



# Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Hampshire LTP3

**SEA Adoption Statement**

**March 2011**





# Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Hampshire Local Transport Plan 3

SEA Adoption Statement

<b>Client:</b>	Hampshire County Council
<b>Report No.:</b>	UE-0072_Hants SEA Adoption Statement_3_280311NCB
<b>Status:</b>	Final Version
<b>Date:</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> March 2011
<b>Author:</b>	NCB
<b>Checked:</b>	NEJP
<b>Approved:</b>	NJD

---

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Purpose of this SEA Adoption Statement	1
1.2	The Hampshire LTP3: Background	1
1.3	Content of this SEA Adoption Statement	3
<b>2</b>	<b>How the SEA process has informed and influenced the LTP3</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	The SEA process and the LTP3	5
2.2	Scoping	5
2.3	Assessment of reasonable alternatives for the LTP3	5
2.4	Development of a Draft Strategy for the LTP3	7
2.5	Updates to the strategy element of the LTP3 following consultation	7
2.6	Development of the Implementation Plan for the LTP3	8
2.7	Where documents linked to the LTP3 and accompanying SEA process can be found	9
<b>3</b>	<b>How environmental considerations have been taken into account by the LTP3</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	How environmental considerations have been taken into account	11
3.2	Recommendations to consider during the implementation of the plan	11
<b>4</b>	<b>How consultation on the SEA has been taken into account</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1	Consultation on the SEA	13
4.2	Consultation on the Scoping Report	13
4.3	Consultation on the Draft Strategy and accompanying Environmental Report	14
<b>5</b>	<b>Monitoring</b>	<b>15</b>
5.1	Monitoring	15
5.2	Links with the LTP3 Annual Progress Report	16
	<b>References</b>	<b>19</b>

**Appendix A:** Scoping Report responses and how they have been addressed.

*This page has been left intentionally blank for the purposes of double sided printing.*

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this SEA Adoption Statement

This SEA Adoption Statement has been prepared for Hampshire County Council (HCC) as part of the strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of the Hampshire Local Transport Plan 3 (referred to throughout this document as the LTP3). It represents the final stage of the SEA process for the LTP3.

The SEA Adoption Statement has been produced in compliance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 SI No. 1633. The statement incorporates the requirement to produce an Adoption Statement as required by the SEA Directive 2001/42/EC.

This SEA Adoption Statement accompanies the adopted LTP3, which can be accessed at: <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/transport/local-transport-plan.htm>.

## 1.2 The Hampshire LTP3: Background

Hampshire County Council (HCC), as the local transport authority for Hampshire, has prepared the third Local Transport Plan (LTP3) for the County. This will replace Hampshire's second Local Transport Plan (LTP2), which was adopted in April 2006, and covers the five year period between 2006-11.

The LTP3:

- ▶ Sets out HCC's transport policies and their relation with national and local policy objectives within a single document;
- ▶ Takes into account an increasing emphasis on maintenance and road safety, the need to support Hampshire's economy, emerging Local Development Framework priorities, sustainability and the worsening public finance outlook;
- ▶ Is a corporate document, relevant to Hampshire but meeting Government expectations on content;
- ▶ Provides guidance on transport issues for the various Local Development Frameworks being developed within Hampshire; and
- ▶ Leaves open the possibility of an early 'refresh' should funding allocations change significantly from expected levels.

The lifespan of the LTP3 will be from 2011 to 2031. This will help ensure consistency with the timescale for the various Local Development Frameworks which are currently being developed in Hampshire. The longer timeframe also enables HCC to set, and help deliver, longer term strategic priorities.

The key facts related to the LTP3 are presented in **Table 1.1**.

**Table 1.1: Key facts relating to the Hampshire LTP3**

<b>Name of Responsible Authority</b>	Hampshire County Council
<b>Title of plan</b>	Hampshire Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3)
<b>What prompted the plan (e.g. legislative, regulatory or administrative provision)</b>	<p>The LTP3 will be the third Local Transport Plan to be developed for Hampshire. It follows the LTP1, which covered the period 2001-6, and the LTP2, which covered the period from 2006-11.</p> <p>The LTP3 is being developed following the implementation of the Local Transport Act 2008. The Act retains the statutory requirement to produce and review Local Transport Plans and policies, and requires local transport authorities to produce an LTP3 by the end of March 2011.</p>
<b>Subject (e.g. transport)</b>	Transport Plan.
<b>Period covered by the plan</b>	The strategy element of the plan covers the period 2011 to 2031. The Implementation Plan covers the period between 2011/12 and 2014/15.
<b>Frequency of updates</b>	When required.
<b>Area covered by the plan</b>	The area covered by the local transport authority of Hampshire County Council.
<b>Purpose and/or objectives of the plan</b>	<p>The LTP3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sets out Hampshire County Council’s transport policies and their relation with national and local policy objectives within a single document;</li> <li>• Takes into account an increasing emphasis on maintenance and road safety, the need to support Hampshire’s economy, emerging Local Development Framework priorities, sustainability and the worsening public finance outlook;</li> <li>• Is a corporate document, relevant to Hampshire, but meeting Government expectations on content;</li> <li>• Provides guidance on transport issues for Local Development Frameworks; and</li> <li>• Leaves open the possibility of an early ‘refresh’ should funding allocations change significantly from expected levels.</li> </ul> <p>The LTP3 has been presented through a long term Strategy and an Implementation Plan.</p>
<b>Plan contact point</b>	<p>Kevin Travers, Principal Transport Planner, Economy, Transport and Environment Department, Hampshire County Council</p> <p>Telephone number: 01962 846856</p> <p>Email: kevin.travers@hants.gov.uk</p>

### 1.3 Content of this SEA Adoption Statement

SEA Regulations 16.3c)(iii) and 16.4 require that a 'statement' be made available to accompany the plan, as soon as possible after the adoption of the plan or programme.

The SEA Regulations highlight that the statement should contain the following information:

- ▶ The reasons for choosing the preferred Strategy and Implementation Plan for the LTP3 as adopted in the light of other reasonable alternatives dealt with;
- ▶ How environmental considerations have been integrated into the LTP3;
- ▶ How consultation responses have been taken into account; and
- ▶ Measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the LTP3.

In this context, the purpose of the SEA Adoption Statement is to outline how the SEA process has informed and influenced the LTP3's development process and demonstrate how consultation on the SEA has been taken into account.

