

**South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan
No.2 (2006-11)**

**Strategic Environmental Assessment
Environmental Report**

**Volume 3 –
Non-Technical Summary**

July 2005

Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Co Ltd

South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan No.2 (2006-11)

Strategic Environmental Assessment Environmental Report

Volume 3 – Non-Technical Summary

Issue No	Status	Date	Prepared By	Reviewed By	Approved for Issue
1	Draft	13/07/05	S B Banks	SR Wild	JMW Holden

July 2005

Prepared For:

South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan
Partnership
Watsons Chambers
Room 1/3, 1st Floor
5-15 Market Place
Castle Square
Sheffield
S1 2GH

Prepared By:

Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Co Ltd
Royal Court
Basil Close
Chesterfield
Derbyshire
S41 7SL



CONTENTS		Page No
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	APPROACH TO THE SEA	1
2.1	SEA Programme and Scope	1
2.2	The Scoping Report	1
2.3	The Environmental Report	2
2.4	The Assessment Process	2
3.0	ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE, PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES	4
3.1	Environmental Baseline	4
3.2	Environmental Problems and Opportunities	6
4.0	SEA OBJECTIVES AND INDICATORS	7
5.0	SOUTH YORKSHIRE LTP NO. 2 (2006-2011)	8
5.1	Introduction	8
5.2	LTP Objectives	8
5.3	The Alternatives Considered	9
5.4	Summary of Assessment of Alternatives	12
5.5	LTP Strategies	12
5.6	Assessment of the Provisional LTP No.2 Vision, Objectives Strategies and Measures	13
5.7	Summary	17
5.8	Changes to the LTP Resulting From the SEA and the Consultation Process	17
5.9	Monitoring	17
6.0	HOW TO COMMENT ON THE REPORT	17

FIGURES

Figure 1 South Yorkshire LTP 2006-2011 SEA Study Area

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Strategic Environmental Assessment, or SEA Directive (European Directive 2001/42/EC1) requires the environmental assessment, at a strategic level, of a wide range of plans and programmes. The aim of the Directive is to *‘provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans with a view to promoting sustainable development’*. The Directive was transposed into UK law as the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SI No. 16332, which came into force on 20 July 2004.
- 1.2 In accordance with the requirements of the SEA Directive and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, the environmental effects of the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (LTP) No.2 (2006-2011), have been assessed and the results reported in the Environmental Report.
- 1.3 This Non-Technical Summary forms Volume 3 of the Environmental Report and presents a summary of the approach to, and findings of, the SEA of LTP No. 2. Further details can be found Volume 1 – the Environmental Report and in Volume 2 – the Summary Assessment Table and Appraisal Worksheets.
- 1.4 It is noted that the assessment has been limited by the level of detail available at the time the assessment was undertaken (May/June 2005). The Environmental Report is currently considered to be provisional and will be available for review during the consultation period subsequent to submission of the provisional LTP No. 2 to the Secretary of State. Contact details for comments on the Environmental Report are provided in Section 6.0 of this Non-Technical Summary.

2.0 APPROACH TO THE SEA

2.1 SEA Scope and Programme

- 2.1.1 The study area for the SEA is that covered by the South Yorkshire LTP No. 2 (2006-2011), i.e. the entire area of the South Yorkshire Metropolitan County, which occupies a land area of around 155,203 ha. This includes the major urban conurbations of Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield and includes a section of the Peak District National Park, as shown in Figure 1.
- 2.1.2 The temporal scope of the SEA is the five year period of the LTP, namely 2006-2011.

2.2 The Scoping Report

- 2.2.1 The stages of the SEA process are shown diagrammatically in Table 2.1. The first two stages were undertaken between November 2004 and March 2005. The final Scoping Report, issued in March 2005, set the context and proposed content of the SEA, established an initial environmental baseline, identified environmental opportunities and problems, and identified SEA objectives and proposed indicators. The SEA objectives and indicators took into account the information collated on the state of the environment within the County, and the environmental problems and opportunities identified. The final Scoping Report was issued to the four statutory consultees: the Environment Agency, English Nature, English Heritage and the Countryside Agency, and also to the Council for the Protection of Rural England.

2.3 The Environmental Report

- 2.3.1 The Environmental Report presents the results of the SEA (Stage C, Table 2.1), which was undertaken between May and July 2005. In preparing the Environmental Report, consideration was given to responses received from the consultees in respect of the Final Scoping Report. Further baseline data collation was undertaken and the proposed SEA objectives, indicators and targets further refined to reflect the available baseline data, and the environmental problems and opportunities identified during the scoping exercise and through the additional data review and collation, and comments received from the consultees.
- 2.3.2 The Environmental Report is intended to inform the final LTP, which will be produced once that full public consultation on the provisional LTP and the Environmental Report has been undertaken (Stage D, Table 2.1).
- 2.3.3 The Environmental Report presents the results of the assessment of the alternatives considered (refer to Section 5) and a more detailed assessment of the strategies and measures included within the provisional LTP, as identified in the *South Yorkshire Provisional Second LTP 2006-2011 Draft for Consultation, Spring 2005*.
- 2.3.4 The SEA Directive also requires the effects of the LTP on the environment to be monitored, once that the plan is implemented. The Environmental Report also includes, therefore, a proposed draft monitoring protocol. It is anticipated that this will be reviewed and agreed by South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Partnership, during preparation of the Final LTP.

