Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 2011/12-2025-26
Strategic Environmental Assessment – Environmental Statement

1.   Background

All local transport authorities are required to produce a local transport plan relating to transport to, from and within their area. The Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 (LTP3) sets out Nottinghamshire's transport strategy and outlines a programme of measures to be delivered over the short, medium and long term. The strategy covers all types of transport including public transport, walking, cycling, cars and freight. LTP3 comes into effect on 1 April 2011 and replaces the previous local transport plans for North Nottinghamshire and for Greater Nottingham.

A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) – including a health impact assessment – and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the LTP3 has been undertaken by Nottinghamshire County Council. The SEA and HRA are requirements under European Directives and have been developed alongside the LTP3 to help inform decisions on the content of the LTP3. The HRA is available from the County Council website www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/ltp#hra

The purpose of the SEA is to provide a high level view of the environmental consequences of the LTP in order that they are considered in the preparation and adoption of the LTP with a view to promoting sustainable development. The SEA therefore informs decisions and the strategy included in the LTP, and has helped provide a broad understanding of the environmental issues in the county and how they can be addressed in the LTP3.

Two key SEA documents were prepared as part of the process, a Scoping Report to determine what will be included in the assessment, and the Environmental Report. Consultation on the SEA Scoping Report and the Environmental Report was undertaken with statutory bodies and other interested parties to help inform the SEA process. In addition to the statutory bodies (Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage); NHS Nottinghamshire County and Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England were consulted on the SEA documents.

The Environmental Report was consulted on alongside the draft LTP3 strategy and implementation plan. To ensure the statutory bodies' views were considered at all stages of the development of the LTP3, they were also consulted on the additional LTP3 consultation to determine transport priorities, challenges and strategy. Each stage of consultation on both the SEA and LTP3 was available for comments from the public. Summaries of all of the consultation responses are available from the County Council's website at www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/ltp3 but the responses from the SEA consultees are detailed within this document.

1.1   Environmental Statement

The SEA Statement is the third SEA document to be produced and is the post-adoption statement for the LTP3. The Statement contains information on:

- how environmental considerations have been integrated into the LTP3
- how the Environmental Report has been taken into account
- how opinions expressed in relation to the consultations on the LTP3 and its Environmental Report have been taken into account
- the reasons for choosing the adopted LTP3; in the light of other reasonable alternatives dealt with, and
- the measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the LTP3.

This document is the Environmental Statement for the SEA of the LTP3 following its adoption and provides the information listed above.

2. How the SEA process has influenced the LTP3
2.1 Consultation
Extensive consultation has been undertaken to assist in the development of the LTP3 from its inception to its completion. Details of the main rounds of consultation are detailed in table 1 below.

Table 1:   Consultation undertaken as part of the development of the LTP3

Topic	Who was consulted	When it was undertaken
Determining the local transport priorities and challenges that need to be addressed in LTP3	• statutory consultees (including the SEA consultees) • the public • County Council elected members, and • a range of stakeholders including district and parish councils, local businesses, transport operators and interest groups	January/February 2010
Determining the preferred broad transport strategic options to deliver transport improvements to address the local transport priorities and challenges	• statutory consultees (including the SEA consultees) • the public • County Council elected members, and • a range of stakeholders including district and parish councils, local businesses, transport operators and interest groups	June/July 2010
Scoping Report of what should be included within the SEA	• SEA consultees (Environment Agency, Natural England, English Heritage, Nottinghamshire County and Bassetlaw NHS, and Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England) • Available to all through the County Council's website	August/September 2010
Draft LTP3 setting out the strategy to deliver transport improvements during the period 2011/12 to 2025/26	• statutory consultees (including the SEA consultees) • the public • County Council elected members, and • a range of stakeholders including district and parish councils, local businesses, transport operators and interest groups	December/January 2011
SEA Environmental Report to determine the environmental impacts of alternatives and identify the preferred LTP3 strategy	• SEA consultees (Environment Agency, Natural England, English Heritage, Nottinghamshire County and Bassetlaw NHS, and Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England) • Available to all through the County Council's website	February/March 2011
LTP3 Implementation Plan setting out the measures to deliver the LTP3 strategy during the period 2011/12 to 2014/15	• statutory consultees (including the SEA consultees) • the public • County Council elected members, and • a range of stakeholders including district and parish councils, local businesses, transport operators and interest groups	February/March 2011
Final draft LTP3 setting out the strategy to deliver transport improvements during the period 2011/12 to 2025/26	• statutory consultees (including the SEA consultees) • the public • County Council elected members, and • a range of stakeholders including district and parish councils, local businesses, transport operators and interest groups	February/March 2011
Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report to assess likely issues and determine if an appropriate assessment is required	• Natural England • Available to all through the County Council's website	February/March 2011

2.2 LTP3 goals and objectives
Consultation on the local transport priorities and challenges has helped identify the Nottinghamshire LTP3 goals and objectives. A summary of the responses from the SEA consultees is included as appendix 1 to this document. The overarching strategic transport goals for Nottinghamshire determined through the development of the LTP3 are to:
- provide a reliable, resilient transport system which supports a thriving economy and growth whilst encouraging sustainable and healthy travel
- improve access to key services, particularly enabling employment and training opportunities, and
- minimise the impacts of transport on people's lives, maximise opportunities to improve the environment and help tackle carbon emissions.

Consultation also identified twelve local transport challenges/objectives that need to be delivered in order to achieve the strategic transport goals. These objectives and how they will deliver the strategic transport goals are detailed in table 2 below.

Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 2011/12-2025-26
Strategic Environmental Assessment – Environmental Statement

Major positive	Positive	Minor positive	No impact	Minor negative	Negative	Major negative

Table 2: How the local transport objectives will deliver the LTP3 strategic goals

	Strategic transport goals		
Local transport objectives	Provide a reliable, resilient transport system which supports a thriving economy and growth whilst encouraging sustainable and healthy travel	Improve access to key services, particularly enabling employment and training opportunities	Minimise the impacts of transport on people's lives, maximise opportunities to improve the environment and help tackle carbon emissions
Tackle congestion and make journey times more reliable	Major positive	Positive	Major positive
Improve connectivity to inter-urban, regional and international networks, primarily by public transport	Positive	Major positive	Positive
Address the transport impacts of planned housing and employment growth	Major positive	Positive	Positive
Encourage people to walk, cycle and use public transport through promotion and the provision of facilities	Major positive	Major positive	Major positive
Support regeneration	Major positive	Positive	Minor positive
Reduce transport's impact on the environment	Minor positive	No impact	Major positive
Adapt to climate change and the development of a low-carbon transport system	Minor positive	No impact	Major positive
Improve levels of health and activity by encouraging active travel instead of short car journeys	Major positive	Minor positive	Positive
Address and improve personal safety when walking, cycling or using public transport	Positive	Minor positive	Positive
Improve access to employment and other key services, particularly from rural areas	Major positive	Positive	Major positive
Provision of an affordable, reliable, and convenient public transport network	Positive	Major positive	Positive
Maintain the existing transport infrastructure	Positive	Minor positive	Minor positive

2.3   SEA Scoping Report

Responses to the consultation on the SEA Scoping Report were generally supportive of the approach to be undertaken although several comments were made by the consultees. The responses received and how these were used to develop the SEA approach is detailed in table 3 below. The Scoping Report identified the key issues and potential future trends related to transport. This helped identify the issues for further consideration during the appraisal stage and subsequent inclusion in the Environmental Report.

Table 3:   SEA Scoping Report consultation responses

Organisation	Consultee response	Action/comment
Environment Agency; Natural England	Green infrastructure: Welcome reference to benefits of green infrastructure and reference to 6C's Green Infrastructure Strategy but query justification for scoping out green infrastructure. Natural England (NE) also queries why green infrastructure has been scoped out. NE further comments that the extent to which the 6C's GI Strategy can be integrated with LTP3 should be explored.	GI is to be assessed as part of habitat fragmentation, wider, landscape and surface water. See para 4.2.20, 5.2.20 and 7.2,18 of Scoping Report. To avoid double counting a separate GI objective was not required. No action.
Environment Agency; Natural England	Network Resilience: EA welcome emphasis placed upon making the transport system more resilient to impacts of climate change. NE comments that sound design principles for new infrastructure and innovative management of the existing transport network could achieve benefits for network resilience (as well as for the natural environment) in response to climate change.	Network resilience is to feature within the maintenance strategy and design specification for transport measures. NCC to document policy commitments.
Environment Agency	Sustainable Urban Drainage: Comment that benefits of SuDs also extend to the objective of making the highway network resilient to impacts of climate change. Suggest uptake of SuDs as a useful indicator for monitoring effectiveness of the LTP in achieving this objective	Benefits of SuDs are acknowledged (see 4.2.16) but impose a long term maintenance cost so that its use is to be evaluated on a case by case basis. Adopt an indicator based on uptake of SuDs
Environment Agency	Notes identification of risks associated with pluvial flooding. Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRA) available: Greater Nottingham SFRA, Ashfield Level 1 SFRA, Newark & Sherwood SFRA, Bassetlaw SFRA. Nottingham City SFRA in preparation.	Reference to available SFRAs to be noted in Environmental Report and Policy/plans appendix.
English Heritage	Query what is meant by an 'integrated whole systems approach to the delivery for transport to contribute towards social, health and environmental objectives'	The concept considers that transport measures ought to deliver across the entire community agenda in an integrated manner that recognises system links in the short, medium and longer term beyond the traditional transport planning silos. An indicator is required that demonstrates integrated approaches.
English Heritage	Comment that it is vital to protect environmental assets (as well as to enhance them)	Noted. Amendment made to Environmental Report.
English Heritage	Comment that whilst "vibration and air pollution damage to listed buildings" (and presumably also to scheduled structures such as bridges may be appropriate to scope out at strategic level, it is still a significant issue.	The significance of the impact is not underplayed, but does not feature as a significant element capable of being addressed within the LTP3. Environmental Report to recognise the issue.
English Heritage	Draws attention to the Nottinghamshire Historic Landscape Characterisation and to the Mature landscape areas.	Noted. Environmental Report to draw attention to the use of such information in the design and assessment of transport measures.
English Heritage	Comments that the SEA will need to assess the potential impacts on the significance of all types of heritage assets (both designated and undesignated).	At the scale of county wide plan and where no specific transport measures can be geographically defined it is not feasible to identify individual designated heritage features. Consideration of undesignated features may be feasible as part of the appraisal of measures within Implementation Plans. No action.
English Heritage	Seems to be a contradiction between the timescale of effects and the fact that they may be reversible.	No contradiction. While an impact may be reversible, there is no guarantee that resources would be provided to reverse the impact. Hence the approach records the significance of the effect assuming it is not reversed, but recognised that potential mitigation measures could be devised. No action.
English Heritage	Comment that major, moderate and minor significance criteria lack clarity and do not adequately reflect the relative importance of assets as well as the degree of harm that might result from LTP proposals.	Significance is defined as a function of scale, duration and probability etc. Relative importance of individual assets and degree of harm can only be proximate as the assessment is of the strategy rather than individual transport measures. No action.
English Heritage	Suggest amend SEA Objective 12 to "To protect and enhance heritage assets and their setting	Objective 12 revised.
English Heritage	Suggested amendment to indicator proposed: "the number of transport schemes where contributions are made to the enhancement of heritage assets or their setting"	Indicator revised.
English Heritage	Suggested additional indicator proposed: "the number of schemes resulting in the loss of heritage assets	Indicator added to capture the number of schemes where heritage assets are lost.
Natural England	Welcome recognition of need for close integration of transport and spatial planning	Noted. No action.
Natural England	Welcome identification of climate change as a focus for the assessment. Comment that the assessment should test the contribution that the LTP makes to climate change mitigation and adaptation.	This is the intention. No action.

