

## Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report - Comments from statutory agencies and the Portsmouth City Council response

Portsmouth City Council carried out an unofficial consultation on the Draft Scoping Report with the Statutory Consultees natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England in May - June 2016. This was to allow a chance to make comments before it became official, and help PCC with any oversights. What we have here are the official comments from December - January and the City Council response.

<b>Organisation: Environment Agency, Laura Lax, Sustainable Places, Solent and South Downs</b>	
<b>Official Consultation Comments January 2017</b>	<b>PCC Response</b>
Generally I think that this is a well written and comprehensive document that addresses all of the relevant environmental factors that require consideration. I am pleased to see that our previous comments on the draft report have been addressed in this version of the document. I do however have a few minor comments that we wish you to consider. I have addressed these in the order in which they appear in the document.	Noted
p.42 – under the section that discusses ‘areas at risk of surface water flooding’ in paragraph 3 you have used the term ‘ordinary watercourses’, I would suggest that this should be altered to be watercourses generally as this could be main rivers as well as ordinary watercourses.	Not changed; there are no rivers in Portsmouth
p.43 – we strongly support the addition of the flood risk management hierarchy in this section.	Noted and was added after informal consultation
p.44 – we acknowledge and support the recognition that you have included information regarding your application of the sequential test for the plan area. We would suggest that a revised version of the ‘tidal flood risk statement of common ground’ is refreshed as previously discussed to provide the evidence needed to support the plan and demonstrate compliance with the NPPF with regard to flood risk.	A revised version of the statement of common ground document is in production as a flood risk background paper for the new Local Plan

APPENDIX 1

<p>p.45 – we would suggest that the title of this section is amended to just ‘flood risk’ or ‘managing flood risk’ as flooding can never be prevented it is about understanding the risk and managing it where possible.</p>	<p>PCC believe that residents would need to feel that the large scale defences will <b>prevent</b> flooding, however we have changed the text to say Managing Flood Risk</p>
<p>We are supportive of the content of this section which gives a good description of the management of flood risk in the city, including the potential impact of climate change. We are however concerned about the assumption at the end of paragraph 3 of this section that seems to assume that ‘funding for the rest of the city will be provided by the Environment Agency Flood and Coastal Defence Grant in Aid’. Whilst we recognise that cells 1 and 4 have funding to bring schemes forward the situation is not the same for the other cells. Whilst there is a plan for the proposed defences in the Portsea Island Coastal Strategy, funding for these is not necessarily guaranteed. There shouldn’t be a blanket assumption that Grant in Aid funding will fund everything. This funding should be seen as a contribution and it needs to be made clear in the text that other sources of funding may need to be sought to supplement it. It is likely for the other cells that there will be a funding gap between the total cost and the grant in aid funding that will need to be filled somehow. This may vary for different cells.</p>	<p>The text was revised and sent to the EA for checking, they changed it and we used what they had written</p>
<p>p.47 – within this section we would suggest that the first paragraph is altered slightly. In terms of flood risk assessments we would suggest that the word ‘professional’ is removed. We would suggest that flood risk assessments need to be proportional to the development proposed. For small scale extensions etc. it may be that an applicant can undertake their own simple flood risk assessment based on guidance that is readily available. Obviously if the proposal was for a larger development then a more experienced professional is likely to be required to produce the assessment.</p>	<p>Text was revised as suggested</p>

APPENDIX 1

<p>We would also ask that the final sentence of the first paragraph is removed. The Environment Agency does not directly review all assessments that are produced. Some of these are covered by our flood risk standing advice that is implemented by the planning authority and therefore in some cases you are the ones reviewing the information submitted. Maybe something more generic could replace it to specify that planning permission will not be granted until a satisfactory flood risk assessment is produced?</p>	
<p>p.50 – we strongly support the water stress section on this page and also the water quality section that has been added. This is very clear and gives an excellent description of the current situation in the city.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>p.89 – it appears that there may have been some confusion over the numbering of the themes as number 8 has been used twice. We assume that ‘to conserve and enhance the natural environment’ is actually theme 9.</p>	<p>This has been corrected</p>
<p>Again we support the content of the information under this theme. There is good recognition of the current situation. I would however suggest that whilst we support the reference in the 4th paragraph on p.90 that discusses the review of the PUSH Integrated Management Study it should be altered. Currently it seems to pre-empt the outcome of the study when it is not yet complete. I am not sure that you are yet in a position to say that ‘it will provide a robust evidence base which demonstrates that at a strategic level there is sufficient environmental carrying capacity for the broad level and distribution of growth planned’. It also obviously wasn’t published in December 2016. It is likely that by the time the SA report is published alongside your draft plan the report may be correct but at this point in time I think it is a bit presumptuous and should therefore be removed.</p>	<p>This paragraph has been changed to say;           PUSH has recently commissioned a study on a new Integrated Water Management Study to cover the period to 2036. It is to assess whether there is sufficient environmental carrying capacity for the broad level and distribution of growth planned. This study will be used by Local Plans in the PUSH area and will be published in March 2017.</p>
<p>p.107 – we would suggest that the issue regarding sea defences is quite specific and whilst that may be where efforts might be</p>	<p>This issue was changed to:          Reducing flood risk to new and existing development’.</p>

