

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Local Transport Plan

SEA - Environmental Report
Appendix C - Scoping Consultation Log

May 2019

Mott MacDonald
22 Station Road
Cambridge CB1 2JD
United Kingdom

T +44 (0)1223 463500
F +44 (0)1223 461007
mottmac.com

Cambridgeshire and
Peterborough Combined
Authority

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Local Transport Plan

SEA - Environmental Report
Appendix C - Scoping Consultation Log

May 2019

Issue and Revision Record

Revision	Date	Originator	Checker	Approver	Description
A	07.05.19	S Robinson	N Levy	S Price J Hitchcock	Issue for Client Comment
B	16.05.19	S Robinson	N Levy	J Hitchcock	Second Issue for Comment

Document reference: 402819 | 001 | B

Information class: Standard

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.

Contents

C. Scoping Consultation Log	1
-----------------------------	---

C. Scoping Consultation Log

The consultation comments from the LTP SEA Scoping Report consultation process and how these have been addressed in the SEA process and Environmental Report are presented in the table below.

Table 1: Scoping Report Consultation Log

Ref	Organisation	Topic	Comment	Response/ Action
1	Historic England	LTP objectives	We would expect to see the conservation of the historic environment included as one of the wider objectives listed in Figure 3 on page 20.	These are the LTP objectives developed by CPCA. CPCA has taken this comment on board and have included the historic environment within one of the environment objectives. The Environmental Report has been updated to reflect this.
2	Historic England	Baseline	We are pleased to note the inclusion of designated heritage assets in section 4.4. However, we are concerned that there is no mention of non-designated heritage assets including below ground archaeological material, and we therefore suggest that more information on the non-designated heritage assets and below ground archaeology in the study area should be included. This can either be obtained from the Cambridgeshire County Historic Environment Record, or via the Heritage Gateway < http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk/gateway/ >.	Information on non-designated heritage assets has been included in the baseline.
3	Natural England	Proposed Assessment Methodology	Our advice is that consideration should be given to any new evidence that may have emerged, such as updates to Natural England's Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zones (IRZs), available through www.magic.gov.uk We note that some of these projects may now have progressed to design or construction stage, in which case they can be considered part of the baseline. New projects will be subject to a full assessment. We welcome that a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be prepared to support development of the LTP.	Projects at the construction stage have been considered as baseline and have not been reassessed.
4	Natural England	General	Natural England advises that LTP policies should seek to enhance as well as protect the natural environment. We would also encourage policies to require transport schemes to deliver net biodiversity gain as far as possible, in accordance with the aspirations of paragraphs 170 and 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Defra 25 Year Environment Plan (YEP).	The LTP objective has been updated to include 'enhance'. Biodiversity net gain is included in the LTP and has been added to the SEA as a monitoring indicator.
5	Natural England	Baseline	An overview of the environmental baseline is presented in section 4 of the Report, including numbers of designated sites across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough provided in section 4.3 and illustrated on Map C.1 in Appendix C. Useful reference could also be made to the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and the following priority areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Cambridgeshire Hundreds - this cluster of ancient woodlands and parkland is particularly special for its plants and bat populations. Natural England and partners support projects to create additional wildlife habitats that link up these small woodlands and strengthen populations of farmland birds such as turtle dove. • Ouse Valleys - the River Great Ouse River and its valley is rich with wildlife. Natural England, working with the Upper Bedford Ouse Catchment Partnership supports projects that contribute towards the protection and enhancement of habitats and reduces pollution. • Greensand Ridge – the dramatic iconic topography provides important refuges for scarce and specialist wildlife. Key objectives are to buffer, enhance and link the important wildlife sites along the ridge, strengthening their ability to adapt to climate change and to making the Ridge a good place to live, work and visit. • Cambridgeshire Fens - an amazing refuge for England's biodiversity whilst also exceptionally important for food production and as a carbon store. Natural England will support strategic 	Reference to the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy included. A description of Priority areas as identified in the response has been added to the baseline.

