

**London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham**

**Local Implementation Plan**  
*for Transport*

**2005-9**

**Environment (SEA)**  
**Statement**

**April 2006**

## **1. Introduction**

1.1. The purpose of the Local Implementation Plan (LIP), as defined in the Greater London Authority Act 1999, is to show how the Council intends to implement the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy in the borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. The purpose of the SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment), is to ensure that all relevant environmental effects have been taken into account in the preparation of the LIP and that where there are adverse environmental effects, reasonable mitigation measures have been incorporated in the LIP. This is in accordance with European Union Statutory Instrument 2004 no 1633, The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes regulations 2004.

## **2. Publications**

2.1. The following publications have been prepared as part of the LIP process:

- Scoping report for Environment Report
- Consultation draft LIP, issued February 2005
- Initial Environment Report, issued with Consultation Draft LIP
- Revised Environment Report, to be issued with
- Final LIP, issued after approval by the Mayor on 20 March 2006.

These documents are available from Hammersmith and Fulham Council, contact Chris Bainbridge, Transport Planning Manager, Environment Department, Town Hall Extension, King Street, London W6 9JU, telephone 0208 753 3354, e-mail [Chris.bainbridge@lbhf.gov.uk](mailto:Chris.bainbridge@lbhf.gov.uk). The final LIP and this Environment Statement (SEA) can be seen on the Council's website, [www.lbhf.gov.uk](http://www.lbhf.gov.uk).

## **3. How Environmental Considerations have been integrated in the LIP.**

3.1 Improving the environment is one of the three fundamental themes of the LIP, along with promoting equality and social inclusion and economic well-being. TfL's LIP guidance requires boroughs to pursue the Mayor of London's cross-cutting goals, two of which are directly and explicitly concerned with environmental issues: encouraging greater use of sustainable means for travel and requirements for sustainable development.

These are dealt with in the LIP as shown below:

<b>Encouraging greater use of sustainable travel</b>	Chapter 3, 7,8, ch 5 paras 5.9-5.15, 5.24-5.25, 5.26-5.28, 5.30-5.119,5.123-5.165,5.166,5.168-5.194, 5.202, 5.205-5.217.
<b>Requirements for sustainable development</b>	Chapter 3, Ch 5, paras 5.1-5.5, 5.11, 5.12, 5.16, 5.23, 5.65, 5.127,

3.2 In Chapter 5 the LIP discusses related strategies which are concerned with environmental issues. These are: Air Quality, Noise, Bio-Diversity and Municipal Waste. There is a great deal of overlap between these strategies and the LIP, particularly the air quality strategy, much of whose actions relate to transport, and the LIP's policies and programmes are co-ordinated with those of these strategies as far as possible.

#### **4 How the Environment Report has been taken into Account**

4.1 The initial environment report and the draft LIP were drawn up in parallel, feeding back into each other at several stages during the drafting process. The environment report has been produced in-house, most of it written by the members of Environment Policy team, with some parts written by the Transport Planning team, who also wrote most of the Draft LIP (with some parts written by other divisions of the Council, including Highways, Community Safety and the Environment Policy team. In particular, the Environment report has acted as a checklist by means of which we ensured as far as possible that we had not missed any significant environmental impacts, positive or negative, of the LIP, and suggesting ways in which the draft could be strengthened in relation to these effects.

#### **5 How Consultation Responses have been taken into account.**

5.1. The scoping report for the Environmental Statement was sent for comments to the statutory consultees – English Nature, English Heritage, the Countryside Agency and the Environment Agency. All of these bodies responded, and no specific changes to the Environment Statement were considered to be necessary as a result of these response.

5.2. The consultation exercise for the Consultation Draft LIP and the Environment Statement were undertaken together. Given the very strong environmental content of the LIP, it was considered inappropriate, and potentially to the confusing to the public, to run separate consultation exercise on the Environment Statement and the Draft LIP. The consultation exercise was advertised in HFM, the Council's magazine, which was delivered free of charge

to all households and businesses in the borough, in March 2005. The advert outlined the objectives of the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the Council's approach in meeting them, and gave contact details for obtaining further information. We offered to hold meetings with groups.

