

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the Portsmouth Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4)

Environmental Report
Non-Technical Summary

Portsmouth City Council

September 2020

Quality information

| Prepared by | Checked by | Verified by | Approved by |
|---|--|--|--|
| Cheryl Beattie Senior Environmental Planner | Alastair Peattie Associate Director | Nick Chisholm-Batten Associate Director | Nick Chisholm-Batten Associate Director |

Revision History

| Revision | Revision date | Details | Name | Position |
|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| v1 | 14/09/20 | Final for consultation | Cheryl Beattie | Senior Environmental Planner |

Prepared for:

Portsmouth City Council

Prepared by:

AECOM Limited
3rd Floor, Portwall Place
Portwall Lane
Bristol BS1 6NA
United Kingdom

T: +44 117 901 7000
aecom.com

© 2018 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited (“AECOM”) for sole use of our client (the “Client”) in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

| | |
|---|---|
| Structure of the Environmental Report / this NTS..... | 1 |
| What is the Plan trying to achieve?..... | 1 |
| What is the scope of the SEA? | 1 |

2. Plan-making / SEA up to this point

| | |
|--|----|
| Development of the Plan..... | 4 |
| Establishing the reasonable alternatives | 4 |
| Summary alternatives assessment findings..... | 7 |
| The preferred approach | 14 |

3. Assessment findings at this stage

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction..... | 15 |
| Assessment of the Draft Plan | 15 |
| Cumulative effects..... | 16 |

4. Next steps

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Strategy finalisation..... | 17 |
| Monitoring..... | 17 |

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1. Introduction

AECOM has been commissioned to undertake an independent Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of Portsmouth City Council's (PCC) emerging Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4).

SEA is a mechanism for considering and communicating the environmental impacts of an emerging plan or strategy and potential alternatives. The aim of SEA is to inform and influence the plan-making process with a view to avoiding and mitigating negative impacts as well as maximising opportunities for positive effects. Through this approach, the SEA seeks to maximise the environmental performance of the LTP4.

The Environmental Report is published alongside the Draft LTP4 for consultation. This report is the Non-Technical Summary (NTS) of the Environmental Report.

Structure of the Environmental Report / this NTS

SEA reporting essentially involves answering the following questions in turn:

1. What has plan-making / SEA involved up to this point?
 - Including in relation to 'reasonable alternatives'.
2. What are the SEA findings at this stage?
 - i.e. in relation to the Draft Strategy
3. What happens next?
 - What steps will be taken to finalise (and monitor) the Strategy?

Each of these questions is answered in turn below. Before answering the first question however, two initial questions are answered in order to further 'set the scene' – i) what is the Plan trying to achieve?; and ii) what is the scope of the SEA?

What is the Plan trying to achieve?

The LTP4 has identified the following vision:

"By 2036 Portsmouth will have a people centred travel network that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport to help deliver a safer, healthier and more prosperous city."

To achieve the vision outlined above, the LTP4 has identified the following objectives:

- Delivering cleaner air:
- Prioritising walking and cycling:
- Transforming public transport:
- Supporting business and protecting our assets:

What is the scope of the SEA?

The scope of the SEA is the sustainability issues and objectives that should be a focus of (and provide a broad methodological framework for) the SEA. The SEA Regulations require that 'when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information that must be included in the report, the responsible authority shall consult the consultation bodies'. In England, the consultation bodies are the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England.¹

¹ In accordance with Article 6(3) of the SEA Directive, these consultation bodies were selected because 'by reason of their specific environmental responsibilities, [they] are likely to be concerned by the environmental effects of implementing plans and programmes.'

As such, these authorities were consulted on the SEA scope for a period of five weeks between July and August 2020.

The SEA framework presented in **Table 1.1** below identifies the sustainability objectives – grouped under seven themes – established through SEA scoping, i.e. in light of context/baseline review and consultation. Taken together, the sustainability themes and objectives provide a methodological ‘framework’ for undertaking the assessment.

As part of the scoping process, it was recognised that transportation will be dealt with in detail through the LTP4 itself, and as such for the purposes of the SEA process, transportation has been scoped out.

