restriction to public transport links have not been highlights in this report. Removing parking/ removing public transport and restricting access to roads is a worse option than a do nothing option! It is my belief that so far only motorists using this</p>	<p>I believe the only viable options for consideration are option 2 (creation of a new bypass) and option 3 (compulsory purchase of the properties). As a resident of Woodside Terrace my preference would be option 3. A bypass will take several years to complete and therefore prolong the current unbearable situation for local residents. When I purchased my property 12 years ago the traffic volumes were significantly lower and only busy during rush hour. However with the increase in valley industries and therefore the increase in commuter traffic, the traffic on the road is similar to</p>	<p>Other than my points above, no.</p>

	<p>road have been considered in any plans progressed by Caerphilly Council. The recent changes to the Crumlin junction point has only improved the flow of traffic and increased significantly the volume of traffic since it's completion. Combined with the incorrect road surfacing completed a few years ago, when council workmen incorrectly repainted the parking bay lines after resurfacing has made the road a death trap. I formally complained to the council at the time and I was told it was too late to change it! Again no consideration by Caerphilly Council. I often see</p>	<p>a motorway bypass with a near continuous steady stream of traffic sometimes travelling at high speed. As a consequence of this and the recent media attention I am unable to sell my property. Therefore I believe the only option is compulsory purchase which will allow the council to dedicate the purpose of the road to commuter traffic.</p>	
<p>Resident – Woodside Terrace</p>	<p>Whilst the Hafod-yr-ynys Air Quality Action Plan - Draft (2017) is welcomed by us, having been residents of Woodside Terrace for the last 25 years we hope that a longer term view is taken with regard to traffic management and improving air quality in the area and not just a cheaper quick fix solution to a problem that is only likely to get worse in years to come.</p>	<p>Of the options considered for inclusion (Table 9), there is without doubt an urgent need to reduce the speed of traffic travelling in both directions along the residential area of Hafod-yr-ynys Road (A472) which currently has a speed limit of 30mph, but in our experience is only adhered to by the residents and a small number of other vehicles using the route. The vast majority of traffic using the road travels at speeds well in excess of the 30mph limit and is only adding to the air quality problems that already exist. The proposal of building a two way bypass, whilst the more costly option, would seem to be the only realistic solution in the longer term. The proposal to demolish the properties on Woodside</p>	

		Terrace might be less costly in monetary terms but is only likely to ease the problems and not solve them. We would certainly be opposed to the Compulsory Purchase of our home.	
Resident – Woodside Terrace	<p>I think that the easiest, Cheapest and Quickest way to deal with this problem is to compulsory purchase and demolish the houses. This is also down to health reasons. In none of your meetings / letters have explained to the residents the seriousness of this. I have researched it many times over and I do not see how any other of your suggestions would benefit the health of the residence. The information provided to us has been very poor and completely unprofessional. People need to know the facts. All the council workers say in the meetings is that they have no money but there are always far too many Council employees at the meeting getting paid over time that have no reason to be there and have not communicated any useful information to the meeting. The bypass and the new road structure will only reduce the emissions by 12 &amp; 25% - This will still be too high. The emissions were exceeded in the first three months of the year and for some reason at the last meeting it was suggested that these 3 months were busier than the other months of the year. I really do not think that this was the case. You need to start</p>		

