

Peterborough Local Transport Plan – Strategic Environmental Assessment

SEA Statement

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
Background	2
2. THE SEA PROCESS	5
Role of the SEA Process in Developing the LTP2	5
Assessing the LTP2	7
3. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS	9

List of Tables

Table 3.1: Monitoring Programme	10
---------------------------------	----

1. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Due to the introduction of the 'Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004' local authorities in England and Wales are now required to carry out Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for a number of statutory documents, including Local Transport Plans. The SEA for the second Peterborough City Council Local Transport Plan (LTP2) began in late 2004, and this Statement is the last of three documents that have been produced as part of the process, namely the Scoping Report, the Environmental Report and this SEA Statement.

Scoping Report

- 1.2 This was the subject of consultation between 11 February and 18 March 2005. The Scoping Report detailed the environmental baseline and environmental issues/problems facing the Peterborough area, the LTP2 alternatives considered, the framework for which the SEA was to be carried out and proposed methods and actions for its completion. The purpose of the document was to allow statutory consultees and other consultation bodies to comment on and participate in the SEA process. The document was distributed to the four statutory consultees below:

- ◆ Countryside Agency
- ◆ Environment Agency
- ◆ English Nature
- ◆ English Heritage

and to those local environmental organisations whom the Council has consulted on other planning initiatives:

- ◆ Peterborough Environment City Trust
- ◆ British Waterways
- ◆ Forestry Commission

- ◆ Forest Enterprise
- ◆ British Horse Society
- ◆ Country Landowners Association
- ◆ Campaign for the Protection of Rural England
- ◆ Cyclist Touring Club
- ◆ Fenland Clarion Cycling Club
- ◆ Friends of the Earth
- ◆ Inland Waterways Association
- ◆ The Open Spaces Society
- ◆ Peterborough and District Angling Association
- ◆ Peterborough Natural History Society
- ◆ RSPB
- ◆ Royal Society for Nature Conservation
- ◆ The Woodland Trust
- ◆ The Wildlife Trust for Cambridgeshire
- ◆ Wildlife Trust.

1.3 The consultation responses were reviewed and taken into consideration in the preparation of the Environmental Report.

Environmental Report

1.4 This was the subject of consultation from 21 November to 23 December 2005. Additionally, the Draft Environmental Report and the Provisional LTP2 were the subject of a public exhibition, on 18 and 19 November 2005 at the Peterborough Town Hall, which was open to the public and attended by Peterborough City Council Officers. The report detailed how the Scoping Report consultation responses were considered, the assessment of the effects of the LTP2 proposals, measures & schemes, proposed mitigation measures, included recommendations to improve the environmental performance of the LTP2, and proposed a monitoring programme for the significant effects identified by the SEA. This was distributed to the same consultation bodies as the Scoping Report. The Provisional LTP2 was made available to the public for comment during this time period. The final version of the Environmental Report, taking account of responses arising from the

consultation on the Draft Environmental Report and Provisional LTP2, is available from the following website:

<http://www.peterborough.gov.uk/page-427>

SEA Statement

- 1.5 In response to the findings of the SEA and consultation on the Environmental Report a number of changes have been made to the LTP2. The purpose of the SEA Statement is to detail those alterations, present reasoning for choosing the plan as adopted, and why other reasonable alternatives were rejected, and confirming monitoring measures proposed in the Draft Environmental Report in light of the consultation responses received. This SEA Statement should be read together with the Final Environmental Report.