**Chapter 2** of this SEA Adoption Statement summarises how the SEA has informed and influenced the LTP3, including in light of the other alternatives dealt with. **Chapter 3** highlights how environmental considerations have been integrated into the LTP3. **Chapter 4** discusses how consultation has been carried out and taken into account by the SEA. The final chapter, **Chapter 5** sets out the proposed monitoring regime for the SEA, which it is proposed will be carried out alongside monitoring for the LTP3.

*This page has been left intentionally blank for the purposes of double sided printing.*

## 2 How the SEA process has informed and influenced the LTP3

### 2.1 The SEA process and the LTP3

The main aim of SEA is to inform and influence the plan making process to maximise the LTP3's environmental sustainability value. In this context the SEA process has fed into the LTP3 through providing information at each stage of its development process.

**Table 2.1** highlights the main outputs of the SEA process in conjunction with those of the development of the LTP3. A more detailed description of how the respective stages of the LTP3 and SEA have interlinked is presented in **Sections 2.2 to 2.6**.

### 2.2 Scoping

The Scoping Report for the LTP3 was published for consultation for a period of six weeks between 19<sup>th</sup> March 2010 and 30<sup>th</sup> April 2010. Its purpose was to establish the scope of and methodology for the SEA, to provide the basis for consultation related to the range and level of detail of reporting for the SEA, and the evidence base on which it is established. Responses were received from six organisations and individuals. Following the receipt of responses, the SEA information, including the SEA's evidence base, policy and plan review, and SEA Framework of objectives and indicators against which the LTP3 would be assessed was updated and the information was included in subsequent SEA Reports.

Scoping for the SEA process complemented initial evidence gathering for the LTP3.

### 2.3 Assessment of reasonable alternatives for the LTP3

The SEA Directive requires that the Environmental Report should consider:

*'Reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme' and give 'an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with' (Article 5.1 and Annex I (h)).*

To address this requirement the following three broad potential scenarios were identified and formed as the basis for the assessment of reasonable alternatives:

#### **Scenario 1: Focus on the economy**

This approach would reflect the economic reality of a heavy reliance on car-based mobility, with targeted investment in highway maintenance and tackling the worst congestion bottlenecks. It is based on a premise of:

*'supporting essential sustainable transport services and measures, but accepting that the private motor vehicle will be the predominant mode of transport for the foreseeable future'.*

### **Scenario 2: Focus on improving sustainability and tackling climate change**

This approach would seek to move Hampshire much more quickly towards a future based on sustainable mobility, for example by prioritising alternatives to the car for local journeys. The priority would be on 'reduce' and 'manage' measures. It is based on a premise of:

*'Prioritise sustainable transport services and measures to offer attractive alternatives to the private motor vehicle'.*

### **Scenario 3: Mixed approach – sustainable growth**

This approach would seek to support a more sustainable future combined with economic growth by encouraging the most 'fit for purpose' transport mode for journeys and designing new development with high-quality alternatives to the car in place from the outset. Walking, cycling and bus would be encouraged for local journeys, and bus/coach, rail, lift-sharing or the car would be promoted for longer inter-urban journeys. Its underlying premise is:

*'Improve sustainable transport services and measures, and help to reduce reliance on the private motor vehicle in urban areas'.*

These scenarios were developed further to incorporate packages of potential interventions and transport measures for the three strategy areas which would inform the LTP3 (Hampshire – Central and New Forest; Hampshire – North; and Hampshire – South (Excluding Cities). The three scenarios, or 'options' developed for each strategy area were assessed as part of the SEA process.

The assessment of the three options for each of the strategy areas engaged a 'high-level' assessment technique which utilised the SEA Framework, the baseline and the review of plans, programmes and policies to assess each alternative option. Findings were presented in matrix format and were accompanied by a commentary on identified effects. The outcomes of the assessment were subsequently fed back to the LTP3 development team. The findings were then presented in a SEA Options Assessment Report (May, 2010). The purpose of this exercise was to ensure proper iteration with plan-making and to provide comprehensive and auditable assessment findings.

Whilst not being a requisite part of the SEA Regulations or DfT SEA Guidance (TAG Unit 2.11, April 2009)<sup>1</sup> the preparation of the SEA Options Assessment Report followed the 'spirit' of SEA through seeking to inform and influence the development of the LTP3 at an early stage to help maximise the plan's environmental value. The results of the assessment of the three options helped the LTP3 development team identify a "preferred option" approach for the strategy element of the LTP3.

---

<sup>1</sup> Department for Transport (April 2009): TAG Unit 2.11, Strategic Environmental Assessment for Transport Plans and Programmes ('In draft' Guidance).

## 2.4 Development of a Draft Strategy for the LTP3

Following the assessment of reasonable alternatives, a long term vision and 16 accompanying Strategic Transport Priorities for Hampshire were developed for the LTP3. These were assessed for their compatibility with the SEA Objectives.

To deliver the long term vision and strategic priorities, Draft Strategies were then prepared for the following three areas:

- ▶ North Hampshire;
- ▶ Central Hampshire and the New Forest; and
- ▶ South Hampshire.

The Draft Strategies set out the emerging approach to transport within the three strategy areas through presenting a series of delivery interventions. These comprised a broad range of transport measures containing a series of proposed packages of interventions for delivery (delivery options). From these Draft Strategies, HCC were able to select interventions for inclusion in the LTP3 Implementation Plans; the three year rolling programmes which set out which schemes will be delivered during that time period (**Section 2.6**).

These Draft Strategies, presented in the *Draft Hampshire LTP3 Strategy* consultation document, were released for consultation for a period of twelve weeks from July to October 2010.

To accompany the *Draft Hampshire LTP3 Strategy* consultation document, an Environmental Report was prepared in conjunction with the requirements of the SEA Directive. This set out the stages of the SEA process that had been carried out to date, and presented the assessment of the delivery options presented for each strategy area. It also discussed how the SEA process had informed and influenced the development of early versions of the delivery options included in the *Draft Hampshire LTP3 Strategy* consultation document.

## 2.5 Updates to the strategy element of the LTP3 following consultation

In November and December 2010, minor changes were made to the draft version of the strategy element of the LTP3 previously released for consultation in July 2010. These updates were made in order to:

- ▶ Reflect changes and developments in Government policy (including the localism agenda, Big Society, Local Enterprise Partnerships and announcements on transport funding);
- ▶ Expand areas that were not fully developed in the consultation documents;
- ▶ Respond to specific comments by stakeholders raised in both formal responses, at briefings and at workshop events;
- ▶ Reflect the views expressed in the consultation; and

- ▶ Reflect various other sources of consultation information (including for example, the National Highways and Transport Survey 2010).

