

SUMMARY OF SCOPING RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES

Consultee	Date Sent	Date Received	Para	Page	Comments	Reaction / Proposed Reaction
Southampton Commons and Parks Protection Society		29 June 2005	1-2	1	They feel that parks as a single entity have not been assessed correctly.	Discussed with ecologist and reviewed Parks and Open Spaces Scoping Study
			3	1	This point needs to be mentioned in the biodiversity, cultural heritage and landscape sections.	Amended
			1	2	They feel that it is very odd that there is no Country Parks are not recognised for their landscape value.	Amended
			6	2	They feel that in Appendix B, page 2 the list of sub objectives need to add "to maintain, and prevent encroachment upon, the public open spaces of the city".	Sub-objectives considered superfluous to requirements.
			7	2	Page three of Appendix B the first Sub Objective is too general.	Sub-objectives considered superfluous to requirements.
			1	3	They would like page 2 of Appendix C to have "the other Commons and Parks of the City likewise enhance its landscape and amenity".	Amended
Southampton sustainability forum		27 June 2005	2	3	They would like on page 58 at the bottom a few extra words to be added to an additional item 6 should follow "The Commons and Parks enhance the landscape throughout the area of the city".	Amended
			3	1	There are a few factual comments and spelling mistakes.	
			1	2	In Appendix B they feel there has been an over-sight, they feel that there is a need for more co-operation with neighbouring authorities as some 30% of Southampton's workers live outside the city.	Links to Solent Transport Partnership explored
			4	2	Appendix C: they are concerned that there is no mention of the geographical shape of Southampton as being a significant effect.	
			7	2	They feel that the current railway system has not been given enough emphasis. The system is already in use and could be enhanced.	Amended
English Nature	25 May 2005	01 July 2005	8	2	Need to have diagrams in A3 size preferably.	Amended
			2	1	English Nature believes that figure 3.1 needs changes as Biodiversity has positive health implications.	Amended
			4	1	Table 4.1 removal of repeated paragraph.	Amended
			5	1	Amend page 17 table 4.1 to "These Sites total 111.5ha and <u>apart from Southampton common SSSI</u> are also part the SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites".	Amended
			6	1	Amend reference to international sites on Page 21 (Water Quality).	Amended
			7	1	Add reference to Protected species paragraph 5.3.1.	Amended
			8	1	Add reference to particularly sensitive sites (SSSIs, SINCS etc) Paragraph 5.3.1.	Amended
			1	2	Appendix B framework of objectives- Additional sources of information on reported conditions of SSSIs, species info held at Hampshire Biodiversity info centre, there is also three pieces of info on conservation objectives which have been written on the SAC SPAs and Ramsars in the area, they comment that if we don't have all the relevant info then they can get it for us.	Noted
			2	2	Appendix C- Baseline Data Pg 2 and 44 river Test are only nationally important.	Amended
			3	2	In Appendix D they think you should add a reference to Ramsar sites.	Amended
Environment Agency		28 June 2005	1	1	All objectives need to be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time-bound) to achieve a better LTP.	Sub-objectives considered superfluous to requirements.
			bottom half	1	They would like to see outcome targets for traffic reduction, climate change, air quality, accessibility and liveability, mode share, road safety, congestion and water quality.	SCC to agree appropriate targets.
			1	1	Under Appendix B Water quality, the plan should aim to improve surface and ground water quality.	Amended
			top half	3	Appendix C Water Quality, the plan is advised to include a target to improve water quality and Aquifer trends. The plan should aim to improve the quality of the run off filtering into aquifers, ground water potential resources and targets to ensure groundwater is maintained as a potential resource.	SUDS suggested, targets to be agreed by SCC
Test Valley Borough Council		01 July 2005	2	1	Suggests that the LTP will also affect the surrounding areas such as the New Forest and the motorway network and questions the scope of the SEA.	Links to Solent Transport Partnership
			3	1	Table 4.1 seems to omit conservation areas from page 22 under cultural heritage.	Amended
			4	1	In the options and alternatives section, option 3 is titled "promotion of non motorised transport" but public transport is mentioned. They think this should be given more thought to consider other options.	Excluded
			5	1	They question the fact that there is no mention of the park and ride Peter Brett Associates funded study.	P&R now integral to assessment
			7	1	Questions that the methodology may be too difficult and onerous to carry out.	Methodology and monitoring requirements agreed with SCC
			1	2	Appendix B: could measurable targets be added to the table to which the indicators could relate to?	Included in ER where agreed with SCC
			2-4	2	There was no attention being drawn to brownfield development over the next 20 years and the policies surrounding them.	Amended
			5	2	There is no preliminary overview of the scoring exercise in scoping report.	Excluded
Southampton PCT		01 July 2005	all	1	There are more up to date figures for life expectancy, Wendy states that a lower proportion of people of an older age is not the correct indicator for life expectancy in Southampton.	Baseline data and indicators updated
			all	2	If you need additional indicators to health of an area they suggest using mortality rates explained on bottom of page.	Baseline data and indicators updated
			all	3	They highlight that the local transport plan could have huge benefits to the populations health and in turn lowering NHS bills.	Baseline data and indicators updated
					They have had problems as there is no update on lifestyle indicators and information on lifestyle indicators on a local level is very sparse but national trends could be used to give a broad estimation.	Baseline data and indicators updated
			top half	7	On Chapter 7 options they suggest that option 2 and 3 overlap too much and make measurements of likely impacts hazy and inconclusive. There are two preferred titles and strategic changes to the options outlined in two paragraphs on page 7.	Alternatives revised
			Bottom Half	7	In chapter 7 they suggest that perhaps network maximisation should read "private road user priority".	Not sustainable
English Heritage		22 July	Bottom Half	7	Long term health benefits of dependence on cars increased in sedentary lifestyle. Implication of increased air pollution. Accident prevention on highways not accessed correctly; no solution given.	Amended
			1 - 2	3	General recommendations on how plan can benefit heritage interest.	Acknowledged
			1 - 2	3	Inter-relationship between streetscene / furniture and appearance of historic features	Included
			3	3	Re-wording of SEA objective: 'Protect and where appropriate...'	Amended
			3	3	Baseline summary changes: conservation areas, historic parks and gardens	Amended
			6	3	Criticises poor quality mapping	Acknowledged and explained in text