

## 8B/ Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (7138)

### South East Plan EiP: Sub-matter 8Biii Infrastructure and Implementation

#### Statement by Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (ref 7138)

##### **8Biii.1 Have the water supply and waste water treatment, flood risk and transport implications of the growth proposals been adequately considered (Policies SH10 and SH14)?**

1. Yes. Work on the strategy for South Hampshire has included extensive participation by the water supply and waste water disposal companies and the Environment Agency. In consultation with PUSH, in August 2006 the Environment Agency commissioned Atkins to undertake an Integrated Water Management Study of the sub-regional proposals. The Agency is committed to working with PUSH to develop solutions to the environmental problems that could result from significant further growth in South Hampshire. PUSH and the Agency recognise the complex inter-relationships between water resources, water quality, biodiversity and flood risk and the scale and location of development. The results of the study have confirmed the view that it should be possible to reconcile the competing pressures on the water environment, but this will require concerted and integrated action, and expenditure on appropriate infrastructure, by many stakeholders.
2. Environment Agency Catchment Abstraction Management Plans (CAMS) show that water resources in this area are already almost fully committed. Proposals for a new water storage reservoir at Havant Thicket to meet future needs are contained in Water Resources Plans and in the South East Plan Implementation Plan. It is recognised that abstraction licences for existing supplies for South Hampshire may need to be reduced to meet the requirements of the Habitats Directive and this is a source of some concern. The South East Plan Policy SH14 commits the authorities to securing reductions in water use in new development, greater water efficiency in existing development and the implementation of sustainable drainage systems where feasible in accordance with Environment Agency advice. Policy SH14 provides a requirement for developers to act sustainably rather than just encouraging it thereby helping to achieve tougher water efficiency targets (refer to PUSH statement relating to Matter 4B.3).
3. The treatment and disposal of increased quantities of sewage effluent is generally not considered to be an insurmountable problem, subject to timely investment in new infrastructure. The study has, however, confirmed that local difficulties may exist where river flows are inadequate to dilute sufficiently the treated effluent from waste water treatment works in order to maintain water quality. The problem is compounded where river flows suffer from further abstraction and the Chickenhall WWTW at Eastleigh will require significant investment to address this issue. Further, more detailed, studies of these issues will be undertaken to ensure a sound basis for planning, funding and delivery of the future water infrastructure requirements of the sub-region.

## 8B/ Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (7138)

4. The strategy for South Hampshire is focussed on the regeneration and renaissance of both Portsmouth and Southampton as well as the other older urban areas. Consequently, the strategy has assumed that the developed coast will be defended in its existing position given their economic, social and recreational roles within the sub-region. This is particularly important for Portsmouth, Southampton, Havant and Gosport where there are large areas of the existing urban area that lie within the tidal flood plain and are protected by flood defences. If the assumption that the existing urban areas will continue to be defended is correct, then the flood risk implications of the growth proposals have been adequately considered. If there is any prospect that the existing urban areas within the tidal flood plain will not continue to be defended, then the flood risk implications of the growth proposals have not been adequately considered. Indeed, the entire sub-regional strategy and the distribution of future housing supply would need to be reconsidered as a Flood Risk Study<sup>1</sup> undertaken by PUSH estimates that an additional 10,624 dwellings will be built within the floodplain between 2006 and 2026. PUSH believes, however, that it is inconceivable to even consider the abandonment of major urban areas like Portsmouth.
5. Some existing flood defences do not provide defence to the recommended standard (i.e. less than a 1 in 200 year event). Development that provides for new flood defences as part of the development, or contributes towards new flood defences outside of the development site, can result in betterment over the existing situation for existing properties. The overall aim of the strategy is to deliver a net improvement in flood risk across the sub-region.
6. To inform this matter a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for South Hampshire is to be undertaken this will consider both tidal and fluvial flooding. Government has recently announced Growth Point funding amounting to £120,000 over two years towards the assessment.
7. The development proposals for South Hampshire have been tested against the Highways Agency's traffic forecasts for the strategic road network. This shows that many of the key road links in the sub-region are already congested at peak periods and that at other times, operating well beyond their built capacity. In many cases, there is no capacity on parallel road links, as the M27 motorway carries a high proportion of local traffic. Calculations suggest that demand for travel is likely to increase by around 30% between 2004 and 2026. Without investment the transport network would suffer from growing congestion and longer journey times. By 2026 overall time on the highway network would increase by over 60%, compared to the overall increase in demand of around 30%. This demonstrates that interventions are necessary to tackle this problem and maintain quality of life for the existing residents of the sub-region. PUSH endorses the Solent Transport Strategy in seeking interventions based

