

SEA POST ADOPTION STATEMENT: LOCH LOMOND AND THE TROSSACHS NATIONAL PARK PARTNERSHIP PLAN 2018-23

SEA Post adoption statement for:

Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Partnership Plan 2018-23

Adopted on:

14 March 2018

Responsible Authority:

Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park

SEA POST ADOPTION STATEMENT INTRODUCTION

This document (referred to here as the post adoption SEA statement) has been prepared in accordance with sections 18 and 19 of the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005.

SEA POST ADOPTION STATEMENT AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS

Website:

The National Park Partnership Plan, the SEA updated Environmental Report, and SEA Post Adoption Statement are available on the National Park website at:

<https://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/partnershipplan>

Office address:

The National Park Partnership Plan, the SEA updated Environmental Report and SEA Post Adoption Statement may be inspected free of charge at the following addresses:

Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Headquarters
20 Carrochan Road
G83 8EG
Telephone: 01389722600

Times at which the documents may be inspected or a copy obtained:

Monday – Friday: 0900 – 1700

POST ADOPTION STATEMENT KEY FACTS

Name of Responsible Authority:

Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park.

Title of the Programme, Plan or Strategy:

Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Partnership Plan 2018 - 2023

Purpose of the Programme, Plan or Strategy:

A Plan must be prepared every five years for the National Park. This Plan is the overarching vision to guide how all those with a role in looking after the National Park will work together over the five year period. The principles, outcomes and priorities in the Partnership Plan are structured around the Park's three work programme areas of Conservation, Visitor Experience and Rural Development.

What prompted the Programme, Plan or Strategy:

The National Park has a duty to develop a Plan every five years under the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000.

Subject:

National Park management.

Period covered:

2018-23

Frequency of updates:

The Plan will be reviewed within 5 years with the replacement being a new Park Partnership Plan.

Area of the Programme, Plan or Strategy:

Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park boundary.

Summary of nature/content of the Programme, Plan or Strategy:

The Partnership Plan is a strategic document which contains high level principles, outcomes and priorities for all organisations that operate within the National Park. The Plan provides direction for lower tier plans such as the Local Plan, Outdoor Recreation Plan and other management plans and strategies. Some lower tier plans are subject to SEA which will provide more detail on site specific impacts.

Date adopted:

14 March 2018

Contact name and job title:

Gordon Watson
CEO
Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park Authority
Carrochan
Carrochan Road
Balloch
G83 8EG

Contents

1. Strategic Environmental Assessment process	5
2. How environmental considerations have been included in the Park Partnership Plan and how the Environmental Report has been taken into account.....	5
3. How opinions expressed during consultation have been taken into account.....	15
4. Reasons for choosing the National Park Partnership Plan as adopted, in light of other reasonable alternatives.....	19
5. Measures that are to be taken to monitor significant environmental effects of the implementation of the National Park Partnership Plan.....	19

1. Strategic Environmental Assessment process

A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has been completed for the Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Partnership Plan, as required under the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005. This has involved preparing an updated Environmental Report which summarises potential significant environmental effects likely to affect the Park as a result of implementing the Plan. The assessment process has also involved identifying appropriate mitigation measures to safeguard against any significant damage to the Park's natural heritage. The updated Environmental Report includes:

- Baseline data relating to the National Park's current state of the environment
- Links between the Partnership Plan and other relevant policies, plans and programmes
- Existing environmental problems and issues affecting the Park
- The potential significant positive and negative environmental effects as a result of implementing the Partnership Plan
- Mitigation and enhancement measures included in the Partnership Plan or other lower tier plans and projects to address any potential significant negative environmental effects
- Alternative options considered
- Partnership Plan outcomes to be monitored

A draft Environmental Report was released for public consultation with the draft Partnership Plan from April to July 2017. The consultation process involved the following:

- Preparation of a draft Environmental Report summarising the draft Park Partnership Plan
- Preparation of an updated Environmental Report summarising the assessment of the finalised Park Partnership Plan including measures that could mitigate adverse and enhance beneficial environmental effects. Both documents were made publicly available following Ministerial approval.
- Incorporation of the views of consultation respondents including Scottish Environment Protection Agency, Scottish Natural Heritage and Historic Scotland regarding the SEA process and conclusions outlined in each Environmental Report.

