Portsmouth CITY COUNCIL

Agenda item:

Decision maker: Cabinet Member

Subject: M275 changes following T&T decision - 13 March 2015

Report by: Head of Service - Transport and Environment

Wards affected: Charles Dickens

Key decision (over £250k): No
dependent on scheme

---

1. Purpose of report

1.1 This report has been requested by the Leader of Portsmouth City Council following the decision made at the Traffic and Transportation meeting of the 19th February. The paper sets out to agree a way forward to address the continued congestion of traffic travelling on the Rudmore Roundabout on slip to the M275 towards Mile End Concerns have been raised by the Leader of the Council about the wider impact to the city due to the congestion entering the city during peak times, the impact it is having on businesses and the reputation it is having on attracting investment in the city.

2. Recommendation

2.1 Retain all current bus lanes into the city centre for buses, taxis (hackney licenced) and pedal cycles only to support the delivery of the Portsmouth Plan and Local Transport Plan 3 outcome.

2.2 Complete a comprehensive review of traffic light timings to relieve pressure on vehicles approaching the M275 from Rudmore Roundabout in liaison with the dockyard.

2.3 Complete a business case to be submitted in the next round of applications for the local growth deal which will set out the economic benefits to deliver the city centre road scheme to ensure effective traffic flows for all road users and economic prosperity for the city. A source of funding would need to be identified enable this.

3 Alternative proposal for the Leader

3.1 The leader reconsiders the decision made at the Traffic and Transportation meeting of 19 February. The decision should be based on the impact the congestion is having holistically to the city from an economic point of view rather than a local traffic issue and suspend the restrictions on the Mile End Road approach bus lane

between Havisham Road and Church Street for a minimum 6 month period through an experimental traffic regulation order (ETRO).

3.2 Monitor as per guidance in section 6.4.

3.3 Return with a paper outlining the results of the trial to the Cabinet with a recommendation on how to proceed.

3.4 Implement temporary variable message signs on the approach from Rudmore roundabout to further advise road users of the new layout ahead. The permanent variable message signs on the M275 gantries can be utilised to advise main line traffic.

3.5 As laid out in the Head of Finance's comments, the capital costs of this alternative proposal are estimated to be £12k. A source of funding would need to be identified and this could either come from the off-street parking reserve or by undertaking a review of the current, or future, local transport plan programme, and re-prioritising schemes within the programme to release funding for this scheme.

3.6 The revenue costs total £11k. This could be funded from the off-street parking reserve.

4. Background (City Development Manager's comments)

4.1 A challenge for Portsmouth is accommodating future additional development that is within the city. Finding suitable development sites is difficult as the city is already built up, faces a number of constraints in particular the impact on existing infrastructure such as the transport network.

4.2 The Portsmouth Plan (the Development Plan for the city) recognises that transport is an enabler of activity, underpinning and enabling regeneration. The regeneration and economic success of the city are dependent upon the reliability of the sub-regional road network, enabling people, freight and goods to access the city with ease.

4.3 Therefore, the Portsmouth Plan (as supported by the Local Transport Plan) identifies as a key objective: 'to make Portsmouth an accessible city with sustainable and integrated transport'. To achieve this objective,

4.4 Developments will be encouraged in areas around our town centres and public transport routes reducing the need to travel and ensuring easy access by a choice of modes of transport;

- Focussing travel around the city on cycling, walking and public transport;
- Improving the city's transport hubs and interchanges, such as safeguarding land for a new interchange at the Hard and Park & Ride at Tipner;

- Implementing highway improvements associated with the strategic sites, such as the new junction on the M275 and the creation of a new road layout into and around the northern part of the city centre;

- Developing a premium bus network and a bus rapid transit linking Fareham, Gosport, and Havant with Portsmouth and improving access to Port Solent, Horsea Island and Tipner.

4.5 The current highway network into the city via the M275 is reaching its capacity at key junctions in terms of traffic at peak times, this causes delays to buses (which has an impact on the wider bus network), creates a poor quality environment and acts a barrier (particularly for pedestrians and cyclists). As previously stated, the success of the city is dependent upon the reliability of the strategic road network, enabling people and goods to access the city with ease. This situation should not be made worse by any move to increase the travel time for buses and could result in financial loss to the council. Any changes to the current bus lanes needs to ensure that there is no increase in the travel time for buses as this will deter usage, any reduction in use will result in an increase in car movements on the M275 which will increase queue times. Further increase in car use of the M275 will challenge the ability to development on other sites going forward as there will be insufficient capacity in the network to support further development.

