



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs

www.gov.uk/defra

Local air quality management review
Summary of responses and government reply
November 2015

© Crown copyright 2015

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/ or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

This document/publication is also available on our website at:

https://consult.defra.gov.uk/communications/laqm-review-next-steps/results_edit

Any enquiries regarding this document/publication should be sent to us at:

LAQM.Review@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Contents

1. Purpose of Consultation.....	1
2. Geographical extent.....	1
3. Impact Assessment.....	1
4. Summary of responses.....	1
5. Responses to individual questions.....	2
6. Part 1	2
- 1, 3 Butadiene.....	2
- Benzene.....	2
- Lead.....	2
- Carbon Monoxide.....	2
Question 1 –.....	3
Question 2 –.....	4
7. Part 2	7
Question 3 –.....	8
8. Overview of responses from campaigns and petitions.....	12
9. Next steps.....	14
10. Annex 1 – List of respondents	14

1. Purpose of Consultation

1.1 This consultation was the second of a series of three consultations on Local Air Quality Management. The consultation ran from 19th December 2014 to 30th January 2015. It was split into two parts. The first part covered proposed regulatory changes including a draft statutory instrument for comment. The second part provided an overview of initial proposals to amend statutory policy and technical guidance ahead of a third more detailed consultation. The Response is published alongside this third and final consultation.

2. Geographical extent

2.1 The consultation applied to England only.

3. Impact Assessment

3.1 An impact assessment covering the proposed changes to technical and policy guidance has been developed and is being consulted on alongside the LAQM guidance and reporting changes. This consultation impact assessment reflects views and evidence from the consultation that this summary of responses covers.

4. Summary of responses

4.1 A total of 155 respondents submitted comments via Citizen Space, Defra's air quality inbox - air.quality@defra.gsi.gov.uk - and/or post as follows:

- Local Authorities – 87 respondents
- Organisations – 44 respondents
- Individuals - 23 respondents

[Biofuelwatch](#) campaign - 818 emails

4.2 Note on the weighting of petitions and campaign responses: Over 800 communications were recorded but not acknowledged individually, as per Government policy. Where materially substantive points were raised in addition to the standard text, these were recorded separately for inclusion in the overall summary of responses. In order not to skew the results of the consultation it is normal practice for campaign responses to be treated as a single, numerical response.

4.3 We were pleased to receive comments from a wide range of interested parties, including local authorities, air quality practitioners, environmental groups, campaigns and

concerned individuals. We also received views from primary school children as part of the 'Pupils 2 Parliament' project.

5. Responses to individual questions

5.1 The following section summarises the responses to each of the three questions posed by the consultation. The summary includes responses submitted online and by post/email.

5.2 Due in part to the number of responses received, the summary report identifies the key themes (i.e. what most people said), together with relevant insights and innovative ideas to help inform policy.

6. Part 1

6.1 Part 1 of the consultation sought comments on regulatory change to the current Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000 (2002 as amended) – specifically, the proposal to remove the following four pollutant objectives, for local authority reporting purposes:

- 1, 3 Butadiene
- Benzene
- Lead
- Carbon Monoxide

6.2 The reasoning behind this decision was because the objectives for these pollutants have been met for many years. For example, the only AQMA ever declared for Benzene was revoked in 2010. Local Authorities should not be required to use their limited resources on pollutants for which there are no problems when we know there are other pollutants (NO₂, PM₁₀) on which they need to focus their actions to improve air quality.

6.3 Objectives and monitoring for these four pollutants would be retained at the national and European level, enabling Government to take action if necessary.¹

¹ The UK Monitoring Network covers these pollutants – e.g. Lead (Pb) is monitored via the Urban Heavy Metals Network; 1, 3 Butadiene and Benzene via the Automatic Hydrocarbon Network; and Carbon Monoxide via the Automatic Urban and Rural Network (which includes sites in London).

Question 1 –

Does the draft statutory instrument achieve its stated purpose of removing the four pollutant objectives for LA reporting purposes?