Table 1.1: The SEA framework, as broadly agreed in 2020

| SEA theme | SEA objective | Assessment questions (will the option/ proposal help to...) |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Environmental quality | Improve air quality within and surrounding the LTP area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce emissions of pollutants from transport? • Improve and monitor air quality within AQMAs? • Promote the use of low emission vehicles? • Promote enhancements in sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport? • Promote enhancements to green infrastructure networks to facilitate increased absorption and dissipation of NO2 and other pollutants? |
| | Reduce noise pollution in Portsmouth. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce noise pollution arising through transport? |
| Biodiversity | Protect and enhance habitats and species within and surrounding Portsmouth. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect the integrity of the internationally and nationally designated sites in Portsmouth? • Protect and enhance locally designated and regionally important sites, including LNRs, in Portsmouth? • Protect and enhance priority habitats and species? • Protect and enhance the interconnectivity of habitats? • Achieve a net gain in biodiversity of at least 10% on the existing baseline? • Assist in monitoring the future health and resilience of Portsmouth’s biodiversity? • Increase the resilience of Portsmouth’s biodiversity to the potential effects of climate change? |
| Climatic factors | Support climate change mitigation in Portsmouth through limiting the contribution of transport to greenhouse gas emissions in the county. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit the increase in the carbon footprint resulting from new transport infrastructure provision? • Promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport? • Reduce the need to travel? • Reduce energy consumption from non-renewable resources? • Encourage the update of electric and alternatively fuelled vehicles? |
| | Support the resilience of Portsmouth’s transport networks to the potential effects of climate change. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure flood risk is not increased to the local area, and provide betterment (where possible)? • Increase the resilience of the transport network to the potential effects of climate change? • Promote a coordinated approach to the management of flood risk across public infrastructure provision? • Improve and extend green infrastructure networks as part of transport infrastructure provision to support adaptation to the potential effects of climate change? • Sustainably manage water run-off, reducing surface water runoff? |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the potential risks associated with climate change are considered through new transport network programmes? • Reduce the impact of extreme weather events on the condition of the road network? • Increase the resilience of biodiversity in Portsmouth to the effects of climate change, including enhancements to ecological networks? |
| Landscape | Protect and enhance the character and quality of Portsmouth's landscapes and townscapes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve and enhance locally important townscape and landscape features in Portsmouth? • Improve accessibility to Portsmouth's townscape and landscape resources? • Protect and enhance characteristic coastal and harbour areas in Portsmouth, including the harbours and seafront? |
| Historic Environment | Protect and enhance the significance of the historic environment, heritage assets (both designated and non-designated) and their settings. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve and where possible enhance the significance of buildings and structures of architectural or historic interest, both designated and non-designated, and their setting? • Conserve and enhance the special interest, character and appearance of conservation areas and their settings? • Support access to, interpretation and understanding of the historic environment? • Conserve and enhance archaeological remains, including historic landscapes? |
| Land, soils and water resources | Promote the efficient and effective use of natural resources. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist in facilitating the use of previously developed land? • Encourage recycling of materials and minimise consumption of resources during construction, operation and maintenance of new transport infrastructure? • Support improvements to water quality? • Support enhancements to the status and/ or potential of waterbodies under WFD objectives, including the Portsmouth shoreline and its' resources? |
| Population and human health | Support sustainable economic development in Portsmouth. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support sustainable economic development by improving accessibility to employment opportunities? • Support town centre/ urban regeneration and inward investment? |
| | Improve the health and wellbeing of Portsmouth's residents. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance the provision of, and access to, green infrastructure in the County, in accordance with national standards? • Improve road safety and reduce road accidents? • Maintain and enhance the quality of life of residents • Promote accessibility to a range of leisure, health and community facilities, for all age groups? • Encourage healthy lifestyles and reduce health inequalities? • Consider the additional needs of residents with disabilities and/ or those 'in need'? |
| | Maintain and enhance accessibility for all people | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage modal shift to more sustainable forms of travel? • Deliver new or improved transport infrastructure that improves connectivity? • Meet the accessibility needs of all residents? |

2. Plan-making / SEA up to this point

Development of the Plan

In line with regulatory requirements, there is a need to explain how work was undertaken to develop and then assess reasonable alternatives, and how HCC then took into account appraisal findings when finalising the draft LTP4.

The SEA Regulations state that alternatives should be explored in light of the objectives and geographical scope of the Plan. The Draft LTP4 has identified four objectives as follows:

- Delivering cleaner air
- Prioritising walking and cycling
- Transforming public transport
- Supporting business and protecting our assets

In line with this, the SEA process has focused on these objectives to develop alternatives. Recognising that the individual objectives are not mutually exclusive the Council and AECOM have worked together to identify realistic and reasonable alternatives.

The Draft LTP4 is influenced by other programmes and related schemes, some of which are relatively progressed already. Some key influences to be considered in the context of the objectives of the Draft LTP4 are the Transforming Cities Bid, Future Transport Zones Bid, Ministerial Directions, the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and the subsequent Implementation Plan to support the LTP4.

Establishing the reasonable alternatives

Draft LTP4 Objective 1: Delivering cleaner air

As a result of Ministerial Directions, ten of the thirty-three local authorities were identified to take forward new measures, developed with and funded by central government, to reduce pollution levels. Portsmouth City Council were identified as one of these ten local authorities and received direction to carry out more detailed studies and progress identified measures that can bring forward roadside NO₂ limit compliance quicker.

As a result of this work, a significant policy implementation requirement under this objective includes the delivery of a new Clean Air Zone (CAZ). The 2020 Clean Air Zone Framework² identifies that a CAZ defines an area where targeted action is taken to improve air quality with the aim to address all sources of pollution using a range of measures tailored to the location. *“Within a clean air zone there is also a focus on measures to accelerate the transition to a low emission economy”*. A CAZ will fall into one of two categories; either charging or non-charging. In the case of Portsmouth, a charging CAZ is being progressed.