2. How environmental considerations have been included in the Park Partnership Plan and how the Environmental Report has been taken into account

The SEA process and Environmental Report identified that due to many of the principles, outcomes and priorities included in the Park Partnership Plan being designed to achieve sustainable development across the Park, there are likely to be many positive environmental impacts as a result of implementing the Plan. The SEA has demonstrated that significant negative environmental impacts as a result of implementing the Plan are unlikely. This is due to the Plan containing a specific conservation chapter focussed on protecting and enhancing the Park's natural heritage, and provisions included within rural development and visitor management policies which will ensure that development will not have significant negative environmental consequences in the Park. There is strong recognition in the Plan of the high ecological, economic and social value of the Park's natural resources and that these require significant protection in order to support future growth and development. As a result of the significant environmental protection element in the Plan, significant changes as a result of the SEA process were unnecessary and any uncertainties highlighted can be better considered by the relevant strategy sitting under this or at project level. Table 1 highlights the suggested changes to wording and the response. The Environment Report also included a table highlighting suggested mitigation for these lower level projects and programmes to ensure these opportunities were flagged up. Table 2 below shows these measures.

Suggested amendments to the wording of NPPP priorities

Amendments to the wording of NPPP priorities have been proposed where the priority has been assessed as: (1) having the potential to cause **minor negative effects**; or (2) having the potential to cause **minor negative effects** but where the effects remain **uncertain**.

Table 1: Proposed amendments to the wording of NPPP priorities and response

Priority	Summary of potential negative effects	Propose amendments to priority wording	NPPP response
Conservation and Land Use theme priorities			
Delivering multiple benefits from nature including natural flood management, carbon sequestration and storage, timber and food production.	Biodiversity, landscape: utilitarian approach to nature (i.e. focus on ecosystem services and multiple benefits) may mean that some habitats and services are prioritised over others where they deliver key priority benefits for people (e.g. flood management, food production, recreation).	Delivering multiple benefits from nature (including natural flood management, carbon sequestration and storage, timber and food production) whilst working to sustain and enhance overall ecosystem health.	Not accepted – considered too detailed wording for this plan and would be better considered at relevant strategy sitting under this or project level
Conserving and enhancing wildness qualities, cultural heritage, tranquillity and dark skies.	Biodiversity: preservation of a certain landscape aesthetic (linked to e.g. perceptions of wildness) may conflict with actions to improve ecosystem health, especially in upland areas (e.g. sensitive restoration and expansion of a more	Conserving and enhancing wildness qualities, cultural heritage, tranquillity and dark skies, whilst considering opportunities to diversify upland habitats where appropriate.	Not accepted – considered too detailed wording for this plan and would be better considered at relevant strategy sitting under this or project level

Priority	Summary of potential negative effects	Propose amendments to priority wording	NPPP response
	diverse mosaic of upland habitats).		
Protecting wild land qualities of upland areas.	See above.	Protecting wild land qualities of upland areas <i>whilst considering opportunities to diversify upland habitats where appropriate.</i>	Not accepted – considered too detailed wording for this plan and would be better considered at relevant strategy sitting under this or project level
Enhancing opportunities to enjoy and experience landscapes, particularly along major transport routes and around settlements.	Biodiversity: the critical issue here is the potential for removal of vegetation alongside roads / railways and subsequent loss of linear habitats which are important for ecological connectivity and landscape. This is only a minor risk but something to consider, especially in terms of cumulative effects.	Enhancing opportunities to enjoy and experience landscapes, particularly along major transport routes and around settlements, <i>in a sustainable manner.</i>	Not accepted – considered wording is unnecessary as projects in National Park should be working in a sustainable manner and project level assessment would be best place to deal with this
Supporting the implementation of Flood Risk Management Plans that cover the Park.	Biodiversity, soils, water: priority could support implementation of traditional engineered FRM approaches (e.g. embankments, flood walls) which can alter watercourse morphology, disrupting natural	Supporting the implementation of Flood Risk Management Plans that cover the Park <i>and promoting sustainable approaches where possible.</i>	Not accepted – considered wording is unnecessary as projects in National Park should be working in a sustainable manner and project level assessment would be best place to deal with this