High level statistics²

6.4 There were 145 responses to this question

Yes: 107 (74%)

No: 38 (26%)

Key themes

- Strong support from local authorities in removing these four pollutants from the LAQM regime as only one AQMA has been declared for Benzene (revoked in 2010)
- Concerns were raised by individuals and campaigns that if the pollutants were removed there would be no incentive to reduce unmeasured/non-monitored air pollution, which could lead to undiscovered breaches affecting people's health

Yes – the SI achieves its stated purpose.

6.5 Approximately two-thirds of respondents agreed that the S.I. achieved its stated purpose. Almost all local authorities and air quality practitioners approved the proposals to remove the 4 pollutant objectives for reporting purposes.

No.

6.6 Those who answered 'no' felt that the SI achieve its stated purpose, but that they disagreed with the proposed removal of some or all of the four pollutants, believing in the main that it would lead to a lack of transparency in reporting problems and risk public health. In particular, many individual and campaign respondents questioned the necessity of scrapping the four pollutants as the accompanying Regulatory Impact Assessment said they were not a burden on Local Authorities and no cost savings were identified.

² 'High level statistics' covers the online element (Citizen Space) of the consultation process, where most of the substantive responses were recorded

Question 2 –

Question 2: Do you have any final comments regarding the decision to remove the four pollutants and in particular on the assessment of costs and benefits?

High level statistics

6.7 There were 145 responses to this question

Yes: 79 (54%)

No: 66 (46%)

Key themes:

- Most local authorities were in favour of removing the four pollutants as they were not affected by nor currently monitored them.
- Concerns from some individual respondents that this was largely a cost cutting measure and that some potentially valuable data could be lost.

6.8 Question 2 elicited a number of comments related to the proposed removal of the four pollutants leading to a significant health risk, specifically:

1, 3 Butadiene

6.9 Very few argued for retention of this pollutant although this was raised in relation to shale gas operations (see below). One respondent noted that while this pollutant breaks down quickly in the atmosphere, it is nevertheless found in ambient air in urban areas as a consequence of its constant emission from motor vehicles.

Benzene

6.10 A small number of respondents felt that benzene should be retained due to it being a recognised carcinogen and in relation it being a by-product of industrial operations.

Typical comments were:

- To consider removing benzene from monitoring requirements at a time when the danger of its presence is likely to be enhanced as a result of shale gas is ill advised
- If we don't monitor Benzene, local industry might start producing more in the knowledge that no one will notice
- Vital that we monitor benzene in residential areas/workplaces that are close to filling stations

- Important that monitoring at national level is retained, particularly for those areas with significant industrial activity (a few respondents cited the importance of retaining benzene analysers in their areas for the monitoring of chemical and steel processes from nearby industrial emitters)

Carbon Monoxide & Lead

6.11 One respondent asked that further consideration be given to retaining carbon monoxide as a pollutant objective due to its impact on human health³. No concerns were raised regarding the removal of lead.

Cost savings of removing the pollutant objectives/streamlining of reports

6.12 Many of the comments in Question 2 were related to the costs and benefits' estimates of removing the four pollutants for reporting purposes. A number of respondents stressed that the savings projected in the Impact Assessment for the streamlining of reports would be lower and not necessarily re-directed into air quality action plan measures. However, LAs recognised that it would remove the burden of unnecessarily reviewing and assessing those pollutants which are not an issue in most LAs, thus allowing for air quality officers to focus on NO₂, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5} and SO₂.

6.13 Some LAs highlighted cost savings or indirect benefits. One, for example, highlighted that the cost of sending an officer out to put up monitoring tubes each month removed vital manpower resources from an already stretched environmental health function.

Concerns over exacerbating pollution (public health impact)

6.14 A number of respondents raised public health concerns in that scrapping the pollutant objectives could encourage polluters.

6.15 A few questioned the logic of removing the requirement to assess these pollutants on the basis of their having been met for several years because this presupposed that environmental and industrial conditions would remain unchanged. There was concern raised as how we would deal with new pollutant circumstances should they arise in the future.

