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The partnership Transport for South Hampshire was established last year as a delivery agency for the South Hampshire sub-region, bringing together the local transport authorities, the transport operators, business interests and government agencies to deliver change.

We all know that the transport situation in South Hampshire, with its two vibrant cities of Southampton and Portsmouth, its successful ports and airport and its highly mobile population is under pressure. Our roads are congested at peak times, our railway services are witnessing continuing growth and our bus services are getting progressively less attractive because of the relentless pressure for roadspace from other vehicles.

As part of the move to create a more vibrant economy, development is planned, as part of the South East Plan covering the period to the year 2026. With this development comes even greater demand for access to employment, school, shopping and other facilities. With sensible planning we can reduce the impact that this will have on our transport networks. But it will demand a step change in our approach to mobility and our rate of investment.

The local authorities involved in Transport for South Hampshire have commissioned a number of technical studies to try and address this difficult trend and maintain a decent quality of life and mobility for its residents. Based on the partnership’s strategy of Reduce, Manage and Invest, the studies have identified a host of schemes and interventions that need urgent investigation and prioritisation, if we are to avoid our transport networks grinding to a halt.

This Statement ‘Towards Delivery’ outlines the approach by Transport for South Hampshire by describing the strategy and the list of schemes and interventions that will need funding from a variety of sources, if we are to address the challenges of delivering growth without gridlock.

Councillor Mel Kendal

Chairman,

Transport for South Hampshire
Executive Summary

Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH) is the transport delivery agency for the South Hampshire sub-region and covers Portsmouth, Southampton and part of Hampshire. This TfSH Statement sets out issues and priorities for the area in the context of planned growth. As the economy expands, demand for travel will increase, adding pressures to the existing transport networks. The new housing and employment for the area included in the South East Plan mean that the economic vitality and growth will be accompanied by more travel - much of it could be by car - with the consequent impacts on the environment. At the same time, growth in levels of activity at the international gateways – Southampton International Airport and the ports of Portsmouth and Southampton – mean that transport issues must be addressed now.

This is a significant challenge for transport. A strategy has been devised which considers how and when journeys are made and how they could be dealt with in the future. There are three main strands of the strategy: Reduce-Manage-Invest. All can work together to enable the planned growth and to deliver the development sites identified.

Studies have been commissioned to investigate the problems and potential solutions in greater depth. Initially proposed solutions were considered in the context of the Regional Funding Allocation (RFA), a source of funding for schemes which facilitate development. This considered options for investment in transport infrastructure, road and rail. A list of schemes was considered and prioritised in light of the limited funding available through the RFA and the need to focus on those proposals that best meet regional and sub-regional objectives.

Along with this investment, the strategy includes initiatives to reduce the need to travel including planning policies and careful design of development sites, significant public transport improvements and the scope to support the sustainable modes of walking and cycling. The ‘Reduce’ element also considers better ways of providing car parking and discouraging the use of cars where appropriate. In addition, the ‘Manage’ element of the strategy addresses means of making better use of existing networks such as changing the way in which motorways and trunk roads are used, improving bus services, introducing park and ride sites and making improvements that allow more trains to operate. Technology applications such as management and information systems and smart cards have also been considered. Alongside Reduce and Manage measures, the ‘Invest’ infrastructure schemes can be delivered.

Two Strategic Development Areas (SDAs) are designated at North/North East Hedge End and North Fareham. These are large housing sites with associated employment and other activities which will affect travel patterns in their respective areas and beyond. For these SDAs to be successful in avoiding large scale car dependency, a range of measures is needed to allow sustainable modes to be successful while managing car movements. This will require concerted efforts to minimize the negative impacts of additional traffic on local communities. The planned South Hampshire Strategic Employment Zone (SHSEZ) at Eastleigh will also affect movements in the area.

Therefore this Statement brings together the main themes arising from investigations to date and attempts to offer transport solutions that can be adopted by all the agencies involved and the wider community across South Hampshire.
1 Purpose

1.1 Purpose of This Statement

1.1.1 This Statement is intended to inform the community and stakeholders of the transport strategy for South Hampshire by outlining the recommendations of recent technical investigations and setting out the priorities which should form the basis for an implementation plan in the context of the growth planned for South Hampshire.

Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH)

1.1.2 The overall framework for TfSH is provided by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) (see Chapter 3) which has been formed to deliver the requirements of the South East Plan. South Hampshire has over 87% of people both living and working within the area; over 60% of commuters both live and work in the same district. Hence the primary focus within the sub-region is to offer alternatives to car use, since journeys are likely to be relatively short, particularly journeys to work.

1.1.3 TfSH is PUSH’s partner in delivering transport solutions to support the economic and housing growth in the sub-region, as well as addressing the existing transport requirements. It is the delivery agent for sub-regional transport projects, programme, policies and operational matters. TfSH is governed by a Joint Committee of the three strategic transport authorities (Portsmouth City Council, Southampton City Council and Hampshire County Council), working in partnership with key stakeholders including train and bus operators, Network Rail, Highways Agency and port and airport authorities. It also works closely with local planning authorities, major employers, large house builders, Chambers of Commerce, Government agencies and other bodies.

1.1.4 The Implementation Plan for the South East Plan contained a long list of transport interventions and schemes across South Hampshire that would require investment to meet the needs of the Plan. Priority for funding can only be justified on the basis of affordability and a robust evidence case. As a consequence, consultants were engaged in 2007 to review the list and identify the most feasible schemes, based upon the regional criteria, that would stand the best chance of securing the support of the Regional Funding Allocation from 2016 onwards. The Statement identifies these schemes and also those which require further justification to secure funding support from other sources.

1.2 Gaining Support and Acceptance

1.2.1 Within the South East region, South Hampshire is a major growth area and considerable development is planned to maintain and expand the economy and consequently increase transport demands. To respond to this, TfSH needs to demonstrate that a coherent and deliverable strategy is in place to provide transport that allows the economy to flourish. This supports the concept of South Hampshire as a strong sub-region, linked with but separate from the Greater London area, with a vital role to play in southern England. Good transport is essential to maintain and enhance this role of the sub-region and its role as a major international gateway to the UK (Portsmouth Port, Southampton Port and Southampton International Airport).
1.2.2 This requires several strands to come together:

- Full participation in decision-making by TfSH and PUSH representatives;
- Securing available funding sources and how resources can be deployed to best effect;
- Integration with Local Development Frameworks, ensuring that land use and transport planning are fully integrated; and
- Effective partnership working involving stakeholders, transport providers and the business community.
2 What are the Challenges?

2.1 Future Challenges

2.1.1 A variety of challenges faces South Hampshire:

- The development predicted for the area;
- Continued traffic growth, congestion and environmental degradation associated with it;
- The increasing emphasis on environmental protection;
- The carbon footprint implications of future mobility; and
- Other concerns related to climate change and lifestyles.

2.2 Development Growth Expectations

2.2.1 The growth agenda to 2026 requires the creation of over 80,000 new dwellings and associated employment to revitalise South Hampshire, reflecting the area’s important role within the economy of the South East region. Specifically, the fact that the sub-region has two major ports and an international airport emphasises the vital role of South Hampshire within the national economy and the significance of these international gateways.

2.2.2 Against this requirement for growth, demand for mobility continues to increase and considerable pressures are being exerted on our transport systems. Roads are becoming busier, congestion on the trunk road network becoming a daily occurrence, while demand for rail travel has increased beyond expectations. At the same time, plans for expanded activity at Southampton International Airport and very large growth in port activity, particularly at Southampton, are compounding the challenges. Transport solutions are needed that result in reliable journeys for both passengers and freight, but which also attempt to balance the diverse current and future demands against economic and environmental objectives.

2.2.3 In planning for transport, it is important to understand that many proposals have a long lead time for implementation and usually take many years to develop, design and deliver. Careful programming and prioritisation is needed to align proposals with the planning system and with funding availability.

2.2.4 Much of the new development – around 80% - will take place in the established urban areas. The remaining 20% will be accommodated in the Strategic Development Areas at North/North East Hedge End and North Fareham plus the new employment focus at the South Hampshire Strategic Employment Zone at Eastleigh.

2.2.5 An indication of the scale and location of development is shown in Appendix A. Continued partnership working will be required to deliver these developments with the full participation of transport providers, business, organisations and relevant individuals.

2.3 Urban Traffic Levels

2.3.1 In Southampton, indications are that peak period car use in 2006/07 was lower than in 2002-04 and that peak and off-peak public transport use increased. DfT figures show a lower
increase in traffic mileage than the national average and a reduction in peak period traffic flows of 4.5%. This has been achieved without any adverse effect on the city’s economy.

2.3.2 An indication of emerging travel patterns is congestion on Saturdays, especially when cruise ships arrive in Southampton and football matches take place. Similarly, large sporting and maritime events in Portsmouth need careful management. Inter-urban movements, however, on the sub-region’s motorway network reflect continuing growth year on year.

2.3.3 Management of the road network is important, building on the pioneering applications of ROMANSE with Urban Traffic Control systems, CCTV and real time information systems.

2.4 Wider Issues

2.4.1 The Stern Review\(^1\) set out the stark prospects for the future resulting from irreversible climate change if no action is taken to reduce emissions now. Transport accounts for 14% of emissions of greenhouse gases. The report stated that reducing the expected impacts of climate change is both highly desirable and feasible and could be achieved through:

- Carbon pricing;
- Technology policy; and
- The removal of barriers to behavioural change.

2.4.2 Climate change is a global concern but at a more local level, measures can be put in place that challenge the accepted view that continuing with current behaviour is sustainable. Thus transport initiatives in South Hampshire need to consider new ways of thinking.

2.4.3 The Government has recently published a discussion paper ‘Towards a Sustainable Transport System’. This pulls together the Stern Review with its challenge to cut emissions of CO\(_2\) and the Eddington Report\(^2\) with its links between transport and economic vitality. It is intended to guide future transport investment decisions. The document proposes five goals, which are entirely consistent with the aspirations of TfSH, to:

- maximise economic competitiveness and productivity through making the best use of existing networks, targeting infrastructure investment, particularly to international gateways and pinch points and prioritising the delivery chain;
- address the causes of climate change;
- protect safety, security and health;
- improve quality of life; and
- promote greater equality of opportunity.

---

\(^1\) HM Treasury (October 2006) *Stern Review: the economics of climate change.*

\(^2\) HM Treasury (December 2006) *The Eddington Transport Study.*
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3 Taking Forward the Sub-Regional Strategy

3.1 An Objective - and Evidence - Based Approach

3.1.1 The transport strategy for South Hampshire addresses the requirements for the region as a whole as set out in the South East Plan. Any strategy across South Hampshire must address agreed objectives and be evidence-based, drawing on known facts and measurable outputs to substantiate and justify proposed changes. The evidence includes demographic data from Census and other sources, known land use changes, road traffic data, public transport data (rail, bus, ferry levels of use), changing travel patterns and the activity deriving from the international gateways (passenger and freight traffic at the ports and Southampton International Airport).

3.2 Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH)

3.2.1 PUSH is a voluntary partnership to undertake spatial planning and includes elected Members and officers of the eleven local authorities in South Hampshire. Since its establishment in 2004, PUSH has been actively developing a series of spatial strategies and background documents to influence the draft South East Plan (the Regional Spatial Strategy). This approach addresses the requirement for South Hampshire to accommodate over 80,000 new dwellings and additional employment floorspace. Central to the PUSH strategy is intensification of activity within the established urban areas, supported by two Strategic Development Areas (SDAs) and Economic Zones as a means of delivering the South East Plan. It is recognised that SDAs will not contribute new housing numbers until 2016 and therefore investment proposals need to reflect that timescale through prioritising development on existing brownfield and urban sites.