Priority	Summary of potential negative effects	Propose amendments to priority wording	NPPP response
	fluvial processes and riparian habitats.		
Visitor Experience theme priorities			
Awareness raising of recreational and access opportunities.	Biodiversity, soils: measures that promote increased recreational usage of the Park (directly and / or indirectly) have the potential to cause increased disruption of habitats and wild species populations and contribute to footpath / soil erosion (especially in sensitive upland areas).	Awareness raising of sustainable¹ recreational and access opportunities and promoting responsible use.	Not accepted – considered wording is unnecessary as projects in National Park should be working in a sustainable manner and following Scottish Outdoor Access Code so project level assessment would be best place to deal with this
Strategic links (new and improving existing) to Scotland’s National Walking and Cycling Network.	See above.	Providing strategic links (new and improving existing) to Scotland’s National Walking and Cycling Network in a sustainable² manner.	Not accepted – considered wording is unnecessary as projects in National Park should be working in a sustainable manner and project level assessment would be best place to deal with this

¹ Use of the word “sustainable” in this context relates to the need to direct any anticipated or planned increase in usage to paths, other recreational infrastructure etc that can accommodate additional or higher levels of usage and / or ensuring that the necessary upgrades (e.g. path works) are programmed or in place already.

² Ibid.

Priority	Summary of potential negative effects	Propose amendments to priority wording	NPPP response
Maximising opportunities from significant network of long distance and local paths, focusing on West Highland Way.	See above.	Maximising sustainable ³ opportunities from significant network of long distance and local paths, focusing on West Highland Way.	Not accepted – considered unnecessary wording for this plan and would be better considered at relevant strategy sitting under this or project level
Promote water-based recreational activities on sea lochs.	Biodiversity: similar issues to those described above but in relation to marine habitats and species populations.	Promote sustainable ⁴ water-based recreational activities on sea lochs.	Not accepted – considered unnecessary wording for this plan and would be better considered at relevant strategy sitting under this or project level
Support more water based recreational facilities for public use on larger freshwater lochs.	Biodiversity: similar issues to those described above but in relation to freshwater loch habitats and species.	Support more sustainable ⁵ water based recreational facilities for public use on larger freshwater lochs.	Not accepted – considered unnecessary wording for this plan and would be better considered at relevant strategy sitting under this or project level

³ Ibid.

⁴ Use of the word “sustainable” in this context relates to the need to direct any anticipated or planned increase in usage and development of loch waterbodies (marine and freshwater) to sites and locations that can accommodate such usage.

⁵ Ibid.

Priority	Summary of potential negative effects	Propose amendments to priority wording	NPPP response
Encourage business to capitalise on growing visitor and recreation trends.	Biodiversity: measures that promote increased recreational, tourism, events etc usage of the Park (directly and / or indirectly) have the potential to cause increased disruption of habitats and wild species populations.	Encourage business to capitalise on growing visitor and recreation trends where appropriate to the Park's natural and cultural heritage.	Not accepted – considered wording is unnecessary as projects in National Park should be working in the context of the appropriate Park's natural and cultural heritage and project level assessment would be best place to deal with this
Rural Development theme priorities			
Supporting land based rural businesses to diversify / expand.	Biodiversity, soils, climatic factors (mitigation), landscape and cultural heritage: poorly planned and / or inappropriate diversification measures have the potential to negatively affect many aspects of the environment (e.g. disruption of habitats and wild species populations, soil erosion, loss / abandonment / change in use of better quality agricultural land, loss / lack of management of traditional landscape features).	Supporting land based rural businesses to diversify / expand in a sustainable⁶ manner.	Not accepted – considered unnecessary wording for this plan and would be better considered at relevant strategy sitting under this or project level

⁶ Use of the word “sustainable” in this context refers to the need for diversification strategies to be delivered in such a way that they respect, protect and enhance existing natural and cultural heritage assets.