---

<sup>1</sup> South Hampshire Sub-regional Strategy Flood Risk and PUSH Housing Figures 2006. EIP Core Document SH18. Viewable on PUSH website: <http://www.push.gov.uk>

## 8B/ Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (7138)

upon the philosophy of reduce, manage and invest. A package of critical transport intervention measures has been produced, with a price tag of some £2 billion, to ameliorate the effects of this growth in traffic demand. Without this package, the development proposals would not be feasible. Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils and Hampshire County Council have included a common Solent Transport Strategy in their second Local Transport Plans. This is reflected in policy SH10.

8. Attached at Appendix 1 is a list of critical transport interventions for South Hampshire. This updates figure 5 in the Solent Transport Strategy 2006<sup>2</sup>. It should be noted that this list includes the 'Reduce' and 'Manage' measures, rather than solely 'Invest', as listed in the Implementation Plan.

### **8Biii.2 Are the proposals in the Implementation Plan (including for social and green infrastructure) clear, justified and well related to the spatial strategy? What are the priorities?**

9. Yes. The proposals detailed in the Implementation Plan are set out clearly, are a pre-requisite to ensure that the growth proposals are sustainable and have been identified as a result of working with stakeholders in developing the sub-regional strategy. They will also assist with the implementation of other cross cutting region-wide policies in the draft Plan. However, the Implementation Plan only identifies schemes of regional and sub-regional importance. Schemes which SEERA regard as of 'local' importance are not identified in the Implementation Plan Investment Framework. These include social and community infrastructure as well as health, education, affordable housing and libraries etc. Neither are the revenue implications of the capital infrastructure schemes identified.
10. During summer 2006, PUSH updated the infrastructure requirements in conjunction with the infrastructure and service providers. The identified schemes of regional and sub-regional importance were incorporated by SEERA into the South East Plan Implementation Plan. The full findings of that PUSH work were recently submitted to the EiP as a background document<sup>3</sup>. That background document includes all infrastructure needs whether sub-regional or local because PUSH regards all infrastructure as being critical to the delivery of the sub-regional strategy.
11. The critical transport intervention measures relate closely with the spatial strategy, in terms of concentrating development and investment in the regional hubs and going further than the manage and invest approach, by proposing the use of behavioural change mechanisms to introduce a reduce phase to the strategy. The measures have been formulated through the close working of the local authorities, together with the stakeholders involved in the multi-modal, multi-disciplinary Solent Transport partnership. All the proposals in the Implementation Plan plus the more local/site specific infrastructure requirements set out in the PUSH background

---

<sup>2</sup> Portsmouth City Council, Hampshire County Council & Southampton City Council Second Local Transport Plans. EiP Core Documents SH12, SH13 & SH14.

<sup>3</sup> South Hampshire Sub-region (Non Transport) Infrastructure Needs November 2006.

## 8B/ Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (7138)

document are needed by 2026 if the development proposals are to proceed. Failure to provide the infrastructure such as transport and utilities, and facilities such as schools and recreational space would mean a repeat of past mistakes of new housing being built without the associated facilities and would thus frustrate the Government's objective to create sustainable communities. All the items listed in the Implementation Plan are essential, so prioritisation of them would therefore be inappropriate, although PUSH does acknowledge that the timing of their implementation will need to be phased to match the pace of new development.

12. PUSH regards green infrastructure as an equally important component of the overall infrastructure requirements. However work is less well advanced on identifying and costing green infrastructure proposals for South Hampshire. PUSH is commissioning consultants to prepare a green infrastructure strategy the methodology and scope of that work is in Appendix 2. The full consultancy brief is available on request<sup>4</sup>. Work on this will have started by the time of this EiP debate and PUSH will press for the resulting green infrastructure proposals to be incorporated into the Implementation Plan. Those proposals will provide alternative recreational venues to those available within the New Forest and the proposed South Downs National Parks, such that new urban development in South Hampshire does not place additional visitor pressures on those two National Parks.

