

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 The following sections describe the Council's approach to the Mayor's Energy Strategy, Biodiversity Strategy, Municipal Waste Management Strategy, Ambient Noise Strategy and Air Quality Strategy.

9.2 Energy Strategy

9.2.1 The Mayor of London adopted his 'Green Light to Clean Power – The Mayor's Energy Strategy' in February 2004. It has identified 3 main issues to address:

1. Minimising emissions of carbon dioxide from all sectors through applying energy efficiency measures.
2. Helping to eradicate fuel poverty by giving Londoners, particularly the most vulnerable groups.
3. Contributing to London's economy by increasing job opportunities and innovation in delivering sustainable energy, and improving London's housing and other building stock.

9.2.2 The Council is participating in the Local Authority Carbon Management Strategy working with Carbon Trust in identifying renewable targets for the borough, and this partnership working is looking to reduce carbon emissions, maximise energy efficiency and improve energy management.

9.2.3 In the adopted UDP (1998) Policy RIM 3.1 Energy Conservation and Development seeks to encourage energy efficiency in relation to proposals for land use, transport and development through a number of measures.

9.2.4 The Council have integrated these key issues in Haringey Unitary Development Plan Revised Deposit Consultation Draft, where:

1. ENV6: Energy Efficiency seeks to reduce energy consumption through careful design in layout and landscaping; encouraging developers to incorporate community heating schemes; development to be located in easily accessible by public transport.
2. ENV6A: Renewable Energy and Mitigating Climate Change seeks to encourage the use of renewable energy wherever possible.

9.2.5 In addition to the above policies, the Council has produced SPG 8c: Environmental Performance, where it encourages in practice that development schemes should take on board sustainable development by submitting with applications a sustainability statement.

9.2.6 The local policies are in line with London Plan's policies.

9.3 Biodiversity Strategy

9.3.1 The Council supports the Mayor's Biodiversity Strategy and has produced its own Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) in September 2004. The Council recognises the biodiversity value that exist amongst the parks within the borough. In the Haringey 's Adopted and Revised Unitary Development, there are many policies which relate to

how developments within and in close proximity to an open space should be carefully designed. Policy OP 1.3 – 1.6 (inclusive), where these policies seek to retain the high quality of greenery that exist amongst the streetscene, private garden space, and along the Green Chain. Policy OS10: Biodiversity where it will resist development that would have a negative impact on the conservation status of a protected species.

9.3.2 Further guidance and detail is set out in SPG 8d: Biodiversity, where it encourages the preservation of trees and tree masses, landscaping issues will need to be addressed wherever appropriate and green roofs are welcomed as long as the development is not in conflict with other policies within the UDP. SPG8g: Ecological Impact Assessment states that where it is considered appropriate or where it is required as part of legislation, the Council will request that the applicant submits an Ecological Impact Assessment as part of any planning application if the proposed development is affecting sites of existing or potential nature conservation value.

9.3.3 The above policies take into account the provisions of Draft Biodiversity action Plan wherever appropriate.

9.4 Municipal Waste Strategy

9.4.1 The Mayor of London has adopted it's Municipal Waste Management Strategy in September 2003. Haringey is working with the North London Joint Waste Strategy (NLJWS), along with another 6 north London boroughs to address the waste issue. The NLJWS has published a draft waste strategy which will cover the period until 2020 which aims to promote recycling and divert waste from landfill, which is in line with the objectives and aims set out in the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy. Currently more than half of the rubbish generated in North London is transported to the countryside outside London for disposal, where it is dumped in specially managed holes in the ground called landfill.

9.4.2 Haringey Council has encouraged waste reduction through promoting community recycling and composting in partnership with Finsbury Park Community Trust, which is not for profit organisation. Over the last few years, recycling services have expanded into educational establishments and there are more recycling facilities have been provided at strategic locations. Recycling rates have increased from 4% in 2002/3 to 9% in 2003/4.

9.4.3 The London Recycling Fund has funded for the conversion of The Park View Road Civic Amenity to be re-opened as a Re-Use & Recycling centre in March 2004, where the centre is able to collect a variety of resources.

9.4.4 In addition to the above waste strategies to the borough, the Unitary Development Plan policies are in accordance with the objectives set out in the NLJWS draft waste strategy. In the adopted UDP (1998) Policy RIM 3.6 Recycling encourages the siting of recycling banks wherever possible. In the revised UDP (2004) Policy ENV8R: Sustainable Waste Management, it seeks to work with the Mayor and with the NLWA in addressing waste disposal issues so that it is line with regional policies. Policy UD 6: Waste Storage, where all new developments are required to provide enough space for refuse storage within the application site. The Council has also produced SPG 8a: Waste and Recycling, where it sets out the

standards for waste storage and recycling facilities.

9.4.5 The Council has recycled 100% of bituminous/asphalt surfacing when removed from highway locations. The removed material is either resold for re-crushed or re-used. This is in accordance with Haringey's waste strategy policies.

9.4.6 The Council fully supports the need to for better waste management strategies.

9.5 Ambient Noise Strategy

9.5.1 The Mayor of London has adopted his 'Sounder City – The Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy' in March 2004, where it aims to reduce noise by noise reducing surfacing on roads and through the better planning and design of new housing. The Council supports this strategy and has addressed this issue in Haringey's Adopted UDP (1998) where in Policy RIM3.2 – Pollution and Nuisance From New Development and Policy RIM 3.3 – Nuisance From Existing Uses and From Road Traffic, where both these policies seek to safeguard the amenities of neighbourhood and quality of life for local people. In the Haringey Unitary Development Plan Revised Deposit Consultation Draft September 2004 Policy M4: Road Schemes encourages the reduction of the adverse effects of traffic and priority should be given to more sustainable forms of movement such as walking, cycling and public transport.

9.5.2 The Council has encouraged quieter vehicles through the use of Stone Mastic Asphalt for resurfacing of roads, in particular in carriageway locations. The material is deemed to be more environmentally friendly as it reduces the noise levels generated by moving vehicles and disperses surface water at a faster rate. Furthermore, locations treated with Stone Mastic Asphalt can be open up to traffic at a very short period of time after resurfacing.

9.5.3 The Council has addressed the ambient noise issue by promoting other means of travelling i.e. Haringey Walking Plan and Cycling Action Plan through the Haringey Cycle Route Network, where minimal noise is created from both these activities.

9.5.4 The Council will take account of the WHO guidelines for human exposure to noise.

9.6 Greenhouse Gas emissions

9.6.1 The Council has set up a Climate Change partnership and is progressing an action plan. The Better Places Partnership of internal Council departments and external bodies such as PCT, housing associations and transport providers is the mechanism for this work. A Climate Change Audit of all Council activities will be carried out. Government data shows that road transport in Haringey emits 252 kilotonnes of CO₂ out of 1226 kilotonnes or 21% of the total. In terms of fuel usage for Haringey the table below shows the prominence of petrol powered cars in fuel usage:

000s tonnes fuel

Buses	8.4
Diesel cars	8.7

Petrol cars	41.9
Motorcycles	0.8
HGV	6.7
Diesel LGV	10.9
Petrol LGV	1.3

9.6.2 The Climate Change partnership will be setting targets for reducing CO2.

9.7 Air Quality Strategy

9.7.1 The Council has declared an Air Quality Management Area covering the whole Borough and has prepared an Action Plan. This includes details of the proposed London Emission Zone and the Council's approach to the LEZ. In summary, the LEZ would bring improvements in air quality within London through reductions in PM10 and NO2 emissions. The LEZ, if implemented, would require the Council to replace its own vehicle fleet to meet the new emission requirements. This would contribute to improvements to air quality at the local level although there are financial costs for progressing this initiative in the planned timescale.