Proposed measures to guide lower level implementation

Table 2 below outlines a range of more detailed operational and management measures, by priority, to guide lower level implementation of the priorities (e.g. via lower level plans, individual partner agreements). The intention of these more detailed measures is to address the inherent uncertainty in the assessment of the NPPP’s strategic priorities; e.g. measures to help ensure that uncertain negative effects are mitigated on implementation.

To focus effort, detailed operational / management measures have been developed for priorities that are likely to cause **major positive effects** or **minor negative effects**.

Table 2: Proposed mitigation and enhancement measures to guide lower level implementation of the NPPP 2018-2023

Note: NPPP priorities in column 1 have been listed in short form only. The potential environmental effects in column 2 have been colour coded to distinguish between positive effects (green cells) and negative effects (red cells).

Priority	Summary of potential environmental effects	Proposed mitigation and enhancement measures
<i>Conservation and Land Use theme priorities</i>		
Woodland enhancement & expansion	Biodiversity: measures will address priority woodland habitats and increase diversity of woodland mosaic across the Park.	Articulate woodland measures at the regional and farm / estate levels through the production of a Woodland Strategy and proposed Regional Land Use Partnerships (RLUPs) and whole farm / estate plans (e.g. identify existing woodland assets and enhancement opportunities, identify woodland habitat network enhancement opportunities at the regional and farm scale).
	Soils: planting in upland and riparian areas can help to manage soil erosion (e.g. planting on steep slopes, in cleuchs etc).	Careful development of farm forestry is required to ensure that the Park’s (limited) areas of better quality soils are retained for food production (e.g. arable land, better quality grazing).
	Climatic factors: carbon sequestration associated with increased above ground biomass. Contribution to ecological networks.	Where appropriate, target tree species and management regime to maximise carbon sequestration effect of new planting and existing woodlands. Ensure that new planting is directed away from areas of

Priority	Summary of potential environmental effects	Proposed mitigation and enhancement measures
	Contribution to runoff reduction (reduced likelihood of flooding).	carbon rich soils in line with yield class thresholds set out in updated guidance on forests and peatland habitats ⁷ . Align woodland expansion with Flood Risk Management Strategies and Plans.
Waterbody & peatland restoration	Biodiversity, soils, water, climatic factors, landscape: numerous positive effects associated with protection, enhancement and improved management of waterbodies and peatland habitats in the Park.	Ensure that the extent, location and condition of peatland habitats (e.g. blanket bog, lowland raised bog) across the Park is clearly defined and understood to facilitate targeted action. Clarify and articulate the support that will be provided to land managers (e.g. advice, resources) as part of their role restoring the more natural functioning of catchments in the Park. Define clear criteria for prioritising intervention (e.g. by catchment) where resources are constrained.
Enhancing opportunities to enjoy landscapes	Biodiversity: potential for removal of vegetation alongside roads / railways and subsequent loss of linear habitats which are important for ecological connectivity and landscape.	Define clear criteria for sustainability of these types of initiative (e.g. number, scale, location, nature of intervention). Describe clear design guidelines to ensure that ecological value of sites is maintained (e.g. in terms of vegetation removal, maintaining habitat and wider landscape integrity).
Collaboration on joint land / water management	Biodiversity, material assets: initiatives have the potential to result in key benefits for several priority habitats in the Park (e.g. blanket bog, wet woodland, upland woodlands).	See <i>waterbody & peatland restoration</i> .
Support for Deer Management Groups (DMGs)	Biodiversity, climatic factors, landscape: improved management of grazing / browsing pressure from deer will deliver benefits at various scales.	Define landscapes and habitats (spatially and thematically) that are particularly sensitive to deer impacts. Spatial targeting of effort / support towards areas with adverse grazing impacts (e.g. areas with high deer densities, areas with sensitive habitats). Clarify scope of funding /

⁷ <http://scotland.forestry.gov.uk/images/corporate/pdf/peatland-habitats-supplementary-guidance.pdf>