### **8Biii.3 Will the proposed mechanisms for implementation be effective (Policies SH4 and SH11)? Would it be appropriate to include a tariff-based approach to be applied to all new development in this sub-region?**

13. Yes. The Solent Transport partnership represents a potential model for the transport delivery agency proposed in Policy SH11, having been established for over 3 years and widely recognised within the spatial strategy and the Regional Transport Strategy as a template for other sub-regions. The establishment of such a delivery agency would, however, need to be accompanied by new and appropriate powers to receive and administer funding and commit expenditure. It is not possible to determine whether this implementation agency would be effective until the scope of powers and availability of funding have been determined but PUSH is confident that an appropriately established body would be effective.
14. Most of the social infrastructure that will be required to ensure that new development is sustainable has not been included within the Implementation Plan. For example, no costs have been included for the increased revenue expenditure that will be required to provide the expected standard of emergency services. Similarly, there are no costs identified for the health sector, social services, libraries or higher education, either capital or revenue. Whilst it is understood that these costs have not been included because they are not specific to the sub-region and would apply

---

<sup>4</sup> Available from David Carman, Environment Department, Hampshire County Council. Email: [david.carman@hants.gov.uk](mailto:david.carman@hants.gov.uk)

## 8B/ Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (7138)

across the region wherever development takes place, it is essential that the government allows for increased expenditure within these areas of service provision. Failure to do so would mean that South Hampshire residents would experience a decline in the quality of life and that the growth proposals would not be sustainable. It is therefore contended that the proposals in the Implementation Plan are not clear in relation to certain aspects of infrastructure provision and that as a result of this, effective implementation must be uncertain.

15. PUSH supports in principle, the concept of a tariff on new development in South Hampshire to fund strategic transport infrastructure but reserves its position on the details of such a tariff e.g. whether certain types and sizes of sites should be exempt. However, PUSH is clear that the highest priority must be given to ensure that sufficient funding is available to ensure the provision of supporting infrastructure both to catch up with present need and for the future requirements of the area. In that regard, a tariff would not provide all the required funding; substantial Government funding would still be required in addition.
16. The South East Plan could helpfully provide more encouragement to local planning authorities to work with service providers and developers to identify, programme and help fund the necessary infrastructure provision required to support the strategy. Otherwise the non-delivery of key infrastructure is likely to lead to further development being deferred until later.
17. PUSH supports the proposal in Policy SH4 for an implementation agency for South Hampshire. The nature of this agency and the scope of its powers have not yet been determined. It would be premature to determine these issues before the sub-regional strategy is defined through the South East Plan process and it is therefore not possible to analyse whether this agency will be effective in delivering the strategy but PUSH is confident that an appropriately established body would be effective. However, PUSH is concerned that any implementation agency must be the subject of local democratic control.



**Solent Transport Strategy - Critical Interventions Required for Development to 2026**

SCHEME	2006- 2011	2011 - 2016	2016 - 2021	2021 - 2026	Tackles Congestion	Access to Development	Access to ports/airport
<p><b>REDUCE</b></p> <p><u>Smarter Choices</u></p> <p>Land use policies to create more sustainable communities including local employment &amp; other services</p> <p>Travel planning for workplace, schools, colleges &amp; neighbourhoods</p> <p>Radical Demand management measures</p> <p>Personalised travel planning, interactive marketing &amp; information systems</p> <p>Hythe - Southampton ferry upgrade including Park and Ride</p>							
<p><b>MANAGE</b></p> <p><u>Strategic Traffic Management</u></p> <p>Controlled motorways - Variable speed limits, swift incident recovery, greater use of VMS &amp; patrols on neighbouring local roads</p>		£15m					

8B/ Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (7138)