Incorporated within these updates, a number of changes were made to the delivery options included in the strategy element of the LTP3. This included the removal of two delivery options, the addition of new delivery options, and revisions to the wording of other delivery options.

To accompany the updated Strategy, an SEA Post Consultation Report was prepared. The purpose of the SEA Post Consultation Report was to examine and assess the changes made to the delivery options put forward for the LTP3.

## **2.6 Development of the Implementation Plan for the LTP3**

Following the finalisation of the LTP3 Strategy, the Implementation Plan for the LTP3 was developed. Implementing the strategy element of the LTP3, the Implementation Plan forms part of the LTP3 document and contains the proposals for delivery for the policies and priorities within the LTP3 Strategy during the first three years of the plan, 2011/12 to 2013/14. It demonstrates how both capital and revenue funding, available to the authority from central Government, council tax and developer contributions is to be used to deliver Hampshire's transport priorities. The proposals for delivery put forward by the Implementation Plan are largely derived from the delivery options that were assessed as part of the strategy element of the LTP3.

To accompany the LTP3 Implementation Plan, an addendum to the Summer 2010 Environmental Report was prepared by the SEA team. The purpose of the addendum was to present an assessment of the proposals for delivery put forward by the Implementation Plan under the various funding streams available for the LTP3. Drawing on this assessment, the addendum also presented a number of recommendations for consideration during the ongoing implementation of the LTP3.

Hampshire County Council are presently preparing to adopt the LTP3, including the Strategy and the Implementation Plan, in April 2011.

**Table 2.1: Stages of the development of the LTP3 and accompanying SEA process**

Stage of the LTP3's development	Stage of the accompanying SEA process
Initial information gathering for the LTP3	SEA Scoping Report (March 2010)
↓	↓
Early drafts of the delivery options to be included in the LTP3 (May 2010)	Options SEA Report (May 2010)
↓	↓
<i>Draft Hampshire LTP3 Strategy</i> consultation document (July 2010)	Environmental Report to accompany the <i>Draft LTP3</i> document (July 2010)
↓	↓
Post Consultation LTP3 Strategy	SEA Post Consultation Report (December 2010)
↓	↓
<i>Draft Implementation Plan</i> (February 2011)	Addendum to Environmental Report (February 2011)
↓	↓
Adopted LTP3 (April 2011)	SEA Adoption Statement (April 2011)

**2.7 Where documents linked to the LTP3 and accompanying SEA process can be found**

All documents and background information associated with the LTP3, including those linked to the SEA process, can be accessed on Hampshire County Council's website at:

<http://www3.hants.gov.uk/transport/local-transport-plan.htm>.

*This page has been left intentionally blank for the purposes of double sided printing.*

## **3 How environmental considerations have been taken into account by the LTP3**

### **3.1 How environmental considerations have been taken into account**

As discussed in **Chapter 2**, the SEA process has informed and influenced the LTP3 throughout its development process. The SEA process therefore highlighted at different stages the environmental issues which had the potential to arise as a result of the implementation of earlier and later versions of the LTP3 delivery options and interventions.

The adopted LTP3 has addressed many of these potential environmental issues through taking into account of the findings of the SEA process. In this context most minor impacts relating to specific or groups of delivery options and interventions have been addressed by other components of the LTP3. Where this has taken place, this has been noted in the analysis undertaken during the SEA.

Besides the various SEA Reports that were prepared as part of the SEA process, the SEA team provided regular feedback to the LTP3 team. This served to keep abreast of proposals and provide direct input to the plan making process.

### **3.2 Recommendations to consider during the implementation of the plan**

Whilst most environmental issues have been addressed through the relevant delivery options and interventions in the LTP3, a number of potential residual environmental effects are likely to remain through taking forward the LTP3. In this context the SEA process has suggested a number of recommendations for consideration during the ongoing implementation of the plan. These include as follows:

- ▶ Street lighting expenditure in Hampshire should seek to minimise light pollution and “night blight” through the appropriate location, design and layout of lighting in the county;
- ▶ The design and layout of the online widening of Newgate Lane in Fareham should seek to support local biodiversity networks through appropriate planting and the use of other measures to support flora and fauna locally. The design and layout of the scheme should also seek to support enhancements to the public realm along the route and seek to minimise land take on areas of the best and most versatile agricultural land;
- ▶ The proposed new link to the strategic employment area at Dunsbury Hill Farm should seek to improve access by non car modes and 'lock in' the benefits of the new route through incorporating new pedestrian and cycle links within the scheme, promoting public transport accessibility and the delivery of employment area-wide workplace travel planning initiatives. It should also seek to mitigate potential

significant effects on biodiversity and landscape quality through the implementation of a comprehensive package of mitigation measures and the appropriate design and layout of the access road. In this context the project level Environmental Impact Assessment for the scheme will identify and examine potential effects on environmental receptors and seek to mitigate effects;

- ▶ The LTP3 should ensure that the benefits of junction improvements on Hampshire's road network are 'locked in' through relevant localised and sub-regional measures to help restrain traffic growth, including through interventions to promote the use of non-car modes of transport;
- ▶ Improved parking provision at rail stations should be accompanied by measures to improve end-to-end sustainable transport use and the appropriate pricing of car parking. The use of well designed, decked, multi-level parking can reduce landtake from new parking on greenfield land and areas of higher quality agricultural land;
- ▶ The maintenance programme for Hampshire's road network should seek to limit effects on biodiversity, air quality, noise pollution, the historic environment and landscape quality through the implementation of robust management regimes and the introduction of appropriate policies, standards and targets;
- ▶ New Park and Ride schemes, where taken forward by the LTP3, should have a focus on improving accessibility for non car users. This can include through improving local bus services, promoting enhanced walking and cycling links and supporting improvements to the public realm on routes. Full consideration should be given to potential localised environmental effects of new Park and Ride provision, with strategic alternatives considered for location and layout; and
- ▶ New public charging points for electric cars in Hampshire should source electricity from renewable sources to support climate change mitigation.

## 4 How consultation on the SEA has been taken into account

### 4.1 Consultation on the SEA

The SEA Directive requires responses to consultation to be taken into account during the preparation of the plan or programme and before its adoption or submission to a legislative procedure.

Consultation has been an integral part of the SEA of the LTP3. In addition to enabling the opinions of the statutory environmental bodies and other stakeholders to be taken into account, it has provided an opportunity for the public to be informed as to how decisions are made.