5. Current arrangements

5.1 Road layout

5.1.1 The attached drawing (Appendix 1) illustrates the current road layout arrangement at the junction of Mile End Road and the southbound on-slip from Rudmore roundabout. The area is currently marked out with three traffic lanes and one bus lane. The two main flow traffic lanes originate from the M275 Rudmore flyover while the third traffic lane merges into the flyover traffic via a standard on-slip arrangement. This traffic merges from lane two of the on-slip with lane one being dedicated to buses, taxis (hackney licenced) and pedal cycles only. This lane is not required to merge in the same manner as lane two in that it can continue past the merge unimpeded by way of its own dedicated lane. The bus lane is separated from general traffic at the merge point by way of an island hatched out with white painted chevrons and reflective road studs.

5.1.2 The new layout was required following the reduction of three lanes to two on the southbound carriageway of Commercial Road North. To avoid congestion and safety concerns with three lanes merging into two at Church Street roundabout, lanes on Mile End Road were realigned. This meant that traffic heading south coming from Rudmore roundabout had to merge with traffic on Mile End Road; an arrangement which is common throughout the area where slip-roads join a major route.

5.2 Bus priority measures

5.2.1 Bus priority measures are currently in place from the M275 through to the city centre and onward towards the Hard Interchange. These measures include the bus lane on Mile End approach between Havisham Road and Church Street.

5.2.2 Bus lanes can be used by buses, taxis (hackney licenced) and pedal cyclists. "Bus includes any vehicle capable of carrying nine or more passengers, this includes minibuses and coaches.

5.2.3 Commercial services that currently use this route include:

Table 1.

Bus company	Service number	Details
First Bus	X4	This service has a frequency of every 30 minutes Monday to Saturday between Southampton and Portsmouth. It also provides an hourly service that is extended to Southsea on Sundays.
	8	This service has a frequency of every 15 minutes. It is a quality partnership route between First, PCC, HCC and Havant Borough Council. Recently First invested over £4 m in new buses for the 7 and 8 Star services.
	X9	Operates half hourly Monday to Saturday between Denmead and the Hard Interchange via QA hospital main entrance. It's partially supported financially by HCC and PCC.
Stagecoach	20	Stagecoach 20 service operates half hourly Monday to Friday between Havant and the Hard Interchange via QA hospital main entrance.
	700	Stagecoach 700 service has recently seen its frequency increased from every 30 minutes to every 20 minutes.

5.2.4 The frequencies of commercial and park and ride services are outlined below:

Table 2:

Bus priority	Bus services	Peak buses per hour (including current peak Park and Ride services)	Park and ride increase in frequency (during school holiday periods) buses per hour
Mile End Road	X4, 8, X9, 20, 700 and park and ride	18	21
Church Street	X4, 8, X9, 20, 700 and park and ride	18	21

5.2.5 On 5 February 2015, the Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation approved a recommendation to recognise the success of the Park and Ride service since its opening in April 2014. This report highlighted that customer numbers are higher than predicted, particularly for leisure users, but that more work is needed to encourage the commuter market.

5.2.6 School services, National Express coaches and coaches visiting tourist destinations also use this route

5.2.7 Bus priority measures protect buses from the effects of traffic congestion and have a beneficial impact on journey times, service reliability, passenger demand, revenue and level of subsidy required to deliver a high quality passenger transport network and reduce the costs of operating a given level of bus service. These measures make public transport a more attractive option when compared with the private car, and encourage modal shift.

5.2.8 The measures also confirm the City Council's commitment and support to the Punctuality Improvement Partnership.

5.3 Changes already made

5.3.1 Following installation of the new on-slip merge layout, minor modifications have been implemented to further highlight the merge point area. The work included new above ground lane destination signs and an increased hatch island size. The island was also extended slightly further north and was surrounded in reflective road studs to make the layout more visible, especially during periods of low light.