The CAZ Framework sets out the minimum requirements in implementing a CAZ, recognising the need to consider the impact on residents, the need for any mitigating measures and avoidance of any displacement effects. A CAZ is clearly expected to:

- be in response to a clearly defined air quality problem, seek to address and continually improve it, and ensure this is understood locally;
- have signs in place along major access routes to clearly delineate the zone;

² DEFRA (2020) Clean Air Zone Framework [online] available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/863730/clean-air-zone-framework-feb2020.pdf

- be identified in local strategies including (but not limited to) local land use plans and policies and local transport plans at the earliest opportunity to ensure consistency with local ambition;
- provide active support for ultra-low emission vehicle (ULEV) take up through facilitating their use;
- include a programme of awareness raising and data sharing;
- include local authorities taking a lead in terms of their own and contractor vehicle operations and procurement in line with this framework;
- ensure bus, taxi and private hire vehicle emission standards (where they do not already) are improved to meet Clean Air Zone standards using licensing, franchising or partnership approaches as appropriate; and
- support healthy, active travel.

In line with government ambitions and Ministerial Directions, Portsmouth City Council are progressing implementation of the Portsmouth CAZ and supporting this intervention through the LTP4. The charging area has been established and has a clearly defined boundary encompassing the major routes network around the port and the majority of four of the five declared Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the city.

In progressing the implementation of the CAZ, the Council are continuing work to deliver a Class B CAZ in the shortest possible time. The delivery of a Class B CAZ covering the southwest of Portsea Island is legally required per the latest ministerial direction (March 2020). However, since the direction was issued, sensitivity tests have been conducted to consider the possible impacts of the pandemic on future road traffic movements and therefore on concentrations of nitrogen dioxide.

These sensitivity tests have been undertaken on transport and air quality monitoring data to consider the impact of changing travel behaviour and traffic patterns as a result of the pandemic, following methodology agreed by JAQU. Some of the sensitivity tests suggest that a CAZ B might not be sufficient under certain future scenarios and a more stringent CAZ (e.g. CAZ C) could be required, whereas other tests suggest that a CAZ may not be required and that compliance can be achieved naturally due to changing travel behaviour/ patterns. At present JAQU are yet to confirm what action we should take on the basis on the sensitivity tests (if any) and the Council are therefore continuing with plans to deliver a Class B CAZ in the shortest possible time as is legally required.

To support decision-making in this respect, the following options are established as alternatives for consideration through the SEA process:

- **Objective 1 - Option A:** Charging CAZ for Class B
- **Objective 1 - Option B:** Charging CAZ for Class C
- **Objective 1 - Option C:** Non-charging CAZ

Draft LTP4 Objective 2: Prioritising walking and cycling

In terms of walking and cycling, the Draft LTP4 is supported by the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) which has identified the key cycle and pedestrian routes which will remain a focus for active travel movement schemes in the City. A key focus in the LTP4 measures to prioritise walking and cycling is the proposed re-allocation of road space, which includes new connections, road widening, and new crossings, as well as public realm improvements.

The LCWIP identifies a total of 79 infrastructure schemes targeted at improving movement through a network of pedestrian and cycle routes. To assist in the potential implementation of LTP4 policy supporting these routes, each route subject to infrastructure proposals was taken forward for high-level assessment of potential environmental constraints/ sensitivities in relation to key receptors. A methodology for this high-level assessment is presented in **Appendix III of the Environmental Report**. The initial screening identified those routes that have constraints or sensitivities and the impacting schemes are explored in more detail in relation to the framework of SEA objectives with the aim of identifying where policy mitigation may support sustainable development objectives. This work has not identified any schemes which could be considered for potential significant effects, noting that

the accompanying HRA will examine potential effects in relation to European designated biodiversity sites.

Draft LTP4 Objective 3: Transforming public transport

As part of the Transforming Cities Tranche 2 Rebid 2, 170 highway, walking and cycling schemes were subject to initial sifting, quantitative assessment and qualitative assessment to arrive a package of options within the specified budget.

The initial sift assessed the schemes against three criteria sequentially; deliverability, contribution to raising productivity and contribution to reducing CO₂ emissions. 61 schemes remained from the initial sift, which were scored quantitatively against nine objectives defined in the assessment. Following the quantitative scoring and weighting of schemes a qualitative assessment was undertaken to form the schemes into Packages. Engagement between HCC, PCC, IWC, Atkins and Systra teams has informed the resultant three package options in the Rebid.

Package 1 consists of a 'core' set of 23 schemes that performed strongly through the assessment. Package 2 consists of the same 'core' set of schemes as Package 1 plus an additional 4 schemes that performed strongly and could complement the 'core' schemes. Package 3 consists of the 'core' set of schemes minus the Gosport Interchange (HCC-13) scheme.

Across the packages, nine of the 'core' bus, walking and cycling schemes are located within the Portsmouth area, and one additional scheme in Portsmouth is submitted under Package 2. The walking and cycling schemes are those identified by the LCWIP and screened under Objective 2.

The additional schemes arising in the Transforming Cities Tranche 2 Rebid packages to those identified through the LCWIP were also screened to assess the potential for significant effects, and this work is also detailed in **Appendix III of the Environmental Report**. No schemes were identified for potential significant negative effects at this stage, noting that the accompanying HRA will examine potential effects in relation to European designated biodiversity sites.

Draft LTP4 Objective 4: Supporting business and protecting our assets

A key issue to address under this theme is reducing the impact of freight movement on the highways network. The Council have identified that the one of the main drives to affect freight movement will be through the progression of new consolidation centres.