6.16 A number argued that the current network of air quality monitoring stations forms the backbone of air quality control in this country and that any reduction in their number or the requirements for reporting would put the public at risk – i.e. it is only through measuring air pollution that a local authority can discover if a problem exists.

³ The respondent cited a 2012 NHS study on Emergency Department patients in London, a small number of whom showed elevated levels of CO.

Shale gas

6.17 Responses made reference to the pollutants proposed for removal and their potential emissions in relation to shale gas operations. The overall message was that we should consider the cumulative effect of shale gas both in relation to benzene and 1, 3 butadiene and those linked to site operation, such as emissions from heavy goods vehicle traffic to and from sites, as well as diesel generator emissions. Caution was advocated as the process to take forward shale gas was still under development and therefore the impact of the regulatory proposals was unclear.

Future proofing

6.18 Support for removing the four pollutants was sometimes caveated by requests that in the absence of evidence, a baseline measurement programme (to be undertaken by Defra) should continue to provide urban exposure information on the four pollutants should standards tighten in the future.

Government response to Part 1

6.19 There was considerable support for local authorities to no longer have to report on the four pollutants under the Local Air Quality Management system. However, following feedback from a number of stakeholders, the Government is of the view that this can be achieved without recourse to removing these pollutants from the Air Quality (England) Regulations. Instead, Government proposes to set out in guidance that local authorities will not be expected to report on these pollutants as national monitoring will be viewed as sufficient for review and assessment purposes under LAQM. This will still provide the indirect benefit of encouraging Local Authorities to focus their resources and attention on addressing those widespread pollutants such as NO₂ and particulate matter which represent the main air quality challenge. However, by retaining these pollutants in regulations, this will give local authorities the flexibility to report on all or any of these pollutants in the future should their local circumstances change.

6.20 Benzene in the UK mainly arises from domestic and industrial combustion processes, as well as road transport. Concentrations of benzene in the UK are low, and have remained below the limit value since 2007, mainly due to the introduction of catalytic converters⁴. Industrial emissions are mitigated through the use of appropriate abatement equipment and regular maintenance regimes.

6.21 In response to concerns raised about potential pollutant emissions arising from shale gas operations, these are strongly regulated under existing environmental permitting regimes, which provide for baseline and operational monitoring of a range of pollutants,

⁴ Air Pollution in the UK 2014, http://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/library/annualreport/viewonline?year=2014_issue_1

including, but not limited to, volatile organic compounds, carbon monoxide, benzene and hydrocarbons. We believe it is more effective, efficient and appropriate to deal with these site-specific pollutants through the environmental permitting regimes rather than to ask local authorities to continue assessing these pollutants across their area when for many years they have had no issues with them. As is currently the case with mining type activities, shale gas operations (including flaring) will be regulated under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 as administered by the Environment Agency. Permits issued under these Regulations protect various aspects of the environment by controlling emissions to air, water and land and thus ensure compliance with environmental standards such as air quality objectives. Wider concerns, such as the impact of additional traffic, can be addressed, where applicable, through the land use planning system, as is the case with any new development.

6.22 With respect to the development of a baseline and picking up future trends - data on the four pollutants are covered under the UK Monitoring Network; e.g. Lead (Pb) is monitored via the Urban Heavy Metals Network; 1, 3 Butadiene and Benzene via the Automatic Hydrocarbon Network; and Carbon Monoxide via the Automatic Urban and Rural Network (which includes sites in London). Should levels deteriorate significantly in the future, then national guidance on the review and assessment of these pollutants will be updated as appropriate.

7. Part 2

7.1 Part 2 of the consultation sought views on initial proposed non-regulatory changes to LAQM, specifically direction of travel changes to the statutory policy and technical guidance that underpins LAQM. It was made clear, however, that the proposals in Part 2 would need to be worked out in much further detail and they would figure in a separate, more detailed consultation on revised policy and technical guidance, which is published for consultation alongside this Response. The proposals outlined were:

- To streamline the LAQM reporting process by replacing and merging a number of the current reports into an Annual Improvement Report
- To give Local authorities a role in statutory guidance to work towards reducing emissions of fine particulates (PM_{2.5})
- To clarify roles and responsibilities and improve best practice and evidence-based measures

Question 3 –

Question 3: Do you have any evidence on the costs or benefits of our proposals under Part 2 to help us finalise the preferred options and develop the detailed guidance for final consultation in 2015?