2.4 The Assessment Process

- 2.4.1 Consideration of alternatives proposed for the LTP was undertaken in the form of a round-table discussion held between members of the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Partnership (SYLTTP) and the Environmental Consultants (Scott Wilson), in December 2004. The broad alternatives identified were then assessed against each of the SEA objectives, to determine whether the measures proposed would be likely to have positive or negative effects in terms of those objectives, in the short, medium and long-term. The level of detail of the assessment was determined by the broad level of detail available for the different alternatives under consideration. The results of the assessment are presented in Chapter 8 of Volume 1 of the Environmental Report.
- 2.4.2 The *South Yorkshire Provisional Second LTP 2006-2011 Draft for Consultation* took into account the results of the assessment of the broad alternatives. A more detailed assessment of the strategies and measures proposed within that document was then undertaken. This assessment was undertaken by the Environmental Consultants, during an internal workshop, and the results recorded in the Summary Assessment Tables and Appraisal Worksheets contained within Volume 2 of the Environmental Report, and summarised in Chapter 9 of Volume 1 of the Environmental Report.

Table 2.1 The Stages of the SEA and LTP Production

SEA Stage	LTP Stage
Stage A: Setting the context and establishing the baseline	
<p>Identify relevant plans, policies and programmes. Identify environmental protection objectives, and state their relation to the LTP. Devise SEA objectives, indicators and targets. Collect baseline data. Establish issues and problems.</p>	<p>Prepare Issues and Options Report. Identify the issues and options, including environmental considerations. Prepare for consultation.</p>
Stage B: Deciding the scope of SEA and developing alternatives	
<p>Identify alternatives and choose preferred alternatives. Prepare SEA Scoping Report. Consult authorities with environmental responsibilities and other interested parties. Output: Scoping Report</p>	<p>Consult on Issues and Options Report. Develop draft strategies and broad-brush programme options.</p>
Stage C: Assessing the effects of the LTP and mitigation	
<p>Predict the effects of the LTP. Evaluate the effects of the LTP. Propose measures to prevent, reduce or offset adverse environmental effects (including implementation of proposed mitigation measures). Output: Draft Environmental Report.</p>	<p>Develop strategies and programme options in detail.</p>
Stage D: Consulting on the draft LTP and the Environmental Report	
<p>Present the results of the SEA. Seek inputs from the public and authorities with environmental responsibilities. Take consultation results into account. Show how the results of the Environmental Report were taken into account in finalising the LTP.</p>	<p>Full public consultation on draft LTP No.2. Consider and document consultation responses. Prepare revised LTP No.2 in light of consultation responses. Notify consultees of changes. Consider need for any inquiry. Set up inquiry if required. Consider outcome of Examination in Public (EIP). Notify consultees of intention to adopt plan. Formal adoption by Partners and submission to DfT. Distribute and make available adopted LTP.</p>
Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects on the environment of implementing the LTP	
<p>Prepare and implement programme to monitor the significant effects of the LTP on the environment, and link to other LTP implementation and review activities.</p>	<p>Monitor implementation of the adopted LTP through proposed programme.</p>

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE, PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

3.1 Environmental Baseline

3.1.1 Baseline data is used to provide the basis for forecasting and monitoring of environmental effects and also aids the identification of environmental problems. Baseline environmental data collated during the SEA process is presented in Appendix B of Volume 1 of the Environmental Report. On the basis of the available data, it appears likely that the following trends are likely to continue:

- the population within South Yorkshire is expected to remain static over the next 6 years. Figures from the 1991 and 2001 census indicate that overall there was a 3.6% reduction in population over the County, with only Sheffield showing a minor increase (0.1%) in population. Of approximately 0.5 million people who work in South Yorkshire, about 50% of those work in Sheffield;
- the current trend, in terms of travel by people living and working within South Yorkshire, is for high and increasing car use, increasing travel distances and higher car ownership;
- within South Yorkshire, road traffic has increased from 7930 thousand vehicle kilometers in 1993, to 9709 thousand vehicle kilometers in 2003, an increase of 18% over 10 years. Road traffic growth can be expected to continue, unless measures to severely reduce car usage are introduced;
- 62% of journeys to and from work within South Yorkshire are made by car. Since 1991 there has been an increase of 29.0% in the number of households in South Yorkshire with access to a car or van. Although the percentage of households without access to a car or van (32.8%) is slightly higher than the national average (26.8%), the increase is similar to the national average and may be expected to reflect the national average in the future¹;
- between 1997/98 and 2003/04 there was an increase in the number of journeys in the County made by tram, from 9.1 million to 11.99 million, with a slight increase in rail journeys from 4.4 million to 4.86 million. There was, however, a decrease in journeys made by bus, from 144 million to 120.1 million. The fall in bus patronage is anticipated to continue as long as car ownership increases and motoring costs continue to fall in comparison with bus fares, though measures such as the extension of Quality Bus Corridors and concessionary fares may slow or halt the fall. In contrast, patronage of the tram system is expected to continue to rise;
- there has been an increase in the number of journeys made by cycle, and an increase in the level of walking²;
- within the County, there has been an overall increase in the number of fatalities/serious injuries due to road accidents (from 686 in 2000 to 740 in 2002), though there has been a slight reduction in fatalities/serious injuries to