The aim of consolidation centres is to reduce the number of large vehicles on the city streets, whilst reducing costs for businesses, and the scheme is interlinked with proposals to improve the sustainability of 'last mile' deliveries (using low-emission vehicles). Consolidation centres seek to effectively consolidate vehicle loads, so the minimum number of vehicles are required in undertaking the transportation of any goods. It is intended in Portsmouth that consolidation centres will also link with e-cargo bikes for the 'last mile' deliveries. There are both macro and micro consolidation centres which form part of a strategic network to serve demand whilst minimising vehicle movements. In the case of Portsmouth, macro consolidation centres are likely to be out-of-city and located on key routes. Micro consolidation centres will be delivered within the city confines close to specific locations with high demand for deliveries. Micro consolidation centres can range in form from lockers and collection points to mobility hub locations.

No specific locations for edge of city macro consolidation centres have been identified at this stage. This predominantly reflects the requirement for partnership working in the wider Solent area, where locations outside of the city may better serve the strategic network. However, eight potential locations have been identified as options for micro consolidation centres within the city.

These options are taken forward for assessment against the framework of SEA objectives as follows:

- **Objective 4 - Option A:** D-Day Car Park (off-street, Seafront area)
- **Objective 4 - Option B:** Flathouse Road (on-street, city centre area)

- **Objective 4 - Option C:** Museum Road (on-street, city centre area)
- **Objective 4 - Option D:** St Georges Road (on-street, city centre area)
- **Objective 4 - Option E:** Airport Service Road Industrial Estate (on-street, Hilsea area)
- **Objective 4 - Option F:** Park and Ride expansion (off-street, Tipner area – on P&R site)
- **Objective 4 - Option G:** Cosham Interchange (dependent on bus interchange removal)
- **Objective 4 - Option H:** Warren Avenue (LGV only)

Summary alternatives assessment findings

Objective 1: Delivering cleaner air

Table 2.1 below provides the summary findings for the assessment of these options. The full detailed assessment is presented in **Appendix III of the Environmental Report**.

Table 2.1: Summary assessment findings for options under Objective 1

| SEA theme | | Option A | Option B | Option C |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Environmental quality | Likely significant effect? | Yes - positive | Yes - positive | Yes - positive |
| Biodiversity | Likely significant effect? | No | No | No |
| Climatic factors: | Likely significant effect? | Yes - positive | Yes - positive | Yes - positive |
| Landscape | Likely significant effect? | No | No | No |
| Historic environment: | Likely significant effect? | No | No | No |
| Land, soils and water resources | Likely significant effect? | No | No | No |
| Population and human health | Likely significant effect? | Yes - positive | Yes - positive | Yes - positive |

Summary:

Under all options the introduction of a CAZ is considered for benefits in relation to environmental quality, biodiversity, climate change, landscape, the historic environment, and population and human health. Significant positive effects are anticipated under the SEA themes of environmental quality, climate change mitigation and human health and these are likely to be enhanced by an incentivised increased uptake in Options A and B given the charging schemes and financial implications attached to these options.

Option B (Class C) is considered for slightly enhanced positive effects by its increased coverage/ capture of more polluting vehicles. However, it is recognised that Option B (Class C) also has increased financial implications for smaller business, the self-employed and social networks in the city.

Objective 2: Prioritising walking and cycling

Routes subject to infrastructure proposals were taken forward for high-level assessment of potential environmental constraints/ sensitivities in relation to key receptors. A methodology for this high-level 'RAG' assessment is presented in **Appendix III of the Environmental Report** and the results are presented in **Table 2.2** below.

Table 2.2: 'RAG' analysis of routes where infrastructure is proposed under Objective 2

| Route | Rating | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------|--------|------------------------|-------|--------|--------|------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|--------|
| | Fluvial Flood Risk | Surface Water Hotspot | Conservation Area | Registered Park or Garden | Scheduled Monument | Listed Building | Locally Listed Building | Area of Archaeological Constraint | SAC | SPA/ pSPA | Ramsar | SW Brent Goose Network | SSSI | LNR | LWS | Priority Habitat | Ecological Network Opportunity Area | Ancient woodland | TPO |
| 108 | Red | Red | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Red | Red | Red | Yellow | Yellow | Red | Red | Yellow | Yellow | Red | Green | Green | Red |
| 205 | Red | Red | Green | Green | Green | Red | Red | Red | Red | Yellow | Yellow | Red | Red | Green | Yellow | Red | Green | Green | Red |
| 301 | Red | Red | Green | Green | Green | Green | Red | Red | Red | Yellow | Yellow | Red | Red | Green | Red | Red | Green | Green | Red |
| 307 | Red | Red | Red | Red | Yellow | Red | Yellow | Red | Green | Red | Red | Yellow | Red | Green | Yellow | Red | Green | Green | Red |
| 405 | Red | Red | Red | Red | Yellow | Red | Red | Red | Green | Red | Red | Yellow | Red | Green | Green | Red | Green | Green | Red |
| 503 | Red | Red | Yellow | Green | Yellow | Red | Red | Red | Green | Red | Yellow | Red | Red | Green | Green | Red | Green | Green | Red |
| 601 | Red | Green | Red | Yellow | Green | Red | Red | Red | Yellow | Red | Yellow | Red | Red | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Red |
| 602a | Red | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Red | Yellow | Red | Yellow | Green | Red | Red | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Yellow | Red |
| 602b | Red | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Red | Yellow | Red | Yellow | Green | Red | Red | Green | Red | Yellow | Green | Green | Yellow | Red |
| 603 | Red | Red | Red | Yellow | Green | Red | Red | Red | Yellow | Red | Yellow | Red | Red | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Red |
| 801 | Green | Green | Yellow | Yellow | Green | Yellow | Red | Red | Green | Yellow | Yellow | Red | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Red | Green | Yellow |
| 802 | Red | Green | Red | Yellow | Green | Yellow | Yellow | Green | Green | Yellow | Yellow | Red | Green | Green | Green | Yellow | Green | Green | Red |