Priority	Summary of potential environmental effects	Proposed mitigation and enhancement measures
		support to implement deer management activities on the ground (e.g. culling, fencing) beyond planning / survey input.
Visitor Experience theme priorities		
Raise awareness of access & recreation opportunities	Biodiversity, soils: measures that promote increased recreational usage of the Park (directly / indirectly) have the potential to cause increased disruption of habitats and wild species populations and contribute to footpath / soil erosion (especially in sensitive upland areas).	Direct any anticipated or planned increase in usage to paths, other recreational infrastructure etc that can accommodate additional and / or higher levels of usage. Ensure that the necessary upgrades to infrastructure and other facilities (e.g. path works) are programmed or in place already to accommodate increased use.
Strategic links to NWCN	See <i>raise awareness of access & recreation opportunities</i> .	See <i>raise awareness of access & recreation opportunities</i> . Ensure continued focus on developing and enhancing the core path network and other active travel linkages between communities.
Maximise opportunities from path network	See <i>raise awareness of access & recreation opportunities</i> .	See <i>raise awareness of access & recreation opportunities</i> and <i>strategic links to NWCN</i> .
Promoting water recreation on sea lochs	Biodiversity: potential to cause increased disruption of marine habitats and wild species populations.	Define clear criteria for sustainability of these types of initiative (i.e. publicly accessible boating and recreational facilities such as piers, pontoons and moorings). Criteria should set out the desired and sustainable scope / scale of this ambition (e.g. location, number of sites, capacity of new infrastructure) with reference to environmental constraints and carrying capacity.

Priority	Summary of potential environmental effects	Proposed mitigation and enhancement measures
<p>Supporting more water recreation on large lochs</p>	<p>Biodiversity: potential to cause increased disruption of freshwater (loch) habitats and wild species populations.</p>	<p>Define clear criteria for sustainability of these types of initiative (i.e. publicly accessible boating and recreational facilities, provision of facilities, services, locations etc to encourage established / emerging water based recreation, developing water bus networks). Criteria should set out the desired and sustainable scope / scale of this ambition (e.g. location, number of sites, capacity of new infrastructure, anticipated number of additional waterbus routes / services) with reference to environmental constraints and carrying capacity.</p>
<p>Encourage businesses to capitalise on trends</p>	<p>Biodiversity: measures that promote increased recreational, tourism, events etc usage of the Park (directly and / or indirectly) have the potential to cause increased disruption of habitats and wild species populations.</p>	<p>Define clear criteria for sustainability of these types of event to be applied on a case-by-case basis (with appropriate flexibility). Criteria should set out the desired and sustainable / scope of this ambition for different trends and growth markets (e.g. walking, cycling and canoeing, food and drink, business tourism). Criteria should be flexible enough to accommodate new trends (e.g. large scale sporting events).</p>

3. How opinions expressed during consultation have been taken into account

The consultation processes held for the draft Park Partnership Plan and Environmental Report raised few issues regarding the environmental assessment, aside from those identified by the three Consultation Authorities of Scottish Natural Heritage, SEPA and Historic Scotland. **Table 3** below summarises the comments received and how they were taken into account.

Table 3: Consultation Authority responses to draft Environmental Report

SEPA

Comment	How comment has been taken into account in the Environmental Report
<p>We have considered the ER and are generally satisfied that that an adequate assessment of the National Park Partnership Plan (NPPP) has been carried out. We welcome the inclusion of Appendix 1 within the ER which summarises the comments from the consultation authorities at scoping stage and how these were taken into consideration in the assessment</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Policy Context We are largely satisfied that a comprehensive review has been undertaken of the key plans, programmes and strategies (PPS) relevant to the NPPP in preparation of the ER. We welcome the inclusion of Appendix 2 which lists these with the relationship between the NPPP and PPS. However, we note that reference to the Forth Flood Risk Management Strategy has been omitted from the table. We also consider, with reference to material assets, that consideration should have been given to the Zero Waste Plan (published in 2009).</p>	<p>Amendment completed.</p>
<p>Baseline and Key Issues The ER provides a good summary of the baseline data and key issues relevant to aspects of the environment that we have an interest in. We welcome the emphasis on peatland restoration in the summary of key environmental issues however it is not apparent that baseline data on this issue, needed to assess and monitor effects, has been included in Appendix 3. State of Scotland's Soil Report and Scotland's Soils Website may be useful sources of information on this.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>