¹ South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 Strategic Context Report;

² South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2001-2006, Fourth Annual Progress Report 2004

cyclists. There has also been a slight reduction in the number of child casualties, however there is generally a higher incidence of casualties involving children in areas of deprivation within South Yorkshire. As traffic volumes rise, the numbers of accidents, potentially resulting in fatalities or serious injuries, are also likely to rise;

- 93% of the rural population within South Yorkshire currently live within 800m of an hourly or better public transport service³. This already exceeds the national target for the proportion of the rural population living within 10 minutes of an hourly or better bus service to increase from 37% to 50% by 2010;
- fourteen Air Quality Management Areas have been declared in South Yorkshire, compared to 19 in Yorkshire and Humberside. Five of South Yorkshire's AQMAs are solely related to the trunk road network (M1, M18, A1(M)), particularly along the M1 corridor in South Yorkshire. It is estimated that there would need to be a reduction of 25 to 30% in traffic volumes to meet the national Air Quality Objectives^{4,5}. In the urban centres it is estimated that there would need to be a 13% reduction in 2005 traffic volumes to achieve the national air quality objective for nitrogen dioxide⁶, by December 2005. As traffic volumes continue to increase, air quality will continue to deteriorate;
- on a regional level, total emissions of greenhouse gases were reduced by 6.6% between 1990 and 2001, however carbon dioxide emissions increased by 1.1% and emissions from transport increased by 17% - twice the rate of increase for the UK;
- in 2003, 91% of rivers in the Yorkshire and Humber region were of good or fair biological quality, with 89% being of good or fair chemical quality, compared to 88% and 90%, respectively, in 2000. These figures are generally slightly lower than national figures, though the trends are similar. The trend suggests that there is only likely to be minor improvement in water quality in Yorkshire's rivers over the next five year period, but that any improvement is likely to reflect national trends;
- there are 34 SSSIs within the County, 54% of which are meeting Public Service Agreement (PSA) targets, that 95% should be in favourable or recovering condition by 2010. Within Yorkshire and Humberside, 56% of SSSIs were meeting PSA targets in 2003/4, whilst 59% are meeting PSA targets in 2005. If a similar trend occurs within S Yorkshire, it would be anticipated that 69% of SSSIs would be in favourable or recovering condition by 2010;
- it is assumed that protected woodland and farmland species and/or their habitats would continue to be protected under statutory processes;

³ www.rurallinks.co.uk/local_transport_plan_rural_links_network_and_ltp.htm

⁴ Report of the Programme Director – Strategic Direction for LTP2, 26 November 2004

⁵ Development Control: Planning for Air Quality. NSCA, November 2004.

⁶ Provisional South Yorkshire Second LTP 2006-2011. Draft for Consultation. Spring 2005

- over 50,000 ha of South Yorkshire is covered by Community Forest. It is anticipated that there will be an increase in woodland cover in the future, helped by the South Yorkshire Forest Plan 2002, part of an initiative to increase woodland cover across the UK by 30% over the next 30 years;
- between the 1960s and the 1990s, there was a 21% reduction in the area of land within Yorkshire and Humberside that was described as “tranquil”, from 11,385 sq km to 9,300 sq km. In the 1960s, 74% of the total land area within Yorkshire and Humberside was described as tranquil, which had reduced to 60% of the total land area by the 1990s. New methodology for identifying tranquil areas was publicised this year by the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE), hence the above figures may alter, however, if the previous trends are indicative, a further 2% loss of tranquil areas could be expected over the next five year period;
- it is assumed that existing Listed Buildings, built heritage conservation areas and sites of archaeological interest and Scheduled Monuments would continue to be protected through the statutory planning processes;
- areas of the County that lie within the Peak District National Park would continue to be protected through statutory processes and legislation relating to National Parks.