5.3 The consultation draft was sent to the following statutory consultees as described in para 3.3 of TfL's LIP guidance:

The Metropolitan Police  
Transport for London  
Hammersmith and Fulham Action on Disability (HAFAD)  
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea  
London Borough of Brent  
London Borough of Ealing  
London Borough of Hounslow  
London Borough of Wandsworth  
London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.

5.4 It was also sent to the following non-statutory consultees:

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority  
London Ambulance Service  
London Development Agency  
Highways Agency  
Network Rail  
Strategic Rail Authority  
Hammersmith & Fulham Better Government for Older People  
Hammersmith & Fulham Cycling Campaign  
London Transport Users' Committee  
Greater London Motorcyclists Action Group  
SWELTRAC  
West London Alliance  
Park Royal Partnership

5.5. In order to give local stakeholder groups an opportunity to influence the contents of the LIP, a report was taken to the Council's Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel (ERSP) in October 2004. As well as elected members from all parties, this panel has representatives of the Hammersmith Community Trust, Hammersmith & Fulham Action on Disability, the Brook Green Association, Local Agenda 21, Richford Street Residents' Association, the Hammersmith Society and Hammersmith & Fulham Chamber of Commerce. The points which the panel made were:

- The plan should include improving the accessibility of the Underground stations in the borough
- Information should be provided in a clear and concise way
- Clarification on traffic targets was sought

- There were possible conflicts between safer routes to school and the need to maintain traffic flow
- There was a need to factor in new developments
- A point was made about an individual bus lane
- There was a need to reduce the numbers of children being driven to school.
- There was a need to ensure that the LIP clearly communicated the priorities of the council with regards to the needs of local residents as distinguishable from the Mayor of London's priorities.

These points were taken on board in the preparation of the draft LIP as far as possible.

5.6 A report on the consultation draft LIP was taken to ERSP in March 2005. The panel:

- Noted the report and welcomed the LIP with the local perspective it offered
- That officers ensure that the LIP be checked for statistical and factual accuracy and revised accordingly
- That further consideration be given to the scope of a disabled parking borough wide review.

These points are addressed in the final LIP as appropriate.

5.7. Meetings on the draft LIP were held in April and May with Better Government for Older People, Hammersmith and Fulham Cycling Campaign and with HAFAD, and a separate meeting was held with the co-vice Chair of HAFAD at which the draft LIP was considered in detail.

5.8. The consultation responses from the public and the way they have been incorporated in the revised LIP are summarised in Appendix 1. The responses from TfL and the way they have been incorporated in the final LIP are summarised in Appendix 2. These appendices are taken from Chapter 10 of the final LIP. TfL also undertook a detailed analysis of the initial Environmental Statement and described the areas in which they considered we had not met the requirements of the SEA regulations and TfL's guidance. This was included with their response to the draft LIP. The areas of deficiency are:

- Lack of a non-technical summary
- More information needed on the consultation process
- An outline of the contents and main objectives of the plan is needed, together with a timescale for the SEA and description of how it interacts with LIP preparation.
- More information needed on the LIP's relationship with other plans.
- Information on national and international strategies should be included.
- Needs clarification of which objectives are to be used.
- Needs justification as to why alternative approaches are not being used
- Needs to identify interrelationships between different effects of the plan

- Does not consider the duration of effects (short, medium, long term)
- Needs to mention secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects
- Include a detailed analysis of the effects which could include reference to mayoral and national standards.
- Needs more information on mitigation measures.
- Needs more information on monitoring

This Environment Statement has been substantially rewritten to cover these points.

## **6. Reasons for choosing the LIP as adopted, in the light of other reasonable alternatives dealt with**

6.1 The range of alternative options which could be considered is limited by the fact that the LIP is a means of implementing the Mayor's Transport Strategy, and therefore options which are not compatible with the Mayor's Transport Strategy have not been considered .

6.2 The SEA process requires some consideration of alternatives to fulfilling the objectives of the LIP plan or programme. The alternatives should be limited to those that are realistic and should aim to find ways of reducing or avoiding significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed plan or programme.

