

Report to the Transport for South Hampshire Joint Committee

Date: 21 June 2010

Report by: Ben Clifton

tel: 01962 846761

email: ben.clifton@hants.gov.uk

Subject: Access to Gosport Study

Purpose of the Report

This report seeks approval from the Joint Committee of the findings and conclusions from the Strategic Access to Gosport study (StAG).

Recommendations

- 1. That the outputs of the study, including the Implementation Plan, are approved as a basis for taking forward and delivering transport and accessibility improvements for the Gosport Peninsula up to 2026.**
- 2. That Stubbington Bypass is retained as a policy measure that could contribute to the wider objectives for improving accessibility onto the peninsula, accepting that implementation of the scheme may not come forward within the study period (to 2026).**
- 3. That the study findings be adopted as a basis to inform the Local Development Frameworks for Fareham Borough Council and Gosport Borough Council, and inform the development of the Solent Transport Strategy section of Local Transport Plan 3 and the findings are shared with the Borough Councils and local County Members via the local Hampshire Action Teams.**

Introduction

1. Almost 10 years have passed since the last strategic transport study for the Gosport Peninsula. Since then the proposed Light Rapid Transit system to link Fareham, Gosport and Portsmouth via a tunnel under Portsmouth Harbour has had its Central Government funding removed. The accessibility issues this scheme sought to address still exist, particularly on the strategic routes on and off the peninsula. The Executive Summary of the report is attached as Appendix 1.

2. This study identifies actions and measures to improve strategic access to the Gosport Peninsula. The overall aim of this study is to define a set of high level deliverable measures, which will contribute to:
 - (i) managing existing and predicted future access issues, including safety and the environment, for the Gosport Peninsula; and
 - (ii) supporting the local economy and growth agenda proposed for the Gosport Peninsula.
3. Re-introducing heavy rail onto the Gosport Peninsula has not been considered within this study. Likewise, Light Rapid Transit has not been considered. Both options would be significantly more expensive to procure than the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Phase 1 scheme, which is the preferred option for the safeguarded disused railway route.

Study area

4. The study area covers the whole of the peninsula, including the southern part of Fareham Borough, with the A27 forming the northern boundary, and the River Meon and Titchfield Gyratory forming the western boundary of the study area. The Strategic Access to Gosport (StAG) study area is abutted by other study areas, including the M27 corridor study, the Wider Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) study and the Delivering a Sustainable Transport Strategy (DaSTS) study for south Hampshire.
5. To the north of the study area, the proposed North Fareham Strategic Development Area (SDA) has been included within the StAG study as it will assert considerable influence on the study area, particularly as a source of employment for Gosport residents.

Study approach

6. The study timescales for assessment have been identified as Current Scenario (2009/10) and Future Scenario (2011-2026). The study provides a review of the Current Scenario by compiling evidence from a variety of information sources, including traffic data and origin/destination data, public transport provision, walking and cycling, population and employment profiles and land use and economy statistics.
7. The Future Scenario is defined to conform with the timescales for the South East Plan, and the main changes to the key indicators (traffic, population, land use and employment) between the Current Scenario and the Future Scenario are identified.
8. The study then identifies a range of measures from existing sources, such as policy documents, and then assesses how these measures

contribute to the aims of the study. Examples of these measures include:

- (i) BRT Phase 1;
- (ii) Newgate Lane improvements;
- (iii) Peel Common Roundabout improvements;
- (iv) Quay Street Roundabout improvements;
- (v) ITS Strategy;
- (vi) Western Access to Gosport;
- (vii) Walking and cycling improvements.

9. The study also identifies a number of areas for future consideration, in addition to the measures already identified from existing sources. These additional areas for consideration arise from the review carried out by the study and are intended to contribute to meeting the aims of the study. Examples of areas identified for future consideration include:

- (i) BRT future phases;
- (ii) A27 route management study;
- (iii) Cycle network for Gosport;
- (iv) Smarter Choices;
- (v) Gosport to Whiteley study.

Western Access to Gosport (Stubbington Bypass)

10. The study reviews the case for a bypass of Stubbington, in particular with regard to how it would contribute to improving accessibility through the western approaches to Gosport.
11. The review of the scheme is based on an evaluation of the benefits that the scheme would provide to travellers and the performance of the network, and the cost and affordability of the scheme in order to test its deliverability. The scheme's environmental and design details were not considered as part of the evaluation.
12. The scheme is likely to provide a benefit in terms of journey times for users. The exact level of benefit would be determined by the alignment and the form of the bypass. In principle the alignment is likely to be relatively circuitous compared to the existing route through Stubbington village, but is likely to have higher average speeds.
13. However, the bypass would still be subject to existing causes of delay along this corridor, such as the Segensworth Gyratory, Titchfield Gyratory and Peel Common Roundabout. If, as would be expected, the bypass attracts additional and new users, these junctions would be subject to increased levels of congestion and delay. This potential additional delay would have to be balanced against any journey time advantage provided by the bypass.

