

Transport for South Hampshire Transport Delivery Plan

Stakeholder Feedback Round 2 – Session 1
Transport Group, 9th October 2012

Report for Transport for South Hampshire and Stakeholders

December 2012



Stakeholder Feedback

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Two sessions were held for the second round of stakeholder consultation for the Transport for South Hampshire Transport Delivery Plan (TDP): Session 1 for select transport operators and representatives and Session 2 for a wider range of stakeholders including local businesses, interest groups and other local authorities. This Note summarises the findings from Session 1, held on 9th October 2012 in Southampton. It includes email feedback from stakeholders who were unable to attend the event.
- 1.2 Feedback from the first round of stakeholder consultation was published to stakeholders in November 2011.

2 Approach

- 2.1 The approach to stakeholder engagement is ongoing consultation with key stakeholders and two rounds of workshops to gather the views of a range of local authorities, businesses, transport operators, healthcare and education providers and other stakeholders. A final consultation round will be held between December 2012 and January 2013 on a draft of the TDP.
- 2.2 This Note provides an overview of evidence contributed by the 13 stakeholders who participated in a two hour discussion in October 2012, session 1 of the second of the two rounds of workshops planned for this study. This was one of two sessions held for the second round of stakeholder engagement. The first round focused on identifying barriers to transport movement in South Hampshire and potential solutions to these barriers. It also presented an opportunity for feedback on the suggested Outcomes that the TDP is trying to achieve and to begin to consider potential solutions.
- 2.3 This second round of workshops sought stakeholder views on the overall approach to the TDP i.e. prioritising cities and public transport, and the proposed Interventions. All participants were provided with an Information Pack setting out the overall concept of the TDP and the technical assessment of the proposed Interventions a week in advance of the workshop. This was compiled from outputs of the sub-regional transport model (SRTM) and other relevant data sources.
- 2.4 The structure of the meeting was as follows:

- 0930 Welcome and introduction
- 0940 Discussion of broader interventions
- 1010 Discussion of public transport interventions
- 1040 Discussion of highway interventions
- 1110 Wrap-up discussions/overall conclusions
- 1130 Close

Stakeholder Feedback

3 Invited Organisations and Workshop Participants

- 3.1 The table below shows those organisations that were invited to attend the meeting. Where no named attendee is provided, it means that the organisation was unable to attend. This first meeting was mainly for transport operators and representatives from the larger local authorities in South Hampshire. A second half day workshop was held with representatives from local authorities, interest groups and local businesses (session 2). Feedback from this workshop is presented in a separate stakeholder feedback note.
- 3.2 Several of the organisations that were unable to attend the workshop contributed comments on the background Information Pack separately via email or telephone conversations and these comments are included in this Note.

Table 3.1 Workshop Invitees and Participants

Organisation	Name of Representative
Black Velvet Travel	
Department for Transport	
First Bus	Matt Callow
Go South Coast	Mark Keighley
Gosport Ferry	
Hampshire County Council	Keith Willcox, Andrew Wilson
Highways Agency	Neil Andrew
Hovertravel	
Isle of Wight Council	Wendy Perara, Chris Wells
Network Rail	Josie Rogers
Portsmouth City Council	
Red Funnel	Murray Carter
Southampton City Council	Frank Baxter, Phil Marshall, Paul Walker
South West Trains	Phil Dominey
Stagecoach Bus	
Wight link	

4 Stakeholder Feedback

- 4.1 The remainder of this Note summarises stakeholder feedback on each of the three main Intervention topics: Broader Interventions, Public Transport Interventions and Highway Interventions; and the overall concept of the TDP. Relevant post-consultation comments are highlighted in green.

5 Broader Interventions

- 5.1 Broader Interventions covers:

- Urban realm;
- Walking and cycling;
- Alternatives to travel; and
- Managing freight.

- 5.2 Overall there was agreement on the assessment of Interventions in this category. There was some discussion about the lack of demand management measures, such as Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) or Low Emission Zones (LEZ) in the assessment but it was felt that such Interventions have the potential to drive jobs and demand away from the city centres and out to the hinterland, which is contrary to the overall approach of the TDP that prioritises growth and investment in the cities. Furthermore, pushing demand to the hinterland could ultimately create greater transport problems in these areas.
- 5.3 On urban realm, it was noted that the neutral scores against the 'reduce unemployment in areas of high deprivation' KPI seemed conservative given that the Intervention should create jobs in an area that's easily accessible by public transport.
- 5.4 The project team has reviewed this scoring and confirmed that it has been correctly calculated. The KPI 4 scoring is based on measures of the improvement in access from identified areas of high deprivation to areas of employment, rather than how an intervention improves employment in areas that are generally well served by public transport.
- 5.5 There was support for the walking and cycling Interventions and in continued investment in this post-LSTF but it was felt the commentary given didn't necessarily match the assessment scoring. In particular that the comment about a "significant" contribution to mode shift was perhaps overstating the impact.
- 5.6 Following the stakeholder meeting we have amended the associated commentary on walking and cycling Interventions.
- 5.7 It was also noted that in some cases, a neutral impact is recorded for Interventions that might be expected to have a positive impact e.g. the contribution of walking and cycling Interventions to carbon reduction. MVA confirmed that these scores are given in respect of the overall range of impacts across all schemes. So whilst walking and cycling Interventions will have a positive impact on carbon reduction, in the context of other Interventions, this impact is relatively small and therefore the assessment against this KPI is neutral.