Table 2 identifies the different overall approaches to achieving the Mayor's priority areas (I – VIII). The LIP policies and objectives are closely linked to these priorities. It should be noted that the Council has developed the LIP policies while taking into consideration the SEA factors. The table lists (a) approaches contained in Hammersmith and Fulham's draft LIP currently under development, and (b) those 'alternative' approaches that are not intended to be used as the basis for proposals and programmes contained in the draft LIP.

Each approach has been assigned positive (+) and negative (–) symbols to demark any likely positive or negative impacts they may have against each of the SEA considerations. The aim of this exercise is to allow decision makers to assess the positive and negative environmental impacts of each overall approach.. The environmental report will contain a more detailed analysis of specific alternative proposals that could be included in the draft LIP. However at this stage only the overall policy approaches are being assessed. These alternatives are subject to further consideration and analysis in Table 3, which describes alternatives which were not adopted and gives reasons why. The option which has been adopted which met most closely the aims and objectives of the Mayor's Transport Strategy and this Environment Statement.

**Table 2: Alternatives to the LIP policies as grouped according to the Mayor's Transport Strategy 'priority areas for implementation'**

Overall approach	Programmes / schemes that can be groups under each approach	SEA considerations							
		Biodiversity, flora & fauna	Population & human health	Soil & water	Air	Climate	Material assets	Culture & heritage	Landscape & townscape
<b>I. Improving road safety – adopted approaches</b>									
Speed reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traffic calming</li> <li>• 20mph zones</li> </ul>	+	+		+	+	+	+	+
Local safety schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accident remedial schemes</li> <li>• safer routes to school</li> </ul>		+		+	+			
Road safety education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• school road safety programmes</li> <li>• broader community education</li> <li>• cycle training</li> </ul>		+		+	+			
<i>Other alternative approaches not adopted</i>									
Segregation of vulnerable road users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more pedestrian guard-rails</li> <li>• more off-road cycle paths</li> </ul>	-	-		-	-	-	-	-
<b>II. Improving bus journey times and reliability – adopted approaches</b>									
Bus priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more and improved bus lanes</li> <li>• priority signalling at junctions</li> </ul>		+		+	+			
<i>Other alternative approaches not adopted</i>									
Faster bus speeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• higher speed limits</li> </ul>	-	-		-	-	-		

Overall approach	Programmes / schemes that can be groups under each approach	SEA considerations							
		Biodiversity, flora & fauna	Population & human health	Soil & water	Air	Climate	Material assets	Culture & heritage	Landscape & townscape
Fewer bus stops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>express buses skipping smaller stops</li> </ul>		-						
<b>III. Relieving traffic congestion – adopted approaches</b>									
Demand management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>traffic calming</li> <li>parking controls</li> <li>travel awareness</li> <li>congestion charging</li> </ul>	+	+		+	+		+	+
Road reallocation to greener modes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>bus priority</li> <li>cycle network expansion</li> <li>pedestrian priority</li> </ul>		+		+	+		+	+
<i>Other alternative approaches not adopted</i>									
Increased road capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>widen principal roads</li> <li>one-way systems</li> </ul>	-	-		-	-	-	-	-
Motor vehicle priority measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>remove crossing points</li> <li>remove traffic calming</li> <li>raise speed limits</li> <li>re-phase signals</li> </ul>	-	-		-	-	-	-	-

Overall approach	Programmes / schemes that can be groups under each approach	SEA considerations							
		Biodiversity, flora & fauna	Population & human health	Soil & water	Air	Climate	Material assets	Culture & heritage	Landscape & townscape
<b>IV. Improving parking and loading arrangements – adopted approaches</b>									
Balanced parking management regime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Controlled parking zones</li> <li>Fair and effective enforcement</li> </ul>		+		+	+		+	+
<i>Other alternative approaches not adopted</i>									
Unregulated parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no parking restrictions</li> </ul>		-		-	-		-	-
Removing some existing parking bays	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reallocation of parking space to buses, cyclists and pedestrians</li> </ul>		+		+	+		+	+
<b>V. Improving accessibility and social inclusion – adopted approaches</b>									
Personal accessible transport services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Taxi Card</li> <li>electric mobility scooter loan</li> </ul>		+		+	+			
Accessible public transport services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dial-a-Ride</li> <li>PlusBus hail-n-ride</li> <li>more accessible mainstream public transport</li> </ul>		+		+	+			
Improved street conditions and DDA compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pavement, junction and crossing improvements</li> <li>street clutter removal</li> </ul>		+		+	+		+	+