APPENDIX 1

<p>focused there are other methods of managing flood risk that should also be considered. We suggest that it could be summarised and changed to 'reducing flood risk to new and existing development'.</p>	
<p>p.109 – we strongly support the water quality issues being summarised here as a main issue. We agree that it is a key environmental consideration.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p><b>Organisation: Natural England, Francesca Sanchez, Land Use Lead Adviser, Dorset, Hampshire &amp; Isle of Wight Area Team</b></p>	
<p><b>Official Consultation Comments May-June 2016</b></p>	<p><b>PCC Response</b></p>
<p>We welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft SA Scoping Report, and we note that most of the recommendations that we made earlier in the year have been taken on board. We have a few more comments at this stage:</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The Integrated Water Management Strategy Report is now due in March 2017, not December 2016 (page 90 in the report).</p>	<p>This has been amended</p>
<p>The Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP) Definitive Strategy is now due in December 2017, not September (page 95 in the report).</p>	<p>This has been amended</p>
<p>The text on page 96 regarding the Milton Common Local Nature Reserve Restoration and Management Framework is not accurate. The framework provides enhanced recreational greenspace at Milton Common for any forthcoming Milton Housing Allocation, which will be in addition to SRMP contributions, due the proximity of the development to the Special Protection Area. The brent goose habitat enhancement on site (that is included in the framework) is to mitigate for impacts of encouraging more visitors to Milton Common, where there are already brent goose records on that site. The rationale for the above is all set out within the Restoration and Management Framework. Natural England is willing to provide further clarity on this if required.</p>	<p>This text was amended and sent back to Natural England and then finalised again. It now reads:</p> <p>Milton Common Local Nature Reserve-has been identified as a potential SANG, subject to enhancements as set out in the Milton Common Local Nature Reserve Restoration and Management Framework to encourage its use by residents from new housing at Milton and Langstone. This should help reduce potential impacts on the SPA of Langstone Harbour.</p>
<p>We advise that the Solent Site Improvement Plan is referenced as a baseline source under Sustainability Issue 9.</p>	<p>A new section on the Solent Site Improvement Plan was added to the Scoping Report</p>

APPENDIX 1

<p>On page 109, Sustainability Issue 9, we advise that the wording is amended to reflect the introduction on page 4: “Protect <u>and enhance</u> the Solent European Marine Sites.</p>	<p>The new wording was added</p>
--	----------------------------------

<p><b>Organisation: Historic England, Martin Small, Principal Adviser, Historic Environment Planning</b></p>	
<p><b>Official Consultation Comments January 2017</b></p>	<p><b>PCC Response</b></p>
<p>General advice on Sustainability Appraisals and the historic environment is set out in Historic England’s publication 'Strategic Environmental Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and The Historic Environment': <a href="http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/strategic-environ-assessment-sustainability-appraisal-historic-environment/">http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/strategic-environ-assessment-sustainability-appraisal-historic-environment/</a>.</p>	<p>This document was published in December 2016 while we were consulting on the SA. Noted and added to Appendix 1</p>
<p>We welcome the short but useful description of the historical development of Portsmouth and Southsea in the “General introduction to Portsmouth”.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>We also welcome, in principle, “Conserving and enhancing the historic townscape in Portsmouth” being one of the themes and the more detailed history of Portsmouth therein. However, we would prefer it to be “Conserving and enhancing the historic environment”, as this would embrace the full range of heritage assets, not just those that contribute to “townscape”, in line with the definition of “historic environment” in the National Planning Policy Framework: <i>“All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or</i></p>	<p>Changed in Scoping Report</p>

APPENDIX 1

<p><i>managed flora</i>".</p>	
<p>The statutory list is under constant review as new buildings are continually being assessed for designation. The National Heritage List for England currently identifies 18 scheduled monuments</p>	<p>Our records say there are 17, we asked Historic England for their list so we could check whether there is a mistake or we have counted two features as one. They did not reply. Text stays the same.</p>
<p>The Heritage at Risk Register is published annually, but heritage assets may be added to or removed from the Register as and when identified as newly being at risk or as no longer being at risk at any point throughout the year. It is correct therefore for the Scoping Report to explain this, but the latest annual Register was published in October 2016. However, it identifies the 16 buildings listed in the Scoping Report as being at risk and there have been no amendments to the Register since then.</p>	<p>We were asked in July to insert a section explaining this and did so: Every year Historic England updates its Heritage at Risk register, a process that has been carried on for twenty years since the Buildings at Risk surveys began. However heritage assets can be removed and added more frequently. The last one was published in 2015.  PCC are aware this is a dynamic situation and things may change for later editions of the SA</p>
<p>Each year local authorities are invited to participate in Historic England's Conservation Areas at Risk survey, from which conservation areas at risk are identified (this year's survey will start next month). We note from the 2016 survey that the City Council has re-surveyed all but two of its Conservation Areas. One of these two is Portsea, which we consider might be at risk. The fact that two Conservation Areas were not surveyed should be identified as a gap in the baseline (as are the two without combined area appraisals and management guidelines. Are these the same two?)</p>	<p>We were asked in July to insert a section explaining this and did so: Two areas without them (combined area appraisals and management guidelines) are owned by the Ministry of Defence, leaving a small gap in the baseline.</p>
<p>It is correct that non-designated buildings or other features on the local list do not enjoy statutory protection but they do enjoy a degree of protection through the National Planning Policy Framework and can be protected through planning policy.</p>	<p>Noted and agree, it is up to the new Local Plan to provide protection. In the original Local Plan of 2006 Policy DC12 Locally Important Buildings And Structures did provide policy protection but was deleted. It is noted that we need to decide whether such a Policy is needed locally or whether national</p>

