

Annex 3

**SEA stage B2
developing the alternatives**

A3.1 Introduction

“...an environmental report shall be prepared in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated” (Article 5(1) SEA Directive)

One of the issues that must be covered in the Environmental Report is an ‘outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with’ (Annex I (h))

A3.1.1 Alongside the development of the environmental baseline, the second important part of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP) development for us was the development of reasonable alternatives or different plan options which could then be appraised to identify the best option for delivery and the likely effects on the environment in doing so. We took a great deal of time to get to the right options, about 6 months in total, but in the end through appraisal it was clear that we had developed three options that were realistic that would generally have a positive effect on environmental issues. However, the final option that we selected for our preferred Derbyshire LTP3 strategy following appraisal was based upon one of our preferred alternatives, with the best performing parts of the other two alternatives. This Annex describes the process and the decisions made to arrive at the preferred Derbyshire LTP3 strategy.

A3.2 Without the plan scenario

A3.2.1 The first stage of the process to develop alternatives is to understand what we would do and have to do in a scenario where we did not have an LTP to guide our local transport investment. Once the without the plan scenario is established we could then look at the alternative options available to us to deliver a plan. Although developing a without the plan scenario is an essential stage within SEA, it should be noted that the Authority does have a statutory duty to produce a Local Transport Plan by March 2011 as required under the Transport Act 2000, as amended by the Local Transport Act 2008.

What do we have to do? an assessment of core duties – key legislation

A3.2.2 In December 2009, we began the process to develop the without the plan scenario. Department for Transport Guidance on SEAs (Webtag 2.11) suggests that this scenario should be developed in line with certain principles. One such principle is that it should be in line with Government policies. Some of the key Government policies are those that are covered by legislation which we would need to ensure are delivered whether we had a plan or not. These statutory duties therefore not only form the core duties of the without the plan scenario, but they also should form the core duties of any alternatives that we were to deliver. To establish these core duties we undertook an exercise to establish a list of key legislation relating to local transport provision; the results are shown in the tables below. Please note that these are based upon the assessment in December 2009 and have not since been updated.

Maintenance

What	Where	What's involved?
Highway Maintenance	Highways Act 1980 Section 41 (1)	The authority who are for the time being the highway authority for a highway maintainable at the public expense are under a duty to maintain the highway."
Winter Maintenance	Highways Act 1980 Sections 41,150 Railways and Transport Safety Act 2003 (Section 111)	The Council, as the Highway Authority, has a statutory duty to provide a winter service on all highways maintainable at public expense within the County except for motorways and trunk roads. The service covers the precautionary salting and snow clearance of the network. Section 41 (1A) A highway authority has a duty to ensure, so far as reasonably practicable, that safe passage along the highway is not endangered by snow or ice. Section 150 (1) A highway authority shall remove any accumulation of snow from the highway if it is causing an obstruction Section 150 (4a) A highway authority may take any reasonable steps (including the placing of lights, signs and fences) for warning users of the highway of the obstruction.

Traffic Management

What	Where	What's involved?
Network Management Duty	Traffic Management Act 2004 Section 8	Network Management Duty to manage our road network to secure the expeditious movement of traffic and to facilitate the same on the networks of other authorities. In this context traffic includes motor vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians and freight traffic, and having due regard to all other services offered by the Authority. Amended under Local Transport Act 2008 to include district councils under the definition of local authority.
New Roads and Street Works	New Roads and Street Works Act 1991	Requires authorities to co-ordinate works on their streets, including both their own works and those carried out by utility companies; requires utilities to co-operate in that co-ordination process. Amended under Local Transport Act 2008 to include reinstatement and remedial works as 'street works'.

Countryside Service

What	Where	What's involved?
Rights of Way Improvement	Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 Sections 60-62	Rights of Way Improvement Plan to include the actions to be taken for the management of local rights of way, and for securing an improved network of local rights of way, including the extent to which local rights of way meet the present and likely future needs of the public, the opportunities provided by local rights of way for exercise and other forms of open-air recreation and the enjoyment of the authority's area, and the accessibility of local rights of way to blind or partially sighted persons and others with mobility problems.

Integrated Transport

What	Where	What's involved?
Habitats Regulation Assessment	Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC) and Regulation 85B of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994 (S.I 1994/2716 as amended)	Requirement to consider whether LTP will have a significant effect on a European site. On 20 October 2005, the European Court of justice ruled that the UK had failed to transpose the Directive's provisions into UK law. DEFRA amended the Habitats Regulations in August 2007. LTP3 Guidance require that local transport authorities need to consider if their LTP is likely to have a significant effect on a European site, and statutory environmental bodies should be consulted.
Bus Strategy	Local Transport Act 2008	Removed requirement to produce separate bus strategy – bus measures should be integrated more effectively into the core LTP Strategy and Implementation Plan (LTP3 Guidance)
Bus information	Transport Act 2000 (s 139-141)	Duty to work with bus operators to determine what should be made available to the public: Bus routes Timetabling Fares (inc concessionary) Facilities for disabled passengers Connections with other services
Bus powers and Passenger Transport	Local Transport Act 2008	Improved powers to influence the provision of bus services in their area.
Travel to school	Education and Inspections Act 2006	Sustainable modes of travel strategy – Assessing travel and transport needs of children and young people, and planning transport infrastructure to maximise potential to promote and use sustainable modes of travel.
School Transport Services	Education Act 2002	Transport support and services for 16-19 year olds in further education.