Overall approach	Programmes / schemes that can be groups under each approach	SEA considerations							
		Biodiversity, flora & fauna	Population & human health	Soil & water	Air	Climate	Material assets	Culture & heritage	Landscape & townscape
<b>VI. Encouraging walking – adopted approaches</b>									
Improved street conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pavement, junction and crossing improvements</li> <li>street clutter removal</li> </ul>		+		+	+	+	+	+
Speed management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20mph zones</li> <li>pedestrian priority</li> </ul>	+	+		+	+	+	+	+
Travel awareness / education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good Going promotions</li> <li>road safety education</li> </ul>		+		+	+			
Improved information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>way-finding maps and boards</li> </ul>		+					+	+
<b>VII. Encouraging cycling – adopted approaches</b>									
Improved cycle routes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>London Cycle Network</li> </ul>		+		+	+		+	+
Travel awareness / education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good Going and Bike Week promotions</li> <li>cycle training</li> <li>road safety education (cyclists and motorists)</li> </ul>		+		+	+			
All streets safer for cycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>speed management</li> <li>cycle symbols painted on-street</li> </ul>		+		+	+	+	+	+

Overall approach	Programmes / schemes that can be groups under each approach	SEA considerations							
		Biodiversity, flora & fauna	Population & human health	Soil & water	Air	Climate	Material assets	Culture & heritage	Landscape & townscape
Improved facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>cycle parking</li> <li>end-of-trip</li> <li>travel plan promotion</li> </ul>		+		+	+			
<i>Other alternative approaches not adopted</i>									
Segregated cycle-ways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>more off-street cycle paths</li> </ul>	-	+?		-?	-?	-	-?	-?
<b>VIII. Improving transport infrastructure – adopted approaches</b>									
Road maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>principal roads programme</li> <li>non-principal roads programme</li> <li>ongoing minor repair works</li> </ul>		+				+	+	+
Improved materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing sustainable recycled aggregates and paving slabs</li> </ul>	+	+		+	+	+	+	+
Co-ordination of street works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>new Traffic Management Act duties</li> </ul>		+				+	+	+
<i>Other alternative approaches not adopted</i>									
Encourage reduced cabling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shift towards satellite and microwave technologies</li> </ul>	-?	-?	+	-?	-?		+	+

## 6.2 Alternatives not adopted and why

**Table 3** assesses the methods by which the Council intends to support the MTS “priority areas” for implementation against the SEA topics; also indicating what some of the specific policies that support these aims are.

**Table 3: Explanation of Why Suggested Alternatives Were Rejected and relative Policy**

MTS Priority Area - Improving Road Safety			
LIP Approach	Programmes or schemes	Adopted, or not	Explanation
Speed Reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic Calming</li> <li>20 mph Zones</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Local Safety Schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>accident remedial schemes</li> <li>SRtS</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Road Safety Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School Road Safety</li> <li>Broader community education</li> <li>Cycle training</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Segregation of Vulnerable Road Users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More pedestrian guardrails</li> <li>More off-road cycle paths</li> </ul>	✗	<p>The introduction of off-street cycle paths could impinge upon, or restrict the amount of available space for pedestrian traffic. Council Policy TN5- 5.115(ii) of the UDP states “pedestrians are one of the most vulnerable classes of traveller (and the largest) in terms of both real and perceived threats to their safety and personal security. UDP policy TN6-5.117 states “In all circumstances the Council will have regard to guidelines...as regards; The segregation of cyclists and pedestrians, unless pedestrian activity is low.</p> <p>As the majority of the cycle network are accommodated by existing highway and public rights of way, as a means of protecting the “most vulnerable” travellers, the Council would have a presumption against opting against the dedication of the pedestrian realm over carriageway.</p>
MTS Priority Area – Improving Bus Journeys and Reliability			
Bus Priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More and improved Bus lanes</li> <li>Priority signalling at junctions</li> </ul>	✓	
Increased Bus Speeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Higher Bus Speed Limits</li> </ul>	✗	<p>It is believed that higher bus speeds will not actually improve service reliability, but instead, would be placing pedestrian and cycle traffic at greater risk of injury with little to be gained in terms of frequency and reliability.</p> <p>The Council does have policy in place TN16-5.157 which states “In developing detailed traffic calming proposals, the Council will seek in all instances to avoid use of traffic calming techniques or other measures which would impede buses, cause discomfort to bus passengers or divert traffic onto any roads</p>