The infrastructure proposals within these routes were explored in more detail in relation to the framework of SEA objectives to identify any potential for significant effects. The summary findings for this screening work are provided in **Table 2.3** below and the detailed table can be found in **Appendix III of the main Environmental Report**.

Table 2.3: Screening of infrastructure proposals along the identified routes under Objective 2

| Route | Section | Potential for significant effects. |
|-------|------------------------------------|--|
| 108 | 1: NCN Route 22 2: NCN Route 22 | Route 108 is constrained by flood risk and located within proximity of designated habitats which are sensitive to effects in relation to water quality. The replacement bridge scheme is unlikely to significantly affect flood risk; however, it is recognised that proposals should seek to sustainably manage surface water run-off. Assuming suitable mitigation is provided for surface water management, and dependent upon the findings of the HRA, no residual significant effects are considered likely at this stage. |

| Route | Section | Potential for significant effects. |
|-------|--|--|
| | | <p>The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality.</p> <p>Infrastructure proposals should also avoid any loss of priority habitat along the route and minimise loss of verges which contribute to ecological connectivity. No residual significant effects are anticipated.</p> <p>The route also falls within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction.</p> |
| 205 | 1: Havant Rd. | <p>Route 205 is constrained by flood risk and located within proximity of designated habitats which are sensitive to effects in relation to water quality.</p> <p>The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality.</p> <p>Infrastructure proposals should also avoid any loss of priority habitat along the route and minimise loss of verges which contribute to ecological connectivity. No residual significant effects are anticipated.</p> <p>The route also falls within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction.</p> |
| 301 | 1: Crookhorn Ln. | <p>Route 301 is constrained by flood risk and located within proximity of designated habitats which are sensitive to effects in relation to water quality.</p> <p>Whilst any new bridge infrastructure is unlikely to significantly affect flood risk; it is recognised that proposals should seek to sustainably manage surface water run-off. Assuming suitable mitigation is provided for surface water management, and dependent upon the findings of the HRA, no residual significant effects are considered likely at this stage.</p> <p>The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should also seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality.</p> <p>Infrastructure proposals should also avoid any loss of priority habitat along the route and minimise loss of verges which contribute to ecological connectivity. No residual significant effects are anticipated.</p> <p>The route also falls within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction.</p> |
| | 2: Gillman Rd (single track section) | |
| | 3: Gillman Rd & Havant Rd. | |
| | A: Havant Rd. | |
| | B: Eastern Rd. | |
| | 6: Eastern Rd. | |
| | 7: Eastern Rd. | |
| | 8: Anchorage Rd, Robinson Way, Airport Service Rd & Dundas Ln. | |
| | 9: Dundas Ln & Moneyfield Ave (former busway) | |
| | 11: Tangier Rd, Milton Rd, Copnor Bridge & New Rd. | |
| | C; George St, Glencoe Rd / Daulston Rd, Hampshire St, Shakespeare Rd and Manor Rd. | |
| | 13: Fratton Rd & Lake Rd. | |
| 307 | 1: London Rd. | |
| | 2: London Rd. | |
| | 3: London Rd & Northern Rd | |
| | 4: Northern Rd | |
| | 5: London Rd | |
| | A: Northern Parade | |
| | B: Northern Parade | |
| | C: Nelson Ave, North End Ave & Penrose Cl. | |