Common to all

What	Where	What's involved?
Strategic Environmental Assessment	European Directive 2001/42/EC	Integration of environmental concerns in policy and planning process – need to decide whether Plans and Programmes require SEA, and proceed with SEA if they do.
Local Transport Plan	Local Transport Act 2008	Develop policies for the promotion and encouragement of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport from and within their area, and carry out their functions so as to implement those policies. - to meet the needs of persons living or working in the area, visiting or travelling through, and the transport required for the transportation of

What	Where	What's involved?
		<p>freight, and facilities and services for pedestrians.</p> <p>Must take into account any policies and guidance with respect to mitigation of, and adaptation to climate change or otherwise with respect to the protection or improvement of the environment – in devising policies and carrying out functions to implement them.</p> <p>Must keep the Plan under review and alter if appropriate.</p> <p>Must have regard to the transport needs of disabled people (DDA 2005) and of persons who are elderly or have mobility problems.</p>
Road Safety	Road Traffic Act 1988 Chapter 52	<p>Each local authority must prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety and may make contributions towards the cost of measures for promoting road safety taken by other authorities or bodies.</p> <p>Must carry out studies into accidents arising out of the use of vehicles on roads or parts of roads, other than trunk roads, within their area,</p> <p>Must, in the light of those studies, take such measures as appear to the authority to be appropriate to prevent such accidents, including the dissemination of information and advice relating to the use of roads, the giving of practical training to road users or any class or description of road users, the construction, improvement, maintenance or repair of roads for which they are the highway authority and other measures taken in the exercise of their powers for controlling, protecting or assisting the movement of traffic on roads</p> <p>In constructing new roads, must take such measures as appear to the authority to be appropriate to reduce the possibilities of such accidents when the roads come into use.</p>
Local Air Quality	<p>Environment Act (1995) Section 86(3) - air quality</p> <p>Air Quality Regulations 1997</p>	Where a district council is preparing an action plan, the county council shall, within the relevant period, submit to the district council proposals for the exercise (so far as relating to the designated area) by the county council, in pursuit of the achievement of air quality standards and objectives, of any powers exercisable by the county council.
Integrated spatial/transport planning	Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004	<p>Introduced a new land use/spatial planning system.</p> <p>Local authorities should seek to ensure that strategies in the development plan and the local transport plan are complementary: consideration of development plan allocations and local transport priorities and investment should be closely linked.</p>
Peak District National Park	Environment Act (1995) Section 62	which sets out the duty to "have regard" to the purposes of the National Park
Community Safety	<p>Crime & Disorder Act 1998</p> <p>Police and Justice Act 2006</p>	<p>Local authorities were given the responsibility to formulate and implement a strategy to reduce crime and disorder in their area (Community Safety Strategies)</p> <p>The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 was reviewed to strengthen partnership performance in tackling community safety. To reflect the changing roles of partners and partnerships, legislative changes were brought in by the Police and Justice Act 2006 and subsequent regulations came into force in August 2007.</p> <p>In two-tier areas, the new regulations require the preparation of a county Community Safety Agreement (based on county and district Strategic Intelligence Assessments). This three year Agreement (refreshed annually) identifies priorities to reduce crime, disorder and substance misuse.</p>
Sustainable Development	Local Government Act 2000 Part 1	includes promotion of economic, social and environmental well-being to enhance the quality of life of local communities and contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
Noise management	<p>Environmental Noise Directive 2002/49/EC 2002</p> <p>Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006</p>	<p>Co-ordinated and systematic approach to the management of transport noise. DEFRA is producing Noise Action Plans, which are due to be adopted 2010. To be integrated into LTPs as appropriate.</p>
Local Economic Assessment Duty	Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act	<p>All county councils to prepare an assessment of economic conditions in their area</p> <p>Due to come into force April 2010</p> <p>Should lead to improved economic interventions, better spatial prioritisation of investment by local authorities and partners</p>
Biodiversity	Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006	Every public authority must have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.

What	Where	What's involved?
Local Area Agreements etc.	Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007	Statutory Local Area Agreements, Joint Strategic Needs Assessments, de-regulation of Best Value, and Duty to Involve. Also, updated guidance on preparation of Sustainable Community Strategies (section 4 of the Local Government Act 2000)
Duty to Involve	Section 38 of above legislation Came into effect April 2009	Strengthening democratic legitimacy by embedding a culture of engagement and empowerment. This means that authorities consider, as a matter of course, the possibilities for provision of information to, consultation with and involvement of representatives of local persons across all authority functions. Appropriate engagement and empowerment should be embedded as standard practice throughout authorities, central to service delivery, policy and decision making.
Climate Change	Climate Change Act 2008	Reduce UK greenhouse gas emissions by at least: 80% on 1990 levels by 2050 34% on 1990 levels by 2020 Introduced carbon budgeting over five year periods: 2008-2012 2013-2017 2018-2022 DfT expectation is that LTP Strategy and Implementation Plans should take significant steps towards mitigating climate change, through sustainable transport systems, facilitating behavioural change, and reducing the need to travel e.g. Smarter Choices measures

Ones to watch

What	Where	What's involved?
Flood management	Flood and Water Management Bill	Clear roles and responsibilities and risk based approach to flood management - local authorities will be given responsibility for surface water flooding.
Equalities and Socio-economic disadvantage	Equalities Bill	Consolidates equalities legislation, giving local authorities a single duty. Also, the introduction of new strategic socio-economic duty to reduce socio-economic inequalities
Child poverty	Child Poverty Bill	Local authorities and their partners must conduct a local needs assessment and produce a joint local child poverty strategy

Other policy context

A3.2.3 In addition to the without the plan scenario being based upon current government policies, it should assume that other adopted plans and programmes will deliver as planned. The identification of relevant plans and programmes, including government policies was undertaken as one of the first tasks for the SEA Scoping Report. The results of this stage were included within the draft Derbyshire LTP SEA Scoping Report (Annex I).