2. THE SEA PROCESS

ROLE OF THE SEA PROCESS IN DEVELOPING THE LTP2

- 2.1 The SEA has informed the development of the LTP2 through the entire plan preparation process. Initially, work undertaken for the Scoping Report in establishing the environmental baseline and identifying environmental issues/problems in the Peterborough area established opportunities and implications for the development of the LTP2. This was summarised in Table 3.1 (Environmental/Sustainability problems in Peterborough that are of relevance to the LTP) of the Scoping Report, and later published as Table 5.1 of the Environmental Report. These opportunities were considered in the development of the LTP2.
- 2.2 At the initial stages of developing the LTP2 a set of LTP2 objectives were devised based on those objectives identified by the first LTP. Two additional plan objectives were added to consider the large amount of growth predicted for Peterborough. An analysis was undertaken to test the compatibility between the LTP2 objectives and those objectives identified in the SEA. No potential conflicts were identified, although it was recognised that the nature of the LTP2 implementation measures would influence the LTP2 performance against certain SEA objectives. This was detailed in Table 6.2 of the Environmental Report, and provided an early indication of where the detailed environmental assessment, to be carried out in the next stage of the SEA process, could identify significant effects.
- 2.3 The SEA played a key role in identifying the reasonable alternatives considered in the development of the LTP2. Section 7 of the Environmental Report considered the analysis of alternatives, and should be read in conjunction with this section of the SEA Statement.
- 2.4 In developing the Provisional LTP2 a number of alternatives were considered, as set out in Table 7.1 of the Environmental Report, after the 'proposed approach' for each objective. This proposed approach was one that was pursued for each objective of the LTP2 as the plan was formulated. The LTP2 objectives, for which alternatives were considered, were:

- ◆ Accessibility – Better accessibility for all, with particular reference to those living in rural areas and those with mobility difficulties
- ◆ Economy – Support local economic performance by the provision of an integrated transport network
- ◆ Efficiency – Make the best use of existing transport infrastructure
- ◆ Environment – Reduce the environmental impacts of transport
- ◆ Healthy Travel – Improve community health by increasing walking and cycling and reducing transport related pollution
- ◆ Integration – Greater integration between different means of travel
- ◆ Safety – Reduce the number of personal injury accidents amongst all travellers
- ◆ Travel Choice – Increase choice and improve quality
- ◆ City Centre – Support the proposals to develop and enhance the City Centre
- ◆ Growth – To support and influence growth through travel solutions

2.5 For each objective of the LTP2, various alternatives were considered to achieve that objective, and the implications of those alternatives were summarised in Table 7.1 of the Environmental Report. Generally, ‘alternative 1’ tied into the ‘without the plan’ situation, and whether the need to travel can be obviated. ‘Alternative 2’ addressed whether technologies or methods can be applied, other than obvious or traditional methods. ‘Alternative 3’ examined methods for changing the proposed location. Finally, ‘alternative 4’ dealt with the timing and detailed implementation i.e. when, and in what sequence should developments be carried out? What details matter? What requirements should be made about them?

2.6 As a result of the analysis of alternatives it was considered that the proposed approach would be the most effective in terms of meeting the transport related objectives of the LTP2. Alternative approaches would generally be less

effective in this regard; for example, for the accessibility objective, the “no plan scenario” (alternative 1) would result in accessibility being worsened due to congestion and increased car usage; investing heavily in technology (alternative 2) would have limited benefits since it would not obviate the need to visit schools/health care facilities. Similarly, in relation to the objective for Healthy Travel, working in isolation without joined-up initiatives (alternative 1) would increase social exclusion; promoting alternative fuels (alternative 2) could improve air quality, but would not necessarily reduce numbers of trips.

- 2.7 The proposed approach also had beneficial implications for the environment in general terms, particularly in terms of improving air quality, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving the health and safety of the local population. Environmental impacts of alternative approaches tended to have negative implications. Construction of new roads and transport infrastructure, such as that advocated for alternative approaches for the economy objective (alternative 2 and alternative 3), could also have negative environmental impacts associated with land use. However, certain measures put forward could have beneficial impacts, such as identifying key corridors for ‘best use’ schemes (efficiency objective), and restricting car travel through sensitive environmental areas (environment objective).
- 2.8 For these reasons it was considered that there was limited scope for changing the proposed approach for the LTP2, however some areas required further investigation; for example paying greater attention to developing policies and programmes which respect local environmental sensitivities while delivering benefits to the greater proportion of the population.
- 2.9 The proposed approach led to the development of the measures and schemes contained within the Provisional LTP2, which were assessed as part of the Draft Environmental Report. Table 8.1 of the Environmental Report details those measures and schemes assessed as part of the SEA.