| Route | Section | Potential for significant effects. |
|-------|---|---|
| | D: Twyford Ave (northbound) & Stamshaw Rd (southbound) | Negative effects in relation to the historic environment are likely to be predominantly short-term during construction phases, and no residual significant effects are considered likely. The route does however fall within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction. |
| | E: Rudmore Roundabout | |
| | F: Mile End Rd. | |
| | G: Guildhall Sq & Guildhall Walk | |
| | H: Hampshire Terrace | |
| | 14: Hampshire Terrace, Landport Terrace, King's Terrace, Jubilee Terrace, Bellevue Terrace & Pier Rd. | |
| | 15: Pier Rd. | |
| | 307a: Section 1: Southwick Hill Rd. | |
| 405 | 1: Westfield Rd path, Jubilee Ave & Allaway Ave. | Route 405 is constrained by flood risk and located within proximity of designated habitats which are sensitive to effects in relation to water quality. The route also runs through a Conservation Area and Registered Park and Garden. Whilst any new bridge infrastructure is unlikely to significantly affect flood risk; it is recognised that proposals should seek to sustainably manage surface water run-off. Assuming suitable mitigation is provided for surface water management, and dependent upon the findings of the HRA, no residual significant effects are considered likely at this stage. The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality. Infrastructure proposals should also avoid any loss of priority habitat along the route and minimise loss of verges which contribute to ecological connectivity. No residual significant effects are anticipated. Negative effects in relation to the historic environment are likely to be predominantly short-term during construction phases, and no residual significant effects are considered likely. The route does however fall within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction. |
| | 2: Allaway Ave. shared use path | |
| | 3: Allaway Ave. | |
| | 4: Marsden Rd. | |
| | 5: Racecourse Ln (Path) | |
| 503 | 1: A27 Southampton Rd. | Route 503 is constrained by flood risk and located within proximity of designated habitats which are sensitive to effects in relation to water quality. The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality. Infrastructure proposals should also avoid any loss of priority habitat along the route and minimise loss of verges which contribute to ecological connectivity. No residual significant effects are anticipated. The route also falls within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction. |
| | 2: A27 Southampton Rd. | |
| | 3: A27 Southampton Rd. | |
| | 4: A27 Western Rd. | |
| | 12: Isambard Brunel Rd. | |
| | G: Winston Churchill Ave (shared use footway / cycleway), St. James' St and Brougham Rd. | |
| | 14: Grosvenor St, Green Rd, Cottage Grove, Grove Rd North & Grove Rd South | |
| | 15: Kent Rd, Portland Rd, Osborne Rd & Palmerston Rd. | |
| | 16: Avenue De Caen | |
| 601 | A: Locksway Rd. | |

| Route | Section | Potential for significant effects. |
|-------|---|---|
| | B: Ironbridge Ln, Maurice Rd and Dunbar Rd. | Route 601 is constrained by flood risk and located within proximity of designated habitats which are sensitive to effects in relation to water quality. The route also runs through a Conservation Area. The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality. Negative effects in relation to the historic environment are likely to be predominantly short-term during construction phases, and no residual significant effects are considered likely. The route does however fall within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction. |
| | C: Goldsmith Ave. | |
| | 4: Goldsmith Ave. | |
| | | |
| 602 | 6: St. Mary's Rd. | Route 602 is constrained by flood risk and located within proximity of designated habitats which are sensitive to effects in relation to water quality. Whilst any new bridge infrastructure is unlikely to significantly affect flood risk; it is recognised that proposals should seek to sustainably manage surface water run-off. Assuming suitable mitigation is provided for surface water management, and dependent upon the findings of the HRA, no residual significant effects are considered likely at this stage. The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality. The route also falls within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction. |
| | E: St Mary's Rd. | |
| | F: Clarkes Rd and Clive Rd. | |
| | G: Stamford St, Clifton St and Arundel St. | |
| | 10: Arundel St. | |
| | 11: Bishop Crispian Way | |
| | 12: Queen St, Wickham St & The Hard | |
| 602a | A: Tangier Rd. | Route 602a is constrained by flood risk and located within proximity of designated habitats which are sensitive to effects in relation to water quality. The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality. The route also falls within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction. |
| | B: Eastern Rd (shared use path) | |
| | C: Eastern Rd (shared use path) | |
| | D: Eastern Rd (shared use path) | |
| | 5: Langstone Rd. | |
| 602b | 1: Tangier Rd. | Route 602b is constrained by flood risk and located within proximity of designated habitats which are sensitive to effects in relation to water quality. The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality. The route also falls within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction. |
| | 2: Neville Rd & Hayling Ave. | |
| | 3: Baffins Rd (Southbound) / Milton Rd (Northbound) | |
| 603 | 1: The Hard | Route 603 is constrained by flood risk. The route also runs through a Conservation Area. The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality. Negative effects in relation to the historic environment are likely to be predominantly short-term during construction phases, and no residual significant effects are considered likely. The route does however fall within areas of |
| | 2: The Hard & St George's Rd. | |
| | 3: Museum Rd. | |
| | 4: King's Road and Elm Grove | |

| Route | Section | Potential for significant effects. |
|-------|--|--|
| | | archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction. |
| 801 | 1: Prince Albert Rd, Landguard Rd, Maxwell Rd, Aston Rd, Haslemere Rd, Pretoria Rd and St. Augustine Rd. A: Frensham Rd. 4: Goldsmith Ave. 5: Fratton Bridge and Sydenham Terrace (off-road cycle routes) 6: Canal Walk, Bridport St and East Surrey St. | The route also falls within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction. |
| 802 | 1: Festing Rd. 2: Elm Grove, Victoria Rd South & Albert Rd. 3: Grosvenor St, Cottage Grove & St. Andrew's Rd. 6: Unicorn Rd shared-use foot/ cycleway (NCN 22) | Route 802 is constrained by flood risk. The route also runs through a Conservation Area. The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality. Negative effects in relation to the historic environment are likely to be predominantly short-term during construction phases, and no residual significant effects are considered likely. |

Objective 3: Transforming public transport

Additional schemes to those identified through the LCWIP have been submitted as part of the Transforming Cities Tranche 2 Rebid. These schemes were explored in more detail in relation to the framework of SEA objectives to identify any potential for significant effects. The summary findings for this screening work are provided in **Table 2.4** below and the detailed table can be found in **Appendix III of the Environmental Report**.