3.2.2 On transport and commuting, PUSH supports a strategy to secure a reduction in commuting distances, particularly by car. The location of a wide range of new homes close to major centres of employment, together with the location of new employment opportunities close to major centres of population and the provision of quality public transport alternatives can help to deliver this aim.

3.3 PUSH Objectives

3.3.1 South Hampshire’s economic performance is mixed (see Appendix B). Gross Value Added (GVA) per head of population is lower overall than the regional average and noticeably lower in Gosport, Havant, New Forest and East Hampshire. Overall, the economic performance of South Hampshire does not reflect the perception of an affluent South East region.

3.3.2 The PUSH vision is for South Hampshire to be a better place for everyone who lives, works and spends their leisure time in the area. The vision will be achieved by delivering a strategy for economic-led growth over the twenty years to 2026, making South Hampshire more prosperous, attractive and sustainable and offering a better quality of life. The detailed objectives and vision are set out in the PUSH Business Plan.
3.3.3 The principle PUSH objective is to stimulate economic regeneration (measured by an uplift in Gross Value Added from 2.7% to 3.5% per annum 2006-2026), supported by development with a sustainable approach that ensures an enhanced quality of life with appropriate and adequate infrastructure.

3.4 Starting Points

3.4.1 The transport strategy is not starting from scratch. Transport policy has responded over recent years according to changing requirements and Government guidance and the stronger emphasis being placed on the integration of land use and transport planning. Two main strands provide a starting point for the sub-region, the TfSH objectives and the Solent Transport Strategy, incorporated into the Local Transport Plans for the area.

TfSH Vision

3.4.2 The TfSH vision is to address the transport challenges in meeting the planned economic growth whilst maintaining the high quality of life for all in a way that is sustainable in the long term – improved economic prosperity without harm to the environment.

3.4.3 TfSH’s key objectives include:

- The development and delivery of sub-regional transport policies, interventions and systems;
- Support for the economic competitiveness of the South Hampshire sub-region;
- Meeting the sub-region’s future transport needs in the most sustainable way;
- Supporting a good quality of life both now and in the future;
- Pursuing and securing funding for scheme delivery; and
- Providing strategic transport advice to PUSH.

The Transport Strategy

3.4.4 The transport strategy was adopted by the three strategic transport authorities in recognition of the need to work across administrative boundaries and was included in the Portsmouth, Southampton and Hampshire Local Transport Plans (LTPs). Three principles underpin the transport strategy:

- **Reduce**: wherever practicable and relevant, to reduce the need to travel and journey lengths;
- **Manage**: to make the best use of existing infrastructure across all modes and introduce measures to influence travel choices;
- **Invest**: to provide additional infrastructure in the most cost-effective way.

3.4.5 This approach is described as **Reduce-Manage-Invest** and is central to the approach taken to develop the schemes for regional transport investment. All three principles need to be advanced at the same time to ensure that the transport networks are fit for purpose.
3.4.6 Whilst in terms of relative importance and of a policy development process these could be viewed as sequential, there are significant pragmatic reasons why all three need to move towards implementation in parallel. The Reduce and Manage elements require funding justified on robust evidence just as much as the Invest element, either as capital or revenue funding. Procurement of some Reduce elements could be as long as some of the Invest options. Also, Reduce and Manage will need to be continued right through the process even with Invest delivering improvements.

3.4.7 This reduce-manage-invest approach is consistent with the approach outlined in the Government’s recently published discussion paper ‘Towards a Sustainable Transport System’.

Local Transport Plans

3.4.8 The LTP visions can be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTP Vision</th>
<th>Shared Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We want to achieve...</td>
<td>... a transport strategy that enhances quality of life and economic prosperity by connecting people, communities, employment, goods, services and amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will do this...</td>
<td>... by the effective provision, co-ordination and management of transport networks for all modes of transport and for all transport users, minimising delays and disruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We want to minimize...</td>
<td>... the number of casualties and fatalities caused by the operation of the transport networks, with a particular emphasis on the safety of vulnerable groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We want to protect...</td>
<td>... the people, communities and environments that are affected adversely by poor air quality, where transport can be a significant causal factor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Regional Funding Allocation

3.5.1 The Regional Funding Allocation (RFA) is a process managed at a regional level that determines which interventions will be funded from the resources available. It requires authorities to submit proposals that meet regional criteria including their contribution to enabling access to the sub-region, enabling strategic development and maintaining economic competitiveness. An initial package of schemes was submitted for the 2006 RFA, which included 49 schemes within four packages, addressing access issues to Portsmouth and Southampton.

3.5.2 The focus has been to identify schemes which help to deliver housing and employment development targets and hence consideration of these interventions has required a selective
3.5.3 The RFA is currently fully committed until 2016 and, in 2007, DfT indicated that the RFA list would need to be refreshed in the light of changing circumstances and the determination of the South East Plan for the period beyond 2016. It was made clear that although some schemes would meet the RFA criteria, others would not and in any case, RFA funding represented only a small proportion of that which will be required; RFA resources are very limited and few schemes will be taken forward for funding through this channel. Priority would be given to interventions that directly facilitate development and meet the objectives of the South East Plan.

3.5.4 While the Regional Funding Allocation is not the only source of transport funding, and indeed transport funding is likely to change in the relatively near future, it is the main source of funding for regional schemes at present. Schemes considered to be of national importance are not funded from the RFA but are likely to require the approval of the Regional Transport Board (RTB) if they are to be successful.

3.5.5 Prioritisation of the interventions does not mean that schemes are ranked lower than others are no longer seen as part of the wider transport strategy and contributing to the travel needs of the sub-region. They are deemed unlikely to meet SEERA’s narrowly defined funding objectives such as specific policy compliance and may therefore need to seek funding from other sources, or could be considered for funding beyond 2016. Interventions that have been given the highest priority are those that comply most closely with the Reduce-Manage-Invest strategy (see sections 4, 5, and 6). The prioritisation methodology has sought to follow the SEERA approach to assessment with three broad factors being considered:

- Compliance with the South East Plan;
- Value for money; and
- Deliverability.

3.5.6 The initial assessment in the consultant studies focused on SEERA’s key questions regarding **compliance with the South East Plan**:

- Does the scheme enable housing development? (RFA form Question 1);
- Does the scheme promote access to employment? (RFA form Question 2);
- Does the scheme increase non-car accessibility? (RFA form Question 3); and
- Does the scheme contribute to journey reliability? (RFA form Question 8).

3.5.7 Investment schemes were scored on each factor and given an overall rating of high, medium or low.

3.5.8 Economic performance of schemes is normally indicated by a benefit/cost ratio (BCR) but these were not available for many proposed interventions. Hence **value for money** considered the following factors:

- What benefits are generated by the scheme?
- Who enjoys these benefits?
What is the geographical impact of the scheme (local, area or sub-regional)? and
What is scale of benefit in terms of numbers affected and degree of benefit?

3.5.9 Finally, schemes were assessed on deliverability:

- Cost;
- Potential availability of third party funding;
- Risk; and
- Degree of inter-dependence with other schemes.

3.5.10 The list of schemes to be considered in more detail requires further analysis using a range of data sources, modelling tools and economic appraisal based on the information available and consultation with the appropriate stakeholders.

3.5.11 This approach identified which interventions could be taken forward through the RFA process. SEERA recommended that packages of schemes be assembled, which were capable of further evaluation both as discrete components and, together, as combined packages.
4 Reduce

4.1 Reducing the Need to Travel

4.1.1 Reducing the demand for travel, particularly for journeys made by car, is fundamental to the wider strategy. There has been considerable growth in travel demand in recent years linked with wider car ownership, economic growth with lower car costs, the dispersal of work locations relative to where people live, expanded leisure opportunities and many other factors. The inevitable consequence has been that traffic congestion is becoming more common and widespread with detrimental effects on essential movements of people and goods and less reliable journeys.

4.1.2 Recent initiatives have shown how ‘smarter choices’ could be applied beneficially. ‘Smarter choices’ cover a range of measures including the promotion of walking and cycling as healthy alternatives to car use, individualised marketing of public transport services and other lifestyle changes linked with travel planning initiatives. Several demonstration towns have been selected and particular approaches have been taken to test how effective targeted initiatives across a wide area could be. The experience of the demonstration towns is discussed here in the South Hampshire context.

4.2 Sustainable Demonstration Towns

4.2.1 In 2004, three towns (Worcester, Darlington and Peterborough) were selected by DfT to demonstrate the effect of ‘smarter choices’ with interventions in a selected area over a sustained period to 2009.

4.2.2 Each town set out a strategy to introduce a variety of ‘hard’ measures (aimed at worsening the cost or convenience of car use) and ‘soft’ measures (aimed at improving alternative modes) to promote walking, cycling and bus use. Improved public transport and personalised travel planning have also featured in the projects. For more details see Appendix D.

4.2.3 In Darlington the focus has been to provide participants of the study with high quality travel information, education and training and a marketing strategy, inspiring individuals to change their travel behaviour. Darlington has used individualised marketing to engage with residents, visiting every household, offering travel information and asking how their experience of travel could be improved. Headline results show that even the non-targeted population i.e. those who have been exposed only to general marketing, are changing their travel habits. Overall, car trips have decreased by 6.6% and walking and cycling have increased by 8.3% and 54% respectively.

4.2.4 Similarly, in Peterborough and Worcester, personalised marketing, supported by targeted improvements in sustainable modes have influenced peoples’ perceptions and behaviour, producing growth in the non-car travel.
Implications for South Hampshire

4.2.5 The demonstration projects indicate that long term commitment will be a key factor for success. South Hampshire’s travel patterns are complex due to the polycentric nature of the sub-region and comparisons with free-standing and relatively self-contained towns are difficult. As noted in Peterborough, infrastructure and public transport changes have strongly supported the travel planning initiatives and without these in place, the impacts would be reduced. This emphasises the close links between the Reduce, Manage and Invest elements of the South Hampshire strategy. To be effective, sustained, detailed travel planning measures are necessary, although for South Hampshire, such a strong shift away from car use is unlikely to be achieved by smarter choices alone.

4.2.6 It would appear that with suitable funding, worthwhile shifts towards sustainable modes can be accomplished within a wider strategy that involves improving infrastructure and public transport services. A combined approach with both travel planning and transport improvements must be the way forward for South Hampshire, particularly to overcome the dominance of car travel across the area. In particular, the strong presence of cycling in Portsmouth and Gosport provides a good starting point while planned improvements in bus services throughout the area would provide an attractive alternative to car use.

4.2.7 The Strategic Development Areas at North/North East Hedge End and North Fareham should benefit from the application of smarter choice initiatives with a strong emphasis on walking and cycling within the development sites and to the adjacent urban areas and transport interchanges. Designing the sites so that bus services play a strong role is also very important. The South Hampshire Strategic Employment Zone at Eastleigh should also demonstrate how sustainable modes can be designed-in.

4.3 Travel Planning

4.3.1 Travel planning is an emerging field through which travel behaviour can be influenced and a shift away from car use generated. Travel plans for workplaces, schools and other applications are becoming more widespread and involve identifying alternatives to car use that can be adopted by individuals on a regular basis. For workplaces, this may mean restricting and/or charging for car parking and encouraging walking and cycling together with the promotion of bus and rail use. Car sharing can also feature with a managed database to link potential car sharers within one or more businesses. In some cases workplace travel plans involve financial incentives or penalties depending on the means of travel.

