

# Transport for South Hampshire Transport Delivery Plan

Stakeholder Feedback Round 2 – Session 2 Wider  
Stakeholders, 10<sup>th</sup> October 2012

Report for Transport for South Hampshire and Stakeholders

December 2012



### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Note summarises the findings from Session 2 of the second round of stakeholder consultation for the Transport for South Hampshire Transport Delivery Plan (TDP), held on 10 October 2012 in Winchester. 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 TDP.
- 2.2 This Note provides an overview of evidence contributed by the 31 stakeholders who participated in a half day workshop in October 2012, the second of the two rounds of workshops planned for this study. The first round covered the identification of current and future 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 sought stakeholder opinion on the overall approach the TDP is taking and then dealt with specifics of the proposed Interventions. A similar meeting was held with key transport operators and Local Transport Authorities (session 1).
- 2.4 The workshop was introduced on behalf of TfSH by Stuart Baker and chaired by Keith Willcox, Head of Strategic Transport at Hampshire County Council. The study team managed the interaction of the stakeholder consultation. All participants were provided with an Information Pack setting out the overall concept of the TDP and details on the proposed Interventions: this was compiled from outputs of the sub-regional transport model (SRTM) and the ongoing review of literature and other relevant data sources. The Pack was issued a week in advance of the workshop.
- 2.5 The structure of the workshop was as follows:

## Stakeholder Feedback

Time	Item	Leader
0930	Welcome & Introduction to the day	Stuart Baker, TfSH Keith Wilcox, HCC
0945	Proposed Interventions	Chris Pownall, MVA Consultancy
1015	Break out groups (4 groups) - urban area & public transport first? - most / least beneficial interventions? - potential negative impacts of interventions? - any interventions missing?	<i>Group Leaders (MVA)</i> Katie Hall Chris Pownall Ian Burden Dave Carter
1115	Coffee	
1130	Plenary - 4 x report back - chairman's discussion	Group Leaders Keith Wilcox
1215	Next Steps Thank you and close	Chris Pownall Keith Wilcox

### 3 Invited Organisations and Workshop Participants

- 3.1 The table below shows those organisations that were invited to attend the workshop. Where no named attendee is provided, it means that the organisation was unable to attend. 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
Associated British Ports	
BAA Southampton Airport	Steve Thurston
Blade Runner Shipping	
Business Solent	
Carisbrooke Shipping	
Community Action Hampshire	
Cowes Harbour Commissioners	
Cyclists' Touring Club	Robert Sebley
DB Schenker	

## Stakeholder Feedback

Organisation	Name of Representative
Eastleigh Borough Council	Cllr David Airey, Ed Vokes, Richard Pemberton
East Hampshire District Council	Sarah Hobbs
Ecoisland	
Environment Agency	
ExxonMobil Fawley	
Fareham Borough Council	Rose Fletcher
Federation of Small Businesses	Charles Burns
Freightliner	Joanne Turner
Gosport Borough Council	David Duckett
Gun Wharf Quays	
Hammerson West Quay	
Hampshire Chamber	Mark Miller
Hampshire County Council	Dominic McGrath, Peter Shelley, Heather Walmsley
Hampshire PCT	
Havant Borough Council	Stuart Wood
Hovertravel	
Institute of Directors	
Isle of Wight Chamber of Commerce	
Isle of Wight Quality Transport Partnership	
Meachers Global Logistics	
New Community for North Fareham	Bruce Slattery
New Forest National Park Authority	
New Forest District Council	Nick Hunt
NHS Hampshire	Dr. Iain MacLennan
Passenger Focus	

## Stakeholder Feedback

Organisation	Name of Representative
PD Ports	
Port of Portsmouth	Kalvin Baugh
Portsmouth City Council	Hayley Chivers, Mike Allgrove, Barry Walker
Propernomics	
Partnership for Urban South Hampshire	Stuart Roberts, Jeff Channing
Rocmor	
Seacat Services	
Southampton City Council	Phil Marshall, Jeff Walters
Solent LEP	
Solent Enterprise Alliance	Graham Ellis
South Downs National Park	Tom Bell
Southern Railway	
Southern Vectis	
Stagecoach	
Test Valley Borough Council	Viv Messenger
Transport Alliance / Sustrans / Hampshire Chamber of Commerce	Nick Farthing
University of Southampton	Adrian Hickford
Winchester City Council	