Organisation	Consultee response	Action/comment
Natural England	Consider that spatial planning system has a pivotal role in securing mitigation and adaptation measures to address long-term threat from climate change.	Noted.
Natural England	Welcome that assessment will take a holistic view and consider contribution transport can make to a wide range of objectives. Comment that well-designed transport links can also provide "green infrastructure" and that multi-functional green infrastructure can deliver a range of benefits.	Noted.
Natural England	LTP needs to include policies that reduce carbon emissions and also recognise the opportunities that the transport network has to assist the natural environment in adapting to climate change, including sound design principles for new infrastructure and innovative management of the existing transport network.	Noted.
Natural England	Comments that there should be improved accessibility to and within the natural environment. Additional objective suggested: "To improve accessibility to, and within, the natural environment taking into account the needs of disadvantaged groups and communities, particularly in relation to health and obesity".	Addressed in SEA Objective 24 "To develop transport policies and strategy that support health, equity and environmental quality". No action.
Natural England	Consider it imperative to incorporate infrastructure that encourages use of more sustainable modes of transport. To encourage modal shift there should be ease of access to an efficient and effective, integrated public transport system and a network of improved attractive pedestrian and cycle routes should be incorporated into the design of new development.	Noted.
Natural England	Welcomes recognition that transport can have both positive and negative impacts on human health.	Noted.
Natural England	Welcome recognition of the opportunity that exists for LTP to contribute to and enhance biodiversity. Comment that it is not clear why statutory designated sites are not considered key to defining the scope of the assessment.	Transport measures not currently defined, it being unlikely that proposals would emerge that affect designated sites, whereas loss of other habitat and fragmentation more likely. A review of outline transport measures to confirm no effects on designated sites will be undertaken.
Natural England	Attention is drawn to the possible future designation of Sherwood Forest as a Special Protection Area, though it is not designated as such yet. Copy of advice note to Local Planning Authorities provided.	Noted. To be considered in the HRA Screening Report.
Natural England	NE believes the SEA objective should be to "…conserve the natural environment and deliver high quality, environmentally sustainable development. Conservation should be defined as the protection, conservation and enhancement of the natural environment by ensuring policies contribute to: • conserve and enhance the natural environment through the wise use of natural resources; • mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change through the creation of an enhanced GI network; • provide the highest levels of protection for England' protected habitats, sites and species; • deliver substantial benefits for the natural environment and people together. "	The GI network issue is captured under landscape. Other aspects need to respect level of detail available in LTP3 and resource availability. It is considered that a pithy and clear objective is needed for the SEA and hence the objective is amended to: To conserve the natural environment and to enhance ecological connectivity and LDAP priority habitats and species.
Natural England	Support the objective to provide a physical environment that encourages the use of non-motorised modes of travel. LTP3 should recognise the importance of providing and maintaining a network of green infrastructure, including RoW, quality green spaces, quiet lanes, greenways and corridors, for an effective non-motorised transport network threading through urban areas and linking to more rural areas.	LTP3 will recognise these aspects.
Natural England	Welcomes reference to the European Landscape Convention (ELC), which confirms that England's landscapes matter for the health, wealth and well-being of society, our cultural identity and for the diverse habitats that exist as part of them.	Noted.
Natural England	Policy wording should establish "the principle of landscape character led consideration of development proposals…… and require development to take forward the positive enhancement of local landscapes, particularly where landscape character has been degraded"	LTPs set the policy context for the management of urban and rural transport. Para 5.2.19 recognises that opportunities may exist to improve landscape quality and local distinctiveness. LTP3 to provide a policy to guide enhancement of local landscapes.

Organisation	Consultee response	Action/comment
Natural England	The assessment should "consider the extent to which LTP3 provides opportunities to protect and enhance the landscape character and quality and manage the landscape effects of transport in recognition of the ELC."	LTP3 sets the policy framework and hence it is not possible to measure the "extent" to which opportunities are provided. Nevertheless the objective is replaced with: To protect and enhance the landscape character and quality and manage the landscape effects of transport in recognition of the ELC.
Natural England	NE hold condition assessment information on statutory designated sites and it may be possible to gather baseline evidence on whether air quality issues are currently affecting the condition of a site	Available information will be sought from Natural England.
Natural England	Comment that would expect LTP3 to assess impacts of its policies and strategies in combination with other development proposals, especially on those sites sensitive to air quality for example: Rainworth Heath SSSI, Strawberry Hill Health SSSI and Birklands West & Ollerton Corner SSSI.	Noted. Request made to Natural England to confirm the list of such sites and related development proposals. NCC requested to provide details of development proposals affecting SSSIs so SEA and HRA can consider potential interactions.
Natural England	Strategies should be adopted to encourage modal shift of necessary travel to more efficient sustainable, low carbon modes and technologies that benefit air quality and the natural environment by: • recognising importance of public transport and active travel and investing in appropriate infrastructure including Rights of Way • encouraging use of smarter choices (travel plans) • recognising importance of rail, water and more fuel efficient vehicles for more sustainable transport of freight; • reinforcing positive driver behaviour and encourage eco-driving	Noted.
Natural England; Campaign for the protection of Rural England (CPRE)	NE comment that not clear why accessibility to public open space has been scoped out. CPRE comment that access to open and green spaces should be built more consistently into the objectives. CPRE comment that whereas access to open spaces and recreational opportunities is included, access to open space has been scoped out. Query why open space cannot be brought in under the recreation objective.	Access to open space was considered to be a local matter more appropriately assessed at a project rather than plan level with larger areas being captured within the accessibility to recreational areas objective although this was not clear. The assessment will focus upon how policies support improved access to recreational areas (including large areas of open space).
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) on behalf of EMTAR	Query ranking of equality of opportunity – ranked 5 in table but second in text	CPRE respondent has misunderstood the text. Whilst stakeholders (such as businesses, interest groups and PT operators) ranked it second of the five priorities, the overall ranking by ALL respondents ranked equality of opportunity fifth. No action.
CPRE	Comment that it is not always possible to distinguish between travel for social and domestic purposes and access to jobs and training.	While this is true, the focus here is upon reducing journey times to areas offering employment and training. No action
CPRE	Comment that options identified (in 2.4.9) are generic and do not appear to be related to the transport challenges identified	The process of drafting LTP3 will give further consideration of alternatives in relation to the transport challenges. No action.
CPRE	Seek clarification on where data gaps are, whether poor accessibility (3.8.2, p27) refers to sustainable modes, connectivity by road network or another criterion, and how economic competitiveness would be established.	Accessibility relates to access by public transport.
CPRE	Request more information on whole life costing	There are similarities between whole life costing and life cycle assessment, although the focus of the former is upon examining the cost benefits of say using a cheaper product but with a shorter life span or a more expensive product with a longer duration.
CPRE	Consider that priorities should be refocused to take account of considerations referred to in 2.1 above	CPRE respondent has misunderstood the text. No action.
CPRE	Comment that access to countryside for non-residents is of economic value to the countryside and argue that SEA objective 22 deals with accessibility for rural communities but not adequately with access for visitors. Comment that an SEA objective to facilitate better access to the countryside by sustainable modes would seem in keeping with the County's overall aims for LTP3 (including commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions)	The focus is upon rural communities as access to the countryside for recreation is captured in objective 23. Objective 14 deals with greenhouse gas emissions.
NHS	Why is a health needs assessment not required?	A separate Health Impact Assessment is not required as health is considered within the SEA.
NHS	LAA expires March 2011	Acknowledged.
NHS	States that there are 10 priorities (under the Sustainable Community Strategy) not six? (3.3.2)	Chapter 10 of the SCS identifies 6 priorities and are titled as such.