5.3.2 The traffic signals at Rudmore roundabout (north of the on-slip merge) have also been programmed to discourage traffic from skipping queues on the flyover when traffic flow is heavier.

5.4 Traffic flow data

5.4.1 Inbound recorded journey time data collated from month long periods in 2012 and 2014 show that since the introduction of the bus lane on the M275, travel times for the average car driver have remained largely the same.

5.4.2 Computer traffic modelling

5.4.2.1 The computer modelling data for the morning peak (8-9am) indicates an additional 38 second delay per vehicle across the whole network while journey times for the PM peak have remained largely the same.

5.4.2.2 Meanwhile the park and ride bus service has a priority route from the Park and Ride site into the city centre and onwards to The Hard Interchange. In addition, existing bus services, the X4, 8, X9, 20 and 700 now also benefit from more reliable and punctual journey times. The new priority layout also provides reduced journey times for taxis (hackney licenced) and an improved arrangement for pedal cyclists who share the bus lane.

5.4.2.3 The data indicates that some roads/junctions have improved and some have worsened as a result of the recent road layout changes. Delays overall however are largely the same, but the point of queuing has moved from within the city centre to the outskirts of the city centre. In the past, vehicles utilised three lanes up to the old Tricorn centre before it merged

to two lanes; now vehicles are merged to two lanes just south of Rudmore roundabout.

5.4.3 Tom Tom journey time data

5.4.3.1 Table 3 below shows the changes in journey time as recorded by TomTom journey time monitoring. This is one of the two journey time source data systems available and was collected over month long periods (before and after the Park and Ride scheme). All data shown is for inbound traffic only:

Table 3.

Journey	Free flow journey time	AM peak (inbound)		PM peak (inbound)	
		Sept 2012	Sept 2014	Sept 2012	Sept 2014
Binsteed Rd to Rudmore via Kingston Crescent	1min 35	4min 22	5min 23	3min 14	2min 48
M27 to Anglesea Road	4min 49	7min	9min 32	8min 54	7min 16
Gladys Avenue to Anglesea Road	5min 35	9min 21	8min 38	8min 58	7min 57
Gladys Avenue to Rudmore Roundabout	1min 34	3min 20	2min 23	2min	2min

5.4.4 Casualty statistics

5.4.4.1 The latest five year casualty data for Mile End Road between the junctions of Rudmore and Church Street roundabouts highlights a total of 21 recorded injury accidents, five of which have occurred since the layout changes were made in April 2014. Of the five recent casualties, none occurred in the modified carriageway area at the end on the Rudmore on-slip.

5.4.4.2 Nearly 50% of recorded incidents (10) can be categorised as 'tail end shunts' i.e. vehicles colliding with the back of those in front in either slow moving or stationary traffic. These types of incidents are unfortunately fairly common on the approaches to busy junction points. The majority of these collisions occurred on the approach to the Church Street roundabout. Eight of the incidents were on the old layout and two on the new layout.

5.4.4.3 The other significant representation in the casualty data is pedal cyclists who make up over 20% of recorded incidents. There have been a total of four recorded injury accidents, two of which were serious.

5.4.4.4 Of the remaining seven recorded accidents, two involved vehicles pulling out of junctions in front of oncoming traffic; one was a vehicle cutting into a bus lane in front of a bus; one was an intoxicated pedestrian stepping out into the carriageway, and the final one involved a spilt load from a passing delivery lorry.

5.4.4.5 None of the recorded incidents over the five year period can be attributed to a problem with the road layout either before or after the April 2014 changes.

6 Alternative proposal

6.1 Layout

6.1.2 The attached drawing (right hand drawing within appendix 1) illustrates the alternative proposed amendments to the current Mile End Road approach between Havisham Road and Church Street roundabout. The changes comprise:

6.1.2.1 Conversion of the lane one on-slip bus lane to an 'all traffic' lane. This will mean that local traffic heading towards Church Street will not have to merge with through traffic heading into the city centre. This will benefit both slip road and main line traffic by removing some vehicle merging manoeuvres.

6.1.2.2 A shortening of the current hatched island on the south end facilitating a longer weaving section and left turn lane for traffic entering Church Street.