Ref	Organisation	Topic	Comment	Response/ Action
			<p>projects to promote the wildlife value of watercourses and connectivity of habitat across the landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chalk and Chilterns - the chalk ridge extending from the Chilterns into Hertfordshire, and beyond, is a fragmented landscape of arable cultivation, chalk grasslands and woodland that is also a farmland bird 'hotspot'. Natural England will support development schemes which help to 'join the dots' through habitat creation and enhancement to provide a robust natural environment along this ridge with improved connectivity and accessibility. 	
6	Natural England	Baseline	We welcome reference to the National Character Areas (NCAs) within the study area and indicated in the Plan in Appendix C.4. Consideration will also need to be given to local landscape character and objectives identified in the landscape character area (LCA).	Details on LCA included in the baseline.
7	Natural England	Baseline	Section 4.11 Evolution of the Baseline – the bullet point on Biodiversity could better reference the continual decline in biodiversity as reported in numerous papers including the Natural Environment White Paper and Biodiversity 2020: A Strategy for England's Wildlife and Ecosystem Services	Text added on declining biodiversity.
8	Natural England	SEA Framework	We are generally supportive of the assessment questions and key indicators for natural environment topics including biodiversity. Natural England's advice is that more appropriate indicators of impact on biodiversity objectives include the extent of habitat in good / favourable condition, the extent and condition of supporting habitat, including local wildlife sites and ecological networks.	Biodiversity indicators updated.
9	Environment Agency	Baseline	<p>Consideration of flood risk within the scoping report is inadequate. Flood risk is a significant and widespread consideration for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. 34.5% of the area is at high risk of flooding in the absence of flood defences, and much of the area is below sea level. Increased incidences of heavy rainfall will make flood risk more likely, while rising sea levels may also contribute to flood risk, particularly affecting low-lying parts to the north of Cambridgeshire and eastern Peterborough. Given the importance of this risk, the SEA scoping report fails to consider the scope of flood risk adequately. As flood risk is a key consideration for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, it needs to be included as a topic in the key issues and opportunities and SEA framework sections.</p> <p>Where flood risk is referenced, it is split between the 'Water' and 'Climatic factors' sections throughout the document. Given the significance of flood risk within the area, we recommend that flood risk is incorporated in its own section in the report.</p>	A separate objective on flood risk has been included within the water environment topic. This covers reducing the risk of flooding to transport infrastructure and minimising its contribution to flood risk. There is a separate objective relating to flood risk and climate change. Additional sections on flood risk have been added to the baseline information.
10	Environment Agency	Baseline	The scoping should include the landscape scale habitat projects that exist within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough e.g. Wildlife Trust Living landscape projects including Great Fen, National Trust's Wicken Vision and RSPB Futurescapes. The Transport Plan has great opportunities to both connect people sustainably to these areas but also impact negatively on them.	Information on landscape scale habitat projects included.
11	Environment Agency	LTP	Suggest second paragraph reads "Efficient, low carbon and reliable transport ..."	Wording updated in the start of paragraph 2 of 2.1 in ER.
12	Environment Agency	LTP	There is no reference to digital technology and how this is likely to impact future travel. NB Greater Manchester Combined Authority's Local Transport Plan Draft Delivery Plan 2020-2025 notes "Digital technology is re-shaping every aspect of our lives in ways which were inconceivable a generation ago: how we work, travel, shop, access services, meet people, communicate and are entertained. High-speed internet, digital skills and access to technology can influence how, and how much, people travel, and are therefore important for the future efficient development of our transport system and giving people access to a range of services without needing to travel"	Policies on digital technology are included in the LTP.