Organisation	Consultee response	Action/comment
NHS	Comment that read as priorities not targets: (3.3.3)	Amended para 3.3.3 to read targets and priorities.
NHS	A new JSNA published 2010.	Revisions to capture 2010 made to Environmental Report.
NHS	Comment that data in 8.3.23 is estimated.	Presume this relates to para 8.33.22. Amended to read "Recent estimated data".
NHS	Obesity data is also limited	Noted.
NHS	Comments that should consider access to health care facilities (8.3.33)	Access to health care recorded in access to community facilities.
NHS	Is reference to "human health" needed	SEA Directive makes reference to human health.
NHS	Suggest para 2.3.3 needs to be more specific i.e. children – what age, health problems etc	SEA will consider impact upon different children's groups if spatial profiles can be provided by the NHS to NCC.
NHS	Reference sought for statement in 8.2.47 on areas with particular accessibility issues	NCC to provide reference to be added to Environmental Report as available. The mapping is included within the Accessibility Strategy.

2.4   Draft LTP3, Implementation Plan and SEA Environmental Report

2.4.1 Strategic options

Before the first draft of the LTP3 was written, consultation was undertaken to determine how people thought that the local transport goals and objectives should be delivered. A summary of the responses from the SEA consultees is included as appendix 2 to this document. The results of this consultation identified public transport improvements as the top strategic option to deliver the transport goals and objectives. Maintenance of the existing highways assets was a very close second. There was also significant support for reducing the need to travel and encouraging active travel; whilst building new roads was the least supported option.

A meeting with NHS Nottinghamshire County was also held to ensure that all opportunities for health improvements relating to transport were explored and included in the LTP3.

Consulting with the public, elected members and stakeholders through this process also helped to develop alternatives used as part of the LTP3/SEA process and the results of this consultation helped develop the transport strategy detailed within the LTP3.

2.4.2 Draft LTP3 and Environmental Report

Four strategic alternative options were considered for LTP3 and assessed as part of the SEA process which are summarised below:
1. **Without a Plan –** one option that we are required to consider is the likely progression of the environmental baseline without a Plan. This is very much a theoretical exercise because the Transport Act 2000, as amended by the Local Transport Act 2008, places a statutory duty on the County Council to produce a Plan by 1 April 2011. This option assumes that the current LTP programmes will be delivered but does not assume the delivery of any strategies or measures that are in development.
2. **Do minimum –** given that transport funding may be very limited this option would propose that no new transport infrastructure be delivered and that only a minimum amount of maintenance would be undertaken, although the highway assets would be allowed to deteriorate.
3. **Asset management –** consultation identified maintenance of the highway assets as a high priority. This option therefore places emphasis on maintaining the existing highway assets to at least its current standard.   It would not include funding for any additional or new infrastructure except road safety improvements but would include non-infrastructure measures that would help ensure statutory obligations are met.
4. **Local improvements –** consultation identified the transport priorities for Nottinghamshire as well as a range of local transport objectives that would need to be met to deliver the priorities. This option includes a mix of infrastructure and non-infrastructure measures that would help deliver the local transport objectives identified through consultation. In the short-term financial

constraints will limit these measures to smaller scale improvements to concentrate on making the best use of our existing transport infrastructure.

The assessment found that the greatest positive environmental effects could be achieved through the implementation of option 4 and this was the preferred option as set out in the Environmental Report. The preferred option was therefore developed further into the strategy contained within the LTP3. None of the statutory consultees disagreed with the preferred option. It should, however, be noted that there is considerable uncertainty over the transport improvements that will be delivered during the lifetime of the LTP3 due to potential funding limitations.

A key change to the draft LTP3 following its consultation with the statutory consultees was a greater emphasis on the maximising the opportunities from transport improvements to provide environmental benefits. This resulted in the revision of one of the strategic transport goals as well as the strategy to deliver the goals. In addition to improving health through encouraging healthy, active travel, a specific transport goal has been included within the LTP3 associated with ensuring that the impacts of transport on people's lives are minimised, whilst opportunities to improve the environment and help tackle carbon emissions are maximised. Consequently the LTP3 contains a chapter on encouraging sustainable and healthy travel which includes the strategy to encourage and provide for active travel; as well as improving road and community safety. The LTP3 also includes a chapter setting out the strategy to reduce CO_2 emissions from road transport; improve air quality; reduce transport related noise and vibration; as well as improving the physical, natural and historic environments.

Table 4 below details the SEA consultees responses to the draft LTP and SEA Environmental Report consultation as well as the actions taken as a result of the responses.

Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 2011/12-2025-26
Strategic Environmental Assessment – Environmental Statement

Table 4:   LTP3 draft strategy and SEA Environmental Report consultation responses from SEA consultees

Organisation	General comments	Action/comment
Environment Agency	Would like opportunity to comment on programme of action for bridges and culverts	Noted. Comments passed to Bridges Team.
	Consider surface water management plan for GN in LTP	Plan considered.
	Greater links to Green Infrastructure	Text reviewed and role of green infrastructure included in Chapter 5 of the LTP3 strategy and cross-referenced in other relevant chapters (already included within the implementation plan).
	Greater links to Low Emissions Strategy Partnership good practice guide	Text reviewed to include reference to Low Emissions Strategy Partnership in Chapter 7 of the LTP3 strategy.
	Supports emphasis placed on climate change	Noted.
	Supports the use of SuDS in new transport infrastructure and retrofitting in existing highways	Noted.
English Heritage	Helpful if road schemes that may be supported by NCC are included in the document	Currently supported schemes are included in the Implementation Plan which was circulated to SEA consultees for comment.
	Concerns over HSR station in Nottingham due to adverse impacts on built and historic environment	Text reviewed to reflect concerns about impacts on the built and natural environment.
	Strategy could include a policy on how we will manage historic transport structures (e.g. bridges)	No action required. Policy on such issues is included within the Highways Network Management Plan.
	Climate change and pollution sections (5.1, 5.2 and 5.4) could make reference to impact on physical and setting of historic environment	Text reviewed to make references.
	More explicit reference could be made on public realm improvements with historic places and conservation areas	Text reviewed.
	Would like NCC to commit to reducing street clutter including signage	The County Council has a commitment to reducing street clutter and text has been amended to reflect this.
	That sensitive design and quality materials continue to be used in conservation areas and other sensitive locations despite reduced funding levels	Noted.
	Supports inclusion of historic environment issues	Noted.
	Supports proposals to ameliorate against noise in environment of heritage assets	Noted.
	Need to clarify the term 'statutorily designated sites' in the SEA by referring to 'statutorily designated *nature conservation* sites'.	Text reviewed to reflect comments.
	It should be made clear that some of the measures shown in the Key Diagram on page 59 of the SEA relate to transport schemes that will clearly have impacts on the designated and undesignated assets listed. It is therefore recommended that the second paragraph is amended to: '..were unlikely to be significantly affected by the policies and measures outlined in the Local Transport Plan, *but could be affected at the scheme level, including transport infrastructure required for new development.*'	Text reviewed to reflect comments.
	The SEA approach to monitoring is generally supported but two additional SEA indicators are proposed to reflect action to improve air quality and reduce the impact of noise; this would benefit the sites which are of historic interest, identified as being adversely affected by noise and air pollution, such as Rufford Abbey: • Reduction in the number of designated heritage assets that lie within AQMAs • Reduction in the number of designated heritage assets that lie within Noise Action Planning First Priority Locations.	Suggested indicators included within the SEA monitoring.
Natural England	Pleased to see that LTP3 recognises many of the issues covered in their LTP guidance	Noted.

Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 2011/12-2025-26
Strategic Environmental Assessment – Environmental Statement

Organisation	General comments	Action/comment
Natural England (continued)	Third strategic goal is unnecessarily negative would like it altered to 'Seek to minimise negative and maximise positive impacts on the environment'. Need to pursue positive impacts on the environment (e.g., potential to raise the wildlife value of parts of the highway network is not detailed). Transport schemes should not only avoid and reduce impacts on the natural environment but also consider/provide opportunities for enhancement such as habitat restoration and creation schemes; as well as creative design to improve the environment. Schemes should seek net environmental gain from necessary transport development whilst avoiding, mitigating or compensating for negative impacts.	Third strategic goal and text reviewed to reflect the comments.
	Links between transport goals and vision and the rest of the strategy are unclear as they do not specifically coincide with the number of chapters or chapter headings – may give undue importance to PT over other modes	Chapters amended to reflect comment.
	A matrix relating the goals to the objectives may help	Tables relating goals to objectives included in LTP3.
	Needs more information on the role of Green Infrastructure	Text reviewed and role of green infrastructure included in Chapter 5 of the LTP3 strategy and cross-referenced in other relevant chapters (already included within the implementation plan).
	Needs more information on Landscape Character to express the wider setting of heritage assets	Text reviewed.
	The Sherwood Forest area landscape might justify a sub-strategy for this particular area	Text has been reviewed to include consideration of sub-strategy for Sherwood Forest SPA once it has been declared.
	Supports emphasis on sustainable travel in at each of the three spatial levels of the transport vision	Noted.
	Strongly commends the content of supporting economy chapter	Noted.
	Strongly endorses sustainable healthy travel chapter	Noted.
	Supports the SEA option selected and mitigation recommendations set out in section 1.8	Noted.
	Any transport proposals that emerge over the duration of the LTP3 would need to be assessed further for their impacts on the environment	Text within LTP3 strategy and Implementation Plan included to this effect.
	We note the LTP3 objectives have been tested against the SEA objectives using a 'compatibility matrix'. The main inconsistency is due to the following objective: *Improving connectivity to inter-urban, regional and international networks.* While it is suggested that it is unlikely any such measures would be implemented in the short term we advise that any significant environmental effects on the environment would need to be correctly identified and effectively mitigated through the normal appraisal process at the project level. Wherever possible specific transport measures should be designed to ensure that positive outcomes are delivered.	Noted.

2.4.3 How the SEA has influenced and been integrated into the LTP3

Undertaking the SEA process alongside the LTP3 from the start of its development has helped ensure that environmental issues were considered alongside all other issues. The findings of each stage of the SEA process has been considered and integrated into the LTP3 development through the LTP3 Steering Group made up of County Council elected members and officers.

The SEA process began at the LTP3 scoping stage with a review of the LTP2 SEA and the SEA evidence used for LTP2. Consultants were used to undertake the SEA and were therefore used as a 'critical friend' to ensure that all environmental issues were examined and considered. Using consultants also allowed for the use of environmental experts to help develop reasonable alternatives as well as impartial assessments of the environmental impacts of alternatives. The assessments of the environmental impacts are recorded in the Environmental Report and were consulted on alongside the LTP3 strategy. This has helped to determine the LTP3 strategy; the monitoring of the LTP3 and the SEA; and to incorporate the environmental impacts and mitigation in the development of the risk assessments of the LTP3.

The final draft of the LTP3 was amended in the light of the LTP3/SEA Environmental Report consultation as detailed in table 4 above. Table 5 below details how the SEA objectives have been integrated into the LTP3.