## 4 Approach to the TDP

- 4.1 Stakeholder feedback was sought on the overall concept of the TDP and whether they felt it was heading in the right direction. Specifically did they approve of the approach which prioritised the cities and public transport?
- 4.2 Overall there was support for this approach and the concept of the TDP. Stakeholders, including those representing areas outside of the two cities, recognised that promoting growth in the cities will have knock-on benefits for the surrounding areas, providing improved access to the cities and improvements to infrastructure in these areas that support growth in cities and public transport usage.

*“the two cities are the economic powerhouses of the area”*

- 4.3 However, it was noted that despite the approach being cities and public transport first, that should not be to the total exclusion of other areas and modes; there needs to be a balance across South Hampshire. There were some concerns that the ‘middle area’ between the cities was going to miss out. It needs to be clearly articulated that the cities are the priority but barriers in other urban areas will also be tackled. The TDP also needs to be clear on whether we mean cities first or all urban areas.

*“it’s certainly right to have cities first, but not cities only”*

- 4.4 Stakeholders agreed that the international gateways are also an important part of the TDP. Although some questioned whether the airport should be on the same standing as the ports, given that it caters for quite a lot of domestic travel and if investment was made in other modes, demand might diminish. Less reliance on the airport would also help to reduce carbon emissions, which is one of the core Outcomes sought through the TDP.
- 4.5 The importance of linking the TDP with land use planning was highlighted. Development areas for both housing and employment will have a significant impact on transport in South Hampshire and, likewise, transport Interventions can help unlock development sites.

## 5 Interventions

- 5.1 The majority of the time for breakout sessions was spent discussing the Interventions that have been included in the technical assessment. Specifically stakeholders were asked:

- Which of these interventions do you think will be most beneficial for South Hampshire, thinking particularly about economic growth and carbon reduction?
- Are there any interventions that you think could have unacceptable negative impacts?
- Are there any interventions missing that you would like to see included?

- 5.2 The following sections of this Note deal with each of these questions in relation to each of the three Intervention categories: Broader Interventions, Public Transport Interventions and Highway Interventions.

## 6 Broader Interventions

### 6.1 Broader Interventions covers:

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

#### Urban Realm

6.2 Urban realm was supported as a priority Intervention to include, recognising that benefits need to be demonstrated. Some stakeholders noted the difficulties in promoting such Interventions to the public when it is hard to demonstrate the benefits in a comparable way to the more traditional cost benefit analysis used for infrastructure improvements.

*“it will support regeneration and revival of the city centre”*

6.3 The importance and value of linking urban realm Interventions with other improvement schemes such as station access was also noted as well as ensuring that it fits with bus access to the city centre.

6.4 Stakeholders also noted that they would like to see urban realm Interventions included for other locations and that other schemes might also be considered in the longer term, such as Romsey Marketplace.

#### Walking and Cycling

6.5 Interventions to encourage walking and cycling were supported. Some stakeholders felt that not enough emphasis has been placed on active modes in the TDP and that there was a need for a more strategic overview of the network, particularly in relation to cycling.

*“the lack of [cycling] network is a big problem”*

6.6 This was also strongly linked to stakeholder feedback that more needs to be made of integration between modes, especially public transport and active modes. Examples include better storage and carrying facilities for cycles on trains and improved linkages between water-borne transport and active modes.

6.7 In terms of particular Interventions that were missing in this category, one stakeholder suggestion was a strategic cycle route from Newport to Yarmouth on the Isle of Wight. The potential for cycle hire was also discussed, building on the commuter and visitor markets in South Hampshire.

6.8 As with urban realm, stakeholders also noted the importance of proper consideration of evaluation of the benefits of walking and cycling to promote further investment in these Interventions and also better direct investment to those Interventions that are most successful in encouraging more walking and cycling in South Hampshire.