9.7.2 The Action Plan seeks to reduce NO2 and PM10 emissions in line with Government targets.

9.7.3 The following table outlines our actions against the Mayor's AQS proposals.

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 9 Environmental Aspects and Statement

Proposal	Borough Comments
<i>Chapter 4B: cleaner road vehicles</i>	
The Mayor will encourage and promote the benefits of cleaner road vehicles including by: Encouraging London boroughs to promote and encourage cleaner vehicles at a borough level and working with technology and fuel suppliers and motor manufacturer.	To support greater use of alternative fuels the Council is supporting greater use through planning policies in the UDP. Policy UD1A on Sustainable Design and Construction seeks provision for alternative fuelling eg electric charging points at off-street parking spaces. There are two filling stations for LPG in the borough on Pinkham Way and Mayes Road.
The Mayor will encourage the use of alternative fuels through measures that will include: The issue of quieter alternatively – fuelled vehicles in the review of the London Night and Weekend Lorry Control Scheme (first phase of review to be completed by March 2003)	The Council supports this initiative.
The Mayor will provide support and the framework for a vehicle maintenance campaign through the Vehicle Emissions Testing Working Group. The Mayor will also undertake a campaign to raise awareness of the issues of idling vehicles, especially through the London Tourist Broad during 2003.	The Council is working with the Police and Vehicle Inspectorate to carry out vehicle testing on a monthly basis.
<i>Chapter 4D: proposals by vehicle type – freight</i>	
The Mayor, through Transport for London, has set up the London Sustainable Distribution Partnership to form the basis of partnerships with business, the London boroughs and other sub-regional partners. The Mayor's proposals relating to freight from his Transport Air Quality, Municipal Waste Management, Ambient Noise and Energy Strategies will be considered through this partnership to encourage the accelerated take-up of cleaner and quieter	The Council supports this initiative.

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 9 Environmental Aspects and Statement

vehicle technologies and to promote better vehicle maintenance and considerate and economical driving.	
The Mayor, through Transport for London, will encourage the early development of Freight Quality Partnerships, particularly at the sub-regional level, to complement similar, borough-led initiatives at the more local level.	The Council supports this initiative. A FQP has been established in Brimsdown through funding from North London Transport Forum partnership of which Haringey is a member. Further schemes are planned through the NLTF
The Mayor, through his Municipal Waste Management Strategy, will seek to ensure, when awarding new waste and recycling contracts that all waste authorities specify emissions criteria for the vehicles used. These criteria should comply with either the currently applicable Euro standard, or the previous Euro standard with suitable after-treatment as a minimum i.e. Euro II with Reduced Pollution Certificate until 2005, Euro III with Reduced Pollution Certificate after that date.	Haringey is a member of the North London Joint Waste Strategy (NLJWS), where it is working alongside with 6 north London boroughs to address the waste issues. The Council will be renewing its vehicle fleet in line with the requirements of the relevant Euro standard.
<i>Chapter 4E: traffic management</i>	
The Mayor, through Transport for London, will develop and implement traffic management measure on the Transport for London Road Network to help reduce emissions and energy use as well as encouraging safe, economical and considerate driving. The Mayor, through Transport for London, together with the Department for Transport and the Highways Agency will investigate further traffic management measures and the Mayor will urge the Highways Agency and the London boroughs to adopt these measures, where practicable, to reduce emissions.	Table 5.2.11 shows the schemes/programme for 2005/6-2010/11 for implementing 20mph zones. Table 5.2.12 shows the possible schemes/programmes for 2005/6 – 2010/11 for implementing home zones.
The Mayor will encourage implementation of Clear Zones	The Council supports this initiative

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 9 Environmental Aspects and Statement

by the London boroughs. Where traffic calming is used this should be implemented following government guidance and should be designed to minimise acceleration and deceleration.	
<i>Chapter 4F: air travel and airports</i>	
The Mayor, through Transport for London, will work with stakeholders to minimise the air quality impact of deliveries at Heathrow, including through the London Sustainable Distribution Partnership and the Heathrow Area Transport Forum.	This does not directly affect Haringey.
<i>Chapter 4H: industrial and transboundary sources of pollution</i>	
The Mayor will urge the London boroughs to inspect their regulated industrial processes and to modify and update their permit conditions, as and when required, in line with appropriate DEFRA guidelines, and to act upon complaints and suspected or actual breaches of permit conditions in a timely manner.	The Council follows the NAQS standards based on European Directives. The Council is encouraging the use of Best Environmental Option in all industrial/commercial sites.
The Mayor will urge the London boroughs to ensure that process emissions do not lead to exceedances of the national air quality objectives and to use regulatory or other measures, as appropriate, to reduce these emissions.	If NAQS standards are breached, the Council may impose more restrictive conditions.
<i>Chapter 4I: construction, construction vehicles and fires</i>	
The Mayor will and the boroughs should expect future developments to meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction, including measures to re-use existing building stock in preference to	Planning agreements and conditions on planning approvals require good construction practices and liaison with local residents on major developments.

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 9 Environmental Aspects and Statement

demolition and reconstruction where practicable.	
<i>Chapter 4J: energy and heating</i>	
The Mayor will encourage efficient local energy generating schemes, particularly combined heat and power (CHP) proposals using the Customs and Excise 'Good quality CHP' index and to ensure that developers demonstrate that opportunities for utilising heat wave have been fully assessed.	The Council promotes energy efficiency through the local press and offering grants. The Council have introduced measures such as window replacement, loft insulation and boiler replacement for it's own housing stock.
<i>Chapter 5B: London borough partnerships</i>	
The Mayor requires London boroughs to agree methodologies for air quality review and assessment with the Greater London Authority, to ensure consistency of approach cross London.	The Council obtains air quality information from Kings College's website.
The Mayor requires London boroughs to take account of any relevant, new information on air pollution that becomes available. Any London borough not declaring an air quality management area should undertake a further, detailed assessment of air quality if significant new data become available.	Haringey has declared an Air Quality Management Area and has prepared an Action Plan which is updated annually.
The Mayor expect any London borough not declaring an air quality management area to produce a borough air quality strategy containing measures to assist London in achieving the national air quality services.	See above
The Mayor requires London boroughs to incorporate into their air quality action plans measures to implement all relevant proposals contained in this Strategy at a borough level.	The AQMA Action Plan supports the Mayor's AQS.

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 9 Environmental Aspects and Statement

<p>The Mayor expects London boroughs to establish a fleet register that includes emissions information and to ensure measures to implement emissions improvements in their fleets are included within their air quality action plans and local air quality strategies.</p>	<p>The Council will seek to replace its vehicle fleet to the highest standards as and when each vehicle comes up for replacement to ensure air pollution from these vehicles are at the lowest level. The Council's fleet will meet Euro 3 and Euro 4 standards by 2008 and 2010 respectively. Biodiesel would be used in vehicles of less than 3 years old. The Council will be seeking to reduce the number of home to school contractors, the majority of which operate minibuses with high levels of emissions. We will also be seeking to increase the Council's own fleet to cover contracted routes with larger coaches. This process would reduce emissions. We will be reviewing the use of electric vehicles which have potential for use as pool vehicles for staff use. See Form 1 no. 050.</p>
<p>The Mayor requires the London boroughs to include within their air quality action plans measures to identify appropriate sites for further alternative refuelling infrastructure within their boroughs.</p>	<p>The Council seeks the provision of alternative refuelling facilities in all new developments i.e. by providing one or more electric vehicle recharging points. Two sites in the Borough already offer LPG.</p>
<p><i>Chapter 5D: planning</i></p>	
<p>The Mayor will encourage the use of appropriate methods for assessing the environmental performance of buildings, both commercial and large residential blocks.</p>	<p>The Council supports the need for assessing the environmental performance of development schemes as set out in SPG 8c: Environmental Performance.</p>
<p>The Mayor will encourage London boroughs to ensure that Unitary Development Plan policies incorporate borough air quality action plan and local air quality strategy measures.</p>	<p>The Council is seeking to encourage the use of cleaner fuels through the planning process through the UDP Revised Deposit Consultation Draft Policy ENV5A:Pollution.</p>
<p>The Mayor will encourage London boroughs to include policies in Unitary Development Plans that set out best practice aspects of design, orientation, density and location of buildings to minimise energy demand, optimise</p>	<p>The Council encourages good design through its policies UD2: General Principles, UD 3: Quality Design, SPG1a: Design Guidance and Design Statements and SPG3a: Density, Dwelling Mix, Floorspace Minima, Conversions Extensions and Lifetime Homes and</p>