6.1.2.3 New and modified road markings and signage to effectively inform road users of the revised layout ahead.

6.1.2.4 The existing bus lane between Church Street roundabout and Market Way (Hope Street roundabout) is not subject to change as part of this proposal. Lane one will remain a bus lane.

6.2 Operation

6.2.2 Safety Audit requirements

6.2.2.1 In accordance with HD19/03 a road safety audit of the final detailed design of the scheme will be carried out prior to works being implemented. This is likely to cost around £1,250.

6.2.2.2 A further road safety audit may be required once the scheme is in place. This is likely to cost around a further £1,250.

6.2.3 Signage improvements

6.2.3.1 In order to safely implement the proposed alterations, existing lane destination signage on both the Flyover and Mile End approach will require removing and/or amending. Consideration should also be given to implementing gantry style displays. Existing bus lane signs and road marking text will also require removal prior to use by general traffic.

6.2.3.2 It is strongly recommended that temporary variable message signs are implemented on the approach from Rudmore roundabout to further advise road users of the new layout ahead. The permanent variable message signs on the M275 gantries can be utilised to advise main line traffic.

6.2.4 Camera enforcement

6.2.4.1 The area of Mile End Road between the Rudmore on-slip and Church Street roundabout had previously been identified and approved by members at the Traffic and Transportation meeting on Thursday, 19th December, 2013 1.00 s an area of bus lane camera enforcement due the number of vehicles driving illegally along the bus lane. This proposal would have to be suspended if the proposed scheme was implemented

6.2.5 Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO)

6.2.5.1 A TRO may include provisions prohibiting or restricting the waiting of vehicles or the loading and unloading of vehicles. A TRO may also make provisions prohibiting, restricting or regulating the use of a road or any part of the width of a road by vehicular traffic of a particular class specified in the order subject to such exceptions as may be so specified or determined, either at all times or at times, on days or during periods so specified

6.2.5.2 A proposed TRO must be advertised, the appropriate bodies (as outlined in section 7.1) and the public given a consultation period where members of the public can register their support or objections. If objections are received to the proposed order the matter must go before the appropriate executive member for a decision whether or not to make the order, taking into account the comments received from the public during the consultation period.

6.2.5.3 An experimental order is similar to a permanent traffic regulation order in that it is a legal document which imposes traffic and parking restrictions such as road closures, one-way streets, banned turns, bus/cycle lanes, controlled parking and on-street parking places. Such Orders are made under Sections 9 and 10 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and all other enabling powers after consultation with the chief officer of police in accordance with Schedule 9 to the 1984 Act

6.2.5.4 Unlike a permanent order, an experimental order can stay in force for a maximum of 18 months while its effects are monitored and the Council decides whether or not to make the provisions permanent. There is no public consultation before the experimental traffic order is brought into effect, but from its commencement date there is a six-month public consultation that allows representations to be submitted based on experience of the traffic scheme in operation.

6.2.5.5 It is recommended that any changes implemented are done so under an experimental traffic regulation order (ETRO) for a minimum of six months. ETROs are not required to be advertised in the newspaper and therefore costs for this element are very low (around £100).

6.3 Timescale

6.3.1 Following an approval for a trial the steps below would need to be completed;

- Detailed highways design
- Safety audit
- ETRO process
- Order new/amended signs
- Road booking (dependant on Colas availability)
- Physical works

6.3.2 Depending on Colas availability, the works could be completed as early as Spring 2015.

6.4 Monitoring requirements

6.4.1 Journey time data

6.4.1.1 Previous traffic flow data has been obtained from two sources. Firstly, from TomTom and secondly from PCC owned monitoring equipment. For consistency and comparability, if a trial should go ahead, it is recommended that TomTom data is procured, and current PCC owned monitoring equipment is relocated as soon as possible to provide sufficient "before" data to compare to data collected during the trial. The cost for these measures is likely to be £4,000 for TomTom data and a further £3,500 for PCC equipment data.

6.4.2 A survey should also be carried out to ascertain the number of pedal cyclists using the route and routes in the immediate surrounding area before and during the trial to see if the changes have any impact on cycling levels on this route. Surveys such as these are normally completed over a 12 hour period at a cost of £7.50 per hour. Costs for surveys on Mile End Road Approach, and up to two alternative routes are likely to be in the region of £540 for a "before" and "mid- trial" survey. These surveys would need to be completed on comparable days (e.g. dry, mid-week, non-school holiday, am peak period).