### 4.2 Consultation on the Scoping Report

The SEA Scoping Report for the LTP3 was published for consultation for a period of six weeks between 19<sup>th</sup> March 2010 and 30<sup>th</sup> April 2010. It was released to the three statutory SEA consultation bodies: English Heritage, the Environment Agency and Natural England and a range of other stakeholders.

The purpose of the Scoping Report was to establish the scope of and methodology for the SEA, to provide the basis for consultation related to the range and level of detail of the SEA process, and the evidence base on which it is established. Responses were received from six organisations. Following the receipt of responses, the SEA information, including the baseline and policy and plan review, was updated. This information was included in subsequent SEA reports.

Consultee responses on the Scoping Report were received from the following organisations:

- ▶ English Heritage;
- ▶ Environment Agency;
- ▶ Highways Agency;
- ▶ Natural England;
- ▶ New Forest National Park Authority; and
- ▶ RSPB.

**Appendix A** summarises the comments raised during the scoping consultation and details how they were taken into account through the subsequent SEA process for the LTP3.

### **4.3 Consultation on the Draft Strategy and accompanying Environmental Report**

The second main stage of consultation during the SEA process was the extensive consultation exercise carried out on the Draft Strategy and the accompanying Environmental Report. This was undertaken for a period of 12 weeks between July and September 2010.

Consultation responses received on the Environmental Report were taken into account and addressed through the ongoing development of the SEA process. Likewise, consultation responses received on the main LTP3 document and the Habitats Regulations Assessment process were considered by the SEA.

As highlighted by **Chapter 2**, in addition to the Environmental Report, a range of further SEA inputs were provided to the LTP3 team throughout its development process. These included appraisals of initial and early versions of reasonable alternatives for the LTP3; consideration of the updates to the strategy element of the LTP3 following consultation; and an assessment of the proposed delivery options to be included in the first LTP3 Implementation Plan. Although these were not subject to further consultation, they provided an ongoing and iterative contribution to the development of the LTP3.

## 5 Monitoring

### 5.1 Monitoring

The SEA Directive states that 'member states shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of plans and programmes.....in order, inter alia, to identify at an early stage unforeseen adverse effects, and to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action' (Article 10.1). In addition, the Environmental Report should provide information on a 'description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring' (Annex I (i)).

The monitoring requirements typically associated with the SEA process are recognised as placing heavy demands on authorities with SEA responsibilities. For this reason, the proposed monitoring framework should focus on those aspects of the environment that are likely to be negatively impacted upon, where the impact is uncertain or where particular opportunities for improvement might arise.

**Table 5.1** outlines proposals for a monitoring programme for measuring the LTP3's implementation in relation to the areas where the SEA has identified potential significant effects, and where significant opportunities for an improvement in environmental performance may arise. It also seeks to monitor where uncertainties relating to the appraisal findings arose and suggests where monitoring is required to help ensure that the benefits of the LTP3 are achieved throughout its implementation.

Monitoring is particularly useful in answering the following questions:

- ▶ Were the assessment's predictions of environmental effects accurate?
- ▶ Is the LTP3 contributing to the achievement of desired environmental objectives?
- ▶ Are mitigation measures performing as well as expected?
- ▶ Are there any unforeseen adverse effects? Are these within acceptable limits, or is remedial action required?

The purpose of monitoring is to measure the environmental effects of a plan, as well as to measure success against the plan's objectives. It is therefore beneficial if the monitoring strategy builds on monitoring systems which are already in place. To this end, many of the indicators of progress chosen for the SEA require data that is already being routinely collected at a local levels by HCC and its partner organisations. It should also be noted that monitoring can provide useful information for future plans and programmes.

**Table 5.1: Proposed monitoring programme for the LTP3**

Potential adverse effect, or area to be monitored	Indicator	Data Source	Frequency of monitoring and scale	Target/ Trigger
Impact of highway improvements on air quality	No. of days when air pollution is moderate or high for NO <sub>2</sub>	HCC and partners	Annually, Hampshire wide	When number of days exceeds year on year
Potential stimulation of car use by some interventions, including planned road improvements, Park and Ride and new parking at rail stations	Traffic flows on key routes.	HCC and partners	Annually, Hampshire wide	When flows increases year on year
Increases in greenhouse gas emissions stimulated by some interventions, including planned road improvements, Park and Ride and measures and new parking at rail stations	Carbon footprint of Hampshire	HCC	Annually, Hampshire wide	When transport sector emissions increase year on year
Potential to use Historic Landscape Characterisation to inform decision making	Percentage of new transport infrastructure developments which are informed by detailed characterisation studies	HCC and partners	Annually, Hampshire wide	When percentage reduces year on year
Loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land from transport schemes	Area of Grade 1-3a agricultural land lost as part of new transport infrastructure development	HCC	Annually, Hampshire wide	When area reduces year on year
Link between public charging points for electric vehicles and climate change mitigation	Proportion of public charging points for electric vehicles sourcing electricity from renewable sources	HCC	Annually, Hampshire wide	When proportion reduces year on year

## 5.2 Links with the LTP3 monitoring process

The SEA guidance suggests that SEA monitoring and reporting activities can be integrated into the regular planning cycle. In line with the increasing emphasis on localism and decentralisation, the Government now only requires a single list of performance data from local authorities, with decisions on what targets to adopt to be made locally, allowing the County Council to place a greater emphasis on local priorities. Therefore LTP3 monitoring is focused on performance in areas of activity that are of direct benefit to the County Council and people of Hampshire. This monitoring programme contains transport indicators relating

to public satisfaction (through participation in the National Highways and Traffic Network Public Satisfaction Survey), highway maintenance, road safety, congestion, levels of use of public transport, and punctuality of bus services.

At scheme delivery level, SEA monitoring takes place at the business case stage for schemes, where biodiversity, landscape and heritage impacts are actively considered and suitable mitigation measures are identified. It is anticipated that elements of the SEA monitoring programme for the LTP3 will be incorporated into this process. The monitoring programme is, at this stage, preliminary and may evolve over time based on the identification of additional data sources (as in some cases information will be provided by outside bodies). The monitoring of individual schemes and proposals should also be addressed at project level.