Table 2.4: Screening of additional schemes under Objective 3

| Scheme reference | Likely significant effect? |
|------------------|--|
| PCC-1 | The area forms part of a Surface Water Hotspot. The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality. |
| PCC-4 | The area is constrained by flood risk and located within proximity of designated habitats which are sensitive to effects in relation to water quality. The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality. The area also falls within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction. |
| PCC-10 | The area falls within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction. |
| PCC-11 | The area contains numerous Listed Buildings lying adjacent to the Guildhall and Victoria Park Conservation Area and Victoria Park Registered Park and Garden (which contains Priority Habitats). Negative effects in relation to the historic environment are likely to be predominantly short-term during construction phases, and no residual significant effects are considered likely. |
| PCC-13 | The area contains numerous Listed Buildings lying adjacent to the Guildhall and Victoria Park Conservation Area and Victoria Park Registered Park and Garden (which contains Priority Habitats). Negative effects in relation to the historic environment are likely to be predominantly short-term during construction phases, and no residual significant effects are considered likely. |

| Scheme reference | Likely significant effect? |
|------------------|---|
| PCC-18 | <p>The area is constrained by flood risk and located within proximity of designated habitats which are sensitive to effects in relation to water quality.</p> <p>Any proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality.</p> <p>The area also falls within areas of archaeological restraint. Where appropriate, archaeological investigation and mitigation may be required prior to construction.</p> |
| PCC-15 | <p>The area forms part of a rich heritage setting; surrounded by three Conservation Area and near to Southsea Common Registered Park or Garden. The area also lies close to flood risk areas and is located within proximity of designated habitats which are sensitive to effects in relation to water quality.</p> <p>Negative effects in relation to the historic environment are likely to be predominantly short-term during construction phases, and no residual significant effects are considered likely. Further consultation with Historic England is recommended in progression of this scheme.</p> <p>The infrastructure proposals which may lead to increased hard surfacing should seek to manage the effects in relation to both flood risk, and polluted surface water run-off affecting water quality.</p> |

Objective 4: Supporting business and protecting our assets

The summary findings for the assessment of the 8 locations considered for micro consolidation site area provided in **Table 2.5** below and the full detailed assessment is presented in **Appendix III of the Environmental Report**.

Table 2.5: Summary assessment findings for options under Objective 4

| Summary findings | | Option A | Option B | Option C | Option D | Option E | Option F | Option G | Option H |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| SEA theme | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental quality | Likely significant effect? | No |
| Biodiversity | Likely significant effect? | No |
| Climatic factors | Likely significant effect? | No |
| Landscape | Likely significant effect? | No |
| Historic environment | Likely significant effect? | No |
| Land, soil and water resources | Likely significant effect? | No |
| Population and human health | Likely significant effect? | No |

Summary:

Delivering micro consolidation centres at any of the options identified is not considered likely to lead to any significant effects in relation to the SEA framework of objectives.

Minor positive effects are considered likely overall for all of the objectives, given the reduced presence of polluting vehicles supporting improved air quality, climate change mitigation objectives, and a more pleasant environment in general in terms of character and quality of place. Any infrastructure proposals under the options are likely to be small-scale and will utilise available brownfield land opportunities. Despite this it is recognised that any infrastructure proposals will need to consider the following:

- Fluvial/ tidal flood risk constraints at Options A, E, F and G;
- Mitigation to protect water quality and reduce flood risk impacts at Options E and G, which are located close to a Surface Water Hotspot;

Summary findings

Option A

Option B

Option C

Option D

Option E

Option F

Option G

Option H

SEA theme

- Opportunities to deliver biodiversity net gain (at all options, but particularly Option F);
- Designated heritage assets and their settings, ensuring development is responsive to local character and historic features at all options except Option F.

The preferred approach

This section presents the Council's response to the alternatives assessment and outlines the main reasons for developing the preferred approach in terms of schemes/ policy directions to improve the function, efficiency and sustainability of transport and movement in Portsmouth in line with the identified objectives for the Plan.

Objective 1: Delivering cleaner air

The progression of the CAZ will be further influenced by the outcomes of sensitivity testing and further consultation with central government. At this stage, the Council are continuing to work to deliver a Class B CAZ in the shortest possible time to address its legal requirements.

Objective 2: Prioritising walking and cycling

The assessed routes under this option are all being progressed as part of the identified network consulted upon through the LCWIP development. The SEA has highlighted where there is a potential for impacts (both positive and negative) which will be taken into consideration as the projects progress.

Objective 3: Transforming public transport

The progression of schemes assessed under this objective will largely be reflective of the outcomes of the Transforming Cities Tranche 2 rebid. The SEA has highlighted where there is a potential for impacts (both positive and negative) which will be taken into considerations as the schemes progress.