Management of the strategic network of the local transport authorities including M27 jct. interface measures.	<-----£175m----->			✓		
Management of public car park capacity & charging regimes	<-----Minimal Cost----->			✓		
<u>Strategic Transport Interchanges</u>						
Southampton Central transport development area	£15m	£30m		✓		
Portsmouth & Southsea new bus/rail interchange	<----£5m---->			✓		
Portsmouth Hard Interchange Improvements	£10m					✓
Southampton Airport interchange improvements	£10m					✓
Premium Interchanges (approx 10 - 20 no.)	<-----£30m----->			✓		
<b>INVEST*</b>						
<u>Premium Network</u>						
Additional, high quality buses	£10m	£30m	£30m	✓		
Key Fastway Corridors	£60m			✓	✓	
Technology & information media	£5m	£5m		✓		
Pump Priming funding ahead of development (approx 6 sites)	£5m	£5m			✓	

\* All Cost figures exclude land and compensation

8B/ Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (7138)

SCHEME	2006 - 2011	2011 - 2016	2016 - 2021	2021 - 2026	Tackles Congestion	Access to Development	Access to ports/airport
<u>Rapid Transit</u>							
North Fareham - Gosport - Portsmouth city rapid transit link		£120m			✓	✓	✓
<u>Access to Strategic Development Areas</u>							
North Fareham SDA - Links with Fareham & Portsmouth		£40m				✓	
North Hedge End SDA - Bus links with Southampton		£40m				✓	
Rail Links with Southampton: Botley - Provision of extra rail capacity			£60m			✓	
Eastleigh Chord			£55m			✓	
<u>Park &amp; Ride*</u>							
Windhover including priority route to city		£10m			✓		
Tipner Site including priority route to city		£10m			✓		
Farlington Site including new rail station		£10m			✓		
Nursling including priority to the city		£15m			✓		
Stoneham including priority to the city		£15m			✓		
<u>Local Roads &amp; Bypasses</u>							
A3024 Bitterne station bridge widening including bus priority	£15m				✓		

8B/ Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (7138)

A3024 Northam railway bridge including bus priority	£15m	✓		
Mile End Road, Trafalgar Gate link	£10m	✓		
North End, Portsmouth highway improvements	£5m	✓		
Chickenhall Lane Link Road	£50m	✓	✓	✓
A326 Highway improvements including bus priorities	£50m	✓		
Improved access to Hamble	£15m	✓		
A27 Bus priority & traffic management	£20m	✓		
Feeder links to A3 bus priority route & junction improvements	£30m	✓		
Shirley Road bus priority	£10m	✓		
Windhover Roundabout improvements	£30m	✓	✓	
A334/A27 Roundabout improvements	£15m	✓	✓	
Port Solent - Tipner Link	£20m	✓		
A32 Access to Gosport	£50m	✓		
Totton Town Centre Improvements	£15m	✓		

8B/ Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (7138)

SCHEME	2006 -	2011 -	2016 -	2021 -	Tackles	Access to	Access to
	2011	2016	2021	2026	Congestion	Development	ports/airport
Western access to Gosport (inc. Stubbington bypass)		£50m	£50m		✓		
Botley Bypass			£25m		✓	✓	
Whiteley Way			£30m			✓	
A35 Rushington - Millbrook highway improvements, including bus priorities			£100m		✓		
Bus and Toll (BAT) lane on the A3024 eastern approach to Southampton		£10m			✓	✓	
<u>Motorway Improvements</u>							
M27 Junction 3-4 widening	£52m				✓		✓
M27 Junction 11-12 climbing lanes	£28m				✓		✓
A3(M)/A27 Broadmarsh junction improvements			£32m		✓	✓	
M275 Tipner Interchange	£17m				✓		
Winchester-Southampton Transport Corridor Improvements		£100m			✓		✓
M271 Spurs				£40m	✓		✓
M27 Junction 4 - 7 extra lane				£80m	✓	✓	✓
<u>Rail Improvements</u>					✓	✓	
Reinstatement of passenger rail services from Hythe & Marchwood		£15m			✓		

8B/ Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (7138)

Southampton to West Midlands rail freight upgrade	£53m				✓		✓
Fratton Intermodal Rail Terminal	£5m				✓		✓
Netley Line improvements (signalling, frequency)		£20m			✓	✓	
Portsmouth Harbour additional platform			£10m		✓		✓
<u>Ferry Improvements</u>							
New ferry service: Southampton - Portsmouth (serving intermediate communities)	£15m				✓		✓
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>£184m</b>	<b>£957m</b>	<b>£713m</b>	<b>£263m</b>			
<b>Overall Cost</b>	<b>£2.117bn</b>						

## **Appendix 2**

### **Main thrust of PUSH's consultancy brief for a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the South Hampshire Sub-region**

#### Methodology

The work will be undertaken in two phases with limited stakeholder consultation, using the following approach:

##### Phase I. Research report

This phase of the project will establish the extent and relevance of information on green infrastructure provision held by the partnership and key stakeholders. Analysis of the information will provide the baseline from which the strategy will be developed. It will evaluate the existing provision of Green Infrastructure assets and determine the need for new research and data. It is also expected that the research report will establish the policy framework for green infrastructure and the scope of its thematic coverage.