A3.2.4 What this means for the without the Plan scenario is that without a plan we would be expected to be undertaking measures that were compatible with International, National, Regional and Local policies, of which there were a great number. Environmental protection would be required under some of these policies. A summary of the key messages of policy context analysis from the SEA Scoping Report are reproduced in the table below (this was compiled from December 2009, and published at June 2010, but noting that national and regional policy was under review following the change of government):-

General

1. The five goals of **Delivering a Sustainable Transport System** form the strategic policy framework for LTP3, relating to tackling climate change, supporting economic growth, promoting equality of opportunity, contributing to better safety, security and health, improving quality of life and promoting a healthy natural environment.
2. The East Midlands Integrated Regional Strategy is the **regional sustainable development framework**. Relevant spatial objectives are to ensure that the location of development makes efficient use of existing physical infrastructure and helps to reduce the need to travel, and to improve accessibility to jobs and services by increasing the use of public transport, cycling and walking, and reducing traffic growth and congestion.
3. The Regional Transport Strategy puts emphasis on better use of existing networks, whilst **improving public transport, and significantly improving opportunities for walking and cycling**.
4. LTP policies and programmes will need to **extract key information from Derbyshire's and the Districts'**

Sustainable Community Plans which are relevant to transport planning.

5. **Inter-regional and Trans-Pennine issues** are very relevant to the LTP.
6. The LTP needs to have regard to the housing, transport and environment policies and allocations in the **Peak District National Park Management Plan**, and specifically address the conservation and enhancement of the National Park.
7. LTP policies and programmes need to **address rural issues**.
8. The process is to be informed by the **previous SEA** of the Derbyshire Local Transport Plan 2006-2011.

Biodiversity, flora, fauna and soil

1. Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard to the purpose of **conserving biodiversity** (Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006)
2. **Improved public transport** links to leisure and tourist destinations.
3. Take into account all local **Biodiversity Action Plans** of relevance to the area.
4. Carry out a **Habitats Regulation Assessment** (e.g. Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation) to identify if the plan will have a significant impact and, if so, what mitigating actions will be taken.

Population and human health, including noise

1. Importance of **locating new developments in existing built up areas with good links to the road and public transport network**, rather than locate in low density areas which will require new infrastructure.
2. Have regard to the influence of housing, transport and environment policies and allocations in the various **local development documents**, both within the county and beyond.
3. Ensure adequate consideration is given to the **public health value of schemes to increase walking and cycling**.
4. Ensure that tackling the barriers to **behavioural change** are addressed.
5. Continue to address the **barriers to work and training**.
6. Be mindful of the importance of allowing opportunities for social interaction within communities, **reducing community severance** where possible.
7. Incorporate the **latest thinking on achieving challenging road safety targets beyond 2010**, in line with 'A Safer Way' consultation (2009) and Advice about Local Road Safety Strategies (2009).
8. LTP policies and programmes need to include measures to **reduce the impact of traffic noise** and safeguard tranquil areas.
9. Consider potential for **links between Greenways and urban facilities** to reduce car use for local journeys.

Water

1. LTP policies and programme needs to ensure **water purity** is protected and enhanced.
2. Various **flood risk management strategies** and **River Basin Management Plans** are relevant to the area (see A.4 below for examples).

Local air quality

1. The development of an **Air Quality Action Plan for Chesterfield** may be relevant to LTP3, if Chesterfield declares of an Air Quality Management Area.

Climatic Factors, including greenhouse gases

1. Importance of all agencies cutting down carbon emissions through **reviewing vehicle fleets and managing commuter and business travel**.
2. LTP3 development should consider strengthening policy objectives around **adaptation and resilience of the transport network to extreme weather events**.

Material assets

1. The bulk minerals and waste transport aspects of **Derby and Derbyshire Minerals and Waste Local Plans** are relevant to the Local Transport Plan. The process of reviewing these has commenced in 2009, with adoption of the waste documents expected in 2012, and mineral documents in 2013. These processes will therefore be interlinked.
2. Asset management will enable a strategic approach to better manage assets to meet customer expectations and ensure the long term sustainability of the transport infrastructure. **Lifecycle planning and costing** will consider a long term period of 15-20 years, to achieve timely maintenance and value for money.

Cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage

1. LTP policies and programmes need to ensure that the **Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site** is protected.
2. Ensure the **protection of historic buildings, structures and areas** against the effects of traffic pollution and other transport related damages particularly designated sites and their settings, with the Historic Environment Record and The Landscape Character Assessments used as key tools in this process.
3. LTP3 will need to reconcile reducing budgets with **increasing demands for higher quality treatment of the streetscape**. Use the expertise of **specialist advisors** as regards Historic Environment Records in devising transport implementation plans, including dealing with issues such as Conservation Areas at risk.

Landscape

1. Recognise the **value of landscape** (an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors) following the European Landscape Convention in developing and implementing the plan.
2. Commitment **to work with PDNPA to develop action plans by 2014**, identify appropriate design standards for PDNP, and continue with the road verge reserve project.
3. Integration of public transport with tourism and recreation facilities in the **National Forest**.

Local Transport Plan 2

- A3.2.5 The development of the without the plan scenario should assume the continued implementation of strategies and measures in earlier adopted versions. In terms of the Local Transport Plan, this refers to the continued implementation of the Derbyshire LTP (2006-2011) and the Derby Joint LTP (2006-2011). In considering the without the plan scenario, we are assuming that both LTPs will complete on March 31st 2011.