High level statistics

7.2 There were 155⁵ responses to this question.

Yes, I have evidence: 74 (48%)

No: 81 (52%)

Key themes

- Almost all local authorities agreed that a single annual report was much simpler than the current system of 3 yearly rounds (Updating and Screening Assessments with additional Detailed and Further Assessments). They said that the information included in these reports was often repeated and did not focus on actions necessary to achieve objectives
- Many respondents, including some local authorities, felt that they could not properly assess the costs/benefits of streamlined reporting without fuller understanding of the content of the new annual single report
- Direct evidence on costs and benefits for Part 2 proposals were minimal, with more respondents offering good practice examples instead
- Wide support for adding a PM_{2.5} role though many felt including it in regulations as well as guidance would enhance its status and encourage action and expenditure by local authorities
- Monitoring concerns were raised by a number of respondents. While some appreciated the cost-effectiveness of nationally-derived data for PM_{2.5}, more were keen to stress that robust actions could only derive from robust data (based on monitoring and/or modelling)
- Dwindling resources at local level could lead to loss of air quality expertise and greater reliance (at cost) on outside contractors

⁵ Please note that some respondents ticked both 'yes' and 'no'

Streamlining reporting

7.3 Most Local Authorities welcomed proposals to streamline the LAQM reporting process stating that the officer time in preparing many of the existing reports, such as Further Assessments, largely duplicated data.

7.4 It was also agreed that simplifying the reporting process might deliver small efficiency savings, especially to those local authorities who have never (or are unlikely to) declare an AQMA, but many commented that estimated cost savings in the Impact Assessment were optimistic as much of the content of the existing reports would still appear to be covered in the new report.

7.5 Those in support of streamlining reporting gave the following main reasons:

- Streamlining the process would ensure resources are used more effectively by allowing LAs to focus on developing and implementing measures to improve air quality
- Having a public facing annual report should raise awareness and engage a wider audience on air quality issues

7.6 A number of respondents provided suggestions for the content of the annual report and offered evidence on their current costs to produce these reports.

7.7 For those who did not support the move to a single annual report, reasons expressed included:

- Amalgamating core information and data into a single annual report would not result in the savings projected in the Impact Assessment and even if they did there was no guarantee the savings would be re-directed into air quality action plan measures
- The scale of reduction in reporting would make it impossible to assess the baseline pollution levels and source apportionment work, which are the basis for all effective actions
- Concerns about whether a single annual report could contain the necessary levels of information required

7.8 Some examples were offered on the costs/benefits of streamlined reporting, including:

- Drafting of reports, such as Detailed Assessments and Updating and Screening Assessments often require the help and expertise of external consultants, which can translate into thousands of pounds for each report (one respondent had spent £10,000 on reports in the previous 2-3 years). An amalgamated 'status' report that required less input from outside experts would be more cost effective.
- If monitoring data were diluted by the reduction in reporting it could impact negatively on the development planning process as the resulting air quality

assessments might lack the necessary baseline and verification data to enforce controls on developments

- Anticipated cost savings in removing the current Progress Reports (one example put each progress report at £1,700) and Further Assessments
- To ensure maximum cost benefit the single, annual improvement report must not try to replicate all the information in the reports it intends to replace

Adding a PM_{2.5} role

7.9 Most respondents supported a PM_{2.5} role for local authorities but many felt that considering its public health impact, it should be an air quality objective not a discretionary duty. Others suggested that only by placing it in regulations would local authorities prioritise taking action. Some challenged the reliance on national monitoring or modelling, suggesting that only by assessing the local contribution to PM_{2.5} concentrations could local sources and actions be identified. The use of regional data would only allow identification of regional-level events, about which LAs can take little action.