Table 5:   How the SEA objectives have been integrated into the LTP3

Theme	SEA objective	How it has been integrated into LTP3
Plans and programmes	1. To contribute towards meeting housing needs 2. To contribute to regeneration and economic development initiatives 3. To ensure that the location of development makes efficient use of existing physical infrastructure and helps to reduce the need to travel 4. To reduce the need to travel and promotion of sustainable modes. 5. To adopt design and management practices that contributes toward social, health and environmental objectives.	• Improve access to employment using sustainable modes • Support the use of technology • Improve regional connectivity • Provide infrastructure for sustainable freight transport • Reduced need to travel • Commitments to deliver objectives during design and delivery of transport measures
Biodiversity, geological sites and soils	6. To conserve the natural environment and to enhance ecological connectivity and LBAP priority habitats and species. 7. To conserve soils thereby supporting other objectives (e.g. minimising erosion by controlling run-off and maintaining vegetation cover). 8. To use brownfield sites where appropriate where there is no conflict with ecological interest	• Commitments to manage the highway estate to promote biodiversity • Measures to avoid damage to soils • Support development of brownfield sites
Landscape, townscape, historic environment	9. To protect and enhance the landscape character and quality and manage the landscape effects of transport in recognition of the European Landscape Convention (ELC). 10. To reduce the intrusion of highway lighting 11. To deliver improvements to the urban environment as part of road improvement schemes 12. To protect and enhance heritage assets and their setting	• Create opportunities to enhance the urban environment • Preserve the character of areas, sites, buildings, and features of historic interest • Promote good design and local distinctiveness • Demonstrate commitment to consider good design through design and delivery of transport measures

Air quality, climatic factors, noise	13. To continue to deliver reductions in particulate and nitrogen dioxide levels across the County and the AQMAs in particular.	• Reduce need to travel • Promote sustainable travel options • Support low carbon fuel initiatives • Reduce traffic congestion • Create a resilient transport network • Reduce traffic noise levels in sensitive areas
	14. To deliver quantified reductions in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 that contribute to the 34% reduction target	
	15. To encourage sustainable transport systems, alternative fuels, aid behaviour changes and reduce the need to travel	
	16. To establish where measures could be taken to enhance resilience of network based on UKCIP 2009 forecasts	
	17. To deliver reductions in road traffic noise focusing upon those areas identified as First Priority Locations	
Water	18. To manage the transport drainage network to ensure no detriment to surface water quality	• Measures to manage water quality • Measures to reduce the impact of flooding
	19. Manage, maintain and where necessary improve the highways drainage network to reduce the economic losses of pluvial flooding.	
Population – Community	20. To develop policies and strategies that are spatially targeted towards specific community groups (elderly, young).	• Promote integration of objectives in design and delivery of transport measures and management of the transport asset • Address physical travel barriers • Meet the travel needs of different communities
	21. To fully integrate the planning, transport, housing, environmental and health systems to address the social determinants of health in each locality	
	22. To improve community capital and reduce social isolation across the social gradient.	
Population - Accessibility	23. To reduce the number of people with access difficulties to employment, community and recreational opportunities	• Improve access to jobs and services using sustainable transport • Improve accessibility for those without access to a car
Population – Public health	24. To develop transport policies and strategy that support health, equity and environmental quality	• Promote sustainable travel options • Improve access to healthcare services and open space
Population – Safer communities	25. To deliver a physical environment that promotes non-motorised modes and enhanced sense of place and improved perceptions of safety, particularly in those areas of greatest need.	• Improve road safety • Reduce fear of crime
Material assets	26. To promote resource efficiency	• Promote use of renewable resources • Reduce energy use • Support local sourcing • Minimise construction waste • Support development of brownfield sites
	27. Deliver reductions in the waste arisings going to landfill from works to the highways network	
	28. Reduce the total energy expended on lighting and fleet vehicles or indirectly funded by the County Council.	

3. Monitoring

The SEA Directive places a statutory duty to monitor the environmental impacts of the delivery of the LTP3. The LTP3 must therefore be monitored and reported upon in order to comply with the Directive, as well as to continue to identify issues that may need resolving. The monitoring of the significant health and environmental effects of the delivery of the LTP3, alongside the transport impacts enables he success of the LTP3 to be expressed in terms of both its environmental and other benefits. The SEA of the Nottinghamshire LTP3 found no significant negative effects of the Plan. It is, however, recognised that the assessment is based upon a number of uncertainties, not least the uncertainty over future funding levels which has been a significant difficulty during the development of the LTP3. Future funding levels may impact on the assumptions made about the delivery of transport improvements and the accuracy of the predictions made in the Environmental Report. Monitoring of the LTP3 and environmental impacts will therefore help to identify if these assumptions are correct (or incorrect) and to provide mitigation or changes to the strategy as appropriate.

The County Council's approach to monitoring has been to select a number of robust indicators that can be easily measured. Table 6 below details the indicators that will be monitored to assess the environmental impacts of the LTP3. The indicators highlighted grey are the LTP3 indicators that are included within the 2011/12-2014/15 Implementation Plan. The monitoring framework will however, be updated during the lifetime the LTP3. Whilst it is no longer a requirement to produce annual progress reports of the LTP, the County Council has committed to continue to produce annual reports which will include changes to the environmental baseline and how these variances will be mitigated where appropriate.

The LTP3 also makes a commitment to undertake appropriate environmental assessments of the impacts of individual schemes, which may also result in the monitoring of individual scheme impacts.