## Stakeholder Feedback

### Alternatives to Travel

- 6.9 Stakeholders were supportive of technology improvements to support home-working and reducing the need to travel. There was agreement that investment in high speed broadband was of value but it was also noted that support and engagement from businesses was really critical to encouraging more people to work from home. Further to this, stakeholders also pointed to the importance of a reliable service and clarity on the balance of working at home costs between employer and employee. Assuming these barriers could be overcome stakeholders were supportive of these Interventions.
- 6.10 Stakeholders also suggested that this is one situation where the 'cities first' approach might be reversed as high speed broadband provision was arguably a greater priority for rural areas and the Isle of Wight. There was also a suggestion that this and other facilities to promote 'home' working could in part be provided on a commercial basis through local hubs.
- 6.11 Although stakeholders were supportive of home-working and technology improvements, concerns were voiced that promoting home deliveries as a means to reduce travel was actually in opposition to some well-supported Interventions such as urban realm improvements. It was felt that such an Intervention could have a negative impact on economic growth by discouraging use of local centres and high street facilities and therefore it was not recommended for inclusion in the TDP by stakeholders.

### Managing Freight

- 6.12 Stakeholders were keen that the Southampton City Centre consolidation centre be used as a pilot and expanded into other areas such as Portsmouth if it proves successful. It was also suggested that a consolidation centre for Southampton City Centre might also be able to serve other nearby locations such as Eastleigh and Winchester.
- 6.13 It was recognised that many of the other Interventions will have benefits for freight movements. No further specific freight Interventions were suggested by stakeholders although it was noted that some Network Rail schemes are in progress that would enhance the rail freight options in South Hampshire and stakeholders were supportive of capacity improvements at key road junctions that support freight movements.

## 7 Public Transport Interventions

7.1 The public transport Interventions cover the following categories:

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

7.2 Although stakeholders were supportive of many of the Interventions targeted at public transport, it was noted that high fares continue to be a barrier to increasing public transport use and that this is a factor that lies largely outside of the control of TfSH.

7.3 Integration between modes and specifically the need to build on the introduction of the smartcard through LSTF funding, was also raised, with several stakeholders wanting to see more on this subject in the TDP.

7.4 Notwithstanding these issues, there was strong support for and good discussion on a number of the Public Transport Interventions.

### Bus

7.5 There was stakeholder support for the Tipner – Horsea high quality bus services and additional East-West high quality bus services. Improvements to these bus services were described as *“an easy win”* and some stakeholders recommended they be brought forward for delivery in the short term.

7.6 BRT also received strong support from stakeholders with some calling for it to be brought forward and delivered as soon as possible. They also reiterated the importance of making the whole package of BRT work including the marketing, ticketing and integration with other modes in addition to the infrastructure improvements.

7.7 One stakeholder suggestion for a bus-based Intervention that could be included was a high quality bus link between Eastleigh – Bishopstoke – Fair Oak as there is enough space for bus priority, reasonable bus use in this area already and it would also contribute to reduced emissions in an area of relatively poor air quality. It could also help to relieve congestion in the surrounding area.

7.8 Some stakeholders expressed a desire to see the TDP include quality contracts and control of operators as an Intervention to encourage greater industry cooperation and investment in public transport, particularly the bus network. This was linked to stakeholder comments that fares and the quality of buses were big barriers to increasing bus patronage in South Hampshire. Without improvements in these areas, stakeholders feel large scale growth in usage will not be possible.

### Rail

7.9 Stakeholders were supportive of strategic rail improvements, particularly line speed improvements between Havant and Woking, which would have benefits for rail journeys to/from South Hampshire.

7.10 One of the most discussed rail Interventions was the Eastleigh Chord, which would improve

## Stakeholder Feedback

public transport access to Southampton International Airport, including a direct service from Portsmouth. Whilst stakeholders were supportive of improved public transport access to the Airport, particularly from the East, many felt this Intervention was unaffordable and should therefore not be pursued. There were several suggestions that lower cost alternatives should be considered, for example the provision of an additional platform at Eastleigh station to allow trains to reverse there.