Final Local Implementation Plan
Chapter 9 Environmental Aspects and Statement

sustainability and minimise the impact of air pollution and noise inside buildings. Guidance on these Unitary Development Plan policies will be given in the London Plan and supplementary planning guidance.	SPG 9: Sustainability Statement-Checklist
The Mayor will encourage London planning authorities to produce supplementary planning guidance on air quality.	The Council's SPG 8i: Air quality sets out the criteria by which an air quality assessment is required.
The Mayor will expect London planning authorities to ensure air quality is taken into account along with other material considerations in making decisions on development proposals and that formal air quality assessments are undertaken where appropriate to inform the decisions, particularly where proposals may affect an air quality management area.	See previous comment.
The Mayor will encourage the use of appropriate conditions and planning obligations to ensure the protection of local air quality and to help work towards the achievement of the national air quality objectives.	Guidance for the use of planning conditions or planning obligations to improve air quality in Haringey are set out in SPG 8i: Air Quality.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background.....	1
2 The SEA Process	1
2.1 The SEA process used to influence the LIP	1
2.2 Summary of how the information in the Environmental Report was used to improve the adopted LIP.....	1
3 Consultation	5
3.1 Statutory consultation – Scoping Report	5
3.2 Formal consultation – Draft LIP and Environmental Report	5
3.3 Public consultation and information	6
3.4 Effects on the Final LIP for adoption.....	6
4 Alternative Options	11
4.1 Alternative Options.....	11
4.2 Incorporation of mitigation recommendations.....	15
5 Monitoring Requirements	17
5.1 Introduction	17
5.2 Air Quality	18
5.3 Noise levels.....	21
5.4 Land-take	22
5.5 Transport accessibility	22
5.6 Amenity in the street	23
5.7 Additional Monitoring	25
5.8 Summary.....	26

Executive Summary

This document is the “*statement of how the environment has been taken into account in preparing the Final Local Implementation Plan*”.

The LIP includes proposals for meeting the Mayor’s key priorities. These proposals require assessment under the SEA whether they are strategies or specific measures. The SEA of the LIP for Haringey has followed the stages set out in the Advice on Strategic Environmental Assessment for Local Implementation Plans prepared by C4S at TRL Limited.

The following key documents have been prepared in the course of the SEA process:

- SEA Scoping Report – April 2005;
- SEA Environmental Report – August 2005.

TO BE COMPLETED

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Faber Maunsell Ltd was commissioned on behalf of London Borough (LB) of Haringey to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) for Haringey. This document is the “*statement of how the environment has been taken into account in preparing the Final Local Implementation Plan*”. Copies of both the Environmental Report and the Final LIP are available at London Borough of Haringey Council, Civic Centre, High Road, Wood Green, N22 8LE.

The LIP for Haringey is the means by which the Mayor’s Transport Strategy for London is implemented at local level by the London Borough of Haringey. It provides the policy context for the annual Borough Spending Plan which boroughs submit to Transport for London (TfL) for funds for transport initiatives. LIPs are prepared by all London boroughs in order to improve transport safety, traffic congestion, bus services and accessibility. Although the LIP focuses on the period to 2011, its strategic environmental effects are likely to extend beyond that period.

Strategic Environmental Assessment, as defined by Directive 2001/42/EC (1), aims to ensure that the environment is considered in the process of preparing a plan or policy, in this case the LIP, rather than afterwards. The directive was implemented in England through the *Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004* (SI 2004 No. 1633). The SEA process serves to provide sufficient information on the environmental effects for informed decisions to be made on the content of the LIP.

The LIP includes proposals for meeting the Mayor’s key priorities. These proposals require assessment under the SEA whether they are strategies or specific measures. The SEA of the LIP for Haringey has followed the stages set out in the Advice on Strategic Environmental Assessment for Local Implementation Plans prepared by C4S at TRL Limited. This advice is contained in a series of unpublished research papers available from the TfL website (<http://www.tfl.gov.uk>).

Table 1.1 sets out the Stages of the SEA of the LIP and the documents have been produced in the course of these stages.

Table 1.1: SEA of Haringey LIP - stages and list of key documents

<i>SEA Stages</i>	<i>What does it involve?</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Stage A	Set the context, establish the environmental baseline, identify problems and decide objectives	Not prepared separately		Reported in the Scoping Report.
Stage B	Decide the scope of the SEA, develop alternatives and consult with environmental bodies	SEA Scoping Report	April 2005	The Scoping Report set the scope of the SEA and ensured that the SEA focused on potentially significant issues.
	<i>Preparation of the draft LIP by the LB of Haringey</i>	<i>Draft LIP</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>The draft LIP contains the strategy and proposals for local transport in the borough.</i>
Stage C	Assess the effects of the proposals in the draft LIP		August 2005	Reported in the Environmental Report
Stage D	Prepare Environmental Report;	Environmental Report;	August 2005	To document full details of the SEA process. The report provides an assessment as to whether or not the predicted effects of the LIP, and the alternative strategies and schemes will be environmentally significant. In addition the report includes measures to mitigate against any significant adverse effects of the LIP on the environment.
	<i>Main consultation on Draft LIP and Environmental Report;</i>		<i>June-July 2005</i>	

<i>SEA Stages</i>	<i>What does it involve?</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	Prepare Final LIP	Final LIP	June 2006	
	Prepare Statement to accompany Final LIP	SEA Statement	July 2006	To indicate how the LIP has been subject to SEA
Stage E	Decide what needs to be monitored	SEA Statement	July 2006	
	Monitor the significant effects of implementing the LIP		2006 onwards	Includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying the information required and any gaps • Confirming potential remedial action • Considering responsibilities for monitoring activities, timing and presentation of results

2 The SEA Process

2.1 The SEA process used to influence the LIP

The process used to ensure that the SEA influenced the LIP was essentially the following:

- A Scoping Report was prepared that included appropriate baseline, an indication of the environmental topic areas likely to be significant for the LIP and an analysis of alternatives. The Scoping Report was provided to those responsible for preparing the LIP and to the four statutory consultees for comment;
- The content of the Scoping Report was taken on board in preparing the draft LIP;
- The measures contained in the draft LIP were assessed in the Environmental Report;
- The Environmental Report was considered by Haringey in reviewing the draft LIP and preparing the Final LIP. However the influence of the Environmental Report was limited because the proposals in the draft LIP were already strongly focused on environmental concerns;
- This SEA Statement includes proposals for monitoring of the LIP. These proposals concentrate on those aspects of the environment, particularly “amenity in the street” which are perceived to be directly affected by the LIP rather than wider environmental indicators that are determined for the most part by other factors.

The LIP SEA has been undertaken in parallel to the preparation of the LIP to ensure that environmental considerations are taken into account in the plan making process.