Table 6: LTP3 and SEA indicators to monitor the environmental and health impacts of LTP3

Theme	Monitoring	Responsible authority	Action trigger
Plans and programmes	• Number of schemes targeted at enhancing employment opportunities through Implementation Plans or daughter documents	• NCC	• Review of Implementation Plans or publication of daughter documents
	• Evidence of continuous improvement in sustainability associated with management of the transport network	• NCC	• Consideration of a formal sustainability award scheme within 3 years
	• Monitoring sustainable transport use for major housing, retail, leisure and employment developments (e.g. number of new developments with travel plans)	• District councils/ Developers/ NCC	• Planning consents for major developments with transport implications following publication of LTP3
	• Number of local bus and light rail journeys originating in the county	• Bus operators/ NCC/ DfT	• Continuous
	• Average journey time to urban centres during the morning peak	• NCC/DfT	• Continuous
	• Traffic flows into town centres	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Changes in area wide traffic mileage	• NCC	• Continuous
Biodiversity, geological sites and soils	• Number of transport measures delivering enhanced ecological outcomes through Implementation Plan or daughter documents	• NCC	• Review of design processes should there be an absence of transport measures in any 3 year period
	• Area of greenfield land taken for transport assets	• District councils	• Continuous
	• Area of brownfield land taken for transport assets	• District councils	• Continuous
	• Percentage of employment land on previously developed land	• District councils	• Continuous
	• Percentage of new and converted dwellings on previously developed land	• District councils	• Continuous
Landscape, townscape, historic environment	• Number of schemes delivering enhanced public realm through Implementation Plans or daughter documents	• NCC	• Review processes if no transport measures submitted for design awards in any 3 year period
	• Number of transport schemes where contributions are made to the enhancement of heritage assets or their setting	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Number of heritage assets adversely or beneficially affected by transport measures	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Length of county roads with low intrusion lighting	• NCC	• Review of Implementation Plans or publication of daughter documents
Air quality, climatic factors, noise	• NI 186 per capita CO_2 emissions	• DECC	• Continuous - Review if no reduction in emissions in any 3 year period
	• CO_2 emissions from road transport	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Number of air quality management areas on County Council managed roads	• District councils/NCC	• Continuous
	• Particulate levels in air quality management areas on County Council managed roads	• District councils	• Continuous
	• Proportion of public vehicle fleet using low carbon fuels	• NCC	• Continuous - Review of measures if no increase in proportion of fleet using low carbon fuels in any 3 year period
	• NI198 Mode of travel to school	• DfES	• Continuous - Review measures if rate of improvement declines over any 3 year period
	• Number of noise complaints related to transport	• NCC	• Continuous

Theme	Monitoring	Responsible authority	Action trigger
Water	• Number of projects incorporating SUDS	• NCC/District councils	• Review of Implementation Plans or publications of daughter documents • Review of design processes should there be an absence of transport measures in any 3 year period
	• Capital costs of dealing with the costs of flooding events on the highway estate	• NCC	• Flooding events
	• Number of days highway network disrupted by extreme weather events	• NCC	• Extreme weather events
	• Quality of water bodies receiving runoff from principal county roads	• NCC/ Environment Agency	• Continuous
Population – Community	• NI 141 – Percentage of vulnerable people achieving independent living	•	• Continuous - Review measures if rate of improvement declines over any 3 year period
	• Number of killed and seriously injured children in social group V or in areas of high deprivation	• NCC	• Continuous - Review measures if rate of improvement declines over any 3 year period
	• Percentage of rural population served by public transport every hour within 20 minutes walking distance	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Proportion of community by age within 800m of hourly or better bus services	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Number of fully accessible bus services	• Transport Commissioner/ Bus operators	• Five year review of LTP3 followed by review of measures if number is decreasing or unsatisfactory
	• Relative cost of bus fares against Retail Price Index	• Bus operators	• Continuous
Population - Accessibility	• Uptake of concessionary fare entitlement within eligible population	• NCC	• Publicity measures to be taken should uptake not increase on a yearly basis
	• Number of fully accessible bus services	• Bus operators	• Five year review of LTP3 followed by review of measures if number is decreasing or unsatisfactory
	• Public satisfaction with local bus services	• Bus operators/ NCC	• Continuous
	• Proportion of community by age within 800m of hourly or better bus services	• NCC	• Continuous
	• NI 176 Working age people with access to employment by public transport (and other specified modes)	• DfT	• Continuous - Review measures if rate of improvement declines over any 3 year period
	• Percentage of rural population served by public transport every hour within 20 minutes walking distance	• NCC	• Continuous
	• NI 175 Access to services and facilities by public transport, walking and cycling	• DfT	• Continuous
	• Access to training by public transport	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Access to healthcare by public transport	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Access to hospitals by public transport	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Access to a supermarket or local convenience store by public transport	• NCC	• Continuous
	• NI178 Bus services running on time	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Level of use made of demand responsive transport services	• Community transport operators/NCC	• Annual review of services

Theme	Monitoring	Responsible authority	Action trigger
	• Rights of Way improvements for all road users	• NCC	• Continuous
Population – Public health	• Length of new/improved multi-user paths to green/ open space as progressed through Implementation Plan or daughter documents	• NCC	• Review of Implementation Plans or publications of daughter documents; • Review of design processes should there be an absence of measures in any 3 year period
	• Number of locally targeted active travel and health promotion initiatives provided through Implementation Plan or daughter documents	• NCC	• Review programme on a 3 yearly basis to focus on communities experiencing most health inequalities
	• Access to hospitals and other health care services	• NCC	• Continuous - Review measures if rate of improvement declines over any 3 year period
	• NI198 Mode of travel to school	• DfES	• Continuous - Review measures if rate of improvement declines over any 3 year period
	• Cycling levels	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Child obesity levels	• NHS/NCC	• Continuous
	• Organisations with a travel plan	• NCC	• Continuous
Population – Safer communities	• NI 47 People killed and seriously injured	• NCC	• Continuous - Review measures if rate of improvement declines over any 3 year period
	• NI 48 Children killed and seriously injured	• NCC	
	• Monitoring required to identify and respond to cycling accident 'hotspots'	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Reduction in the total and reduction in the gap between mortality and morbidity of different social groups	• NCC	• Five year review of LTP3 followed by review of measures if there is an unsatisfactory result
	• Public perceptions of safety (including place survey analysis)	• NCC	• Continuous
Material Assets (transport infrastructure, minerals, waste and energy)	• Proportion of recycled aggregates used in transport and public realm projects	• NCC	• Continuous
	• Number of transport measures supporting activities bringing brownfield land into productive uses	• NCC/District councils	• Review of Implementation Plan or publication of daughter documents; • Review scheme prioritisation on absence of schemes within any 3 year period
	• Number of low energy lights installed per year	• NCC	• Continuous

Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 2011/12-2025-26
Strategic Environmental Assessment – Environmental Statement
Appendix 1: LTP3 priorities and challenges consultation responses from SEA consultees

Organisation	Priorities (and rank)	Challenges to delivering priorities	Other comments
		Consultation response	
NHS Nottinghamshire County/Bassetlaw PCT	1. Supporting economic growth	• Unreliable journey times because of congestion • Not being able to get to where you want by bus or train • Not being able to walk or cycle to where you want due to lack of facilities • Unreliable journey times because of incidents such as accidents or breakdowns	
	1. Tackling climate change	• Too many short car journeys made instead of walking or cycling	
	1. Contributing to better safety, security and health	• People injured in car accidents • Not enough cycle facilities (cycle routes, parking etc) to encourage cycling • Not enough walking facilities (footpaths, crossings etc) to encourage walking • Too many short car journeys made instead of walking and cycling • People feeling unsafe when walking, cycling or using the bus	
	2. Promoting greater equality of opportunity	• Not being able to get to where you want to by bus or train • Not being able to walk or cycle to where you want due to lack of facilities • Bus and train travel is not frequent or reliable enough • Having to catch too many buses to get where you want	
	2. Improving quality of life and promoting a healthy environment	• Not being able to get to leisure activities by bus, walking or cycling • Unreliable bus journey time and quality of buses or trains • Unreliable car journey times because of congestion • Not keeping up with repairs to roads and footpaths • Road traffic stopping you from easily getting where you want when walking or cycling	
NHS Nottinghamshire County	3. Supporting economic growth	• Not being able to get to where you want by bus or train • Not being able to walk or cycle to where you want due to lack of facilities • People unwilling to stop using their cars and use the bus, walk or cycle	
	3. Tackling climate change	• Too many short car journeys made instead of walking or cycling • People unwilling to stop using their cars and use the bus, walk or cycle	
	3. Promoting greater equality of opportunity	• Not being able to walk or cycle to where you want due to lack of facilities • Not enough information about buses and trains or it's too difficult to understand	
	3. Improving quality of life and promoting a healthy environment	• Not being able to get to leisure activities by bus, walking or cycling • Road traffic stopping you from easily getting where you want when walking or cycling	
	4. Contributing to better safety, security and health	• Not enough walking facilities (footpaths, crossings etc) to encourage walking	
NHS Nottinghamshire County	1. Tackling climate change	• Road traffic causing air pollution • Lack of take-up of low emission vehicles • Too many short car journeys made instead of walking or cycling • Too many long distance car journeys made instead of using the bus or train • People unwilling to stop using their cars and use the bus, walk or cycle	
	2. Supporting economic growth	• Unreliable journey times because of congestion • Not being able to get to where you want by bus or train • Unreliable journey times because of incidents such as accidents or breakdowns • People unwilling to stop using their cars and use the bus, walk or cycle	

Organisation	Consultation response		
	Priorities (and rank)	Challenges to delivering priorities	Other comments
	2. Contributing to better safety, security and health	• Road traffic causing air pollution • Too many short car journeys made instead of walking and cycling • People feeling unsafe when walking, cycling or using the bus	
	2. Improving quality of life and promoting a healthy environment	• Road traffic damaging the natural environment, buildings and landscape • Not keeping up with repairs to roads and footpaths	
	5. Promoting greater equality of opportunity	• Not being able to get to where you want to by bus or train • Bus and train travel costs too much • Bus and train travel is not frequent or reliable enough • Having to catch too many buses to get where you want • Not enough information about buses and trains or it's too difficult to understand	• Difficulty of reaching health facilities via public transport, specifically routes between Newark/ Ollerton and Kings Mill Hospital In Mansfield
CPRE (Nottinghamshire)	1. Promoting greater equality of opportunity	• Not being able to get to where you want to by bus or train • Not being able to walk or cycle to where you want due to lack of facilities • Bus and train travel costs too much • Bus and train travel is not frequent or reliable enough • Having to catch too many buses to get where you want • Not enough information about buses and trains or it's too difficult to understand	
	2. Tackling climate change	• Too many short car journeys made instead of walking or cycling • Too many long distance car journeys made instead of using the bus or train • More traffic from new housing and employment developments on the roads • People unwilling to stop using their cars and use the bus, walk or cycle	• Many elected members do not believe climate change is happening or, if happening, man-made
	3. Improving quality of life and promoting a healthy environment	• Noise from road traffic or rail • Road traffic damaging the natural environment, buildings and landscape • Not being able to get to leisure activities by bus, walking or cycling • Unreliable bus journey time and quality of buses or trains • Road traffic stopping you from easily getting where you want when walking or cycling • The design of new transport schemes affecting the streetscape, public realm or rural environment	• Take leisure and social journeys into account when planning for accessibility in rural Nottinghamshire - not just access to work and training
	4. Supporting economic growth	• Unreliable journey times because of congestion • Not being able to get to where you want by bus or train • Not being able to walk or cycle to where you want due to lack of facilities • More traffic on the roads from new housing and employment developments • People unwilling to stop using their cars and use the bus, walk or cycle	• Focus on local economic development so people don't have to travel so far or often
	5. Contributing to better safety, security and health	• Not enough walking facilities (footpaths, crossings etc) to encourage walking • Too many short car journeys made instead of walking and cycling • People feeling unsafe when walking, cycling or using the bus	• Lack of pavements or other safe walkways between villages discourages walking

Appendix 2: LTP3 strategic options consultation responses from SEA consultees

Organisation	Strategic option consultation response									
	Bus priority and infrastructure	Public transport interchanges	Public transport service improvements	Active travel	Local safety schemes	New roads and local road schemes	Maintenance of roads, footways and bridges	Reducing the need to travel	Demand management	Highest priorities
Campaign to Protect Rural England Nottinghamshire	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium	High	Medium	1. Reducing the need to travel 2. Public transport service improvements 3. Bus priority and infrastructure
NHS Nottinghamshire County	High	High	High	Medium	High	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	1. Public transport service improvements 2. Bus priority and infrastructure 3. Public transport interchange
NHS Nottinghamshire County and NHS Bassetlaw	Medium	Medium	High	High	High	Medium	Medium	High	Medium	1. Active travel 2. Local safety schemes 3. Reducing the need to travel
Natural England	Medium	Medium	High	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	High	1. Reducing the need to travel 2. Active travel 3. Public transport service improvements