Ref	Organisation	Topic	Comment	Response/ Action
13	Environment Agency	LTP Objectives	Suggest should read protect and enhance	These are the LTP objectives developed by CPCA. CPCA has taken this comment on board and have included 'enhance' in the environment objective. The Environmental Report has been updated to reflect this.
14	Environment Agency	LTP development	Include reference to the transport-related findings and recommendations of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review (CPIER) Final Report (2018)	Added to LTP Context Section 2 of the ER and Added to Figure 4 and Appendix B - Policies, Plans and Programmes Review.
15	Environment Agency	Relationship with other Policies, Plans and Programmes	Suggest reference to the Automated and Electric Vehicles Act 2018	Added to Figure 4 and Appendix B - Policies, Plans and Programmes Review.
16	Environment Agency	Relationship with other Policies, Plans and Programmes	Suggest reference to the Natural Capital Committee's Sixth Report (Jan 2019)	Added to Figure 4 and Appendix B - Policies, Plans and Programmes Review.
17	Environment Agency	Relationship with other Policies, Plans and Programmes	Biodiversity net gain is currently out for consultation re its proposed inclusion in NPPF. Environmental net gain is a longer-term objective.	Removed 'Halt overall biodiversity' and included 'promote and achieve biodiversity net gain' to Section 4.3.
18	Environment Agency	Relationship with other Policies, Plans and Programmes	Suggest change to read "The creation and long term provision of green infrastructure ..." Suggest change to read "Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality ..."	Added to Section 4.3 of the ER.
19	Environment Agency	Baseline	There are a number of sources of flooding affecting Cambridgeshire, including fluvial flood risk, surface water flood risk, and tidal flood risk. The scoping report only refers to flood zones, which relate only to fluvial and tidal flood risk; all other sources of flooding including surface water flood risk should be reviewed as part of the SEA process. There is no explanation of what the flood zones mean (i.e. Flood Zone 3 shows land with a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability of flooding or 1 in 200 or greater annual probability of tidal flooding). At the very least, there should be an indication of the level of risk indicated by the Flood Zones (i.e. Flood Zone 3 – high risk, Flood Zone 2 – medium risk etc.). This section of the report contains so little information that it is thoroughly inadequate in terms of scoping the relationship between flood risk and the LTP and needs to be significantly improved and extended. There should be some narrative regarding flood risk issues at a catchment scale for the main river catchments identified.	Other sources of flooding included in the baseline. Explanation of flood zones and risk provided Additional baseline on flood risk included Information included

Ref	Organisation	Topic	Comment	Response/ Action
			LTP projects have the scope not only to affect existing risks but should also be able, if well designed, to reduce flood risks, thereby leading to a net reduction in flood risk. The SEA should identify not only how LTP projects could affect existing risks with a view to mitigating and minimising harm, but also identify where they could reduce risks overall.	Risk from flooding and how the LTP could reduce flood risk through design included
			The section on flood risk also includes references to groundwater SPZs and surface water SPZs. Although relevant environmental considerations, these are not flood risks, so are included within this section erroneously and should be moved to a section on water quality.	Information on SPZ moved to sub-section on water quality
20	Environment Agency	Baseline	We recommend that discussion around climate change impacts in relation to flood risk is incorporated into a more robust flood risk section. The section should include discussion on the flood risk implications of projected climate changes, with reference to impacts on fluvial, tidal and surface water flood risk. Which climate change epoch is to be considered in the SEA? 2040-2059 is referenced – is this sufficient for the design life of transport infrastructure?	Within the climate topic a sub-section on climate impacts in relation to flood risk has been included Additional time slice added (2080s) to take into account the design life of projects.
21	Environment Agency	Baseline	Should read Water - increased economic growth and climate change. Human health – obesity, heart disease and respiratory problems are ongoing issues in the UK and are likely to continue. Active lifestyles, improved air quality, and healthy eating campaigns will help reduce this trend.	Added to Appendix D – Baseline Review
22	Environment Agency	Baseline	Biodiversity Implications – just protecting designated sites will not be enough to ensure the survival of habitats and species into the future. Many of these sites are small and isolated which prevents robust populations establishing and prevents movement of species between sites.	Updated to include further protection measures e.g. creating green corridors, new habitat and biodiversity net gain
23	Environment Agency	Key Environmental Issues and Opportunities	This section excludes flood risk from key issues and opportunities. Flood risk is not identified within this section. Given the extent to which flood risk affects Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and the need and opportunity to use all forms of development, including transport infrastructure, to address and reduce flood risk, this exclusion is inappropriate. Flood risk must either be scoped into this section as a topic in its own right (it is not adequately covered by minor references within the water topic), or made far more prominent within an improved water topic	Flood risk given more prominence in the water topic.
24	Environment Agency	Key Environmental Issues and Opportunities	Suggest adding wording in 'Water column' to say Options within the LTP have the potential to be affected by flooding. Flood risk adaptation and mitigation, (including surface water drainage), should be incorporated into the design of the LTP options in line with future climate change. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the protection, improvement and sustainable use of all waterbodies • Ensure all sources of flood risk are considered, including residual risk where applicable, to demonstrate no increase in flood risk to the development or third parties as a result of the options • Reduce or control water pollution • Adhere to Environmental Permitting Regulations (https://www.gov.uk/permission-work-on-river-floodsea-defence) 	Suggested text included in issues and opportunities under the water topic.
25	Environment Agency	Key Environmental Issues and Opportunities	Biodiversity - Impacts on Biodiversity linked to transport include increasing access to nature reserves which may not be robust enough to withstand the increased visitor and dog numbers. Fragmentation of habitats is also a major concern. Opportunities should include connecting people with nature and access to greenspace in a sustainable way for well-being and active health	Wording added to Key Issues and Opportunities.