2.2 Summary of how the information in the Environmental Report was used to improve the adopted LIP

The proposed schemes within the draft LIP were identified in order to allow an appraisal process that evaluated unintended adverse effects and considered alternatives that avoided or reduced these. However this posed certain difficulties. In particular:

- Many of the proposals in the draft LIP were phrased in fairly general terms. This is not surprising given the timescale for the LIP. However this meant that it was difficult to appraise the environmental effects of the proposals with any degree of precision;
- The quality [of the](#) environment is affected by a wide range of factors. Even for the factors coming from the transport sector, the LIP's effects may be modest in comparison with for example, strategic transport strategy and decisions from the Mayor of London and TfL and changes in the composition of the vehicle as a

result of European emission control standards;

- In formulating alternatives to the proposals in the draft LIP, it was not considered practical to do this other than in very general terms. In view of this no attempt was made to assess these alternatives. In retrospect this should have been explained better although it is perhaps self-evident that, for example, measures that reduce the need for travel will reduce the adverse environmental effects of that travel;
- The potential environmental effects of proposals in the draft LIP were limited, not because transport impacts are not important but because the influence of LIP proposals on transport impacts was not that great. Because of this the SEA focused on those limited topics where it was believed that the LIP proposals might have significant effects.
- Because the potential environmental effects of proposals in the draft LIP were limited, the identification of secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects posed difficulties. In view of this it was considered appropriate that the SEA focused on the cumulative effects of the LIP insofar as these could be established for people in their homes, people on the street, people elsewhere and flora and fauna. Although it was not specifically stated this included all effects whether primary, secondary or synergistic.

The LIP and SEA have a number of stages and steps that are dependent on each other due to the interrelated and iterative nature of both work streams. Proposals and objectives identified in the draft LIP were assessed under each of the identified SEA topics and quantified in terms of negative or positive environmental impact. It was evident that the draft LIP proposals had been developed with consideration to potential environmental impacts in mind. Out of 53 proposed draft LIP measures, only nine proposals were assessed as having a negative impact on the environment. All of these environmental impacts were attributed to either an increase in emissions to air and an increase in noise attributed to a reduction in the speed of vehicles or an increase in the number of vehicles; or a reduction in space available to people in the street through the introduction of disabled parking; they were all considered to be minor adverse. Most effects of the proposals in the LIP were assessed as being beneficial to the environment.

The most significant potential effects of the proposals in the draft LIP were identified as:

- Changes to emissions to air from transport within the borough as a result of the LIP and consequent effects on human health, on climate change, on the health of flora and fauna and on amenity. In the event that the LIP proposals result in a reduction in traffic, and hence emissions to air from transport, these will be positive. In our view it is not possible to accurately predict the changes resulting specifically from LIP proposals. However we believe that these will be minor particularly in comparison with changes which result from the strategic transport proposals by the Mayor of London and TfL and with changes which result from a vehicle fleet with lower emissions per kilometre travelled;
- Changes to noise levels from transport within the borough as a result of the LIP

and consequent effects on human health, on the health of flora and fauna and on amenity. In the event that the LIP proposals result in a reduction in traffic, and hence noise from transport, these will be positive. As indicated above, in our view it is not possible to accurately predict the changes resulting from LIP proposals. However we believe that these will be minor particularly in comparison with changes which result from the strategic transport proposals by the Mayor of London and TfL and with changes which result from a quieter vehicle fleet (particularly buses and heavy goods vehicles);

- Land-take, if any, from resources of environmental value as a result of the LIP. We have not identified any specific example where there will be significant land-take from resources of environmental value as a result of the LIP proposals. This would in any event require detailed knowledge of the design of all individual proposals and this is not available at this stage. The highest risk of land-take is likely to be from amenity features within highway boundaries, for example trees, shrub planting and grassed areas. This might occur during implementation of the proposed town centre improvement measures at Tottenham, Green Lanes, West Green and Seven Sisters, Crouch End and Muswell Hill. This impact has potentially negative effects but in our view these are not likely to be significant;
- Changes in demand for material assets because the construction and maintenance of transport infrastructure is a major user of aggregates. It is assumed that increased investment in local transport would result in increases in demand for material assets in the form of aggregates. However the LIP does not provide any indication as to the level of investment in local transport and it is not therefore possible to say whether the impact of the LIP would be negative. Furthermore recycling of existing material is well established as a means of reducing demand for aggregates. It is unlikely that any negative effects from this impact would be more than of minor significance;
- Effects on people as a result of changes which affect people's ability to use particular modes of travel. This will include for example effects on human health where walking and cycling are made easier. For this area positive benefits of minor to moderate significance have generally been identified for the LIP proposals. However the level of significance will depend on the level of investment;
- Cumulative effects on the overall quality of the street environment. Again for this area positive benefits of minor to moderate significance have generally been identified for the LIP proposals. However the level of significance will depend on the level of investment;
- Cumulative effects for people in their homes and elsewhere (other than in the street) and for flora and fauna. . No negative effects were associated with the LIP. There were some benefits but these were generally of minor significance.

Note that no schemes are proposed at this time in relation to major projects which might potentially have more significant environmental impacts.

As a consequence of the process a number of changes were made in the draft LIP which are reported at the end of Chapter 3 Consultation.

The changes made between the Draft LIP used as the basis for consultation and the Final LIP are set out in **Appendix A**. Note that this does not fully cover the changes to Chapter 11 – Borough Core Capacity Statement, which is to be revised following the review of the structure of the Environment Theme area.

The changes made partially as a result of the influence of the Environmental Report were the following:

- Chapter 4 -The Equality Impact Assessment looks at the need to ensure that the impact of schemes on equality target groups is addressed. This is clearly appropriate in that effects on people, particularly people in the street are identified as some of the more significant effects and these target groups include people, such as older people and disabled people, who are particularly affected by, for example poor footway conditions.
- In the LIP proposals summary an additional proposal was included on “creating a green environment”, “parking discount for alternative fuelled vehicles”, “healthy walking campaign” and “greening the fleet campaign”;
- Under Chapter 9 Performance measures the target for traffic growth was revised downwards to reflect the effect of implementing the Mayor’s Transport Strategy.

Additionally as a consequence of the consultation process a number of changes were made in the draft LIP which are reported at the end of Chapter 3 Consultation.

Although other changes have been made to the LIP none of these affect the assessment undertaken in the Environmental Report significantly. Further commentary is provided in Appendix A covering this area.

3 Consultation

3.1 Statutory consultation – Scoping Report

The following statutory bodies have been formally consulted on the scope of the SEA of the Local Implementation Plan for the London Borough of Haringey; in the case of Haringey these consultations took place at the *Scoping Report* stage:

- English Nature;
- The Countryside Agency;
- The Environment Agency; and
- English Heritage.

A generic response was received from the Countryside Agency which was taken into account in preparing the Environmental Report. The Countryside Agency were not able to have a detailed involvement in the SEA. The response they gave provided generic information and advice for all Greater London that advised to the SEA to consider the extent to which Haringey's LIP affects Landscape, Access and Recreation; and to the extent to which the suggested baseline information and indicators are suitable for an appropriate assessment of the environmental impact of the LIP.

No responses were received from English Nature, The Environment Agency or English Heritage. However in respect of the Barnet LIP Scoping Report, which follows a similar format the following comments were made:

- English Nature confirmed that the biodiversity objectives are unlikely to be a significant consideration in the development and implementation of LIP.
- The Environment Agency indicated that more consideration should have been given to water resources across the borough, in particular rivers within the area that are subject to flooding. During the scoping exercise it was assessed that water resources were not a significant topic area for SEA of the LIP.
- A number of SEA objectives and indicators were suggested by English Heritage, including enhancement of street/public realm. During the scoping exercise it was assessed that archaeology and cultural heritage were not a significant topic area for the SEA of the LIP.

3.2 Formal consultation – Draft LIP and Environmental Report

The consultation strategy included sending the full draft to those organisations listed as statutory consultees including the Metropolitan Police, Transport for London, organisations representing disabled people and adjoining Boroughs. The statutory consultees for the SEA [English Heritage, English Nature, Countryside Agency, Environment Agency] were sent the draft LIP. The Environmental Report was included with the draft LIP and was placed on the

Haringey Council's website during August and September 2006. The responses received as a result of this exercise were summarised in Chapter 7 Consultation of the Local Implementation Plan.