			<p>which are used at present by buses where this would cause delay to bus passengers.”</p> <p>Safety considerations render this suggestion contrary to the MTS as well as the Borough's LIP.</p>
Fewer Bus Stops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Express buses</li> <li>• Removal of smaller stops</li> </ul>	✘	<p>It is not felt that an express bus would provide any improvement in convenience, reliability and/or frequency. As a result of current levels of congestion on Borough bus routes, it is highly unlikely that a bus that makes fewer stops would actually provide a more effective service for bus patrons. However, this approach might be more feasible should the Council meet traffic reduction targets, and would be considered more thoroughly in such case.</p> <p>Scheduled improvements to the LBPB might also increase the possibility of introducing an “express bus” as a means of improving reliability and frequency.</p> <p>The removal of smaller stops in no way corresponds with the Council's efforts to improve bus accessibility. It has therefore been abandoned as a potential method meeting this MTS objective.</p> <p>Also, with PTAL ratings being a strong decision making tool in terms of the allowable density of development, the reduction in the number of stops would result in a lower density built environment, a characteristic indicative of sprawl and its undesirable effects on the environment. UDP Transport and Accessibility, Policy G4, Transport and Accessibility 2. states: “ The intensity of development will be related to accessibility by public transport, with new developments expected to include measures designed to promote traffic restraint and reduction, so as to reduce congestion and air pollution and to avoid the need for increased road capacity.</p>
<b>MTS Priority Area – Relieving Congestion</b>			
Demand Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic calming</li> <li>• Parking controls</li> <li>• Travel awareness</li> <li>• Congestion charging</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Road Reallocations to Greener Modes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus Priority</li> <li>• Cycle network expansion</li> <li>• Pedestrian priority</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Increased Road Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widen principal roads</li> <li>• One-way systems</li> </ul>	✘	The widening of principal roads would be contrary to UDP policy G4: Transportation and Accessibility. Policy G4, Transport and Accessibility 2. states: “ The intensity of development will be related to accessibility by

			<p>public transport, with new developments expected to include measures designed to promote traffic restraint and reduction, so as to reduce congestion and air pollution and to avoid the need for increased road capacity."</p> <p>The provision of additional road space would undermine the Council's aims to reduce traffic congestion, as road users would enjoy more comfortable, vehicle-based travel, perpetuating all of the negative ramifications associated with this mode of transportation.</p>
Motor Vehicle Priority Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove crossing points</li> <li>• Remove traffic calming</li> <li>• Raise speed limits</li> <li>• Re-phase signalling</li> </ul>	✘	<p>Statistical evidence shows that the introduction traffic calming measures reduce KSI incidences and promote a more walkable community environment. The removal of crossing points would effectively promote social exclusion, thus fostering worsened community health (accident occurrences) and exasperated conditions related to problems with social mobility and community access. Such an action would be entirely contrary to local policy as well as Mayoral initiatives and plans.</p> <p>Policy G4: Transport and Accessibility 4. states: "The siting, design and layout of development will be required to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• easy access by disabled people;</li> <li>• safe, secure and direct access by pedestrians;</li> <li>• facilities to encourage travel to and from the development by cycling and other sustainable modes of travel and transport.</li> </ul> <p>UDP Policy TN16 – 5.156 states: "traffic calming' is a design-based approach to managing traffic in residential areas and on main roads which aims to significantly reduce the dominant impact of motor traffic in urban areas and to improve the appearance/environment of the street-scene through the introduction of features which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• regulate the flow of traffic;</li> <li>• emphasise to motorists the need to restrict their speed;</li> <li>• take full account of the particular needs of pedestrians and cyclists and persons with a disability; and</li> <li>• form and environmental improvement, for example, in their planting and landscaping content.</li> </ul>
<b>MTS Priority Area - Improving Parking and Loading Arrangements</b>			
Balanced Parking Management Regime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Controlled Parking Zones</li> <li>• Fair/Effective Enforcement</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Unregulated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No parking restrictions</li> </ul>	✘	In terms of the environment, the removal of