6 Public Transport Interventions

6.1 The public transport Interventions cover the following categories:

- Bus priority and bus rapid transit (BRT);
- Rail; and,
- Water.

Bus

6.2 In the discussion about BRT, it was pointed out that we need to be clear on what is being tested as part of this Intervention i.e. is it additional/replacement to existing services or a complete overlay on the existing network.

6.3 Stakeholders also expressed some surprise that BRT scored negatively against the reducing emissions KPI, given that there should be resultant increases in public transport use and mode shift towards more energy efficient buses.

6.4 Following the consultation we have reviewed and made small revisions to the KPI 5 scoring for this Intervention in light of comments received.

6.5 There was also some discussion about the Intervention to provide additional East – West high quality bus services. It was noted that First have recently improved service provision in this area and also that it might be more appropriate to consider this Intervention in the longer term programme. Furthermore, some stakeholders questioned why this Intervention performed negatively against KPI 3 – linking people to jobs and key facilities, when one of its primary functions is to bridge the gap in public transport provision between Portsmouth and Southampton.

6.6 Upon investigating, we made the decision to rerun a dedicated test for this Intervention, which had previously been tested as part of the package. As a result, the score for this Intervention against linking people to jobs and key facilities KPI has been adjusted upwards to 'neutral'. The previous score was linked to a small change in access times from a large zone that is unlikely to have been as a direct consequence of the Intervention.

6.7 The model re-run has also resulted in a more positive economic assessment and improved scoring against the unemployment in deprived areas and emissions KPIs. However, the overall assessment of this Intervention still remains 'potentially viable with refinement' as it would require on-going subsidy.

Rail

6.8 The Portsmouth – Southampton skip-stop Intervention was discussed as there was some surprise that it was only given a neutral assessment against the 'reducing emissions' KPI. In respect of this Intervention it was also noted that there are multiple train operating companies involved, which could be a challenge, as could the operating costs for this scheme.

Stakeholder Feedback

- 6.9 Stakeholders were supportive of the suggested inclusion of Havant to Woking line speed improvements and it was noted that Network Rail have already investigated this and can provide some additional information. The discussion in the TDP needs to clarify that this assessment does not consider any knock-on crowding impacts from an improved service but stakeholders were of the opinion that this was unlikely to be a problem.
- 6.10 Stakeholders were also in agreement that the Eastleigh Chord should be removed from the assessment on affordability grounds. However, they supported the principal of looking for alternative options to improve public transport access to the airport on this route.
- 6.11 The electrification spine and the form of traction that will be provided was discussed. North of Basingstoke the definition was clear that it would be overhead powered, but South of Basingstoke the position was less clear.
- 6.12 Furthermore, there are concerns that even if the electrification was to take place, rail freight operators may continue to use diesel rolling stock on cost grounds.
- 6.13 There was also some discussion about whether the potential for a new station at Totton Parkway should be included in the TDP. This is not currently included in the testing programme.
- 6.14 Several of these Interventions also prompted further discussion on costs, particularly the balance of capital and revenue costs. It was recognised that greater consideration needs to be given to the financial and commercial aspects of some Interventions, particularly Rail and Park and Ride Interventions.
- 6.15 Finally Network Rail noted that many of the Control Period 4 schemes are committed and are currently being constructed. Network Rail will provide a list of these.

Water

- 6.16 Stakeholders were in agreement with the assessment of the Interventions in the water category and no significant additions were suggested. However, one of the ferry operators noted that the Citylink bus service may have its funding withdrawn and this could have an impact on ferry services and passenger numbers. In order to promote an integrated transport system, more funding may be required to support this bus service and therefore provide the public transport linkages with ferry services.

Stakeholder Feedback

7 Highway Interventions

7.1 Highway Interventions have been categorised into three main categories:

- Unlocking development;
- Targeted investment; and
- Park and Ride.

Highway – Unlocking Development

7.2 There was little support for Gosport Western Access (to M27), particularly as it is contrary to the policy approach to Daedalus, which promotes a mix-use, integrated Enterprise Zone, which will reduce the need for local residents to use the strategic network to access jobs elsewhere. However, it was recognised that all access options to Daedalus are considered in the technical assessment of Interventions.

7.3 Stakeholder registered surprise the M27 Junction 10 Intervention scored poorly against the economic growth KPI (KPI 1) because it is located next to both planned job and housing growth.