3.3 Public consultation and information

Chapter 7 Consultation of the Local Implementation Plan summarises the approach taken to public consultation and information. Due to the difficulties in consulting effectively on a large document, it was not considered appropriate to prepare a LIP summary leaflet for distribution to all residents in the Borough. Experience has suggested that there are very low responses to consultations on broad policy and programme documents due mainly to the difficulty in summarising an extensive document in an easily digestible format.

Therefore the following strategy was adopted:

- A initial Stakeholder Forum was held on December 10th 2004. This was attended by officers, members of the Council and representatives of stakeholder groups. This early meeting allowed the broad policy parameters underpinning the Local Implementation Plan to be established before the writing of the document. A summary of the outcomes may be found below as Section 7.2 of Chapter 7;
- An all day workshop was held on Saturday April 23rd 2005 for organisations representing businesses, local environment and transport groups. The invitees will include those organisations invited to the Stakeholder Forum for the Scrutiny Review of Transport in December 2004 plus organisations and individuals expressing an interest in transport issues who participated in the Better Haringey workshop.

A summary of the workshop findings was included in the May edition of Haringey People with invitation to comment through a dedicated email address. The formal period for consultation was from June to July 2005. The draft LIP was included in the Haringey website with an opportunity for direct comment.

No public consultation on the draft LIP and on the associated Environmental Report was carried out by the London Borough of Haringey. However the draft LIP and the Environmental Report were placed on the London Borough of Haringey website for information.

3.4 Effects on the Final LIP for adoption

The Council's responses to the comments made by statutory consultees and other organisations is detailed in Table 7.2 in Chapter 7 of the Final LIP. Many of the comments have environmental implications. Some changes were made to the LIP as a result of the consultation process but in many cases the comments could be dealt with by clarification of the scope and content of the LIP.

TfL's response to the draft LIP ran to 10 sections and more than 100 pages. Only part of this related to the SEA and we have therefore focused on:

- Section E of the response Environmental Review which deals with the Environmental Report.

Unfortunately TfL based their review on the earlier draft Environmental Report and many of the comments were dealt with in the final version of the report dated August 2005. In the summary four improvements were indicated and in Table 3.1 we have summarised how each has been dealt with.

Table 3.1: Improvements to meet SEA Regulations

<i>Suggested improvement</i>	<i>Response</i>
Non Technical Summary	Provided in Final Environmental Report
Clarification of consultation	Consultation on the LIP and the Environmental Report was carried out by Haringey. Consultation is fully reported in the Final LIP and dealt with any environmental concerns in a satisfactory way. In particular the initial stakeholder meeting and the LIP workshop represent effective avenues for consultation on a document of this nature.
Information on the LIP's relationship with other relevant plans and policies	Provided in Final Environmental Report. It is accepted that more information on, for example on the plans of adjoining boroughs, but this would have led to an unwieldy document and confuse the key issues. The overall focus of the Environmental Report is to tease out only what is relevant to the LIP process in Haringey.
A review of policies, plans and programmes at international, Community and national level.	Regulation 12(4) of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 states that "Information referred to in Schedule 2 may be provided by reference to relevant information obtained at other levels of decision-making or through other Community legislation." The approach that has been taken in the Environmental Report is entirely consistent with this. London Government policy guidance is clearly written to reflect both European policy guidance and UK Government policy guidance. It is not therefore necessary to deal with these any further as the key priorities from the <i>Mayor's Transport Strategy</i> and the <i>London Plan</i> should reflect those higher policy levels. Any attempt to do this within the Environmental Report would have considerably extended the document and could have confused the issues. It would have been difficult to have reviewed these higher level policies without, in effect, assessing how the Mayor's Transport Strategy and London Plan fitted within them.

Describe the likely evolution of the environment without the LIP.	It was not considered practical to develop a no LIP scenario. The LIP is the overarching plan under which all expenditure on local transport in the Borough takes place. Would a no LIP scenario imply no expenditure? More practicable is the suggestion that comparison should be made with a 'business as usual' scenario. However even this poses considerable difficulties in that the LIP does not present a great change from previous policy. Identifying the proposals in the LIP and assessing the direction that they are likely to take you vis-à-vis the existing situation is an effective approach to this. The existing situation, including trends and future changes, is summarised by topic area in the baseline and provides the basis for this.
Define indicators and targets where appropriate	This area is further considered in this SEA Statement. This includes better clarification of the links between the SEA objectives and the monitoring indicators.
Consultation with statutory bodies at scoping stage	This was undertaken by Haringey. The only response received was from the Countryside Agency and this was included in Appendix F of the Environmental Report.
Coverage of alternatives and clarifying which alternatives have been taken forward.	It is accepted that this area of the <i>Environmental Report</i> was weak. In part this reflected the difficulty in effectively identifying alternatives other than in very broad terms and in indicating what the environmental effects of those alternatives might be. This has been included in Chapter 5 Alternative Options of the <i>Environmental Report</i> but it needs to be treated with caution. The real alternative which cannot be assessed at this stage is the funding balance between the proposals put forward in the LIP. Essentially the alternative is, to put more or less, money into, for example, 'encouraging walking' which has relatively high environmental benefits. At a London wide level this does not appear to have been addressed as a whole – are there greater environmental benefits to be gained from increased investment at a local borough level in, for example, measures to enhance walking and cycling as opposed to major infrastructure projects, for example, West London Tram.
Inter-relationships between the various effects on the environment are identified	Given the difficulty of identifying and assessing the various effects on the environment themselves it was not considered practicable to analyse these inter-relationships other than through identifying possible cumulative effects.

Duration of effects	The duration of the effects is essentially dependent on continuing implementation of the LIP. Effectively once a measure has been implemented its effects will continue into the future provided continuing maintenance support is available.
Secondary and synergistic effects	Given the difficulty of identifying and assessing the various effects on the environment themselves it was not considered practicable to analyse secondary and synergistic effects other than through identifying possible cumulative effects.
Where relevant, the prediction and evaluation of effects makes use of accepted standards, regulations, and thresholds	The proposals in the LIP were generally expressed in broad terms and effects could not readily be predicted or evaluated using accepted standards and thresholds. A subjective approach, supported by commentary, was considered the only practicable means of assessment.
Issues to be taken into account in project EIAs should be identified.	No measures are proposed in the LIP which are likely to be the subject of project EIAs. In the event that this changes the <i>Environmental Report</i> provides sufficient information to assist in identification of issues for any project and to scope any project EIA.

Consideration has been given to the detailed comments contained in Section E of TfL's response. Insofar as the clock cannot be turned back to before the consultation there is no point in revising the *Environmental Report* at this stage. The *Scoping Report*, the *Environmental Report* and this *SEA Statement* read in combination meet the requirements of the legislation adequately.

4 Alternative Options

4.1 Alternative Options

The SEA process identified a number of broad alternatives that could have been considered in the Haringey LIP and that fitted the aims of the Mayor's Transport Strategy. These were:

- Measures which reduce the need for travel;
- Measures which reduce or discourage motor vehicle traffic;
- Measures which increase the capacity for motor vehicle traffic and/or improve conditions for motor vehicle users;
- Measures which improve public transport;
- Measures which improve conditions for walking and cycling.

It was not considered practical or reasonable to develop these in detail as the measures in the draft LIP itself were not detailed. Subsequently further detail has been provided in some 51 Form Ones but it is not considered practicable to develop alternatives for all measures contained within these.

The relationship between the above alternatives and the key policies of the *Mayor's Transport Strategy* were set out in the *Environmental Report*. However there was no specific assessment of the alternatives against the topic areas identified in the scoping of the SEA. **Table 4.1** sets out an assessment of these alternatives insofar as this is considered practicable. In reality the alternatives that could provide greater environmental benefit are essentially an increase in the quantity of measures already included in the LIP as opposed to any new measure not already included in the LIP.