7.10 For those who supported the inclusion of a PM_{2.5} role in statutory guidance, reasons given included:

- It is important that LAQM links with this pollutant, considering the health impacts
- Access to national data on PM_{2.5} makes the role cost-effective for LAs (many LAs do not have the capability to monitor/model PM_{2.5})
- Should improve engagement between Public Health, Transport and Environment teams, as well as alignment between County and District authorities
- Should provide a stronger impetus to provide better local knowledge about this non-threshold pollutant
- Adopting a 'work towards' approach is practical as a regulatory requirement would incur costs on LAs

Roles and responsibilities

7.11 There was strong support for clarifying roles and responsibilities between different tiers of Local Authorities but few were able to comment substantially before draft statutory guidance was made available in the next consultation due in late 2015.

7.12 All agreed that the responsibility for air quality delivery rested with a number of relevant parties including highways and planning and that they needed to cooperate to deliver the aims and objectives of local air quality management. A number expressed disappointment that the proposals did not include setting out roles and responsibilities in regulations.

7.13 Suggestions for clarifying roles and responsibilities included:

- Placing a stronger role on Highways England to engage with the development of Action Plans as well as developing their own to demonstrate how they intend to support their borough councils with air quality improvements
- Improving guidance with information on best practice and case studies
- Strengthening the relationship between County and District authorities

7.14 A number of examples of good practice in clarifying roles and responsibilities were offered, such as County councils working with neighbouring and District authorities through external environmental groups to share knowledge and experience as well as coordinating funding and the development of measures to address and monitor air quality throughout the County.

Costs and Benefits

7.15 The Impact Assessment included with the consultation raised a number of questions and concerns, particularly in relation to a perception that the consultation was putting forward a proposal to reduce local monitoring and what many considered to be an over-estimation of the potential cost savings from streamlining reports. More generally a large number of responses sought to highlight the public health benefit of tackling air quality and wanted to see this reflected more in the assessment.

7.16 Typical comments included:

- Cost of associated ill health arising from the existence of pollutants to be removed far exceeds any cost of monitoring – health benefits should be monetised to provide a more complete picture of costs. One respondent reported that cardio-vascular disease, which claims over 160,000 lives each year in the UK, is exacerbated by elevated air pollution.⁶
- The cost/benefits of monitoring equipment would be more justifiable if the data they provided translated into effective solutions to reduce emissions
- There are hidden costs in not monitoring – e.g. Recent Environmental Audit Committee report calls for stronger measures to protect clean air and public health through the planning system. Without detailed local authority air quality monitoring and reporting, communities and planning authorities will have no way of knowing where standards may or may not be breached
- Inclusion of a PM_{2.5} role in the reporting process could absorb a significant amount of the savings expected from streamlining the current reports. Likewise, the need to

⁶ British Heart Foundation (2015) statistic

move to compliance with NO₂ and the expectation on LAs of increased collaboration with health and other departments may diminish savings and hence expenditure on measures.

8. Overview of responses from campaigns and petitions

8.1 Campaign letters used a standard template, with occasional variations and personal remarks. The substance of the letters remained the same though. The focus of the campaigns and petitions revolved mainly around the risk identified as part of the Government's preferred Option, which many believed would diminish local monitoring.

8.2 We identified one official campaign, [Biofuelwatch](#), which invited users to email the below standard template (which could be edited to include personal comments) to Defra's air quality inbox. The campaign drew heavily on Clean Air in London's official response, criticising our preferred option, which they stated would lead to a significant reduction in air quality monitoring. This assumption was based on a combination of proposals to remove four redundant pollutant objectives from regulations and streamline the current reporting requirements. Criticism was also raised in relation to two of the pollutants scheduled for removal, which respondents associated with shale gas; as well as our developing a PM_{2.5} role for local authorities in statutory guidance as opposed to regulations, which they believed was insufficient to drive forward real progress in tackling fine particles at the local level.

8.3 Standard Template (Biofuelwatch campaign):

Dear...