ASSESSING THE LTP2

- 2.10 The Environmental Report contained a detailed assessment of the proposals, schemes and measures contained within the provisional LTP2. The SEA identified potential environmental effects of LTP2 proposals, measures and schemes, both adverse and beneficial.

- 2.11 Two alternatives – with and without the inclusion of major schemes were assessed. When assessed without major schemes, the LTP2 was deemed to have a range of significant positive effects on various SEA objectives. Therefore no changes were recommended to be made to the non-major schemes component of the LTP2. However, a range of potential significant negative effects were identified with the inclusion of major schemes in the assessment. Although these major schemes will be subject to separate project based Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), the Environmental Report recommended the inclusion of a section in the LTP2 to outline how potential negative effects identified could be avoided or mitigated, and how potential positive effects could be further enhanced.
- 2.12 In response to the Environmental Report findings, the following alteration was made to the LTP2.
- ◆ Section 5 '*Transport Solutions*' was amended to summarise the findings of the SEA process with regards to the 'with' and 'without' plan assessment scenarios. Specifically, Section 5.3 '*LTP2 Programme*' was amended to refer to the overall SEA results, whilst describing general mitigation measures that may be used to mitigate any negative environmental effects identified as a result of new road infrastructure, the specifics of which would be determined through project based EIA. Section 5.4 '*Major Schemes*' was amended to include summary SEA assessments for the major schemes, and the priority LTP2 scheme has the specific SEA assessment detailed.

3. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

- 3.1 The Draft Environmental Report proposed a monitoring programme for those significant effects identified by the SEA of the LTP2. This can now be confirmed in Table 3.1. The SEA monitoring programme will be integrated into the LTP2 monitoring programme, and reported alongside LTP2 monitoring reports to be produced biannually.

Table 3.1: Monitoring Programme

Effect to be monitored	Indicator(s) to be used	Current source of monitoring data and frequency of monitoring	Suggested frequency of review/analysis of monitoring data	Responsibility for undertaking monitoring	When should remedial action be considered?	What remedial action could be taken?
Effect on biodiversity, including characteristic habitats and species throughout their range (negative)	Number and area of Nature Conservation Designated ¹ sites lost due to LTP2 major schemes	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC/English Nature	When indicator shows that any designated sites have been lost due to LTP2 major schemes.	Further mitigation measures which may include the creation of additional habitats and incorporating biodiversity into transport schemes. Consider the use of features such as 'green bridges' and underpasses to maintain species connectivity.
	Number and area of Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats and number of Species lost due to LTP2 major schemes	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC/English Nature	When indicator shows that any Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats or Species have been lost due to LTP2 major schemes.	
	Number and percentage of LTP2 major schemes where studies of ecological impact were undertaken before planning permission was received	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	When studies show that any designated sites, Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats or Species have been lost due to LTP2 major schemes	
	Number and percentage of LTP2 major schemes that incorporate measures to restore or enhance the nature conservation value of the area affected by the scheme	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	When indicator shows that any LTP2 major schemes are shown to have a significant permanent adverse effect on biodiversity, habitats and species once restoration and enhancement measures have been applied.	
Effect on local air quality (positive)	City wide concentrations of NO ₂ at air quality monitoring stations	Annual	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	When monitoring shows that year on year improvements in NO ₂ concentrations are not being achieved.	Traffic and congestion related measures (routing, lane restrictions, etc) in the short term.
	Number of traffic related air quality management areas	Annual	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	When indicator shows that any traffic related air quality management areas have been created.	Further promotion of sustainable transport modes, investment in sustainable

¹ Nature Conservation Designations include Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protected Areas, Ramsar Sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, National Nature Reserves, Local Nature Reserves, and Ancient Woodlands.