Parking			<p>parking restrictions would have a variety of undesirable impacts. It would promote journeys by car, as parking restrictions and lack of availability serve as deterrents for car users this increase in trip generation would have adverse impacts on air quality, noise pollution, and overall community health.</p> <p>Beside the loss of Council revenue, the deregulation of parking restrictions would also result in a variety of problems relating to freight movement and business operation, as numerous logistics and delivery conflicts would be expected. This would mean that the Council could less effectively manage parking demand and freight movement, undermining the WLFQP's aims as well as the MTS.</p> <p>UDP Policy TN15 – 5.151 states: "The importance of parking control is three-fold. Firstly, when satisfactorily enforced, it is an effective means of sharing out a limited availability of parking space. Secondly, it is a valuable means of helping to implement an element of traffic restraint policy, since the availability of a parking space at the end of a car journey is an essential element if such a journey is to be made. Thirdly, it acts as a traffic management mechanism to prevent obstructive parking.</p>
Removing some existing parking bays	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reallocation of parking bays</li> </ul>	✘	See above
<b>MTS Priority Area – Improving accessibility and social inclusion</b>			
Personal accessible Transport Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taxi Card</li> <li>• Electric mobility scooter loan</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Accessible public transport services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dial-a-Ride</li> <li>• PlusBus hail-n-ride</li> <li>• More accessible mainstream public transport</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Improved Street conditions and DDA compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pavement, junction and crossing improvements</li> <li>• Street clutter removal</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
<b>MTS Priority Area – Encouraging Walking</b>			
Improved Cycle Routes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• London Cycle Network</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Travel Awareness/ Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good Going and Bike Week</li> <li>• Cycle training</li> <li>• Road safety education (cyclists and motorists)</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
All street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speed management</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.

safer for cycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle symbols painted on streets</li> </ul>		
Improved Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle parking</li> <li>• End-of-trip</li> <li>• Travel plan promotion</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Segregated Cycle Ways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More off-street cycle paths</li> </ul>	✗	As current policy stands, the hierarchy of vulnerability applied to users of the public highway suggests that ordinarily, pedestrian dominated thoroughfares should not be impinged upon by lanes designated for alternative, less vulnerable modes of transport (i.e. cyclists). Where possible, the Council has reallocated cycle lanes from carriageways, reinforcing the Council's support of pedestrian travel.
<b>MTS Priority Area – Improving Transport Infrastructure</b>			
Road Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal roads programme</li> <li>• Non-principal roads programme</li> <li>• On-going minor repair works</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Improved Material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing sustainable recycled aggregates and paving slabs</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Co-ordination of works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Traffic Management Act responsibilities</li> </ul>	✓	Already adopted as a part of the LIP.
Encourage Reduced Cabling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shift Towards satellite and microwave technologies</li> </ul>	✗	At this point in time, too little research has been completed to justify a confident switch in signalling delivery and management. Upon the availability of more reliable data, the Council would consider making the shift, pending the presence of economic, environmental and pragmatic benefits.

## 7.0 Monitoring Measures

This section is intended to explain the means by which the Council will be monitoring the significant effects that the implementation of the LIP would most likely have on the various SEA topics, as defined by the SEA Directive and during the scoping process.