What would this mean for the without the plan scenario?

- A3.2.6 To understand what this would mean without the plan scenario, we held a group discussion in May 2010 with both policy and environmental officers in attendance. This group considered what would happen with; the completion of LTP2s as planned; within the context of the delivery of other plans and programmes; and fulfilment of our statutory duties to meet key legislation.
- A3.2.7 During discussions the group highlighted six themes that were likely to occur looking forward to the time horizon of 2026. These are listed below:-

Without the Plan Scenario

New development

The significance of new development across the county, particularly when considered at the housing market level, would suffer from a lack of transport planning input. Sustainable travel, accessibility planning, and potential funding sources could be compromised.

Climate change/carbon reduction/Peak oil

The profile of climate change is more prominent compared with the LTP2 planning period. Without the plan, less would be done to focus the transport planning framework towards carbon reduction (particularly mitigation).

Social Exclusion

With higher fuel prices expected, and the loss of commercial public transport services, together with a growing elderly population, there would be a poorer performance on tackling social exclusion in a co-ordinated way. Also, importantly, there would be a lack of support for the voluntary sector, and a lack of pooled knowledge about tackling the barriers to accessibility.

Investment Planning

It was felt likely that investment planning would naturally 'default' towards highway maintenance. Also, there was a risk of 'throwing money at problems,' which may not necessarily be effective. There would be less of a focus on 'doing more with less,' and achieving value for money across the range of transport planning measures. There was a danger that transport services became budget driven in silos, without the overview that the Plan provides. Without a plan, opportunities for carbon, environmental and financial savings through the co-location of service providers and promotion of zero and low carbon travel may be lost. Within the context of economic constraints, investment planning is more important.

Strategic forward planning/capacity for innovation and engagement

There would be no attempt at a forward look, and less engagement with people and practitioners about planning ahead. There would be a reactive approach to problems, and a limited capacity for innovation. There would be a lack of overall co-ordination/direction.

Monitoring

The lack of systematic monitoring (whether external influences, local data analysis or performance monitoring) would mean that the effect of measures taken could not be evaluated and there would not be a proactive approach to transport planning. There would be a lack of meaningful targets/monitoring framework.

NB Also, without the Plan there would be no Strategic Environmental Assessment to inform whether we were continuing to travel in the right direction to achieve environmental, social and economic goals in the light of changing circumstances.

How would the 'without the plan' scenario affect our measures in maintenance and design, behavioural change, vehicle fleets, spatial planning, network management, etc?

A3.2.8 To deliver local transport networks and services, even where a plan does not exist, still requires a wide range of different measures or interventions to be undertaken. To assist us in developing the plan and considering the different ways we would implement options we needed to examine what the measures available to us were. A list of measures were developed by looking at what we had delivered in implementing previous LTPs; a list of measures provided in the Local Transport Plan 3 guidance; and a list of policy instruments contained within the Department for Transport's Webtag Unit 2.3. The list of measures we compiled is included within the Table below:-

Maintenance and design	Accessibility
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Routine maintenance of roads• Routine maintenance of pavements• Routine maintenance of rights of way and greenways• Flooding management• Maintenance of vegetation• Management of the transport asset to support local journeys• Improving the local streetscape through high quality design, use of local materials and multi-disciplinary approach• Removing unnecessary infrastructure• Managing special road verges (biodiversity)• Habitat protection for plants and wildlife• Reducing light pollution• Reducing street lighting carbon emissions• Minimising damage to the environment• Improving public satisfaction with maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Joined up public transport information and branding• Volunteer car schemes• Community Transport Services• More demand responsive transport services e.g. dial-a-bus• Wheels to Work• Getting people to jobs and training• Bringing services to the people• Community rail• Home to School Transport• School Crossing Patrol Service• Making public transport physically accessible• Independent travel training• Improving access to public and green spaces• Equality Impact Assessments
Vehicle fleets	Spatial planning
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Environmental specification in contracted services• Use of alternative fuels e.g. plug in points for electric vehicles• Low Emission Zones• Sustainable freight distribution networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Influencing spatial planning to reduce car use and enable more walking, cycling, public transport• Influencing spatial planning to minimise the impacts of road freight

Behavioural change	Public transport
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel Plans for businesses and new developments, including monitoring • School Travel Plans, inc. monitoring • DCC to tackle commuting mileage • Road user charging • Personalised travel planning • Better promotion of existing opp for cycling and walking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Smart ticketing' improved technology for paying • More flexible ways of paying e.g. multi-operator ticketing scheme • Review of supported public transport network • Concessionary fare scheme • Discounted travel scheme – buses and trains • Improvements to public transport services
New infrastructure	Accounting/decision-making
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycling facilities • Walking networks • Green infrastructure – linking up habitats • Infrastructure linked with new housing • Major schemes – congestion and safety: • Major schemes – environmental: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best use of resource to reduce carbon footprint • Buy carbon credits to offset unavoidable carbon emissions
	Economy
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the use of local facilities and local businesses • Support tourism growth for specific road users and locations • Support moving freight from road to rail
Network management	Road and community safety
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing events to reduce car use • Dealing with disruption on the roads • Co-ordination of street works • Parking controls • Keeping roads clear in bad weather • Keeping pavements clear in bad weather • Keeping lorries out of villages • Tackling bad parking in rural areas • Better direction and tourist signing • Providing travel information • Improved social contact e.g. reduced traffic levels/ speeds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road safety education • Road safety training e.g. cycling and walking • Road safety publicity • Road safety engineering to reduce danger on the roads • Road surfaces that help reduce skidding • Road safety enforcement • Speed reduction schemes • Improved street lighting e.g. waiting areas and crossings • Monitoring and evaluation of road safety measures