3.2 Environmental Problems and Opportunities

3.2.1 Chapter 6.0 and Table 6.1 of Volume 1 of the Environmental Report present overarching issues and related environmental problems and opportunities of relevance to LTP No. 2. These were identified through the review of the baseline data and of policies within other plans and programmes, in particular those relating to the environment, and have been grouped under the following key themes (refer to Table 6.1, Volume 1):

- traffic growth and congestion;
- alternative modes of transport;
- cross-boundary issues;
- safety issues;
- air quality;
- climate change (regional air quality – greenhouse gas emissions);
- other environmental and quality of life issues (rural transport, biodiversity & nature conservation, cultural heritage, physical fitness, use of material resources, impacts on water resources)

3.2.2 In many cases, there is considerable overlap between the environmental problems and opportunities identified, in particular, issues related to traffic growth and congestion, alternative modes of transport air quality and climate change.

4.0 SEA OBJECTIVES AND INDICATORS

4.1 Although the SEA Directive does not specifically require the use of objectives and indicators in SEA, they are a recognised way in which environmental effects can be described, analysed and compared. The SEA objectives used for the SEA of the South Yorkshire LTP No. 2 (2006-2011) SEA were established taking into account:

- relevant legislation⁷ and guidance⁸;
- environmental protection objectives included in relevant plans and programmes;
- NATA objectives and sub-objectives; (presented in **Table 3.2** of Volume 1); key objectives as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and Humber⁹; and
- an overview of the environmental baseline for South Yorkshire, and the environmental problems and opportunities identified (refer to Section 3.0).

4.2 The SEA objectives were as follows:

1. Conserve and enhance biodiversity at all levels.
2. Adopt the principle of no net loss of designated habitats, and attach the highest priority to conserving and improving designated sites.
3. Reduce the negative impacts of the transportation network on air quality.
4. Introduce measures that minimise noise impacts on people and noise sensitive properties.
5. Improve road safety and make people feel safer when using all forms of transport.
6. Reduce levels of transport-related crime and fear of crime.
7. Improve access to key services and facilities using sustainable modes of transport wherever possible.
8. Encourage healthier lifestyles through travel choice.
9. Minimise the impact of the transport network on the quality and quantity of the County's water resources.
10. Reduce the contribution of transportation to greenhouse gases.
11. Preserve and enhance the County's landscapes and townscapes.
12. Preserve or enhance the County's cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage.
13. Preserve or promote those assets of economic value to an area.
14. Promote regeneration in areas of low income and social exclusion.

4.3 The compatibility between the different SEA Objectives was compared (refer to Table 7.2, Volume 1). The main potential for incompatibilities arise in relation to the following types of issues:

- land-take associated with infrastructure improvements related to public transport improvements or to footpath and cycle route improvements (favours SEA Objectives 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14 but may not favour SEA Objectives 1, 2, 11 and 12);

⁷ The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations, 2004

⁸ Strategic Environmental Assessment for Transport Plans and Programmes, TAG Unit 2.11, December 2004, DfT, Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG); and The Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive: Guidance for Planning Authorities, October 2003, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM).

⁹ Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber, 2004.

- measures to reduce private car use and promote sustainable transport alternatives (favours SEA Objectives 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, but may not favour SEA Objectives 13 and 14 where alternative transport modes may be inadequate).

4.4 Where there are potential conflicts between SEA Objectives, these can be resolved via mitigation measures incorporated into the LTP, or recommended for implementation during the period of the LTP (refer to Chapter 10 of Volume 1 – Recommendations and Mitigation).

4.5 Performance of the LTP against the SEA objectives will need to be monitored. This will be achieved through reference to selected environmental indicators and targets (refer to the Baseline Data Table, Appendix B, Volume 1 and to Chapter 5, Volume 1 for further details).

5.0 SOUTH YORKSHIRE LTP No. 2 (2006-11)

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The South Yorkshire LTP No.2 will provide a 5 year integrated transport strategy from 2006 to 2011. It is the means by which overall policy direction is translated into a detailed and costed programme of transport schemes and initiatives, and will include:

- local objectives consistent with Government’s overarching objectives for transport;
- an analysis of problems and opportunities;
- a coherent, integrated strategy to tackle the problems and deliver the LTP objectives;
- a 5 year implementation programme of schemes and policy measures; and
- targets, performance indicators and other outputs which can be used to assess whether the plan is delivering its objectives.

5.1.2 The LTP will address the four Government/Local Government Association shared priorities of congestion, safety, air quality and accessibility. It is the means by which the South Yorkshire Partners can move towards securing the longer-term vision for transformational growth in the county over the next five year period. The provisional LTP will be submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) in July 2005. The Partners will then have the opportunity to produce a revised and finalised LTP for submission by the end of March 2006. The first round LTP will remain in force until March 31, 2006.