Ref	Organisation	Topic	Comment	Response/ Action
			benefits, without damaging that greenspace. Other opportunities should include increasing the biodiversity connectivity of sites.	
			Water Transport infrastructure can increase the speed at which rainwater enters the watercourse causing faster peaks in stream height which could impact on downstream nature reserves. This should be mitigated for if the opportunity for flood risk adaption/mitigation is implemented.	
26	Environment Agency	Key Environmental Issues and Opportunities	Air - reference the Government's recent announcement to end the sale of new conventional petrol and diesel cars and vans by 2040. Also, its plan to tackle roadside nitrogen dioxide concentrations by making an additional £475m available to support local authorities with the biggest pollution problems to tackle hotspots in their areas – part of a wider £3.5bn spending commitment to air quality and cleaner transport.	Suggested text included in issues and opportunities under the air topic.
27	Environment Agency	SEA Framework	Flood risk is excluded from this section. This exclusion is inappropriate for the aforementioned reasons. Although water is mentioned as a topic, there is no reference at all to flood risk within this. Flood risk should be included as a topic in its own right or given prominence within an improved water topic.	Flood risk added to water topic.
28	Environment Agency	SEA Framework	Mentions flood risk but in the Climatic Factors column rather than in the Water column; suggest these columns are amended to ensure the specific flood risk elements are included in the Water column, (Areas at risk of flooding, Will it affect flood risk in the area etc.) but the ones relating to climate change are obviously best placed in the Climatic factors column	Columns amended so that flood risk is covered under water but ones relating to climate change are under the climatic factors column.
29	Environment Agency	SEA Framework	Reduce road traffic and congestion – add promote home working and /tele commuting. Soft measures equally important e.g. travel for work options which seek to influence / change behaviours. Also, businesses being encouraged to promote car sharing and provide facilities (showers, drying rooms etc.) for cyclists who commute to work.	Added 'will it promote home working or tele commuting' to SEA Framework Table in section 4.5.1 of the ER.
30	Environment Agency	Appendix C - Baseline Maps	The map in this section shows fluvial and tidal flood risk. Additional maps showing flood risk from all sources should be included. It would also be useful to include a map showing the main river catchments.	Maps included for flood risk from surface water. Map showing main river catchments included. Flood risk from reservoirs and lakes we not included as unable to obtain data
31	Environment Agency	Appendix D - Environmental Indicators	Climatic Factors: Quantified Data for the CPCA region It is stated that <5% of Cambridgeshire area labelled as 'high priority' under flood risk management. It is unclear how this has been quantified and what the definition of 'high priority' is. Issues Identified Data relating to the 1% and 0.1% risk of flooding is provided from 2005. This information is now 14 years old and is therefore likely to have been superseded by updated hydraulic modelling.	Removed reference to this indicator. The flood risk baseline is covered within the Baseline Maps. Removed reference to the 2005 data from the issues identified column.
32	Environment Agency	Appendix D - Environmental Indicators	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna: It is pleasing to see that invasive species have been included in the topic assessment questions. More thought is required for the Key Indicators as it is not just the number or area of designated sites or habitats present but the condition of those habitats that is important. Whilst woodland is included other important habitat characteristics of the Peterborough and Cambridge area are meadows and fen wetlands – these should be considered in the assessment too. Topic assessment questions: Will the option contribute to landscape scale restoration and/or	Indicator on condition of habitats included. Meadows and fen wetlands included.