Workplace Travel Plans

4.3.2 In Portsmouth, 96 businesses have signed up with the Signpost Travel Forum and 15 workplace travel plans have been agreed with others in preparation. In Southampton, 29% of the city’s workforce is covered by a travel plan including Southampton University, the General Hospital and the City Council. 13% of the Hampshire workforce is subject to travel plans. All three authorities have combined to invest in software that monitors travel plans.

4.3.3 Portsmouth City Council as a major employer has introduced a series of measures to encourage its staff to travel sustainably including the following measures:

- the provision of secure cycle parking;
- payments for cycling for business use;
- making pool cycles available;
- providing loans for cycle purchase;
- providing pool cars including an electric car;
- events including the Commuter Challenge (involving 982 people from 32 organisations to save 18,378 car miles in total) and Bike to Work Day attracting 13 large employers;
- interest-free loans for bus tickets and considering a salary sacrifice scheme; and
- interest-free loans for rail tickets, intended to attract a discount from operators.

4.3.4 Similar measures are available for employees of Southampton City Council through its adoption of the Improvement Plan for the Use of Transport. Hampshire County Council has adopted a Corporate Travel Strategy, supporting sustainable travel for its staff with discounted train tickets, bus season tickets and car sharing initiatives.

4.3.5 The eHampshire Partnership and the Smart-Commute Week sponsors (including the County Council, Stagecoach in Hampshire and large employers) are among those who aim to promote alternatives to car use.

4.3.6 A car club has been established at Gunwharf Quays with others planned for Admiral Gate and further residential development at Fratton and an on-street facility is planned for Southsea. Southampton City Council is a member of a car club that is now established in the city.

4.3.7 Three local Portsmouth companies have offered match funding for measures to support car sharing and active modes travel.

4.3.8 A Business Improvement District has been established at Segensworth and Whiteley (M27 Junction 9) and Broadmarsh (close to the A27(T) in Havant), which will also be the subject of smarter choice initiatives, involving the Highways Agency to reduce the impact of additional traffic on the trunk road network.

4.3.9 Promotion of an Active Travel Plan in Southampton involving Sport England, the NHS Primary Car Trust and Sustrans is intended to increase walking and cycling. This is achieving good results with a 215% increase in cycling between 2004/05 and 2006/07.

**School Travel Plans**

4.3.10 In Portsmouth, 54 school travel plans have been agreed out of 75 schools. In Southampton, all the city’s schools have travel plans in place. Of the 600 schools across Hampshire, the County Council is working with 90% on travel initiatives and 63% have a travel plan in place. Other initiatives are underway through the Safer Routes to Schools programme.

4.3.11 School travel planning directly addresses the problems of the ‘school run’ by aiming to reduce the number of children taken to school by car. A wider approach is adopted involving walking, cycling and the use of buses and makes the connections between transport and health and fitness, road safety and lifestyles.
4.4  Land Use and Car Dependency

4.4.1 A report by the Commission for Integrated Transport (CfIT)\(^3\) investigated the impact of new residents’ travel behaviour compared with established residents in new housing developments in Oxfordshire. The results indicated that a lower proportion of new residents worked locally compared with the established population and tended to make longer commuter journeys and some transferred from non-car modes to car as a result. In total almost a third of workers were making less sustainable journeys after their move.

4.4.2 There is little evidence available to show that urban containment policies such as PPG13 have a significant impact on encouraging people to undertake activities, such as working and shopping, close to places where they live and therefore reducing the amount and distance of travelling.

4.4.3 Despite most towns retaining their traditional compact character, urban densities remaining relatively high and areas of open countryside being protected, the UK has still seen an enormous increase in car use. People travel much further, and by car, not because the land use pattern forces them to but because they choose to (and because the relatively cheap cost of car travel enables them to do so).

4.4.4 The CfIT report concludes that in terms of countering suburban sprawl:

‘...research on the New Towns demonstrated that, despite being very carefully planned with self-sufficiency in mind, they in fact became progressively less self-contained over time as far as travel to work is concerned. The objective of a jobs/housing balance within an area (in purely numerical terms) is a similar example of enduring but simplistic professional folklore.’

4.4.5 Given the findings of the CfIT research, the South Hampshire development sites face greater challenges than would otherwise be the case given their location and context.

4.5  Location of Development Sites

4.5.1 The location of development sites is a key influence on how and when people travel and their destinations. Reducing the need to travel, building on the concept of a sub-region of two hubs centred on the cities, can reduce the demand for resources (and reduce carbon footprint) by encouraging shorter journeys. Journeys of less than 5km (2 miles) can often be made by walking or cycling; public transport can sometimes substitute for longer urban journeys. This supports the expansion of facilities in the city centres of Southampton and Portsmouth so that shorter journeys can be made by sustainable means between homes, workplaces, retail, leisure and other facilities.

4.5.2 Land use planning decisions will contribute to reducing the need to travel. This involves locating development sites where they are accessible by means other than the car so that people have choices about how they travel. This is particularly important for locating homes and workplaces so that they are easily connected by walking and cycling routes for shorter distances and by public transport for longer distances. Good access to retail, health, education and leisure sites is fundamental; if non-car modes can be used easily then there

are benefits for individuals and the wider community in terms of health, air quality and traffic congestion.

4.5.3 Taking this concept further, mixed use development can be located together to minimise the need to travel with many facilities on-site or close by. Such locations could include around Southampton Central Station, in and around Eastleigh town centre and the airport/South Hampshire Strategic Employment Zone (SHSEZ), Cosham and other locations where good bus and rail services are available and local links for walking and cycling trips are in place, or could be put in place. These more accessible locations can provide the nucleus for development such that there is less need to travel further on a regular basis, especially by car.

4.6 Public Transport Improvements

4.6.1 Improving public transport is a key component of the strategy. Local rail services and the extensive bus networks can be improved to be a realistic alternative for many people who are habitual car users. This may involve extending high frequency commercial services into the evenings and at weekends and coupled with travel planning initiatives could benefit from creative marketing. At the same time, improvements in bus reliability are necessary in the form of priority measures while other aspects of the services such as vehicles continue to be improved.

4.7 Application of Technology

4.7.1 Technology has a role to play in making the use of cars more efficient and reducing their harmful impacts and also to determine ways in which demand for travel is reduced.

4.7.2 Technology applications such as internet access have allowed home working to grow considerably and there may be opportunities to consider how this type of application could spread such as through the sharing of facilities (‘telecottages’) and video conferencing to minimize the need to travel. The widespread adoption of broadband and cable networks in urban areas has helped to facilitate home working in more densely populated areas but has been less effective in meeting the needs of communities in the hinterland beyond.

4.8 Car Clubs

4.8.1 The basic idea of a car club is that people can have access to a car in their neighbourhood without having to own it. Typically, car club members pay an annual membership fee to an operator who provides and maintains a range of vehicles in their neighbourhood. Members then pay by the hour and mile when they use a vehicle. The combined costs of membership and use are intended to be cheaper than personal car ownership, for car owners who do not do a high mileage and to encourage the adoption of relatively diverse personal transport strategies. Reserved parking spaces can be introduced by local authorities for car club vehicles.
4.8.2 In 2002, membership of UK car clubs was 500; currently there are 23,000 members belonging to a total of 42 car clubs\(^4\). Research has shown that car club members who give up a car are likely to reduce their mileage by around 60-70\%\(^5\). The average change in mileage for all car club users is a reduction of 33\%. In addition, car club members are more likely to use other forms of transport compared to those who own cars. Car club members tend to be more careful and resort to car club use for journeys that can only reasonably be made by car. This pattern of travel activity reduces traffic volumes and increases the demand for, and viability of, alternative transport networks.

4.8.3 Building on the existing schemes, car clubs could be introduced for South Hampshire development sites as well as established areas. This would encourage the development of residential sites with limited car parking and where alternatives are readily available. However, the impact of car clubs is small compared with the total mileage undertaken, even in densely populated areas.

4.9 Supplementary Planning Documents

4.9.1 Under the previous development plan system, supplementary planning guidance (SPG) is non-statutory local authority approved policy which could be a material consideration in terms of determining planning applications. Under the new system, supplementary planning documents (SPD) have statutory status but are not part of the statutory development plan. Transitional arrangements are in place that allow SPD to supersede SPG.

4.9.2 The process for preparing SPD is simpler than for development plan documents, as there is no examination. The SPD is part of the local development framework and has greater weight than SPG because it has complied with the requirements for community involvement and sustainability appraisal and is in conformity with a development plan policy.

4.9.3 SPD can be used to feature transport measures within planned developments and gain wide acceptance of sustainable travel principles through the consultation process.

4.10 Central Area Parking Policies

4.10.1 In common with many other areas, South Hampshire’s approach to parking management is based on historic legacy and is largely uncoordinated. However, it is clear that many of the measures proposed in the sub-regional strategy are dependent on some restraints being put in place to be effective. Typically park and ride needs to be a better prospect than low cost or free parking in central areas. The use of public transport, a major component of the strategy, is affected strongly by the ability or otherwise to drive and the cost of car use. In this respect, parking policy needs to be more co-ordinated across the area and reflect more accurately its role in the wider strategy.

4.10.2 Parking in central areas, especially surface car parks, is costly to provide and uses land that could be better used for other purposes. Private non-residential parking exists in large quantities and simply encourages car journeys to work. Co-coordinating the provision and charging regimes of car parking across the sub-region is an activity with considerable
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\(^4\) www.carplus.org.uk.

potential for influencing car journeys and modal split. Local Authorities and car park providers need to work closely together to ensure that the economic competitiveness of each town centre and that of the sub-region are not compromised.

4.11 Workplace Parking Levy

4.11.1 Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) is a mechanism for which legislation is in place and through which local authorities can charge some or all workplaces for the use of private non-residential parking. To do so would discourage their use while raising revenue for transport schemes. This could be applied very selectively, initially at least, to certain areas and to the largest employers with the most spaces and the levy could be modest. To date only one scheme is being promoted on this basis, in Nottingham, linked to the funding of proposed light rail extensions. WPL could be applied to some effect in South Hampshire, taking care not to damage the local economy but linking revenue with specific transport initiatives.

4.11.2 WPL would be part of the wider parking strategy in that it can redress the imbalance between free commuter parking for some staff at office complexes and similar sites and long stay parking for other staff in public spaces where payment is required.

4.12 Road User Charging and Congestion Charging

4.12.1 Road User Charging (RUC) has been proposed in some areas as a means of restraining demand for road use particularly at peak times. Appropriate technology is required to track and charge individual vehicles for RUC to apply to large areas or nationally. Currently, the Government is holding back on RUC, but will support authorities that wish to promote congestion charging schemes as a local alternative.

4.12.2 Congestion charging can be applied at a smaller scale for specific areas such as sub-regions or city centres. Transport for London’s Congestion Charge remains the only large scale urban scheme in the UK and has produced benefits in reducing traffic levels and growth and encouraging the use of buses, trains, walking and cycling as part of an integrated approach. Congestion charging could be appropriate in the future for South Hampshire but only after the implementation of alternative access arrangements and a realignment of parking policies.
5  Manage

5.1  Managing the Existing Networks

5.1.1  The Manage element of the strategy seeks to make the best use of existing transport networks, across all modes and takes a number of forms. It involves making better use of the available road space to assist movement of particular types of vehicle and maximising the use of the rail network and local bus networks. Comprehensive upgrading of services, improved information and promotion of services offer considerable opportunities as an alternative to car use. Also, walking and cycling networks can be improved to create effective local links that can in many cases substitute for car movements.

5.2  Highway Networks

5.2.1  Making best use of the existing highway network is an important part of the strategy. While there are already computer based traffic control systems in many urban areas there is considerable potential for improved performance and co-ordination.