- 7.11 There was some concern voiced that Interventions to provide an electric rail spine from Southampton to Basingstoke could cause significant disruption during construction and that careful planning would be required to avoid *“operator chaos”*. Furthermore, questions were raised as to whether it would be fully utilised by freight companies, as they had already made a significant investment in diesel powered locomotives and other infrastructure that may conflict with overhead lines. There were further doubts over whether it would deliver the anticipated level of carbon reduction as well.

*“There are other things, other than the electric spine, that could bring about significant rail freight development”*

### Water

- 7.12 Stakeholders suggested that more could be done to integrate water-borne transport and active modes, for example through the provision of cycle storage facilities on ferries.
- 7.13 There was also some support for making the most of the Lymington ferry, particularly as it is served by a good rail link. Aside from that, stakeholders were generally supportive of the water Interventions currently in the TDP.

## 8 Highway Interventions

8.1 Highway Interventions have been categorised into three main themes:

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

8.2 Stakeholders were generally most supportive of highway schemes that unlocked development sites, as opposed to those in the targeted investment category. Comments were made that behavioural change could play a role in reducing demand on the network and therefore may negate the need for some of the targeted investment schemes.

### Highway – Unlocking Development

8.3 Particular schemes that stakeholders showed strong support for were Whiteley Way, M27 Junction 10 and Tipner Interchange. Tipner Interchange was seen as very important in supporting good access to Portsmouth Port. Improvements to the Redbridge Roundabout and Windhover Roundabout were also supported by stakeholders.

8.4 The M27 Junction 10 Intervention received strong support as a means to improve accessibility from Fareham and North Fareham to the west. Stakeholders were surprised that this scheme scored slightly negatively against the economic growth KPI because it is located next to both planned job and housing growth.

8.5 One stakeholder expressed concerns over the impact on the environment of the Gosport Western Access as an option for this scheme might run through the Meon Valley, which is within the Titchfield Abbey Conservation Area. Environmental and heritage constraints would certainly need to form part of the assessment of this Intervention.

8.6 Stakeholders also made note of the fact that although the M27 Junction 5 scheme is now committed, the work that the Highways Agency will carry out doesn't represent the full scheme as it was originally intended. There is the potential for the remaining elements of the Intervention (on the Southampton side) to be completed in the longer term as other development sites come online and this should be captured in the TDP.

### Highway – Targeted Investment

8.7 Stakeholders were generally supportive of some junction improvements that will increase capacity for freight movements, however, those Interventions that were focused on unlocking development sites gained more support overall.

8.8 One particular targeted investment Intervention that received support was the Windhover Roundabout improvements on the Southampton Eastern Corridor. The Highways Agency may fund partial improvement to this junction and stakeholders felt it was beneficial for the TDP to include an Intervention that would complete the upgrade of this junction to reduce congestion by signalling all approaches to the roundabout.

8.9 Stakeholders also noted that the M3 Junction 9 A34 grade separation Intervention scored slightly negatively against economic growth. This seemed surprising given its role in strategic freight movements. Further investigation suggests that it could be due to the role of the Intervention in detracting jobs from Southampton (part of the core modelled area) by allowing

## Stakeholder Feedback

better movement. This is more than compensated for by projected job growth in the marginal area, particularly in Winchester district.

- 8.10 Some stakeholders were in favour of Botley bypass and noted that there are studies currently underway to look at options for this. However, it was noted that there is some difficulty in bringing these schemes forward due to the cost of the Intervention. Therefore, it was noted that this might be a scheme for the longer term.
- 8.11 There was some concern expressed that controlled and managed motorways were a *“medicine rather than a solution”* and would not fully deal with the capacity problems on the motorway network.
- 8.12 They were also keen to stress that Interventions should not be seen in isolation and that where capacity is improved at one point on the network, this might just move the problem elsewhere on the network rather than solve the issue. With this in mind, stakeholders were generally more in favour of those highway Interventions that would unlock development sites, over those that were about further capacity improvements. Stakeholders suggested that behaviour change Interventions may be able to play a role and may enable targeted investment in the highway network to be delayed or even abandoned in favour of other transport improvements.