7.4 Further investigation suggested this was largely due to convergence issues in the model and therefore minor adjustments have been made to the KPI 1 score for this Intervention.

Highway – Targeted Investment

7.5 Stakeholders questioned the negative scoring of M3 Junction 9 – A34 grade separation against the 'economic growth' KPI (KPI 1). It was also noted that this scheme is a high priority for the Enterprise M3 Local Economic Partnership (LEP).

7.6 Further investigation of this confirmed that the low scoring against economic growth for this Intervention is related to its role in detracting jobs from Southampton (part of the core) by allowing better movement. However, this more than compensated for by job growth in the marginal area, which is concentrated in Winchester District.

7.7 In relation to Controlled Motorways, stakeholders made reference to John Bates' paper on journey time reliability and the need to consider journey time savings versus reliability in the assessment of these sorts of Interventions.

7.8 It was noted that the Highways Agency are also looking at improvements that could be made to the M3 between Junction 14 and Junction 9. Although outside the South Hampshire area, this will impact on the road network operation in the area and is therefore worth considering. We will liaise with the Highways Agency to ensure this is accounted for in our assessment.

Park and Ride

7.9 Some stakeholders commented that the assessment for all Park & Ride schemes looked relatively generous and that the assessment needs to consider the commercial and operational realities as well as modelled outputs. In particular, we were asked to review

Stakeholder Feedback

scoring on the Tipner and M27 Junction 8 sites as a priority.

- 7.10 Following stakeholder consultation, a comprehensive review of the Park & Ride assessments was undertaken based on a fuller consideration of the operating costs and the commercial realities of delivering such Interventions. This has resulted in adjustments to the KPI scoring for all four Park & Ride Interventions. The scoring of the Adanac Park & Ride site has been downgraded to 'poorer performing' because while this scheme performs well in terms of linking people to opportunities, this will come at the cost of significant ongoing subsidy and poor value for money to the public purse. The overall result is that, at this stage, no Southampton area Park & Ride Interventions are recommended for inclusion in the TDP.
- 7.11 As was mentioned in relation to the rail schemes, there also needs to be a fuller consideration of the costs and clear description of what is included / excluded in scheme costs. For example, in relation to Park & Ride sites, whilst the cost of building the associated car park is included, the operational costs for this car park are not. Stakeholders agreed this needs to be included in the assessment.
- 7.12 It was also noted that schemes were tested in isolation for this assessment and there may be linkages to other schemes, and therefore additional benefits, that are not accounted for in this assessment. For example, stakeholders noted the potential interaction between Park and Ride and the BRT and Eastern Corridor schemes.

8 Feedback on Overall Concept

- 8.1 This meeting also gave the opportunity for stakeholders to give their views on the overall concept being adopted for the TDP and to confirm that they're happy with the approach taken and the likely direction of the TDP.
- 8.2 There was widespread support for the concept from the stakeholders present. It was noted that more discussion on how the Interventions have been sifted and assessed would be beneficial. Greater discussion of how scheme costs have been developed and what they cover is also required. It was noted that costs need to be presented consistently i.e. over the same time period and dealing with capital and revenue costs in the same manner for each Intervention.

9 Conclusions

- 9.1 This part of the second round of stakeholder consultation was a very important step in checking the direction of the TDP and the technical assessment work supporting it. There was strong stakeholder support for the overall concept and general approval of the Interventions included for consideration.
- 9.2 The feedback received has resulted in some of the scorings against KPIs to be checked. In some cases scores were amended, while other comments highlighted where greater explanation of these scorings is required.
- 9.3 No significant gaps were noted in terms of Interventions that might be included. Totton Parkway was the only scheme to be mentioned, but only in the context of being a legacy scheme rather than one that stakeholder were keen to promote. Stakeholders were also largely in agreement about which Interventions had been excluded.
- 9.4 However, as a result of the stakeholder feedback, we have considered the assessment of Park and Ride Interventions, proving a fuller appreciation of the operating costs involved and the commercial consideration of these types of Interventions. Also, for some of the more 'blue-sky' road interventions, namely the Gosport Eastern and Western Access schemes and the Portsmouth – Gosport link, an adjustment has been made to the Optimism Bias applied to scheme costs to capture the risk associated with what could be complex projects.
- 9.5 It has also been noted that the TDP should provide a full discussion of how scheme costs have been developed and considered in the assessment and that they must be presented consistently across all Intervention types.
- 9.6 The TDP document will also allow for greater consideration of the interactions between Interventions and how they might link together to create the optimal package of measures for South Hampshire, which maximises the synergistic benefits of the individual Interventions.
- 9.7 The feedback we have received in the second round of stakeholder consultation will inform the TDP. It also provides some guidance in terms of the narrative required in the TDP to communicate the concept and decisions on Interventions to a wider audience. Importantly, this feedback also contributes to an Intervention sifting process that should help South Hampshire leverage transport funding from a number of sources in the future.