6.4.3 Bus punctuality data can be gained from both commercial bus operators (First and Stagecoach).

6.4.4 Casualty statistics

6.4.4.1 Casualty data provided by the police (STATS19) will be reviewed to see if a trial has had an impact on safety of users.

6.4.4.2 Except in the case of a fatality, when data is reported to the council within a few working days, data is submitted to the council three months in arrears. It should be recognised that for a report to contain relevant casualty data, a delay of three months from the end of the trial period would be necessary before a report could be brought to the Traffic and Transportation Cabinet meeting.

6.4.5 Stakeholder feedback will be requested from all Transport Liaison Group attendees list as detailed in section 7.2. Stakeholder feedback can also be sought from other current users of the bus lane such as National Express, the local private schools, and the visitor destinations such as the Dockyard.

6.5 Impacts and risks

6.5.1 Safety

6.5.1.1 Merge points - the conversion of the bus lanes into an 'all traffic' lane may result in safety issues at the end of the hatched island as vehicles attempt to move across to the main flow lane. Conversely, there may be similar difficulty for vehicles moving across from the main flow into the nearside left turn lane. Although the inside left lane will be marked and signed 'local traffic' on the approach from Rudmore roundabout, many vehicles may take the opportunity to try and skip the earlier offside merge in an attempt to save a small period of time. It is only envisaged however that this is likely to cause a problem during the busier am and pm peak periods, weekends, school holiday times and public holidays. In order to partly mitigate this problem, the merge area to the south of the current hatched island will be extended north, by reducing the current hatched areas (see appendix 1) to provide additional weaving room. In order to protect buses leaving the bus stop, the cut back of the solid white line will be limited to the bus stop exit.

6.5.1.2 If all traffic is permitted to use the current bus lane to Church Street southbound, there are concerns that this traffic may continue straight ahead onto Upper Commercial Road (in front of All Saints Church) or have to merge at this point, which could lead to an increase in injury accidents.

6.5.2 Congestion

6.5.2.1 Computer traffic modelling has recently been undertaken as part of the Air Quality and Road Optimisation project, commissioned by the council. This tested and simulated various lane layouts in this location. The results of this analysis indicated that implementing a revised layout would only have a small impact on current journey time and delays.

6.5.2.2 Given the effective gating of traffic at Rudmore roundabout and the large main line flow from the M275, the proposed new layout is not considered likely to provide a significant reduction in current journey times and delay.

6.5.2.3 Access to Church Street will be improved (during am and pm peak periods) for traffic approaching from Rudmore roundabout due to the removal of the merge requirement. Traffic from the M275 may however find the manoeuvre more difficult as the lane will be regularly filled with on-slip traffic. Under the current arrangement, this lane is only utilised by buses, taxis (hackney licenced) and pedal cyclists. During am and pm peak periods, some vehicles may have to wait to find a gap in this lane which could in turn cause a blockage to the main through flow. This is not considered likely to happen during off peak periods.

6.5.3 Commercial bus services

6.5.3.1 Should the proposed changes go ahead commercial services may be delayed. This could impact on the passenger experience and may have a negative impact on passenger numbers and an increase in numbers of private vehicles entering the city centre.

6.5.3.2 Where a bus operator has failed to run a service to its registered timetable, without reasonable excuse, the following powers are available to the traffic commissioners:

- Prohibit the holder of the licence from using vehicles to provide local bus services. This can be for a specified or indefinite period;
- To attach a condition restricting the number of vehicles which the operator may use under the licence;
- Apply financial sanctions (pay a penalty) in accordance with specified limits. The amount specified in all circumstances must not exceed £550 multiplied by the total number of vehicles which the operator is licenced to under all the PSV operators held by the operator.

6.5.3.3 Traffic commissioners can expect local traffic authorities to be equally proactive in the way in which they comply with their statutory responsibilities. Along with other requirements local traffic authorities are expected to:

- manage the road network in an effective and efficient manner taking into account the vital need for bus operators to run a reliable and punctual registered bus service and utilise the road network not only to reduce congestion but also to promote punctual and reliable bus services;

- in developing and maintaining the network, recognise that bus services provide an essential and important public service for passengers who use buses to access other vital and essential public services;

- to provide full and detailed evidence of partnership working with the relevant operators on reliability and punctuality, including the development and implementation of joint action plans to deliver high standards.