14. A bypass improvement will attach a significant cost, estimated at £8-10 million in 2004, but likely to be considerably higher once costs associated with environmental regulations, land and project fees are taken into account. The planned level of development on the peninsula will not be able to fund the measure, and in the current economic climate, central or regional government funding is unlikely to be forthcoming.
15. Stubbington Bypass is included within the Implementation Plan (see below) as a policy commitment. However, the current funding context makes it unlikely that a scheme will come forward within the timescales of the study period. Therefore the scheme should be reviewed periodically in line with the Implementation Plan timescales in recognition that the funding situation could change.

Implementation Plan

16. The study proposes an Implementation Plan of measures, including further studies, to be taken forward within a framework of Short (2010-2015), Medium (2016-2020) and Long (2021-2026) timescales.
17. Each scheme is defined according to project phases – Policy, Planning, Funding and Implementation. The potential funding stream options are also identified based on best knowledge and understanding at this time.
18. Within the Implementation Plan, 19 measures are identified, together with eight areas for further consideration. The exact phasing of the measures is heavily dependent on factors such as funding availability and policy review, and the Implementation Plan will need to be monitored and reviewed regularly in accordance with the Local Transport Plan (LTP) and Local Development Framework (LDF) monitoring processes. The full Implementation Plan is attached as Appendix 2.

Conclusion

19. The Strategic Access to Gosport study identifies actions and measures to manage and improve access to the Gosport Peninsula. A review of the Current Scenario (2010) and the predicted Future Scenario (2026) provides the basis for identifying a number of measures that contribute to the aims of improving accessibility and supporting the local economy on the peninsula.
20. The Implementation Plan sets out an outline programme of measures and further studies, whose delivery depends on a number of factors, including future funding availability and policy context. It is therefore important that the plan is kept under review and updated. Stubbington Bypass is retained as a scheme within the Implementation Plan as a policy commitment, subject to periodic review.

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background papers

The following documents disclose facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and has been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report.

NB the list excludes:

1. Published works.
2. Documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.

TITLE

LOCATION

Strategic Access to Gosport (2010 - 2026), February 2010 Transport for South Hampshire

Executive Summary

Mott Gifford has been requested by Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH) on behalf of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH), to undertake a transport planning study that will identify high level actions and measures to improve strategic access to the Gosport Peninsula up to 2026. This study is called and referred to as Strategic Access to Gosport (StAG) within this report.

This study will form part of the transport evidence in both Gosport Borough Council and Fareham Borough Council Local Development Framework (LDF) processes covering the period up to 2026, and also subsequent rounds of Hampshire County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP), with LTP 3 covering 2011-2016 and beyond.

TfSH defines the overall focus of this study as deliverable measures which could contribute to the management of issues related to journey delays and accessibility by all modes, within the context of combating climate change, supporting the economy and accommodating planned growth up to 2026. Through managing these issues, this study will be consistent with the goals of Delivering a Sustainable Transport Strategy (DaSTS), in particular by supporting economic growth, promoting equality of opportunity, tackling climate change and improving quality of life.

This study report provides a high level consideration of strategic access issues for trips to and from the Gosport Peninsula based on key indicators derived from a variety of references. Areas identified for future consideration are identified to an extent that they communicate the intent and location of the measure, but with sufficient flexibility to respond to further detailed assessment in due course.

The StAG report derives an implementation plan for measures related to strategic access to/from the Gosport Peninsula by firstly examining the current scenario (2009/10) to clarify the issues, then setting out a projected future scenario (2011/26). This enables discussion regarding the change in opportunities and constraints in terms of strategic access to/from the Gosport Peninsula. These findings and their implications for strategic access to Gosport are then considered, before a set of measures (both currently identified and areas for future consideration) is identified.

This process enables a StAG implementation plan to be defined and consideration given to phasing and funding opportunities. This StAG implementation plan is prepared in accordance with the mix of measures both currently proposed by policy and also areas identified through StAG for future consideration. The implementation plan therefore reflects a mixture of car and

non-car based measures, seeking to better manage network and mode share utilisation, for both strategic and non-strategic trips.

The implementation plan sets out when the various measures may achieve key measure milestones, spread between the current (2010/15), medium (2016/20) and future (2021/26) programmes. This is based on current best knowledge and is therefore likely to evolve over time.