Ref	Organisation	Topic	Comment	Response/ Action
			reversing habitat fragmentation? Will the option provide sustainable access to greenspace/nature reserve without causing impacts on the existing habitats	The suggested topic assessment questions have been added
33	Environment Agency	Proposed SEA Scope and Assessment Methodology	The correct terminology is not being used here. Sensitivity of receptors is not applied correctly as it is likely to be the habitat type that is sensitive rather than its level of designation which is currently being used. The current table is linked to the hierarchy of sites, rather than any actual sensitivity of the receptor to the potential impacts.	This has been removed to avoid confusion.
34	Peterborough City Council	Key Issues and Opportunities	Section 5.1/ Table 10 re Biodiversity, should be ensuring biodiversity net gain is achieved (as per NPPF), not simply "slowing/ halting biodiversity losses"	Included 'Promote and achieve biodiversity net gain' to ER Key Issues and Opportunities
35	Peterborough City Council	SEA Framework	Table 11 Key indicators (biodiversity) should include demonstrating biodiversity net gain is achieved	Included as indicator in the SEA Framework Table and included as a monitoring indicator
36	Peterborough City Council	Appendix C - Baseline Maps	Appendix C1 Designated Sites map should also include County Wildlife Sites.	Information could not be obtained due to license issues. It is recommended that this is considered as projects are taken forward.
37	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Baseline	The role of the Transport Network to the NHS has not been acknowledged i.e. CUH is a regional trauma centre so has patients from an area far bigger than the spatial reference for the LPT and therefore the SEA, in addition the role of the NHS as one of our largest employers could be referenced along with the associated need for easy staff access to transport to delivered local health services	Role of the transport network to the NHS included in baseline
38	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Baseline	There is no mention of the baseline for vehicle types e.g. split between diesel, petrol, electric and hybrid	Included information on vehicle licensed by type in the baseline
39	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Baseline	The SEA has not mentioned freight and the modes of transport associated with freight, both the A14 and A47 are major freight routes east to west with the A1 and M11 north to south and the rail network plays an important role in freight movements.	Freight transport included in baseline
40	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Baseline	Community Transport and its important role in rural locations is not mentioned	Community transport included in baseline
41	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council		It is difficult to see where and if the main findings of the Transport and Health JSNA have been addressed within the SEA	Various updates from the JSNA: Data added from transport JSNA in Air Pollution baseline section Information added to the community transport baseline section Active Transport section added to the Transport baseline section

Ref	Organisation	Topic	Comment	Response/ Action
42	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council		No mention is made of the change in shopping habits i.e. move to online with potential increases in small delivery vehicles	Added to the evolution of the baseline and the key issues.
43	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan	Figure 3 LTP Vision - there is a vision of Equity - but the definition supporting it is one for equality - the two are different - the LTP should strive for equity not equality to reflect the difference in the population and urban vs rural differences	These are the LTP vision and objectives developed by CPCA. CPCA has taken this comment on board and have updated the figure to 'social'. The Environmental Report has been updated to reflect this.
44	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Transport Plan	Should "Health" be a wider objective in figure 3	These are the LTP objectives developed by CPCA. CPCA has taken this comment on board and have included a health objective. The Environmental Report has been updated to reflect this.
45	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Relationship with Policies, Plans and Programmes	Under Table 3 national plans and programmes reference should be made to the various CMO reports including the all pollution report from last year	Added CMO Report on Health Impacts of Air Pollution, Figure 4 and Appendix B - Plans, Programmes and Policies Review
46	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Relationship with Policies, Plans and Programmes	In table 3 - Local plans and programmes reference should be made to the Peterborough Health and Wellbeing strategy to ensure comparability with Cambridgeshire	Added Peterborough Health and Wellbeing Strategy included in P&P review, Appendix B - Plans, Programmes and Policies Review
47	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Relationship with Policies, Plans and Programmes	The Various JSNA's for Cambridgeshire and for Peterborough - particularly the "Transport and Health" and Core Data Sets should be referenced	Added to P&P review.
48	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Relationship with Policies, Plans and Programmes	Under section 3.2 why has health and wellbeing not been identified as a key theme/message? It might be because the key health reports and data sets have not been used.	Health and wellbeing included in the key themes/messages.
49	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Baseline	4.11 outlines the major trends going forward including "Human health – obesity, heart disease and respiratory problems are ongoing issues in the UK and are likely to continue. Active lifestyles and healthy eating campaigns will help reduce this trend." I would suggest this point need to be expanded to recognise the ongoing challenge of Health Inequalities across the UK with significant difference in health outcomes depending where you live and your characteristics.	Expanded wording to include information on health inequality in the baseline
50	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Baseline	In section 4.2.1 the populations of the market towns quoted add up to greater than 100%	Amended
51	Peterborough City and	Baseline	Section 4.2.2 is the main human health data, but the ones used are very narrow - the summary in the core data sets should be used instead	Update using core data sets