A3.2.9 At the same discussion group in May 2010, we went through each of these measures and considered what would happen if we did not have a plan. This identified which measures we were likely to do more of, which we would do about the same, which we would expect to do less of and which we would not do at all. This comparison was done against the Authority having some form of a plan. We used the definition of a plan as “The purpose of a Plan is to establish where we are now, where we would like to be, and how we get there”. The results of this assessment are provided in the table below:-

Summary by 2026, without the plan

More

We would do more routine maintenance of the highway, flooding management, reducing light pollution and reducing carbon emissions through street lighting. Dealing with disruption on the roads will be greater, as will the need for parking controls. There will be infrastructure linked with new housing provision and smart ticketing on public transport (i.e. using technology for paying).

About the same

There will be improved public satisfaction with maintenance and practical responses will have been made to the demands of changing vegetation as a consequence of climate change (e.g. as a result of longer growing seasons). Developments will have been made in line with external influences such as electric plug in points or Low Emission Zones. The key strands of network management would continue – co-ordination of street works, winter maintenance and lorry routeing. Major schemes relating to tackling congestion and safety concerns would be pursued. The School Crossing Patrol service would continue, and buses made more accessible to comply with Disability Discrimination Act requirements. Equality Impact Assessments would continue as part of the corporate programme. Road safety engineering and enforcement measures would continue.

About the same or less

It is less clear how major schemes with an environmental basis would emerge, whilst support of the public transport network would remain under review. Support of moving freight from road to rail would continue, as would Community Rail initiatives.

Less

There would be less routine maintenance of pavements, rights of way and Greenways. Improvement of the local streetscape would be limited as would minimising damage to the environment and removing unnecessary infrastructure. Road safety education, training and publicity services, and community safety measures, would be less likely to be pursued. Most aspects of influencing behavioural change through travel planning will have been lost, as would opportunities for sustainable freight distribution networks and environmental specification for bus contracts. Influence on spatial planning would be much reduced, and opportunities to improve social contact overlooked. The best use of resources to reduce carbon emissions would not have been researched or enacted. New walking and cycling networks, and green infrastructure would be less in evidence, with poorer health outcomes. Improvements to public transport services from the customers' point of view would be poorer, with little or no progress on more flexible ticketing (e.g. multi-operator ticketing schemes), discounted and concessionary fare schemes. Many measures relating to improving accessibility for local people would not be pursued - Community Transport services, volunteer car schemes, Wheels to Work, getting people to jobs and training, bringing services to the people and independent travel training.

Not at all

It is felt unlikely that road user charging will be implemented within the timescale of the plan, and that focussing maintenance on local journeys would be unlikely without the plan, as maintenance tends to focus on the busiest roads.

What would be the impact of the without the plan scenario on the environmental baseline

A3.2.10 At the meeting in May, the draft SEA Scoping Report was at a stage where we were aware of most of the environmental issues that a potential impact could be made from local transport networks and services. Therefore at this meeting we could make an assessment to what the likelihood or evolution of the environmental baseline would be under a without the plan scenario. The assessment is provided in the table below, from which the summary of the effect of the without the plan scenario was made:

Consideration of the without the plan scenario over the fifteen year period shows that there would be an overall poorer performance for carbon reduction measures, environmental protection, social inclusion, behavioural change and good health outcomes (personal and public).

SEA Issues	Impact – ☺positive, ☹negative or 😊same
Landscape and Townscape	
Designated landscape and townscape of Peak District National Park	☹ poorer environmental protection
Visual intrusion by transport infrastructure	☹ not taking out unnecessary infrastructure
Less darker areas due to light pollution from illuminated transport infrastructure	☺ being addressed through carbon reduction measures
Localised damage from parking at busy tourist locations	😊 problems would still be addressed as they arise
Localised damage from use of motorised vehicles in the countryside	☹ less rights of way and greenway maintenance
Localised erosion damage from walking, cycling and horse riding	☹ poorer rights of way network infrastructure
Less tranquil areas due to traffic noise and light pollution	☺ light pollution would be less
Landscapes and townscapes act as a tourist attraction of which many people travel by car to visit	☹ less impetus for sustainable travel habits
Biodiversity & Soils	
Condition of designated wildlife sites	☹ poorer environmental protection
Severance of habitats and role of transport network in providing green corridors	☹ poorer environmental protection
Recreational disturbance	☹ less impetus for sustainable travel habits
Road casualties (protected species)	☹ less focus on environmental mitigation
Light pollution	😊 to ☺ likely to be positive, but not necessarily in the right locations
Soil erosion	☹ less rights of way and greenway maintenance