**Table 4 – Information on Monitoring measures and contact details by SEA topic.**

SEA Topic	Methods for Monitoring and Mitigation	Contact Information
Air	<p>The Council adopted its Air Quality Action Plan in 2003, which was drawn up within the framework of the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy and outlines a range of actions intended to help reduce emissions and improve air quality.</p> <p><b>Policy 30</b> – Continue to monitor air quality and make information available to all.</p>	Paul Baker – Senior Environment & Policy Officer (0208 753 3431)

	<p><b>Action 30.1</b> - Continue to monitor NO2 and PM10 levels around the Borough.</p> <p><b>Action 30.2</b> – Continue to monitor other pollutants, i.e. sulphur dioxide, benzene and PAHs.</p> <p>Monitoring of air quality is undertaken at two automatic monitoring stations, one permanently located at Hammersmith Broadway, the other mobile, with 20 diffusion tubes monitoring NO2 and five monitoring benzene at strategic locations throughout the borough, plus one site for PAH.</p>	
Water Soil	<p>The Contaminated Land Strategy details the means by which the Council intends to identify, monitor and improve lands that have been subject to contamination. This is supported by planning policy, PPG23 and the Environmental Impact Assessment Act, as well as Pollution Prevention and Control.</p> <p>Water quality within the Borough is monitored by the Environment Agency, who have been granted authority to “prevent and remedy the pollution of controlled waters” through the Water Resources Act 1991.</p>	Toby Andrews – Contaminated Land Officer (0208 753 3378)
Flora and Fauna	<p>A Bio-diversity plan for the Borough has been adopted through a partnership with the H&amp;F LA21 Forum. We have continued to work with Groundwork West London in implementing the management plan for the borough’s Local Nature Reserve at Wormwood Scrubs. A new project, Flora for Fulham, has started in partnership with Flora for Fauna and with Heritage Lottery Fund support.</p>	Steve McAndrews – Principal Officer Env. (0208 753 3329)
Biodiversity	<p>Hammersmith &amp; Fulham is a member of the London Borough Biodiversity Forum (LBBF) and the West London Alliance Biodiversity Partnership. Wildlife and habitats do not conform to administrative boundaries and neither is it intended that the BAP will be operated in isolation. Instead it is proposed that the BAP be prepared having regard to particularly vulnerable habitats and species that are of value to Hammersmith &amp; Fulham but also taking into account national, London and local priorities and targets.</p> <p>A BAP for Hammersmith &amp; Fulham will allow for the monitoring of biodiversity in the borough and help gauge the quality of life of our surroundings through the indicators provided by the health of our local habitats and species. It will also provide an opportunity</p>	London Borough Hammersmith and Fulham Emma Banthorpe 020 8753 5686

	for those living or working in the borough to become involved in protecting and enjoying their local environment and wildlife.	
Human Health (access and inclusion)	As a part of the LIP, and aided by the appointment of an access officer, the Council will be monitoring the number, or % of accessible bus stops and level footway crossings within the Borough. Additionally, the Council will be monitoring the number and rate of trips made on each mode of transport for: disabled peoples, older people and for women between the hours of 19:00 and 7:00. Data are presented quarterly as part of Best Value Performance Indicator regime	Access Officer- Mr. Peter Monk Environment Dept. (ext. 3429)  Data is also made available by TfL.
Population	Census data is held within Departments and there is at least one person in each Department trained in the use of the Census software.  For easy reference, three basic reports have been produced and are on the Council Intranet: - Key Statistics for the Borough - Key Statistics for Wards - Ethnic Groups in Hammersmith & Fulham  These reports summarize some, but not all, of the data available from the Census.  Both the Mid Year Estimates and the Borough level projections will be placed on the Intranet as they appear. These will go down to 5-year age groups but if further detail is required, Alan Brooks should be contacted. Similarly, if Ward or ethnic group projections are required, contact Alan Brooks.  Customer First - Optimising Locations / Improving Accessibility of Council Services	The Census Liaison Officer, and therefore the main source of Census data within the Council is Alan Brooks in the Environment Dept (ext 3481). He can give advice on the data.

	<p>The Customer First Channel Strategy is about the development of our Authorities medium term access plan, how will we corporately provide face to face, internet and phone access to our services. Is a one stop shop in the middle of the borough suitable in the LBHF context or is a local community centre model more appropriate? What services should we be providing via the web or phone that are not presently available and that people will actually use? How can we configure a join up of our services (across our organization structure) in a way that will make sense to our residents?</p> <p>The starting point for the strategy was that in order to make recommendations of how the authority should configure its access channels and to align these to our residents we needed to ensure that we had an in depth understanding of our customers needs, what services they use and why, identify their channel preferences and understand what changes would be most effective for them i.e. what their drivers of satisfaction are.</p>	
--	---	--