5.2 The LTP Objectives

5.2.1 The LTP strategy is built around a vision and six overarching objectives. The broad vision for transport is:

“..that by 2020 South Yorkshire’s transport network will have linked all areas through a high quality, integrated transport network, the essential elements of which include:

- excellent road, rail and air links from South Yorkshire that build on the County's relatively strong position on the motorway network, and on crucial north-south and Trans-Pennine rail routes;
- a core, high quality public transport system that links the main centres and the new international airport;
- first class public transport feeding into the main centres and the Strategic Economic Zones, which could include the extension of Supertram;
- a well-maintained, effectively managed road network that supports and develops in a sustainable way the county's freight and commercial position;
- environmental and land use policies that radically improve the quality of town and city centres, that encourage cycling and walking. "

5.2.2 The six overarching LTP objectives, which have informed the LTP are:

Objective A: To improve access to services and opportunities, especially for those members of the community experiencing disadvantage.

Objective B: To reduce congestion and improve the efficiency of the transport network.

Objective C: To provide choices of travel mode that act as genuine alternatives to the private car.

Objective D: To improve safety for all travellers.

Objective E: To protect and enhance the environment, and in particular to minimise air pollution from transport emissions.

Objective F: To maintain the transport network to ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and goods.

5.3 Alternatives Considered

5.3.1 In developing the LTP, three broad alternative scenarios were addressed. These can be summarised as follows:

- **Alternative 1: Rolling Forward the Current Strategy** (The "Carrot Approach")
- **Alternative 2: The Stick Approach** (adopting a proactive approach to public transport provision linked to measures to manage demand for private car use)
- **Alternative 3: The Proactive Approach** (combining the Carrot Approach with clear criteria to precipitate implementation of the Stick Approach)

5.3.2 An outline of each of the three alternative approaches is presented in the sections below.

Alternative 1: Rolling Forward the Current Strategy (The Carrot Approach)

- 5.3.3 This alternative strategy assumes no basic change to the existing arrangements in the current LTP. The strategy aims to reduce car use by promoting sustainable transport alternatives to the private car and thereby reduce the amount of car travel and improve air quality. The strategy, however, includes relatively few direct measures to restrict private car use and adopts a relatively hands-off approach to the provision of public transport services.
- 5.3.4 Measures included in this approach to restrict private car use primarily revolve around parking restrictions and constraints, particularly aimed at reducing long-stay commuter parking within the urban centres, whilst maintaining short-stay parking and expanding park and ride facilities.
- 5.3.5 Measures to widen travel choice focus on a rolling programme of Quality Bus Corridors, expansion of the Supertram network, working with partners to develop public transport initiatives, including community and rural bus services, improving transport interchange facilities and improving the reliability of public transport, particularly buses, through real-time information systems. The strategy would also continue a programme of measures to continue to improve and develop networks of cycle routes and cycle facilities and provide/improve walking links, for example to public transport.
- 5.3.6 Work and School Travel Plans would continue to be developed and promoted as part of this alternative strategy, to encourage environmentally friendly modes of transport, particularly cycling and walking, through Safe Routes to School projects, car sharing and reduction in the number of car journeys to schools.
- 5.3.7 With regard to road safety, there would be increased emphasis on addressing safety at locations with poor casualty records and in areas of deprivation. The Road Safety Improvement Plan, developed under LTP1, would be used to enable resources to be targeted in areas of greatest need by providing a consistent, county-wide approach to analysis of accident data to identify where resources can best achieve casualty reduction. At the scheme level, schemes would generally combine a mixture of measures aimed at reducing the priority of vehicular traffic and raising the profiles of more vulnerable road users, such as sheltered parking, parking free areas, pedestrian refuges, safer road crossing, for example at school entrances, traffic calming measures and the creation of Child Safety Zones, i.e. 20mph zones, in areas of deprivation, in addition to measures implemented under Safe Routes to School projects.
- 5.3.8 In addition to the above measures, further speed cameras would be introduced under the South Yorkshire Safety Camera Partnership.

Alternative 2: The Stick Approach

- 5.3.9 This alternative is linked to a more robust approach to demand management as a means to restrict traffic growth and to support public transport investment. The strategy would require a significant change in the quality and reliability of public transport provision, particularly buses.

5.3.10 Both “wide-area” and local demand management measures would be implemented and could include:

- road tolling or congestion charging on main cross-region routes, or on main access routes into city/town centres;
- traffic restraint measures, eg. removal of extraneous traffic (“segregation”);
- physical restrictions on car use, e.g. extension of bus lanes, banning through traffic from specific areas;
- regulatory restrictions on car use, e.g. two-person only lanes, local congestion charging (eg within Sheffield city centre);
- parking controls.

5.3.11 With respect to public transport, there would be greater intervention by the local authorities in the specification of service standards. This approach could include the introduction of measures such as statutory Quality Bus Contracts. The proactive approach to the provision of public transport services would be actively coordinated with regeneration initiatives in Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield.

5.3.12 This alternative focuses on the issue of reducing car use in order to reduce congestion, and on achieving a shift to public transport, particularly buses, by introduction of the types of measures described above within the period of LTP2.