Construction and maintenance of county council transport networks	☺ procedures already in place and should continue
Biodiversity acting as a tourist attraction which many people travel by car to visit	⊗ less impetus for sustainable travel habits
General biodiversity issues	⊗ less focus on environmental mitigation
Cultural Heritage	
Visual intrusion by transport infrastructure	⊗ e.g. conservation areas at risk
Material usage and poor design can lead to visual intrusion of transport infrastructure	⊗ not using specialist advisors
Collision damage to Swarkestone Bridge and Causeway	⊗ unlikely to be pursued as a major project – only as emergency repair measures
Localised damage from use of motorised vehicles in the countryside	⊗ less rights of way and greenway maintenance
Climatic Factors	
CO2 emissions	⊗ less impetus for pursuing ways to reduce the need to travel and sustainable travel habits
Flooding	☺ flooding management would still happen, but could be more proactive in the context of the plan
Vegetation	☺ likely to be dealt with in the same way
Peat Soils	⊗ Moors for the Future etc. There could be more damage if there is less rights of way and greenway network
Water	
Surface water quality	☺ Likely to be the same without the plan, or improve, due to the impact of the Flood and Water Management Act
Population, health & noise	
Population growth/ housing provision/ transport usage.	⊗ Would be more reactive and not built in with plan development
Increasing elderly population	⊗ ⊗ This is a particular concern in terms of social exclusion, independent living, social care and Quality of Life for Derbyshire's population
Limiting long term illness/ mental and physical disability	⊗ As above
Physical exercise and obesity	⊗ less investment in walking and cycling networks and less impetus for sustainable travel habits
Road casualties	☺ likely to reduce, but at a slower rate – activity would continue without the plan, so effect would be about the same
Community severance	⊗ less impetus for sustainable travel habits
Air quality	☺ likely to improve overall anyway, with improved vehicle technology and the effect of increasing costs of fuel
Noise	☺ would still be dealt with where possible
Material Assets	
Transport asset	☺ greater investment in highway maintenance ⊗ less investment in pavements and rights of way maintenance
Use of materials and reuse	⊗ less emphasis on sustainable procurement of highway materials and re-use and recycling
Use of fuels/ oil	☺ likely to improve with energy efficiency (but could be offset by growth in traffic)
Use of energy	☺ invest to save budget – already tackling use of electricity

A3.4 Developing Alternative LTP Options

A3.4.1 Examining alternatives helps to ensure that the plan's likely significant environmental effects are addressed during the plans preparation. It also helps explain to decision makers and consultees why these strategies and measures have been selected as the preferred way of developing the Derbyshire LTP3. Plan alternatives should also aim to deal with environmental problems, or at least not make them worse. There are various guides to developing options, but these can be expressed in different ways e.g.

- Achieving objectives of the plan
- Achieving aspirations of the local community
- Dealing with environmental problems
- Dealing with transport problems.

A3.4.2 As mentioned above, the development of alternative LTP3 options was an important stage of LTP3 development and our SEA process. Because of this we looked at many ways of expressing our options and it took many months before we settled upon the final three alternatives.

Elimination of alternatives that are not considered reasonable

A3.4.3 Guidance documentation and common sense means that many alternatives can be rapidly eliminated on financial, technical, social or environmental grounds. It is recommended that alternatives that are more environmentally friendly should not be eliminated purely on cost grounds at an early stage. Equally, measures that on their own do not fully deliver the plan objectives should not be automatically disregarded: good strategies are often built out of many, coherent, small fixes. Article 9(1(b)) of the SEA Directive requires our reasons for eliminating alternatives to be documented. This section deals with this.

A3.4.4 The following examination of context for developing reasonable options shows that there is in fact not a great deal of room for manoeuvre for developing options. This context provides quite firm guidelines in which we have to deliver transport services.

On Legal Grounds

A3.4.5 The assessment of our legal statutory duties shows that there is not a great deal of manoeuvre in which transport services we deliver. We cannot therefore consider any alternatives that would not fulfil our legal requirements e.g. we could not decide upon an option that would not maintain the highway. We therefore concluded that all our options should have our statutory duties at their core. However there are still choices in the way we deliver these core duties which may differ under different options through the measures chosen.

Resources

A3.4.6 Within the context for developing reasonable options we have to consider the level of resources available. There is currently much uncertainty in overall levels of funding for LTP3 as this is still to be determined as part of the Government's spending review at the end of October 2010. What is certain though is that resources are likely to be less than during the LTP2 period, at least in the short to medium term.

A3.4.7 We are also unlikely to be able to raise significant revenues ourselves from other sources. An option could be based upon revenue raising through a road pricing project. This option was considered unreasonable due to it being unpopular locally as identified during our 'Local Transport Futures' consultation; it is not currently being pursued at a national level which would make a scheme difficult to progress; and the timescales for developing such a proposal would take into the long-term to progress and establish. Therefore, realistically the only revenue raising schemes would be through small-scale initiatives such as on-street parking or developer contributions which would not significantly change the amount of resources available.

A3.4.8 A financial option we have available to us, is to borrow more money to implement more. Over half of our current capital allocations are in the form of supported borrowing i.e. the Government gives us permission to borrow funds and helps us pay the interest. We therefore have to use our own publicly-raised funds to pay for the interest on borrowing over time. In the current financial climate, it is extremely unlikely that we would be able to raise Council Taxes to cover additional borrowing or

reallocate existing funds to cover increases in debt payments. We therefore consider further borrowing as an unreasonable option.

- A3.4.9 It is unlikely that there will be significant resources available for a significant programme of new infrastructure. Funding for such schemes is a separate funding stream, but this is also subject to the Governments spending review. In recent years, funding of schemes has been difficult in a period of what has been considered a high level of financial contributions to transport. Therefore, it is unrealistic to consider options that would contain a significant programme of new infrastructure.