Ref	Organisation	Topic	Comment	Response/ Action
	Cambridgeshire County Council			
52	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Baseline	Section 4.2.3 - economy keeps referring to East Cambridge instead of East Cambridgeshire in addition there is a table in the New Housing Developments JSNA on average house prices against average income which could be used here	Amended throughout
53	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Baseline	Section 4.11 in the human health section fails to mention mental health i.e. poor mental health linked to poor connectivity and social connectedness/community severance, noise pollution where transport has a function.	Wording added regarding mental health and transport accessibility
54	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Scoping	Table 10 should scope in Mental Health in the "population, Commutes and human health SEA Topic	Mental health scoped in
55	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	SEA Framework	Table 11 SEA Framework - the data in the Transport and Health JSNA should also be updated and included for example the following indicators should be added: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PHOF on local mortality burden due to PM2.5 • No access to car/van for people with limiting activity long term illness • The "Flagged" ward data would be useful to consider • National Travel survey 2013 • Number of car trips • Is there any local traffic count data? 	PHOF on local mortality burden due to PM2.5, Local traffic count data as indicators. Added information on access to car/van for people with limiting activity long term illness to baseline information. Flagged Wards added to the community transport section of Appendix B Air Pollution paragraph added to appendix B (B.8.1)
56	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	General	There is a lack of reference to groups who may experience transport related exclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children • Women • Older people • Disabled and people with other health problems • Those in low-income groups 	Added to baseline and key issues
57	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	SEA Method	Chapter 7 it's possible that since the SEA's on the previous projects were completed prior to the EIA regs changes to include impacts on human health - therefore some of the assessments which are assumed might not need to be reviewed as the baseline has not changed may still need to be reviewed to see if impacts on human health have been fully assessed.	The previous SEA included an objective on human health therefore the previous assessment will have considered this.
58	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	References	References - the Transport and Health JSNA has been quoted but it is difficult to see where it has been used in the SEA Scoping report	More information has been included from the Transport and Health JSNA in line with other comments and referenced e.g. P&P review, baseline and indicators
59	Peterborough City and	LTP development	LTP Policy Alignment (Section B) - The table is very narrow and most of the policy do align with most of the objective therefore it is difficult to see the rationale for which ones have been chosen as linking and which ones haven't	The CPCA sifting and development process is explained in Chapter 2 of the ER.

Ref	Organisation	Topic	Comment	Response/ Action
	Cambridgeshire County Council			
60	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council	Baseline indicators	Why is only childhood obesity at year 6 only being used - why is not overweight AND obese at both Reception and year 6 being used?	Updated indicator to include both overweight and obese children at Reception and Year 6
61	Cambridgeshire County Council		What metrics were in the last local LTP? I guess these ones – as it does state “These are based on the indicators in the previous LTP SEAs”. Think there are way too many!	Noted. The indicators have been refined.
62	Cambridgeshire County Council		What particular local contextual and other issues are there for transport planning related to health and what are the best metrics for these (alongside the obvious general ones)?	Indicators from the Transport and Health JSNA have now been included in line with other comments to better reflect local context and planning related health issues
63	Cambridgeshire County Council		Overall, I think there are way too many measures listed and I don't know what the rationale is for including many of these. I don't see how all the indicators link to a LTP related area – it would be better if they gave a rationale for measures, or groups of measures, and instead of generally interpreting the data (i.e. in the 'issues identified' column) they interpreted the data in the context of the LTP and its aims. Asking if something is missing is like asking someone to look for a needle in a hay stack!	The environmental indicators have been refined. The indicators are to help support the baseline and context for the LTP area.
64	Cambridgeshire County Council		I think things like overall death rates and things like LE are too remote from the LTP and are too general. It would be better to isolate the core themes and aims of the LTP rather better and to have metrics that related to these where the influence on the LTP is more direct, e.g. road safety, public transport availability and use, active travel use and infrastructure, congestion, pollution and air quality, road and footway condition, noise and other environmental factors, specific transport and health related assessments for growth areas, related health based risk factors like child and adult obesity, etc, etc. Sometimes the broad theme areas cross-over – e.g. economic growth is a driver of health and so have to include in both.	Removed death rates and life expectancy from indicator database
65	Cambridgeshire County Council		Don't know why some very specific indicators are included, e.g. Adults in contact with mental health services in settled accommodation?	Agreed. Removed specific indicators.
66	Cambridgeshire County Council		Should they try to include more asset-based measures – like community transport schemes etc and relate them to healthcare use as we did in the Transport JSNA?	Included community transport scheme data from JNSA.
67	Cambridgeshire County Council		If they do want to use some data – i.e. Census health questions they'd be better to use the age standardised ones we produce in the JSNA CDS But not sure I'd include anyway.	Removed the health census question data.
68	Cambridgeshire County Council		Fraction of mortality attributable to particulate air pollution – agree include this, though not great variation locally (albeit Cambridge City has numerically the highest %).	Added in data for fraction of deaths attributable to particulate matter.
69	Cambridgeshire County Council		Some communities (could be ethnicities, could be geography, could be age related, could be combinations of these) may be disproportionality affected – think this needs to be considered carefully and holistically alongside the main LTP themes.	Impacts on different community groups will be covered in the community impact assessment which has fed into relevant SEA objectives.