Alternative 3: The Proactive Approach

5.3.13 This approach would combine measures to encourage increased use of public transport, such as bus priority measures and increased investment in public transport, with the potential for progressive introduction of more robust demand management measures, such as congestion charging, road user pricing and working place levies. Under this approach, a variety of measures would be proposed to encourage use of public transport and non-vehicular forms of transport and there would be liaison with public transport service providers, for example through voluntary or statutory Quality Bus Partnerships, to enhance the quality and reliability of service provision.

5.3.14 Under this approach, measures introduced under LTP1 would be continued where these have been shown to produce positive results, however, there would also be a change in the way in which the effects of the measures, for example those aimed at reducing congestion, would be monitored.

5.3.15 Rather than monitoring the amount of car travel to the main urban centres and from households, the existing LTP monitoring regime would be developed to extend the coverage of existing methods of collecting and analysing traffic volume data, and would measure congestion by addressing issues relating to journey time and delay and modal shift.

5.3.16 Under this approach there would be greater emphasis on measures to encourage and facilitate use of public transport as a means of reducing congestion, improving accessibility and improving air quality. This approach recognises that easing congestion per se., in the absence of achieving a shift to public transport use, or non-vehicular modes of transport, is likely to be detrimental to the objective of improving air quality. It also recognises the detrimental effects that early introduction of robust demand management measures could have on accessibility and therefore on the economy of the region if appropriate alternative means of transport are not put in place.

5.3.17 Under this alternative, the proposed approach to the introduction of demand management measures would be to assess, during the course of LTP2, the economic conditions that must prevail before progressively more robust forms of demand management measures can be introduced.

5.4 Summary of Assessment of Alternatives

5.4.1 The assessment of the alternatives against the SEA objectives (refer to Volume 1, Chapter 8) indicated that Alternative 3 would be expected to result in the greatest number of positive medium to long-term effects. Alternative 1- rolling forward the current strategy – would be likely to have continuing adverse impacts on air quality and climate change, and, in the longer term could adversely affect economic assets in the County, due to increased traffic congestion. Alternative 2, whilst having potential to have a positive effect on air quality and climate change in the medium to long term, does not include any measures that would have positive effects in terms of the other SEA objectives. It could also adversely affect regeneration and the value of economic assets in the short-term.

5.5 LTP Strategies

5.5.1 The approach adopted within the provisional LTP No. 2 broadly reflects, and builds upon, the approach proposed under Alternative 3 – the Proactive Approach. The following strategies are included within the Provisional LTP No. 2, 2006-2011:

- Accessibility Strategy;
- Congestion Strategy;
- Road Safety Strategy;
- Air Quality Strategy;
- Maintenance Strategy;
- Bus Strategy;
- Rail Plan;
- Freight Strategy.

5.5.2 Table 5.1 summarises those elements of Alternative 3 that have been included within the provisional LTP No. 2, and how these relate to the LTP objectives.

Table 5.1 Relationship Between LTP No. 2 Strategies and Key Elements of Alternative 3 – the Proactive Approach

Alternative 3 – Key Element	LTP No. 2 Objective (refer to Section 9.3)	Measures included under LTP No.2 Strategies as follows (refer to Section 9.3)
Encourage increased use of public transport	Objective C	Accessibility Strategy; Congestion Strategy, Bus Strategy, Air Quality Strategy
Progressive introduction of more robust demand management measures	Objective B	Congestion Strategy
Encourage use of public transport as means of reducing congestion	Objective B, Objective C	Congestion Strategy, Bus Strategy,
Encourage use of public transport as means of increasing accessibility	Objective A, Objective B, Objective C,	Accessibility Strategy, Bus Strategy, Rail Plan
Encourage use of public transport as	Objective E	Air Quality Strategy, Congestion

Alternative 3 – Key Element	LTP No. 2 Objective (refer to Section 9.3)	Measures included under LTP No.2 Strategies as follows (refer to Section 9.3)
means of improving air quality		Strategy, Accessibility Strategy
Continue implementation of measures included in LTP1 relating to road safety	Objective D	Road Safety Strategy, Maintenance Strategy
Continue implementation of measures included in LTP1 relating to development of Quality Bus Corridors	Objective B	Bus Strategy, Congestion Strategy

5.5.3 In addition, the LTP No.2 includes the following Major Schemes:

- Supertram extension;
- Yorkshire Bus project;
- Yorcard;
- A61 Penistone Road/Upper Don Valley Quality Bus Corridor;
- Doncaster Finningley and Rossington Route Regeneration Scheme (FARRRS);
- Sheffield Waverley link Road; and
- Barnsley M1 Town Centre Link

5.6 Assessment of the Provisional LTP No.2. Vision, Objectives, Strategies and Measures

Assessment of LTP No. 2 Vision and Objectives

5.6.1 The LTP vision and objectives as a whole are broadly compatible with the fourteen SEA objectives. The main compatibilities and non-compatibilities between LTP objectives and the SEA Objectives are considered in the sections below.