Increasing the quantity of measures included in the LIP is constrained by funding. For example footway renewal is a key area which could improve conditions for pedestrians. In recent years footway condition in many urban areas has deteriorated. While the SEA is not able to determine whether this is the case in Haringey or to identify the specific reasons, increased damage to footways as a result of incursion by vehicles and inadequate funding for maintenance are likely to be concerns. An alternative is therefore to increase funding for those measures in the LIP that have the greatest environmental benefits.

Insert Table 4.1 (Excel Spreadsheet)

Table 4.2 is a revised version of Table 6.4 taken from the Environmental Report which includes the policies and measures in the Final LIP. The change between the Draft LIP and the Final LIP represents a slight improvement in the potential environmental performance of the LIP. With additional funding this could clearly be improved further but in the absence of more funding it is not clear how the environmental performance of the LIP could be improved by increasing the emphasis on one of the broad alternatives set out in **Table 4.1**.

Insert Table 4.2: Assessment of Policies and Measures in the Final LIP

4.2 Incorporation of mitigation recommendations

Many of the proposals in the LIP are designed, in themselves, to reduce the effects of traffic on the environment. This is generally true of improvements in public transport; and proposals to reduce congestion. Within the *Environmental Report* it was suggested that additional mitigation could include:

- Evaluation of how measures to improve road safety will operate in practice to ensure that safety benefits are not offset by higher noise levels and emissions to air.
- Assessment of the environmental benefits of bus priority measures on a scheme by scheme basis before deciding to proceed.
- Reduction in congestion by measures to discourage people from using their cars, for example by ensuring that the use of public transport to access town centres is, in overall terms, more convenient than using a private car and having to park. This fits with the promotion of sustainable transport.
- Parking improvements need to be accompanied by improvements that encourage people to use other modes, walking, cycling and public transport, wherever possible. The key is to manage this in a way that provides no net increase in motor vehicle traffic and encourages the use of more sustainable modes. Mitigation might be achieved by measures to discourage people from using their cars, for example by ensuring that the use of public transport to access town centres is, in overall terms, more convenient than using a private car and having to park. This fits with the promotion of sustainable transport.
- Proposals to enhance public transport, notably station access and bus stop accessibility may only achieve wider environmental benefits if there is a shift away from the private car; the noise, emissions to air and other environmental impacts of the improved modes are better than the private car; and there is no shift towards increased trip length as public transport trips become easier. Mitigation might be achieved by assessment of the overall environmental benefits on a scheme by scheme basis before deciding to proceed.
- Walking and cycling are two of the mayoral priorities. The effectiveness of some cycle facilities may need further evaluation particularly kerbside lanes on busy roads and it has been suggested that experienced cyclists agree with these views. There is a clear emphasis on footway renewal and on practical and focused improvements for walking, for example in town centres, at stations and at bus stops. There is potential for a greater emphasis on walking and cycling, particularly at a strategic level, but clearly if underlying adverse conditions for cycling and longer distance walking are present this will not deliver wider environmental benefits.
- For road maintenance and bridge strengthening, recycling of secondary aggregates, including those deriving from road construction and maintenance activities, can reduce demand for aggregates from natural resources. There are other benefits from using such material, including

reduced impacts from the transport of secondary aggregates, which are sourced from within London, and the avoidance of landfill of waste materials.

- The aim of town centre development and redevelopment is to attract investment and consumers to an area. This inevitably means more traffic. Careful planning consideration needs to address the balance between private vehicles, public transport, and pedestrian and cycle access. Parking improvements need to be accompanied by improvements that encourage people to use other modes, walking, cycling and public transport, wherever possible.
- Promoting the use of sustainable travel modes through travel awareness and travel plans is clearly an area where environmental benefit is possible. However the sustainability of travel modes is sometimes imperfectly understood. Under some circumstances, family car carrying a full load of passengers can perform well against public transport modes with low patronage. In pursuing this area there needs to be a good understanding of what is sustainable, for example walking and cycling are almost always sustainable. While public transport by bus is usually sustainable it has problems in dealing with low flows. Public transport by train can be relatively inefficient in terms of environmental costs particularly where utilisation is low. Private vehicle use may generally be poor in terms of sustainability but there are instances, for example use by people working unsocial hours where it is more efficient.

To a large extent these areas need to be addressed during the implementation of the LIP.

The changes between the draft LIP and the Final LIP for adoption are set out in Appendix A. A comment on each change is provided as to whether this changes the strategic environmental assessment in that area.

5 Monitoring Requirements

5.1 Introduction

Monitoring requirements were discussed extensively in the Environmental Report and this is repeated here. Section 6 of the Environmental Report identified seven broad categories of environmental impact associated with the LIP:

- Those potentially arising as a result of changes to emissions to air from transport and consequent effects on human health, on climate change, on the health of flora and fauna and on amenity;
- Those potentially arising as a result of changes to noise levels from transport as a result of the LIP and consequent effects on human health, on the health of flora and fauna and on amenity;
- Land take from resources of environmental value, potentially arising as a result of new infrastructure provision;
- Changes in demand for material assets because the construction and maintenance of transport infrastructure is a major user of aggregates;
- Those potentially arising as a result of changes in people's ability to use particular modes of travel (e.g. public transport, walking, and cycling);
- Those potentially arising as a result of changes to the overall quality of the street environment; and
- Cumulative effects for people in their homes and elsewhere (other than in the street) and for flora and fauna.

Monitoring enables the measurement of performance of the LIP against environmental objectives or targets, and can help in answering the following questions:

- Is the LIP contributing to the desired environmental objectives and targets?
- Is the plan performing as well as expected?
- Are mitigation measures performing as well as predicted?
- Are there any undesirable environmental effects? Is remedial action required?
- Are the environmental effects predictions of the SEA accurate?

The following information was taken into account when designing a monitoring system:

- Determining what needs to be monitored;
- Identify what sort of information is required;
- Identify existing sources of information;
- Identify and fill any gaps in existing information;
- Determine when remedial action would be required and what actions should

- be taken; and
- Develop a management plan outlining responsibilities, timeframes and presentations.

This has been sourced from DfT (2004) but has one major weakness in that it is very difficult to identify any monitoring indicators that can be used to realistically monitor progress on the LIP. Almost all of the commonly used indicators are affected by a range of variables, for example the cost of fuel and advancement in engine emission technology over which Haringey has little or no influence through its LIP.

The following sections outline the methods that will be adopted in order to monitor change in the future for particular topics.

5.2 Air Quality

General

Air quality is influenced by both local emissions and by emissions from elsewhere which are blown into an area. Air quality affects both human health and the health of other living things.

One of the major sources of local air pollution is from motor vehicle transport, which is a significant source of particulate matter (PM10) and nitrogen dioxides (NO₂). Today the amount of pollutants dispersed by heavy industrial activity has declined due to closure of heavy industry and retro-fitting of cleansing equipment to reduce emissions. The reduced volume of industrial activity that produce vast quantities of air pollutants, including Carbon Monoxide, Lead, Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) and Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x), Particulate matter (PM10) and Sulphur Dioxide, has meant that across a national/strategic level, transport based pollution has overtaken industrial based pollution.

Monitoring of air quality is routinely undertaken by London boroughs including Haringey. This monitoring is effective in understanding how air quality is changing in overall terms. However air quality is affected by a range of factors other than the implementation of the LIP policies and measures. To establish the effectiveness of LIP policies and measures an assessment of these other factors will need to be undertaken as part of the monitoring. The objective of this is to tease out changes in air quality that can be attributed to LIP policies and measures.

Air pollution from NO_x and PM10 is predominantly attributable to HGVs. Both forms of pollution are detrimental to human health and the local environment. These transport related pollutants are of particular concern within residential

and shopping areas where the concentration of pedestrians is greatest, and where wildlife habitats are adjacent to major roads.