*This page has been left intentionally blank for the purposes of double sided printing.*

## References

Department for Transport (2009): TAG Unit 2.11, Strategic Environmental Assessment for Transport Plans and Programmes ('In draft' Guidance), April 2009

Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment

The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, Statutory Instruments 2004 No. 1633

UE Associates (March 2010), Hampshire LTP3 SEA Scoping Report

UE Associates (May 2010), Hampshire LTP3 Options SEA Report

UE Associates (July 2010), Hampshire LTP3 Environmental Report

UE Associates (January 2011), Hampshire LTP3 SEA Post Consultation Report

UE Associates (February 2011), Hampshire LTP3 Environmental Report Addendum: Assessment of the Implementation Plan proposals for delivery

**UE Associates Ltd**

Eagle Tower Montpellier Drive Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL50 1TA

T: 01242 524111 E: [enquiries@ue-a.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@ue-a.co.uk)

W: <http://www.ue-a.co.uk>

© UE Associates Ltd 2011

**BRIGHTON | CHELTENHAM | EXETER**

## **Appendix A: SEA Scoping Responses**

*This page has been left intentionally blank for the purposes of double sided printing.*

# Analysis of consultation responses received on the Hampshire LTP3 SEA Scoping Report (March-April 2010)

Comment number (internal use)	Page of response	Scoping Report ref	Comment	Action for SEA
<b>Organisation &amp; contact: English Heritage (Steve Williams, Regional Planner)</b>				
<b>Date received: 30th April 2010</b>				
1	1	General comment	We welcome the approach being taken by the three authorities in working together in pooling information and seeking an integrated approach.	Comment noted.
2	1	General comment	We welcome recognition of the need to protect and enhance designated and non designated heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a sustainable approach	Comment noted.
3	1	General comment	The contextual material provided for each draft Scoping Report, while general, seems proportionate in support of the identified key issues.	Comment noted.
4	1	Appendix B: SEA Framework	SEA Objectives 4 & 5 (Table 15.1) are considered appropriate under the circumstances.	Comment noted.
5	1	Appendix B: SEA Framework	In terms of the SEA Framework at Appendix B, Topic 4 includes decision making criterion 4a that is broad in extent i.e. including listed and non-listed buildings of historic interest, although the two indicators both deal with the more limited range of 'buildings at risk'. It might be better for one indicator to deal with the absolute number of assets (with a target of no losses) and the other to deal with assets at risk.	Indicators for SEA Objective 4 have been updated to reflect comment.
6	1	Appendix B: SEA Framework	Please note that English Heritage is not responsible for assessing Grade II buildings at risk. The Hampshire County Council website provides information based upon a 2005 survey.	Comment noted, target for Historic Environment amended.
7	1	Appendix B: SEA Framework	Would indicator 4b be better expressed as an actual number rather than a proportion?	Indicator has been updated to reflect comment.
8	1	Appendix E: Policy & Plan Review	Appendix E Policy & Plan Review needs updating to take account of last month's PPS5 'Planning for the Historic Environment'. As a consequence you should delete reference to PPG16. The attached note provides further references that you may wish to take into account.	PPP review has been updated to include PPS5 and its accompanying practice guide.
9	4	Generic LTP guidelines	<b>The Identification and Appraisal of Potential Impacts on the Historic Environment</b>  Reducing traffic flows and parking pressures from historic town centres can help by reducing the damaging effects of vibration, air pollution, and visual intrusion. Improvements in public transport provision or measures to encourage cycling and walking might also serve to increase accessibility to and improve the recreation and tourism potential of heritage sites.	These potential effects and opportunities have been considered throughout the assessment process.

Comment number (internal use)	Page of response	Scoping Report ref	Comment	Action for SEA
10	4	Generic LTP guidelines	As part of the appraisal process all designated historic assets should be considered, including the site and setting of Scheduled Monuments and other nationally important remains, Listed Buildings (Grades I, II*, II), Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest, and Registered Battlefields. Some bridge structures are listed or scheduled. It is also important that the historic environment is broadly defined, and potential impacts on non-designated features of local historic interest and value are fully considered since these can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity. Even small-scale roadside features such as milestones, some of which are listed, might be affected by improvement schemes. Retention and enhancement of such features can be a positive addition to the public realm.	The full range of historic environment features have been considered through the assessment.
11	4		In a wider context, urban characterisation and historic landscape characterisation studies can help assess the potential impacts of major schemes, and the cumulative effects of smaller scale projects, on the character of the local townscape and landscape.	Characterisation studies have been used to inform the assessment under the historic environment and landscape SEA Objectives (SEA Objectives 4 and 5).
12	4		Finally, it should be emphasised that for proposals involving land take there could be potential impacts on unrecorded archaeological sites or remains, and this should be factored into the appraisal process. In particular, this is relevant for schemes located within river valleys, which can retain important organic archaeological remains and other features of historic interest.	The potential for impacts on unrecorded archaeological finds has been considered through the assessment.
13	5	Generic LTP guidelines	<b>Reuse of Existing Structures</b> English Heritage generally welcomes proposals for the reuse of existing structures either for the reinstatement of public transport provision or the introduction of new transport proposals, as for example the restoration and conversion of disused railway lines as cycling and walking routes. In the design and implementation of such schemes, however, the presence of historic features and structures should be identified and their retention made an integral part of the project. Where structures such as historic bridges are subject to listing, special consideration should be given to their repair and restoration either as part of a proposal or wider maintenance programmes.	Comments have been fed back to the LTP3 development team.