Social and political acceptance

- A3.4.10 We have already referred to social and political acceptance as being an important part of our options being reasonable. As already examined in the without the plan scenario our options should be based upon current government policies. We also have local policies set by the County Council which should be considered for options to be reasonable. The Council Plan sets out this:-

Leading the Way

- Giving local people better choice and more of a say
- Achieving more in partnership
- Working with local communities to help them flourish
- Doing things better and being open to doing things differently

Good use of public money

- Services that provide excellent value for money
- Strong and effective financial management
- Well managed assets
- A valued workforce

Raising aspirations

- Giving children in Derbyshire the best start in life
- Providing an excellent education for all
- Helping local people achieve their full potential
- Encouraging healthy, active and rewarding lifestyles

High quality personalised services that meet individual needs

- Giving people the choice and flexibility to live independent lives
- Safeguarding and providing excellent support to those who need it most

Places where people want to be

- Confident and safe communities
- Making places easier to reach
- A resilient economy
- Rich, diverse and protected environments
- A county of cultural opportunity

Developing our reasonable alternatives

Derbyshire LTP2 Options

- A3.4.11 The starting point for developing reasonable alternatives was to revisit the options we used for the development of the Derbyshire LTP2 options. The assessment of options within the SEA for LTP2 was to consider three main factors: traffic growth prediction, available finance and the shared priorities of accessibility, air quality (including other environmental issues), congestion and road safety. This methodology required a high degree of certainty over funding levels to be able to calculate the likely outcomes of each. It was clear that the uncertainty in resources and that the changes in coverage of issues since LTP2 would mean that this approach would be difficult to use again for LTP3. However, before we eliminated this approach we undertook to examine whether or not we could amend this for use in LTP3.

Resources versus ambition

- A3.4.12 The result of this approach was to try and develop a methodology for the options that could be flexible in the resources available. Alongside this the methodology looked at how the options could be different depending on the level of ambition. This would promote achieving more with less.
- A3.4.13 A matrix of options based upon resources versus ambition was developed, as shown in Figure A3.4.1 below. This matrix was presented to the Derbyshire LTP3 Steering Group in December 2009. It must be said that the meeting found the concept difficult to understand, particularly the reasoning behind why we had selected a shift to sustainability before a shift to demand management i.e. what were our ground rules for doing so. Following the meeting it was clear that this methodology was not providing a way to develop different options for the Derbyshire LTP3.

Figure A3.4.1

Option 1: Without the Plan				
LEVEL OF AMBITION	FUNDING			
		Low Indicative less a half	Medium Indicative less a third	High Indicative
	Option 2 Basic e.g. Core duties			
	Option 3 Basic + shift e.g. shift to sustainability			
	Option 4 High e.g. Demand management, behavioural change, 20mph zones			
Option 5: Flexibility Flexibility of ambition according to resources e.g. more experimental/ambitious with higher levels of funding				

Options based upon transport goals

A3.4.14 To try and move this forward an interim Steering Group meeting was held to focus specifically on developing reasonable options. This focused on examining the core statutory duties as listed before and highlighting where we had a choice in the way we could deliver them. A key turning point in the development of options was the consideration of results of consultation that we had undertaken during 2009 about the relative importance of the plan goals. Table 3.4.1 below shows the results:-

Table 3.4.1 Consultation Quantitative Results Summary

Consultation Title	LTP 3 Transport Goals				
	Climate change	Economic growth	Equality of opportunity	Safety, security and health:	Quality of life & healthy natural environment
Citizens Panel Survey May 2009	L	H	L	H	MP
LTP stakeholder survey May 2009	H	MP	L	L	H
B_line website survey October 2009	H	L	L	MP	H
DCC Senior Management Forum September 2009	L	MP	L	L	H

Note:-

For each consultation the quantitative results that indicate the Highest Priority and Lowest Priority are indicated in the table by the letters H and L respectively, and MP indicates the single highest priority. No attempt has been made to summarise in this table, the open ended questions that formed part of consultations.

A3.4.15 It was following this meeting that an approach to develop options based upon the LTP3 transport goals with different mixes of measures to deliver them could offer realistic options to be tested.

A3.4.16 The next step was to consider what the options should consist of in relation to the transport goals. The examination of options for Derbyshire LTP2 considered a similar approach by looking at the shared priorities which are similar to the transport goals for LTP3. The methodology then used was to consider five separate options that 'majored' on each shared priority and also a sixth option that considered a 'best mix' of the shared priorities. This concluded that the best option was the mix of options. Experience in undertaking LTP2 has shown that a mix of priorities is always likely to offer

more benefits individually and cumulatively (although potentially negative effects too) than an option that 'majored' on one goal. However, it is also clear that testing priorities or goals individually can also tease out significant effects that can be used to develop a 'preferred option'.

A3.4.17 Therefore the challenge for the development of our Derbyshire LTP3 options by using the transport goals was to develop a number of 'best mixes' or select particular goals that we could test individually to enable us to develop a preferred option through appraisal.

A3.4.18 Our consultations about the transport goals again provided the basis for one of our options. The results of the Derbyshire consultations showed that three transport goals were generally of a higher importance and could be grouped together to form an option where we placed emphasis on these three goals:-

- Supporting economic growth
- Better safety, security and health
- Quality of life and a healthy natural environment

A3.4.19 It was clear that this option conflicted to some degree with the Department for Transport's biggest challenge in 'Delivering a Sustainable Transport System' which focused on:-

- Tackling climate change
- Supporting economic growth

A3.4.20 By giving emphasis to these two goals gave us our second option. These two options ensured that four of the transport goals would be appraised through the SEA process, however the remaining goal of promoting equality of opportunity would not be considered. We made the decision to use this remaining goal as an option following our Equality Impact Assessment which highlighted that during consultations etc, hard to reach groups such as people with mental or physical disability or ethnic minorities were more unlikely to make their views known. In examining the environmental baseline at the scoping stage also highlighted that rural accessibility was important. Therefore by appraising an option about this goal would ensure that the equality of opportunity would be considered and the effects understood.