Ref	Organisation	Topic	Comment	Response/ Action
70	Cambridgeshire County Council		There are some typos – I'm not listing them all, e.g. Mortality rates by cause – they have 2015-2017 and then under top measure on "current trends" same data but period stated as 2013-2015.	Checked that dates match up throughout and undertook another review for spelling and grammar.
71	Cambridgeshire County Council		Obviously stating some old data e.g. 2005-2007 and then stating the latest they find 2015-2017, doesn't constitute a trend – I think they should look at the trend not the difference between some old value and the latest. No problem with setting a baseline, but I don't think this is what they are trying to do here	Removed trend column.
72	Cambridgeshire County Council		We do have local deaths data and so we could break things down into more meaningful areas/groups if we have the data and we can track things going forward a bit sooner than PHE published material	This will be collected and included as part of the Environmental Report Consultation.
73	Cambridgeshire County Council		There is a lot of quoting 'NI' this and that – weren't these from the old national indicator set, which is now defunct I think? I have no issue with the ethos of including some of these but think we need to try to find the current measures, or approximations, if these exist locally or nationally	National Indicators removed from indicators, excluding those for climate vulnerability.
74	Cambridgeshire County Council		Matt and BI have much newer data on KSI in our constabulary area– and this can be broken down locally (including into residents and non-residents, road user type, type of road, where people live and where the accident occurred etc etc) – there are important local diffs – i.e. casualties in some areas (e.g. Fenland) are much more 'resident' based than in other areas with lots of commuting and major A dual carriageway roads (S Cambs, Hunts etc)., and people in places like Fenland may have to travel further for work and services on relatively riskier roads (single carriageway A roads and rural roads). There are also local reports on accident 'hotspots' (or there used to be). PHI deaths data are for residents wherever the accident occurred. Locally they also like to adjust KSI for traffic throughput and not use the KSI rates in national and PHE stats that use the resident population as the denominator for an area-based numerator. We do have local hospital data A&E for 'RTA' and admissions data where we know quite a bit about the person, their residence, injuries, road user type and outcomes etc	This will be collected and included as part of the Environmental Report Consultation.
75	Cambridgeshire County Council		Hospital data could be linked to air pollution for residents of some more polluted areas but cause and effect far from clear specifically as opposed to evidence base (for the latter see page 11 of air pollution of JSNA).	Noted.
76	Cambridgeshire County Council		There are local collections of data on traffic counts – well there used to be surveys, imagine these are still done. See "Trend in proportion of traffic counts at cordons" on page 28 of active transport part of JSNA	Added indicator
77	Cambridgeshire County Council		Local data from roadside pollution monitoring? See Local data: What do we know about air pollution levels in Cambridgeshire? From JSNA	Additional information added to baseline.
78	Cambridgeshire County Council		Some data you have to watch the interpretation of – e.g. Percentage of residents within 30-minute walk/public transport of nearest town centre – the lowest %s are in the least deprived areas! Don't think that means all is well everywhere else and that this is universally a good thing, as it depends on many, many things! Some, like walking, decrease as affluence increases	Noted. Amended issues identified column.
79	Peterborough City and Cambridgeshire County Council		Indicators seem quite out of date and lack granularity which averages out some of the local issues. We need an idea if these indicators are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The right indicators • At the right spatial level (County V's District – do they highlight inequalities) 	Indicators have been reviewed and refined. Additional data from the JNSA on Transport and Health has been included. The indicators also reflect

Ref	Organisation	Topic	Comment	Response/ Action
			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The most current data sets• Do they add anything to the Environmental Scope?• Are there any key indicators missing e.g. the PHOF indicator 3.01 - Fraction of mortality attributable to particulate air pollution is not included• Do we have any local data to supplement what is already available?	those that will be monitored through the LTP.