Objective 4: Supporting business and protecting our assets

All sites are likely to be progressed as micro consolidation site options, although the extent of each individual scheme has yet to be determined. The SEA has highlighted where there is a potential for impacts (both positive and negative) which, alongside consultation responses, will inform further decision-making in this respect.

3. Assessment findings at this stage

Introduction

Part 2 of the Environmental Report presents an assessment of the Draft Plan. Assessment findings are presented as a series of narratives under the 'SEA framework' themes. Summary findings for each theme are provided below.

Assessment of the Draft Plan

Environmental Quality

As a result of the significant investment in schemes and measures to support a move to low emission vehicle movements (particularly within the areas which current exceed emissions limits), the Draft LTP4 policies are considered likely to directly improve environmental quality in the city, and **long-term significant positive effects** are anticipated overall.

Biodiversity

Whilst negative effects for biodiversity may arise (particularly in the short-term during construction) as a result of increased disturbance, noise and light pollution, the overall effects are considered likely to be **indirect minor positive effects** given the interventions identified which are likely to support biodiversity with cleaner air and reduced effects of noise pollution.

Climatic factors

The Draft LTP4 policies together are considered for significant interventions in support of climate change mitigation and the Council's aim to become carbon neutral by 2030. This includes targeted interventions to improve air quality and prioritise active travel opportunities and public transport connections, as well as efforts to reduce the impact of freight movements, particularly that associated with port operations. As a result, **long-term significant positive effects** are anticipated overall in relation to climate change mitigation.

In relation to climate change adaptation, the flood constraints in the city will need to be considered in infrastructure proposals, and surface water management to avoid polluted run-off should be considered where applicable. However, given existing mitigation provided through the NPPF and Local Plan policies, no significant effects are considered likely. Despite this, it is recognised that the Draft LTP4 has the opportunity to identify the links between policy initiatives and the Council's intent to support sustainable development in this respect.

Landscape

Infrastructure proposals will need to avoid any loss of trees or natural features to avoid localised minor negative effects arising for landscape character. On this assumption, **long-term minor positive effects** are considered likely overall; as a result of reduced traffic and congestion impacts affecting landscape character, and targeted interventions to improve the public realm.

Historic environment

A potential for negative effects is identified as a result of infrastructure proposals which intersect designated heritage settings; however, these effects are considered likely to be predominantly minor and short-term during construction, and protections for these settings are provided through the NPPF and Local Plan policies. Overall, the targeted interventions to improve the public realm are considered likely to lead to **residual minor long-term positive effects**.

Land, soil and water resources

The Draft LTP4 policy provisions to reduce parking capacity are recognised for likely **minor long-term positive effects** in relation to efficient land use; by freeing up brownfield land opportunities for alternative housing and growth or new green spaces. Whilst infrastructure proposals which increase hard surfacing in the city will need to manage the effects of polluted water run-off in relation to water quality, no significant effects are anticipated, particularly considering the existing policy mitigation provided through the NPPF and Local Plan. Despite this, it is recognised that the Draft LTP4 has the opportunity to identify the links between policy initiatives and the Council's intent to maintain or improve water quality in this respect.

Population and community

Whilst some of the Draft LTP4 proposals are considered for potential impacts on local economies, the overall drive to work with businesses and support sustainable economic development, improve the movement networks in the city; including active travel networks, improve air quality, and improve accessibility, are considered likely to benefit communities and human health. As a result, overall **significant long-term positive effects** are considered likely.

Cumulative effects

While there is the potential for interventions proposed within the Draft LTP4 to interact with and have cumulative impacts with development proposed in the emerging Local Development Plans as well as other plans and strategies, the majority of these interactions are likely to result in long term positive effects. The Draft LTP4 seeks to improve congestion and access to sustainable modes of transport, it will help to minimise the impacts of housing and employment growth and the predicted increased in population on transport infrastructure.

While there is the potential for localised cumulative negative effects as a result of individual interventions interacting with the development of new homes/ employment it is considered that there is suitable mitigation available at the project level to ensure that any residual negative effects are not significant.

It will be vital for housing, employment and transport infrastructure to be delivered in a co-ordinated manner in order to maximise potential benefits, such as a modal shift away from the private vehicle, while minimising potential negative impacts such as significant increases in congestion.

4. Next steps

Strategy finalisation

The Draft LTP4 will be consulted on with members of the public and stakeholders in latter part of 2020. Following the consultation there will be a period in which Portsmouth City Council gives consideration to feedback and makes any necessary revisions to the LTP4. The SEA Environmental Report will also be updated during this period to consider and reflect feedback and respond to any Plan amendments.

Monitoring

At the current time, there is a need only to present 'measures envisaged concerning monitoring'. The SEA Regulations expect monitoring and mitigation to be linked, and that the focus should be on any significant negative effects identified through the assessment. Where possible existing arrangements for monitoring should be used to avoid duplication of effort.

Based on the findings of the SEA at this stage, which predicted no significant negative effects; no specific monitoring measures have been proposed.

Further consideration will be given to monitoring in due course once the responses to the Draft LTP4 and accompanying Environmental Report have been received. If necessary, the SEA Adoption Statement will set out monitoring measures against SEA objectives, including responsibilities.