A3.4.21 Therefore the three alternatives we developed are:-

Option 1

This alternative would seek a combination of measures which place an emphasis on the following goals, based on Derbyshire consultations carried out last year:

- **supporting economic growth**
- **better safety, security and health**
- **quality of life and healthy natural environment.**

By 2026, this option would show that we had worked on creating more opportunities for social contact and access to the natural environment to improve community well-being, an improved journey experience, enhancing the street scene in towns and villages, and a protected and enhanced natural and historic environment.

It would show that a clear link between transport planning and local sustainable economic development has helped the economy of Derbyshire in towns and villages.

It would result in safer roads, links with community safety planning for different areas of the county, and more active travel habits, particularly cycling and walking, leading to improved health.

Option 2

This option would seek a combination of measures which put an emphasis on the following goals:

- **tackling climate change**
- **supporting economic growth.**

This combination was described as the biggest challenge in the Department for Transport's 'Delivering a Sustainable Transport System.'

By 2026, this option would result in 'smarter' travel choices, with an emphasis on using public transport, cycling and walking, reduced use of the private car, and 'greener' vehicles, with an overall reduced carbon footprint for travel in Derbyshire.

It would show that a clear link between transport planning and local sustainable economic development has helped the economy of Derbyshire in towns and villages.

Option 3

This option would seek a combination of measures which put an emphasis on the following goal:

- **promoting equality of opportunity**

Although this goal was not a popular choice in the consultations, it is one which is particularly relevant to Derbyshire. This goal helps disadvantaged people to access services, and is relevant to Derbyshire in terms of rural accessibility, and also in the more deprived urban areas of the county. By 2026, this option would ensure that investment relates to the varying nature of problems in both urban and rural areas, with the aim of reducing inequalities relating to transport.

Consultation on our alternatives

A3.4.21 In May 2010, we undertook two consultations about the challenges and our options. A public survey was undertaken which asked people which transport goals they would like us to give emphasis to. This survey allowed people to tick any combination they liked. Separate questions asked about the importance of the groupings of measures. The result of the question relating to goal emphasis is given in the table below:-

	Climate change	Economic growth	Safety, security, health	Quality of life and healthy natural environment	Equality of opportunity	No responses	Percentage
	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	88	18
				✓		39	8
	✓		✓	✓		34	7
	✓			✓		30	6
	✓	✓		✓		29	6
OPTION 1		✓	✓	✓		27	6
		✓		✓		21	4
		✓				20	4
	✓	✓	✓	✓		17	4
			✓	✓		17	4
	✓					15	3
OPTION 2	✓	✓				13	3
			✓			13	3
		✓	✓	✓	✓	12	3
	✓			✓	✓	12	3
		✓	✓			10	2
	✓		✓	✓	✓	9	2
	✓		✓			8	2
		✓		✓	✓	8	2
	✓				✓	5	1
				✓	✓	5	1
			✓	✓	✓	5	1
	✓	✓	✓			5	1
	✓		✓		✓	4	<1
		✓	✓		✓	4	<1
	✓	✓		✓	✓	3	<1
	✓	✓	✓		✓	3	<1
OPTION 3					✓	3	<1
		✓			✓	3	<1
	✓	✓			✓	2	<1
			✓		✓	1	<1
%	21	20	19	27	13		

A3.4.22 A more detailed questionnaire was developed for consultation with stakeholders alongside a document that explained in more detail the challenges for the Local Transport Plan under each of the goals and the three options that we had developed. We also asked whether other groupings could be considered as a fourth option. The results are shown in the table below:-

	Climate change	Economic growth	Safety, security, health	Quality of life and healthy natural environment	Equality of opportunity	%
OPTION 1		✓	✓	✓		53
OPTION 2	✓	✓				19
OPTION 3					✓	5
OPTION 4:	other combination					22

A3.4.23 It is clear from both tables that we could develop many different options based upon many different mixtures of transport goals. It is tempting to select some of the more 'popular' mixtures of goals to take forward into the appraisal stage. However, because each of the goals are being tested under one or more of the options, it is clear that we are not going to miss any effects through appraisal and therefore would not be an effective use of resources in undertaking the assessment. By remaining with the three options, we also are examining options across a range of popularity i.e. a popular option, and mid-range option and a least popular option. As referred to above this ensures that we have not left out of the appraisal stage, any transport goals that may be favoured by or relevant to, a small sector of society.

A3.4.24 These three options were therefore used at the appraisal stage.

A3.5 The Preferred Option

A3.5.1 The appraisal of each option confirmed their realism in that each one would be generally acceptable albeit with some mitigation required for options 2 and 3. It was clear that option 1 would provide the most positive effects. However, it is clear that options 2 and 3 offer greater long term benefits for climate change and use of resources; and for services for elderly people and social effects in our communities. The option selected as the preferred option therefore was Option 1 with the measures that brought greater long term benefits from Options 2 and 3 added into it.

Derbyshire LTP3 Preferred Strategy:-

Gives emphasis to:-

- Supporting economic growth
- Better safety, security and health
- Quality of life and healthy natural environment

But also includes an emphasis on:-

- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions
- Minimising use of resources
- Consideration of transport and services for a growing elderly population
- Enhancing well-being and sense of community

A3.5.2 Returning to the public consultation, in terms of popularity, the preferred option can be considered as a popular option as it is based upon the most popular of the three options considered. It also brings benefits across all five transport goals that was preferred by 88% of people who returned a response. However, because only the best parts of the options have been used in the preferred option it means that the option is more focussed which would not have been the case had we just selected to test an option based upon all five transport goals.