There are X sites that are continuously monitored on behalf of Haringey Borough Council. Each of the sites monitors NO2 and PM10 levels (CHECK); see **Table 5.1** below for details:

Table 5.1: Air quality monitoring sites across the London Boroughs of Haringey

<i>Location</i>	<i>Borough</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i>Start of monitoring</i>	<i>Monitored emissions</i>

Source: ???

Emissions to air and climate change

Climate change is considered to be one of the major potential issues in terms of SEA of the LIP proposals. Transport is a major source of greenhouse gases notably carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide. Even though LIP measures may have a comparatively small impact on overall greenhouse gas emissions, the link between overall traffic and climate change is very strong particularly when considered on a wider geographical scale.

It is difficult to directly measure the effects of climate change at a local level. However CO2 emissions, generally regarded as one of the main contributors to climate change, can be monitored at a local level. There are currently no fixed air-quality monitoring sites within the Borough that record CO2 levels.

As Haringey has designated the whole Borough as an AQMA – the Council has the power to enforce vehicle emission standards at the roadside in co-operation with the police. Roadside vehicle testing will measure un-burnt hydrocarbons from petrol, and Carbon Monoxide and PM10 from diesel.

Alternative indirect measurements that could be implemented in order to assess the affects of air quality within the Borough are listed below:

- The promotion of cleaner vehicles and modes of sustainable transport can be monitored by recording the number of advertisements across the borough;
- Monitor the number of alternative refuelling facilities across the Borough, e.g. electric vehicle recharging points. There are currently X filling stations for

- LPG in the borough (CHECK);
- Monitor the number/proportion of the bus fleet that are within or exceeding the European Emission Standards as proposed within the LEZ; and
 - Monitor the number/proportion of vehicles within the Council's fleet that are within or exceed the European Emission Standards as proposed within the LEZ.

Using existing Census records a temporal analysis of private vehicle ownership, and public transport usage can be undertaken. In order to compare annual trends in traffic, individual traffic counts can be undertaken throughout the Borough. If count locations are selected appropriately then a good appreciation of trends in traffic volumes can be gained. Although this does not directly measure air quality it does give an indication of the trend in vehicular use across the Borough.

Air quality and flora and fauna

One of the main trends identified within the baseline report highlights air pollution continuing to affect plants and lichen. Species are directly affected by increased levels of particulate matter and air pollution from increased volumes of motor vehicle traffic.

Biodiversity in habitats along or in close proximity to transport corridors needs to be monitored, as these habitats are within the immediate impact zone of air pollution from vehicular traffic.

A possible monitoring solution regarding the impact to flora and fauna is to record the population of protected species within the Borough. Although changes in population size may not be as a direct consequence of air quality changes, it may serve as a useful guide. Protected species are identified in local Biodiversity Action Plans but this does not necessarily indicate that species are currently being monitored. Further consultation with conservation officers within the Borough may establish this.

Conclusion on air quality monitoring

Air quality monitoring is already undertaken in Haringey by the Council. However it is not considered to be an effective means of monitoring the effects of the LIP on the environment. It is effective in terms of evaluating the overall impact of the transport sector as a whole on the environment as transport emissions are likely to be the major factor in determining local air quality. In respect of appropriate thresholds, these are already set by the Government's air quality standards and are recognised through the designation of the whole of the Borough as an Air Quality management Area.

5.3 Noise levels

General

Noise from traffic is the main source of noise in most urban areas. It is considered to be one of the major potential issues in terms of SEA of the LIP proposals. Transport has a very direct impact on noise levels which has indirect impacts on amenity and on human health.

Noise and human health

Noise may affect health particularly at night. Traffic contributes significantly to noise levels and disturbance in the local community/environment. The Borough has imposed an on-street night-time lorry parking ban on all vehicles exceeding 5 tonnes gross vehicle weight (CHECK)

The London Road Traffic Noise Map was commissioned by Defra in 2004 and modelled the level of noise associated with motor vehicle traffic. The model calculated that during the daytime, 14% of Haringey is affected by noise levels greater than 60 dB(A). At night the area that is affected by noise levels greater than 60 dB(A) is reduced to 3% of the Borough.

The London Road Traffic Noise Map is based on estimated 2001 traffic flows and provides detailed baseline information that can be utilised by the Borough to monitor future noise levels and mitigate accordingly.

Noise and fauna

Transport has an indirect impact on biodiversity in terms of noise and disturbance of habitats. Reference has already been made to monitoring of protected species under air quality.

Conclusion on noise monitoring

Noise monitoring could be undertaken if the London Road Traffic Noise Map is updated at some stage in the future to reflect changed traffic flows. It would not however be appropriate for the Borough to undertake this locally. In any event this is not considered to be an effective means of monitoring the effects of the LIP on the environment. It would be effective in terms of evaluating the overall impact of the transport sector as a whole on the noise environment as road

traffic is likely to be a major factor in determining local noise levels.

5.4 Land-take

It is not anticipated that any measure in the LIP will involve significant land-take outside existing highway boundaries. Within highway boundaries there may be a case for monitoring and change in the area devoted to footway, cycle route, shared footway/cycle route and carriageway. This would indicate the provision of additional street space for walking and cycling.

Conclusion on land-take monitoring

Land-take from environmentally sensitive resources is considered unlikely as a result of the LIP. Monitoring land-take is not therefore considered necessary.

5.5 Transport accessibility

Population and social exclusion

Population and social exclusion is considered to be one of the major potential issues in terms of SEA of the LIP proposals. Transport is an important factor in the lives of all people and is a key factor in social exclusion particularly in respect of employment. How LIP measures affect the access which socially excluded people have to transport and their ability to move around, is critical.

The Revised Transport Strategy recognises that poor access to the transport system can present particular barriers for people with disabilities.

Public transport accessibility mapping can provide a basis for monitoring in this area.

Human health

Human health is adversely affected by the reduced exercise associated with motorised modes, by injury accidents associated with their use, by the adverse effects of emissions on air quality and through increased stress as a result of reduced amenity within streets.

Promotion of alternative modes of transport, such as walking routes to suburban rail stations and school travel plans, form a major part of the

initiatives to reduce road traffic levels, accidents and to improve air quality.

The following targets identified within the LIP refer to targets defined in Chapter 5 LIP Proposals: Improving Road Safety.

In the Governments road safety strategy, “Tomorrow’s Roads – Safer for Everyone”, new road accident casualty reduction targets, based on 1994 to 1998 average figures, include:

- To reduce overall KSI numbers by 40% by 2010;
- To reduce the number of children killed and seriously injured (KSI) by 50% by 2010;
- To reduce slight casualties by 10% by 2010; and
- 40% reduction in pedestrian, cyclist and powered two wheeler rider killed and seriously injured.

The Borough is committed to achieving these targets.

Conclusion on transport accessibility

It is understood that public transport accessibility of land within the Borough has been mapped for the Borough by TfL. If this is repeated at regular intervals it provides the basis for monitoring of changes in public transport accessibility. (NOTE – THIS IS SUBJECT TO CONFIRMATION). Note this has shortcomings as a LIP monitoring measure as it reflect changes in accessibility as a result of all involved with public transport, including transport providers and TfL. Comparison between maps should indicate net positive and negative changes in public transport accessibility.

Traffic accident statistics are maintained at Borough level by Haringey and can be readily monitored. However it would be inappropriate to regard these as accurately reflecting the LIP as other factors, for example police enforcement will affect the level of traffic accidents.

5.6 Amenity in the street

General

Much of the landscape and townscape in Haringey adjoins roads and other transport infrastructure. Traffic is an integral part of this landscape and townscape and the extent to which it is dominated by traffic is significant. In terms of SEA of the LIP proposals landscape and townscape can be

considered as part of overall amenity, in particular of the street.

Increasing traffic on major transport corridors has reduced the value of landscape over the years and led to a reduction in townscape quality as the street scene is increasingly dominated by traffic. However where traffic has been managed better than in the past improvements in townscape and landscape have occurred.

