

Annex D – Full Responses

Note: responses are anonymised but are replicated verbatim

Table D1 - Full responses to question 16 in the survey

Survey Response No.	Comment
1	We are looking to move to Elvington. If these proposals go ahead we will have to think again
2	If that is the only way to heat the individual's house/water let them. This country gets worse by the day with the cost to us true British! It's time to appreciate the cost of living here
3	There are much bigger issues that our resource and time should be spent dealing with that - vehicle pollution, HGVs in rural villages etc
4	I can't see the point in objecting because you will do it anyway. I live in Elvington and we have local businesses who will suffer if this is brought in.
5	Please do not enforce this ban.
6	The countryside need fires many relatives of mine have had heating allowance cut and you want to stop them burning wood or make them change their log burner at further great cost. Stop interfering and controlling people.
7	Some people obtain there wood for free and some people don't have modern heating. And can't afford it either.
8	Smoke control areas need to be policed - they're not. The controls need to be extended to include bonfires and fire pits.
9	I worry that air pollution has a bad impact on health. However, people need financial support if they end up having to change the way they currently do things. Don't impose change. Please support people financially to chance, because many people may not afford alternative options.
10	I fail to see the logic of a smoke free zone when BBQ's and bonfires are permitted. We burn our own logs produced from pruning of our own trees and shrubs and properly seasoned for 2 or more years. We use our Woodburn to supplement our heating in cold weather or instead of using gas, thus reducing the amount of fossil fuel we are burning. This contributes to carbon reduction as we cut our use of fossil fuels and heat only one room instead of the whole house if the central heating is switched on.

11	We have a log burner, which save cost and use of fossil fuel (gas). We only burn logs from trees on our own land, from fallen trees or ones pruned by a tree surgeon. It is irrational not to use this free resource, and crazier still, we would be permitted to burn on a bonfire. Policy is patently unsuitable for rural areas and will cost us money unnecessarily.
12	Has the air quality in the outlying villages ever been tested? I think there are far greater issues of air quality that need addressing long before this. The air quality along the whole length of Fulford Road for example, must be horrendous (and not just outside the old Mecca where the air quality measurements are taken - how about testing it from Fulford to Hospital Fields where the traffic lights are used as a filter?). Open top tour buses pouring out diesel fumes constantly! Also, the air quality in the outlying villages is far more affected by dust from nearby agriculture than from chimneys. Most villages have no access to mains gas and oil is extremely expensive. How about a compromise by insisting the wood burned must be kiln dried? This policy appears to be more political than logical.
13	Sick off smelly burning from allotment
14	I fully support smoke control in the densely populated urban areas. 80% of the population live in the 14% of the area which is currently covered. That means that the remaining 86% of the city contains only 20% of the population. That means that the concentration of population in the area currently covered by the SMO is around 20 times greater than the remaining area. Burning wood and solid fuel is a tradition in the villages and wood burning is sustainable and almost carbon neutral, important in tackling climate change. It is also cheap, as many people have access to free wood, important in tackling fuel poverty after the Government's callous removal of the winter fuel allowance. Personally, the extension of the SMO makes no difference to me, as I have a fully DEFRA compliant appliance and burn wood which I season myself. I shall, however, seek the views of my residents and the feedback I have had so far is that this is a city-focussed council trying to impose its will on the rural village communities and their way of life. This may change as more people give feedback. I have had just one complaint about a wood burning stove in 6 years as a councillor. I have had dozens about fire pits, chimleas and bonfires, none of which are covered by the new regulations. Unless the pollution caused by these is addressed, the extension of the SMO is utterly pointless.
15	What is wrong with having a nice open fire with coal or wood. Us changing what we do is not going to change the fact that we as a country emit 1/30th of what China emits. A plaster on a leaking dam is going to do nothing so why waste money on stuff like this. It's not leading by example
16	The council needs to ensure there is an effort to make the new rules well known if the proposals go ahead because I only found out about this by chance from a post from our local councillor. The expansion of the smoke control area

	will be redundant if people in the new areas are not sufficiently informed as they won't know that anything has changed.
17	More regulation, more waste....Let's get back to basics and concentrate on running essential services in a cost effective way. There is no issue with smoke in Strensall other than bonfire night (and that isn't covered!)
18	I live alone and find heating bills very expensive. I buy wood from Lower Derwent Nature Reserve who cut wood for regeneration & sell it to raise money to reinvest in the reserve, they would lose out if this is approved. I don't believe that there is a pollution problem from wood burners in the rural areas this is proposed for. There are other ways to reduce pollution such as reduce the number of HGVs driving through small villages
19	Another stupid scheme / proposal by CYC that won't and can't be policed or managed. Attention and money would be better spent on other things like potholes, Anti Social Behaviour or Emptying Bins / Dog waste. There's no evidence that York and surrounding areas has poor air quality so this is unnecessary, and with the way China and USA are carrying on with their attitude to emissions and global warming is it really going to make a difference! Needs serious rethink with more of a focus on other priorities
20	Using seasoned logs as kindling is useful to get a smokeless fuel fire started and to supplement it as there are few flames from smokeless fuel and logs add to the reach of the heat from the fire
21	There are properties which solely rely on open fires. This proposal is another restriction on our right to live in a free democracy. If CYC pay for a new ground source heat pump, then ok but no this will not happen. Yet again we as residents are left paying the price for 'green washing' and the 'green' agenda. It is absolute nonsense and CYC should be looking at budgets, and the impending bankruptcy not penalising their own residents.
22	I object to the proposals, as it directly impact me on the ability to heat my home as I choose, yet farmers/businesses can have massive bonfires that create far more smoke are exempt. I fail to see what the difference is between a log burner where smoke is emitted via a chimney and a fire pit where it's emitted direct in the garden.
23	"York" includes a number of outlying villages and rural areas, despite the perception of the Council and visitors to the city, and many of these have no mains gas. Banning the use of wood-burning appliances in these areas is out of keeping with their rural character and would impose an enormous additional cost on residents, many of whom can ill afford it, in terms of electricity use for heating. Personally, we would look to move out of the area if we were no longer allowed to use out wood burner.
24	Mines an open Stovax fire if they want to compensate me a large amount of money to change it then okay otherwise I'll carry on burning whatever keeps me warm and cheaper than gas , when all the coal burning countries of the world

	and the war bombing countries stop sending chemicals from explosions into the atmosphere then I might consider stopping ,until then let the smoke continue
25	People should be required to maintain and sweep their chimneys. Their wood/multi fuel appliances should also have safety certificates as for natural gas boiler installations.
26	Our log burning stoves are regularly serviced and are a vital supplement to our central heating system which relies on LPG and is very expensive. Although we have two, only one is used mainly in the winter and when the weather is very cold. With the cessation of winter fuel allowance for pensioners, any further restrictions would be very punitive.
27	Due to rise in living costs, it is vital that we use our log burner for heat. We burn seasoned wood and smokeless fuel. We are not sure if our log burner is defra approved - we do not have funds to replace it if not.
28	We use our stove and open fire responsibly for additional heat, turning down central heating and also to give an atmosphere. We are aware of the the supposed health issues but we chose a defra approved stove. The new proposals do not seem to take into consideration country homes outside bigger cities.
29	Rural small villages such as Stockton on Forest do not need to be included as it is not a close built up area.
30	A lot of the outer villages .. have no gas ! Or alternative !
31	More education and enforcement is needed.
32	Another thought, when the government cancels the purchase of British Steel at Scunthorpe and stops burning tonnes of coal a day and all heritage railway lines are shut down then I might consider been a smokeless zone until then happy to carry on staying warm
33	Unnecessary for Naburn and not justified in any way
34	People in the villages around York will find this difficult to accept as many rely on burning wood and coal for their heating. They see it as their right and probably won't accept the risks to health and air quality. This control will only be any use if it is enforced which I doubt it will be. Who is going to check that people are conforming and enforce this late in the evenings?
35	Air quality issues are underestimated as a health hazard and it makes sense to apply restrictions to all areas.
36	I believe that outdoor fires such as barbecues, bonfires etc can be as polluting- why aren't you including these in the criteria?
37	I have a defra approved appliance and burn responsibly and therefore object to any limitation placed on me to be warm in my own home.