It is anticipated that the consultant will:

- Undertake a brief scoping exercise to identify the sustainability issues facing the region, which of these issues the Green Infrastructure strategy will address, which are being covered by other initiatives, and what the relationships are between Green Infrastructure and other projects and initiatives
- Identify and collate relevant data available for the sub-region from local authorities and other key stakeholders.
- Undertake analysis of the data to establish:
  - The broad characteristics of the sub-region and its surrounding area
  - The physical extent of green infrastructure provision.
  - The extent to which the green infrastructure assets are meeting their potential. This is expected to be addressed in general terms rather than on a site-by-site basis
  - Gaps in information that will be required to complete the strategy.

The information will be collated and presented as maps in GIS, supported by a database. The maps and data will also be reproduced as a written report

In addition to spatial analysis, the consultant will undertake an analysis of each of the identified themes. This will address:

- The current issues affecting each theme
- The potential implications of the proposed housing provision
- The main opportunities for addressing these issues and impacts..

It is also expected that the research report will set out examples of best practice in green infrastructure provision

##### Phase II. The Strategy.

Continuation to Phase 2 of the project is conditional on the satisfactory completion of Phase 1. The following information is provided to inform tenderers of the expectations of the Partnership in terms of a completed strategy. Once again, it is expected that tenderers will demonstrate in their submission the methodology to be applied in meeting those expectations. The strategy must be set at a scale that provides a meaningful basis for the recommendations it contains. As part of the tender submission, tenderers will need to provide an indication of the scales and levels of detail that will be applied to the different aspects of the strategy, such as urban areas, links between urban areas and sub-regional level.

## 8B/ Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (7138)

A strategy for green infrastructure will include:

- A vision for green infrastructure in the sub-region, developed from engagement with the partners and key stakeholders
- The objectives that can be met through the provision of green infrastructure
- The themes that green infrastructure will encompass
- The issues to be addressed in delivering green infrastructure in the sub-region
- New research to be commissioned that falls outside that needed for the delivery of the strategy
- Mechanisms and funding streams for delivery of green infrastructure
- Broad geographical areas of potential provision of green infrastructure assets
- The priorities for delivery
- Potential early projects that demonstrate what can be achieved
- Examples of good practice in green infrastructure provision
- Model policies on green infrastructure for local authorities to incorporate into their Local Development Frameworks.

It is not anticipated that there will be an extensive public consultation exercise. Consultation will be restricted to a limited number of key stakeholders through two stakeholder events.

### Themes to be addressed

The following themes for inclusion in the strategy have been identified by the partners, but it is acknowledged that other themes may be brought out as high priority through the scoping exercise and stakeholder consultation:

#### Recreation and health

- The role of Green Infrastructure in improving health, mental wellbeing and increasing levels of exercise
- Open spaces, green spaces, the wider countryside network
- Sustainable travel

#### Biodiversity and landscape

- Landscape: protected landscapes, Landscape Character Assessment, the role of the wider countryside
- Sustainable land management
- Coastal management
- The role of the urban-fringe
- Biodiversity: habitats, species, 'hotspots', interconnectivity

#### Climate change

- Renewable energy production opportunities
- Mitigation and adaptation measures
- Coastal change and sea level rise

#### Cultural and historic environment

- Historic landscapes, archaeological assets, built heritage, cultural heritage
- Safeguarding/ enhancing natural, historic and cultural assets
- Contribution of cultural/historic environment to sense of identity and local distinctiveness

#### Waste reduction

- Improved market for local recycled green waste products on Green Infrastructure assets

#### Flood prevention and water resources

- Reduced risk of flooding
- Contribution of water resources to Green Infrastructure
- Management of water resources