Effect to be monitored	Indicator(s) to be used	Current source of monitoring data and frequency of monitoring	Suggested frequency of review/analysis of monitoring data	Responsibility for undertaking monitoring	When should remedial action be considered?	What remedial action could be taken?
	Modal shift to Sustainable Transport Modes	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	If target of 'At least 37% of the population of the city travelling by sustainable travel modes by 2010/11' is unlikely to be met.	transport, reducing travel demand in the long term.
Effect on landscape and townscape character (negative)	Number and area of designated landscapes ² lost due to LTP2 major schemes	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	When indicator shows that any Designated Landscapes have been lost due to the LTP2 major schemes.	Promotion of further mitigation measures such as sensitive landscaping planting.
	Number and percentage of LTP2 major schemes where studies of landscape or townscape impact have been undertaken before planning permission was received	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	Remedial action not considered appropriate for this indicator.	
	Number and percentage of LTP2 major schemes that incorporate measures to restore or enhance the landscape or townscape character of the area affected by the scheme	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	When indicator shows that any LTP major schemes are shown to have a significant permanent adverse effect on landscape and townscape character once restoration and enhancement measures have been applied.	
	PCC will undertake a review of the effects of LTP2 major schemes on landscape and townscape character	Not monitored	Two yearly	Peterborough CC	When indicator shows that any LTP major schemes are shown to have a significant permanent adverse effect on landscape and townscape character once restoration and enhancement measures have been applied.	
	Area of public green space lost/gained as a result of LTP2 major schemes	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	When indicator shows that any areas of public green space have been permanently lost as a result of LTP2 major schemes.	

² Area defined as 'Area of Best Landscape' in Peterborough Local Plan.

Effect to be monitored	Indicator(s) to be used	Current source of monitoring data and frequency of monitoring	Suggested frequency of review/analysis of monitoring data	Responsibility for undertaking monitoring	When should remedial action be considered?	What remedial action could be taken?
Effect on surface and groundwater quality (negative)	Number of LTP major schemes incorporating conditions (such as SUDS) to protect surface and groundwater	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	When indicator shows that not all LTP2 major schemes have incorporated such conditions.	Stricter planning conditions to enforce the incorporation of SUDS into transport schemes
	Number of water pollution incidents attributable to transport	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC/Highways Agency/ Environment Agency	When trends shows that number of pollution incidents attributable to transport is increasing.	Improved education and information to prevent polluting incidents.
Effect on the function of watercourses, water bodies, rivers and groundwater systems including floodplains and catchments (negative)	Number of LTP2 major schemes that cover zones 2 or 3 of the Environment Agency indicative flood plains and require a Flood Risk Assessment	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC/ Environment Agency	Remedial action is dependent on the setting of an appropriate target to be achieved. Action required if target is unlikely to be met.	Placement of stricter planning conditions.
Effect on soil quality and quantity (negative)	Area of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land permanently lost due to LTP2 major schemes.	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	When indicator shows that any area of grade 1 or 2 agricultural land has been permanently lost as a result of LTP2 major schemes.	Further mitigation measures to promote reuse of valuable soil resources
	Area of safeguarded mineral reserves permanently lost due to LTP2 major schemes.	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	When indicator shows that any area of safeguarded mineral reserve has been permanently lost as a result of LTP2 major schemes.	Improved education and information to prevent polluting incidents.