<p>Likewise, we welcome the identification of ‘sustainable infrastructure’ as a key issue but little information on this is included within the baseline data. Reference could be made to Scottish Water’s Strategic Asset Capacity and Development Plan for detail on water and waste water comment treatment capacity. Further sources of potential baseline information and key issues on topics in our remit are available within our SEA topic guidance on our website.</p>	
<p>We are satisfied with the SEA objectives and assessment criteria as set out in the SEA Framework. However, we would highlight with reference to Objective 5 that the water environment includes rivers, lochs, transitional waters (estuaries), coastal waters, groundwater and wetlands.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p>Compatibility Assessment (NPPP Outcomes) We welcome the inclusion of the assessment of compatibility of the NPPP outcomes with the SEA objectives. However, as acknowledged within the ER there is a lack of detail on how the NPPP Outcomes and Priorities will be delivered. As such there is some uncertainty around the extent of activities proposed to take forward the plan. As discussed below, it will be necessary to give further consideration to how these activities are assessed (i.e. at project level) as NPPP is implemented.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p>Assessment of Alternatives We are satisfied with the alternatives, and the assessment of these, set out in Section 7 of the ER. The SWOT analysis comparing the extant plan with the NPPP was a particularly useful way to examine this issue.</p>	<p>Comment noted and welcomed.</p>
<p>Assessment of Proposed Plan (NPPP Priorities) Whilst we acknowledge that there are a large number of Priorities in the plan it would have been useful to include a list of these in the assessment (perhaps as an appendix) with an associated number for reference purposes. It is apparent that changes have been made to the NPPP since the assessment was undertaken and it is difficult to understand whether new priorities have been added, if some have been combined or whether these have been changed as a result of the SEA. Notwithstanding this observation, we note that a number of positive effects have been predicted</p>	<p>Amendment completed.</p>

for the environmental topics in our remit which we welcome.	
A limited number of minor negative and mixed effects are also predicted, for example with reference to delivery of Flood Risk Management plans, promoting recreational use of water and across a range of Rural Development Priorities. As the plan is strategic in nature we agree that many of the effects predicted depend on how the aspirations of NPPP are implemented. We therefore welcome the recommendations, as set out in Table 8.4, that priorities are amended to better reflect the need to manage the activities in a sustainable manner. We also support the operational and management measures set out in Table 8.5 which focusses on increasing the certainty around the intended scope and scale of proposed activities to deliver priorities. The Responsible Authority may wish to consider how to take forward these recommendations to project level.	Amendment completed.
Monitoring We welcome the monitoring proposals set out in Section 9 of the ER. We recommend reference is made to our SEA guidance documents available on our website for further options and indicators which will support the monitoring of the environmental effects of the plan.	Comment noted.

Scottish Natural Heritage

Comment	How comment has been taken into account in the Environmental Report
The ER addresses the concerns and comments outlined in our response to the SEA Scoping Report of 21 April 2016. We are happy with the scope and comprehensiveness of the ER and we agree with the conclusions you have made regarding the strong environmental focus of the draft National Park Partnership Plan (NPPP), and the wider role of the Park Authority.	Comment noted and welcomed
The environmental baseline is comprehensive and covers all relevant natural heritage issues, concerns and trends. The NPPP is the overarching strategic document that sets out the visions for the National Park over the next five years, and as such we agree with the assessment the likely significant effects of the NPPP against the SEA objectives.	Comment noted.
You have identified some minor areas of potential environmental risk associated with the NPPP that relate to priorities within the Plan's	Comment noted