LTP Objective A: Improve access to services and opportunities, especially for those members of the community experiencing disadvantage

5.6.2 LTP Objective A has a strong positive effect in terms of SEA Objectives 13 and 14. This relates to the improvement of access to services, facilities and employment areas.

LTP Objective B: Reduce congestion and improve the efficiency of the transport network.

5.6.3 This objective has potential for either positive or negative effects in relation to SEA Objectives 3 (local air quality) and 10 (greenhouse gases), subject to effects on the number of vehicle journeys and traffic speeds. Removal of congestion has potential to encourage greater private car use. However, this may be counteracted, to some extent, by improvements to the transport network, including public transport services, as a whole. Reductions in queuing traffic have potential to reduce emissions, subject to vehicle speeds.

5.6.4 LTP Objective B would be anticipated to have positive effects in relation to SEA Objectives 7 (access to key services using sustainable modes of transport) and 13 (preserve/promote assets of economic value) and may also have positive effects in terms of Objectives 4 (noise impact) and 5 (road safety).

LTP Objective C: Provide choices of travel mode that act as genuine alternatives to the private car.

- 5.6.5 LTP Objective C has potential for positive effects in relation to SEA Objectives 3 (local air quality), 7 (access to services using sustainable modes of transport), 8 (healthier lifestyles) and 10 (greenhouse gases). Positive effects on Objectives 3 and 10 will be dependent upon the degree of modal shift that may result from measures implemented to address this objective. Objective C may also have positive effects on SEA Objectives 13 (preserve/promote economic assets) and 14 (regeneration in areas of low income and social exclusion) by improving accessibility for all members of the community, including those without use of a car. There are also potential benefits with respect to SEA Objective 9, relating to water resources, where promotion of alternative travel modes may reduce vehicular road traffic and reduce the potential for impacts on water resources associated with road drainage and accidental release of oil/diesel or other pollutants from older vehicles and as a result of accidents.

LTP Objective D: Improve safety for all travellers.

- 5.6.6 This objective has a direct positive effect on SEA Objective 5 relating to road safety and may also have a positive effect on SEA Objective 6, relating to transport-related crime.

LTP Objective E: Protect and enhance the environment, and in particular to minimise air pollution from transport emissions.

- 5.6.7 LTP Objective E inherently supports SEA Objectives 3 and 10 relating to air pollution from transport emissions. It may also have positive effects in terms of Objectives 1, 2, 9, 11 and 12, relating to biodiversity, water resources, landscape and townscape and cultural heritage, though these are not specifically identified. It is recognised that particular schemes may have potential to adversely affect the environment. This will only be determined by detailed assessment during the development and detailed design of schemes.

LTP Objective F: Maintain the transport network to ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and goods.

- 5.6.8 This objective has potential positive effects in terms of SEA Objectives 5 and 13 in particular.

Assessment of LTP Strategies and Measures

- 5.6.8 The environmental effects of the strategies and measures included in the appraisal are summarised in the sections that follow, grouped according to the effects on each of the SEA Objectives 1 to 14.

SEA Objective 1 Conserve and enhance biodiversity at all levels; and

SEA Objective 2 Adopt the principle of no net loss of designated habitats, and attach the highest priority to conserving and improving designated sites.

- 5.6.9 The potential development of new and/or improved infrastructure, under the Accessibility, Congestion, and Maintenance strategies and the Rail Plan have

potential to cause cumulative direct short to long-term adverse effects on biodiversity and nature conservation. There is also, however, potential to identify opportunities to enhance biodiversity through the design of new and improvement schemes, resulting in medium to long-term benefits.

SEA Objective 3 Reduce the negative impacts of the transportation network on air quality; and

SEA Objective 10 Reduce the contribution of transportation to greenhouse gases.

- 5.6.10 There are potential cumulative medium to long-term benefits, in terms of reducing the adverse impacts of transportation on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, associated with measures proposed under the Accessibility, Congestion, Air Quality, Maintenance and Bus strategies and with the Rail and Freight plans. In most cases, however, the magnitude of those benefits is dependent upon the effectiveness and magnitude of modal shift away from single-occupancy, private car use. Those Major Schemes that are aimed at encouraging or facilitating use of public transport or non-vehicular modes of transport (Yorcard, Yorkshire Bus project) would also contribute to the medium to long-term benefits. New road schemes may have benefits in terms of reducing travel distances, however they may equally encourage private vehicle use.

SEA Objective 4 Introduce measures that minimise noise impacts on people and noise sensitive receptors.

- 5.6.11 Whilst measures incorporated into the LTP No.2 strategies are aimed at reducing road traffic volumes, or growth in volumes, redirecting traffic away from sensitive receptors, such as residential areas, reducing the extent and frequency of roadworks, or constructing low noise road surfaces, have potential for cumulative, medium to long-term benefits. In contrast, the construction of new road links or generation of traffic flows in new areas of sensitive receptors could have medium to long-term adverse effects.

SEA Objective 5 Improve road safety and make people feel safer when using all forms of transport; and

SEA Objective 6 Reduce levels of transport-related crime and fear of crime.