I wish to respond to Defra's current consultation "Review of Local Air Quality Management (England) – regulatory and guidance changes". Your 'preferred option' is one which was condemned by 18,000 respondents to your 2013 consultation. As your impact assessment shows, your proposals could see local authority air quality monitoring slashed by 75% and spending on air quality reporting by 60%. Local authorities are encouraged to rely on Defra's air quality monitors but there are only 137 of those across England, compared to over 2,500 air quality monitoring devices run by local authorities.

Without detailed local air quality monitoring, many 'hotspots' of air pollution will be missed and local authorities will have no incentive to reduce pollution in those areas. The National Planning Policy Framework emphasises the importance of taking existing or likely breaches of air quality standards into account when assessing new planning applications.

The recent Environmental Audit Committee's Air Quality report calls for stronger measures to protect clean air and public health through the planning system. Yet without detailed local authority air quality monitoring and reporting, communities and planning authorities will have no way of knowing where standards may or may not be breached.

In many places, air quality monitoring is already insufficient – it needs to be strengthened, not decimated, while air quality reporting requirements must not be watered down.

I am further concerned about the proposal to abolish air quality objectives for four pollutants, two of which happen to be of particular concern in relation to fracking. I believe that the UK's Air Quality Objectives must be strengthened, not eroded. The air quality objective for PM10 is twice as high as that recommended by the World Health Organisation (WHO) for protecting public health while the PM2.5 objective is 2.5 times as high as that recommended by the WHO.

Your consultation claims to encourage local authorities to take more action to reduce PM2.5 emissions, which are especially harmful to human health, but proposes that PM2.5 should not be incorporated into air quality regulations and that local authorities should not have to monitor and report on it.

Without comprehensive monitoring and reporting, nobody can know what PM 2.5 levels are and whether they are going up or down and whether EU Air Quality Standards will be met.

Air pollution is a significant cause of illness and premature death in the UK and the country is facing infringement procedures for having failed to meet EU air quality standards since 2010. I therefore urge Defra to withdraw the current proposals and to draw up genuine plans for reducing air pollution, ones which must incorporate the Environmental Audit Committee's recent recommendations.

8.4 The standard template on Biofuelwatch was editable, allowing users to input additional comments and concerns. These additions have been taken into account and amalgamated into the summary response.

Government response to Part 2

8.5 On streamlining of reporting: we recognise the difficulty in commenting on a single, annual report (to replace four existing reports) until the substance of the report is made clearer. We are grateful for the suggestions provided by respondents in relation to the development of such a report and we will be developing this report over the coming months, working with stakeholders and delivery partners, taking on board the suggestions provided by respondents to this and the previous consultation. The content of the report and other non-regulatory facets under Part 2 is the subject of a further consultation.

8.6 On adding a PM_{2.5} role for local authorities: PM_{2.5} is the most commonly used metric for assessing the mortality impacts of long-term exposure to air pollution, so its absence from LAQM currently impedes action at local authority level. Local Public Health Directors can (under the Public Health Outcome Framework) already prioritise action on PM_{2.5}. Including a flexible role for LAs in guidance, alongside advice on appropriate measures, will ensure a better joined up response to tackle this important health issue. We remain of the view that such a role fits better in guidance instead of regulation because it strikes the right balance between tackling the public health impacts of PM_{2.5} and allowing the necessary flexibility for Local Authority to define the role as best suited to their circumstances and take proportionate action as needed, for example, related to the sources of PM_{2.5} they can control in their locality.

8.7 On clarifying roles and responsibilities: We recognise that an integrated approach to air quality is important to achieve improvements air quality both locally and nationally.

We will continue to work closely across Government, stakeholders and delivery partners to ensure that both the obligations and benefits of all parts of local authorities, including at county level, working together on air quality are clear and well understood. We intend to do this through updated policy guidance. Revised guidance and evidence-based tools will help quantify the environmental and health benefits of key actions, thus lending credibility to measures proposed by local air quality teams. Some further funding has already been made available, for instance, Highways England's, Road Investment Strategy, represents a major new commitment to the environment with a dedicated £100m fund to help mitigate air pollution across the Strategic Road Network.