### Park & Ride

- 8.13 The overall stakeholder feedback on Park & Ride Interventions was that the technical assessment perhaps overstated the impact of such Interventions and did not give enough consideration to the commercial practicalities of such schemes. Some stakeholders doubted whether these Interventions were viable.
- 8.14 However, others suggested that they might work in concentrated centres of activities such as Portsmouth, Gunwharf Quays and Junction 5 of M27 where it could provide access to Southampton City Centre, Southampton Airport and Eastleigh. Nevertheless, concerns were also raised over the political sensitivity of placing Park & Ride sites next to the M27, which might encourage more car travel on an already congested route.
- 8.15 Some also pointed out that Park & Ride Interventions need to be considered in the wider context of parking strategies across South Hampshire and there was some scepticism that such Interventions would be successful in this area. Park & Ride facilities in the UK are more commonly seen in historic cities with limited road capacity and parking space.
- 8.16 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.

## 9 Summary

9.1 At the Plenary session some key themes from the consultation emerged:

- Greater need for **integration between modes**. Particularly ensuring maximum value from smartcards and integrating public transport and active modes;
- Related to this, the value of delivering a **package of Interventions** in order to maximise impacts and benefits from a strategic approach, rather than unconnected and piecemeal improvements;
- The need to **deliver committed schemes** in order to ensure continued funding support from Government and private investors;
- The number of **big trip attractors** that are in South Hampshire e.g. international gateways, universities, hospitals, major employment and retail sites, and the need to provide greater focus on these in the TDP;
- That **attracting businesses and industry** to the area is critical and a key Outcome for the TDP;
- The important role that **community facilities** and 'village hubs' can play in reducing the need to travel and supporting local communities;
- Whether **demand management Interventions**, such as parking policies and tolling, should be included in the TDP and, if so, how;
- Serious consideration of **lower cost options** where the concept of an Intervention is supported but the current approach looks unaffordable and undeliverable e.g. Eastleigh Rail Chord;
- **Integration between transport and land use planning** to ensure that transport is not seen as a secondary driver to planning and to build on the current strengths of South Hampshire, such as innovative maritime.

## 10 Conclusions

10.1 There was support for the overall approach to the TDP and most stakeholders were in favour of the Interventions put forward during this session. Stakeholders did point out the need for balance in the approach, ensuring that cities and public transport first didn't mean a complete lack of investment in other areas and modes. The focus should be on prioritising cities and public transport and then building on these Interventions to make improvements in other areas and modes.

10.2 Those interventions that received particular support were:

- Urban realm improvements;
- BRT;
- Strategic rail improvements;
- Highway Interventions that unlock development sites; and
- Walking and cycling improvements.

10.3 However, there were some Interventions over which stakeholders expressed concern or

## Stakeholder Feedback

suggested that they should not be included in further analysis. In particular:

- Eastleigh Chord was seen as unaffordable and stakeholders encouraged a review of lower cost options;
- Park & Ride around Southampton was not deemed to be as beneficial as the technical assessment currently suggests and some stakeholders were doubtful of its applicability in South Hampshire;
- Promoting home deliveries could have negative impacts on economic growth and may also be contrary to urban realm Interventions, which stakeholders deemed were more valuable;
- Doubts over whether the electrification spine Intervention represents good value for money and if it would actually be utilised by freight companies.

10.4 A few suggestions were also made as to what Interventions were missing and might be included in the TDP going forward. These included:

- A more comprehensive approach to the use of cycles to include complete routes, segregation, parking and security;
- Urban realm Interventions in other areas of South Hampshire;
- Greater efforts to build on smartcard technology and Interventions to promote integration between modes;
- Eastleigh – Bishopstoke – Fair Oak bus priority route;
- Potential for greater role of taxis and private hire and also regional coaches;
- Interventions to tackle road safety issues;
- Little consideration of demand management although it was recognised that policy needs to be consistent across South Hampshire to ensure uniformity in attractiveness of that area for business, visitors and residents. Likewise, some stakeholders noted that South Hampshire has a “visitor economy” and that implementing demand management measures could result in businesses and visitors going to areas where such restrictions are not in place.

## 11 Next Steps

11.1 The feedback we have received in the second round of stakeholder consultation will be used to inform the further development of 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.