38	I live in Rufforth which does not have a gas supply. We have to use oil for our central heating. Our house is an old house without double glazing and we need an open fire to keep warm in the winter. We burn smokeless coal which does not throw out heat the way coal does and we therefore use seasoned logs for extra heat. The fire only tends to get lit in the evenings.
39	It just makes sense to stop pollution when other heating options are available
40	I would prefer all types of solid fuel burning to be included, outdoor cooking is prevalent in summer months in this area.
41	Bits of Clifton are not covered by SCA which makes no sense. At very least include the whole area inside ring road.
42	I do not object to the smokeless zone being increased and I understand the reasons for it. However, you cannot just tell people they suddenly can't use their main heating system. If stoves / fires are not allowed, then either a grant should be given so people can replace older stoves / fires, or the rules should apply to newly fitted stoves / fires. Many people use a stove / fires because their other heating system (eg gas boilers / electric) is too expensive to solely rely on. You risk people not being able to afford to heat their homes properly.
43	A lot of people supplement heating with open fires and wood burning stoves in our village of Knapton, some people don't have a gas supply and some older people use it as their sole heat source - the cost of heating bills have risen and are due to rise again why penalise people for wanting to keep warm - the amount that is generated in our village is minuscule and will not affect the environment- you are assuming that all people who live in villages have lots of money - by making this decision you are affecting the old and vulnerable and I personally think you should be more concerned about the environment and the amount of rubbish that people dump in our village- we massively object to this proposal.
44	Many if not most properties in my village have some form of solid fuel stove or fire used in winter months. This change is frankly ridiculous for more rural areas.
45	Only have oil to heat the house so my stove helps to heat my living room to keep costs down
46	York Council waste collection department class is as rural. There is a low density of houses in this area. I have a large garden. I already mulch, compost, use bonfires & green bins to remove garden waste. I dry logs in several log stores to burn in the winter months in a room that gets damp, with the chimney open fireplace. My house is over 100 years old. My usage does not harm anyone. Imposing a restriction will force me to use less environmentally friendly methods to remove garden waste.
47	As per below excerpt. the Labour Government is allowing new homes to be built with Wood Burning stoves, so why the need to change in York. As you already state, 80% of homes are covered by Smoke control areas and those you

	<p>are planning to include are way outside of Central York and not affecting air quality there.</p> <p>In addition, any change to having to comply with the smoke control zones, will mean a significant expense for us, where we already have a Fire Basket and only burn seasoned timber and smokeless fuel, but will now need to purchase an approved appliance. This is unfair and prohibitive in the current economic climate. Which Labour is supposed to care about working peoples economic circumstances. I believe that if I only burn Smokeless Coal and Seasoned logs, I should be able to continue to use my existing fire basket.</p> <p>In a letter to the SIA, the ministry responsible said: "A full technical consultation on the Future Homes Standard was launched in December 2023 and closed in March 2024.</p> <p>"Under the standards proposed in the consultation, a wood-burning stove would be permitted as a secondary heating source in new homes.</p> <p>"The Government acknowledges that it is possible to significantly reduce the level of smoke emitted through domestic burning if the right fuels, appliances and practices are used."</p> <p>In November, the Scottish Government also scrapped its controversial ban on installing wood-burning stoves in new homes following a huge backlash in rural Scotland.</p> <p>A government spokesman said: "The Future Homes and Buildings Standard, to be published later this year, will ensure all new homes are energy efficient and use low-carbon heating systems.</p> <p>"As set out in the Future Homes Standard consultation, the use of a wood fuel appliance as a primary heating system would not achieve the standards proposed, however, their installation would still be permitted as a secondary heating source."</p>
48	It should include bonfires
49	<p>Our central heating system is fully dependent on our multi fuel stove - it also heats the water for the house - we can't afford to change it over to other heat sources - we live in a conservation area in a 19th century cottage so there are restrictions on what we can do to change over to any other heat source - also the layout of our house has just led to a decision that we are not eligible for loft insulation grants . we only use the stove when it's cold so approx 4 to 5</p>

	<p>months of the year. The wood suppliers around us rely on selling wood from well managed farm estates - bizarrely though if this comes in then we'd have more fire pits and bonfires in the garden to keep warm- although we recognise that smoke has an impact on health we live in a very rural area with lots of space around us - this would be devastating for our finances and heat supply.</p>
50	<p>Firstly, our village is in a very rural area, so applying the urban rules are inappropriate to our area which has very low housing density. Should it apply to farms who have no other houses nearby? Secondly, it should not be applied in places where there is no mains gas supply. Many people may still rely on burning fuel for heating.</p>
51	<p>I object strongly to the proposals. This is a 'one size fits all' proposal which does not take into account that parts of the City of York area is actually quite rural. Housing stock in these areas tend to be older and many have fireplaces used to supplement the heating of their homes. Ours dates back to 1860's and using our log burner gets the living area to a comfortable temperature in cold weather, something central heating alone doesn't always do. Also these properties are several miles from the city centre (we are 6 1/2 miles) so smoke is unlikely to affect the city. Using wood from our own trees during necessary pruning and seasoned for at least 2 years means that we can cut our carbon emissions as we can reduce the use of gas, a fossil fuel, and at times only heat one room rather than the whole house to heat a room. if we couldn't use our own wood for burning we would probably have a bonfire of wet wood (smoky!!!). Surely a smoky bonfire will have a greater environmental and health impact than the burning of seasoned wood in a woodburner? We do not buy wood as we generate quite a lot of our own. It should be pointed out that the English Nature reserve at Wheldrake sells wood generated from conservation work which probably helps fund further conservation work. Again if this wood wasn't sold, would it be burnt on a bonfire?</p>
52	<p>rules for smoke from outdoor garden fires also need to be considered as they cause considerable nuisance and pollution in this area</p>
53	<p>I suffer from asthma/COPD overlap syndrome. I am increasingly suffering from air pollution in York and am highly sensitive to wood smoke, BBQs and smokeries. Local residents are increasingly poor at managing this (I doubt they know the rules) and I have little confidence any of these proposals will be enforceable or make a difference. For instance, i know certain neighbours burn scrap wood, and how are officers going to find out what people are burning or in what? I would prefer stricter traffic controls or, in this case, an outright ban on wood burners.</p>
54	<p>The rules for smoke control areas should apply to chimineas too. The smoke from those is horrible and smelly and some people, my neighbour for one, burns random bits of wood on theirs which makes the smoke and the smell worse</p>

55	i agree with the proposals but i think the council needs to explore ways to control or even stop bonfires, the smell and smoke is a significant polluter and problem in poppleton
56	Extending the area will serve little purpose unless punitive action is taken against offenders. From my experience stove owners are fully aware they are contravening the rules but say things like "whose going to stop me, the Council have no staff to police it".
57	Please expand the smoke control areas as soon as possible
58	I think there is a difference between people using stoves all the time and people using them just occasionally, so it is good this is being recognised. I also think there should be more awareness around what kinds of fuel are available and more help for purchasing the right kind of wood and alternatives where possible. I think warnings should go on wood packets like with cigarettes.
59	The council should be spending our resources on essential road repairs, youth clubs and social care rather than paying staff to put together pointless surveys on air pollution from fires. There are far more polluting things than house fire
60	It is impossible to keep my home a habitable temperature without the use of my open fireplace. The house is around 100 years old and insulating to a modern standard would be financially impossible for me. It keeps damp out of my home and means I don't need to run a tumble dryer and other very expensive heating to be able to keep my home warm. Without the fire my average temperature in the home is 9 degree c in the winter.
61	stop telling me what I can/cannot do
62	Educating people who are not interested is worse than useless as it gives the impression that something is being done where as it isn't. If you are going to extend the Smoke Control Areas you need to effectively enforce the existing areas, extend the existing boundaries where there is new housing. This would be my proposal. Stop anyone who has fitted central heating from using coal, wood or smokeless fuel. This would be very simple to enforce. No monitoring needed. If you cannot go that far then Parish Councils should be co-opted where poor planning permissions are at the root of any smoke canyoning problems and residents are asked to stop or make good any problems caused, such as fitting better chimney filters.
63	easier to implement for the council if everyone has the same rules, but, I assume many people won't know if there individual circumstances/stove/fire is breaking them, and there might be a financial cost to switching to an alternative that's within the rules - perhaps you can help with that education piece and with individual checks at properties and some advice about next steps for households, feels like there should be a grace period to allow existing fires/stoves to be upgraded or replaced, or for trying different fuels with some support... if the switch is easy, less people will 'fail',

	and everyone probably wants the benefits of smoke free areas, so selling it as 'we're all working together for the same goal' sounds better than 'we're banning something' IMHO! Good luck!
64	You need to inform the council tax payers exactly what they can and can not do in a Smoke free Area as confusion reigns around chimineas, bbq, bonfires etc
65	There is little value in this. The Council would do better in making sustainable low-emission solid fuels more affordable and accessible; to ban the sale or resale of non-compliant burners and fuels, except by exemption. This is an unnecessary distraction from the real urgent problem of vehicle emissions, to which we are all exposed every day.
66	During the winter months air pollution from chimneys is high. Washing hung outside to dry and open windows are not advisable during this time as is any outside activity.
67	How about car emissions due to congestion? Narrow streets blocked by delivery vans, lorries or riders, slow cyclists with 30 cars behind, burning more fuel than needed, thus causing more pollution?
68	My objection to extending the Smoke Control Area Boundary is because the village where I live (Naburn) does not have a mains gas supply.
69	For the more rural areas within the York area, the density of properties is more sparse and therefore any impact on air quality is much reduced from that in areas of dense population. A log burner or a solid fuel Aga at an isolated farmhouse for instance would have a negligible impact on the air quality of other York residents but may currently be their own source of heat.
70	Not sure necessary beyond outer ring road in more rural locations where less built up. Also - use a wood burner to reduce use of gas as have central heating on less when in use.
71	Enforcement is a problem. We often have smoke rising into our sitting room and bedroom from neighbouring houses. We don't know how to stop this.
72	Given the current cost of utilities any further impact on any heating and or cooking facilities is ridiculous.
73	They don't go far enough to reducing smoke. We live in an area that is already covered by a smoke control zone and the smoke on calm winter evenings is horrendous. We have a MVHR system fitted to our house to help improve indoor air quality and we often have to turn it off between 4-10pm in the winter as it brings in the heavily polluted air from the very many houses around us that have fires burning.
74	If 80% of residents are already covered by a SCA, I don't think the change will make a significant difference to air quality. But I support the change to remove anomalies (e.g. Fulford) and to make the area clear and easier to administer/ advise/ enforce.

75	What a waste of council money and time. At a time when reform are growing in popularity you decide to launch this! No information on how many fires are being used, no supporting data for or against a really poor piece of work driven by what? Whoever is in charge of this should be ashamed by the poor quality and bias questioning. Why don't you spend council time and money on more important issues?
76	With fuel prices as they are, I think it's wrong to bring in measures. There are other air pollutants which add far more pollution to the atmosphere so they should be targeted first.
77	There are no problems with nuisance caused by domestic chimney smoke in Acaster Malbis. On the occasions that "non-approved" wood is burnt on my stoves, it is only for short periods usually in milder weather when the fire is only lit for an hour or so for some quick hot water and the smokeless fuel is not lit for a full day's heat. Attention is always paid to the wind direction and nothing at all smoky is ever burnt if it would cause distress to our neighbours (and the same with their chimney and us) In other words, just common sense. The same goes for most of us in the village. No need for unnecessary legislation.
78	How will it be enforced. Need to educate all residents in York on current policy. I have never heard of fuel for thought. Some residents don't care on how smoke affects neighbours.
79	Not one of the key problems affecting York, especially rural areas. Focus on other improvements
80	If this is enforced, i will contemplate moving from the area. I take great pleasure in harvesting, processing and drying my own wood.
81	Local pollution affects my asthma making it hard to exercise, walk, cycle, sleep, etc. and fully support cleaner air
82	Many rural villages on the edges of York have houses built with fireplaces and chimneys as the temperature is colder than in more built up areas. Houses are also built further apart so they are not a nuisance to neighbours
83	Communication, education are important re implementing this. enforcement will be difficult. Needs to be accompanied by support to insulate and provide less negatively environmentally impactful heating which works to warm houses.
84	We cannot afford to put our heating on and rely on free wood to keep us warm in the winter months, out of the city centre has very little issues with the air, remember this is the countryside so dont include our villages as part of your big city of york please

85	We live in a rural location with no immediate neighbours and supplement our heating by burning dried wood and dried waste wood from our land. This proposal is outrageous and represents an overreach into rural, traditional life from metropolitan councillors. Please reconsider extending this zone to the entire council area and restrict it solely to built up areas.
86	We have already invested money in a supply of logs for the coming winter. I would like to be able to use them up if the area does become smokeless and then convert to smokeless solid fuels. The search facility on the Defra site for permitted smokeless fuels does not work. A simple symbol showing Defra authorisation on packaging will be helpful.
87	Please make this happen, I have 3 children and want them to grow up with healthy lungs
88	This is not an issue within the rural area of Stockton-on-the-Forest, which would cause further cost of living issues, when many of the elderly population have lost the winter fuel allowance.
89	We live in a rural village with 2 young children with no mains gas supply therefore in the colder months it is essential we have other ways of heating our house. Thank you
90	Yet another assault on the energy costs of poorer households. Particularly in rural areas where lack of population density will have minimal impact on air quality.
91	I think this is an unnecessary expansion into primarily rural areas where the impact of smoke is much less. Also, I have not seen any evidence of problems being caused by smoke in these areas.
92	I am very careful to only burn briquettes as these produce very little smoke and am aware of the implications of burning wood. Perhaps a way forward is to inform/limit which wood fuels are acceptable
93	I have an issue that numerous approved smokeless fuels are being imported from overseas...Argentina and Australia to name but a few. What effect has the carbon burnt in shipping these fuels on our health. The bigger picture is not as beneficial as you are making out I'd imagine.
94	I live in a rural area and regularly experience smoke from local farms and commercial landscaping businesses burning waste materials and wood often emitting thick black acrid smoke. tackling these nuisance bonfires would achieve a greater benefit than extending the existing smoke control area. It would seem pointless to extend the existing smoke control area without tackling what in my area ins an infinitely bigger source of particulate creation.

95	We live in a listed building with period hobgrate fireplaces constantly used. We are certainly not replacing with horrid log burners which will not be given listed building consent. Irrespective of this we live in a small village not within the built up area of York and surrounding villages. We are not part of an urban area. We have no mains gas supply and this is an invasion of our personal freedom!
96	This was discussed at a Parish Council Meeting on 19th May and it was unanimously agreed that Earswick Parish Council do not support this initiative.
97	There are a number of homes outside of the ring road, in a rural setting, that don't have a gas mains connection. It is essential to assist in heating these homes to maintain the ability to burn solid fuels in fires and stoves. There are a number of elderly people in locations such as Rufforth who will be unable to keep warm in winter months if these proposals are extended to the wider York area.
98	Ridiculous- bonfires barbques fire pits all OK but burning seasoned hardwood logs in an approved log burner not! Try tackling car polllution to make a difference - better cheaper public transport. The bus service is a disgrace
99	Our village has no mains gas, so a wood burner is an important topup option to go with our heat pump.
100	I will only stop if the council are going to Fully pay for the replacement
101	Bonfires are the main problem and should be band across the country Every bonfire will burn waste which will harm the environment more than a typical log burner burning season dried wood from the log company wasting your time trying to make areas smokeless where more pollution coming more from bonfires
102	We are aware of other people living with only wood burning heating and hot water locally.We both work from home and use the the stove to heat our downstairs living space in lieu of using oil fired central heating. Banning solid fuels in villages that are not on a mains gas and have to burn oil makes little sense.
103	Whilst I can see that having smoke control is necessary within the city of York itself it is not appropriate to extend this to villages outside of the city which are within the city of york jurisdiction when there is no mains gas supply. These villages don't have the luxury of being able to heat their homes with gas due to the poor fuel infrastructure. An exemption should be made for villages that fall into these categories. Many villagers don't have the money to replace their current stove with a new defra one when the cost of doing so is in the thousands. Therefore this would leave those residents unable to heat their homes. As an asthmatic I am well aware of the impact of pollution however I am more effected by the dust and fumes generated in my own home putting smokeless fuel into my multi fuel burner

	<p>than I am burning kiln dried wood. Therefore if I lived in an effected village, as someone with a non defra approved stove who has no other means of heating my home , I would be forced to use smokeless fuel which actually impacts on my asthma more than me using kiln dried logs</p>
104	<p>I object to the proposal to designate all the rural areas of York as Smoke Control Areas. I live in Strensall. Strensall is a rural village sitting on the outermost North Eastern boundary of the York area. Strensall is surrounded by open countryside on all sides. The prevailing winds in the area are from the South West, taking any smoke away from populated areas of York.</p> <p>Future development protection is given as one of the reasons for expansion of the SCA. - There are no plans within the recently approved Local Plan for any further significant quantity of new homes with the Strensall. Therefore the density of housing within Strensall will not increase.</p> <p>The Affordability Impact Assessment data included in the proposal is fundamentally flawed and out of date (March 2022). Households will have been burning more in recent years due to cost of living crisis. The world has changed since March 2022. The costs of gas and electricity (burdened with government imposed green surcharges) have increased significantly and continue to do so. The cost of living crisis and high levels of inflation mean that more and more households are struggling to 'make ends meet' and are turning to alternative ways to stay warm and heat their homes. The government has removed the Winter Fuel Allowance for the majority of pensioners, forcing more and more households into fuel poverty. Log burners and open fires allow residents to stay warm without incurring high utility bills. The proposal cites the November 2023 campaign, "Fuel for Thought" claiming that 34% of people surveyed used their stoves less than in previous years. Again this data is out of date. Due to the very high cost of gas and electricity caused by the Russian invasion of Ukraine and the British government's imposition of 'Green levies', people are using their log burners even more.</p> <p>Concentrations of PM2,5 within the York Area are already below the UK health-based Air Quality Objectives and will be even lower in a rural village on the periphery of the York boundary. There is no evidence to indicate that there is a Particulate Matter problem in Strensall. - Either in the past, present or future, as there is no large scale housing development in the local Plan for Strensall.</p>

This proposal appears to be a 'box ticking' exercise to satisfy certain political and environmental activist campaigns and initiatives.

There is no smoke pollution problem in Strensall.

Applying a York wide SCA is totally unnecessary and does not fix any problems. There is no problem to fix in the first place in Strensall.

The current SCA zones and map are not confusing as commented recently by a City of York Councillor- They are crystal clear and can be easily found on the City of York Council website.

Both myself and friends, neighbours and other people I know in Strensall are not aware of any smoke problems or complaints about smoke , - ever.

This is a cruel, poorly thought out and ill targeted proposal.

It will cause financial stress to many households in Strensall. - Households who cannot afford to upgrade their appliance, or cease burning scavenged wood from their own & neighbours gardens.

Many of these residents, relying on older stoves or open fires will be elderly people , who have just lost their Winter Fuel Allowance and are struggling with the cost of living crisis.

The proposal document talks about Human Rights. It is a fundamental Human Right to stay warm, even if you cannot afford utility bills from energy suppliers.

Imposing unnecessary restrictions in a rural village where the PM2.5 levels are already way below the UK based health quality levels seems to be State interference in the basic freedoms of the individual, simply in order to 'tick some boxes'.

This is just another example of an urban focused council attacking the traditional rural way of life. It is unnecessary and cruel to include Strensall within these proposals.

Using highly inaccurate EPC data from 3 years ago as a basis for impact assessment is flawed and unacceptable. There is no problem in Strensall. There are no more large developments planned for

	Strensall. It is unnecessary to apply restrictions, anxiety and more financial pain on it's residents. I robustly object to the proposal to designate the whole of York as a SCA.
105	Why should my rural village be lumped into this zone for the administritive convenience of the council when there is no problem with smoke. An open fire is my sole source of heating
106	We don't have a choice, we don't have gas in the village where we live. Our house floods and often needsnto be dried out at extra cost off course
107	Our home has had an open fire for the past 150years, which heats the small sitting room when temperatures are low, we have no gas to the village and if the proposed smoke control area includes our village the only means of having a fire would be electric, which as you will know is the most expensive form of heating. We are pensioners and have had our winter fuel payment taken from us and have found the last winter unbearable at times.
108	<p>Since the dawn of time humans have burnt wood to keep warm and to cook with and the Parish Council see no reason to extend the existing smoke control areas in York nor to increase the relatively 'light touch' current enforcement of current areas and restrictions. From an air quality perspective the imperative for change and greater enforcement can not be justified, certainly in Dunnington, air quality monitoring doesn't indicate an issue.</p> <p>Ordinary people supplementing their household heating by using open wood burning fires or enclosed wood burning stoves should be left to make that decision themselves, as most fires will be DEFRA approved stoves and if they are not presently they will eventually be brought up to date during household appliance renewals.</p> <p>The unintended consequences of banning open wood burning fires on already struggling public houses cannot be underestimated. Log burners provide an off grid, reliable source of heat during power outages (which seem to be on the increase across Europe), natural disasters or energy supply crises. For low income households, especially in the winter months, wood can be a cheaper option which is critical during this current cost of living crisis.</p> <p>This could be a slippery slope to personal freedom and some residents may perceive as this as government overreach. Controlling our energy source could be seen as an infringement of personal liberty and choices, particularly as alternatives are seemingly becoming more unreliable.</p> <p>CYC's urban pollution concerns do not justify the plans to start monitoring rural areas where there is already clean air</p>

109	I have never had a problem with air quality when walking round the area I live in and do not feel that making the whole of the YCC area would benefit anyone. I feel this would penalise anyone who has an older house and who have kept the original features or who live in an area where there is only electric available. I do not feel that this policy adds anything to our local environment and would ask how this would be policed? I feel it would also give neighbours who do not get on the ability to report, as they did in covid times, leading to neighbourhood tensions that police would have to deal with, adding to their already busy load.
110	Rufforth does not have mains gas supply so the ability to supplement heating by use of a log burner, stove or open fire is important to the village residents.
111	In the push for achieving Net Zero for the year 2050, it seems quite backwards to force people to use more oil (a fossil fuel) for heating their homes. We currently use sustainably sourced logs (seasoned or kiln dried) to provide most of the heating in our home during the colder months, which I know a number of other local residents do too. We are not financially able to switch our oil heating system over to air sourced or to install solar panels. Nor would we currently have sufficient finances to switch our log burner over to a DEFRA approved burner type. This will result in us using more fossil fuels to keep our home warm. There will be a number of others in a similar position to us. How badly polluted is the air in the small villages on the outskirts of York? I suspect that it is actually very low.
112	Naburn is not connected to the gas infrastructure. Most residential properties have for generations been heated by open fires using a combination of coal or smokeless fuel and logs. Walking around the village in the winter months it is obvious that open fires are in operation but there is no evidence that there is smoke pollution. The implications of the proposal will be yet another cost to the householder & eliminate an efficient & traditional way of heating homes.
113	York council need to ensure our villages have a gas supply if they are going to stop us from using our multi fuel burners.
114	You say you will take financial concerns as mitigating circumstances when levying a fine however people with low incomes tend to live in areas of deprivation. And this means neighbours are likely to have health issues. By being lenient with one householder you will continue to expose family members an neighbours to danger and cause/exacerbate health issues. Please find solutions that stop the burning/the belief the householder has no other options. Please also do more to alert residents to the dangers. I don't believe asking people to act responsibly is sufficient. Forcing people to confront the effects of consequences on themselves, their children, their grandchildren, their parents, their visitors with images such as those on cigarette packets and the cost of illhealth - 20 years of not being able to work will cost... etc

115	<p>This is needless additional control over residents, we live in Poppleton surrounded by open fields, most PM2.5 particles around here come from either the busy A59 or A19 so what effect would this additional control on residents provide? Zero! and this comes from Council who block/close roads to create more air pollution, have the main household waste tip in the centre of York which again causes more air pollution. I notice Bonfire is not covered! so it's ok to pollute on one night but not the others! Double standards there! I think the council have more pressing matters to deal without this pointless extra regulations for residents who are not in the centre of York and most of the pollution is actually traffic that cant get into or out the city and this proposal will do feck all for that.</p>
116	<p>I'm completely in favour of this and can't see any good reason not to expand the Smoke Control Area to my village and other outlying villages. I understand some people feel strongly about using wood-burning stoves etc, but the reality is that sometimes we need to change our habits for the sake of public health and the climate. I realise there will be objections from people who don't want to give up what they're used to. In fact, I came across this in a village Facebook group, which seemed to be encouraging people to object, but clean air is essential, not optional. Breathing polluted air shouldn't be the price we pay for outdated heating methods. It would be great if we could also further educate people who are using wood burning stoves etc how bad it is for them in their own homes. I hope the council will be bold and push this through.</p>
117	<p>I support responsible use of fireplaces and multi fuel stoves. CYC should be more proactive in raising awareness of this issues. Areas outside of the ring road are generally more rural in character. I have chosen to live here, one of the main reasons being that it was NOT a smokeless zone. I believe that levels of air pollution are generally lower in these areas than inside the ring road. With responsible and considered use of solid fuels I do not see the need to declare these neighbourhoods smokeless.</p>
118	<p>I support improving the city's overall air quality and achieving this goal. However, it should not be forced onto residents in this manner and should allow for a phased and timely transition giving residents adequate time to update and upgrade their appliances, many of whom rely on for heating and cooking in the surrounding villages of York. This will also negatively impact local businesses who legitimately supply seasoned firewood to thousands of homes within York and the surrounding area.</p>
119	<p>I can understand the need for stricter control within an urban environment due to the number of properties in close proximity. I do not think it is appropriate to extend such controls into a rural setting where properties are more sparse and may need traditional heating rather than a reliance on gas / electric.</p>
120	<p>This is a total waste of time and money. Strensall should not be included. There is no problem. The council should stop wasting money on activities like this. The residents of Strensall have been using Wood Burning Stoves for years without causing any problems for anyone. The reasons and data given by the council for this initiative are</p>

	weak,flawed and out of date.There is no smoke problem in Strensall and surrounding areas.This seems to be a 'politically driven' initiative to support a nonsense government agenda of net zero. Wood burning stoves are sustainable and environmentally friendly.
121	The Council should lobby government to extend smoke control to outside of properties (bonfires, etc.)
122	At a time of great pressure on household budgets, how can you expect people to replace or update their wood burning stoves, especially in my area where there is no access to mains gas?
123	My use of a wood burning stove is to supplement heating provided by an air source heat pump which was installed for its environmental benefits. Unfortunately it can't cope with demands of heating an old rural property hence the need for additional heating. Restricting the use of home-sourced logs leaves few practical options for heating for people like me.
124	Rufforth has no gas mains supply so we are dependent on oil fired central heating.
125	<p>These proposals are too much of a 'blunt tool', and risk undermining existing good practice that is less harmful to the environment than their implementation would be.</p> <p>- I am opposed to stipulating the wood burnt must be kiln dried: It is essential that all wood burned is low moisture (below 20%). this can be achieved without buying kiln dried wood. Kiln dried would potentially incur more CO2 emissions through its production and transportation costs. This consequence directly contradicts the council's own Climate Emergency policies. Whereas there is local produced wood, from suppliers and in residents' gardens that can season naturally. Remember many of these outer villages have a plentiful supply of aging trees that is part of a natural cycle.</p> <p>- I am opposed to stipulating all woodburning stoves must be DEFRA approved: I support all stoves installed from now being DEFRA approved. However existing stoves that are in use and cannot be changed with kits should be permitted to be in use until they have ended their lifecycle. Otherwise the rules potentially cause wastage of good resources and emissions through production and transportation of new appliances (just pushing the problem elsewhere). To be clear, it is not a solution to suggest that 'older stoves can be used burning smokeless fuel', this notion is undermined by my first point, as in the virtues of burning naturally seasoned locally produced wood.</p>

	<p>- I am opposed to stipulating open fires must burn smokeless fuel: As previously explained all appliances and open fires should be able to burn low moisture local wood.</p> <p>Instead of the proposed regulations I would support further raising public awareness on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - importance of regular sweeping of chimney's - how to optimize combustion - the importance of seasoned wood
126	<p>I do not support the extension of the smokeless zone to Poppleton.</p> <p>I recognise and support CYC's commitment to clean air and reducing the impact of PM10 and PM2.5 particles on public health. I also recognise that the Council does not seek to ban the burning of solid fuels but seeks to stipulate compliant stoves and fuels. I also support the Council's public awareness campaign on this issue.</p> <p>However, I do believe that extending the zone into Poppleton and similar outlying York areas should not proceed for several reasons. Sources of PM2.5 and PM10 are many and varied. Given the varied sources and nature of PM2.5 particles, I believe that targeting solid fuel burning is misdirected and risks alienating many people in the proposed extension zones. Sources that effect people include road transport from vehicles exhaust fumes, tyre dust and brake wear not to mention from road erosion. Poppleton has very low levels of traffic and I would assert that exposure to road transport induced PM2.5 particles is relatively low.</p> <p>I live in Nether Poppleton very close to the boundary of the proposed smokeless zone and therefore close to agricultural areas. It is common for agricultural waste to be spread on land around Poppleton which is a source of ammonia. This would be true for the other proposed areas which are similar in character to Poppleton. Ammonia reacts with nitrogen oxides to form ammonium nitrate PM2.5 particulates which can travel long distances. Indeed, pollen and even sea spray can contribute to PM2.5 particles. Burning scented candles indoors has a similar effect. I'm not seeing a proposed ban on candle sales.</p> <p>Not being a smokeless zone is one of the reasons I chose to live in Poppleton. That said, I have always taken a responsible attitude to solid fuel burning by using seasoned wood with a moisture content less than 20%. I am aware that numerous houses in the area have solid fuel stoves. Despite this, I cannot recall ever even smelling solid fuel smoke in winter and have not noticed any impingement on air quality. This suggests to me that people are already adopting a responsible and common sense approach to their local air quality. Our house is also old, and we rely on</p>

	<p>our wood burner, and intermittently used open fire, to supplement our central heating in the colder months despite double glazing, cavity wall insulation, increased loft insulation and under floor insulation.</p> <p>Regulating for kiln dried wood offsets the problem and runs contrary to the Council's climate commitments. Without knowing the provenance of kiln dried wood, it is possible that drying the wood has a significant CO2 footprint, releases VOCs and if biomass is used for heating the kiln, displaces particulates elsewhere. There is also a network of wood fuel suppliers that provide locally sources sustainable wood fuel that is well seasoned. Insisting on kiln dried wood will destroy many people's livelihoods.</p> <p>As an alternative I make some recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Do more to raise public awareness about air pollution and quality. This can be to promote wood fuel seasoned for more than 2 years with a moisture contents less than 20%, regular servicing and sweeping of chimney/flues. I would even support the Council stipulating that people have their chimneys/flues swept. I believe that this will have a greater positive impact on people complying than imposing regulations which would be unenforceable. ii. Work with farmers to reduce the air quality impact of manure management, and fertilizer application. This could be positive publicity for CYC. iii. Promote less reliance on car transport. This can extend to more cycling routes – York's outlying areas have poor cycle provision – the very areas to which you propose extending the smokeless zone. iv. Raise awareness of other sources of PM 2.5 and what people can do to mitigate exposure.
127	The population density of housing in Rufforth is not so great as to require a smokeless zone. One size does not need to fit all. Within an urban environment I can see the need for control, but not within an open rural area.
128	The proposals are really necessary to improve the air quality. I don't believe that my neighbours know or are concerned about what they are allowed to burn.
129	We live in a listed property which is very leaky and the log burner is the only way of effectively heating the house when it is very cold. Most of the properties in Naburn have the same problem. Naburn is rural and log burner smoke will not have the same impact as in a built up area. If the enforcement comes in to play we will have to consider moving as it is impossible to effectively heat our house without the log burner.
130	We have no gas supply in Rufforth and while I am particular in what type of wood I burn I feel that this proposal goes too far.

131	Making the villages smoke free zones will have minimal impact on air quality which is already very good. Requiring residents to change stoves and buy smoke free fuel is an unnecessary added cost.
132	This initiative to penalise rural villages and communities is a complete waste of taxpayers' money. There are no smoke problems in the countryside.
133	I agree with the advice/guidance but 'No smoke' is impossible to achieve on start up therefore renders the rules impossible to comply with
134	We live in a rural area with no mains gas supply. We have reduced our use of fossil fuels (oil) by changing to a biomass fuelled boiler for heating and hot water. The house is a listed building (grade 2) and is not well insulated. Seasonal use of wood-burning stoves, covered by the exemptions, should continue to be allowed. Where stoves do not meet the exemption there needs to be a period of notice before enforcing any change of the zone, so that any residents affected can make changes in an affordable manner, i.e. have time to save or budget for the expense of changing
135	<p>While I fully support City of York Council's commitment to improving air quality and reducing the impact of PM10 and PM2.5 particulates on public health, I do not believe that extending the smokeless zone to Poppleton is an appropriate course of action.</p> <p>I acknowledge that the Council is not seeking to ban solid fuel burning outright but rather to ensure the use of compliant stoves and fuels. I also support the Council's efforts to raise public awareness on this issue. However, I believe that expanding the smokeless zone into Poppleton and similar outlying areas requires further reconsideration for several reasons.</p> <p>The sources of PM2.5 and PM10 particulates are numerous and varied. By focusing primarily on solid fuel burning, the proposed extension may be misdirected, potentially alienating many residents in the affected areas. Significant contributors to PM2.5 pollution include vehicle exhaust, tyre dust, brake wear, and road erosion. Given Poppleton's low traffic levels, exposure to these pollutants is likely minimal compared to more urban areas.</p> <p>Additionally, as a resident of Nether Poppleton near the boundary of the proposed zone, I am aware of the impact of agricultural activities in the area. The spreading of agricultural waste on nearby land releases ammonia, which reacts with nitrogen oxides to form ammonium nitrate PM2.5 particulates—capable of traveling considerable distances. Other natural sources, such as pollen and sea spray, also contribute to PM2.5 levels. Indoor activities, such as burning scented candles, can have a similar effect, yet no restrictions are proposed on such products.</p>

	<p>I have always taken a responsible approach to solid fuel burning, ensuring that I use seasoned wood with a moisture content below 20%. I have never noticed an impact on air quality, nor have I detected smoke during winter months from other households. This suggests that residents are already exercising common sense and care regarding their local air quality.</p> <p>My home is Victorian, and I rely on my wood burner and open fire to supplement central heating in colder months. Regulation requiring kiln-dried wood presents additional concerns, as its environmental footprint remains uncertain. Drying processes may contribute to CO2 emissions, release volatile organic compounds, and, if biomass is used for heating kilns, relocate particulate pollution elsewhere—all of which contradict the Council’s climate commitments. For these reasons, I urge the Council to reconsider the proposed extension to the smokeless zone in Poppleton and similar outlying areas. A more comprehensive approach to air quality should take into account a wider range of pollution sources and their relative impact on affected communities.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>
136	<p>In the more rural areas of York, the decision on what to burn in a stove should be left to the individual, being aware of the health risks involved. Housing is sufficiently dispersed so the particulates make do not affect air quality outside of the home any more than traffic would. The Guardian had an article on the subject which said that DEFRA stoves emit almost as many particulates as other stoves, and the exemptions for bonfires etc make a mockery of the policy anyway. There is an environmental cost to kiln drying wood to make it legal and it is also more expensive. People in the rural areas often air dry fallen trees, providing free disposal service, which costs nothing to the resident who eventually burns the wood. Many rural villages do not have a gas supply, so burning wood is essential to keep some residents warm. Finally, how do you police the policy without resorting to big brother tactics and forcing entry into people's home, when the are doing nothing which will harm their neighbours - only themselves?</p>
137	<p>This would cause problems to us and other local residents some of which don't have gas mains</p>
138	<p>we need our open fire to heat our house and use wood from our garden. it is always seasoned. gas heating is very expensive and the winter fuel allowance has ended, it is how we manage our household finances.</p>

Table D2 – Comments received via email / letter

Email Response No.	Comment	Respondent Type
1	<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible terms regarding the legislation to make Naburn a smoke free area. Naburn is a small rural village completely separate to York the village consists of mainly properties in a non urban type environment ie space between the individual properties. The village has no gas supply so sources of heating are limited and the majority of houses are heated by oil or biomass boilers ,this legislation is unfairly victimising people of Naburn. The majority of houses in the village are older and wouldn't be suitable for air source heat pumps due to the method of construction used without undertaking much improvement work at considerable cost to the residents. I feel that this legislation hasn't been thought out and is grossly unfair to residents in the rural villages in York City Council area.</p>	Resident
2	<p>Dear York council, You have put a notice order in towthorpe regarding smoke protection. Can you please explain in plain English exactly what this means, to the house holds under the York council who have a log burner for heating and a back boiler to heat their water!! Are you saying that any one with a log burner to heat their home can't use it from June 25, therefore must spend thousands of pounds installing some other type of heating or go cold this winter. A explanation would be grateful. I await your response.</p>	Resident
3	<p>I wish to object to the imposition of this order on the residents of Naburn on the following grounds;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no justification for this applying to Naburn unless you have scientifically validated data to suggest otherwise. 2. Most houses use oil fired central heating supplemented by solid fuel. There is no gas supply to the village. 3. The notice about this was skilfully hidden and seemingly the council want neither a consultation nor any objections. 	Resident
4	<p>It has been brought to my attention a recently posted notice within the village of Askham Richard regarding a smoke control initiative. There is a concern, especially from the elderly</p>	Parish Council

	<p>residents, who have coal and log burning methods of heating, that this could have an effect on their current status. Could you advise, in plain english, what, if any, the effect this order will have upon the village households. Thanking you for your attention.</p>	
5	<p>I am writing as a resident of Stockton on the Forest to formally object to the proposal to extend the Smoke Control Area (SCA) across the entire City of York Council area. I use a solid fuel stove as part of my home heating system and, importantly, it is already DEFRA-approved. While I take air quality concerns seriously, I believe the current proposal is disproportionate and unnecessarily penalizes responsible users like myself.</p> <p>1. Minimal Number of Affected Households According to the Council’s own figures, only 98 households across the entire CYC area use solid fuel as their primary heat source and fall outside the current SCA. Implementing a sweeping policy that affects thousands of households to address such a small number appears excessive — particularly when many of us, including myself, are already compliant.</p> <p>2. Data Used Is Outdated and Fails to Reflect the Ongoing Cost-of-Living Crisis The analysis underpinning this proposal relies on EPC data from March 2022, which is now outdated and does not take into account the significant changes in household circumstances since then. Over the past three years, residents have faced record-high energy prices, inflation, and a worsening cost-of-living crisis — all of which have made solid fuels a more financially viable and necessary option for many households. It's highly likely that more families are now turning to solid fuel, especially in rural areas like mine, for affordability and security of supply. Relying on pre-crisis data underrepresents the real number of people who may be affected, particularly those who are already vulnerable or financially constrained. Implementing restrictions based on outdated assumptions risks disproportionately punishing those already facing hardship.</p> <p>3. Disproportionate Impact on Rural and Responsible Users Rural communities like mine often use solid fuels for practical and economic reasons. Many rural homes are older, poorly insulated, or entirely off the gas grid, making solid fuel stoves one of the few effective and affordable ways to keep homes warm during cold weather. As someone who has already invested in a DEFRA-approved stove and uses it responsibly, I take pride in using cleaner-burning methods. Applying a blanket restriction to compliant users, particularly those in properties with limited alternatives, seems punitive and unnecessarily burdensome.</p>	Resident

4. Lack of Local Pollution Evidence

The proposal states that PM2.5 levels across York are already below national limits, and no evidence has been provided that villages like Stockton on the Forest significantly contribute to pollution. Without specific, localised data demonstrating a public health risk in my area, applying the same restrictions citywide lacks reasonable justification.

5. Legal and Policy Overreach

The Clean Air Act allows discretion in setting SCAs — it does not mandate total coverage. In the absence of robust, recent evidence or clear necessity, proceeding with a blanket approach may be seen as exceeding the Council's remit and could risk undermining public confidence.

6. Inconsistency in Exemptions for Outdoor Burning

The proposed SCA continues to allow burning through outdoor sources such as barbecues and pizza ovens, even though these can also contribute to particulate pollution — especially in built-up or enclosed areas. It seems inconsistent that outdoor recreational burning is permitted while indoor wood-burning stoves, often used responsibly and as part of essential heating, are subject to tight restrictions. This inconsistency undermines the argument that this proposal is based purely on reducing emissions and protecting health.

7. Solid Fuel Systems Are Often More Efficient and Practical for Rural Heating

Modern solid fuel stoves, particularly DEFRA-approved models, can offer superior thermal efficiency and localized heat compared to central heating systems or electric heating, especially in older rural homes with poor insulation. Solid fuel systems allow households to heat the spaces they use most, reducing wasted energy. They are also more reliable during power outages — a concern not uncommon in more remote areas. Replacing or restricting solid fuel appliances may force households to rely on less efficient, more expensive, and less sustainable heating alternatives, potentially increasing both emissions and financial strain.

8. Risk of Unintended Consequences and Energy Inefficiencies

This proposal could inadvertently lead to less sustainable outcomes. Households who are no longer able to use solid fuels may resort to inefficient electric heaters during peak hours, increasing both demand on the grid and their energy bills. Depending on the time of day and the energy mix, this could actually increase overall emissions, especially where fossil fuels still make up part of the UK's electricity generation. Others may turn to unregulated

outdoor burning, such as fire pits or chimineas, which fall outside SCA enforcement but can still contribute to local air pollution. The policy risks encouraging worse alternatives in an attempt to restrict a form of heating that is, in many cases, already being used responsibly.

9. Lack of Transitional Support for Affected Households

There appears to be little to no provision for financial or practical support to help households transition away from solid fuel use if needed. For low-income, elderly, or rural residents, the cost of replacing appliances or switching to more expensive fuels can be significant. A fair policy must include meaningful assistance — such as grants, advisory support, or phased implementation — for those who would be most affected by such changes.

10. Greater Impact Could Be Achieved by Addressing Methane Slip in Gas Boilers

If the goal is to achieve meaningful reductions in air pollution and climate-related emissions, I urge the Council to instead focus and consider regulating methane slip from domestic gas boilers, which remain widespread throughout York. Methane slip refers to the unburned methane that escapes during combustion or from leaks in gas systems. Methane is over 80 times more potent than CO₂ over a 20-year period in terms of its climate impact, and it also contributes to ground-level ozone, which worsens respiratory illness and cardiovascular disease. Unlike wood-burning stoves, which are often localized and already heavily regulated, methane slip occurs across tens of thousands of conventional boilers and remains largely unaddressed. Policies targeting this issue could deliver significantly greater environmental and health benefits with broader reach.

11. Insufficient Community Engagement

Lastly, I question the adequacy of local engagement and communication regarding this proposal. Many residents of Stockton on the Forest were not aware of this policy change until very recently, despite its potentially serious impact. Communities should be fully consulted — not just via citywide publicity — before major regulatory changes are introduced, especially when they affect how people heat their homes.

Given the scale of this proposal and the number of residents it will affect across both urban and rural areas, I also urge the Council to undertake a more thorough, citywide public consultation process. This should go beyond online feedback and legal notices — and include public meetings, engagement with parish councils, and clear outreach to affected households. A policy with such broad implications requires a fair and accessible

	<p>consultation process that gives residents the opportunity to properly understand, question, and respond to what is being proposed.</p> <p>Request</p> <p>I respectfully request that City of York Council either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Exempt areas like Stockton on the Forest, where there is no identified air quality issue and many residents already use DEFRA-approved appliances; or -Introduce a more targeted or tiered approach, focusing only on areas with proven air quality issues. <p>Should the proposal proceed as currently outlined, I ask that my objection be formally recorded and that I be informed of any public inquiry or a further opportunity to make representations to the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Closing Summary</p> <p>In closing, I strongly urge the Council to reconsider the breadth and bluntness of this proposal. A citywide Smoke Control Area may appear to offer consistency on paper, but it unfairly impacts responsible rural residents, risks unintended environmental consequences, and is based on outdated data. I support the goal of reducing harmful emissions, but this policy overreaches, lacks flexibility, and does not reflect the lived reality of many households in communities like mine. A more balanced, evidence-led approach would better serve both the environment and the public. Thank you for considering my views.</p>	
6	<p>I would like to object to the plans to prohibit wood burning stoves in Skelton. Like many rural homes I rely on my wood burner to keep small areas of my home warm, and there are many in Skelton with no gas</p>	Resident
7	<p>In order for us to be able to respond to the consultation for expanding the Smoke Control Area into Rural West York, we would be very interested to know what the air quality is in the seven villages and farmsteads which make up the ward and how that compares with public safety standards. We would appreciate your sending us that information in the next week before the May Parish Council meeting cycle starts on Wednesday 7 June with Askham Richard PC. Many properties in the ward are not connected to the gas network and so residents burn wood in their hearths. Are domestic fires excluded from the rules? Whenever a tree falls in the ward, especially when there is a storm or the tree is diseased, residents normally recover the wood and dry it for use in their stoves. It would be a shame if such a useful resource could no longer be put to good use and had to be disposed of at</p>	Councillor

	considerable cost – sometimes to CYC or a cash-strapped parish council. We look forward to receiving the data on clean air quality in our ward.	
8	Since my ancient gas boiler died last year, I have been using my wood stove, (which is on the Defra Exempt list, serviced regularly, I use kiln dried wood, by design to keep emissions low) to heat my home whilst I save up to outfit my home with a heat pump. I don't earn enough to be considered earning enough to live modestly on, but earn enough not to be able to claim benefit top ups. So it is a big deal to save for new heating. So whilst the changes don't effect me, as I have exempt status, I do think that you could spare a thought for my neighbours across the road (aged 96 and 78) whose small old farm house non central heated home is powered by solid fuel. Whatever they can get their hands on cheap, they don't have much, no holidays for them. We are a village here surrounded by fields. Apparently we are urban enough here for you to ban my elderly neighbours from heating their home, but too rural for you to provide a bus service for them to get their groceries. Make your changes but provide free insulation and free heat pumps to the villagers affected not just those on benefits, the squeezed lower too. Not everyone in Knapton lives at the posh end. Some of us have to bike everywhere, and ration energy in Winter	Resident
9	I'm writing to express my objection to the proposed expansion of the smoke control order in York. We have a wood burner and with the excessively expensive utility bills use it in the winter to heat our home. I notice that briquettes will still be allowed ... but these are also very expensive. Dunnington is a rural area and there fire do not see the need for the expansion.	Resident
10	I'm writing to express my objection to the proposed expansion of the smoke control order in York. We have a wood burner and with the excessively expensive utility bills use it in the winter to heat our home. I notice that briquettes will still be allowed ... but these are also very expensive. Dunnington is a rural area and therefore I do not see the need for the expansion.	Resident <i>(comments almost identical to respondent 9)</i>
11	I haven't voted for this measure. It us ridiculous given the price of gas and electricity that you are preventing alternative heating sources. You are causing fuel poverty. Try focusing on measures which will improve safety in the city by cutting out crime associated with hen and stag do every weekend. This is a much greater risk	Resident (via webpage comment)

12	I fully support the Council's proposal to extend the Smoke Control areas.	Resident (via webpage comment)
13	I would agree of smoke free areas in York. But not in the country on the outside of the city of york	Resident (via webpage comment)
14	<p>Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council have some serious concerns over the proposals to extend the smoke free zone over the entirety of the authority area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rufforth and Knapton are traditional rural villages with many of the properties featuring open fires which are regularly used to supplement central heating. Rufforth has no connection to the gas supply network meaning that residents have no alternative to oil central heating with it's corresponding relative cost. 2. A significant proportion of residents within the Parish are of pensionable age and many can be categorized as "asset rich, cash poor" - a group about which CYC has expressed considerable concern over recent years. Such people do not have the wherewithal to adapt their heating arrangements to comply with the new regulations and equally rely on their open fires to keep warm in winter. 3. At a time when winter fuel payments have been withdrawn and when CYC are spending considerable time and effort on initiatives such as encouraging uptake of pension credit and "keep warm" grants it seems perverse to cast more burdens on this vulnerable group of people. 4. We note in the consultation notes that the Council intend to take a considered approach to prosecution of non compliance but this will not prevent the fear of prosecution causing distress and resulting in vulnerable people suffering the consequences of being cold. 5. It is our belief that these proposals have been put forward as a simplistic city wide approach with no consideration for rural communities such as ours and evidenced by the lack of prior consultation with parish councils. 	Parish Council
15	<p>I write to object to City of York Council's (CoYC) plans to impose and enforce a Smoke Control Order across its entire administrative area. I live in Naburn and object to the proposed order on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public health impact: 	Resident

Naburn is a small rural village surrounded by farmland. The minimal smoke created by the domestic heating appliances of a population of fewer than 500 people disperses across open fields and pastures. It is not concentrated, and prevented from dispersing, by tall buildings (as happens in densely populated, built-up areas). The public health impact of the Proposed Order will therefore be negligible.

2. Financial impact on residents:

a. Naburn, despite being located less than 4 miles from York Minster, does not benefit from a mains gas supply. Residents are therefore reliant on oil or LPG as main heating sources, putting us at a significant financial disadvantage compared to other residents in the CoYC area. Many Naburn residents have woodburning stoves and open fires as supplemental heating sources to mitigate their high heating costs. Prohibiting us from using those supplemental sources will increase that already substantial financial disadvantage.

b. The branded manufactured solid fuels that would be permitted for use under the Proposed Order are prohibitively expensive compared to the cost of well-dried logs many currently burn - compounding our financial disadvantage.

c. Setting aside the environmental cost of disposing of several hundred existing appliances, the many hundreds of pounds it will cost to remove existing appliances, and purchase and install one of those on the DEFRA exempt appliances list, will further exacerbate the financial impact of the Proposed Order.

3. Inadequate consultation and publicity:

I do not believe residents have been given adequate, accessible information on the Proposed Order, its implications, and their right to object. This is not "public consultation" as announced by CoYC. Disappointingly, I view this a deliberate attempt to minimise public awareness of the Proposed Order, and the volume of objections to it.

	<p>a. The Clean Air Act Public Notice is posted on a single lamp post in the village. It is folded around the lamp post and laminated, making it difficult to read, especially in bright conditions (photos attached). The notice has not been posted on the official Parish Council notice board, no notices have been posted in additional village locations, there has been no leaflet delivered to residents' homes, and no consultation meetings have been arranged and publicised. If residents don't happen to have walked past that one lamp post, noticed the poster affixed to it, and taken the (significant) time required to read it, they will remain unaware of the Proposed Order.</p> <p>b. The Clean Air Act Public Notice consists of multiple paragraphs of dense, technical text, with a Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level of 16.6, equivalent to academic papers studied at postgraduate level. This makes it entirely incomprehensible to many residents who may well be unaware of its implications, or their right to object (which appears some 700 words into the document) as a result. Councils are expected to communicate in plain English using clear, easy-to-understand language, avoiding jargon, technical terms, and complex sentence structures.</p>	
16	<p>In response to the invitation by CYC to contribute to the CYC Smoke Control Area Consultation Osbaldwick Parish Council respond thus;</p> <p>Since the dawn of time man has burnt wood to keep warm and to cook with and the Parish Council see no reason to extend the existing smoke control areas in York nor to increase the relatively 'light touch' current enforcement of current areas and restrictions.</p> <p>From an air quality perspective the imperative for change and greater enforcement can not be justified, certainly in Osbaldwick air quality monitoring doesn't indicate an issue and if it did then perhaps the large industrial wood burning plants at Derwenthorpe and York University ought to be addressed first.</p> <p>Ordinary people supplementing their household heating by using open wood burning fires or enclosed wood burning stoves should be left alone as most fires will be DEFRA approved stoves and if they aren't will eventually be brought up to date during normal household appliance renewals.</p> <p>The unintended consequences of banning open wood burning fires on already struggling public houses can not be underestimated.</p>	Parish Council

	<p>Certainly in Osbaldwick and Murton Parishes faced with acre upon acre of incendiary BESS installations it is bizarre to for the local authority to be seeking to impose restrictions on wood burning by citizens when the impact of a BESS thermal runaway event or minor fire would far out way the emissions and pollution if every household in the two Parishes burnt wood for heating and cooking!</p> <p>Similarly the regular burning of cable at the Osbaldwick & Gypsy Caravan Site and the previous burning of scrap fridges/freezers that saw no enforcement action by CYC will have and has had a much greater impact on local air quality than more restrictions on wood burning.</p> <p>City of York Council and the clearly overburdened Environmental Protection Unit ought to be tasked with more important matters that are clearly of interest to residents.</p>	
17	<p>Both myself and my next door neighbour object most strongly to the proposal to enlarge the smokeless zone to the whole of the York area for no good reason other than it is easier for the council. We live in a rural village with no similarities to a York urban environment and where smoke is no problem. The open fire is my sole source of heating and next door uses his for the majority of his heat kindly leave us alone we do not need saving from your spurious excuse of saving us from the effects of pollution.</p>	Resident
18	<p>I would like to object to the proposed smoke control order, which I understand is open to consultation and I would like to make the following points.</p> <p>I believe the consultation process is inadequate. I live in Naburn & there is one single laminated poster on a lamp post.</p> <p>There are none on any notice boards, websites, parish council information or other public areas. I do not believe that this can be considered a proper consultation.</p> <p>We are a small village & the public health impact on us would be negligible compared to a crowded city. Houses are more dispersed, we are surrounded by trees, fields and open spaces.</p> <p>It would have a big financial impact on many residents.</p> <p>We don't have mains gas so are already at a disadvantage. We have no choice but oil, LPG or solid fuel for heating & cooking.</p> <p>Most houses have an open fire or would burner and prohibiting their use would be a financial burden.</p>	Resident

	<p>The branded fuels suggested are typically more expensive compared to seasoned logs. Many of these fuels are imported which actually defeats the object when you consider getting the into the UK.</p> <p>Some people would have to get new appliances in order to comply, another huge individual cost and a total waste of resources.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my strong objections.</p>	
19	<p>We object to the above order due to the fact that older people use logs and logs to heat their houses and have done so for many years. It was one reason for us to move there and feel the use of small quantities of the above products should be allowed.</p>	Resident
20	<p>As a resident in Dunnington for over 15 years I object to the proposed extension of the smoke control area. We live in an area with low population and housing density where there is plenty of air movement between properties reducing the impact of smoke from chimneys. (We are surrounded by fields front and back of the property).</p> <p>We have an old house (built 1928) which is wholly unsuitable for modern heat source pumps etc and have installed 2 log burners - one of which is our primary source of heating in our main living/kitchen area. One was installed in 2011 and the second (the living area) in 2013 so before the DEFRA rules and both would require replacing at considerable cost. I object into the strongest terms.</p>	Resident
21	<p>I been a resident and pensioner of Rufforth rural village. I E-mail to object at including our Rufforth rural village into the Smoke free zone.</p> <p>1/ Rufforth is a traditional rural village with many properties with open fire witch are regularly used to supplement central heating . Rufforth has no connection to gas supply network witch means that residents have not alternative to oil central heating with high relative cost.</p> <p>2/ With winter fuel payments have been withdrawn York CC should be looking to help rural villages with heating restriction issues such as only oils heating option rather than impose smoke free zone proposal for rural villages.</p>	Resident

	<p>3/ In my opinion its is YCC 'one fits all solution proposal' this bring and not protecting rural residents that have very little options</p> <p>4/ I strongly object to rural villages been included in this proposal</p>	
22	<p>I OBJECT most strongly to you thinking of Revising the Smoke Control Order , we live in Naburn and are disabled pensioners , our heating and hot water is supplied via our coal fires , and has been for many years , as we are state pensioners we are finding things hard enough financially then for the government to remove our heating allowance on which we relied added to our financial burden .</p> <p>We are in no position to upgrade our present heating / hot water as we have not the funds . We think you people who suggest these changes should come down from your ivory towers and live in the real world .</p> <p>It appears to us you are trying implement these changes through lack of public awareness and your noiifaction leaves a lot to be desired.</p> <p>I OBJECT MOST STRONGLY</p>	Resident
23	<p>I write to object to this Smoke Control Order, Hessay being a small village on periphery of York area and should be excluded from this Smoke Control Area. Many people burn wood on there open fires or in there stoves, wood being readily available. It should be noted that smokeless fuel is difficult to light and requires paper and wood initially to get going creating smoke. At times bonfires are required particularly on celebrating bonfire night November 5th. At times bonfires are required necessary to clear rubbish and tree brash and so ban will interfere with farming practices.</p>	Resident
24	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of the Parish Council regarding proposals to expand the Smoke Control Area (SCA) in York.</p> <p>We are aware that there was a consultation which ran to 3rd June 2025 which we were advised, was a consultation for individuals and therefore I am writing to you to express the views of the Askham Bryan Parish Council.</p> <p>We appreciate there may be a need to have an SCA but equally, we feel that most rural environments differ significantly from such built up areas where close proximity of residential dwellings and businesses is a contributing factor.</p> <p>The rules in an SCAs concern make reference to emission of smoke from chimneys. Whilst small scale smoke emission may have an adverse effect on air quality in densely populated</p>	Parish Council (received after consultation closing date)

	<p>areas, in rural areas such as Askham Bryan and other such areas around York, such controls will have little effect beyond a de minimis amount due to the lack of population density. Spacing between housing and the sheer limited number of dwellings in a rural area effectively make emission of smoke of such limited impact and concern that we do not feel the perceived benefit in any way compensates for the inconvenience and costliness that any ban would cause to those living in such areas. Many homes in such areas already include fire places and stoves that are key to life in a rural Parish.</p> <p>We therefore do not support proposals to extend the SCA and rather would oppose such an extension.</p>	
--	---	--