6.5.3.4 Portsmouth may be overlooked for investment in improved bus services. If the local authority takes a decision that will impact on commercial services, bus operators may not invest in new buses and instead cascade any new investment to other, more productive areas where they feel they will achieve a better return on their investment.

6.5.3.5 Delays could impact the financial viability of commercial services. Should this happen bus operators may reduce the frequency of bus services, reduce operating hours, re-route services or de-register the service entirely.

6.5.3.6 Whilst this is a low to medium risk, if a service is changed there is a risk that residents would ask for the council to financially support the route.

6.5.3.7 At present, the council supports 20 tendered bus routes at a total cost of £414,000 per year. It is uncertain what impact the proposed changes will have on commercial bus services and so it cannot be known if any services are likely to require financial support in the future.

6.5.4 Park and Ride services

6.5.4.1 In addition to the impacts to commercial services, the following issues may impact on the park and ride services:

6.5.4.2 The Council is currently progressing products and services to increase customer numbers from the commuter market, including carnet ticketing and a payment app, these could be less successful and monitoring may prove difficult if the proposed changes are made. The commuter market is less likely to improve if journey times are longer or the service is unreliable.

6.5.4.3 This could result in less income to the park and ride site but potentially higher income to council owned city centre car parks where charges are

higher. However, customers could chose to park in city centre car parks not owned by the city council.

6.5.4.4 The park and ride service operates on a registered 12 minute frequency using three branded buses. Any delay could mean that the timetable may not be able to be maintained during Monday to Friday morning peak times, and throughout the day on Saturdays, Sundays & public holidays.

6.5.4.5 To mitigate this risk the council may have to implement one of the following two options:

- Pay for an additional bus (unbranded or branded) to maintain the current frequency
- Reduce the frequency to enable the contracted bus resource to maintain a registered timetable.

6.5.4.6 An unbranded bus would incur operational costs only. To maintain the current frequency is likely to cost £72,600 as per table 4. A source of funding would need to be identified.

6.5.4.7 To run an additional bus the total cost is £30.25 per hour.

Table 4.

Additional bus Operational hours	Cost	Additional bus Operational hours
Monday to Friday	6 hrs x 260 days x £30.25	£47,000
Saturday	9.5 hrs x 52 days x £30.25	£14,900
Sundays and public holidays	6 hrs x 58 days x £30.25	£10,500
Total cost estimate		£72,600

6.5.4.8 A fourth branded bus would require a capital investment of £235,000. A source of funding would need to be identified.

6.5.4.9 Alternatively the frequency of services Monday to Friday at peak times could be reduced to one service every 15 minutes. This would result in a 15 minute frequency between the start and end of the day; however this could impact on customer numbers and the reputation of the Park and Ride service.

6.5.4.10 As buses are often full and there is a requirement to maintain capacity Saturday, Sunday & public holiday frequency could not be reduced in the same way as the Monday to Friday service.

6.5.4.11 A decision was taken in the Traffic and Transportation Cabinet meeting on 5 February 2015 to approve a new school holiday timetable with an 8/9 minute frequency, and a Southsea timetable with an hourly

frequency. If the proposal to shorten the bus lane is taken forward, these timetables may not be achievable.

6.5.4.12 The school holiday timetable may need to be reduced to a 9/10 minute (9 minutes inbound, 10 minutes outbound where there are fewer bus priority measures), or an even 10 minute frequency (10 minutes each way). Frequencies under 10 minutes do not require a published timetable, with punctuality measured on headways between buses. This means that full buses do not have to wait at bus stops until an advertised time before departing. This is known as load and go. However, services with a frequency of over 10 minutes (e.g. current 12 minute frequency) do not allow load and go.

6.5.4.13 The approved hourly service (over a six month trial) to Southsea uses one non-branded bus. If the bus lane is altered, it is possible that the hourly frequency may not be maintained as the timetable already has little time at either end of the journey to catch up if traffic levels are higher than normal. To ensure the timetable is achievable, the service will not stop at The Hard Interchange

6.5.4.14 The alternative is to provide another bus to maintain the timetable. This would double the cost of providing this service - £91,466 for the operation of the bus (for a 9.00-6.30pm operational period) and £3,200 for an on-board Ticketer machine.