APPENDIX 1

<p>There is little reference to archaeology in this section, other than the fact that there are 17 scheduled monuments in the city (which should be 18).</p> <p>I believe there is an Urban Archaeological Database for the City and there is also the Historic Environment Record for non-scheduled archaeological remains. We suggest a separate subsection on archaeology and a reference to these two sources of information.</p>	<p>protection is sufficient</p> <p>We were asked in July to insert a section discussing archaeology and two paragraphs were added to the SA.</p> <p>In January 2017 we added a much larger section (2 pages) provided by Jennifer Macey, Historic Environment Record Assistant at PCC. A copy of this was sent to Historic England who said they were 'much happier with the expanded archaeology section'.</p> <p>HER also provided us with data on the Hill Forts and other fortress defences which were included in the revised Scoping Report in a separate section.</p> <p>David Hopkins at HCC revised our planning archaeology ALERT map recently, which highlights the areas of most archaeological potential across the whole of the city. This has been used when assessing sites for housing recently and is a constraint identified.</p> <p>Portsmouth does not have an Urban Archaeological Database.</p>
<p>We note that tall buildings are identified as a potential concern under the theme of conserving and enhancing the natural environment of Portsmouth. However, inappropriately designed or sited tall buildings can also adversely affect the significance of historic buildings and open spaces. There could therefore be a reference to tall buildings as an issue in the section on the historic environment, although we acknowledge that this is covered to an</p>	<p>We have added an extra section on tall buildings to the chapter on conserving and enhancing the historic environment in Portsmouth</p>

APPENDIX 1

<p>extent in the section on “Requiring good urban design in Portsmouth”.</p>	
<p>We welcome the main issues identified under the Key Sustainability Issue of “Conserving and enhancing the historic townscape. Perhaps “providing access to and understanding and enjoyment of the historic environment” could be another issue?</p> <p>Creating and maintaining a comprehensive historic environment database is another issue, although one that should be addressed prior to the preparation of the local plan rather than one to be addressed by it.</p>	<p>It is an important issue, however it is difficult to assess for the purposes of an SA, as most development is unlikely to 'provide access to and understanding and enjoyment of the historic environment'. An SA is looking at ways to mitigate against adverse impacts, not tackle access issues.</p>
<p>We welcome and support the Assessment Criteria for the historic environment sustainability theme.</p> <p>We suggest that the first indicator be broken down by type of asset).</p> <p>The second indicator essentially duplicates the first,</p> <p>but other potentially helpful indicators are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of Conservation Areas in Portsmouth with an up-to-date character appraisal (and management plan)</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Other sections such as the environment indicators do not contain this level of detail, it would seem disproportionate and PCC left it as it is</p> <p>The Council felt historic and cultural are not always the same thing, hence the distinction</p> <p>This work is up to date, as stated in the SA; 'These Conservation Areas are re-surveyed annually at the request of Historic England and in 2016, as in previous years, none of the areas were considered to be at risk.' PCC does not have the resources to carry out management plans. Only two areas without up to date character appraisals are owned by the Ministry of Defence and are outside our control.</p>



APPENDIX 1

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the number of locally listed heritage assets</li>                   <li>• the number of major development projects that enhance the significance of heritage assets;</li><li>• the number of major development projects that detract from the significance of heritage assets or historic landscape character; and</li>  <li>• the percentage of planning applications where archaeological mitigation strategies were developed and implemented.</li></ul>	<p>The SA 7 objective is 'Conserving and enhancing the historic townscape.' This objective is to be monitored by actions within the Local Plan. The Council do not feel that monitoring things which are unlikely to change (locally listed heritage aspects) will actually be useful in looking at ways to mitigate against adverse impacts.</p> <p>In SA7 we already have;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Will it protect and enhance the cultural townscape and historic assets?</li></ol> <p>Therefore an additional one on heritage assets seems unnecessary.</p> <p>Assessing the number of major development projects that detract or enhance from the significance of heritage/historic assets is a difficult one to measure, and arguably very subjective. There is no easy way to measure and assess this, even though it is important. It would be an adverse impact to mitigate against, but is difficult to quantify.</p> <p>Archaeological mitigation strategies rarely happen in Portsmouth and we do not intend to add this</p>
<p>In Appendix 1, European Conventions are not “legislation”. Reference should be made to the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada Convention) and The European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (Valetta Convention). Reference should also be made to the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.</p>	<p>The word 'legislation' has been removed</p> <p>These documents have been added to Appendix 1</p>