- 5.6.12 With the exception of the Air Quality Strategy and the Major Schemes, which do not include measures related to road safety, the measures proposed under the LTP No.2 strategies would have cumulative short to long-term benefits in terms of improving road safety.
- 5.6.13 Measures proposed under the Accessibility, Maintenance and Bus Strategies, and the Rail Plan, would be anticipated to have short to long-term cumulative benefits in terms of potentially reducing levels of transport-related crime and fear of crime.

SEA Objective 7 Improve access to key services and facilities using sustainable modes of transport wherever possible

- 5.6.14 There are potential cumulative medium to long-term benefits associated with measures proposed under the Accessibility, Congestion, Air Quality, Maintenance, and Bus strategies, and with the Rail and Freight Plan. With the exception of the Freight Plan, in general, the benefits are subject to the effective improvement to

public transport services, including identification of appropriate service requirements, and the extent of modal shift away from private car use.

[SEA Objective 8 Encourage healthier lifestyles through travel choice](#)

- 5.6.15 With the exception of the Major Schemes, there would be short- to long-term cumulative benefits associated with measures proposed under each of the strategies proposed under LTP No.2. Of the Major Schemes, the Barnsley Town Centre to M1 Link Road could also have benefits in terms of encouraging healthier lifestyles.

[SEA Objective 9 Minimise the impact of the transport network on the quality and quantity of the County's water resources.](#)

- 5.6.16 There is potential for medium to long-term indirect benefits associated with measures under the Air Quality Strategy (reduced travel need, promotion of sustainable travel alternatives). Measures under the Freight Strategy and Major Schemes could have direct short to long-term adverse effects on water resources, particularly water quality and flood susceptibility. In general, however, any adverse effects would be mitigated by adherence to statutory requirements, adoption of best practice and through scheme design.

[SEA Objective 11 Preserve and enhance the County's landscapes and townscapes; and](#)

[SEA Objective 12 Preserve or enhance the County's cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological assets](#)

- 5.6.17 There is potential for indirect medium to long-term benefits associated with measures under the Air Quality Strategy that would control development. Measures under the other strategies, including the Major Schemes, could have positive or negative medium to long-term effects, subject to the nature and locations of individual schemes. Cumulative effects arising from different schemes within the County could have an overall effect on the Countryside Character Areas.

[SEA Objective 13 Preserve or promote those assets of economic value to an area; and](#)

[SEA Objective 14 Promote regeneration in areas of low income and social exclusion](#)

- 5.6.18 In terms of preserving or promoting assets of economic value, it is anticipated that there would be potential cumulative medium to long-term effects associated with measures proposed under all of the LTP No. 2 strategies, including the Major Schemes but with the exception of measures proposed under the Road Safety Strategy, which would not have any significant benefits.

- 5.6.19 In terms of promoting regeneration in areas of low income and social exclusion, with the exception of the Congestion strategy and the Road Safety strategy, all of the above strategies have potential for cumulative medium to long-term benefits, subject to the transport requirements of the various user groups being effectively identified and addressed. The Congestion strategy could have adverse effects if demand management measures are not integrated with, and preceded by, the introduction of effective alternative transport provision. Measures included under the Road Safety strategy are not anticipated to have any significant effects in terms of regeneration in areas of low income and social exclusion.

5.7 Summary

- 5.7.1 Table 5.2 summarises the results of the assessment and links these to recommendations for mitigation. The table presents the key effects and mitigation recommendations. Only those effects that are considered to be significant are shown in the summary table; where there is no entry against a particular SEA objective/LTP strategy, there are considered to be no significant overall effects. Further details and recommendations on mitigation may be found in Chapter 10 of Volume 1.
- 5.7.2 Overall, the objectives and strategies proposed within LTP No. 2 are considered likely to have positive effects in terms of the SEA objectives for which significant effects have been identified. In some cases, in particular in terms of SEA objectives relating to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, the benefits will be dependent upon the effectiveness and magnitude of modal shift away from private car use. This in turn, will be subject to the effectiveness of improvements in the provision of alternative modes of transport and the identification of where and when the introduction of more stringent demand management measures should be applied.

5.8 Changes to Plan Resulting From the SEA and the Consultation Process

(To be completed after consultation)

5.9 Monitoring

- 5.9.1 The SEA Directive explicitly requires monitoring of the significant effects of the LTP, following LTP implementation. Volume 1 includes a proposed draft monitoring protocol (refer to Appendix H of Volume 1). This may be refined by SYLTPP in response to comments from consultees and prior to adoption of LTP No. 2.

6.0 HOW TO COMMENT ON THE REPORT

- 6.1 To comment on the contents of the Environmental Report, please contact:

Mr Paul Feehily
South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan Partnership
Watsons Chambers
Room 1/3, 1st Floor
5-15 Market Place
Castle Square
Sheffield
S1 2GH