Visitor Experience and Rural Development themes. We are content with the mitigation you have outlined, namely amendments to the wording of the NPPP as well as more detailed operational and management recommendations to support the implementation of the NPPP.	
The proposed monitoring measures robust. We note that the monitoring arrangements have not been fully developed and that more detail, including clear responsibilities for monitoring will be forthcoming in the SEA post-adoption statement. We would welcome inclusion in this process.	Comment noted

Historic Scotland

Comment	How comment has been taken into account in the Environmental Report
The assessment is clearly presented and we are broadly content with the findings in relation to the historic environment, subject to the following comments:	Comment noted and welcomed.
<i>Unknown effects</i> We note that you have identified that for many aspects of the Plan, likely effects on the historic environment are unknown. We recommend that you consider how implementation of those elements of the Plan where effects are unknown can be monitored to ensure that unforeseen adverse effects can be identified and mitigated.	Comment noted monitoring plan established.
<i>Table 9.1: Proposed monitoring of key significant effects identified in the assessment</i> You have identified significant positive effects for the historic environment as a result of built and historic environment enhancements, however, these effects and monitoring measures which relate to them have not been included in Table 9.1. We recommend that you include monitoring indicators to address this.	Comment noted monitoring plan established

4. Reasons for choosing the National Park Partnership Plan as adopted, in light of other reasonable alternatives

Refer to Section 7.3, page 33 of the Updated Environmental Report for a summary of alternative options considered and reasons for why they were not taken forward as preferred options.

5. Measures that are to be taken to monitor significant environmental effects of the implementation of the National Park Partnership Plan

A monitoring framework has been developed for the Partnership Plan. The framework involves identifying indicators of success and will incorporate the requirements for SEA monitoring. **Table 4** below lists the monitoring framework for NPPP.

Table 4: Monitoring Framework for NPPP

National Park Partnership Plan 2018-23 Indicators and Targets			
Indicator of Success		Target (s)	Frequency of data availability
1	Area of new woodland	2,000 hectares of woodland expansion by 2023	Annual
2	Area and condition of restored peatland	2,000 hectares of restored peatland by 2023	Annual
3	Percentage of designated sites in favourable condition	Increase from 2017 baseline of 76% of designated site features to 80% by 2023	Annual
4	Percentage of water bodies achieving at least good ecological condition	Increase from 2016 baseline of 44% to 59% by 2023	Annual
5	Proportion of people travelling to and around the National Park by public or active transport	Reduce proportion arriving by car from 2015/16 Visitor Survey baseline of 85%	On production of Visitor Survey
		Reduce proportion exploring by car from 2015/16 Visitor Survey baseline of 62%	

National Park Partnership Plan 2018-23 Indicators and Targets			
Indicator of Success		Target (s)	Frequency of data availability
		Increase proportion exploring by foot, water and bike from the from 2015/16 Visitor Survey	
6	Proportion of people taking part in active recreation	Increase from 2015/16 Visitor Survey baseline of 24% for active sport	On production of Visitor Survey
		Increase from 2015/16 Visitor Survey baseline of 49% for low level walking	
7	Overall value of the visitor economy	Increase from 2016 STEAM baseline of £340m by 2023	Annual
8	Reported public experience of the Park's settlements and landscapes	Increase in proportion of people reporting a good quality experience	On production of Visitor Survey
9	Number of volunteers and volunteer hours	Increase by 20% [the number of volunteers] from the 2017/18 baseline by 2023	Annual
		Increase by 20% [the number of volunteer hours] from the 2017/18 baseline by 2023	
10	Number of young people having an outdoor learning experience in the National Park	At least 2500 young people per year over the Plan period	Annual
11	Number of new homes built and proportion of affordable homes	375 homes over the Plan period	Annual
		minimum of 25% of new homes built	

National Park Partnership Plan 2018-23 Indicators and Targets			
Indicator of Success		Target (s)	Frequency of data availability
		being affordable	
12	Number of projects delivering well-designed sustainable places	Delivery in 3 communities per year of the Plan	Annual
13	Number of community-identified projects delivered	Delivery of 3 projects per Community Action Plan by 2023	Annual
14	Number of new skills development opportunities from projects in the National Park	Increase opportunities in the National Park over the Plan period	Annual