Comment number (internal use)	Page of response	Scoping Report ref	Comment	Action for SEA
14	5	Generic LTP guidelines	<p><b>Traffic Calming and Management</b></p> <p>In preparing a LTP it should be recognised that schemes associated with traffic calming and management can affect the character and appearance of historic features and areas. A well designed scheme provides and opportunity to enhance the historic environment, by removing unnecessary street clutter, restoring historic features, and reducing the dominance of motorised traffic. However, the introduction of poorly designed and sited infrastructure and signage, and the use of inappropriate materials can be detrimental to the local area. These issues are applicable to rural settlements as well as larger urban areas and to the wider countryside as, for example, in the ‘urbanisation’ of the rural road network through the use of standardised surfacing materials and structures. In the design and implementation of all transport schemes, the underlying aim should be to ensure that the proposed measures are integrated sensitively into the surrounding townscape or landscape so that local character is reinforced rather than eroded.</p> <p>Practitioners’ guidance ‘Streets for All’, which has been developed in conjunction with the Department for Transport and includes practical case studies, can be viewed at: <a href="http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/streetsforall">www.english-heritage.org.uk/streetsforall</a></p> <p>It should be remembered that wider transport management strategies such as “Smarter Choices” measure can bring about benefits for the historic environment as well as the more usually cited benefits. Reducing the need to travel, providing more information, and promoting alternatives to car travel can all help to reduce the pressure on the historic environment.</p>	Comments have been fed back to the LTP3 development team.
15	6	Generic LTP guidelines	<p><b>Design</b></p> <p>In line with the goal to improve quality of life, LTPs should incorporate overarching design principles. In many cases the cumulative impact of smaller scale projects on the character and appearance of an area can be as damaging as larger schemes. Good design principles should aim to ensure that all proposed programmes and schemes respect and seek to enhance the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of urban and rural areas. This should involve conserving distinctive heritage features in situ, reinstating them where appropriate, ensuring the sympathetic design and siting of new street furniture (including lighting), and promoting the use and, where appropriate, re-use of local natural materials.</p> <p>Detailed features such as floorscape, street furniture, signage, lighting, and roadside trees can all make an important contribution to the appearance and character of Conservation Areas. ‘Streets for All’ sets out general principles for such features with the aim of reducing clutter, co-ordinating design and reinforcing local character.</p>	Comments have been fed back to the LTP3 development team. The full range of cumulative, synergistic and indirect effects have been considered through the assessment process.
16	6	Generic LTP guidelines	<p><b>Consultations</b></p> <p>English Heritage strongly advises that the Council’s conservation and archaeological staff are closely involved throughout the preparation and implementation of the LTP. They are best placed to advise on: local historic environment issues and priorities, including the relevant Historic Environment Record; how transport solutions can be tailored to minimise potential adverse impacts on the historic environment; the nature and design of any required mitigation measures; and opportunities for securing wider benefits for the future conservation and management of historic assets.</p>	Comments have been fed back to the LTP3 development team.

Comment number (internal use)	Page of response	Scoping Report ref	Comment	Action for SEA
17	6	Generic LTP guidelines	<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>English Heritage recommends that the preparation and review of the Local Transport Plans incorporates the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A holistic approach to the historic environment encompassing designated and nondesignated aspects, as well as the wider landscape and townscape;</li> <li>- A clear understanding and recognition of locally significant aspects of the historic environment, in addition to national designations;</li> <li>- A comprehensive appraisal of the potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on the historic environment;</li> <li>- A consideration of the opportunities for measures to improve the conservation and future maintenance of the historic environment, as well as its use and enjoyment;</li> <li>- A set of overarching design principles which seek to ensure that all programmes and schemes respect and reinforce local character and distinctiveness; and</li> <li>- An integral programme of on-going liaison with local conservation officers and archaeological staff.</li> </ul>	Comments have been fed back to the LTP3 development team.

**Organisation & contact: Environment Agency (Laura Bourke, Planning Liaison Officer, Solent & South Downs)**

**Date received: 30th March 2010**

Comment number (internal use)	Page of response	Scoping Report ref	Comment	Action for SEA
1	1	General comment	I am unable to provide detailed comments on the above, attached is a fact sheet for your information which I hope you find useful.	The Environment Agency will not be responding to the LTP3 Scoping Report consultation for Hampshire Portsmouth and Southampton. This was confirmed by subsequent communication with Laura Bourke on 7th April 2010.

**Organisation & contact: Natural England (Holly Niner, Government Team, South East Region, Western Area Team)**

**Date received: 19th April 2010**

Comment number (internal use)	Page of response	Scoping Report ref	Comment	Action for SEA
1	1	General comment	I would firstly like to refer to the appended general guidance, 'Natural England Guidance on Local Transport Plans and the Natural Environment', received from colleagues in our National Policy Team. You will note that the guidance sets out Natural England 5 key priorities for Local Transport Plans (LTPs) and how these should be addressed under the 5 national transport goals. It includes hyperlinks, in the footnotes, to a range of resources on issues such as the Integration of Rights of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP) with LTPs, and guidance on SEAs and Habitat Regulations Assessments. I hope you find them helpful.	The guidelines have been considered through the assessment process. The guidance document has also been provided to the LTP3 development team.

Comment number (internal use)	Page of response	Scoping Report ref	Comment	Action for SEA
2	1	Chapter 6: Biodiversity & Geodiversity	The Scoping Report identifies the SSSIs and SACs within the District boundary, but should also refer to the need to consider any nationally or internationally designated sites outside the District boundary which may be significantly affected by the LTP, together with other relevant development in other Districts.	The Scoping Report has identified and considered the presence of internationally designated sites within 20km of Hampshire's boundary. This is reflected in the Evidence Base to accompany the Environmental Report.
3	1	Chapter 6: Biodiversity & Geodiversity	It should also be recorded that sites of European importance require the impacts of LTPs are to be assessed under the Habitats Regulations, now entitled 'The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010'. Please see the attached guidance in relation to the Habitats Regulations. The HRA process should be explained in the SEA, although the SEA and HRA should be reported on separately.	The Environmental Report has included references to the HRA, which is being undertaken concurrently with the SEA, and explains its relationship with the SEA process.
4	1	Chapter 6: Biodiversity & Geodiversity	In terms of all existing sites of biodiversity importance the SEA should promote the hierarchy of first avoidance of impacts, then necessary mitigation and then consideration of alternatives and compensatory measures.	This approach has been promoted through the SEA appraisal process.
5	1	Chapter 8: Health	It is the suggestion of Natural England that the Scoping Report should refer to contributing to health objectives through the extension and improvement of public access and green infrastructure networks.	Green infrastructure provision is a decision making criteria for the landscape SEA Objective (SEA Objective 5) and the health and wellbeing SEA Objective (SA Objective 10).
6	1-2	Chapter 8: Health	Natural England strongly promotes the provision of multi-functional green infrastructure (GI), which will increase the connectivity of areas in which people travel and provide attractive routes for walking, cycling and recreation, thus contributing towards healthy and physically active lifestyles, helping to reduce stress, obesity and cardiovascular related diseases, whilst also helping to maintain or enhance biodiversity and characteristic landscape features. Green Infrastructure is therefore a cross-cutting issue which should also be strongly featured in the Scoping Report's sections on landscape and biodiversity. Please see further details in the South East Green Infrastructure Framework ( <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/south_east/ourwork/greeninfrastructureframework.aspx">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/south_east/ourwork/greeninfrastructureframework.aspx</a> )	Green infrastructure provision is a decision making criteria for the landscape SEA Objective (SEA Objective 5) and the health and wellbeing SEA Objective (SA Objective 10).
7	2	Chapter 10: Landscape	This section should stress the national importance of AONBs and National Parks and the highest level of landscape protection given to AONBs by Government, as set out in PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas. Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CROW) 2000 requires that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an AONB, all public bodies have a duty to have regard to the statutory purpose of AONBs, which is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of their areas.	AONBs and National Parks in and near Hampshire have been included in the Evidence Base.
8	2	Chapter 10: Landscape	Natural England strongly advocates the use of Landscape Character Assessment to underpin decisions affecting the landscape, using methodologies consistent with those set out in Landscape Character Assessment: Guidance for England and Scotland Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage, 2002, available at: <a href="http://www.countryside.gov.uk/LAR/Landscape/CC/landscape_character_assesment.asp">http://www.countryside.gov.uk/LAR/Landscape/CC/landscape_character_assesment.asp</a> . This provides a sound basis for guiding, informing and understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change and to make positive proposals for conserving, enhancing or regenerating local character and distinctiveness, as detailed proposals are developed.	The findings of the Landscape Character Assessments which have been carried out in Hampshire (including the Historic Landscape Character Assessment) has been considered through the appraisal process.