Human Health

Human health is adversely affected through increased stress as a result of reduced amenity within streets.

The adverse effects of streetscape are both to character of the landscape and townscape and to the views which people see in their daily lives.

Promoting walking can make a real contribution to reducing traffic congestion even if just a small percentage of short trips are made on foot instead of by car. Many people are becoming less physically active and walking can result in an improvement in health.

Generating extra footfall can have the effect of creating vibrancy in areas in need of regeneration. It may also increase natural surveillance which can have the effect of improving perceptions of personal security.

Good quality walking surfaces, roads uncluttered by street furniture, dropped kerbs and tactile paving are all important to improving the street environment for those people with a disability or mobility handicap.

Encouraging individuals to change transport modes to walking is regarded as a key priority in reducing the volume of private motor vehicle transport. The following presents a good summary indicating the key factor in encouraging people to use alternative transport modes:

“The quality of the pedestrian environment is linked to factors such as the quality of the public realm, traffic volumes and speed, and good street lighting. A good quality environment for walking is a pre-requisite to more walking. The approach should be to address the environment in an area-wide basis and seek to address all the issues within an area. This approach is most appropriate in areas within and near to the borough’s town centres and around public transport interchanges and rail stations.”

Monitoring the street environment

It is understood Haringey maintains a footway condition survey for the Borough, following Best Value Indicator (BVI) 187. This survey identifies footways that require maintenance, whether improvements to street furniture, surface condition, or physical extent of footway. The BVI187 footway index identifies past maintenance trends, acting as a useful platform to assess any future impacts of the LIP.

In order to monitor whether the LIP has had any impact on streetscape, one solution is to annually monitor 50 randomly selected sections of street, assessing factors such as:

- Quality of public realm;
- Level of traffic;
- Extent of street furniture;
- Presence of on-street servicing;
- Width of footway;
- Number of pedestrians within a defined amount of time (e.g. 30 minutes);
- Presence of urban vegetation (e.g. trees)
- Function of street (e.g. residential, commercial, main transport link).

A quantitative judgement should be made regarding each of the defined streetscape factors, this can then be compared annually to assess whether the LIP has had an impact on quality of streetscape.

5.7 Additional Monitoring

We have not been able to identify any specific additional monitoring on the basis of the LIP provided to us. The following areas are appropriate for monitoring:

Improving bus journey times and reliability

- A reduction in bus Excess Wait Time; and
- Borough bus target – to be agreed by TfL by Summer 2005.

Reducing traffic congestion

- Traffic volumes growth or reduction to be set;
- Journey times on 'A' roads and busy bus routes;
- Proportion of personal travel made by means other than car; and
- All schools to have a school travel plan in place by 2008.

Improving working of parking and loading arrangement

- Target for parking and loading regulations compliance to be agreed with TfL;
- Extent of Controlled Parking Zones.

Improving accessibility and social inclusion on the transport network

- Accessibility of the transport network, particularly for disabled people, older people and women travelling at night.

Bringing transport infrastructure to a good state of repair

- Target for 'A' Roads and Busy Bus Routes to achieve a serviceable standard.

5.8 Summary

The key to monitoring the progress of the LIP is to identify indicators that properly reflect the environment as it is affected by LIP measures. Most of the indicators set out above will be affected much more by influences that are external to the LIP than by LIP measures. They are considered appropriate only as general indicators of the state of the environment rather than indicators of LIP progress. In some cases, for example air quality, it should be possible to undertake an assessment that will separate out change attributable to LIP measures from change attributable to other factors.

The key area where the LIP has a major impact is on the amenity of the street environment on roads that are the borough's responsibility. This will include such indicators as footway conditions that are already monitored under best value. The most appropriate way forward appears to be to monitor either selected locations on an annual basis or to choose a sufficiently large random sample of street locations at appropriate intervals, perhaps 5 years, and monitor change over that period.

Appendix A: Changes to Haringey LIP between Draft LIP and Final LIP

The main changes in each chapter are set out below. The changes included are those made between the draft LIP that was consulted on and the final LIP that has been sent to TfL and The Mayor for approval.

Chapter 1 – Local Socio Economic / Demographic Context	Update to UDP text included.
---	------------------------------

No change to SEA.

Chapter 2 – Local Transport Context	Text change re orbital bus services. Updated North London LIP common statement. Reduced housing requirement from Mayor [down from 19,000 to 6,800].
--	---

No change to SEA except that baseline environmental impacts are likely to be somewhat lower as a result of the reduced housing requirement.

Chapter 3 – Haringey Transport Strategy	Amended text re West Anglia Route Development (WARD) to reflect TfL comments. Amended road space allocation priorities to reflect TfL comments on bus passenger priority. Additional policy [T34] relating to waste in response to TfL comment.
--	---

No change to SEA.

Chapter 4 – Equality Impact Assessment (of LIP)	Some additional text to explain impact on equalities impact groups.
--	---

This lends some support to the conclusions of the assessment in the *Environmental Report*.

<p>Chapter 5 – LIP Proposals</p>	<p><i>Introduction</i> Additional section on cross-cutting goals with links to sections in the LIP and targets.</p> <p><i>Improving Road Safety</i> Updated details on programmes for road safety. Additional details of our programme of clamping and removal to assist reductions in road accident casualties. Updated proposals for 20mph zones and programme until 2011.</p> <p><i>Bus Priority</i> Information on gritting programme for roads with bus routes added.</p> <p><i>Relieving Traffic Congestion</i> Additional clarification on the Council’s approach to road traffic reduction is provided.</p> <p><i>Accessibility/safety and security</i> Information added on Safer Travel at Night as well as the Crime and Disorder Strategy for the Borough including promotion of the safe use of minicabs.</p> <p><i>Walking</i> Details of programmes for walks for health included as well as promotional activity to support more walking. Section added on the Council’s actions in relation to Mayor’s Walking Plan for London.</p> <p><i>Cycling</i> Section added on greenway cycle routes. Additional section on the Council’s actions in relation to the London Cycle Action Plan.</p> <p><i>Transport Infrastructure</i> Additional information provided on the road maintenance programme. Proposals for an asset management plan included.</p> <p><i>Town Centres</i> Additional information provided for the programme of town centre enhancements.</p>
---	--

The additional details on Walking and Cycling and Town Centres are likely to increase environmental benefits.

Chapter 6 – Performance Indicators	Performance Indicators and targets updated in line with TfL advice on bus target and local safety scheme target.
---	--

No change to SEA. The changes to the performance are more explicit and therefore beneficial to the SEA. However the performance measures as a whole do not fully address the environmental area. It would be useful if a discussion could take place on the implementation of monitoring under the SEA and the performance measurement to be undertaken on the LIP.

Chapter 7 – Consultation	Details of general consultation undertaken included and summary of results. For statutory consultees and other organisations, a table has been included of comments and the Council's response.
---------------------------------	---

No change to SEA.

Chapter 8 – Borough Core Capacity Statement	Organisational charts for Streetscene and Planning added as requested by TfL.
--	---

No change to SEA.

Road Safety Plan	We have separated this chapter into a standalone document. Text has been updated as well as accident data and analysis.
-------------------------	---

No change to SEA.

School Travel Plan strategy	We have updated the strategy taking on board TfL comments including linkages to national and strategic policies. The strategy is now a separate standalone document.
------------------------------------	--

No change to SEA.

Parking and Enforcement Plan	Additional information on disabled parking provision included as well as a programme for introducing new CPZs around rail stations. Map of existing and proposed CPZs has been added.
-------------------------------------	---

Form 1s	Additional information on existing Form 1s have been included and additional Form 1s provided in the final LIP.
----------------	---

No change to SEA???

Appendix B: Consultation Responses - Statutory and Non-Statutory

Appendix C