5.2.2  Changes to the highway network might include the reallocation of road space in favour of buses and high occupancy vehicles, two examples having been in place in the UK for several years. This may require a reduction in the space available for other traffic as part of a wider approach to managing demand. Such reallocation could take place alongside complementary measures such as park and ride schemes and revised parking availability and charges.

5.2.3  TfSH is working with the Highways Agency to improve the management of the trunk road network and its connections with the local road network. The aim of this is a broad approach to modal shift to reduce car movements, understanding the impacts associated with proposed development sites, promoting public transport as an alternative to car use and to consider freight movements, particularly those associated with the ports and larger commercial premises and distribution centres.

5.2.4  Active Traffic Management has been trialled successfully in the West Midlands on the M42. This has involved new gantry structures to direct traffic, with flexible speed controls and the use of the hard shoulder as a running lane at peak times with emergency lay-bys available. The Highways Agency currently has a study under way into a similar scheme for parts of the M3 and M27 motorways. Such measures on the M27 could accommodate a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service between the North Fareham SDA and Cosham. Ramp metering, in which access to the motorway is controlled by traffic signals on slip roads, has been trialled in the past on the M3 in an attempt to regulate traffic joining the motorway at busy times.

5.3  Public Transport Networks

Bus

5.3.1  Bus operators will be encouraged to develop their networks to satisfy changing demands resulting from mode shift from the new developments and within existing communities. A bus priority network linking communities will be supplemented by a more radical, high quality Bus Rapid Transit system. Working in partnership with operators, the quality of the entire
system can be improved to attract new users with innovative fare and ticketing systems including the widespread adoption of smart cards, new vehicle specifications, personal security measures and new types of service.

5.3.2 Non-commercial local bus services operate with revenue support from local authorities. This generally maintains evening and weekend services to provide coverage when services are not well used. This situation could change with changes in lifestyles and travel patterns, particularly as the cost of revenue support is rising and funding has to be targeted selectively. This ongoing support is an important means of maintaining services and represents continued commitment from local authorities. There may be ways of redeploying these funds and perhaps attract other sources such as workplaces in the future.

Park and Ride

5.3.3 Park and ride has been identified as a means of reducing traffic congestion in central areas by substituting bus journeys for car journeys and parking provision. This can be effective but only where demand management measures are in place, notably controls over the availability and price of parking. Corridors in which extensive bus priority measures are in place are also a pre-requisite to provide an attractive alternative for the displaced car user. For South Hampshire, an integrated approach is proposed linking park and ride facilities into the wider picture:

- For Southampton:
  - Nursling park and ride to the west could meet demands from Southampton General Hospital as well as the city centre;
  - Stoneham park and ride could be extended north to Southampton Airport Parkway station and SHSEZ; and
  - Windhover park and ride to the east is linked with the proposed A3034 bus and high occupancy vehicle lane into the city centre but could also address demands from large development sites.

- For Portsmouth:
  - Tipner park and ride would be developed as part of an interchange associated with large scale employment and housing development and be linked with further development at Port Solent; and
  - Farlington park and ride would intercept journeys from the Havant and A3(M) eastern corridor.

5.3.4 However, it is important to remember that park has ride has a valuable but limited role to play. Indeed, there are suggestions that it may do little to address congestion on the trunk road network outside the park & ride cordon, particularly if it makes park & ride a more attractive option than the use of public transport for the whole of a journey. The impacts of constrained parking at destinations served by park and ride will need to be assessed in terms of possible increased use of cars to access park and ride sites and any abstraction from other public transport. Even with sites accommodating up to 1,000 cars each, this is only a small proportion of the total inbound journeys to the cities.
Rail

5.3.5 Improvements to rail services and the quality of stations will be encouraged with greater emphasis on interchange at stations (linking stations with local buses and more clearly defined walking and cycling routes). Improved use of the local rail network will be promoted for local passenger journeys and freight.

5.4 Technology

Traffic Management and Information Systems

5.4.1 South Hampshire has been at the forefront of technology applications to manage traffic conditions with the implementation of ROMANSE initiatives in Southampton. Similar urban traffic management systems have been developed for Hampshire and Portsmouth and other towns. These intelligent transport systems involve managing the transport networks, car park and incidents, by monitoring traffic conditions, collecting data in real time and disseminating information to users via a wide variety of media. Technology is continually improving and the scope for gathering and presenting information expands. This supports the availability of widespread travel information so that people can make informed decisions, taking into account their mode of travel and when they make journeys.

5.4.2 Transport for South Hampshire is currently working with the Highways Agency to develop a case for bringing these systems together, perhaps with the Police, to form a single South Hampshire Traffic Control Centre.

Smart Cards

5.4.3 Moves are underway to allow the widespread adoption of smart cards in South Hampshire. Currently applications are limited and are constrained by the technology currently available and the institutional arrangements involving operators and local authorities are complex. Franchise commitments by rail operators need to be taken into account and implementation issues need to be overcome, but smart cards could represent a step change in how people perceive and use public transport and could help promote ‘seamless’ transport across a wide area.

5.5 Freight

5.5.1 A freight strategy is being developed in partnership with road and rail operators, port agencies, trade associations and others to provide for the more efficient management of freight and logistics within the sub-region. The movement of goods is important to the local economy, particularly warehousing and retail activity.
6 Invest

6.1 Targeting Investment

6.1.1 To address the investment needs of South Hampshire, the previously identified list of transport interventions has been reviewed with a view of prioritising those that are considered to stand a realistic prospect of winning the support of the Regional Funding Allocation in its refresh for 2016 onwards. There remains a residual list of schemes and interventions that are considered important to meet the challenges of growth and congestion relief, but these will need to be justified as candidates for funding from other sources. The full list can be found at Appendix E.

6.1.2 The ports of Portsmouth and Southampton and Southampton International Airport are major international gateways. They are nationally important and improving access for both passengers and freight is key to sustaining the local economy. At a regional level, the growth in port activity is a major challenge. The rapid expansion in container traffic handled by the Port of Southampton is a particular issue with significant growth requiring onward movement by road and rail. Gauge enhancement works are improving operational flexibility for rail although route capacity is constrained. Many container movements are made by road but with inevitable environmental consequences within and beyond the sub-region. The introduction of rail facilities for use by some of the Port of Portsmouth’s traffic has helped reduce heavy vehicle movements.

6.1.3 The planned expansion of Southampton International Airport in terms of the throughput of passengers is also a challenge but is a valuable contribution to the area’s business activity. While a proportion of the additional demand can be accommodated by rail, the construction of the Eastleigh Chord will allow more trains to access the airport, although more car trips will continue to be generated.

6.1.4 Traffic growth forecasts suggest that to meet economic aspirations, capacity improvements on the main transport corridors are inevitable. The TfSH strategy is to maximise the potential of ‘reduce’ and ‘manage’ and TfSH is developing a robust evidence base to properly assess the contribution that can be made in this area. The strategy is being formulated on the premise that even with a successful ‘reduce’ and ‘manage’ strategy, there will still be a need for significant investment in public transport and highway capacity. With the long lead times for appraisal and investment it is essential that efforts are made to fund the priority schemes as soon as possible. This strategy will be reviewed as progress develops.

6.1.5 At a sub-regional level, pressures for development are considerable and space is limited. The strategy envisages much of the growth up to 2016 being on brownfield sites and urban extensions closely associated with the cities, such as Tipner and Port Solent as well as committed development at North Whiteley. It is vital that investment takes place concurrently with the development to create the social conditions that will reinforce a new, sustainable approach to meeting travel demand.

6.1.6 From 2016 there will be a greater reliance on greenfield development. This will create further demands for new transport infrastructure whilst placing greater demands on that which already exists. Concentrating a significant proportion of new development on specific sites is planned with the SDAs at North/North East Hedge End and North Fareham while the
proposed South Hampshire Strategic Employment Zone at Eastleigh will be a major focus for activity.

6.1.7 Without significant investment in transport infrastructure, none of these sites can be accessed satisfactorily and hence would not be suitable for development on the scale planned. Such investment will be essential to achieve the growth in economic vibrancy and competitiveness anticipated by PUSH whilst still maintaining a high quality of life for the communities that make up South Hampshire.

6.1.8 Public transport services and infrastructure would need to be in place as a pre-requisite for demand management measures. This means that alternatives to car use are in place before restrictions are considered, allowing people to amend their travel behaviour and understand their travel options before major changes are made. In this respect the travel planning Reduce and Manage measures are invaluable. Reallocation of road space, establishing bus priority corridors and creating park and ride opportunities also contribute.

6.1.9 Without effective and efficient public transport services, there are few options but to drive and add to the congestion already being experienced, particularly in the light of existing dispersed travel patterns. This could continue to undermine reliable access to the international gateways and local businesses. Highway and public transport schemes have been considered in the consultants’ studies with a view to identifying the best combination to serve future needs and which are essential for the sub-region. Future developments need to be planned in such a way that travel needs can be satisfied by walking and cycling as alternatives to the car, particularly if commercially viable public transport services cannot be provided.

6.1.10 The paragraphs that follow summarise the deliberations of the consultants’ studies. As a result of these and other technical considerations, the emerging priorities for investment are described in Section 7.

6.2 Access to the Sub-Region via M3 Winchester-Southampton corridor

6.2.1 The M3 provides the main access to the sub-region from the Midlands and the North via the A34(T) and the principal access from London and much of the south of England to the west of the sub-region. A number of highway improvement schemes have been investigated including grade-separation at M3 Junction 9, additional capacity at M27 Junction 3 and at the start of the M271. The main purpose is to improve access for vehicles associated with the port’s activities from the strategic road network. Lower cost options for the M271 could be implemented relatively easily.

6.2.2 The indications are that even with increased use of public transport and smarter choices there will need to be significant capacity improvements in the corridor to support the economic growth agenda. Further development work is required with national and regional agencies to identify the most practical approach. The consultant’s study looked at specific junctions on the M3 and M271 together with the case for individual improvements and packages of schemes including Active Traffic Management (ATM) over a wide area. This will require joint working with the Highways Agency and other key partners to bring about results. The strategy identifies a number of projects and packages with high levels of economic performance, highlighting the need for a co-ordinated approach for the corridor as

---

6 Mott Gifford and MVA Consultancy (January 2008).
a whole. Improvements at one junction cannot be realised without associated improvements further along the corridor, some of which have severe environmental implications.

6.2.3 **Scope for rail capacity enhancements** is limited but the proposed improvements between Eastleigh and Southampton Airport Parkway help. This gives the option of adding additional tracks which will help relieve the constraints arising from the high demand from a mix of local, longer distance and freight trains by providing passing opportunities. The award of funding for gauge enhancement works applicable to Southampton Tunnel removes one obstacle in accessing the port but capacity constraints between Southampton and Basingstoke are still evident and any scheme which addresses this would be of benefit.

6.3 **Access to Portsmouth and South East Hampshire**

6.3.1 Four main proposals have emerged, emphasising the role of bus-based services and facilitating access to the proposed larger development sites.

6.3.2 In South East Hampshire, the local bus network has experienced little growth in the number of users in recent years and has considerable spare capacity. However, the use and image of buses could be boosted very considerably with the introduction of **Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)**. Initially, it is envisaged that BRT would run between Fareham town centre and Gosport, largely using the disused railway line, with connections via the Gosport Ferry to Portsmouth. This segregated route would offer high quality bus travel and would be extended into the North Fareham SDA with links to Cosham’s Queen Alexandra Hospital and Waterlooville. Other core corridors could be upgraded to provide BRT services or improved local buses in the form of a **premium bus network**. Encouraging people to use buses for journeys instead of cars will be essential to managing future travel demands across South Hampshire in the future. While a premium bus network may not perform as well as other schemes in cost benefit terms, this does not diminish the need for future investment in bus priority measures and supporting infrastructure and service changes in a phased programme.