Comment number (internal use)	Page of response	Scoping Report ref	Comment	Action for SEA
9	2	Chapter 10: Landscape	We would also support the methodology set out in the publication Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, produced by the landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment in 2003 (2nd edition). This guidance is accepted good practice, and provides a transparent and robust process for informing decisions on impact assessment and significance.	The findings of the Landscape Character Assessments which have been carried out in Hampshire (including the Historic Landscape Character Assessment) has been considered through the appraisal process.
10	2	Chapter 10: Landscape	Natural England therefore advises that the SEA should include a commitment to a full assessment of the potential impacts of proposed LTP schemes using these methodologies. This should include the detailed design of highway infrastructure such as measures to avoid / reduce light pollution and noise levels, contributions to green infrastructure and use of traditional materials and designs in any built features.	The project level Environmental Assessment will consider these issues. Many of the proposed road schemes are not progressed to the extent which these project level considerations can be considered. These considerations however have been incorporated within proposed mitigation measures.
11	2	Appendix B: SEA Framework	1. Air Quality. Reduce air pollution and ensure continued improvements to air quality: Add indicators/targets for air quality relating to designated sites of nature conservation importance and include the provision or enhancement of green infrastructure which may contribute to air quality improvement.	Indicators/targets amended for Air Quality.
12	2	Appendix B: SEA Framework	5. Landscape. The views of the relevant National Park or AONB unit should be sought for further indicators and targets.	The New Forest National Park Authority and South Downs Joint Committee were consulted on the SEA Scoping Report.
13	2	Appendix B: SEA Framework	6. Biodiversity and Geodiversity. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity: Indicators / targets should be added for changes in the condition, extent and pattern of semi natural habitat, including BAP habitats (this is likely to be a better indicator than only monitoring SSSIs which may/may not be relevant to road schemes); changes in the extent and condition of statutorily protected sites (SAC/SSSI) and sites of County/local importance (Note for protected sites, the threshold target should at least be no reduction in the areas of these sites and any opportunities for enhancement should be taken); amount of habitat gained/restored/enhanced through the LTP and number of sites fragmented or linked through the LTP.	Indicators/targets amended for Biodiversity & Geodiversity SEA Objective (SEA Objective 6)
14	2	Appendix B: SEA Framework	10. Health. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and well being: Indicators/targets should be added for additional length of cycle routes/footpaths/bridleways access routes and improved connectivity of the cycleway / footpath network.	Indicators/targets amended for Health SEA Objective (SEA Objective 10)
15	3	Appendix E: Review of PPPs	Natural England would suggest that the Environmental Report should include consideration of Rights of Way Improvement Plans, Regional and Local Biodiversity Action Plans, Species Action Plans and Habitat Action Plans, Minerals and Waste Plans and Flood Risk Assessment / Catchment Management Plans (to be advised by the Environment Agency). This is not intended to be an exhaustive list and reference should be made to other Sustainability Appraisals for other plans or projects which may be relevant, such as in the Hampshire Core Strategy SA.	The SEA appraisal process has considered the outcomes of these plans and assessments where appropriate.

Comment number (internal use)	Page of response	Scoping Report ref	Comment	Action for SEA
16	3	Appendix E: Review of PPPs	The Environmental Report should provide information on the LTP's relationship with other relevant plans or programmes, and its structure and content should address the requirements of Regulation 12(3) and Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations (Statutory Instrument 2004, No 1633, The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004). This will also help to identify any external social, environmental or economic objectives that should be taken into account in the SA of the plan, identify other external factors, including sustainability issues that might influence the preparation of the plan and to determine whether other policies, plans and programmes might give rise to cumulative effects when combined with the LTP.	A full policy and plan review was carried out as part of Scoping. The updated review is included in the Evidence Base.

**Organisation & contact: RSPB (Irene Curran, Conservation Officer)**  
**Date received: 16th April 2010**

1	1	General comment	We welcome the work that has been undertaken in preparation of this document, and in particular we welcome the commitment at paragraph 1.4 of the Scoping Report that a "Habitats Regulation Assessment will be carried out independently of the SEA process and will be reported on separately". We would greatly welcome the opportunity to comment on the HRA for LTP3.	Comment noted. The RSPB will be consulted on the HRA.
2	1	General comment	We have examined the baseline information that has been provided in the SEA Scoping Report and consider that the key issues identified provide a robust framework for progressing the subsequent stages of the SEA.	Comment noted.

**Organisation & contact: New Forest National Park Authority (Chris Gregory, Transport & Tourism Officer)**  
**Date received: 30th April 2010**

1	1	Section 4.2/4.3: Accessibility & Transport	Re: public transport links: text could also mention the need to provide adequate links for recreation purposes. Could also be picked up in key issues box. It is not just an issue of providing better public transport for those without access to a car – it should be about providing better public transport for all (carbon emissions, health, etc.) But good to see they are planning to invest in transport services in the National Parks (if that's what it means).	Key issues have been updated for Accessibility & Transport.
2	1	Section 4.3: Accessibility & Transport -	Key issues box. Need to maintain existing highway network to a high standard – does this include all highways including PROWs? Referring back to section 4.1, it should.	Key issues have been updated for Accessibility & Transport.
3	1	Chapter 6: Biodiversity & Geodiversity	One of the Key issues relating to biodiversity/transport locally is impact on animal accidents on Commoning.	Key issues have been updated for Biodiversity & Geodiversity to incorporate effect of road kills.
4	1	Chapter 6: Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Air quality can also be an issue for biodiversity.	Key issues have been updated for Biodiversity & Geodiversity to recognise effect of air quality on species and habitats.