	<p>listening to the residents and start taking their health seriously. This has already been pushed back and ignored</p>		
Public Health Wales	<p>While we note that specific mention is given in the consultation to the role of, and advice and support provided by, Public Health Wales, the role of the Aneurin Bevan University Health Board (having the statutory duty to protect and improve population health) should also be acknowledged. In addition to Public Health Wales, the Health Board should be a key member of the Action Plan Steering Group</p> <p>In section 2, it is stated that a key objective of the plan is to “work towards bringing the levels of NO<sub>2</sub> back to within acceptable levels”. While we agree that this is the priority, it should be regarded as a minimum is to achieve compliance with national air quality objectives. Given strengthening epidemiological evidence it may be more appropriate to state that the endeavour is to drive down pollution concentrations as low as possible and beyond national standards. The word ‘acceptable’ is subjective and, without definition, may be open to interpretation.</p> <p>We understand why the proposed action plan focuses on tackling problems identified in Hafod-yr-ynys (in line with Local Air Quality Management requirements), but there is</p>	<p>The four scenarios presented all have the potential to bring about tangible air quality improvements locally. However, it may be useful to consider incorporating scenarios 1 and 2 into a more-formal Clean Air Zone approach. Within this, it would be worth assessing the [cost] effectiveness of implementing a Low Emission Zone so that vehicles within the AQMA must comply with specified emissions standards. We appreciate that the geographical area affected is small and this latter option may not be appropriate nor feasible but this is not mentioned anywhere in the consultation and so it is not clear whether it has been considered</p> <p>Although each option has been appraised (in terms of cost and impact), it is not clear which is the preferred option, which would be more acceptable to the public and other stakeholders and/or whether it is even possible for some to be taken forward in parallel. There is no conclusion or recommendations contained in the report and so greater clarity on the preferred options based on all analyses undertaken would be helpful. Perhaps it</p>	<p>Many of the measures outlined in the consultation, if agreed and implemented, are likely to take time to materialise and impact in the medium to long-term (e.g. policy integration, planning system improvements, travel plan development, improving walking to school routes). While it is appreciated that there is no ‘quick fix’ to solve identified problems, we would recommend that consideration is also given to interventions that may have smaller but more immediate and tangible positive impacts e.g. advice to local residents on how to minimise exposure to pollution when appropriate.</p> <p>In relation to the preceding point, it would be helpful to provide details of timescales and milestones associated with each of the measures outlined.</p> <p>We note that one measure is concerned with improving local air quality by reducing CCBC emissions. Given that there are likely many other medium to large employers (both public and private sector) operating in the locality - like the NHS, for example – it would be a missed opportunity not to extend messages and actions to improve vehicle/fleet emissions and encourage car sharing/clubs to other</p>

	<p>merit in providing greater clarity and description on how this plan will form part of broader strategic efforts and actions to reduce air pollution and associated risks across the entire Caerphilly County Borough (as encouraged in recently-issued Local Air Quality Management policy guidance).</p> <p>We agree that in integrating this work to reduce air pollution in Hafod-yr-ynys with other relevant policy and practice, it is important to make links with Public Services Board plans and activity. As such, this action plan should be considerate of other actions being undertaken locally to promote and improve health and wellbeing, and reduce risks and health inequalities.</p>	<p>is the intention for the Action Plan Steering Group to collectively agree the next steps?</p> <p>Finally, it is not clear why scenario 2 was not subject to economic analysis.</p>	<p>employers.</p> <p>As indicated above, integration with local wellbeing plans is important but the measure proposed is vague and consists mainly of ‘making reference’ to local air pollution problems and their management in linked policy areas. It is recommended that consideration is given to agreeing and implementing specific actions against this measure that could deliver positive impacts in both the short-term (e.g. linking with smoking cessation services and encouraging active travel to improve cardiovascular and respiratory health and reduce susceptibility to air pollution exposure) and the long-term (e.g. adopting a co-ordinated and broad-minded approach to influence the planning system and create healthy, fair and sustainable communities).</p> <p>The measure relating to the provision of the local air quality strategy has a very narrow focus. At present, it is suggested that Caerphilly and Hafod-yr-ynys action plans are linked to produce an integrated air quality strategy for the Borough. In light of the recommendations made by Welsh Government to adopt a two-pronged approach to local air quality management (that requires targeting action in areas where likely or actual breaches of air quality objectives are identified <i>alongside</i> universal</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>action that intends to reduce risks for everyone). Adopting a broader, Borough-wide action plan would not only encourage universal risk reduction action beyond but it would also reduce the possibility of unintended consequences occurring elsewhere between Caerphilly and Hafod-yr-yngys</p> <p>Awareness-raising should extend beyond publicising alternative transport available locally. In conjunction with Public Health Wales and the Health Board, communications should also cover health impacts and effective actions to take to minimise exposure and risks and improve health generally.</p>
Strategic Planning		<p><b>M1: Integrate local policies in line with air quality</b>  <i>Development of policies that will work towards reducing pollutant levels and ensure future decisions within the area do not have an adverse effect on air quality</i></p> <p>Although in line with national policy, the feasibility of employing such an approach through the LDP is questionable, as most development contributes to an increase in air pollution through generating a need to travel, even if it reduces a similar need elsewhere. The formulation of LDP policy and the determination of site allocations already considers air pollution through</p>	