6.3.3 **Access to North Fareham SDA** requires significant highway changes in that the A32 would be diverted from a point to the north of the site to link directly with M27 Junction 11. The existing Junction 10 would be restricted to bus and high occupancy vehicles only to discourage use of this junction for through traffic. Priority routes for buses, to BRT standards, will need to be incorporated into the site design, taking advantage of the restricted Junction 10 to provide a rapid link to Portsmouth city centre via the M27 and M275. Another BRT route would link the SDA with Fareham rail station, providing the crucial link between residential areas and the rail station and town centre, before continuing on to Gosport. In addition, the Fareham SDA could also provide homes for employees in the Cosham area including around 10,000 staff at the expanded QA Hospital and hence a direct BRT service will be appropriate.

6.3.4 A major **interchange at Tipner** is planned in association with major residential development including a park and ride facility. A new bridge from Tipner is proposed to provide a walk/cycle/bus-only route to link further development at Port Solent with Portsmouth city, providing an attractive alternative to the current need to drive.
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6.4 Eastern Access to Southampton and South West Hampshire

6.4.1 A range of possible schemes have been investigated in some detail in this part of the sub-region. Several rail improvement schemes are presented together in recognition of the considerable role they could play. These are based around the Eastleigh Chord proposal and link this with the expansion of Southampton Airport Parkway station as a major interchange and gateway to the area in conjunction with Southampton International Airport. The Chord would allow direct rail services to operate on the east-west axis, opening up direct access to the airport from a wide corridor using existing train services covering an area from Brighton to Bristol. In combination with a very strong north-south route between London Waterloo and Southampton/Bournemouth, the expansion of Parkway presents a clear opportunity to fully develop the sub-regional interchange. The associated improvements also serve the Strategic Employment Zone and improve access to the North/North East Hedge End SDA. Allied to this is the possibility of creating additional capacity for rail freight traffic to and from the Port of Southampton to help meet expanding demand and complementing approved investment in gauge enhancement. The package also includes capacity improvements for the Botley line between Eastleigh and Fareham to overcome the current operational difficulties. The package of major rail enhancements could be achieved for an estimated £160 million with significant regional and local benefits.

6.4.2 Road access to SHSEZ will be by the proposed Chickenhall Lane Link Road, a new connection between the M27 Junction 5 and Parkway area, through SHSEZ to Bishopstoke Road. The road is essential to provide access to the site in the absence of adequate road links currently.

6.4.3 The Southampton area has a comprehensive bus network in place. Upgrading this systematically to is envisaged to meet the needs of new and expanding communities. This would require a series of priority measures to be put in place in addition to those already provided to ensure that buses are reliable and punctual and offer a good image of efficiency to potential users – bus priority corridors. High frequency services can be upgraded with better stop facilities, improved reliability, better user information and other features on an incremental basis and achieved through the Local Transport Plan process. Major infrastructure could not be delivered in the built-up areas without large scale cost and disruption but there is scope to improve facilities for buses in key corridors and to create segregated routes and priority accesses in new development sites. Working in partnership can deliver significant improvements and the creation of a new management framework for transport in the sub-region will support this approach. Ultimately this approach will be most effective when restraints on car movements are introduced.

6.4.4 Park and ride at three strategic sites around Southampton will be effective provided that central area parking constraints on availability and price are introduced, without which park and ride cannot be attractive and effective, together with priority routes, to enable swift operation by the linking buses.

6.4.5 Access to the North/North East Hedge End SDA can be achieved not only by rail via the Eastleigh Chord but also by a core bus priority corridor to Southampton city centre via the established area of Hedge End and either Junction 7 and Thornhill Park road, or the A3024 corridor, taking advantage of proposed improvements to create the bus/high occupancy vehicle lane throughout and improve the Northam rail bridge. The link to the SDA is an essential means of linking the new community with employment, retail, health and leisure
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facilities and to offer a high quality alternative to car use. However, the success of this core link is dependant on the extent to which priority measures can be provided in the Hedge End area and across M27 Junction 7. The connection to the highway network at Windhover requires a new road link to Junction 8, in order to avoid additional car bound traffic using Junction 7, adding to congestion and undermining the reliability of bus services.

6.5 Access to the SDAs

6.5.1 The main proposals associated with the North/North East Hedge End SDA and North Fareham SDA are indicated above9. It is acknowledged that the development sites can benefit from some self-containment of employment and application of smarter choices but their contribution may not meet some expectations.

6.5.2 The landtake for developments of this size is significant and the sites are sub-optimal from a transport point of view. Good transport links are needed but the location of the North/North East Hedge End SDA in particular – distant from two rail stations, rather than being centred on the transport node – presents particular challenges in providing the necessary transport services and infrastructure that are essential for the sites to function effectively.

6.5.3 Traffic generation associated with the sites is significant even when a ‘progressive’ approach to the role of sustainable transport is applied. The current evidence base regarding the smarter choices agenda suggests that a reduction of 10% of car trips is the high end figure that could be expected in the absence of demand management initiatives.

6.5.4 For the SDAs, a containment factor of 40% has been assumed for the purposes of the studies undertaken i.e. 40% of the employment in the development areas being taken up by local residents. If the containment factor were lower, the inbound movements in the morning peak and outbound movements in the evening peak would be greater as more people from outside the sites would be accessing employment opportunities within it. Further investigation is needed to establish the level of self-containment that is realistic and will have a lasting influence on travel patterns.

6.5.5 Radical site layouts are important to create a culture of sustainable travel by design. Walking and cycling routes need be attractive and comprehensive. Strong use of proposed public transport services will need to be engendered through the creation of extensive bus priority measures in the development sites and off-site.

6.5.6 Although transport strategies for the SDAs have been identified which will provide multi-modal access between the development areas and key destinations, the strategies have not been considered in the context of demand management measures such as city centre parking controls. The aspirations for sustainable development are only likely to be realised in terms of transport if area-wide demand management of some sort is implemented at some point over the next 20 years.

6.5.7 The South East Plan includes an allocation for 6,000 dwellings and associated employment development (B1, B2, B8 mix) on land North/North East of Hedge End. The construction of this Strategic Development Area (SDA) is planned for 2016 to 2026. Inevitably there will be significant transport implications both for the established urban area and for the residents

9 MVA Consultancy and Mott Gifford (January 2008).
and businesses in the SDA itself. In addition, it is expected that land to the north of Whiteley will be developed with around 2,000 dwellings. Main issues arising from the study are set out below.

6.5.8 The distribution of trips associated with the SDA during the peak periods is orientated strongly towards Southampton as the main employment and retail centre but with strong connections with the established Hedge End area.

6.5.9 Public transport connectivity to key destinations is critical and bus priority corridors are the centrepiece of the public transport strategy for the SDA, with a proposed route to access the site from Southampton city centre via M27 Junction 7 and Hedge End Retail Park. Another route could connect the SDA with the rail stations, North Whiteley and Portsmouth.

6.5.10 Hedge End and Botley rail stations are close to the SDA and could attract users, particularly with frequent bus links. The proposed Eastleigh Chord would facilitate direct rail services to the airport and Southampton city centre.

6.5.11 Cycling and walking networks are also important, not only for movement within the development areas themselves but also to connect with Hedge End which is within an acceptable distance for journeys on foot or by cycle.

6.5.12 Consideration of highway access from the Strategic Road Network (SRN) has involved both M27 Junction 7 and M27 Junction 8. In directing traffic towards Junction 8, new road construction from the SDA is needed. This could be very costly but meets the requirements of Southampton City Council in directing general traffic away from Junction 7. The bus priority corridor alignment through Junction 7 would be impeded if additional traffic is directed the same way in the absence of a link to Junction 8. However, an alternative route could use a reconstructed underpass beneath the motorway and major reshaping of the local highway network, but this would involve considerable engineering complexity, cost and disruption to existing residential areas. Alternative routes for other traffic have been investigated to accommodate journeys across the motorway to provide a link with Windhover park & ride.

6.5.13 The proposed A3024 Northam Road bus/high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane towards Southampton city centre would be used by bus and other traffic from the development site. Improvements to Northam rail bridge would also be of benefit to journeys on this route from the SDA.

6.5.14 From a transport point of view, this SDA is in a sub-optimal location. The site is between, not around, existing rail stations and a reasonable distance from the strategic road network, resulting in more local traffic on the highway network. However, implementation of the above measures will mitigate the problems of transport access.

North Fareham SDA

6.5.15 The South East Plan includes an allocation for 10,000 dwellings and 124,000m² of employment development (B1, B2, B8 mix) on land north of Fareham. The construction of this SDA is also planned to be between 2016 to 2026. Inevitably there will be significant transport implications both on established urban areas and for the residents and businesses in the SDA itself.
6.5.16 The landtake for a development of this size is very significant and work is ongoing by other parties to consider the footprint required. It appears that the land parcel identified, primarily to the west of the existing A32, is insufficient to accommodate the scale of development envisaged.

6.5.17 The distribution of trips associated with the SDA during the peak periods is orientated strongly towards Portsmouth as the main employment and retail centre.

6.5.18 Public transport connectivity to key destinations is critical and is the centrepiece of the public transport strategy for the SDA, with a route proposed to penetrate the site through M27 J10. A rail halt at Knowle has been considered as part of the strategy, but discounted as it would be remote from much of the SDA, presents operational difficulties and would not offer the same range of services as those available at Fareham station.

6.5.19 Cycling and walking networks are also important, not only for movement within the development area itself, but also to connect with Fareham town centre which is within an acceptable distance for journeys, particularly by cycle.

6.5.20 Consideration of highway access from the Strategic Road Network (SRN) has involved both M27 J10 and J11 as well as a combination of the two. Any solution will need to complement the SDA’s public transport package rather than compete against it and any option which allows movement for all traffic through M27 J10 will preclude the ability to provide a segregated BRT route under the motorway at this point.

6.5.21 Only a small percentage of trips associated with the SDA would be distributed to the north towards Alton. The A32 north of the SDA will carry significant traffic levels with or without the SDA going ahead, as background traffic using this route is forecast to be significant in 2026.

6.6 Packages of Interventions

6.6.1 The consultants’ deliberations have been helpful in informing a view of emerging priorities that should be packaged for funding in order to address the transport challenges associated with growth across South Hampshire. The programming of prioritised schemes and initiatives in a series of packages is necessary to implement the strategy set out here. Not all schemes can be delivered at the same time and some will take several years to develop. However, it is important to consider the strategy as a whole and how each of the individual elements plays a role in it. The Reduce, Manage and Invest components will need to work together to achieve change (see Appendix D).
Emerging Priorities

7.1 The Study Outputs

7.1.1 Consultants have validated the schemes with the greatest prospect of meeting the criteria for funding from the refresh of the Regional Funding Allocation. The Transport for South Hampshire authorities recognise these emerging priorities. However, there is no guarantee that the Regional Transport Board will afford them the necessary approval for funding for 2016 onwards and there is only a slim prospect of any uncommitted funding becoming available before that date. The schemes identified to go forward to the RFA refresh will need further work, in terms of design and detailed assessment, using the evidence base that is currently being assembled.