Comment number (internal use)	Page of response	Scoping Report ref	Comment	Action for SEA
5	1	Section 6.2: Biodiversity & Geodiversity - baseline data	Would it be useful to clarify how much of the SPA/SAC/Ramsar/SSSIs lie within each of the NPs? This could in turn impact on the need to provide alternative means of transport (e.g. not the car) in the areas that are highly designated.	Whilst the SEA will consider effects on internationally designated sites and SSSIs, the HRA being carried out alongside the LTP3 will examine potential effects on internationally designated sites in more detail.
6	1	Chapter 8: Health	Cycling in the New Forest is a sensitive issue. The image used shows cycling off the permitted network. Please could this be replaced with another image? A suggestion is attached.	Image provided by NF National Park replaces the previous image. See Evidence Base, Chapter 6.
7	1	Chapter 8: Health	Would have liked to have seen some key issues relating to the improvement of "person-powered" transport networks (e.g. PROW) and reducing car-dependency.	Key issues have been updated for Health to acknowledge the contribution of walking and cycling to health and wellbeing. This issue has also been considered throughout the appraisal.
8	1	Section 10.3: Landscape - key issues	Good to see the reference to significant opportunities re: Green Infrastructure. Would like to see more commitment to actually improving these linkages.	Comment fed back to LTP3 development team.
9	1	Appendix B: SEA Framework	5. Landscape – Add a question e.g. will it improve the green infrastructure network?	An additional decision making criterion has been included for landscape to cover green infrastructure.
10	1	Appendix B: SEA Framework	7. Climate Change – Add an indicator e.g. % of highway network available solely to non-carbon emitting modes of transport	Indicator added for Climate Change.
11	1	Appendix B: SEA Framework	9. Population, Accessibility & Transport - Q9b – Add an indicator e.g. length of new cycle track/footpath provided by new development	Indicator added for Population, Accessibility & Transport.
12	1	Appendix B: SEA Framework	10. Health – Add a question e.g. will it provide new linear routes for walkers and cyclists?	An additional decision making criterion has been included for Health.
13	1	Appendix B: SEA Framework	10. Health - Q10b – Add an indicator e.g. amount of new public greenspace provided by new development	Indicator added for Health.
14	1	Appendix B: SEA Framework	10. Health - Q10d – Add an indicator e.g. % of population living within x metres of a PROW	Indicator added for Health.
15	1	General comment	References to RAMSAR should be replaced with Ramsar	Text has been amended throughout document.

**Organisation & contact: Highways Agency (Patrick Blake, South East Regional Planning Group)**

**Date received: 30th April 2010**

1	1	General comment	The HA is an executive agency of the department for Transport (DfT). We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving England's strategic road network (SRN) on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. In the case of Hampshire this relates directly to the M3, M27, M271, A3, A27, A31, A34, A36 and A303.	Comment noted.
---	---	-----------------	--	----------------

Comment number (internal use)	Page of response	Scoping Report ref	Comment	Action for SEA
2	1	Chapter 4: Accessibility & Transport	The key issues refer to worsening congestion and the need for mitigation of transport impacts on the SRN of planned growth. The HA continue to work with Local Planning Authorities (LPA) in Hampshire to identify how planned growth can be delivered through the Local development Framework process. The appropriate mitigation of the transport impacts of new development should be identified through Local Development Documents produced by LPAs.	Comment noted.
3	1	Chapter 4: Accessibility & Transport	The HA work in partnership with a number of bodies in the County to identify and deliver transport solutions to support sustainable development. These include but not limited to Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH), Hampshire County Council (HCC), and Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH).	Comment noted.
4	2	Chapter 5: Air Quality	The primary responsibility for addressing the Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) rests with the relevant LPA. Where the SRN is identified as a significant contributor to air quality issues, the HA will work with the relevant LPA to identify how the issue can be improved.	The SEA process will consider the presence of AQMAs throughout the assessment.
5	2	Appendix D: Evidence Base	Please contact me to provide the appropriate data to update Table 2.3 which shows projected congestion levels on the SRN in South Hampshire as published in LTP2. You might consider expanding this table to also include other sections of the SRN in Hampshire.	Patrick Blake has been contacted to gain information. Updated data has been included in the revised Evidence Base accompanying the Environmental Report.
6	2	Appendix D: Evidence Base	Please also note that the HA hope to publish a new South East Regional Network Report later in the year, which would need to be considered when developing the evidence base to inform LTP3.	Comment noted and fed back to LTP3 development team.
7	2	General comment	There does not appear to be a reference to Noise Action Plans (NAP) in the SEA Scoping Report. The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs recently adopted NAPs for major roads including sections of the SRN. The NAPs set out the strategic approach to managing environmental noise and its effects. The NAPs define Important Areas (IA) that are considered to be severely impacted by noise and therefore must be investigated. However, the NAPs require those IAs that contain First Priority Locations (FPL) to be investigated as a priority.	Noise Action Plans have now been covered in the updated policy and plan review, included in the Evidence Base accompanying the Environmental Report.
8	2	General comment	Information on the exact locations of IAs is not yet available. Once information on IAs becomes available later this year, we expect to review those IAs containing FPLs identified alongside the SRN by October 2011, in accordance with the timetable set out in the NAPs. The implementation of any noise mitigation measures following any review will be subject to available funding.	Comment noted and fed back to LTP3 development team.
9	2	General comment	The HA would like to be proactively involved in the development of the Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton LTP3. Please contact me for any information or assistance that the HA can provide.	Comment noted and fed back to LTP3 development team.

*This page has been left intentionally blank for the purposes of double sided printing.*

**UE Associates Ltd**

Eagle Tower Montpellier Drive Cheltenham GL50 1TA

T: 01242 524 111 E: [enquiries@ue-a.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@ue-a.co.uk)

[www.ue-a.co.uk](http://www.ue-a.co.uk)

© UE Associates Ltd 2011

**BRIGHTON | CHELTENHAM | EXETER**

**UE Associates Ltd**

Eagle Tower   Montpellier Drive   Cheltenham   GL50 1TA

T: 01242 524 111   E: [enquiries@ue-a.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@ue-a.co.uk)

W: <http://www.ue-a.co.uk>

© UE Associates Ltd 2011

BRIGHTON • CHELTENHAM • EXETER