Effect to be monitored	Indicator(s) to be used	Current source of monitoring data and frequency of monitoring	Suggested frequency of review/analysis of monitoring data	Responsibility for undertaking monitoring	When should remedial action be considered?	What remedial action could be taken?
	Percentage of previously developed land as overall land take for LTP2 major schemes.	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	Remedial action is dependent on the setting of an appropriate target to be achieved. Action required if target is unlikely to be met.	
Effect on the heritage resource (negative)	Number of listed buildings/scheduled ancient monuments/archaeological protected sites/registered parks and gardens permanently lost due to LTP2 major schemes.	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	When indicator shows that any listed buildings/scheduled ancient monuments/archaeological protected sites/registered parks and gardens have been permanently lost as a result of LTP2 major schemes	Promotion of further mitigation measures and review of current policies regarding archaeological investigations and/or identification and recognition of importance of heritage features.
Effect on crime and community safety (positive)	Travel Security	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	If target of 42% of people or less expressing fear of crime as a major barrier to travel crime by 2010/11 is unlikely to be met.	Promotion of further measures to improve travel security such as CCTV and improved lighting
Effect on travel choice that improves overall levels of health (positive)	Travel information	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	If target of 'At least 69% of the population informed about travel choice by 2008/09' is unlikely to be met.	Traffic and congestion related measures (routing, lane restrictions, etc) in the short term.
	Personalised journey planning	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	If target of 'At least 70,000 people to be offered personalised journey planning service by 2008/09' is unlikely to be met.	Further promotion of sustainable transport modes, investment in sustainable transport, reducing travel demand in the long term

Effect to be monitored	Indicator(s) to be used	Current source of monitoring data and frequency of monitoring	Suggested frequency of review/analysis of monitoring data	Responsibility for undertaking monitoring	When should remedial action be considered?	What remedial action could be taken?
	Modal shift to Sustainable Transport Modes	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	If target of 'At least 37% of the population of the city travelling by sustainable travel modes by 2010/11' is unlikely to be met.	
	Mode share for journeys to school	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	If target of 'No more than 34% of 5-10 year olds and no more than 18% of 11-16 year olds travelling to school by car in 2010/11' is unlikely to be met	
	Cycling	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	If target of 'To increase cycling trips by 9% by 2010/11 relative to 2003/04 baseline' is unlikely to be met.	
	Walking trips	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	If target of 'Increase of 7% in walking trips by 2010/11' is unlikely to be met.	
Effect on noise pollution (positive)	% of new roads covered with low noise surfacing	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	Remedial action is dependent on the setting of an appropriate target to be achieved. Action required if target is unlikely to be met.	Further consideration of noise mitigation measures (e.g. noise barriers) if adversely affected areas
	Number of complaints regarding traffic noise	Not monitored	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC	When trends show that the number of complaints regarding traffic noise is increasing	

Effect to be monitored	Indicator(s) to be used	Current source of monitoring data and frequency of monitoring	Suggested frequency of review/analysis of monitoring data	Responsibility for undertaking monitoring	When should remedial action be considered?	What remedial action could be taken?
Effect on road safety (positive)	Total killed and seriously injured	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	When target of 'No more than 95 people killed or seriously injured per annum by 2011' is unlikely to be met.	To be targeted at particular accident problem sites but may include:
	Child killed and seriously injured	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	When target of 'No more than 14 children killed or seriously injured per annum by 2011' is unlikely to be met.	Further traffic calming measures Further road safety education (driver training, cyclist training)
	Total slight casualties	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	When target of 'No more than 1151 slight casualties per annum by 2011' is unlikely to be met.	Improved/expanded cycle lanes and walkways Improved enforcement
Effect on accessibility (positive)	Accessibility	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	When target of 'At least 90% of rural households within 13 minutes (400m) walk of an hourly or better bus service by 2008/09' is unlikely to be met.	Raise public awareness of new transport infrastructure/facilities at their disposal.
	Workplace travel plans	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	When target of '26 organisations with more than 50 employees receiving a Travel Plan Award by 2010/11' is unlikely to be met.	Further removal of physical and other barriers to access. Additional investment into Travel Plan programmes.
	School travel plans	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	Bi-annual	Peterborough CC LTP2 Monitoring	When target of 'At least 90% of (70 local) schools to have a completed travel plan by 2010/11' is unlikely to be met.	