7.1.2 There are other schemes to deliver the growth within this strategy of Reduce-Manage-Invest. These will require further justification before clear funding sources are identified to take them forward. They are likely to be funded from sources other than the RFA. TfSH will need to work with stakeholders in their role as transport providers, with local planning authorities as part of the Local Development Framework process and potential funding providers.

7.1.3 Within the TfSH ‘Reduce, Manage and Invest’ strategy, one of the principal tasks is to examine the contribution that each of the three elements can make to ensuring that a balance transport strategy can be delivered which enables the economic aspirations of PUSH to be achieved. To this end a computer modelling-led robust evidence base is being developed which will enable the strategy to be validated. This evidence base will also support the case for individual policy interventions and transport projects and it is essential this is accepted by Government and other interested parties if schemes are to receive public funding support.

7.1.4 It is expected that this evidence base will not be completed until 2010 when it will be needed to underpin the detailed scheme appraisal stages of projects. In the meantime TfSH must be able to take advantage of appropriate funding opportunities as they arise. The Regional Funding Allocation for South East England is currently a principal source of funding for major transport schemes. This fund is currently fully utilised for the period to 2016 and SEERA are expected to issue a call for candidate schemes for the period 2016 to 2018 in Spring 2008.

7.1.5 The consultants commissioned by TfSH looked at potential schemes for inclusion in the RFA programme and for larger national investment programmes where a successful bid would need support through the RFA process. The Regional Transport Board’s criteria are:

- Compliance with the South East plan;
- Value for Money; and
- Deliverability

7.1.6 The studies reviewed schemes that best met the criteria of the Regional Transport Board and prepared assessments, sometimes with preliminary level drawings, to enable reasonable proposals to be put forward when the RFA refresh call was made. These proposals need to include provisional cost estimates (with high levels of optimism bias to reflect the early stages in the design process) and information on cost/benefit ratios to give an indication of value for money and comparison with competing projects.
7.1.7 The government is changing its approach to transport investment and its approach to scheme appraisal but to wait for these changes to be clarified would reduce the opportunities for investment and it is therefore proposed to proceed with TfSH’s strategy development programme without delay and to review it in the light of policy and appraisal changes as they come forward.

7.2 **Priority Schemes Identified in the Investment Programme**

7.2.1 The investment table at Appendix E sets out an indicative investment programme for South Hampshire for the period 2009 to 2026. The programme is derived partly from the investigations undertaken in 2007/08 and partly from translating ‘typical’ costs for approaches from one area to another to provide an overall picture for South Hampshire. All figures should be regarded as indicative only at this time.

7.2.2 The table suggests that investment of about £2.5 billion is desirable in the time period. It sets out those packages of schemes which may be suitable for regional support (approximately £2 billion) and a further list of £500 million where there is no obvious funding route at present.

7.2.3 Eight packages of interventions have been assembled for submission to the 2008 Regional Funding Allocation refresh for prioritisation at a regional level for funding.

These are:

- Access to the Sub-Region;
- Eastern Access to Southampton (including the North/North East Hedge End SDA);
- Access in South East Hampshire including North Fareham SDA;
- Access to the South Hampshire Strategic Employment Zone and associated rail improvements;
- Access to Tipner (Portsmouth);
- Strategic Traffic Management;
- Developing the Evidence Base; and
- Schemes identified through the LDF process.

Separate allocations for preparing the evidence base and for schemes identified through the evidence base are identified and at the bottom of the list are the schemes which are considered least likely to be successful in the RFA process.

7.2.4 The columns in the spreadsheet identify different types of investment. They are:

- Motorway junctions and widenings (to increase capacity);
- Active Traffic Management on Motorways – includes hard shoulder running and advanced signing with variable speed limits etc to increase capacity;
- Traffic Management on local (i.e. non-trunk) roads. Where wide area and local traffic management assists in meeting the objectives of one of the packages A to E on the table then it is included in those packages. Otherwise it is included in package F;
New Roads and junctions (local roads);
Railway and Interchange - new rail lines and junctions and improved rail and ferry related interchanges;
Bus Priority – improvements to provide priority for buses and other vehicles (potentially freight or high occupancy vehicle) through bus lanes, gates or priority at junctions. Quality bus Partnerships, improved stops, and similar measures are also included;
Park and Ride – proposed new sites principally for car to bus but potentially for rail based park and ride also;
Information systems and other management – includes real time information for bus and car users advice available on line, in retail centres etc as well as promotional strategies;
Other measures – includes ferry improvements, pedestrian and cycling measures, freight innovations and developing the modelling required to support the strategy; and
Reduce – travel planning (including workplace, school and residential), flexible working the co-ordination of parking regimes across the sub-region and appropriate promotional work to influence modal choice.

7.3 Package A – Access to the South Hampshire Sub-Region

7.3.1 Much of the initial work looking at potential transport investment was focussed on access to the two cities and their immediate hinterland. While these are very important in terms of the operation of the sub-region, access to the sub-region is no less important if economic success is to be achieved. This part of the motorway network is also important for the New Forest, Dorset and Isle of Wight economies as well as South Hampshire, its cities and ports.

7.3.2 Consultants have so far looked at some of the issues around the busiest access to the sub-region, the Winchester – Southampton corridor. This is defined for the purposes of this table as starting at the approaches to M3 Junction 9 at Winchester (including the A34) and leading to Southampton city, port and airport.

7.3.3 The approach has been to examine the problems caused by forecast traffic growth and looking at ways of dealing with this problem covering the potential to reduce traffic growth, the ability to 'Manage' traffic, encourage transfer to public transport and park and ride and the ability to increase capacity on the main motorway network.

7.3.4 The potential for increasing capacity on the motorways has been investigated on the M3 at Junction 9, on the M27 at Junction 3, at the southern end of the M271 and at various links on the motorways through active traffic management. There is still further work required, including at the key area around Junctions 13 and 14 of the M3 where the Eastleigh traffic and the two arms of the M27 diverge. The estimates given on the table include a nominal allocation for this very complex area.

7.3.5 Essentially the work done so far suggest that the potential for transfer to other modes for general traffic is relatively limited (but further work will be carried out in this important area, including better use of trains and buses for local journeys) there is more potential for freight and this is being examined through the freight strategy while the ports are proposing increased transfer to rail and short sea feeder transport.
7.3.6 The potential for active traffic management on South Hampshire motorways is restricted by the short distances between some junctions and capacity constraints at places like Twyford Down. The 'road capacity improvement only' approach would require five lane motorways for much of the southern M3 and further widening on the M27. Such a solution is impractical, environmentally unacceptable and unaffordable especially when taking into account the impact on local roads that would be needed to feed and take the disgorge from such a motorway system.

7.3.7 There is much work still to be done on the art of the practical in this corridor but the initial studies suggest that a package of the order set out in A1 on the table does show a good rate of return in traditional cost benefit terms but it would need to include an efficient traffic management system on local roads and strong promotion of 'Reduce' measures to keep congestion to acceptable levels for the economy to operate.

7.3.8 Nominal sums are included for wide area traffic management on local roads, station improvements, bus priority, park and ride (at Stoneham and Nursling) and information and Reduce measures.

7.3.9 No detailed work has as yet been carried out on the M27 and A3(M) corridors beyond looking at M27 Junction 5 for SHSEZ (package D) and Junctions 7 and 8 for package B.

7.3.10 However these are important corridors for access to the south central sector and south east Hampshire/Portsmouth and its port. Consequently indicative allocations have been made on the likely approach and investment required rather as a marker in advance of further more detailed work on the potential for reducing demands, transfers and increasing, taking into account the development plans.

7.3.11 The construction of the A3 Hindhead Tunnel is underway and its completion in 2011 will improve the congestion and reliability of journeys on this major route to the eastern part of the sub-region. This may attract journeys that currently use the M3 corridor, particularly to access Portsmouth port and there may be implications for traffic in the A3(M)/A27(T) in the Havant area.

7.3.12 There is much more detailed modelling and design related work required at the strategic level before there can be real confidence in the costs and benefit equations. However there are strong indications that, without drastic intervention on the demand side, investment of the order of £1 billion will be required to allow the motorway network in South Hampshire function reasonably. If such levels of expenditure are not to be realised then it will become necessary to address radical interventions in managing the demand for travel.

7.4 Package B – Eastern Access to Southampton including the North/North East Hedge End SDA

7.4.1 The northern and western approaches to Southampton are largely covered by package A, while this package looks at the eastern approach and in particular the access from the proposed SDA.

7.4.2 The package comprises a bus priority (and high occupancy vehicle) lane from Windhover, with a strategic Park and Ride site, to the centre of Southampton, along the A3024 incorporating the existing Bitterne Bus Priority scheme and enhancing it with road widenings across railway bridges.
7.4.3 An improvement at Windhover roundabout is proposed to allow improved access to the A3024 from the M27 at Junction 8 which is intended to improve traffic flows there and ease access to the Park and Ride.

7.4.4 The strategy for the SDA is for the site master plan to minimise traffic generation, through the provision of local services and employment and the provision of good public transport links to Southampton and SHSEZ. The proposed Eastleigh rail chord (listed under package D) will encourage rail use and studies have suggested that bus access to Southampton should be directed across Junction 7 of the M27 via the Hedge End retail area with road traffic directed to Junction 8.

7.4.5 Bus priority will need to be introduced on the approaches to and across Junction 7 and again there will need to be area wide traffic management and information systems. Information and travel planning will need to contribute to the promotion of non-car uses if the aspirations of reduced traffic generation are to be realised.

7.4.6 A new road link is proposed east and south of Hedge End to provide the link to M27 Junction 8 with a possible extra link towards the A3024 via St John’s Road and Botley Road. Botley Bypass is proposed to protect the village from generated traffic.

7.4.7 The whole package has a provisional cost of £183 million and provisional calculations by the consultants suggest that a high benefit/cost ratio can be achieved. This together with its direct relationship to the development agenda gives the package a good chance of attracting funding. The rail bridge widenings in Southampton have a sum allocated already in the Regional Funding Allocation.

7.5 Package C – Access in South East Hampshire and Portsmouth including North Fareham SDA

7.5.1 This package is based on a proposed Bus Rapid Transit network which will ultimately cost about £175 million out of a total package cost of around £344 million.

7.5.2 The proposal is to develop the approach taken on the A3 Portsmouth-Waterlooville corridor to provide good quality services on the main spine routes in South East Hampshire. Gosport-Fareham-North Fareham is likely to be an early phase with links to Cosham, Portsmouth and later Havant. Improved interchanges with the ferry between Gosport and Portsmouth are also envisaged as part of this package.

7.5.3 Links from the SDA are proposed to be by bus through M27 Junction 10 towards Portsmouth and for other traffic via a new road access to Junction 11.

7.5.4 As with other packages the key investments will need to be supported by traffic management and bus priority measures (with an area-wide premium bus network) and significant investment in information systems, promotion and the promotion of smarter choices.

7.6 Package D - Access to SHSEZ (South Hampshire Strategic Employment Zone)

7.6.1 This package is primarily centred around the South Hampshire Strategic Employment Zone, a crucial part of the economic strategy providing one of the largest new employment centres in the South East Plan.
7.6.2 Approaching £80 million is required to provide the road link into SHSEZ with associated traffic management and improvements to M27 Junction 5.

7.6.3 The second significant investment in this package is in proposed rail improvements covering the Eastleigh rail chord, adding a second track to part of the Eastleigh-Fareham rail line and improvements to Southampton Airport Parkway station to provide more platforms and passing places as well as developing its potential as a multi-use interchange and links with Eastleigh and its station. Eastleigh chord and the development of Parkway station would greatly assist airport expansion with direct access by rail from the east.