8.8 On costs and benefits: The impact assessment accompanying the second consultation contained a high sensitivity scenario showing reductions in costs relating to local authority monitoring. This was a hypothetical scenario intended to capture a possible outcome whereby Local Authorities would decide to reduce the monitoring they undertake. As decisions on monitoring and levels of monitoring are for local authorities this was simply a possible outcome; the scenario was not a proposal for reduced monitoring nor a recommended scenario. The evidence from the consultation that such a scenario was highly unlikely has been fed into the development of the consultation impact assessment that accompanies this policy and technical guidance consultation.

9. Next steps

9.1 We have launched a third and final consultation on updated LAQM technical and policy guidance. This will run for eight weeks. During the consultation period we will engage directly with LA stakeholders to ensure that as far as possible the revised approach meets LA needs. Subject to the consultation, we intend that a revised approach to LAQM reporting will be in place from mid-2016. In the first year, submission of the Annual Status Report will be required by 30 June.

10. Annex 1 – List of respondents⁷

Air Monitors Ltd
Ashfield District Council
Ashford Borough Council
Autogas Ltd
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Bath and North East Somerset Council
Birmingham City Council
Blueskybio
Bolsover District Council and North East Derbyshire District Council

⁷ List excludes the names of individuals as per Defra consultation guidance

BRC (GB) Ltd
Calderdale Metropolitan District Council
Canterbury City Council
Castle Point Borough Council
Chelmsford City Council
Cherwell District Council
Chesterfield Borough Council
City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council
City of Lincoln Council (for Lincolnshire Environmental Protection Group)
City of London Corporation
Clean Air in London
Cleaner Diesel Fuels Ltd
Client Earth
Colchester Borough Council
Cornwall Council
CPRE
CPRE Kent
CTC the national cycling charity.
Darlington Borough Council
Dartford Borough Council
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
Dover District Council
Dudley Metropolitan District Council
Eastleigh Borough Council
Environmental Protection UK
Environmental Health Lancashire
Fondazione Edmund Mach
Frack Free Balcombe Residents Association
Friends of the Earth
Friends of Hartlepool
Gedling Borough Council
Greater London Authority
Harborough District Council
Harrogate Borough Council
Hartlepool Borough Council
Henley in Transition
Hornbeam Centre
Hospital Street Association (Nantwich, Cheshire)
Human beings on earth
Huntingdonshire District Council
Institute of Air Quality Management
Ipswich Borough Council
JHS Acupuncture
Lancaster City Council
Leeds City Council
London Borough of Lambeth
London School of Economics
Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells Borough Councils
Marylebone Association

Middlesbrough Borough Council
Norfolk Local Air Quality Management Group
North Devon Council
North Hertfordshire District Council
Northumberland County Council
Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council (on behalf of Greater Manchester)
Oxford City Council
Portsmouth City Council
Public Health England
Pupils 2 Parliament
Queen Mary University of London
Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
Rochdale Metropolitan District Council
Rochford District Council
Royal College of Physicians
Runnymede Borough Council
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council
Sandwell Metropolitan District Council
Sefton Council
Sevenoaks District Council
Soul
South Cambridgeshire District Council
South Derbyshire District Council
South Gloucestershire Council
South Hams District Council
South Northants Council
St Albans City & District Council
St Helens Council
Stevenage Borough Council
Stockton on Tees Borough Council
Stoke-on-Trent City Council
Stratford on Avon District Council
Suffolk and Waveney District Councils
Sustainable Business Solutions Ltd
Sustainable Wallingford
Sussex Air
Sutton Bridge Parish Council
Swale Borough Council
The Reading Sustainability Centre
Thurrock Council
Transport Research Laboratory and Transport and Travel Research
University of Kent, Centre for Health Services Studies
University of West of England
Wakefield Council
Waveney and Suffolk Coastal District Councils
Waverley Borough Council
Westminster City Council
West Suffolk - Forest Heath District Council & St Edmundsbury Borough Council

Wiltshire Council
Worcestershire Regulatory Services
York Green Party

Campaign and Petition emails:

Biofuelwatch