		<p>the strategic environmental assessment process, in conjunction with other sustainability and environmentally-pertinent factors.</p> <p>There is the possibility of limiting site allocations that would feed traffic directly onto Hafodyrynys Hill, although opportunities for new development in this part of the County Borough are limited and it would not be advantageous to sterilise the rest of the north-east of the County Borough on this basis that some of its traffic may utilise this road. The emphasis from the point of view of the planning system should be to permit development that would not further decrease air quality in AQMAs or other sensitive areas alongside a promotion of alternative routes, especially for HGVs.</p> <p><b>M3: Provision of local air quality strategy</b> <i>Revise Caerphilly AQAP and consider other areas within the County Borough which are likely to exceed the air quality objectives</i></p> <p>Formulating a single, corporate approach to tackling air quality in the County Borough may be useful in terms of identifying other areas of sensitivity outside the two existing AQMAs, which would be beneficial for documents such</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>as the LDP which need to take account of these. However, adopting a Borough-wide strategy need not lose sight of the fact that each area's issues are locally discrete and, in the case of Hafodyrynys, dependent to a degree on external influences, suffering as it does from the impact of cross-Valley traffic moving in and out of the County Borough.</p> <p><b>M8: Use of planning system to secure air quality improvements</b> <i>To use planning as a control on developments which could have an adverse impact on air quality</i></p> <p>As for the response to M1, the planning system is limited in terms of what it can do in this regard without unreasonably restricting development. The adopted LDP already does as much as it can by including policies promoting the use of green travel plans and alternative modes of transport for proposals that are likely to generate significant numbers of trips as well as trying to facilitate, from a land-use perspective, greater integration between different transport modes by allocating sites for new park and ride facilities, for instance.</p> <p><b>M9: Require an air quality impact assessment for any proposed development likely to increase local</b></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><b>traffic</b></p> <p><i>To ensure that there is no adverse impact of air quality from proposed development</i></p> <p>This needs to be qualified dependent on the amount of traffic that would use Hafodyrynys Hill. Air quality is a material planning consideration, but it would have to be balanced against other issues. It doesn't help that this road is a main route in and out of the County Borough, and will inevitably feed some of the development sites in that area.</p> <p>A narrative would be useful, explaining the limitations that exist regarding the planning system's ability to have a positive impact on air quality, whilst at the same time still seeking to deliver development.</p>	
<p>Planning Development Control</p>		<p>Measure M1 - This is in line with Planning Policy Wales, but I'm not sure how feasible it is, or how much it would deliver through the LDP. We could limit development allocations that would feed traffic directly onto Hafodyrynys Hill, although there's not much opportunity in that part of the borough for development in any case, but we couldn't reasonably</p>	

		<p>sterilise the rest of the north-eastern part of the borough on the basis that some of the traffic may use that road.</p> <p>Measure M8 - As above – I'm not convinced we can deliver a lot without unreasonably restricting development elsewhere in the borough.</p> <p>Measure M9 - I think this needs to be qualified dependent on the amount of traffic that would use Hafodyrynys Hill.</p>	
NRW	No Comments		