Once the implementation plan and list of measures/areas for future consideration is agreed a key action and next step is to take the measure definition/planning forward, beyond this initial high level stage, so that measures are ready to take advantage of funding opportunities as and when they arise.

Consideration is also given to funding opportunities. There is a mix of funding streams available so measures need to be flexible enough to be defined to meet various funding stream criteria and ready to be packaged with other measures as appropriate to enable potential early delivery or a phased approach.

In conclusion, it is considered that the implementation plan for StAG will need to be reviewed and updated as the measure development process progresses. It is considered that the monitoring and review of the implementation plan should be carried out in accordance with established policy/strategy review processes and that the LTP and the Local Planning Authority's Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) present the most appropriate means for StAG review/monitoring.

The StAG Study report recommends that:

- (i) the contents of the StAG Implementation Plan are reviewed and agreed in terms of measures and timescales;
- (ii) the measures identified within the StAG Implementation Plan are taken forward to measure planning (as required) to enable proactive allocation from future funding opportunities when they arise;
- (iii) the StAG Implementation Plan is monitored and reviewed as part of the on-going LTP and LDF policy/measure review process; and
- (iv) the StAG study report and implementation plan are considered as an input into the Fareham and Gosport Borough Council's Local Development Framework processes, and are considered during future rounds of LTP formulation and future development of TfSH strategy/policy.

Table Error! No text of specified style in document..1: Implementation Plan and Funding Stream Options

		Short (2010 - 2015)				Medium (2016 - 2020)				Long (2021 – 2026)			
	Measure	Policy	Planning	Funding	Imp	Policy	Planning	Funding	Imp	Policy	Planning	Funding	Imp
1a	Newgate Lane (A)			LTP / DC									
1b	Newgate Lane (B)			LTP / DC									
2	Peel Common Roundabout			LTP / DC									
3	Quay Street / Fareham AQMA			DC									
4	Access to Daedalus			RDA									
5	ITS Strategy			LTP / DC				LTP / DC				LTP / DC	
6	Brockhurst Roundabout			DC									
7	BRT Phase 1			CIF									
8	Gosport Waterfront Interchange							LTP/DC					
9	Western Access to Gosport *												
10	A32 Access to Gosport							LTP/DC					
11	Portsmouth to Southampton Ferry											RDA/OP	
12	Delme Roundabout							LTP/DC					
		Short (2010 - 2015)				Medium (2016 - 2020)				Long (2021 – 2026)			
	Measure	Policy	Planning	Funding	Imp	Policy	Planning	Funding	Imp	Policy	Planning	Funding	Imp
13	Stubbington Village Centre							LTP / DC					
14	A27 Bus Priority + TM							LTP/DC					
15	Access to North Fareham SDA							CIL				CIL	
16	Fareham Rail Station Interchange							NR/CIL				NR/CIL	
17	Walking and Cycling Improvements			LTP/DC				LTP/DC				LTP/DC	
18	BRT Vision / Future Phases			CIL/Op				CIL/Op				CIL/Op	
Areas Identified (through StAG) for Future Consideration													
A	Western Boundary Severance Study							LTP / DC	STS			LTP / DC	STS
B	Quay St/Newgate Lane Pedestrian Links Study							LTP/DC	STS			LTP/DC	STS
C	Cycle Network for Gosport			LTP/DC				LTP/DC				LTP/DC	
D	BRT Future Phases			CIL/Op				CIL/Op				CIL/Op	
E	A27 Route Management Study							LTP / DC	STS			LTP / DC	STS
F	M27 Route Management			HA				HA				HA	
G	Gosport Smarter Choices			LTP/DC				LTP/DC				LTP/DC	
H	Gosport to Whiteley Study							LTP / DC	STS				

Abbreviations and Funding Streams:

STS **Subject to Study**
CIF **Community Infrastructure Fund (or other forms of Central Government Funding)**
CIL **Community Infrastructure Levy**

DC **Developer Contributions**
HA **Highways Agency**
Imp **Implementation**
LTP / DC **Local Transport Plan / Developer Contributions**
RDA **Regional Development Agency**
RFA **Regional Funding Allocation**
SEEPB **South East England Partnership Board**
Op **Transport Operator**

Notes:

* = Any reassessment of WAG will be based on the policy and funding context at the time of review.

DC = Developer contributions for schemes are subject to agreement with external parties.

LTP / DC = It is unlikely that funding for subsequent LTPs will be of the same magnitude as for LTP1 and LTP2. It is therefore likely that schemes will require some level of developer contribution to make up the deficit.