6.5.4.15 Alternatively the frequency could be reduced from hourly to every 70 minutes.

7 Consultation with stakeholders

7.1 Statutory consultees for an experimental traffic regulation order comprise of; Central Ambulance, Chamber of Commerce, Portsmouth Cycle Forum, First Group (bus services), Hampshire Fire & Rescue, Hampshire Traffic Police, Freight Haulage Association, Portsmouth Water, Royal Mail, Southern Electric, Stagecoach (bus services), Portsmouth Magistrates' Court, Portsmouth History Centre, Colas. The public is also consulted.

7.2 Feedback should also be sought from attendees of the council led Transport Liaison Groups. These groups include:

- PCC transport, parking and highways officers
- PCC health officers
- PCC city centre manager
- PCC licensing officers
- Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transport
- Opposition spokespersons
- Independent taxi trade representatives
- Aqua Cars
- Citywide Taxis

- Stagecoach
- First
- Clearchannel
- University of Portsmouth Transport Manager
- Friends of the Earth
- Portsmouth Cycle Forum
- CTC local representative
- Sustrans local representative
- British Cycling
- Walking Friends Portsmouth
- Ramblers
- South West Trains
- Gosport Ferry
- Hayling Ferry
- Hovertravel
- Wightlink
- Colas
- Hampshire Roads Policing Unit
- Shopmobility
- Portsmouth Disability Forum

7.3 Stakeholder feedback can also be sought from other current users of the bus lane such as National Express, the local private schools, and the visitor destinations such as the Dockyard.

8. Reasons for recommendations

8.1 The current bus lane supports the delivery and long term aims of the Portsmouth Plan and Local Transport 3 outcomes to achieve growth whilst minimising increases in traffic.

8.2 It provides commercial bus services and Park and Ride buses with a priority route towards the city centre, protecting them from the impacts of congestion and enabling a predictable and short journey time.

8.3 Modal shift is a long term aim for Portsmouth. Behaviour change regarding travel modes can take a long time and anything that makes these options, such as park and ride, more attractive will support this aim and therefore help reduce congestion over the long term.

8.4 Park and Ride services may suffer reduced patronage if journey times are increased, this could reduce income to the city council and affect the viability of the Park and Ride in Portsmouth.

8.5 The bus lane provides a shared route for pedal cyclists entering the city centre, away from the majority of traffic. The council is committed to increasing the number of pedal cyclists in Portsmouth.

8.6 Further monitoring and revisions to traffic light systems should continue together with closer liaison with the dockyard would ensure that traffic flows into the city are keep at an optimum level during the busy peak periods when traffic flows into the city are at their highest.

8.7 Rather than attempt to try and provide a "short term fix" to the congestion issues on Mile End, especially before completing any monitoring, the recommendation is based on future planning for the city and to seek local growth funding to ensure a wider road scheme can be delivered. This would improve the congestion into the city on the M275 and also adjoining roads and junctions. This would also ensure that the strategy for the city continues to promote sustainable transport and Public Health benefits.

8.8 Should a trial be taken forward, the Mile End Road Approach between Havisham Road and Church Street is recommended as costs to implement the changes are lower than other sections of the bus priority route where resurfacing would be required for a trial to take place.

9. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

9.1 This report has undergone a preliminary equality impact assessment and there are no equality issues arising from this report.

10. Head of legal services' comments

10.1 There are a number of legal implications in the proposed removal of the part of the bus lane between Havisham Road and Church Street. These include obligations by the Council under the Transport Acts and contracts with the bus companies and potential risks of action by other bodies.

10.2 The Council must ensure that all consultation appropriate to the means of amending the bus lane is properly undertaken. Failure to do so may result in a challenge to the implementation of the scheme which, if successful, may result in delay and confusion as to what is, and is not permitted on this road.

10.3 There will need to be careful consideration of which route to follow with regard to the implementation of the TRO to bring the change about. The difference between the two methods is set out in the body of the report together with the benefits and disadvantages of each. In either case the appropriate signs must be put in place as soon as possible to ensure that it is clear what is, and what is not a bus lane.