7.6.4 The total cost of the package has an indicative total of £298 million.

7.7 Package E – Tipner

7.7.1 This is a combined scheme of three main interventions, (Tipner interchange, a bridge linking it with Port Solent and a park and ride site) designed to promote increased public transport (and less car) use within Portsea island.

7.8 Package F - Strategic Traffic Management

7.8.1 Modelling work carried out to date strongly indicates that the current trend of a high proportion of traffic growth being accommodated on the motorway network cannot continue.

7.8.2 It is therefore proposed that wide areas traffic management and information systems will be required to manage the traffic which is linked to the active traffic regimes and access control measures on the motorway and allows the maximum benefit to be derived from the road system.

7.8.3 It is anticipated that there will be joint control systems which cover areas around key parts of the network (linked to motorway junctions) and that these will also incorporate public transport priority and special ‘plans’ to cover events and emergencies etc. This package includes provision of a call centre and assistance in freight innovations.

7.8.4 Parts of this package form elements of other packages, particularly package A and efforts have been made to avoid double counting. All figures in this package are indicative only and no detailed work has been carried out on costs and benefits but an improved traffic control system will be an essential part of the approach to transport in the future.

7.9 Package G – Developing the Evidence Base

7.9.1 A robust evidence base is required both to get the TfSH strategy accepted by national and regional government agencies and for testing individual policy interventions and investment proposals. It is also good transport planning practice to verify the proposed strategy as far as is practical and affordable.

7.9.2 It is hoped that a new South Hampshire transport model can be completed by 2010 for use not only to support the TfSH strategy and scheme assessment but also to help assessing future development proposals and Local Development Frameworks.

7.9.3 It is estimated that £5million will be required for this work, including ongoing maintenance and periodic data refresh.
7.10  **Package H – LDF schemes**

7.10.1 A nominal allocation has been included for transport investment including information and ‘Reduce’ measures emanating from and supporting Local Development Frameworks.

7.11  **Other Non-Package Schemes**

7.11.1 There are 16 schemes and programmes listed here with a provisional cost estimate of about £500 million.

7.11.2 These schemes have been assessed by consultants and officers to be less likely to receive funding via the regional funding process.

7.11.3 Some of these schemes relate to smaller interventions like Town Access Plans or Walking and Cycling, while others do not directly meet national or regional objectives.

7.11.4 Inclusion in the ‘others’ list does not mean that TfSH has assessed and dismissed these schemes, far from it, but it does mean that at present there is little point in promoting them for early inclusion in a funding stream.

7.11.5 The government is reviewing its transport investment policies and its appraisal system but at this time it is uncertain whether this will change the relative priority for schemes on the list.

7.11.6 TfSH intends to keep the list under review and liaise with district councils and other interested parties in terms of possible development work on the ‘O’ list bearing in mind current budget constraints and the need to progress schemes within the packages.

7.12  **Conclusion**

7.12.1 Effective transport is one of the preconditions for economic growth in South Hampshire, but its multi-centred geography and complex travel patterns have resulted in significant congestion that presents real challenges. The targeted investment in major transport infrastructure is an important first step towards meeting the demands of the South East Plan and the pressures on South Hampshire. However, capital investment alone cannot resolve the problems of access and congestion in this growing sub-region. Ongoing commitment to a raft of measures aimed at Reducing the need to travel and Managing the transport networks will assist, but will still fall short without a major slice of investment for the many critical schemes for which funding sources have yet to be identified.
8 Funding Sources

8.1 The Range of Funding Sources Available

8.1.1 The Regional Funding Allocation (RFA) process has highlighted a need to justify and prioritise schemes. It has also demonstrated that no one source of funding is adequate to fulfil the investment needs of the sub-region in order to meet growth objectives in line with the South East Plan.

8.1.2 A range of funding sources may be applicable from national, regional and local sources, public and private sector agencies and organizations. Funds such as the Government’s Community Investment Fund (CIF) and New Growth Point Fund could become increasingly important for transport applications although there are other infrastructure needs to facilitate development. A sub-regional approach to developer contributions is helpful in establishing the likely resourcing from land values. There is also scope for transport operators and infrastructure providers to contribute on a commercial basis including Highways Agency, Network Rail, BAA, port authorities and the larger rail and bus operating groups.

8.1.3 All funding sources need to take into account affordability criteria (especially Government sources), value for money (indicated from robust economic appraisals) and the use of resources should be monitored carefully to gain experience about the most beneficial ways of spending the available funds.

8.1.4 It is also clear that prioritising transport proposals is a useful means of establishing their relative merits, taking into account their feasibility and deliverability. The selection criteria used for South Hampshire have also indicated those schemes which have little hope of being funded or delivered in that they do not meet regional criteria. The schemes that have been prioritised include those that are significant at a national and regional level and those that meet sub-regional and local objectives in facilitating development and support economic growth.

8.1.5 South Hampshire is located on Trans European Road and Rail Networks (TENs) and the importance of the area with its international gateways suggests that greater deployment of European Union funding may be possible.

8.1.6 Government grants have been available towards the cost of operating freight trains (track access grants) or infrastructure such as sidings. However, securing the funding has proved difficult and there may be opportunities to negotiate with DfT in this respect in the light of benefits accruing from the avoidance of heavy road vehicle movements.

8.1.7 The possibility of raising revenue through a supplementary business rate is gaining momentum in the UK, having been applied in Europe for some years. This would gather relatively small taxes across the sub-region which in combination could be directed towards capital schemes or revenue costs for transport initiatives such as travel planning or public transport support.

8.1.8 A workplace parking levy and/or road user charging would also generate revenue at a broader scale to support investment and is a discretionary charge to individuals or businesses who could then benefit substantially.
8.1.9 Planning Gain Supplement (PGS) has been proposed to generate funding for infrastructure to support development. PGS is a mechanism through which a proportion of the value uplift arising on land for which full planning permission has been granted but is currently not approved by Government. PGS would be used for funding towards roads and on-site traffic calming, street lighting, landscaping, access roads etc but not other requirements such as education and health facilities. However, in the event that PGS is not introduced, a Supplementary Development Tariff is being investigated by PUSH to provide a funding pool for investment in sub-regional infrastructure.

8.1.10 It would also be possible to raise funding through the City financial institutions by establishing investor confidence in South Hampshire, offering an attractive rate of return with a sound strategy that provided an income stream.

### FUNDING – PUBLIC SECTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Funding Allocation</td>
<td>Regional Transport Board</td>
<td>Prioritised Transport Schemes that deliver SEP objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SEEDA/SEERA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growth Point</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>To support housing growth (&amp; possibly transport growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Infrastructure Fund</td>
<td>SEEDA</td>
<td>Regionally important infrastructure to aid economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Infrastructure Fund</td>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td>To unlock housing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Innovation Fund</td>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>To increase national GDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transport Plan(s)</td>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>Integrated Transport &amp; Maintenance – local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Public Sector</td>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>Schemes of national &amp; regional importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail, Highways Agency,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Area Agreements</td>
<td>Groupings of LAs</td>
<td>Shared priorities including transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUNDING – PRIVATE SECTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developers’ contributions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Transport – Impact fee, (S 106) or</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Transport contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Transport contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Community Infrastructure Levy</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Transport &amp; others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Supplementary Development Tariff</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Transport &amp; others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Business Rate</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Transport &amp; others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major private sector companies – Multi</td>
<td>Private Company</td>
<td>Transport contribution scheme specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationals/Operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage Capital from City Investors PFI</td>
<td>Fund Managers</td>
<td>Loan facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 Towards Delivery

9.1 How Are Initiatives Implemented?

9.1.1 Transport schemes often have long lead times which makes planning difficult. This is particularly the case for rail and major road schemes which can take many years to develop and often involve complex statutory procedures. To ensure that measures are in place when they are needed, planning has to take place now. It is also important that schemes are reviewed regularly to make sure that they continue to meet policy objectives which can change over time.

9.1.2 To achieve this, careful planning is needed to deliver transport schemes:

- Determining a work programme over forthcoming years for interventions taking into account long lead times, identifying lead agencies and involving the relevant stakeholders;
- Develop a strategic model for the whole of the sub-region involving client steering group with academic and specialist expertise with stakeholders. This will be used to test land use and transport scenarios as well as to present justifications for individual schemes;
- Establish a strong evidence base to develop initiatives with regular monitoring data, building on LTP and other resources and databases;
- Identifying and securing funding from a range of sources;
- Continued liaison with all interests and partnership working with the key players, including the Primary Healthcare Trusts, the transport operators, local authorities and other stakeholders;
- An initial step is to submit applications for RFA resources by identifying the most appropriate interventions that meet regional objectives;
- Transport for South Hampshire is seeking to progress some of these initiatives through the PUSH Multi Area Agreement, with the expectation that the freedoms and flexibilities and aligned funding streams, involving close working between Government agencies and TfSH, will help to deliver the necessary outcomes; and
- In addition, TfSH is exploring the opportunities made possible by the provisions of the Local Transport Bill, notably the possibility of creating a new Integrated Transport Authority for South Hampshire.

9.1.3 Expressions of interest for part funding under the Community Infrastructure Fund have been submitted to Government to deliver early schemes.
Appendix A – Planned Development Locations

- East Hampshire
  - Housing sites with permissions including Lindford and reserve sites at Clanfield (275), Rowlands Castle (40) and Horndean (145);

- Eastleigh
  - 6,000 dwellings at North/North East Hedge End SDA and associated employment;
  - other housing sites;
  - Around 6,000 employment opportunities at South Hampshire Strategic Employment Zone with associated rail schemes (Eastleigh Chord and Southampton Airport Parkway expansion) and road access improvements (Chickenhall Lane Link Road);
  - Improving the capacity of the M3 corridor for road and rail to facilitate better access to the sub-region for both people and freight;

- Fareham
  - North Fareham SDA 10,000 dwellings and 121,000m² of employment floorspace;
  - Within the urban area of Locks Heath (341), Park Gate (163), Titchfield Common (303) and North Whiteley (299);

- Gosport
  - 2,500 dwellings between 2006 and 2026 including sites at Daedalus and Gosport Waterfront with employment allocations and the Rowner Renewal project;
  - Daedalus Phase II (152) and Royal Clarence Yard (394);

- Havant
  - Housing at Havant, Leigh Park, Emsworth and South Hayling;
  - Planned development of the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area;
  - Employment at Harts Farm Way/Broadmarsh, Dunsbury Hill Farm and Waterlooville Business Area;

- New Forest
  - Housing allocations including sites in Totton and Marchwood;

- Portsmouth
  - 14,700 new homes by 2026 including 2,000 at Port Solent and 1,500 at Tipner with Tipner Link (M275 access to Port Solent);
- Permissions include Fratton Park (300), St Mary’s Hospital West Wing (200), City Centre North (200), Pompey Centre Phase IV (167), Land at St James’s Hospital (145) and Halliday Crescent, Eastney (134);
- Additional employment at IBM North Harbour, Tipner, Blueprint (Voyager Park), Fratton Goods yard and Portsmouth University;
- Additional office floorspace in the city centre;
- Northern Quarter retail and commercial development in the city centre;

**Southampton**

- Major city centre redevelopment including Mayflower Plaza, Land at Ocean Way/Maritime Walk (Ocean Village), Royal Pier/Town Quay, Civic Centre/Guildhall Square, 144-146 High Street, Habitat Block (Castle Way), Lower High Street and Charlotte Place for large mixed use sites including residential units, retail, leisure, offices, etc;
- Southampton Central Station comprehensive redevelopment as a multi-modal interchange with associated mixed uses as a gateway to the city;
- Further retail and leisure development at West Quay Phase 3;
- Neighbourhood regeneration for St Mary’s focusing on The Square, Kingsland;
- Edge of centre sites including New College site (The Avenue), land adjacent to Dock Gate 10 and Norman Offer site for mixed use including employment;
- Other sites for mixed use and employment including Drivers Wharf, Antelope House (Thornhill), Woolston Riverside and Test Lane South;

**Winchester**

- 6,740 dwellings from 2006 to 2026 in the southern part of Winchester district within the PUSH area;
- Committed housing at West of Waterlooville Major Development Area (3000 dwellings including the reserve element of which 2,400 are in Winchester district), Knowle and Whiteley;
- Possible extensions to the north of Whiteley, west of Waterlooville, Knowle and other locations;
- Strategic employment sites at Whiteley (Solent Business Parks) and West of Waterlooville.
Appendix B – Key Statistics: population, economic indicators and journeys to work

Grey highlight indicates relatively high figures

Yellow highlight indicates relatively low figures
### Population and Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Hampshire District</td>
<td>46,900</td>
<td>110,100</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastleigh Borough*</td>
<td>49,900</td>
<td>119,000</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareham Borough*</td>
<td>45,500</td>
<td>108,400</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosport Borough*</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>78,200</td>
<td>3,128</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td><strong>0.53</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havant Borough*</td>
<td>51,300</td>
<td>116,800</td>
<td>2,124</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>69,600</td>
<td><strong>0.69</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest District</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>173,700</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>99,300</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth*</td>
<td>84,300</td>
<td>196,400</td>
<td>4,910</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>133,400</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton*</td>
<td>95,500</td>
<td>228,600</td>
<td>4,572</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>158,200</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td><strong>7.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Valley Borough</td>
<td>47,200</td>
<td>113,600</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>70,800</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td><strong>13.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Borough</td>
<td>46,600</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>68,100</td>
<td><strong>1.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>579,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,354,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,848</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>857,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Total for Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entirely Within South Hampshire</td>
<td>361,500</td>
<td>847,400</td>
<td>2,948</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>552,200</td>
<td><strong>0.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hampshire Economic Partnership ([www.hep.uk.com](http://www.hep.uk.com))

---

10 Figures less than 1 = net import of workers; greater than 1 = net export of workers.

Transport for South Hampshire Statement
### Economic Competitiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GVA per Head of Population 2006 (£000)</th>
<th>Productivity GVA per Person Employed 2007 (£000)</th>
<th>VAT Registered Firms with Turnover &gt;£1m 2007</th>
<th>Vacant Commercial/Industrial Property 2004/05</th>
<th>Employee Jobs in High Tech Industries 2006 (% of Total)</th>
<th>Working Age Adults Qualified to NVQ Level 4 and Above 2006 (% of Total)</th>
<th>Mean Weekly Earnings (Workplace) 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Hampshire District</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>£396.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastleigh Borough*</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>£379.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareham Borough*</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>£399.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosport Borough*</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>£366.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havant Borough*</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>£414.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest District</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>£407.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth*</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>£470.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton*</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>£486.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Valley Borough</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>£439.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester District</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>£504.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>£426.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Total for Districts Entirely Within South Hampshire</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>£419.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>£474.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hampshire Economic Partnership ([www.hep.uk.com](http://www.hep.uk.com))
## Journey to Work Mode Share (Resident Population: People Currently Working) 2001 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work at Home</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Bus/ Minibus/ Coach</th>
<th>Taxi/ Minicab</th>
<th>Car/Van Driver</th>
<th>Car/Van Passenger</th>
<th>Motorcycle</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Hampshire District</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastleigh Borough*</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareham Borough*</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosport Borough*</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havant Borough*</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest District</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth*</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton*</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Valley Borough</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester District</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Total for Districts Entirely Within South Hampshire</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South East Region</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2001 Census (www.statistics.gov.uk)

---

11 Includes self-employed, agricultural workers, etc

Transport for South Hampshire Statement
### Journey to Work Mode Share (Daytime Population: People Currently Working) 2001 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work at Home</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Bus/Minibus/Coach</th>
<th>Taxi/Minicab</th>
<th>Car/Van Driver</th>
<th>Car/Van Passenger</th>
<th>Motorcycle</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Hampshire District</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastleigh Borough*</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareham Borough*</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosport Borough*</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havant Borough*</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest District</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth*</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton*</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Valley Borough</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester District</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>10.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Total for Districts Entirely Within South Hampshire</td>
<td><strong>8.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2001 Census (www.statistics.gov.uk)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Works Mainly At or From Home</th>
<th>Less Than 2km</th>
<th>2km to 5km</th>
<th>5km to 10km</th>
<th>10km to 20km</th>
<th>20km to 30km</th>
<th>30km to 40km</th>
<th>40km to 60km</th>
<th>60km and over</th>
<th>No Fixed Place of Work</th>
<th>Working Outside UK</th>
<th>Working Offshore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Hampshire District</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastleigh Borough*</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareham Borough*</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosport Borough*</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havant Borough*</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Forest District</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth*</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton*</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Valley Borough</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester District</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Total for Districts Entirely Within South Hampshire</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Region</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2001 (www.statistics.gov.uk)
In 2004, three towns were selected by DfT to demonstrate the effect of ‘smarter choices’ with interventions in a selected area over a sustained period. The project will run until 2009 and a total of £10 million was awarded between Worcester, Darlington and Peterborough.

Each town has set out a strategy to introduce a variety of ‘hard’ measures (aimed at worsening the cost or convenience of car use) and ‘soft’ measures (aimed at improving alternative modes) to promote walking, cycling and bus use. Improved public transport and personalised travel planning have also been key components to the projects and some initial results have been published\textsuperscript{12}.

In Darlington the focus has been to provide participants of the study with high quality travel information, education and training and a marketing strategy, inspiring individuals to change their travel behaviour. Darlington has used individualised marketing to engage with residents, visiting every household, offering travel information and asking how their experience of travel could be improved.

Headline figures show that even the non-targeted population i.e. those who have been exposed only to general marketing, are changing their travel habits. Overall, car trips have decreased by 6.6% and walking and cycling have increased by 8.3% and 54% respectively.

Personalised marketing has also been central to Peterborough’s project, with 12,000 households having received personalised travel information packs. These have been provided along with incentives to help residents try out walking, cycling, bus and car sharing. Results show growth in all sustainable travel modes which have been attributed to the individualised marketing programme.

However Peterborough, due to its location and compact urban structure, has a high level of self containment within its urban area\textsuperscript{13,14}. Public transport, walking and cycling are therefore already more favourable given the shorter distances undertaken to travel to work, shopping and other leisure destinations.

Changes, in terms of transport provision and infrastructure, will also influence mode choice and travel habits. A review of the Delivery Report\textsuperscript{15} shows that investment has been made in public transport corridors (including bus priority and real-time information), a new transport interchange, the introduction of a seasonal park and ride service, upgrading of walking and cycling routes and also safer routes to school programmes. In addition, decriminalised parking enforcement is in place.

The project sample rate was around 3.7% of all households within Peterborough district. The sample may be more susceptible to behavioural change measures because they may already have sustainable lifestyles or have aspirations to do so. If so, then changing the travel behaviour of people who are more attached to their car

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{12} DfT Letter to Chief Executives on the success of the sustainable travel towns, 23rd May 2007, www.dft.gov.uk
\textsuperscript{13} Peterborough: Sustainable Travel Demonstration Town, Travel Behaviour Research Baseline Survey Report, February 2004
\textsuperscript{14} Peterborough: Sustainable Travel Demonstration Town, Interim Evaluation of ITM Programme (Stage 1), July 2005
\textsuperscript{15} Delivery Report for First Local Transport Plan (2001-2006), Peterborough City Council, July 2006
\end{flushleft}
may not produce results similar to the Peterborough, and other, demonstration projects.

- In summary, the changes in travel behaviour of the sample population after individualized marketing results of the after survey show that:
  - In terms of all trips by main mode, there has been a 13% reduction in car driver trips;
  - With trips switching to more sustainable modes so that cycling (up 25%), walking (up 21%) and public transport (up 13%) use have all increased; and
  - Figures show that the total number of cycling trips increased by 24%, walking increased by 21% and public transport use increased by 13% although the sample sizes were small.

- Other results show that the reductions in car use were generated during the morning and afternoon peak periods and there was a 15% reduction in car distances travelled. A control group, who were not exposed to marketing interventions, was also assessed and before and after surveys show that there was no change in behaviour in contrast to Darlington.

- The Worcester project also used individualised marketing which helped change people’s travel behaviour. The most significant change has been an increase in the number of people using the bus. Individualised marketing was not the only reason for growth in bus use however. The promotion of a new bus service which linked to an existing park and ride site, the city centre and target area, made significant contribution (and perhaps bigger contribution given that growth in bus use was much higher compared to increases in walking and cycling).
Appendix D – Proposals for Reduce, Manage, Invest
Appendix E – Proposed Transport Implementation Requirements to 2026

Transport for South Hampshire: Proposed transport implementation requirements to 2026
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme / Project Description</th>
<th>£ (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motorway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junctions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Access To Sub-Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 (M3 Jct 9 - Southampton port incl tfc management)</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 M27 corridor</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 A3 corridor (inc. Farlington P&amp;R &amp; Broadmarsh)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Eastern Access to Southampton inc SDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Southampton Central station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 A3024 Bus &amp; High Occupancy Vehicle Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Northam railway bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Windhover P&amp;R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Windhover Junction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 M27 Jct 7 Bus priority and approach roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7 St. Johns Road/Botley Rd link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8 Link road from N/NE Hedge End SDA to M27 Jct 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9 Other Bus Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10 Botley Bypass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11 Traffic Management, Hedge End Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access in South East Hants inc. N Fareham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>BRT Gosport-Fareham - N.Fareham - Portsmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>SDA Link Rd to Jct 11 &amp; Bus Priority + HOV on M27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Premium Bus network, South East Hants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Gosport, Fareham &amp; Portsmouth Interchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Smarter Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to SHSEZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Chickenhall Link Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>M27 Jct 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Rail improvements - Eastleigh Chord, Botley Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Southampton Airport Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Local Traffic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Smarter Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to Tipner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Park &amp; Ride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Port Solent-Tipner Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Tipner Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Traffic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Smarter Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Traffic Management (not included above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>South Hampshire Traffic Control Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Other Traffic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Freight Delivery Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Developing the Evidence Base</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>South Hampshire Transport Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Schemes Identified through LDF process</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Urban Extensions &amp; other developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Total A, B, C, D, E, F, G &amp; H</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other non-package schemes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Access to North Whiteley</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>Bus Priority Corridors, Southampton Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3</td>
<td>Mile End Road Trafalgar Gate, Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4</td>
<td>A32 Corridor Improvements, Gosport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5</td>
<td>Western Access to Gosport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6</td>
<td>Solent Ferry Links</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7</td>
<td>Rail Access to Southampton Waterfront</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O8</td>
<td>West Totton Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O9</td>
<td>A326 /A35Highway Imps. Waterside &amp; Totton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O12</td>
<td>Totton Town Centre</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O13</td>
<td>Reopening of Waterside rail line</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O14</td>
<td>Walking &amp; Cycling measures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O15</td>
<td>Town Access Plans within sub-region</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O16</td>
<td>Northern Rd bridge renewal, Portsmouth</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Total A to O</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>481</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Cost figures are estimates at this stage which are subject to further refinement following detailed assessment / study

Note 2: Capital schemes include optimism bias in accordance with DfT guidance

Note 3: Cost estimates exclude cost of land purchase
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