10.4 The Council also has a number of contractual arrangements with bus companies for the provision of subsidised services, one of which is the park and ride. If the change to the road layout affects the timetable with the prior agreement of the relevant bus company then the Council may be in breach of that agreement. In any event, as is set out in the report if the timetables are to be maintained the contract terms will have to be amended to reflect any changes that are appropriate.

10.5 If the change is implemented without adequate consultation with the bus companies affected then the Council may, as is set out in the report be liable for penalties from the Traffic Commissioners. There is also a possibility that the companies may seek to reclaim losses from the Council for making this change if they do not have adequate opportunity to make changes to their service, therefore sufficient time should be allowed for consultation with other affected authorities and for any changes to be registered with the transport commissioners.

10.6 In addition to the potential financial risk there is also a risk in that changes such as this may affect our reputation with the bus companies and make it more difficult to secure economic co-operation in future projects.

11. Head of Finance's comments

11.1 The recommendation as at 2.1 is to retain the status quo and therefore no financial implications arise as result if it is approved.

11.2 The second recommendation contained within this report if approved would require estimated funding of £5k to enable the comprehensive review of traffic light timings to be undertaken. A source of funding for this activity would need to be identified.

11.3 The third recommendation if approved would require estimated funding of £150k to complete a fully Webtag compliant business case to be submitted in the next round of local growth deal applications to the Solent LEP. This funding would be needed to carry out, amongst other things, detailed traffic modelling. A source of funding for this activity would need to be identified. Potentially this could be funded from the Off Street Parking Reserve.

11.4 If the alternative proposal as set out in paragraph 3 is adopted then there will be financial implications of this course of action and funding will need to be identified. Additionally the proposal as detailed in this report exposes the Council to financial risks as set out below.

11.5 The capital costs of making the physical changes to the network including related Traffic Management activity are estimated to be £12k. A source of funding would need to be identified. This could either be from the Off Street Parking reserve, or by undertaking a review of the current or future Local Transport Plan programme and re-prioritising schemes within the programme to release funding for this scheme.

11.6 The revenue costs required to implement the alternative proposal as set out in this report relate to monitoring requirements and required safety audits as set out in paragraphs 6.4 and 6.2.1 respectively and total £11k. These total an amount of £4k for TomTom traffic data and £4k for PCC monitoring equipment and to undertake a cycling survey. The balance is to fund a safety audit. A funding source would need to be identified to fund these surveys. This could be funded from the Off Street Parking Reserve.

11.7 There is a risk that the changes made would deter people from using the park and ride as their journey times have been increased. This risk is set out in paragraph 6.5.4. In mitigation the Council could either procure an additional vehicle at a cost of £235k with associated running costs of £73k. If this risk were to materialise and the Council wanted to maintain services at one bus every 12 minutes then a source of capital would need to be identified along with a source of funding for the additional revenue running costs.

11.8 Alternatively the frequency of services could be reduced to one bus every 15 minutes as opposed to the current frequency of every 12 minutes to avoid additional costs. However, this may impact on the attractiveness of the Park and Ride offering and impact on income generated.

11.9 There is potential that if the alternative proposal is adopted that the recently approved trial of the Park and Ride service to Southsea would be impacted. Again the Council would have the choice of either investing more in the service (this could be an additional amount of £96k) to maintain the proposed frequency of the service.

11.10 Alternatively, if the frequency of the bus services to Southsea is impacted the Council could decide to review the timetable and extend the time between each bus from the current proposal of one per hour in order to avoid additional costs.

11.11 In summary if the alternative proposal is adopted a capital sum of £12k will be required. This could be funded from either the Off Street Parking Reserve of from the Local Transport Plan Programmed if this is reviewed and reprioritised.

11.12 There is a revenue impact of £11k for implementing the monitoring required for the alternative proposal and this could also be funded from the Off Street Parking reserve.

11.13 There are other financial risks as set out above and solutions to these impacts and related financial implications and options would need to be considered if and when they arose.

……
Signed by Head of Transport & Environment

Appendices:

1. Current layout and outline design of proposed layout detailed in section 3

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/

rejected by …… on ……

……
Signed by: