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1 Introduction

Purpose

1.1 In order to ensure that new development delivers sustainable communities, the facilities and service needs of these populations must be properly planned for.

1.2 This document is the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) that sits alongside the Portsmouth Plan, the city’s Local Development Framework Core Strategy. It reviews Portsmouth’s infrastructure needs for the plan period as well as the structures that are in place for delivering infrastructure into the future.

1.3 Infrastructure planning is a requirement of the Core Strategy production process. National Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 12¹ emphasises the focus of the planning system on deliverability of plans and the need for local planning authorities to demonstrate that the necessary social, physical and green infrastructure is provided to support the delivery of the development planned for their area.

1.4 The IDP and its production process seek to:

- Identify infrastructure needs and costs (including where possible phasing of development, funding sources and responsibilities for delivery);
- Further strengthen relationships between the Sustainable Community Strategy and Local Development Framework (LDF);
- Improve lines of communication between key delivery agencies and the local planning authority, including identifying opportunities for integrated and more efficient service delivery and better use of assets;
- Provide evidence for the setting of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or other local tariff;
- Be a ‘live’ document that will be used as a tool for helping to deliver infrastructure.

What is ‘infrastructure’?

1.5 The term ‘infrastructure’, in this instance, is used in its broadest sense to mean any service or facility that supports the city and its population. It includes, but is not restricted to the following:

- Transport: Road, Rail, Bus, Travel Management, Port, Harbours, cycle / pedestrian facilities, car parking
- Energy: gas and electricity generation and provision
- Water and drainage: Water supply, waste water, drainage, flood defences
- Waste: Collection & disposal
- ITC: broadband and wireless; public phones
- Open space: Parks, Children’s play areas, Sports pitches and courts, Country parks & Accessible Natural Greenspace, Green public realm, Allotments, Footpaths; Seafront; access to Langstone and Portsmouth Harbours
- Affordable housing: Social rented/intermediate
- Education: Nursery and pre-school; primary, secondary; further education, higher education, adult education
- Health: Hospitals; Health centres/GP surgeries; Public health and prevention

¹ Planning Policy Statement 12- Local Spatial Planning (June 2008)
http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/planning/planningpolicyguidance/planningpolicystatements/planningpolicystatements/pps12
Community services: Libraries, Community centres, Youth, Social services/over-50s/support, police, fire & rescue, ambulance, cemeteries and crematoria, courts, prisons, hostels, places of worship, post offices, Children’s centres; special needs and disability.

Culture & Leisure: Museum/galleries, Theatres / Venues, Cinemas, Sports centres, Swimming pools, events, festivals and town centre programmes, Markets.

1.6 While the term infrastructure is very broadly defined, this does not mean that this IDP seeks to cover in detail all of the above items. That would make the process unmanageable.

1.7 This report seeks to give a broad overview of the way certain infrastructure is planned and the agencies involved in its delivery. It also looks in more detail at costs and likely funding mechanisms for some items of infrastructure, in particular those that are critical to delivering the Core Strategy.

**Structure of this report**

1.8 Following this introduction, the main body of this report reviews infrastructure needs by type. The discussion includes information on responsibilities and delivery partners and, where available, some more detailed project information. A separate section sets out the needs of the strategic sites specifically.

1.9 The final section of this report looks at governance arrangements, both within the city council and with its partner organisations, which will facilitate infrastructure planning and delivery into the future. This section is about demonstrating that the city council and its partners have the mechanisms in place to enable delivery as and when the need arises.

1.10 A summary of the infrastructure projects can be found in two tables in Appendix 1 – this first listing the items critical to the Core Strategy including specifically highlighting the needs of the strategic sites; the second listing all the other items of infrastructure. The former is also found in the Core Strategy itself, albeit in a slightly different format. This distinction is not to belittle those items found in the second part. It merely functions to highlight what infrastructure is crucial to the Core Strategy and will need to be brought forward to allow development to go ahead. The second list will be used as the starting point for planning for those other services and facilities which are crucial to the smooth running of a city and the quality of life of its residents, but that do not necessarily have to be in place before development comes forward.

**Caution**

1.11 The IDP was largely drafted in the early months of 2010, and in the first few weeks following the May election. The policy and financial climate has changed rapidly as the new Government has re-examined all spending approvals made since 1 January 2010 and announced savings of £6.2bn. An emergency budget was published on 22 June 2010, and further detail was added in the Comprehensive Spending Review announcements in October 2010. This IDP has been updated to take account of any cuts that have been announced, but some uncertainty remains over the future of some funding streams.

1.12 In any case, the IDP is intended to be a live document and planning tool, so regular reviews will be necessary to keep it up to date. The Council together with its partners will need to look for innovative ways to fund and provide the necessary infrastructure.
2 The IDP process

Planning Advisory Service support

2.1 In preparing this IDP, the city council has been supported by Baker Associates on behalf of the Planning Advisory Service (PAS). PAS is part of the Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) and is funded directly by the Department of Communities and Local Government. The support has consisted of regular advisory meetings and telephone conversations, good practice guidance and the chance to exchange ideas with other authorities undergoing the same process. In using the PAS help in this way, the city council is confident that this document and the process used to produce it meet the requirements of an IDP to accompany a sound Core Strategy.

Joint working

2.2 A key principle in producing the IDP was to avoid duplicating work. Much of the information contained within it had already been collected to inform the development of the Core Strategy policies, or other strategies of the city council and its partners.

2.3 In parallel with the production of this IDP, the city council and its external partners were working on a Regeneration Strategy for the city. The purpose of this strategy is to bring together the physical, social and economic regeneration projects of the city council and its external partners to ensure effective joint delivery. There were therefore obvious links with the IDP, and an aim to ensure the delivery of infrastructure was included in the Regeneration Strategy.

2.4 Officers working on both projects undertook joint evidence gathering for the Regeneration Strategy and the IDP, saving resources and ensuring strong linkages.

Steps Taken

2.5 The PAS IDP guidance suggested a ‘steps approach to infrastructure planning and delivery’, breaking the process down into 7 steps. The city council took account of this guidance when preparing this IDP, but found that many of the suggested steps overlapped significantly in Portsmouth, and therefore steps were notionally combined into a more streamlined process of evidence gathering.

2.6 Steps taken to produce the IDP were:

a) Review of plans and projects
   Wherever possible, information was taken from published reports or strategies. As a starting point, a thorough review of partners’ websites, business plans, board minutes etc was undertaken and the results summarised and included in the IDP.

b) Information gathering direct from partners
   To fill gaps in information, interviews were held with internal and external partners to ascertain their plans and their assessments of what infrastructure requirements arise from future development proposals.

2.7 These steps were not necessarily taken chronologically; sometimes interviews were the first step followed by a review of published plans; in some cases steps were repeated. For some infrastructure items, only step one or step two was considered necessary to feed into a draft document. A draft IDP was then sent out across the council and to external partners for review, which filled some outstanding gaps in information. The result is this final draft IDP.
3. The Demand for Infrastructure – development & population growth

**Planned Development**

3.1 Portsmouth sits in the wider sub-region of South Hampshire, providing a focus for jobs and services to the surrounding towns and rural areas in the south eastern part of the sub-region, namely Fareham, Gosport, Havant, and the southern parts of the districts of East Hants and Winchester City. The local authorities in South Hampshire have agreed that the sub-region should strive for economic growth, with a focus on the regenerating the cities of Southampton and Portsmouth. In line with that strategy, Portsmouth is planning to provide, between 2006 and 2027,

- Between 111,100 and 13,300 additional homes,
- around 300,000m² of new employment floor space,
- around 50,000m² net of retail floor space.

**Projected Population Growth**

3.2 Long term population forecasts to 2026 were produced by Hampshire County Council during the preparation of the sub-regional strategy for South Hampshire. These were based on natural changes in population and the development planned through the South Hampshire Strategy in the South East Plan.

3.3 In anticipation of the abolition of the plan, a number of local authorities in South Hampshire are reviewing their housing targets and some further work has been done on projected population and dwelling figures. These take into account actual dwelling completions to 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>84,751</td>
<td>88,801</td>
<td>92,732</td>
<td>96,897</td>
<td>100,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>191,995</td>
<td>197,614</td>
<td>202,145</td>
<td>207,275</td>
<td>212,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hampshire County Council: actual dwelling completions to 2010, then ZNM (2010)

2010: 88,263 dwellings

3.4 Clearly, additional population means additional pressures on infrastructure. Some infrastructure needs arise from the growth in population generally, while others arise due to development proposals in specific locations. The diagram overleaf shows the indicative spatial distribution of development, based on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2009. It shows clearly a strong bias towards development on the western side of the city, which is the location of most of the key strategic sites. This pattern of development influences the city wide infrastructure needs (for example the western of two main sewers is already at capacity and development on the western side of the city will require investment in drainage infrastructure). But delivery of the strategic sites themselves also relies on a significant amount of on site infrastructure provision, which is highlighted separately in section 4.
4 Infrastructure Requirements and Delivery – a city wide view

4.1 Flood risk management

In this chapter:
- Coastal defences in the Portsea Island Coastal Strategy Study
- Coastal defences in the Portchester to Emsworth Coastal Flood and Erosion Risk Management Strategy
- West-East Sewer link
- Eastney Pumping Station
- Surface and Foul Water Separation
- New pumping station and outfall along south coast of the city

NB readers should note that the council has also produced a statement of common ground on the approach to development and flood risk paper in partnership with the Environment Agency, which sets out how flood risk will be addressed.
See the Core Strategy library at http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/17833.html

Coastal Flood & Erosion Risk Management

Responsibilities

4.1.1 The Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) has overall policy responsibility for flood and coastal erosion risk in England. Defra funds most of the Environment Agency’s flood management activities in England. It provides grant aid on a project by project basis to the other flood and coastal defence operating authorities (local authorities and internal drainage boards) to support their investment in capital improvement projects for managing flood and coastal erosion risk.

4.1.2 In April 2008, the Environment Agency became responsible for overseeing the management of all coastal flood and erosion risk in England. Under these arrangements the Environment Agency now:
- ensures that proper and sustainable long-term Shoreline Management Plans are in place for our coastline, and approves them on behalf of Defra (Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs);
- allocates all flood and coastal erosion risk management capital funding.

4.1.3 The Environment Agency and the city council are the operating authorities for Portsmouth’s coastline and work in partnership to manage the coastal erosion and coastal flood risks to the city.

4.1.4 Operating Authorities have no legal duty to build and/or maintain coastal defences, but do have permissive powers that allow them to protect both people and property where it is economically, technically and environmentally viable to do so, and if it is affordable within national budgets.

Policy Framework

4.1.5 The local framework relating to flood and coastal erosion risk management is set by Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs) and Coastal Defence Strategies (CDS). Catchment Flood Management Plans (CFMPs) are also relevant, but these are related to pluvial flood risk and are discussed further in the drainage section of this paper.

4.1.6 SMPs are high-level, non-statutory, policy documents planning the future management of England’s coastline over the next 100 years.

4.1.7 Portsmouth’s coastline is covered by the North Solent SMP (2010), which covers the Solent’s mainland coastline between Selsey Bill in West Sussex to Hurst Spit in the New
Forest. The North Solent SMP recommends a long-term policy of hold the line for all of Portsmouth’s frontages but also recognises that Farlington Marshes has the potential, subject to the outcome of detailed ecological studies, to be fully or partially realigned from 2030.

4.1.8 At a more detailed level, Coastal Defence Strategies review economic, environmental and social issues associated with the coastline. The Portsmouth City Council led Portsea Island Coastal Strategy Study (PICSS) is well advanced and forms the backbone of coastal flood risk management planning for the city. The city’s mainland coastline is covered by the emerging Portchester to Emsworth Coastal Flood and Erosion Risk Management Strategy which is being led by the Environment Agency.

The Portsea Island Coastal Strategy Study

4.1.9 This study sets out the proposals for a 100-year flood and coastal erosion risk management strategy for Portsea Island (excluding Whale Island).

4.1.10 The strategy area contains assets at risk of flooding with an estimated present value of £1.25 billion over the next 100 years if no coastal management activities took place. Assets at risk of flooding include:

- Over 9000 residential properties
- 950 commercial properties
- 117 MoD Properties
- HM Naval Base
- Historic Dockyards including the HMS Victory and Mary Rose
- Continental Ferry Port
- 15 areas of known landfill
- 2 main road arteries on and off Portsea Island
- The rail line
- 40 scheduled monuments and more than 450 listed buildings
- 70 sites of archaeological interest
- Key infrastructure such as local roads, rail links and utilities

4.1.11 Portsea Island’s coastline extends over 27km in length, and incorporates a variety of different defence types, of which over 14km have an assessed residual life of less than 10 years. The study indicates that in 50 years time approximately 11.5km of the coastline will not be able to provide safe levels of flood risk management to the City due to the effects of predicted sea level rise.

4.1.12 The study concluded that Portsea Island consists of seven discrete flood cells. Flood cells 1: Southsea and 2: Eastney have a low existing standard of protection and require improvements works to raise defence levels. Flood cells 3: Eastney Lake, 4: North Portsea Island, 6: Continental Ferry Ports and 7: HM Naval Base have an appropriate standard of protection now but need future improvement works due to sea level rise. Flood Cell 5: Tipner contains a large area of contaminated land and requires defence improvement works to protect against leaching of contaminants. All flood cells contain defences with a low residual life that require improvement works to protect against potential breach formation.

Recommended Strategy

4.1.13 The following table gives an indication of the types of coastal defence options that may be required to manage the Coastal Flood and Erosion Risk Management to each of the seven flood cells around Portsea Island:

---

2 For a map, see p3 of: [http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/media/TRANS_coastalstratleaflet.pdf](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/media/TRANS_coastalstratleaflet.pdf)
### Portsea Island Coastal Defence Strategy: Recommended Option for each flood cell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Cell</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recommended Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Southsea (Old Portsmouth to Royal Marines Barracks)</td>
<td>The preferred option is hold the line of defence and improve the standard of protection to 0.5% APF* (Splash Wall). Works may consist of raising sea walls, improving sea wall structural integrity and establishing sustainable methods of retaining beach materials.</td>
<td>Hold the line of defence and improve the standard of protection to 0.5% APF* (Splash Wall). Works may consist of raising sea walls, improving sea wall structural integrity and establishing sustainable methods of retaining beach materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Eastney (Langstone Harbour Entrance Channel)</td>
<td>The preferred option is hold the line of defence and improve the standard of protection to 0.5% APF (Crest wall). Works may consist of raising sea walls, improving sea wall structural integrity and establishing sustainable methods of retaining beach materials</td>
<td>Hold the line of defence and improve the standard of protection to 0.5% APF (Crest wall). Works may consist of raising sea walls, improving sea wall structural integrity and establishing sustainable methods of retaining beach materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Eastney Lake</td>
<td>The preferred option is to hold the line, sustaining the current standard of protection (0.5% APF) to keep pace with predicted levels of sea level rise. Works may involve raising sea wall and embankment crest heights and replacing some of the existing structures with enhanced defences.</td>
<td>Hold the line, sustaining the current standard of protection (0.5% APF) to keep pace with predicted levels of sea level rise. Works may involve raising sea wall and embankment crest heights and replacing some of the existing structures with enhanced defences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – North Portsea Island</td>
<td>The preferred option is to hold the line, sustaining the current standard of protection (0.5% APF) to keep pace with predicted levels of sea level rise. Works may involve raising sea walls and embankment crest heights and replacing some of the existing structures with enhanced defences.</td>
<td>Hold the line, sustaining the current standard of protection (0.5% APF) to keep pace with predicted levels of sea level rise. Works may involve raising sea walls and embankment crest heights and replacing some of the existing structures with enhanced defences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Tipner</td>
<td>The preferred strategy option is to maintain the existing level of defence. In this option, the standard of protection falls as predicted sea level rises but it secures contaminated land against erosion and thereby prevents contamination of the harbour. This is the least cost option based on the site’s current use.</td>
<td>Maintain the existing level of defence. In this option, the standard of protection falls as predicted sea level rises but it secures contaminated land against erosion and thereby prevents contamination of the harbour. This is the least cost option based on the site’s current use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Continental Ferry Port</td>
<td>The preferred option is to hold the line, sustaining the current standard of protection (1.3% APF) against predicted levels of sea level rise.</td>
<td>Hold the line, sustaining the current standard of protection (1.3% APF) against predicted levels of sea level rise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – HM Naval Base</td>
<td>The preferred option is to sustain the current standard of protection (0.5% APF) against predicted levels of sea level rise.</td>
<td>Sustain the current standard of protection (0.5% APF) against predicted levels of sea level rise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*APF = Annual Probability of Flooding

4.1.14 The city council took the Portsea Island Coastal Strategy Study to the Environment Agency’s National Review group in December 2009, where some changes were recommended. Further changes were suggested in July 2010. At the time of writing the Strategy was awaiting Defra’s approval of the Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest (IROPI) for protecting people and property above the detrimental environmental impact to Langstone and Portsmouth Harbours.

4.1.15 The strategy proposes a programme of capital works to manage the coastal flood and erosion risk to Portsea Island. The strategy recommends that coastal flood and erosion risk management schemes are progressed within the next 5 to 10 years for Flood Cell 1: Southsea and Flood Cell 4: North Portsea Island due to the coastal defences’ low residual life and the potential consequences of a significant number of properties flooding in the event of a breach. The strategy also recommends that a coastal defence scheme is progressed for Flood Cell 5: Tipner as a priority to secure the environmental interests of Portsmouth Harbour.

4.1.16 In 2010 Portsmouth City Council submitted a business case to the Environment Agency for Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) to develop design options for coastal flood and erosion risk management schemes to Flood Cell 1: Southsea and Flood Cell 4: North Portsea Island.
4.1.17 Flood Cell 5: Tipner is a Strategic Development Site – it is currently undeveloped and does not meet the current national criteria for FDGiA. If the site was to be redeveloped the developer would need to improve the coastal defences, to make the site safe in terms of coastal flood and erosion risk. In the event that redevelopment of the site is not forthcoming the city council will need to take alternative approaches to managing the risk of contaminating Portsmouth Harbour.

4.1.18 Implementation of some of the strategies recommendation will depend upon Portsmouth City Council securing the necessary funds, and working together with partners, operating authorities, defence and land owners.

Costs

4.1.19 Costs have been estimated using the economics from the Portsea Island Coastal Strategy Study which used a base date of Quarter 2 2009 for:

a) Capital works costs
b) External fees (design and site supervision)
c) Portsmouth City Council - Project Management costs
d) Maintenance costs

4.1.20 Estimated Capital costs for the preferred strategic option for each of the flood cells are shown in the table below together with estimated future and maintenance costs over the 100-year strategy appraisal period. It is worth noting that all of the cost estimates include a 60% optimism bias as recommended in HM Treasury Green Book. It is anticipated that when the designs of schemes are developed, the estimated capital and maintenance costs are likely to be refined and substantially reduced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portsea Island Coastal Defence Strategy: Estimated costs of preferred options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Cell / Item (£k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Cost 1st 10 Yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Build Cost (PVC) for 100yrs of strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole life cash cost with 60% contingency inc. maintenance but without inflation, or pre-STARC fees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation of the strategy

4.1.21 Due to the uncertainties associated with climate change and any future changes to sea level rise guidance it is important that adaptability is designed as an integral part of any flood and coastal erosion risk management solution.
4.1.22 Publicly funded coastal defences will be maintained by the council funded from its coastal revenue budget. In order to keep future revenue costs down, capital schemes will be designed to incorporate low maintenance solutions.

4.1.23 Private owners will continue to be responsible for the maintenance of their own coastal defences. This maintenance will be monitored by the council in order to manage the coastal flood and erosion risks to wider communities.

4.1.24 Where a developer improves a coastal defence the future maintenance of the asset should be with the developer but this will need to be confirmed through a legal agreement.

Portchester Castle to Emsworth Coastal Flood and Erosion Risk Management Strategy

4.1.25 The defence strategy for the city’s coastline north of Portcreek is covered by a wider strategy for the coastline from Portchester to Emsworth, which is being prepared by the Environment Agency in partnership with Havant Borough, Portsmouth City, Fareham Borough, and Chichester District Councils.

4.1.26 The strategy area has been divided into seven frontages, three of which cover Portsmouth’s northern coastline. These frontages are:
- Portchester Castle to Paulsgrove
- Horsea Island
- M27 and Farlington Marshes

4.1.27 Partners and the public were consulted on a draft strategy in the spring of 2009. Following feedback from this consultation the strategy is being revised and is due to be completed in 2011. All information provided below has been taken from the draft strategy of 2009 and may be subject to change.

4.1.28 The draft strategy recommends that the vast majority of properties should be protected to their current standard or better. However, the draft strategy also recognises that securing Government funding for building and maintaining defences cannot be guaranteed.

4.1.29 The draft strategy makes recommendations to manage coastal flood and erosion risk in the short (0 – 20 years), medium (20 – 50 years) and long term (50 – 100 years). It does not propose detailed schemes, but sets out draft recommendations.

4.1.30 The following strategic options were considered initially for each section of the frontage:
- No Active Intervention – Do nothing (baseline option)
- Limited Intervention – Do minimum
  - Maintain
  - Sustain
  - Improve
- Managed re-alignment

4.1.31 Options appraisal considered the options’ effectiveness in addressing flood risk, including the long term sustainability in the light of sea level rise, construction considerations, cost benefit analysis, and social, economic and environmental impacts;

4.1.32 The preferred options in the draft strategy for the three Portsmouth sections of the coast are set out in the table below:
### Frontage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frontage</th>
<th>Preferred option</th>
<th>Estimated whole life costs (£million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Portchester Castle to Paulsgrove | Hold the line – improve; The existing defences at Portchester need to be improved to reduce flood risk. The condition of the defences along the Paulsgrove frontage is good, so improvement work will not be necessary for about 30 years. This option continues to offer protection to Portchester Castle, the recreation ground, residential and commercial properties. | 20 yrs: 7  
100 yrs: 22 |
| Horsea                    | Hold the line – maintain. The southern frontage of the island is owned and maintained by the Ministry of Defence (MoD). Portsmouth City Council maintains the defences along the western frontage. The island is reclaimed from the sea using landfill, and potentially contains contaminated materials, so it is important that it remains protected to prevent Portsmouth Harbour from pollution from the old landfill site. The existing defences at Horsea Island provide a very high standard of protection and are in good condition. The current standard of protection should be maintained for the next 100 years. This will provide Port Solent Marina and HMS Excellent Defence Diving School with an appropriate level of protection from flood risk. This also reduces the risk of pollution to Portsmouth Harbour and the designated nature conservation sites through erosion of the landfill site. | 20 yrs: 4.6  
100 yrs: 19 |
| Farlington Marshes        | M27: Hold the line – sustain; Farlington Marshes: Maintain for about 10 years whilst long-term options are studied; A more detailed environmental study is currently looking at the long term impacts on the area of holding the line or realigning the existing defences. It is possible that some form of managed realignment will be required due to the costs associated with maintaining the existing defences. A sustainable location for the defences is needed to ensure that the flood risk to the residential areas north of the A27 does not increase. Managed realignment could create valuable tidal habitat for wildlife that would otherwise be lost from the harbour as sea levels rise. If realignment will cause a loss of existing habitat, then this would need to be recreated elsewhere within the Solent. | 20 yrs: 20.5  
100 yrs: 38 |

4.1.33 Based on further work in 2010/11 to assess likely costs since the tables above were put together, the following likely cost picture emerges for the two strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Portchester Castle to Paulsgrove</th>
<th>0-20 Years Present Value Cost (£k)</th>
<th>0-100 Year Present Value Cost (£k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reach 1</td>
<td>Portchester Castle to Paulsgrove</td>
<td>6,639</td>
<td>9,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach 2</td>
<td>Horsea Island</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>5,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach 3</td>
<td>M27 &amp; Farlington Marshes</td>
<td>2,679</td>
<td>18,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Cell 1</td>
<td>Southsea</td>
<td>42,995</td>
<td>43,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Cell 2</td>
<td>Fraser Battery</td>
<td>9,799</td>
<td>16,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Cell 3</td>
<td>Eastney Lake</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Cell 4</td>
<td>North Portsea Island</td>
<td>36,942</td>
<td>37,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Cell 5</td>
<td>Tipner (no development)</td>
<td>3,462</td>
<td>5,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Cell 6</td>
<td>Continental Ferry Port</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>13,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Cell 7</td>
<td>HM Naval Base</td>
<td>9,444</td>
<td>10,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>129,460</strong></td>
<td><strong>163,431</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Funding Issues**

4.1.34 Ideally, funding for the capital improvement and capital maintenance schemes for flood defences will principally be sourced from the Flood and Coastal Defence Grant in Aid. However, there is uncertainty over the availability of funds and therefore other sources of funding are also being explored. While Portsmouth is one of the places where defences would protect significant assets and therefore would bring good value for money, there is no guarantee that funding will be forthcoming, given the current budgetary climate. In addition, the mechanism for allocating national flood defence funding grants is currently being reviewed, creating further uncertainty.

4.1.35 However, it is still possible to broadly categorise the level of confidence on the likelihood of public funding of the different frontages, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Flood Cells</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cells likely to be funded publicly based on cost benefit analysis</td>
<td>Portsea Island Cell 1 Portsea Island Cell 4 Portchester Castle to Paulsgrove Farlington Marshes</td>
<td>All cells would bring significant benefits compared to the costs involved The city council is therefore hopeful that public funding for these schemes will become available. As the chances of public funding increase if other contributions are made, CIL funding for part of these schemes will be explored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cells unlikely to be publicly funded – sources of alternative funding identified</td>
<td>Portsea Island Cell 2 Portsea Island Cell 5 Portsea Island Cell 6 Portsea Island Cell 7 Horsea M27 frontage</td>
<td>Third party contributions and funding from other sources will be pursued from the Ministry of Defence, Landowners, developers and Continental Ferry Port Operators. Landowners should continue maintenance of the Horsea Island &amp; the M27 frontages. In the case of Tipner (Flood Cell 5) and Flood Cell 3, flood defences are needed to allow development to proceed. Here, the developer must fund the provision or provide the necessary defences directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cells unlikely to be publicly funded – alternative methods of funding not yet identified</td>
<td>Portsea Island Cell 3</td>
<td>Alternative sources of funding; possibly developer contributions through CIL and PUSH level contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.36 As well as landowners paying directly for some defences, it is envisaged that developer contributions will be the key mechanism for securing alternative sources of funding, rather than relying on uncertain grant funds. Flood defence spending will form a significant proportion of the city’s CIL regime. Sub-regional level contributions or other funding sources will also be explored.

4.1.37 The principal aim of PPS25 is that new development is made safe and that flood risk overall should be reduced where possible. If new development in the city contributes to funding for flood defences, it will be contributing to reducing flood risk in the city as a whole.

**Drainage & risk of sewer flooding**

4.1.38 Southern Water is responsible for the public foul and surface water systems in Portsmouth.

4.1.39 Surface water and foul water currently flow into one combined system. Flooding has become a growing threat in the city because rainwater and sewage share the same Victorian sewers and they can potentially become overwhelmed during severe storms. In addition, much of the area served by the sewerage system is below high tide level.
4.1.40 The city has two main interceptor foul water sewers; one running down the west side of the city and one along the east side. Currently there is no capacity left in the western interceptor sewer to deal with additional development.

**Southern Water’s liaison with planning authorities**

4.1.41 In light of the housing growth proposed through the South East Plan Southern Water has put together guiding principles in relation to planning for waste water infrastructure. In order to ensure that the provision of necessary wastewater infrastructure is coordinated with development, Southern Water has committed to assessing the capacity of the local sewer system on a site-by-site basis when sites are proposed for development in a draft DPD. This will establish whether existing capacity is sufficient to accommodate the anticipated demand. The company will advise the planning authority if capacity is insufficient so that the timing of development can be co-ordinated to coincide with delivery of necessary investment. Planning policies will be required to achieve this co-ordination. Southern Water will also advise planning authorities if any future potential constraints have been identified in treatment of wastewater.

4.1.42 Other important guiding principles include ensuring that planning policies are in place to promote appropriate surface water drainage systems and flood protection. This will prevent inundation of the public sewerage system, and consequent foul water flooding, and realise opportunities on previously developed sites to separate surface water run-off from foul sewers. This will provide more efficient use of foul sewers and release capacity for new development.

**City wide infrastructure needs:**

4.1.43 The city’s foul and combined drainage system is at capacity now and therefore any additional development will require improvements to the existing infrastructure, or reduction in current surface water/ highway drainage entering the system. Southern Water has stated that additional development must not increase the current rate of flow into the combined sewer system. A new pumping station facility is also required to protect existing and future developments from flooding and the challenges of climate change.

4.1.44 Infrastructure that is needed to deal with these issues citywide is:

- Additional sewerage capacity, or additional headroom created by the separation of surface water,
- New pumping station(s) and associated outfall
- New surface water networks and outfall(s), to connect existing networks and relieve the foul sewer network

4.1.45 Southern Water has thoroughly modelled proposals to modify the system to reduce flood risk and allow for future growth in Portsmouth. In 2007, a 10 point plan of action to reduce the risk of sewer flooding in Portsmouth was prepared, followed in 2009 by a business plan for 2010-2015, which supersedes the 2007 plan and was used to bid for funding from Ofwat for a suite of investments. Schemes in the business plan are primarily designed to reduce the risk of flooding and the number of storm discharges to the environment, but may also provide capacity in the interim for phasing of some of the future development. It has been agreed, however, that the capacity freed up by schemes will not be used to accommodate growth in the long term.

4.1.46 The key projects identified are

- the Eastney pumping station project,
- surface water separation projects
- a new pumping station and outfall.

---

3 available by email from Southern Water
4.1.47 It is not possible to give costings for these schemes, as that information is commercially sensitive.

4.1.48 **Eastney Pumping Station** – A critical asset, it acts as the sewerage pumping station for the whole of the Portsmouth peninsula. The city experienced significant flooding in the year 2000. A £10 million scheme of additional pumps at Eastney pumping station was completed in 2010. This provides a standby facility to improve the security of the pumping station, ensuring that pumping can continue in the event that the existing diesel pumps fail. However, the new pumps have not increased pumping capacity in terms of the maximum number of litres of water that can be removed per second.

4.1.49 **Surface and Foul water separation**: where practicable, surface water can be discharged into the sea and does not have to enter into the combined system (although consents for this are required). The overriding issue is not just the level of surface runoff but also the rate. This is an important issue as, even when development takes place on a site which is already impermeable, the rate may increase due to more efficient drainage systems. Separating out surface water at the development site and discharging it into the sea allows capacity for foul water to be released. Alternatively, attenuation facilities (e.g. SUDS or underground storage tanks) would release surface water at a reduced rate over a longer period of time in stormy conditions.

4.1.50 The following projects have been approved by Ofwat and included in Southern Water’s Business Plan for the period 2010 to 2015:
- Royal Navy Dockyard – surface water separation
- Spice Island – tidal inflow removal and surface water separation
- Other surface water separation projects with potential to address issues at Stirling Street; Commercial Road; Tangier Road; St Mary’s Hospital; Copnor Road and Kiln Road.
- Gruneisen Road Surface Water Pumping Station
- Kirtley Road CSO

4.1.51 The primary purpose of all these projects is to increase the level of flood protection in Portsmouth. Developers will need to ensure that the rate of flow into the combined system from new or redevelopment sites is not increased above the current rates in order to ensure that the level of flood protection provided by the above projects is not undermined.

4.1.52 **A new pumping station and out-fall along the south-coast of the city**: Another scheme to manage storm water flows during storm events. This facility will provide additional pumping capacity and prevent the existing pumping station at Eastney becoming overwhelmed during a storm event. Therefore in the future, a site will have to be found in the south-coast of the city to provide a new pumping station and outfall.

4.1.53 An area of search for the pumping station is shown below.
4.1.54 This scheme was not agreed by Ofwat as part of the 2010-2015 Business Plan, and will therefore not be delivered in the period to 2015. This means that flood resilience will be not be as high, making it even more important that the rate of flow from new development & redevelopment does not increase beyond existing levels. Southern Water will keep this under review and funding may be forthcoming in the future.

4.1.55 The scheme will require planning permission, coastal modelling and probably an environmental statement. The planning process will likely take approximately 2 years. The outcome of a current investigation to consider the impacts of discharges on Shellfish Water Designations in the Harbours and the Solent will also have to be considered. This study has the potential to limit the acceptability of new discharges.

**Strategic Sites Infrastructure needs:**

4.1.56 Tipner & Port Solent / Horsea: All surface water from this area will have to discharge directly into the sea to minimise the risk of flooding and to make efficient use of the foul drainage system. There is no capacity in the main western interceptor.

4.1.57 Therefore, foul water will have to be diverted away from the western interceptor sewer. A feasibility study for two options for achieving this was completed in 2010\(^5\). Developers must requisition any such network.

4.1.58 For further detail see the strategic sites section.

**Small sites & other strategic sites:**

4.1.59 As sites come forward, local networks may need upgrading if new development is to be accommodated. This will need to be paid for by developers by connecting off-site to the nearest point of adequate capacity, or by removing and safely diverting surface water which currently drains to the combined system.

4.1.60 Southern Water has requested that any new development should not increase the rate of flow into the sewage system. Therefore new development should separate out the surface water from foul water and that where possible surface water should be discharged straight

---

to the sea. Where this is not possible sustainable drainage systems should be used, or surface water should be held in attenuation tanks and released when there is capacity in the drainage system such as after a storm event. Such local schemes will have to be funded by developers.

4.1.61 The post development rate of discharge of both surface and foul water to the combined system should be no greater than the existing rate. If the new discharge to the sewerage system is predicted to increase above existing level, investment will be required to ensure demand is met, and to manage the potential increase in risk of flooding. This will need to be delivered before or in phase with the development.

4.1.62 The Core Strategy includes a policy setting out the above requirements.

Surface Water Management Plan

4.1.63 One of the key actions for Portsmouth from the South East Hampshire CFMP is to prepare a Surface Water Management Plan. Portsmouth City Council has received funding from Defra to undertake a Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP).

4.1.64 The SWMP for Portsmouth has just been commissioned by PCC. It is due to be completed in June 2011, for submitting to the Environment Agency. This will be a living document, subject to alteration as development take place. The SWMP will aim to

- Identify the ownership of watercourses and the like
- Identify flow routes and areas susceptible to flooding
- Raise the understanding of the risks of flooding amongst stakeholders
- Appraise options for mitigating flooding, with the feasibility, costs, effectiveness and public acceptability of different measures compared and tested
- Recommend a preferred option for a delivery plan to reduce flooding potential, which identifies responsibilities of each stakeholder
- an Action Plan for a surface water management strategy
- inform spatial planning and investment decisions
4.2 Transport & access

In this chapter:
- LTP3 priority schemes
- Tipner M275 junction
- Horsea- Tipner Bridge Link
- Park & Ride
- Limited stop ZIP express bus routes (BRT)

Current Situation

4.2.1 The city is a growing destination for tourism, shopping and leisure which has also contributed to increasing levels of traffic on the three road access points on to Portsea Island. The combined effect of forecast growth in homes and employment across the wider Urban South Hampshire region is likely to increase the level of traffic compared to the present day by some 42% by 2031 for the AM Peak hour (based on the number of journeys made in the Portsmouth Western Corridor Model area).

4.2.2 In order to achieve this growth it is essential that sustainable quality transport and access is available.

4.2.3 The M275 is the spine road that links all the proposed strategic sites on the western corridor together and importantly provides access to the city centre and the port, which are important economic drivers for the city and the sub-region. Pedestrian, cyclist and public transport access to the key development sites in the Western Corridor at Tipner, Port Solent and Horsea Island and Lakeside is currently poor – significant improvements are required to ensure that the proposed development here does not exacerbate current traffic problems. Without associated improvements, development at Port Solent and Horsea Island will put further pressure on the existing Port Way/A27 Junction, and development at Tipner will result in more traffic on Twyford Avenue as the principal access to the site.

4.2.4 The city council therefore commissioned a study to consider the issues and interventions associated with the western access corridor in support of the Core Strategy.

4.2.5 The study acknowledges that access to and from Portsmouth cannot be examined in isolation from the surrounding urban area of South Hampshire and its current and projected transport and movement issues. While the study has concentrated on bringing forward interventions that tackle problems and issues in Portsmouth Western Corridor, it has reviewed a wider area for potential interventions. This is particularly true of public transport, where Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and rail schemes that address travel to and from the wider area have been considered. The appraisal of packages concentrated on the objectives of improving access to Portsmouth, but it should be recognised that these schemes may well have impacts and benefits which cover a much greater area.

*The Western Corridor Transport Strategy* and Local Transport Plan 3

4.2.6 A transport strategy for South Hampshire to 2031 is being jointly developed by the three Local Transport Authorities of Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council and Southampton City Council, working together as Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH). This strategy will be shared content within final Local Transport Plan 3 documents being developed by the three Local Transport Authorities, including priority schemes for delivery, which will be published by April 2011.

4.2.7 During the first half of 2010, as well as ongoing work on LTP 3, a Western Corridor Transport Strategy looked specifically at issues and potential solutions for transport linked to the proposed development of the strategic sites on the city’s western corridor (while also taking into account the wider development proposals for the rest of the city). The results of

---


7 TSFH: [http://www3.hants.gov.uk/ftfh](http://www3.hants.gov.uk/ftfh)
This study informed the Portsmouth LTP3 and contributed to the LTP3 strategy covering the wider South Hampshire sub-region.

4.2.8 This study has shown that to accommodate the levels of growth in a sustainable way, an integrated cross mode strategy is required which contains elements aimed at reducing and managing the existing travel demands and measures to invest in new infrastructure and services to enable the key development areas to fulfil their potential. These are the same three principles which underpin the transport strategy for the sub-region as adopted by the three strategic transport authorities.

4.2.9 The preferred transport strategy put forward through the Western Corridor Transport Strategy to support the development proposals in the Core Strategy is the first stage of developing a BRT network into Portsmouth, building upon the ZIP bus priority corridor between Clanfield and The Hard Interchange along the A3 corridor.

4.2.10 The four principal elements that underpin the Preferred Strategy for the corridor are:

- **Tipner M275 junction**
  - to provide access to a key development site in the Western Corridor,
  - to provide a potential access to Horsea Island and
  - to facilitate the Park and Ride site at Tipner.

- **Horsea-Tipner Bridge**
  - to allow access to achieve the full development potential for both Horsea and Port Solent,
  - to provide the key priority access for new public transport connecting the main corridor development sites together, initially as ZIP bus routes, but later potential for BRT.
  - A bus gate between Port Solent and Horsea Island would prevent traffic using the Tipner-Horsea Link Bridge rather than the M275, whilst allowing direct, competitive, bus services. Port Solent development traffic would access the road network via the Port Way junction, and Horsea Island via the Link Bridge.

- **Tipner Park and Ride**
  - to provide the means to reduce congestion on the City Centre approaches at peak times
  - to assist the realisation of further development in the City centre.

- **Limited stop ZIP Express bus Routes**
  - To provide an alternative to the car for existing and new journeys to and from the principal travel corridors to the City. They provide a step change in public transport for the key Western Corridor sites which would allow higher levels of development through increased mode share to public transport. These routes can be upgraded with increased priority measures to be the building blocks for a wider BRT network at a later date.

**Other proposals set out in the Western Corridor Strategy include:**

- Local bus service improvements (service 57)
- Pedestrian and cycle schemes between the Queen Alexandra Hospital and the City Centre
- New/improved interchanges at Station Square, The Hard, and the Queen Alexandra Hospital.
- Northern Road Bridge Replacement.
- Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) and Smartcards

4.2.11 Further details of the whole preferred strategy can be found on p.119 of the draft Western Corridor Transport Study: They are also shown on the plan at the end of this section.
4.2.12 In addition to the above elements the study recommends that consideration should be given to the potential of demand management measures.

4.2.13 The study confirms that with the measures contained in the preferred strategy in place, the level of housing development that can be delivered is in line with the Portsmouth Core Strategy. Without the schemes outlined in the preferred strategy, it is likely that significantly lower levels of new development could be accommodated on the existing transport network, and that the resulting congestion and delays may be detrimental to the perception of Portsmouth as a place to work, live or conduct business. Without the measures, a significantly reduced level of dwellings, approximately 8,000 in total, could be delivered on the existing highway network (assuming the levels of employment and retail remain the same).

4.2.14 Taking this into account, the city council has reviewed its proposed housing number, and decided to go forward with a lower number than previously planned for through the South East Plan, but also to propose a range, which acknowledges the fact that the level of development is linked to the delivery of key infrastructure items, in particular for transport.

**Taking the Strategy forward – further work, funding and delivery**

4.2.15 The strategy contributes to Portsmouth LTP3 in both the 20 year strategy which is joint across the South Hampshire sub-region between Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council and Southampton City Council, and through the three year implementation plan in which Portsmouth identifies the measures most appropriate for the city.

4.2.16 The future of the four key elements identified in the Western Corridor Strategy identified are described below (see also the strategic sites section of the IDP for information on the Tipner M275 Junction & the Horsea – Tipner Bridge Link, as they are direct requirements of developing these sites).

4.2.17 **M275 Junction at Tipner** - planning permission has been granted for this scheme to go ahead. However this scheme was relying on Department for Transport which was not brought forward as part of the coalition government’s spending review in 2010.

4.2.18 The proposed Park & Ride at Tipner is also dependent on the M275 junction coming forward.

4.2.19 **Tipner Park and Ride** - as part of development at Tipner, the city council intends to provide a 900 space surface car park initially, with the intention of a multi-storey car park to provide 1800 spaces eventually.

4.2.20 Costs will be determined by standard development costs for tarmac etc, but will also be influenced by the level of decontamination needed, which has not yet been determined.

4.2.21 Funding options could include full funding by the city council, or shared funding with developers of the employment element of the development on the basis of shared use, or funding from other potential users.

4.2.22 **Horsea-Tipner Link Bridge** - in the summer of 2010, a Bridge Feasibility Study by Peter Brett Associates, Atkins and Savills⁶, provided outline and high level evidence demonstrating the potential for a bridge link between Horsea Island and Tipner in a civil engineering context and outlined the onward process of delivering a crossing.

4.2.23 The city council has been working on a Tax Incremental Financing Proposal to fund the Tipner M275 junction, park and ride and bridge link schemes. CIL is also expected to play
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⁶ Bridge Feasibility Study - [http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/18208.html](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/18208.html)
a part in funding infrastructure to bring forward the strategic sites (see strategic sites section)

4.2.24 Limited stop ZIP Express bus Routes - the possible BRT network is shown below:

4.2.25 The BRT board is considering setting up sub-group to take forward delivery of this corridor. Funding for BRT may come partly from a sub-regional CIL.
4.3 Green infrastructure

In this chapter:
- Southsea Common and the Seafront
- Paulsgrove Country Park
- Pocket Parks across the city
- Open Space at Port Solent

4.3.1 The term ‘green infrastructure’ (GI) refers to a joined up network of multifunctional open spaces and the greening of the built environment. An extensive, high quality GI network can improve quality of life and stimulate the economy. Importantly, it will also divert recreational pressure away from designated nature conservation sites – Langstone and Portsmouth Harbours are internationally protected sites on the edges of the city, which could be threatened by increased recreational use linked to the growth in population.

4.3.2 The GI needs associated with the growth planned for Portsmouth have been assessed as part of a PUSH wide GI Strategy (October 2009). The strategy examined the existing GI provision, how the provision operates, whether it operates to the best of its abilities or whether more GI provision is needed in light of the planned housing growth and Habitats Regulations requirements. The strategy then sets a framework for strategic initiatives across South Hampshire, which will improve the GI offer, recommending projects that maximise the multi functionality of open and natural spaces and promote connectivity between sites in order to direct recreational pressure away from internationally designated nature conservation sites.

4.3.3 For Portsmouth the following key projects have been identified:

4.3.4 Southsea Common & the Seafront - Southsea Common requires GI improvements to enhance the greenspace for recreational users and wildlife. The project should enhance the common and reinforce links with local seafront features including the various scheduled ancient monuments and listed buildings, the historic dockyard, Gunwharf Quays, Spinnaker Tower and western waterfront. Details could include:
- landscaping which responds to coastal character,
- increasing access routes
- a range of high quality facilities
- attractive recreational spaces

4.3.5 Paulsgrove Country Park - create an informal ‘country park’ to provide a major new coastal recreational location in an area of relatively low sensitivity in ecological terms. It could create a prominent and distinctive landform as its location is at a ‘gateway’ of Portsmouth.

4.3.6 Pocket parks - the project should establish and promote an improved network of pocket parks with better linkages across Portsmouth. This could include promoting the public use of school playing fields or negotiations with other institutions’ land such as MOD land or cemeteries. Pocket parks and greenspaces could potentially be linked up by a better network of trees across the city.

---

Delivery

4.3.7 Delivery of green infrastructure in its widest sense will involve a partnership approach involving the local authorities, central government and the development industry. Government agencies such as Natural England, the Environment Agency, and Forest Enterprise can provide advice and support whilst SEEDA and developer may provide investment.

4.3.8 PUSH has appointed a GI officer who will lead the delivery of the strategy, including considering a governance structure; commitments of partners to delivery; funding arrangements; and timetable for action.

4.3.9 The following sources of funding will be explored for the delivery of green infrastructure:

- Multi-agency public grant funding (e.g. Big Lottery Fund and Heritage Lottery Fund, Safer and Stronger Communities fund)
- Growth Point funding.
- CIL
- private sector funding (e.g. from sponsorship, charitable donations, endowments or income from letting event space)
- Land management support from bodies such as natural England and the Forestry commission (Environmental Stewardship, Rural Development programme for England and Woodland Grant Scheme)
- Government funding e.g. the Aggregates Levy and Landfill Tax; and

4.3.10 The projects identified for Portsmouth in the PUSH GI strategy are progressing.

4.3.11 Plans for Southsea Common and the Seafront will be taken forward through the Council’s Seafront Strategy. This strategy sets out a clear ambitious vision for the future of the seafront and has a detailed action plan in order to achieve the vision by co-ordinating activities and attracting substantial investment. Immediate priorities include a splash pool, seafront lighting stage 1, café facilities and a monuments and fortification maintenance programme.

4.3.12 Work on the country park in Paulsgrove is already well progressed. The estimated cost for this project is £2.1 million, funded through National Lottery grants and developer contributions. Restoration works are due to be completed in December 2011. Currently no funding for future maintenance has been identified.

4.3.13 Parks and open spaces will be managed and improved through the implementation of the city’s Open Spaces Strategy. The strategy sets standards for the provision of the quantity and type of green space and ensure they are safe, easily accessible and of the highest quality. It also identifies costs for the schemes identified, delivery mechanisms and timescales, and will be used to direct funding to the areas of green infrastructure that most need it. The Open Spaces Strategy has not yet been published, but details of its contents will be included in future iterations of the IDP.

4.3.14 All development in the city will be expected to contribute towards the enhancement and provision of new green infrastructure, through a combination of financial contributions and measures integral to the development, such as green roofs and landscaping. Furthermore, developers of larger schemes (50 dwellings or more) will be expected to provide pocket parks on-site. Biodiversity issues will also have to be considered as part of development – for example, the existing open space at Port Solent is a brent goose feeding site and enhancements should be provided as part of development (see strategic sites section).

4.3.15 As part of its ongoing efforts to protect and enhance Portsmouth’s green infrastructure network, the city council, in partnership with other stakeholders, will regularly survey existing and potential local wildlife sites. This survey process will identify the species which

---

use these sites, the extent of the habitats and what measures could be put in place to improve the sites’ nature conservation value.
4.4 Utilities

In this chapter:
- Mary Rose electricity main station
- Electricity sub stations
- Combined Heat and Power plant
- Gas network (no needs identified)
- Washwater Recovery Plant at Farlington WTW
- Winter Storage reservoir at Havant Thicket
- Broadband

Electricity

4.4.1 National Grid owns and maintains the high-voltage electricity transmission system in England, and operates the system across Great Britain. Scottish and Southern Energy (SSE) is the local Distribution Network Operator (DNO) covering the whole of Hampshire. SSE are the owners and operators of the network of towers and cables that bring electricity from the high-voltage transmission network to homes and businesses. Southern Electric (part of Scottish and Southern Energy group) is the company which then supplies and sells electricity to domestic, commercial and smaller industrial premises.

4.4.2 Electricity in Portsmouth is provided by SSE from two main power sites in the city. One of the power sites is situated in the north of the city on Cows Lane in Wymering, with the second in the south of the city at the Mary Rose site on Warblington Street. These power sites supply a network of nine smaller substations situated across the city.

Impact of growth on services

4.4.3 Scottish and Southern Electric have indicated that the Mary Rose main station is at capacity and that all of the smaller substations are more or less fully loaded at present, and therefore capacity at these sites either needs to be increased or new sites for substations are needed.

4.4.4 Infrastructure requirements to increase capacity and enable the system to accommodate the anticipated growth are:
  - Supply some of the sub stations from the Wymering site instead of the Mary Rose site and this will be done within SSE’s own costs. This should be sufficient to cope with the additional development in Portsmouth to 2026.
  - Provide new substations as part of developments where there is a need. This would be done on a case by case basis as development comes forward and would be provided by the developer. SSE under regulations are not allowed to plan for future growth so can only require sub stations as and when the need arises.

CHP for the city

4.4.5 The city council’s Carbon Management Board is keen to progress a Combined Heat and Power project for the city. The Board agreed in April 2010 to invest in a feasibility study for no more than £10k which would be funded or part funded from the Carbon Management Reserve. The city council would drive the project in partnership with a commercial provider, who is also likely to have access to funds for delivery.

Gas

4.4.6 Energy is regulated by the public sector through the Office of Gas and Electricity Markets (Ofgem).

4.4.7 National Grid is responsible for transporting gas through the National
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11 Carbon Management Broad Minutes 22 April 2010
4.4.8 Transmission System (NTS), the high-pressure system which transports gas from the import terminals to major centres of population and some large industrial users, such as power stations on behalf of the gas suppliers. Twelve Local Distribution Zones (LDZs) contain pipes operating at lower pressure, which eventually supply the consumer. The LDZs are managed within eight Gas Distribution Networks (GDNs). The distribution network in Hampshire is owned and managed by Scotia Gas Networks, operating as Southern Gas Networks.

4.4.9 The latest Long Term Development Statement for Scotia Gas Networks was published in October 2009\(^\text{12}\). It sets out their assessment of the long term development of the network’s two gas transportation systems (Scotland Gas Networks and Southern Gas Networks) in terms of future demand and the consequences for investment in the Networks. The statement does not refer to any major projects for the Portsmouth area over the next 10 years.

Water supply

4.4.10 Portsmouth Water is the water operator responsible for supplying water to households in Portsmouth. The water operator has a duty to ensure that there are sufficient water resources to meet the needs of its customers. With initiatives to encourage water efficiency in recent years, capacity is currently adequate for demand, but with the proposed level of development, measures will have to be taken to increase supply.

Water Supply - Impact of growth on services

4.4.11 The water company recognises that consumption has been rising steadily for a number of years, due to the increase in the number of households in the region. Portsmouth Water has produced an updated Water Resources Management Plan (2010) (WRMP)\(^\text{13}\) to identify ways to manage demand and increase supply, which will ensure that it can meet future demand. In order to increase capacity with projected growth, Portsmouth Water is seeking a ‘twin track’ approach to both demand management and resource development which will include a number of phased developments:

- The development of a Washwater Recovery Plant at Farlington WTW by 2017/18. This will decrease operational losses.
- A Leakage Savings Programme between 2015 and 2020.
- Water Efficiency Programme 2018
- Winter Storage reservoir at Havant Thicket, filled by surplus yield from the company’s Havant & Bedhampton Springs between 2025 and 2035 - £53 million
- Meter all households in Portsmouth from 2015 to 2030 – this is reliant on funding from the business plan.

4.4.12 The overall scheme of works will ensure that there is adequate availability of water supply in Portsmouth through to 2035. Portsmouth Water has forecasted the demand for water as far forward as 2035 and has set out how this will be met in their draft business plan. Portsmouth Water has concluded that the increase in water supply needed to accommodate the additional households in Portsmouth can be met from within planned projects and at their own cost.

4.4.13 They have also made clear that development at Tipner West would need to be served by a new pipeline running under the M275.

4.4.14 Portsmouth Water relies on funding from Ofwat to bring forward schemes. Funding is allocated through agreement to the Water Resources Management Plan, which process the company is currently going through.

\(\text{12} \) Scotia Gas Networks: Long Term Development Statement October 2009: [http://www.sgn.co.uk > corporate > publications](http://www.sgn.co.uk)

ICT infrastructure

4.4.15 Access to good quality, high speed broadband is becoming increasingly important in globalised markets and changing working practices such as home working.

4.4.16 BT has committed to roll out fibre-based broadband to 40 per cent of the country by 2012, pledging to spend £1.5 billion on this programme. BT will offer access on an open, wholesale basis through both Openreach and BT Wholesale.

4.4.17 This programme is currently being rolled out to southern parts of Portsmouth and BT intends to extend coverage to the rest of Portsmouth in the future, following a review of the first phase.

4.4.18 This more strategic programme needs to be complemented by the consideration of IT needs in the design and build of new development. East Midlands Development Agency, South East England Development Agency et al's Information and Communications Technology Toolkit\(^\text{14}\) may be helpful in this regard.

4.4.19 In terms of public access, the planned installation of wireless internet provision in the Central Library will make a significant contribution to supporting lifelong learning in the city, allowing all library users to access the Internet via their own laptops, as well as the People’s Network.

---

\(^{14}\) Information and Communications Technology Toolkit: [http://www.emda.org.uk/icttoolkit/](http://www.emda.org.uk/icttoolkit/)
4.5 Education

In this chapter:
- Primary schools
- Secondary Schools
- FE Colleges
- Portsmouth University
- Early Years
- Adult & Family Learning
- Informal Learning

4.6.1 In Portsmouth there are
- One nursery school,
- 53 primary schools (including 21 Infant, 17 Junior and 15 Primary schools, which provide education from ages 4 to 11,
- 10 Secondary schools, which provide education from ages 11 to 16 including one Academy,
- Five special schools and nine special needs units within other schools.

4.6.2 As an education authority, the city council has a duty to plan the provision of school places and to provide school places to meet existing and future demand. The authority needs to respond to changes in demand over time by increasing or removing capacity. This can be achieved by:
- building new schools
- extending existing schools
- reducing places at existing schools; or
- amalgamating or closing schools

Primary Sector

Primary Sector – current position

4.6.3 Standard advice from the then Department for Children, Schools and Families guidance is that authorities should have some 6-8% surplus capacity in primary schools to ensure adequate choice for parents and allow for fluctuations in population.

4.6.4 In the past the city has had surplus capacity due to the fall in birth rate and consequential reduction in primary school pupil numbers in the late 1990s and early 2000s.

4.6.5 Portsmouth schools have used this surplus capacity to:
- host additional nursery provision
- host Children’s Centres
- increase specialist provision within schools
- provide extended and community services.

Primary Sector – Effect of Planned Growth

4.5.5 Projected pupil numbers to 2025/26 compared to school capacity is set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary NOR / NOR Forecast</td>
<td>13393</td>
<td>13802</td>
<td>14399</td>
<td>14764</td>
<td>14586</td>
<td>14271</td>
<td>14052</td>
<td>13933</td>
<td>13924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Net Capacity</td>
<td>15293</td>
<td>15488</td>
<td>15488</td>
<td>15488</td>
<td>15488</td>
<td>15488</td>
<td>15488</td>
<td>15488</td>
<td>15488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Surplus</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Surplus %</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB It is important to note that there is health warning RE the accuracy of the forecast figures for the latter years.
4.6.6 This indicates that the citywide level the provision of primary school places is sufficient now and up to 2026. There will however, be the need to expand and/or create additional primary school provision to meet:

- parental preference
- pupil movement within the city
- the implications of new major projects e.g. Tipner, Somerstown etc.

4.6.7 There will, therefore, be a need to regularly keep the capacity of primary schools under review, given remaining uncertainties over the exact location of planned development. The SHLAA gives an indication of likely location and timings of development, but exact geographic spread, timescales, and pupil yield of development will only become known as sites come forward and proposals progress through the planning system. If there is a lot of development within very localised areas this could cause issues for capacity in specific schools.

**Secondary Sector**

**Secondary Sector – current position**

4.6.8 The current secondary school estate has a wide variety of ages, construction types, styles and conditions both within most schools and across the city. Condition surveys indicate that the condition of buildings varies from school to school and within each school due to the different ages of buildings and other variables such as maintenance schedule 5 and usage. Notwithstanding these variations, most schools have some significant condition and suitability issues and the current backlog maintenance estimate is put at £11,238,916m (Building Schools for the Future, Strategy for Change\textsuperscript{15}).

4.6.9 The poorest condition school (King Richard) has been the council’s highest priority in the previous Targeted Capital Funding bidding round. The two newest schools, Admiral Lord Nelson School and the Miltoncross School constructed in the last 10 years, also require further investment to ensure they are of comparable standards and functionality where practical.

**Secondary Sector – Effect of Planned Growth**

4.6.10 2007 pupil projections were used as the basis of planning and funding Building Schools for the Future. This analysis indicated that the 2007 pupil numbers of 9,700 would trough in January 2016 at 8,500 and would rise to 8,900 in January 2018 (the Partnerships for Schools BSF pupil planning requirement). These projections have been independently verified by a leading national advisor in planning school places within the Partnership for Schools (PfS).

4.6.11 Current revised pupil projections to 2025/26 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary NOR / NOR Forecast</td>
<td>9106</td>
<td>8820</td>
<td>8527</td>
<td>8519</td>
<td>8903</td>
<td>9421</td>
<td>9589</td>
<td>9443</td>
<td>9204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Net Capacity</td>
<td>10310</td>
<td>10310</td>
<td>9980</td>
<td>9300</td>
<td>9300</td>
<td>9300</td>
<td>9300</td>
<td>9300</td>
<td>9300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Surplus</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>-121</td>
<td>-289</td>
<td>-143</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Surplus %</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{15} Building Schools for the Future - Strategy for Change Part 1: Key Challenges & Objectives, June 2008

http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/media/BSF_strategy_for_change_part_1.pdf
4.6.12 This indicates continued growth in pupil numbers post 2018 which may require reviewing the capacity of some schools to reflect the current demand (NB there is no PfS funding available for potential pupil number growth beyond 2018).

*Primary & Secondary Sector – planning, funding and delivery*

4.6.13 Major investment in the city’s primary and secondary schools was planned through the Primary Capital Programme and the Building Schools for the Future Programme. Both schemes were the victim of the 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review. The city council is therefore producing a strategy to set out how educational transformation can be delivered in the absence of these programmes and funding streams\(^{16}\).

4.6.14 In terms of planning for school places, the city council has a very good record in forecasting pupil numbers, and is usually correct within 1% as per the last Ofsted inspection (2004). Pupil Place Planning is consistent with DCSF requirements and the Learning & Skills Council’s revenue funding predictions. It has regard to natural changes e.g. birth rate, family groupings, historic parental choice etc, and any capacity ‘hot spots’ are addressed with a regular housekeeping review of schools capacity.

4.6.15 Currently the DfE national cost of providing a school place is £10,372 for a primary school place and £15,848 for a secondary school place. In order to cover the cost of any additional school places required as a result of new developments the city council will continue to negotiate financial contributions towards education through section 106 agreements linked to individual developments. Where additional schools, or school places, are required as a consequence of development, as far as possible the cost should fall on the landowners and/or developers, by way of contributions i.e. planning obligations. Such contributions will be expected from all developments that create a shortfall in capacity or where there are significant suitability problems that restrict the ability of existing schools to absorb additional pupils. An SPD has been produced that sets out these guidelines in more detail, including cost information, which is linked to the type and size of the proposed units.

*Further Education*

4.6.16 There are two FE Colleges in Portsmouth’s: Portsmouth College, a sixth form college located on a single site on the eastern edge of Portsea Island; and Highbury College, a general further education college which has three main campuses in Cosham, North Harbour and in the city centre. South Downs College and Havant College, whilst located in Hampshire, also serve Portsmouth’s residents; and in the case of South Downs College caters for the largest group of 16-18 year old Portsmouth residents (41%).

4.6.17 Significant capital investment has been secured in recent years at Highbury College, and Portsmouth College is self funding ongoing improvements. These investments have strengthened the local FE sector’s capacity to respond to the raising of the participation age to 18 by 2015, any future growth in post-16 learner numbers in vocational and academic subjects, and any new and emerging vocational skills requirements.

*Higher Education*

4.6.18 Universities (Higher Education) are independent bodies responsible for their own investment decisions, and control over their own finances. They develop strategic plans to guide the future direction of the university and identify priorities.

4.6.19 Portsmouth University provides a range of undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications. There are currently 19,000 students and the university is not expecting a significant rise in student numbers over the next few years. The University estate covers some 26 hectares distributed in Guildhall Centre and Guildhall South in the city centre and the Langstone campus in the east of the city.

\(^{16}\)Cabinet report: [http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/media/cab20100720r11.pdf](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/media/cab20100720r11.pdf)
Capital building programme

4.6.20 In 2008/09 the University concluded the second phase of its capital building programme, which started in 2000.

4.6.21 Planning continues for the next phase of investment, scheduled to take place from 2009 to 2014. This includes major new facilities for visual and performing arts and new space for the School of Education and the Institute of Criminal Justice, and a dental academy. There will be more large teaching spaces provided to address shortages in these facilities. A substantial number of student bedrooms is also planned in order to help address an increasing shortfall in student housing which has been problematic for some students in recent years. It is also anticipated that over the next 5 years additional space for support services will need to be acquired.

4.6.22 The future development opportunities of the university are limited due to the lack of space in the city centre. The university would not consider any relocation due to the amount of resources already spent on creating a city centre campus.

Delivery

4.6.23 Two schemes that address the needs identified above are currently progressing:

- Victoria Baths: at the time of writing this is going through the planning process for the development of student accommodation - to be completed 2012.
- Performing Arts Accommodation: The University is working with the New Theatre Royal on a centre of excellence for performing arts. This will involve a rear extension to the New Theatre Royal to provide a studio theatre and to house the university performing arts facility. The centre will be for use by professional artists, students and the local community. The cost for this project is £4m, £500,000 of which will be contributed by the city council – to be completed 2012.

4.6.24 In the spring of 2009, governors considered the overall estates objectives, totalling some £65 million. It was agreed that the University should be committed to this scale of capital expenditure because the quality of the student experience was key to the success of the University’s strategy. An in principle commitment was given to £44 million of this expenditure.

4.6.25 In planning the next phase of capital investment assumptions have necessarily been made about available funding, including the continuation of the HEFCE teaching capital investment fund, which currently runs to 2011. The University has assumed that this continues, albeit at a reduced level, given the public spending cuts. Likewise, the availability of the University’s own cash surpluses to support the plan has been predicated on the level of spending cut announced in April 2009. If either of these assumptions ultimately proves too optimistic the plan will need to be reviewed and projects deferred, scaled back or cancelled. (University of Portsmouth Financial Review 2008/09)

Early Years

4.6.26 The council’s early learning and childcare service leads on the strategic planning and local delivery of childcare services, information for parents, children’s centres, parenting, portage and standards across the 0-5 Foundation Stage.

4.6.27 The Early Years & Childcare Plan 2008 -201117 reviewed the level of service and forecast future needs for early years provision. Key elements of this plan are:

- Childcare sufficiency
- Outcomes quality & inclusion
- Children’s centres

4.6.28 The Childcare Act 2006 placed statutory responsibilities on the local authority to secure better outcomes for children and their families. The key requirements that underpin Childcare Sufficiency and Access are as follows:

- Local authorities take the strategic lead in their local childcare market, planning, supporting and commissioning childcare. This includes the requirement for local authorities to assess the local childcare market and to secure sufficient childcare for working parents.
- Provide Information to parents, to ensure parents and prospective parents can access the full range of information they may need for their children right through to their 20th birthday.
- Secure a free minimum amount of early learning and care for all 3 and 4 year olds whose parents want it.

4.6.29 A childcare sufficiency assessment was carried out in 2008\(^\text{18}\), which assessed the level of existing provision against parental needs and population / development forecasts. This included an action plan to plug service gaps including gaps in local service provision. The assessment is updated annually to keep track of progress.

4.6.30 Children’s Centres, providing support, advice and services to parents of young children on health and development matters, have been developed in a staged approach – referred to as Phase One (2004-2006 serving the 20% most disadvantaged), Two (2006-2008 serving the 30% most disadvantaged) and three (2008-2011 serving the rest).

4.6.31 Phase three is currently under development, and new centres are being developed at:
- Cosham Baptist Church
- New Highbury Community Centre
- Milton Park Primary School
- Havelock Community Centre
- Meredith Lodge

4.6.32 Funding for these are secured and delivery is expected by March 2011, and should ensure that every household in the city has access to a children’s centre within 20 minutes of where they live.

**Adult and Family Learning**

4.6.33 The main focus of the AFL service is to target those adults with low/no qualifications, via contracts with a range of quality-assured providers, to deliver ‘first steps’ learning opportunities (e.g. Basic IT Skills; Food Preparation; Construction; DIY Skills), which enable progression to further learning and training or to jobs. Programmes are targeted towards lower performing schools and deprived areas, and are generally provided in existing community venues.

4.6.34 The key drivers for the provision of adult and family learning are:
- Levels of unemployment
- Numeracy and literacy
- Aging population

4.6.35 Funding is split between PCC (30%) and the Learning & Skills Council for the day to day provision of services and new facilities are generally funded from special bids (e.g. the NEAL centre in North End, recently completed). Funding is allocated on a year on year basis, and, while it has been relatively stable for the past years, service delivery can only be planned on an annual basis once funding known, rather than longer term.

---
Development in different parts of the city could trigger the need for additional services, and the city council keeps a watching brief on future development. However, the level and type of provision would be determined by the social make up of the new community, so would only be planned and funds committed after a community is established.

Informal Learning

Cultural and creative activity plays a central role in enhancing traditional teaching methods and resources, engaging with children and young people in a unique way that, often, does not ‘feel like learning’. It allows children and young people to engage with new subjects, skills and activities on their own terms and pupils who struggle with traditional teaching methods and environments for a variety of reasons (behavioural issues, learning difficulties or excluded children, for example) often flourish when engaging with learning agendas in this way.

The city council’s Cultural Service work in conjunction with local schools, colleges and the University of Portsmouth to maximise their contribution to the learning agenda. For example, the Library Service delivers a range of informal learning opportunities for all ages, in the areas of literacy, foreign languages, and IT. Museums, Records and Archives work closely with local schools to enhance understanding of history and heritage while the Tourism, Visitor Services and Events supports local tourism, students at college and university.

Portsmouth has also secured funding under the EU Interreg IV funding stream, utilising creative and cultural activity to enhance language learning skills; and continues to secure funding from dedicated funding streams for targeted events and activities for young people (e.g. Find your Talent project).
4.6 Health

In this chapter:
- Primary & Community Care, including St Mary’s Hospital
- GPs
- Dentists
- Queen Alexandra Hospital

4.6.1 Notwithstanding the coalition government’s plans to abolish Strategic Health Authorities and Primary Care Trusts by 2013, the responsibility for health care provision in Portsmouth currently lies with NHS Portsmouth, working in partnership with Portsmouth City Council, other NHS Trusts, such as Portsmouth Hospitals NHS Trust, Solent Healthcare, voluntary groups and the local population. NHS Portsmouth has two main functions:
  - commissioning (buying) a wide range of health services for the local population
  - engaging with partners, patients and the public over the planning and delivery of local health services.

4.6.2 Portsmouth Hospitals NHS Trust provides a significant portion of acute care for the Portsmouth population. Inpatient care and specialist diagnostic provision is generally provided on the Queen Alexandra Hospital site. A range of acute healthcare is provided in community settings for example Health Centres and St Mary’s Site.

4.6.3 Overall the requirement for health facilities is influenced by many factors including:
  - Population;
  - The demographics of the population;
  - Changes to service models and the way in which services can be best provided e.g. care in local settings and advances in technology.

Primary Care & Community Care

4.6.4 NHS Portsmouth has published a new Estate Strategy (2009-14)\(^\text{19}\), which sets out the main development priorities:
  - Support ongoing re-provision or redevelopment of GP Premises as part of Strategic Service Development Plan for Primary Care.
  - Commissioning development of new Primary Care facilities to meet healthcare pressures created by future housing development.
  - Provision of new GP led facility including aligned community services in Copnor.
  - Somerstown Health Centre – major re-provision as part of Portsmouth City Council long term regeneration.
  - Identify options for redesign and redevelopment of facilities in Cosham. The replacement of facilities including Health Centre, Ambulance facilities, GP Out Of Hours and GP Surgery.
  - Deliver the Outreach Dental School in Collaboration with Portsmouth University.
  - Comprehensive refurbishment at St Mary’s site of previous maternity and paediatric building to form Community Health Care Campus.
  - Review future use of peripheral estate at St Mary’s to reduce costs.
  - Undertake option appraisal/feasibility study to deliver improvements in Out of Hours accommodation.
  - Review future accommodation requirements for Learning Disability residential services.
  - Undertake strategic review of Children’s Services Buildings to include major refurbishment and reconfiguration of accommodation.
  - Re-provision of low secure inpatient Adult Mental Health facility at St James’ Hospital.

Facilitate the provision of a Nursing Home and Extra Care Housing on non-operational land at St James' in conjunction with Portsmouth City Council.

**Independently Provided Services**

**General Practice**

4.6.5 Most General Practitioners (GPs) are independent contractors, with responsibility for their own premises and staff. NHS Portsmouth is working closely with the City GPs to ensure that there is an ongoing programme of re-provision and redevelopment of premises throughout the City.

4.6.6 The Department of Health recommend that there should be one GP per 1400-2000 people. In Portsmouth the current provision is 1707 patients per whole time equivalent of GP. Discussions with the NHS have highlighted the following points:

- Provision of GP’s in the southern part of the island is adequate. Many practices built recently were built with future enlargement in mind to accommodate any increases in population.
  - Portsea – John Pounds centre has a 2 GP practice, which can increase to 4, and also the University practice is nearby.
  - Somerstown - this practice is no longer fit for purpose and needs re-providing. A community hub that could accommodate this facility is being planned through the wider Somerstown and North Southsea regeneration project (see AAP)
  - Fratton – the Sunnyside practice is new and was built with room for expansion if needed.
  - Lake Road health centre – recently refurbished
  - Carlisle Road – a new site and premises for a GP surgery.
  - St Mary’s - walk in centre and minor injuries unit

- There is a shortage of GP provision in the northern part of Portsea Island especially around Hilsea, North Copnor and Anchorage Park. The PCT are currently looking for a site to increase provision in this area. The museums store in Copnor is allocated for a surgery in the local plan, however, due to problems of relocating the museum store this allocation will be reviewed.

- Provision of GP’s north of Port Creek is adequate.

4.6.7 The estimated increase in population for Portsmouth between 2006 and 2026 is 15,200 (see section 3), which equates to a need for an additional 7 or 8 GPs across the city. As mentioned previously the south of the island is well served by GP surgeries, some with the ability to expand. Therefore new GP surgeries will only be needed to serve the north of the city.

4.6.8 The NHS have highlighted that the developments at Tipner and Port Solent would create a need for a 3-4 GP surgery together with an associated pharmacy. Tipner is the preferred location for a new surgery because it could help alleviate existing pressure in the Hilsea / Copnor area.

**Dental Services**

4.6.9 Most dentists are independent contractors, with responsibility for their own premises and staff. NHS dental services are provided by dentists who hold NHS contracts with the PCT.

4.6.10 The majority of dental practices in the city are in converted residential premises, there are no purpose built NHS dental facilities currently. There is a good spread of dental practices across the city including new practices which opened in spring 2010 in Paulsgrove, Hilsea and Portsea.
Specialist Acute / General Hospital Care

4.6.11 Portsmouth Hospitals NHS Trust has now concentrated many of its specialist and acute run services on the Queen Alexandra (QA) Hospital. The healthcare model is for QA to be the sub-regional hospital for South East Hampshire, serving a population of 550,000 people, supported by a network of community facilities at St Mary’s, Fareham, Gosport, Havant and Petersfield.

4.6.12 The redevelopment of Queen Alexandra Hospital to form a sub regional health facility has more than sufficient physical capacity to cope with the projected increase in population. Sufficient physical capacity exists for the foreseeable future, particularly when coupled with the move from hospital based premises into the community. There will also be ongoing and continuous reviews of healthcare services commissioned and delivered for the population of Portsmouth and SE Hampshire. This will be achieved through working with partners to ensure sustainable economic high quality services are maintained.

Funding and Delivery of Future Provision

4.6.13 The NHS has been fortunate in experiencing continuous levels of growth in the last decade, and this has resulted in new and improved services emerging, providing an NHS which has good access, quality and scope. However the economic climate is challenging and will mean that in the next few years funding for the public sector will be constrained. Delivering value for money has always been a key consideration for NHS Portsmouth but with less money, and forecast greater need for health care it will become even more important to get the most from the resources available. While the coalition government’s spending review during 2010 announced a 0.4% real terms growth in funding to 2014.15, health providers will still have to plan to meet the gap between the funding available and expenditure plans by means of cash releasing efficiency savings target, delivered through transformation and not through blanket budget reductions. There is an expectation that assets will need to be used with increased effectiveness (longer opening times, different ways of working for office based workers and increased one stop shops for healthcare provision including diagnostics.

4.6.14 However, there are a number of strategic developments that are already either planned or underway and revenue funding has been set aside in the plans of NHS Portsmouth.

- The provision of an Outreach Dental School in Portsmouth University scheduled to open in September 2011.
- The development of the St Marys Community Health Campus. The Full business case for which was agreed by the Board in November 2009.
- The development of a new Health Centre for Somerstown. This was agreed by the Board in December 2009 subject to some requirements.
- NHS Portsmouth is currently working closely with Portsmouth City Council in respect of the transfer of the locally based hospital units (Hamilton House and Avenue House) to a registered social landlord. This transfer is expected to take place during 2011.
4.7 Housing

In this chapter:
- Affordable housing
- Supported Accommodation for people with special needs

Affordable Housing

4.7.1 Affordable housing includes social rented and intermediate housing, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market.

4.7.2 Demand for affordable housing remains high in Portsmouth. This is especially true for low cost social renting, although interest in alternative housing solutions (shared ownership for example) is now also very great.

4.7.3 The immediate priority is to ensure a greatly increased supply of housing of all kinds to meet the undoubted gap between demand and supply in the housing market. However the city council, as strategic housing authority, aims to ensure an increased supply of affordable homes.

4.7.4 The city council is responsible for planning the supply of affordable housing, while registered providers, registered with the Tenant Services Authority, deliver the housing. This includes Local Authorities.

4.7.5 Requirements for affordable housing in local communities are determined through Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs) which superseded Housing Needs Surveys. SHMAs are the responsibility of local authorities, often prepared jointly with neighbours to reflect housing market areas. The aims of SHMAs are to understand the housing market, inform the Housing Strategy and inform the Local Development Framework. They provide the evidence for housing needs including the mixture of house sizes and tenures in each authority area.

4.7.6 The South Hampshire Housing Market Assessment 2005\(^2\) estimated that 28,500 of the 80,000 new homes to be provided between 2006 and 2026 in South Hampshire should be affordable housing. This includes a backlog of over 5,000 dwellings in the sub-region and the newly arising need over the next 20 years. Of these, 65% should be affordable rented housing and 35% intermediate housing.

4.7.7 Portsmouth's housing strategy\(^2\) was prepared prior to 2005, and was influenced by a housing needs study commissioned from Fordham Research in 2004 and a south Hampshire level housing market assessment. Fordham found that Portsmouth’s need for affordable housing was more than double the national average. The results showed that there was a need for 3,000 affordable homes each year from 2005 to 2010.

4.7.8 While needs studies and housing market assessments show very high levels of need, it would not be realistic to expect or plan to deliver these high numbers, as they surpass the city’s total housing delivery. The annual need identified in the housing needs assessment was just over three times the amount of the total supply of all types of housing estimated to come forward each year. Portsmouth's housing strategy therefore set a six year target for 2,000 affordable homes by March 2011. This is reflected in the LAA target\(^2\). The city council is currently in the process of reviewing its affordable housing target.

---

\(^2\) South Hampshire Housing Market Assessment: [http://www.push.gov.uk/work/housing-and-planning/housing-market-assessment.htm](http://www.push.gov.uk/work/housing-and-planning/housing-market-assessment.htm)


\(^2\) Portsmouth LAA: [http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/yourcouncil/7345.html](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/yourcouncil/7345.html)
4.7.9 The housing strategy target above refers to all forms of delivery of affordable housing, i.e. those secured through the planning system and those provided directly by registered providers in discussion with the council's housing enabling team.

4.7.10 Delivery has generally taken the form of:
- letting newly developed homes, mainly by housing associations;
- tenancies via the city council’s Access Scheme for properties owned by private landlords;
- Homebuy assisted purchase managed by HomesinHants but also, for a temporary period, by commercial developers such as Persimmon and Barratt;
- mortgage rescue
- empty properties brought back into use

4.7.11 The council has also embarked on a programme of council house building, for example at Watts Road and Warwick Crescent.

4.7.12 The development of affordable homes is subject to a wide number of variables which differ over time (e.g. property size, subsidy available, land costs, build costs, professional fees, profit expectations etc.). It is therefore nearly impossible to set out a standard set of costs for affordable housing and as the Viability Study Update explains costs will differ across areas even within the Portsmouth planning boundary.

4.7.13 Affordable housing should:
- meet the needs of eligible households including availability at a cost low enough for them to afford, determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices; and
- include provisions for:
  - the home to be retained for future eligible households; or
  - if these restrictions are lifted, for any subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.

4.7.14 This definition is provided by Planning Policy Statement 3 and in order to reach low enough costs in this locality there is a need for subsidy so that homes are affordable. In order to be affordable charges for the dwellings need to be low. The income derived from this small charge can be used in order to help fund the costs of the property but affordable housing will still require a subsidy.

4.7.15 There are three sources of finance available to support the development of new affordable homes:
- Government subsidy,
- Private finance and
- Registered Providers own finance

4.7.16 Government subsidy can come from a range of budgets and from a range of government sources e.g. the European Union and local government. The largest proportion of direct central government subsidy has been distributed by the Homes and Communities Agency. However, under the coalition government’s reforms and comprehensive spending review for 2011/2015, the government has stated that the HCA will continue as a more streamlined enabling and investment agency. The agency faces a reduction in its running costs by half over two years. Despite this, the government is claiming a strong commitment to housing and regeneration: £4.5bn will be made available in the review period to fund new affordable homes, including existing HCA commitments and the new Affordable Rent tenure. This represents a significant reduction in affordable housing funding, so the future of delivery now seems uncertain.
4.7.17 At the time of writing it is not yet clear what exact impact the cuts will have on affordable housing funding and delivery in Portsmouth. It is, however, likely that it will not be possible to deliver the number of affordable homes estimated to be deliverable in the Local Investment Plan (1300 by 2014/15). Assuming the finance figures from the Hampshire Community Infrastructure Study this would have generated a finance requirement of £136 million, which is unlikely to be forthcoming. The city council will work with the HCA in its streamlined enabling role to review the investment plan to take account of the new situation.

4.7.18 Private finance covers a range of items - Registered Providers typically borrow private finance against the substantial capital assets that they hold and the sources of such finance can be from e.g. individual banks or (more recently) the bond market.

4.7.19 The finance of the Registered Provider includes such items as the income stream from charges for residential property but may also include recycled grants and the sale of assets.

4.7.20 Another source of finance, in kind, is the benefit derived through the planning system. In order to provide affordable housing on a site a developer may introduce a Registered Provider. The developer will not pay all the affordable housing costs but will discount the affordable housing price, often to reflect free land although within the Portsmouth boundary the price is negotiated between the provider and developer, a matter which is confirmed as a suitable way to proceed by the Affordable Housing Economic Viability Study Update 2010\textsuperscript{23}.

**Supported Accommodation**

4.7.21 A number of groups are in need of supported accommodation, for example those with mental health problems, physical disabilities, learning difficulties, young people who have had to leave home and the elderly.

4.7.22 The percentage of older people in the population is increasing and future planning to meet the needs of this growing group is essential.

4.7.23 Older people in Portsmouth are supported in a number of ways. Services have developed over the years, with a greater emphasis on enabling people to remain within their own homes for as long as possible, with appropriate levels of support.

4.7.24 The city council and the PCT have a vision for older people in the city, which promotes wellbeing and maintains independence, postponing and where possible preventing people going into long-term care and keeping people at home by preventing unnecessary admission to hospital. The joint accommodation strategy 2006-2016 aims to identify current provision of service for older people, and the availability of suitable accommodation with appropriate support where necessary, taking into account projected population growth. An update report was made in 2007\textsuperscript{24}.

4.7.25 It identified that in Portsmouth a 12% increase in the population of over 85’s is expected between 2005 and 2021. At the same time there will be a 27% increase in the incidence of dementia.

4.7.26 The report also shows that by 2015 of the total population 35,082 people will be over 65 years old, 15% of which will be 85 and over. A needs assessment taking into consideration dementia prevalence and existing provision, identified a total accommodation need for the elderly by 2015/16 of 1191 spaces.

\textsuperscript{23}Adams Integra Affordable Housing Economic Viability Study Update 2010 http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/17119.html
\textsuperscript{24}Joint Accommodation Strategy update report: http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/yourcouncil/11959.asp
Delivery

4.7.27 Appendix 1 of the report details how this need in 2015/16 could be met, based on the delivery of current projects, the optimum development of social care sites for extra care and the conversion of part 2.5 sheltered accommodation to extra care subject to the results of the sheltered housing review. This would provide 1141 accommodation places, 50 short of the projected need but allows for a 4% margin of error on projections and assumptions.

4.7.28 The guiding principle in meeting the future accommodation needs of older people in Portsmouth is to promote independence and move away from institutional care by providing care in people’s own homes and providing homes where people can receive care.

4.7.29 The primary source of delivering Extra Care (EC) housing in Portsmouth will be through the replacement of existing local authority residential homes. The Milton Village and Brunel Court developments were the first two schemes to be delivered in the city, providing 80 social rented EC units and 40 shared ownership EC units. These mixed tenure schemes attracted Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) grant funding and represent significant revenue savings to the city council. PCC retains nomination rights to the rented flats, with the schemes being managed by housing associations.

4.7.30 The Adult Social Care team are currently taking forward a development project that will see the Caroline, Alexandra and Longdean Lodge sites provide up to 170 Extra Care units, together with a new rehabilitation and respite unit to assist in helping people move from hospital back into either their own homes or Extra Care. This mixed tenure project is likely to see development commence in mid 2011 and is seeking to attract HCA funding.

4.7.31 The future delivery of Extra Care units to meet the predicted need is dependant on a number of factors. First is the availability of land and whether the city council can continue to provide existing care home sites, taking into account the necessity for home closure consultations and the ongoing continuity of service provision. Both of these issues can limit the timing of the release of land which may not always run concurrent with grant funding programmes. Secondly, the ability to attract HCA funding is likely to be a key component of successful schemes as this enables a more cost efficient and value for money development to be delivered. The comprehensive spending review cuts could mean a reduced number of schemes in Portsmouth are successful in attracting grant.
4.8 Emergency services

In this chapter:
- Police officers
- Police stations
- Fire and Rescue Service
- Ambulance Stations

Police

4.8.1 Hampshire Constabulary is the body responsible for the promotion of community safety in Hampshire. Portsmouth Operational Command Unit (OCU) is one of eight units in Hampshire, covering the city’s local police area, which covers the local authority area.

4.8.2 The functions of the police service fall within the five directorates of local policing, operational support, specialist operations, performance and strategic issues and resources. Hampshire Constabulary requires infrastructure in the form of property provision such as police offices, stations, training accommodation, enquiry points and CCTV in order to operate.

4.8.3 In Portsmouth the main issues are that Southsea and Fratton police stations are not ideally located, and therefore, if funds allow, they ought to be re-provided within the next few years. In addition to this, the police would like a presence in shopping centres preferably in a shop unit, so that members of the public can drop in informally to raise any concerns they may have.

Police - Funding

4.8.4 The Hampshire Police Authority is funded by Government grants, inclusive of business rates, plus other income, such as service income and earned income on surplus cash and Council Tax. As with other public services, long term funding is difficult to predict.

Police - Impact of growth on services

4.8.5 In its joint representations to the Draft South East Plan, the Police Authority and Hampshire Constabulary made clear that ‘with the significant growth in housing and infrastructure as proposed, Hampshire Police Authority will have difficulties in maintaining and providing an efficient and effective police service unless it is recognised additional funding and support from central Government is required’.

4.8.7 Across Hampshire, assuming maintenance of the current (2009) ratio of police officers to population (approx 2.1 officers per thousand population), an additional 250 police officers will be required. The total cost of employing this additional number of officers is approximately £13m p.a. (it currently costs £52,154 per annum inclusive of basic salary and organisational support overheads to employ one police officer). Brought down to the Portsmouth level, maintaining the current ratio above would require an additional 22 police officers, at a cost of £1.15m p.a.

4.8.8 The increase in residential dwellings will place increased demands on police resources and Hampshire Constabulary will not be able to operate the same level of policing with the projected levels of growth without funding. At the time of writing no capital funding from government and other sources has been identified.

Fire and Rescue

4.8.9 The Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service provides the fire and rescue service for the whole of Hampshire, including Portsmouth and Southampton.

4.8.10 There are two fire stations in Portsmouth, at Central Southsea and Cosham following the closure of the Copnor station in October 2008. Both stations have been refurbished to accommodate the vehicles and crew from the Copnor station and will therefore be retained.
for the foreseeable future. In additional to the two stations there is also a mobile community contact point which serves Portsmouth.

4.8.11 There are some 10 Watch Managers, 20 Crew Managers and 115 Fire Fighters serving the city.

Fire & Rescue - Funding

4.8.12 The Fire and Rescue Service is funded through a combination of Council Tax, Support Grants and Business Rates.

4.8.13 The Service has set its Capital programme for 2010/11 - 2012/13, with Capital schemes to the value of £3,030,000 to support service provision across Hampshire. The Authority will be using a combination of borrowing, revenue and capital contributions, grant and capital receipts, capital payments reserve and finance lease to finance the programme.

Fire and Rescue - Impact of growth on services

4.8.14 For developments proposed within or around urban areas, the service has the ability to adjust provision through adjustments to existing services, for instance by matching resources to risk. In 2011 a small fires vehicle will be deployed in Portsmouth to deal with all secondary fires. This will ensure that our usual front-line fire engines and crews will be immediately available to tackle life-threatening and other critical incidents.

Ambulance service

4.8.15 Ambulance services in the city are provided by South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) NHS Trust. The Trust provides services to 3.9m people across 4,600 sq miles around the Thames Valley and Hampshire areas from Buckinghamshire in the North through Oxfordshire and Berkshire to Hampshire on the South coast. The trust is responsible for providing emergency, urgent and non-urgent ambulance and transport services and out-of-hours unscheduled care services.

4.8.16 The SCAS Strategy and Business Plan 2007-2010 sets out its vision and strategy. One of the key strands of this strategy is to implement a hub and spoke model with divisional variations according to local needs. This is defined as

- **Hub:** A fully serviced and supported ambulance station, known as a ‘resource centre’ capable of providing 21st century service with excellent facilities, economies of scale and scope for expansion.
- **Spokes:** Spokes feed into a hub and are a mixture of satellite stations or serviced standby points from which resources can be flexibly deployed.
- In some areas non-serviced standby points will be employed in which crews are parked in a designated standby point but without accommodation.

4.8.17 For the **Hampshire Division application of this model would mean** three hubs:

- Southampton & New Forest (resource centre at Nursling already operational),
- Mid & North Hampshire Area (based on the Alton Ambulance Station) and
- Portsmouth & South East Hampshire Areas (Portsmouth Ambulance Station).

4.8.18 The resource centre hubs would be supported by Ambulance Station spokes and satellite stations.

4.8.19 In 2009, SCAS published a trust wide Estates Strategy25, to develop further plans for investment in their estate. A comprehensive review of the estate’s condition found that the backlog in maintenance for the Hampshire estate with its 15 ambulance stations required a total investment of £1,456,000, mainly to remedy functionality and condition issues.

---

25 South Central Ambulance Service Estates Strategy 2009

4.8.20 Portsmouth Ambulance Station is considered to be one of the poorest facilities in the Trust in terms of condition and functionality, and its replacement is a high priority. Operational difficulties are also caused by the current location on one of the three roads that serve the Portsmouth peninsula. Any blockage on one of those three roads causes major manoeuvring issues.

4.8.21 The implementation of the hub and spoke model envisages the establishment of a Portsmouth Hub based on a new Portsmouth Resource Centre to replace the existing ambulance station. It would serve Portsmouth, Havant and Gosport/Fareham. Establishing the Portsmouth hub is the main priority for the Hampshire Division of the Trust. The area of search is the A27/M27 corridor, ideally near junctions 9-12. The location is determined by access and the need to meet national targets for response. The service is looking for a facility of approx 2800 sq m (2000sqm garage, 800sqm offices) plus yard parking.

4.8.22 The site of the Portsea Ambulance station is likely to be sold in the near future.

4.8.23 Currently there are serviced standby sites at Avenue de Caen, and Havant Surgery. Further sites are being investigated, including joint use of Police Station at Kingston Crescent; St Mary’s Hospital).

4.8.24 The Indicative Project & Investment Plans included in the estates strategy foresaw the replacement of the Portsmouth ambulance station for 2009-11, at a cost of £ 1,580,000.

Ambulance Service - Impact of growth on services

4.8.25 Demand for the ambulance service is driven by a number of factors; growth in population, changes in the type of patients accessing the service and the transformation of local NHS
services. However, increased demand is predominately driven by an increase in patients with primary care needs accessing healthcare via the 999 service.

4.8.26 The service has based the requirements for the Portsmouth Hub on a notional 10-15% population growth the area, which will allow for the growth in population predicted to 2026.
4.9 Community and cultural facilities

In this chapter:
- Community centres & neighbourhood facilities
- Sport & Leisure
- Libraries
- Arts & Performance Venues
- Museums & Archives

4.9.1 The city council is responsible for the provision and management of community services such as libraries, community centres and some sports facilities. It is also heavily involved in the arts and cultural services, providing some services itself and supporting partner organisations in delivering others.

Community centres & neighbourhood facilities

4.9.2 Community centres provide accessible, open to all, venues for the local delivery of a range of services and opportunities seven days a week and during evenings as well as daytimes. Service are frequently aimed at and delivered to people who traditionally would not participate in activities in more formal environments.

4.9.3 There are currently 15 council owned community centres. Of these, 13 are managed by charitable associations, of which 12 operate under service level agreements and 2 are directly managed. Council officers are seconded to work at 5 of the larger centres, the remainder being staffed by association employees and volunteers only. In addition to the council’s centres, there are a number of independent community buildings which are also defined as community centres and which are advised and supported by the city council.

4.9.4 As a result of a long term lack of resources to maintain them, many community centres are in a relatively poor condition. The city council’s Cultural Service has identified a need for redevelopment of some community facilities in the business plan and this could form part of a Neighbourhood Facilities Strategy. Part of this review would be to understand provision in different neighbourhoods and to work with associations to seek external funding or development partners to improve the quality of the buildings including exploring of co-location possibilities. The review would also take into account the growth proposals in the Core Strategy and associated facilities needs.

4.9.5 There is no capacity at present to undertake this review, but in the meantime, the city council will continue to work with associations to seek external funding and or development partners to improve the quality of the buildings including the exploration of co-location possibilities. Some major refurbishment / re-provision projects are currently underway at Milton Village Hall, Wymering Community Centre and Highbury Community Centre, and funding for these is secured. New development through the Core Strategy is likely to lead to pressure on existing facilities, so some funding will be sought through developer contributions.

Sport & Leisure

4.9.6 Recent developments in Portsmouth’s sports facilities provision have been based on the following aims from the 2002 – 2007 Sports Facilities Strategy:
- Develop the Mountbatten Centre as a ‘hub’ and establish a range of local neighbourhood sports and physical activity centres across the city
- Better community use of public facilities (e.g. schools, University of Portsmouth, Further Education facilities, Royal Navy facilities)
- Development of Centres of Excellence in “key” sports to enable talented sports people to realise their full potential.
4.9.7 The completion of the Mountbatten Centre 50m pool in 2009 has greatly improved the quality of the sports facility provision in Portsmouth and has helped the city move towards these aims, but there are a number of issues that still need to be addressed.

4.9.8 In general terms the provision of community sports facilities relative to Sport England benchmarks appears to be at least average, but there are deficiencies in parts of the city, particularly the north. It should also be noted that while Sport England’s facility planning model may indicate that the city has sufficient provision, it does not account for the ageing stock of local facilities, the extent of accessibility to non-council run leisure facilities or aspirations for levels of participation.

4.9.9 Now that the Mountbatten Centre has been completed as a hub for sporting activity in the city, there is a need to review the council’s Sports Facilities Strategy that promoted a central hub with neighbourhood level facilities, to set out how the neighbourhood facilities will be brought forward. It will also have to review provision for individual sports – for example tennis, where there is a need to re-provide an indoor tennis centre. Funding and potential sites at Burnaby Road and the Mountbatten Centres have been identified for this project.

4.9.10 In terms of leisure facilities, the continuing operation of ageing facilities is a key challenge, and an options rationalisation programme includes continued examination of the future of a number of properties including The Pyramids centre, where negotiations with a preferred bidder are ongoing, and the Hilsea Lido, Blue Lagoon and Splashpool which was recently taken over by the Hilsea Lido Pool for the People Trust.26

Libraries

4.9.11 Portsmouth is generally well served by libraries, with 9 libraries spread across the city. Most people live within one mile of a library, with the exception of Drayton and Farlington, which relies on the Cosham library and a mobile library. The council also operates the Family Library Link service for local community groups, and a Housebound Service for anybody unable to get to one of its libraries.

4.9.12 Infrastructure needs of the library service over the next twenty years are going to be driven by changes in the way services are provided as a well as a rising population. The focus is on reviewing the suitability of the quality and the location of library buildings as well as opening times, staffing levels and exploring possibilities for joint service provision. The whole service has engaged in identifying current shortcomings and developing solutions to increase overall use and engage communities. Portsmouth Library Service is currently in a process of change and is demonstrating its willingness and ability to adapt to new needs and altered patterns of demand detailed in the Libraries Development Plan27.

4.9.13 A review of all the city’s library buildings was undertaken as part of the 2009 Libraries Development Plan. It sets out the developments needs of the service, both in terms of the ways the library service is run and physical alternations proposed for the 9 libraries.

4.9.14 Key changes to service delivery will be through the introduction of Radio Frequency Identification Data (RFID) in all libraries, freeing up space in library space, staff time and making stock easier to manage. The project will be funded through a spend to save proposal totalling £401,541 with £9,600 funded from Library revenue budgets and the remainder from the MTRS Reserve. The monies will be recouped within 3 years following full implementation.

26 www.hilsea-lido.org.uk
4.9.15 Key needs identified in terms of the building stock are set out in the table below along with an update for spring 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Development needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Library</td>
<td>Updates to the building; House the Conan Doyle Collection at the library; A report recommending the relocation of the Conan Doyle archive into the Central Library was accepted by the executive member for culture and leisure in January 2010. The Library Service is working with the Conan Doyle Trust to secure external funding; Bringing together the current library Historical Collections and Museum Archive to be housed collectively within the building. A feasibility study is being undertaken, led by the Senior Archivist, Portsmouth Museums and Records Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderman Lacey, Baffins:</td>
<td>To be expanded on existing site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beddow, Milton:</td>
<td>Updates to the buildings; the service should continue to explore potential developments with partners. The future of the library may be affected by decisions over the development of community facilities on an adjacent site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie, Fratton:</td>
<td>Explore the feasibility of relocating Carnegie Library to City Girls Secondary School as part of the BSF programme or other suitable space if alternative and suitable use can be found for the existing Carnegie building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosham:</td>
<td>Relocate to a site in the commercial heart of Cosham. The size of the facility required would be dependent on the availability of library facilities in the Drayton Farlington area. There continues to be an ambition to develop a public library in this area of the city if a suitable site can be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Grove:</td>
<td>Relocate to Palmerston Road. This project has been agreed in 2010. Following the Council decision to seek a lease for the Former Woolworths store in the Southsea Shopping precinct, the development and delivery of the New Southsea Library has become a priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North End:</td>
<td>In the medium term explore an extension of the overall library footprint through building into the garden area or adjacent buildings. Continue to explore the potential for other locations within the North End shopping area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulsgrove:</td>
<td>Improve signage to the library. Continue to explore the potential for other locations within the Paulsgrove area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsea:</td>
<td>Internal changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9.16 It is intended that all revenue implications of recommendations contained within the library development plan will be funded from within the existing cash limit of the Culture and Leisure Portfolio. It is anticipated that some of the required capital funding can be secured externally, however proposals will require that some existing library assets are disposed of and PCC capital resources are made available to fund new service development.

4.9.17 The service continues to explore the feasibility of re-locating libraries.

**Arts & Performance Venues**

4.9.18 The Arts & Cultural Development Service has for many years part funded local cultural organisations in return for the provision of services. The city council currently provides funds to the following organisations:

- New Theatre Royal;
- The Kings Theatre;
- Dot to Dot;
- Aspex Gallery;
- Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra;
- Art Space Portsmouth.

4.9.19 Funding to these services plays a part in the cultural makeup of the city supporting the development of creative practices and ensuring a good cultural offer to the residents and visitors of Portsmouth.
4.9.20 The Portsmouth Theatre Strategy\textsuperscript{28} looks at, amongst other things, the future of funding for theatres. As future funding for local government is uncertain at the present time, funding to these organisations by the city council will have to be reviewed year on year. In any case, the city council will retain a role in supporting cultural organisations and venues.

4.9.21 A key performance venue is the city council owned Guildhall. The city council is reviewing options for the long term future and management arrangements for the Guildhall, as the nature of the existing management contract is preventing the city council and the current contractor from developing either a coherent long-term development plan or from committing significant resources to improving the building. A tender process is currently in progress to ensure a take over of the running of this facility and therefore its future as a performance venue.

Museums & Archives

4.9.22 A key identified need for the museums & archives service is to increase access, particularly participation by groups that do not traditionally visit museums. A community archives project linked to Charles Dickens celebrations planned for 2012, and finding a new storage space are key projects in meeting this aim.

4.9.23 The collections that tell the stories of Portsmouth and Southampton are a valuable resource. However, their full potential for public engagement is not being achieved because they are currently managed in subject ‘silos’, distributed across a range of storage facilities with limited public access and provide varying standards of collection care.

4.9.24 Portsmouth needs to identify an alternative to its main museum store at Hilsea as the Primary Care Trust requires this site for a doctors’ surgery. Portsmouth and Southampton are working together to find a cost effective storage solution for their collections. £155K has been secured for a joint storage, the Museums Libraries and Archive Council (MLA).

Community and Culture Infrastructure needs as a result of development:

4.9.25 PUSH has a Quality Places Delivery Panel, whose remit is to consider how PUSH can meets its key aims of creating quality places – places which are well designed, have excellent leisure and sporting facilities, offer a range of cultural activities for all our citizens and are a magnet for visitors. With funding from SEEDA, it commissioned work to assess the sub region’s needs for cultural infrastructure.

4.9.26 The study, completed in September 2010, assessed the physical state of buildings, access issues, capacity and broad usage patterns. The intention was to establish a baseline to inform future provision. It is limited to the following types of cultural infrastructure:

a) Public libraries
b) Public archives
c) Publicly owned or regularly supported facilities for the arts:
   i. Galleries
   ii. Multi-use arts venues and theatres
   iii. Production, rehearsal and education space for the arts
d) Publicly owned or regularly supported Accredited Museums

4.9.27 For Portsmouth, the audit shows that: Portsmouth acts as a sub-regional hub for arts provision; in terms of floorspace it exceeds the national benchmark, but this is important to the wider sub-region
   o There is reasonable arts provision across the city, but provision in the north of the city is weaker than in the south

\textsuperscript{28} Portsmouth Theatre Strategy report: http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/media/cl20100318r05.pdf
Cultural provision will play an important role in regeneration by establishing the city as a desirable place to live.

Spatial coverage and floor space of libraries is good in the city (above the national benchmark), but coverage in the north east of the city is weaker.

Spatial coverage of museums is good, as is floorspace compared to the national benchmark.

City archives meet the needs of residents, but also people with a connection with or an interest in the city.

4.9.28 In addition, the city council’s cultural services have identified the need for

- Community facilities and library provision to serve the developments at Tipner & Port Solent. It is unlikely that new facilities would be needed on the site. Instead, provision would be made as part of the review of existing facilities. In terms of the library, cultural services are exploring the possibility of library provision at Tesco’s at North Harbour to serve Paulsgrove, which could also serve the new populations at Tipner and Port Solent.
- A community centre to serve Somerstown & North Southsea, which is planned for through the Somerstown and North Southsea Area Action Plan.

4.9.29 Much of the delivery of future provision of community uses will rely on the remodelling of existing facilities and the joint provision of services. With this in mind, the council has been working with partners to identify whether the role of schools could be widened to better service the community for example providing library services and sports facilities. Under the Building Schools for the future programme, the following outline proposals for each school were made. However, BSF funding has now been withdrawn, and the local strategy to replace it (Strategy for Schools – see education section) is not yet completed, so it is not clear whether these proposals will remain active.

- Admiral Lord Nelson, City of Portsmouth Girls, Priory, Charter Academy – already provide community and / or services.
- City of Portsmouth Girls – reviewing options for relocating Carnegie Library and Fratton Community Centre at the school.
- Mayfield – consideration is being given to the school hosting the multi agency behaviour support service, harbour Cosham, and relocate the youth provision.
- Springfield – school keen to provide a new library / learning centre facilities.
- St Edmunds – school keen to provide a new city wide “ethnic/minority cultural offer” and become a lead for Roman Catholic activities.
- City of Portsmouth Boys, King Richard, Miltoncross – no proposals for providing community services.

Source: [http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/15057.html](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/15057.html)
4.10 Waste

In this chapter:
- Waste disposal facilities
- Waste water treatment facilities

Waste Disposal

4.10.1 Portsmouth is both a collection and a disposal authority, with a duty to fund, plan and deliver the collection and the processing and treatment of municipal waste.

4.10.2 Portsmouth is part of Project Integra, the Hampshire partnership of local authorities and a private waste contractor working together to provide an integrated solution to Hampshire’s waste. Under this partnership, waste processing and disposal operational activities are undertaken by Veolia Environmental Services Hampshire Ltd. (www.integra.org.uk).

4.10.3 In 2008/09 433kg of waste was collected per head of population. This is an increase of 6.6Kg from the previous year (PCC 09). 25.1% of this household waste was recycled or composted.

4.10.4 In terms of planning for waste facilities to meet future needs Portsmouth City Council is working in partnership with Hampshire County Council, Southampton City Council and the New Forest National Park Authority to develop the Minerals and Waste Development Framework for Hampshire30, including identifying waste sites needs and setting the direction for their location. This work takes into account the development strategy for the area. For further information see:

4.10.5 Any further waste facilities needed to deal with municipal waste will be provided and paid for by the Project Integra Partnership. Funding for Project Integra comes from partner authorities’ contributions, income from the sale of recyclables, as well as external funding when it is available.

4.10.6 Infrastructure to deal with commercial waste is provided by private companies on a commercial basis.

Waste water treatment

4.10.7 Waste water in Portsmouth is managed by Southern Water and is piped to waste water treatment works at Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works in Havant. The sewage flows from Eastney Pumping Station at the southern tip of Portsea Island are pumped to Budds Farm, where it goes through several cleaning processes before being released into the Solent via a 5.7km pipe. The storm flows are pumped to storm tanks at Fort Cumberland.

Impact of growth on wastewater treatment services

4.10.8 The PUSH Integrated Water Management Study31 concluded that no new waste water treatment works would be needed to accommodate the growth in the PUSH area provided that additional capacity was provided at existing works where necessary. This conclusion was based on the assumption that water demand would level off or diminish as predicted and that this would in turn reduce wastewater treatment demand. Therefore water efficiency measures including surface water separation, metering and implementation for Code for Sustainable homes limits are essential to provide capacity for growth.

30 http://www3.hants.gov.uk/planning/mineralsandwaste.html
4.10.9 Additional capacity may be needed at Budds Farm treatment works to deal with the anticipated growth in Portsmouth and Havant. Southern Water has reviewed the situation and considers that sufficient process capacity exists until 2020. Additional capacity can be provided beyond this horizon, as the need arises, through the water industry’s periodic review process.

4.10.10 It should be noted, however, that environmental standards are getting tighter, which will decrease the ability of the treatment works to accommodate additional flows. The Environment Agency warns that a nitrogen concentration limit has been set for Budds Farm. All new development connecting to the Budds Farm WWTW sewerage system catchment will have to be accommodated within consented limits until advances in treatment are made and considered acceptable in terms of both cost and sustainability. Nevertheless, based on the latest performance data at the works, Southern Water do not anticipate any environmental constraints during the plan period and consider that sufficient consent capacity will be available to serve the level of development identified in the South East Plan. Southern Water’s investment planning will be informed by Portsmouth’s and Havant’s adopted development plan documents.
Strategic Sites Infrastructure Requirements and Delivery

Strategic Sites’ Infrastructure Needs

5.1 The previous chapter has drawn out the city’s infrastructure needs by topic area. Some of these are city wide needs while others apply only to certain areas of the city. Some are linked directly to the ability of the strategic sites to be delivered. As the Core Strategy relies heavily on the delivery of the strategic sites, this chapter serves to draw out the infrastructure requirements of these sites, in order to ensure that it comes forward before or alongside the development of the sites.

Tipner & Port Solent / Horsea

5.2 Although these are two distinct strategic sites which will be developed separately, many of their infrastructure needs arise due to the combined housing numbers on these sites and much of the delivery should be considered jointly across the two sites.

5.3 Below is a summary of the infrastructure needs linked to the development of these sites. Further detail can be found in the concept statements prepared in the summer of 2010, and in particular the supporting paper that contains more technical information. Both can be found at [http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/7923.html](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/7923.html). Updates are currently being produced, which will be published in the same location.

Bridge Link Tipner - Horsea: Improving public transport access is key to unlocking the development potential of Tipner, Port Solent & Horsea Island. A bridge link is required from Tipner to Horsea Island to provide a second access point to Port Solent, and to improve the connectivity of the community at Port Solent with the rest of the city. It would also better the access to the new country park from the rest of the city.

- Estimated Cost: £25M
- Potential Funding Sources: Developer Funding (CIL); Public Subsidy (Local, Regional, National); Tax Incremental Financing (TIF)
- Needed when: 2017

M275 junction and Tipner Park & Ride: P&R (900 spaces) at Tipner to provide the means to reduce congestion on the City Centre approaches at peak times; to assist the realisation of further development in the City centre.

- New junction and associated slip roads from the M275 motorway, with a bus lane southbound from the site. Planning permission was granted in April 2010. This scheme is seeking Department for Transport funding. Alternative sources of finance are also being explored, in particular a Tax Incremental Financing option and city council land sales.
- Estimated Cost (combined): £33M
- Potential Funding Sources: DfT; TIF; PUSH; PCC
- Needed when: Nov 2012

Electricity sub-station: Scottish & Southern Electric have stated that a new substation will be needed to serve the developments. The station will need to be located at one of the sites with cabling connecting the two sites possibly via the proposed bridge link.

- Estimated Cost: £2 million
- Potential Funding Sources: Developer
- Needed when: 2017
Increased sewage capacity: On site all surface water will have to be discharged directly into the sea. In terms of foul water, there is no capacity in the main western interceptor. Thus for strategic sites to go ahead, a cross city pipeline to connect to the eastern inceptor sewer or another mechanism for relieving the western interceptor will be needed.

A study was completed in April 2010 to review the feasibility of these waste water options, setting out the implications of 10 scenarios, including phasing and timing comments and estimated costs for all options. The report also includes further detail on the proposed pipe routes, lengths, depths and sizes for four preferred options. The feasibility of two options was tested further during 2010, one serving the strategic sites only, the other one going beyond this to free up further capacity.

Estimated Cost: Option 1: £1.5M; Option 2: £5.2M
Potential Funding Sources: Developer direct or CIL, depending on option
Needed when: 2015

Schools: Current information relating to capacity in local schools indicates that whilst capacity exists for a small element of the proposed development, there will not be sufficient capacity to serve all the development proposed. Developer contributions will be required to address any shortfall. Given the range of number of new dwellings proposed, and potential mix of the type and tenure of the dwellings, this contribution could range from increasing capacity within nearby schools to providing a new primary school.

Whilst every effort has been made to determine the education requirements at this relatively early stage in the planning process, until the proposals for each of the sites have been finalised it is not possible to say whether the education requirements can be met through the expansion of existing schools or whether a new school will be required. The situation will be kept under review and will inform the final policy within the Portsmouth Plan. The exact requirements will be determined on the basis of the most up to date information available when individual planning applications are received.

Estimated Cost: Not yet known
Potential Funding Sources: Developer;
Needed when: To serve development

Health and community facilities: 3-4 doctors GP surgery with pharmacy needed at Tipner & Port Solent. Tipner is the preferred location, as this could help alleviate existing pressure in the Hilsea / Copnor area; Discussions with the PCT have also indicated that the scale of development at Port Solent and Tipner means that a new dentist in that area may be needed.

Estimated Cost:
Potential Funding Sources: Developer direct ; GPs
Needed when:

Green Infrastructure: Port Solent Open Space enhancements: the option exists to fence off some of this existing open space following development for Brent Goose feeding. Access could be permitted in the summer through appropriate management; Another option could be the creation of more formal recreation facilities on the Port Solent open space (with further ecological enhancements to the Country Park to
mitigate the impact on the Brent Geese)

Estimated Cost: Not yet known
Funding Sources: Developer direct;
To be completed when: As development comes on stream

Water Supply: Portsmouth Water has highlighted that development at Tipner WEST would have to be served by a new pipeline running under the M275, as the existing pipe is not big enough to serve the proposed quantum of development. To keep costs down, this must be done at the same time as the M275 junction work.

Estimated Cost:
Potential Funding Sources: Developer direct
Needed when: To be done at same time as Tipner M275 junction

5.4 It is clear that the need for and delivery of any infrastructure will depend upon the final amount of development proposed at Tipner, Port Solent and Horsea. Developers will be expected to provide the infrastructure but should viability become an issue the council will aim to assist in securing public funds.

North Harbour

5.5 The land east of IBM at North Harbour is allocated for a substantial amount of employment development. However, the site is not yet well served by all types of infrastructure, and any developer would have to ensure the infrastructure is provided in time for when the development becomes operational.

5.6 Any development must provide:

- Highway and access improvements including links to Cosham centre and train station, and cycle and pedestrian facilities
  - construction and eastern and western accesses off Western Road
  - improvements to footpath/cycleway on Western Road and carriageway crossing
  - improvements and signalisation of Portsbridge Roundabout
  - improvements and signalisation of North Harbour roundabout
  - improvements to Marriot junction

- Waste Water & Drainage
  - Capacity in the system is such that early phases of the development will be able to discharge into the public sewer system. However, Southern Water have indicated that later phases would require additional off-site sewers or improvements to existing sewers and an adoptable foul pumping station and rising main to Budds Farm Sewage Treatment works.
  - An on site surface water drainage scheme based on sustainable drainage principles will also be needed. The likely costs of this have not yet been identified.

Somerset & North Southsea

5.7 A detailed Area Action Plan has been produced for Somerst & North Southsea, which includes development proposals and associated infrastructure requirements. Details can be found at [http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/15057.html](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/15057.html)

5.8 Infrastructure requirements in summary are:

- A reduced roundabout at Winston Churchill Avenue, Isambard Brunel Road and Grosvenor Street (currently being implemented)
- Community Facilities:
  - New and improved green infrastructure
Community Hub to include a doctor's surgery, community halls, youth club, plus, if possible other health services e.g. dentist, pharmacy, childcare facilities

5.9 Funding sources are currently being reviewed. Some requirements will be met by developer contributions for example towards community facilities and open space.

City Centre

5.10 City Centre North Road Improvements - plans for the city centre include a large scale redevelopment of the northern end of the main retail area. Outline permission was granted for a 96,200sqm scheme in 2006, with reserved matters granted in the following two years. This scheme included substantial road improvements around the city centre to be provided by the developer. Although the scheme is now being reviewed in light of the economic climate, road improvements may still be needed for an alternative scheme. Costs will depend on the nature and scale of any work required.

5.11 Transport interchanges Station Square & The Hard - new interchange facilities are planned for Portsmouth & Southsea Station at Station Square\(^\text{32}\) and improvements to the existing interchange at the Hard are planned for the Harbour Station\(^\text{33}\). A site has been identified in the Station Square & Station Street SPD, but the scheme is currently not being progressed further.

5.12 At the Hard, the existing interchange is in need of upgrading alongside wider public realm improvements. The cost for these works is estimated at £2m, but a detailed feasibility study is planned for 2010/11. The city council will lead on the implementation of the scheme. Possible funding sources include LTP, contributions from developers via CIL, Network Rail and landowners / users.

\(^{32}\) Station Square & Station Street SPD [http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/8473.html](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/8473.html).

\(^{33}\) The Hard SPD [http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/16251.html](http://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/living/16251.html).
6 Governance Arrangements

6.1 The role of partnerships and their strategies

6.1.1 A key principle in producing the IDP was partnership working in order to avoid duplicating work. In parallel with the production of this IDP, the city council and its external partners were working on a Regeneration Strategy for the city. The purpose of this strategy is to bring together the physical, social and economic regeneration projects of the city council and its external partners to ensure effective joint delivery. There were therefore obvious links with the IDP, and officers working on both projects undertook joint evidence gathering for the Regeneration Strategy and the IDP, saving resources and ensuring strong linkages.

6.1.2 The implementation stage of the IDP will also require partnership working across council departments and beyond. An aim to ensure the delivery of infrastructure has been included in the Regeneration Strategy, thereby linking its delivery clearly to deliver of infrastructure. Within the council, existing structures of governance will be built on to make decisions on priorities for funding and implementation – the Strategic Directors Board (SDB) will regularly review the items in this IDP and drive their delivery within the city council and with external partners. Links with the LSP will also be essential to take account of partners’ plans and projects.

PUSH

6.1.3 The Partnership for Urban South Hampshire has set up an External Funding Delivery Panel, which is developing a Strategic Investment Plan for South Hampshire, which will identify potential funding models to deliver key strategic priorities and build up a portfolio of “ready to go” projects. Work is ongoing on refining the PUSH list of infrastructure investment needs, and turning this into the Strategic Investment Plan, as well as identifying possible pilot sites to test out some of the funding options that may become available. The work of the External Funding Panel will make use of specialist financial advisors to ensure modelling is robust.

6.1.4 In addition, as part of the single conversation between PUSH and the HCA, a Local Investment Plan was published in May 2010. It focuses on the delivery of homes to 2015, but also reviews the need for and potential finances for infrastructure provision to serve communities. While this plan will need to be reviewed following the comprehensive spending review, the principles in terms of infrastructure planning will remain the same.

6.1.5 In this document, PUSH acknowledges that one of its challenges is to seek to ensure that the funding is in place to deliver the investment necessary to support its economic development objectives.

6.1.6 PUSH is considering what potential sources of funding exist to support development in a period of economic restraint. The options are listed below and further details of PUSH’s thinking are set out in chapter 10 of the updated South Hampshire Agreement (the MAA)34.

- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or other similar tariff
- Regional Infrastructure Fund
- Prudential borrowing
- LABGI (business growth incentives)
- tolls
- Tax Incremental Finance
- PFI
- Special Purpose Vehicles/Local Asset Backed Vehicles (LABV)

34 PUSH MAA http://www.push.gov.uk/priorities/multi_area_agreement.htm
Bonds
European funding

6.1.7 PUSH believes that Tax Incremental Finance is likely to be the most promising way forward.

6.1.8 As well as PUSH, the new Solent Local Economic Partnership[^35] will also be a key driver for sub-regional infrastructure.

6.2 **Developer contributions - Planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

6.2.1 As well as direct delivery through public and private funding and partnership working, the city council will expect developers to make a contribution towards infrastructure provision.

6.2.2 Where infrastructure needs relate directly to the delivery of one of the sites, such as flood defences for a particular site such as Tipner, the developer will be expected to provide these items directly at his own expense. Such contributions will be negotiated via section 106 agreements. Equally, the provision of affordable housing will continue to be secured via section 106 agreements.

6.2.3 Where infrastructure items are needed more widely to benefit the whole city, contributions may be sought from all developments, via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), which came into operation in April 2010. The CIL is a standard charge that applies to all new development within an area, and local authorities can choose whether or not to bring in a charging system based on CIL. The city council intends to establish a CIL charging schedule alongside the Core Strategy to help fund infrastructure provision.

6.2.4 A sub regional tariff approach is also being investigated by PUSH in order to provide infrastructure that is needed across local planning authority boundaries. If a sub regional approach is agreed then a proportion of money collected in Portsmouth could be allocated for infrastructure needed at the PUSH level, but equally, a proportion of money collected in other authority areas is likely to benefit Portsmouth, particularly given the PUSH cities first approach.

6.3 **Monitoring and Updating**

6.3.1 This IDP has been produced so that it can be a live tool which can be updated through active monitoring to inform service and spatial planning decisions. Progress on the delivery of infrastructure to serve planned development will be reviewed as part of the annual monitoring report.

6.3.2 A database has been established which will allow information on individual projects to be updated easily and additional projects or identified needs to be added. It is envisaged that over time, the cost and timing information will be refined and delivery mechanisms will become more established.

6.3.3 This is the first IDP and therefore is at the beginning of a process to integrate the capital investment programmes of various services and partner organisations with planning for new development. The baseline position within this IDP will allow the Council and its partners in the LSP to continue to prioritise spending and address funding gaps.

Infrastructure delivery plan
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Infrastructure Delivery Plan
## Community and Cultural Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Details:</th>
<th>Community Hub to include a doctor’s surgery, community halls, youth club, plus, if possible other health services eg dentist, pharmacy, childcare facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Hub in Somerstown</th>
<th>Project Details:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Relates to Strategic Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Estimated cost: | 
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Potential Sources of Funding: | part CIL |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Partners:</th>
<th>PCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Funding and Delivery Notes: | As part of delivery of Somerstown Regeneration Project; hsg assuming £100,000 from developer contributions |

| Estimated Timescale: | 2011 - 2016 |

## Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Details:</th>
<th>Additional capacity to accommodate growth in pupil numbers across the city; For Tipner, current information relating to capacity in local schools indicates that whilst capacity exists for a small element of the proposed development, there will not be sufficient capacity to serve all the development proposed. Developer contributions will be required to address any shortfall. Given the range of number of new dwellings proposed, and potential mix of the type and tenure of the dwellings, this contribution could range from increasing capacity within nearby schools to providing a new primary school. The exact requirements will be determined on the basis of the most up to date information available when individual planning applications are received.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Schools</th>
<th>Project Details:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Relates to Strategic Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Estimated cost: | site by site |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Sources of Funding:</th>
<th>Government grant; developer contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Partners:</th>
<th>PCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding and Delivery Notes:</th>
<th>£10,372 = estimated cost of primary school place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Estimated Timescale: | Ongoing |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes on Timescale:</th>
<th>ongoing - when needed for development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Flood Risk Management

### Portchester Castle to Emsworth Coastal Flood and Erosion Risk Management Strategy

The project sets out the proposals for a 100-year flood and coastal erosion risk management strategy for the coastline north of Portsea Island. The coastline is divided into a number of discreet frontages, 3 of which are in Portsmouth. Proposals are put forward for each frontage, and implementation is independent of the other frontages. Partners consulted on a draft strategy in the spring of 2009, and are aiming to finalise the strategy in 2011.

**Estimated cost:** £12,818,000  
**Potential Sources of Funding:** EA Grant in Aid; Developers & Landowners; Highways Agency; CIL  
**Delivery Partners:** PCC, Environment Agency, Landowners, Developers  
**Funding and Delivery Notes:** Costs = PVC for all cells, 20yrs; based on 2009 draft strategy with early 2011 update work  
**Estimated Timescale:** Implementation

### Surface and Foul water separation

Separating out surface water at development sites and discharging it into the sea allows capacity for foul water to be released. Alternatively, attenuation facilities (e.g. SUDS or underground storage tanks) would release surface water at a reduced rate over a longer period of time in stormy conditions. A number of projects have been approved by Ofwat and included in Southern Water’s Business Plan for the period 2010 to 2015.

**Estimated cost:** Site by Site  
**Potential Sources of Funding:** Developers; Ofwat  
**Delivery Partners:** PCC, developers, Southern Water  
**Funding and Delivery Notes:** Costs will vary from site to site; Southern Water projects have secured funding for period 2010-2015  
**Estimated Timescale:** 2011 - 2016  
**Notes on Timescale:** Ofwat funding to 2015 for certain projects; others will be integral to development of sites

### New pumping station and out-fall along the south-coast of the city

This facility will provide additional pumping capacity and prevent the existing pumping station at Eastney becoming overwhelmed during a storm event. Therefore in the future, a site will have to be found in the south-coast of the city to provide a new pumping station and out-fall.

**Estimated cost:** commercially  
**Potential Sources of Funding:** Ofwat  
**Delivery Partners:** Southern Water  
**Funding and Delivery Notes:** Funding was not secured for 2010-2015 business planning period - Southern Water will keep need for this facility under review and funding may come forward in the future.  
**Estimated Timescale:** 2016 - 2021  
**Notes on Timescale:** Until facility is delivered, flood resilience will be lower
**Flood Risk Management**

**Link from western sites to eastern interceptor sewer**

- **☑ Relates to Strategic Sites**

  On site all surface water will have to be discharged directly into the sea. In terms of foul water, there is no capacity in the main western interceptor. Thus for strategic sites to go ahead, a cross city pipeline may be needed to connect to the eastern interceptor sewer.

  A study was completed in April 2010 to review the feasibility of options of providing this pipeline, setting out the implications of 10 scenarios, including phasing and timing comments and estimated costs for all options. The report also includes further detail on the proposed pipe routes, lengths, depths and sizes for four preferred options.

  **Estimated cost:** £1.5M or £5.2

  **Potential Sources of Funding:** CIL; PUSH; Developer

  **Delivery Partners:** Developers of western strategic sites in conjunction with PCC & Southern Water

  **Funding and Delivery Notes:** costs shown are for two possible options; one serving the strategic sites, the other a wider scheme

  **Estimated Timescale:** 2011 - 2016

  **Notes on Timescale:**

**Portsea Island Coastal Defence Strategy**

- **☑ Relates to Strategic Sites**

  The project sets out the proposals for a 100-year flood and coastal erosion risk management strategy for Portsea Island. The island's coastline is divided into 7 discreet floodcells, for which different proposals are put forward, and implementation is independent. The city council took the Portsea Island Defence Strategy to the Environment Agency's National Review group in December 2009, where the strategy was accepted as sound subject to some changes.

  **Estimated cost:** £116,642,000

  **Potential Sources of Funding:** EA Grant in Aid; Developers & Landowners; CIL

  **Delivery Partners:** PCC, Environment Agency, Landowners, Developers

  **Funding and Delivery Notes:** Costs = PVC for all cells, 20yrs; based on 2010 strategy study with early 2011 update work

  **Estimated Timescale:** 2011 - 2016

  **Notes on Timescale:** Construction to start 2012; ten year and year 10+ build programme contained in strategy
## Green Infrastructure

### Open Space enhancements at Port Solent

- **☑ Relates to Strategic Sites**

**Project Details:**
The option exists to fence off some of this existing open space following development for Brent Goose feeding. Access could be permitted in the summer through appropriate management; another option could be the creation of more formal recreation facilities on the Port Solent open space (with further ecological enhancements to the Country Park to mitigate the impact on the Brent Geese).

**Estimated cost:**

**Potential Sources of Funding:** Developer

**Delivery Partners:** Developer, PCC, Natural England

**Funding and Delivery Notes:** To be borne directly by developer

**Estimated Timescale:** 2016 - 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes on Timescale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### New and improved green infrastructure in Somerstown

- **☑ Relates to Strategic Sites**

**Estimated cost:**

**Potential Sources of Funding:** Developer; CIL

**Delivery Partners:** PCC, developers

**Funding and Delivery Notes:** As part of delivery of Somerstown Regeneration Project

**Estimated Timescale:** 2011 - 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes on Timescale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Southsea Common & the Seafront

- **☑ Relates to Strategic Sites**

**Project Details:**
PUSH GI strategy suggests improvements to enhance the greenspace for recreational users and wildlife. The project should enhance the common and reinforce links with local seafront features including the various scheduled ancient monuments and listed buildings, the historic dockyard, Gunwharf and the western waterfront. Details could include landscaping which responds to coastal character, increasing access routes, a range of high quality facilities, attractive recreational spaces.

**Estimated cost:**

**Potential Sources of Funding:** PCC; lottery; CIL

**Delivery Partners:** PCC, Natural England, EA, English Heritage

**Funding and Delivery Notes:** Mainly to be implemented through seafront strategy, which has action plan attached. £2m needed for promenade works (David Evans)

**Estimated Timescale:** Ongoing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes on Timescale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Seafront strategy action plan splits actions into short term (1yr), medium term (2-5 yrs), long term (6-16yrs) |
### Green Infrastructure

**Paulsgrove Country Park**

- **Project Details:**
  Create an informal ‘country park’ to provide a major new coastal recreational location in an area of relatively low sensitivity in ecological terms. Parts of the area could be ecologically enhanced, with access discouraged through landscape design, to provide new Brent goose foraging areas. Staged restoration could create a prominent and distinctive landform as its location is at a ‘gateway’ of Portsmouth.

- **Estimated cost:** £2.1M
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** National Lottery grants, developer contributions, Veolia
- **Delivery Partners:** PCC, Veolia
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** Funding secured for implementation, but ongoing maintenance funds needed
- **Estimated Timescale:** 2011 - 2016
- **Notes on Timescale:** Restoration works due to be completed December 2011, with some additional works before opening

**Pocket parks for Portsmouth**

- **Project Details:**
  The project should establish and promote an improved network of pocket parks with better linkages across Portsmouth. This could include promoting the public use of school playing fields or negotiations with other institutions’ land such as MOD land or cemeteries. Pocket parks and greenspaces could potentially be linked up by a better network of trees across the city. Pocket parks should also be provided as part of larger development sites.

- **Estimated cost:** site by site
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** PCC, CIL; direct developer provision
- **Delivery Partners:** PCC; developers
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** To be implemented through open spaces strategy & as part of new large development sites
- **Estimated Timescale:** Ongoing
- **Notes on Timescale:** Ongoing - when needed for development

### Health

**Additional GPs**

- **Project Details:**
  DoH recommended standard is is one GP per 1400-2000 population. Planned growth therefore means 7-8 more GPS across the city. The south of the city is well served by GPS, some with the ability to expand. New surgeries needed in the north of the city, including at Tipner & Port Solent (3-4 doctor surgery). Tipner is the preferred location, as this could help alleviate existing pressure in the Hillsea / North Copnor / Anchor Park area.

- **Estimated cost:** £2M
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** PCT, GPs, Tipner Developers
- **Delivery Partners:** PCT, Tipner developers
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** Cost info based on £1M estimate for 1 surgery in Savills Nov 2010 viability work
- **Estimated Timescale:** 2011 - 2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Details:</th>
<th>Transport and Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M275 junction at Tipner (CONSIDER W/ P&amp;R)</td>
<td>New junction and associated slip roads from the M275 motorway, with a bus lane southbound from the site. Planning permission granted March 2010.; TO BE CONSIDERED IN COMBINATION WITH P&amp;R AT TIPNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost:</td>
<td>£33M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Sources of Funding:</td>
<td>DfT, LABV; TIF; CIL; PCC; LTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Partners:</td>
<td>PCC; Tipner Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Delivery Notes:</td>
<td>Cost is combined cost for M275 junction and P&amp;R; substantially reliant on DfT funding (not yet secured)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Timescale:</td>
<td>2011 - 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on Timescale:</td>
<td>Delivery expected Nov 2012, subject to funding coming forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Details:</th>
<th>Bridge Link from Tipner to Port Solent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving public transport access is key to unlocking the development potential of Tipner, Port Solent &amp; Horsea Island. A bridge link is required from Tipner to Horsea Island to provide a second access point to Port Solent, and to improve the connectivity of the community at Port Solent with the rest of the city. It would also better the access to the new country park from the rest of the city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost:</td>
<td>£25M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Sources of Funding:</td>
<td>developers; LABV; TIF; DfT, PUSH; CIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Partners:</td>
<td>PCC; Tipner / Horsea / Port Solent Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Delivery Notes:</td>
<td>Cost estimate from Savills Nov 2010 viability work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Timescale:</td>
<td>2016 - 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on Timescale:</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Details:</th>
<th>Park and Ride at Tipner (CONSIDER W/ M275 junction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R at Tipner (900 - 1800 sapces) to provide the means to reduce congestion on the City Centre approaches at peak times; to assist the realisation of further development in the City centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost:</td>
<td>see M275 jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Sources of Funding:</td>
<td>DfT, LABV; TIF; CIL; PCC; LTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Partners:</td>
<td>PCC, developer, future occupiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Delivery Notes:</td>
<td>Reliant on M275 junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Timescale:</td>
<td>2016 - 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on Timescale:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transport and Access

**Highway and access improvements to link Lakeside to Cosham**

- **Project Details:** Highway and access improvements including links to Cosham centre and train station, and cycle and pedestrian facilities
  1. Construction and eastern and western accesses off Western Road
  2. Improvements to footpath/cycleway on Western Road and carriageway crossing
  3. Improvements and signalisation of Portsbridge Roundabout
  4. Improvements and signalisation of North Harbour roundabout
  5. Improvements to Marriott junction

- **Estimated cost:**
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** Developer
- **Delivery Partners:** Developer, PCC
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** To be borne directly by developer
- **Estimated Timescale:** 2011 - 2016

---

**City Centre North Road Improvements**

- **Project Details:** Plans for the city centre include a large scale redevelopment of the northern end of the main retail area. Outline permission was granted for a 96,200sqm scheme in 2006, with reserved matters granted in the following two years. This scheme included substantial road improvements around the city centre to be provided by the developer. Although the scheme is now being reviewed in light of the economic climate, road improvements may still be needed for an alternative scheme.

- **Estimated cost:** £25M - £30M
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** PCC; TIF; LABV; highways PFI; CIL
- **Delivery Partners:** PCC; CCN developers
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** Current cost estimate at Feb 2011
- **Estimated Timescale:** 2016 - 2021
### Transport and Access

#### The Hard Interchange
- **Project Details:** At the Hard, the existing interchange is in need of upgrading alongside wider public realm improvements.
- **Estimated cost:** £2M
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** LTP, network rail, PCC, land owners / occupiers; CIL;
- **Delivery Partners:** PCC; network rail; bus operators
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** Detailed feasibility study planned
- **Estimated Timescale:** 2011 - 2016

#### Station Square Transport Interchange
- **Project Details:** New bus interchange in the vicinity of Portsmouth & Southsea Station
- **Estimated cost:** £2.25M
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** LTP, network rail, PCC, land owners / occupiers; CIL;
- **Delivery Partners:** PCC, Network Rail, bus operators, land owners
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** Project currently on hold, but will be needed later in plan period
- **Estimated Timescale:** 2016 - 2021

### Utilities

#### Water Supply Pipeline for Tipner West.
- **Project Details:** Portsmouth Water has highlighted that development at Tipner WEST would have to be served by a new pipeline running under the M275
- **Estimated cost:**
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** Portsmouth Water
- **Delivery Partners:** Developer, Portsmouth Water, PCC
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** Significant cost savings if implemented at same time as Tipner junction
- **Estimated Timescale:** at same time as Tipner junction
Utilities

**Electricity Sub-station for Tipner & Port Solent**

- **Relates to Strategic Sites:**
- **Estimated cost:** £2M
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** Developer
- **Delivery Partners:** Developer in conjunction with Scottish & Southern Electric
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** To be borne directly by developer
- **Estimated Timescale:** 2016 - 2021  
  **Notes on Timescale:** 2017

---

**Waste Management**

**Waste Water at Lakeside**

- **Relates to Strategic Sites:**
- **Estimated cost:**
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** Developer
- **Delivery Partners:** Developer, Southern Water
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** To be borne directly by developer
- **Estimated Timescale:** 2011 - 2016  
  **Notes on Timescale:**
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## Appendix 2b: Infrastructure Schedule: Other Infrastructure Projects

### Community and Cultural Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Details:</th>
<th>Estimated cost:£1m</th>
<th>Potential Sources of Funding:</th>
<th>Delivery Partners:</th>
<th>Funding and Delivery Notes:</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale:</th>
<th>Notes on Timescale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Tennis Centre</td>
<td>To re-provide an Indoor Tennis Centre at Burnaby Road or Mountbatten to improve the Tennis Development in the city. The Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) minimum requirement is for the provision of a 4 court Indoor Tennis Centre and 4 outdoor courts. Failure to re-provide an Indoor Tennis Centre at Burnaby Road or Mountbatten will seriously affect the Tennis Development in the city. The programme and numbers participating will be drastically reduced, as the only remaining indoor venue, the 3 court Priory School Tennis Centre, is not able to accommodate the existing programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCC, Lawn Tennis Association</td>
<td>PCC, LTA</td>
<td>PCC contributing £250K, LTA £750K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Storage Project (Portsmouth &amp; Southampton)</td>
<td>Project to investigate joint storage solutions for local collections to allow for greater efficiency and better access to local collections. Portsmouth has a particular need to identify an alternative to its main museum store at Hilsea as the Primary Care Trust requires this site for a doctors surgery.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Museums Libraries and Archives Council Grant; Captial Bids</td>
<td>PCC &amp; SCC</td>
<td></td>
<td>To 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildhall Revue</td>
<td>Ongoing review of the Guildhall considers the best way for Portsmouth City Council to develop a new vision for this landmark historical and cultural building, and investigates the best possible delivery vehicle to achieve this vision, including new management arrangements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCC &amp; selected provider</td>
<td>Depending on option selected - not yet decided – competitive dialogue process currently ongoing</td>
<td>To 2011</td>
<td>It is imperative that a solution to the management of the Guildhall is identified in order to complete the handover by 31st March 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community and Cultural Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Details:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New southsea library and contact centre</strong></td>
<td>A lease of the former Woolworths store in Palmerston Road Southsea for conversion into a library with contact point and café facility identifying the unique opportunities presented by the availability of these premises to deliver information and learning services from the retail heart of Southsea making best use of this prominent site and part of the 10 year library development strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Sources of Funding:</strong></td>
<td>Sale receipt of Elm Grove Library; MTRS reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Partners:</strong></td>
<td>PCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding and Delivery Notes:</strong></td>
<td>£1.49m = capital cost of Ground Floor refurbishment works only; on-going revenue costs: £234,000 per annum in the &quot;steady state;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Timescale:</strong></td>
<td>To 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes on Timescale:</strong></td>
<td>The likely completion date of the new facility is Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Details:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries review incl library to serve Drayton &amp; Farlington</strong></td>
<td>Infrastructure needs of the library service will be driven by changes in expected service provision as well as a rising population. Focus is on reviewing suitability of quality and location of buildings as well as opening times, staffing levels and exploring possibilities for joint service provision. A review of all the city’s library buildings was undertaken as part of the 2009 libraries development plan. It sets out the developments needs of the service, both in terms of the ways the library service is run (eg introduction of RFID technology) and physical alterations proposed for the 9 libraries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated cost:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Sources of Funding:</strong></td>
<td>PCC; CIL (for D&amp;F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Partners:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding and Delivery Notes:</strong></td>
<td>All revenue implications to be funded from within the existing cash limit of the Culture and Leisure Portfolio. Some funding may be secured externally, but some library assets may need to be disposed of to raise funding, and PCC capital resources needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Timescale:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes on Timescale:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Details:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood sports facilities</strong></td>
<td>Now that the Mountbatten Centre has been completed as a hub for sporting activity in the city, there is a need to review the council’s Sports Facilities Strategy that promoted a central hub with neighbourhood level facilities, to set out how the neighbourhood facilities will be brought forward. It will also have to review provision for individual sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated cost:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Sources of Funding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Partners:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding and Delivery Notes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Timescale:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes on Timescale:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community and Cultural Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Centre</th>
<th>Project Details:</th>
<th>Cultural Centre for Portsmouth combining museums, archives and records functions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Relates to Strategic Sites</td>
<td>Estimated cost:</td>
<td>Indefinitely delayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Sources of Funding:</td>
<td>Lottery funding, capital receipts, prudential borrowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Partners:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Delivery Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Timescale:</td>
<td>Notes on Timescale:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Buildings

| □ Relates to Strategic Sites | Project Details: | A need for redevelopment of some community facilities in the business plan and this will form part of a Neighbourhood Facilities Strategy. Part of this review would be to understand provision in different neighbourhoods and to work with associations to seek external funding or development partners to improve the quality of the buildings including exploring of co-location possibilities. In the meantime a number of refurbishment / reprovision projects are being progressed at Milton Village Hall, Wymering Community Centre and Highbury Community Centre. |
| Estimated cost: | | |
| Potential Sources of Funding: | | |
| Delivery Partners: | | |
| Funding and Delivery Notes: | | |
| Estimated Timescale: | Notes on Timescale: | |

### Education

| □ Relates to Strategic Sites | Project Details: | Portsmouth College’s last Strategic Estate Plan identified the optimum college size of 1260-1300 full time 16-19 leavers for 2016. To achieve this, suitable capital investment is needed in specific projects, specifically further refurbishment of the 1950s teaching block, student service/welfare, reception and a multigym. |
| Estimated cost: | | |
| Potential Sources of Funding: | | |
| Delivery Partners: | Portsmouth College |
| Funding and Delivery Notes: | | |
| Estimated Timescale: | Notes on Timescale: | 2011 - 2016 |
### Education

#### Secondary Schools

- **Relates to Strategic Sites:**
- **Estimated cost:**
- **Potential Sources of Funding:**
- **Delivery Partners:**
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** £15,848 = estimated cost of secondary place
- **Estimated Timescale:**
- **Notes on Timescale:**

**Project Details:**
Additional capacity to accommodate growth in pupil numbers

### Performing Arts Accommodation at New Theatre Royal

- **Relates to Strategic Sites:**
- **Estimated cost:** £4m
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** University; New Theatre Royal; PCC
- **Delivery Partners:** University; New Theatre Royal
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:**
- **Estimated Timescale:** 2011 - 2016
- **Notes on Timescale:** Estimated completion: 2012

**Project Details:**
The University is working with the New Theatre Royal on a centre of excellence for performing arts. This will involve a rear extension to the New Theatre Royal to provide a studio theatre and to house the university performing arts facility; The centre will be for use by professional artists, students and the local community.

### Family Learning Provision

- **Relates to Strategic Sites:**
- **Estimated cost:**
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** PCC (30%); Learning & Skills Council
- **Delivery Partners:**
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** The level and type of provision would be determined by the social make up of the new community, so would only be planned and funds committed after a community is established.
- **Estimated Timescale:**
- **Notes on Timescale:** Provision would only be planned and funds committed after a community is established

**Project Details:**
Development in different parts of the city could trigger the need for additional services, and the city council keeps a watching brief on future development. Key drivers for the provision of adult & family learning are levels of unemployment, numeracy and literacy levels, aging population, rather than the level of development per se.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children's Centres</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meredith Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Relates to Strategic Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Sources of Funding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Partners: PCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Delivery Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Timescale: To 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on Timescale: by March 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Details:**
Phase III children's centres: Cosham Baptist Church, New Highbury Community Centre, Milton Park Primary School, Havelock Community Centre, Meredith Lodge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>University Accommodation upgrades</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Relates to Strategic Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Sources of Funding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Partners: University; developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Delivery Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Timescale: 2011 - 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on Timescale: Estimated completion: 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Details:**
Victoria Baths Student Accommodation
### Emergency Services

**Policing Levels (22 more officers needed for planned growth in population)**

- **Relates to Strategic Sites**: [ ]

  **Project Details:** The increase in residential dwellings will place increased demands on police resources and Hampshire Constabulary will not be able to operate the same level of policing with the projected levels of growth without funding. In its joint representations to the Draft South East Plan, the Police Authority and Hampshire Constabulary made clear that ‘with the significant growth in housing and infrastructure as proposed, Hampshire Police Authority will have difficulties in maintaining and providing an efficient and effective police service unless it is recognised additional funding and support from central Government is required’

- **Estimated cost**: £1.15m p.a.

- **Potential Sources of Funding**: Hampshire Constabulary, but reliant on Government grants, inclusive of business rates, plus other income, such as service income and earned income on surplus cash and Council Tax

- **Delivery Partners**: Hampshire Constabulary

- **Funding and Delivery Notes**

- **Estimated Timescale**

### Portsmouth Ambulance Station

- **Relates to Strategic Sites**: [ ]

  **Project Details:** Current station is considered poor in terms of condition and functionality, and its replacement is a high priority. Operational difficulties caused by current location. A new Portsmouth Resource Centre to replace the existing ambulance station would serve Portsmouth, Havant and Gosport/Fareham.

- **Estimated cost**: £1,580,000

- **Potential Sources of Funding**: South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) NHS Trust operational

- **Delivery Partners**: South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) NHS Trust

- **Estimated Timescale**: To 2011

### Police buildings replacements

- **Relates to Strategic Sites**: [ ]

  **Project Details:** Southsea and Fratton police stations are not ideally located, and therefore, if funds allow, they ought to be reprovided within the next few years. In addition to this, the police would like a presence in shopping centres preferably in a shop unit, so that members of the public can drop in informally to raise any concerns they may have.

- **Estimated cost**

- **Potential Sources of Funding**: Hampshire Constabulary

- **Delivery Partners**: Hampshire Constabulary, PCC

- **Estimated Timescale**

- **Notes on Timescale**: As soon as funding is available and alternative sites are found
### Emergency Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Stations</th>
<th>Project Details:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None - For developments proposed within or around urban areas, the service has the ability to adjust provision through adjustments to existing services, for instance by redeploying appliances from low risk areas at certain times of the day to more densely populated areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated cost:**

**Potential Sources of Funding:** Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service: combination of borrowing, revenue and capital contributions, grant and capital receipts, capital payments reserve and finance

**Delivery Partners:** Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service

**Estimated Timescale:**

### Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospitals - no needs identified</th>
<th>Project Details:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The recent redevelopment of the Queen Alexandra Hospital has ensured sufficient physical capacity exists for the foreseeable future, particularly when coupled with the continuous changing nature of healthcare provision. Funding for the community hospital at St Mary's is secured, and the project is due to be completed in 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated cost:**

**Potential Sources of Funding:**

**Delivery Partners:**

**Funding and Delivery Notes:**

**Estimated Timescale:**

### Somerstown Health Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Somerstown Health Centre</th>
<th>Project Details:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re-provision of Somerstown health centres - out of date and beyond economic refurbishment. Needs to be re-provided, but need continuity of service so best option is to find a new site in the vicinity and once developed move out and dispose of old site. Somerstown health centre will be reprovided in the proposed community hub.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated cost:**

**Potential Sources of Funding:** PFI?

**Delivery Partners:** PCC; PCT

**Funding and Delivery Notes:**

**Estimated Timescale:** 2011 - 2016

**Notes on Timescale:** Scheduled to open 2012

---

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Health

**Cosham Health Centre**

- **Project Details:**
  Re-provision of Cosham health centre - out of date and beyond economic refurbishment. Need to be re-provided, but need continuity of service so best option is to find a new site in the vicinity and once developed move out and dispose of old site. Options for combining the redevelopment of Cosham Health Centre and Cosham Community Centre are being investigated.

- **Estimated cost:**
- **Potential Sources of Funding:**
- **Delivery Partners:** PCC; PCT
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:**
- **Estimated Timescale:**

### Housing

**Extra Care Project**

- **Project Details:**
  Redevelopment of three PCC sites to provide Extra Care Housing. Sites in question are Caroline Lodge, Portsea; Alexandra Lodge, Northern Parade; Longdean Lodge, Paulsgrove. PCC will appoint a developer to deliver the new schemes, and then procure a care provider/RSL to manage the facilities.

- **Estimated cost:** Unknown
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** HCA grant, PCC, PCT
- **Delivery Partners:** PCC and developing partner in conjunction with RSL
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:** Developing partner appointed will make application to HCA for grant funding to support the delivery of the scheme. This will add to contributions in land and service from PCC/PCT.
- **Estimated Timescale:** 2011 - 2016

**Affordable Housing**

- **Project Details:**
  Portsmouth’s housing strategy sets a six year target for 2,000 affordable homes by March 2011. This is reflected in the LAA target. Affordable Housing target beyond 2011 is XXXXXXXX

- **Estimated cost:**
- **Potential Sources of Funding:** Developers; RSL finance,
- **Delivery Partners:**
- **Funding and Delivery Notes:**
- **Estimated Timescale:**

**Notes on Timescale:**

---
## Transport and Access

### Express Bus Corridor (1st step towards BRT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️ Relates to Strategic Sites</td>
<td>A step change in public transport for the key Western Corridor sites which would allow higher levels of development through increased mode share to public transport. These routes can be upgraded with increased priority measures to be the building blocks for a wider BRT network at a later date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Estimated cost: |  |
| Potential Sources of Funding: |  |
| Delivery Partners: |  |
| Funding and Delivery Notes: | consider for PUSH wide CIL; £5m assumed for local sustainable transport contributions |

| Estimated Timescale: | Notes on Timescale: |

### Utilities

#### Sub-stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️ Relates to Strategic Sites</td>
<td>Provide new substations as part of developments where there is a need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Estimated cost: |  |
| Potential Sources of Funding: | Developers |
| Delivery Partners: | SSE; developers |
| Funding and Delivery Notes: | This would be done on a case by case basis as development comes forward and would be provided by the developer. SSE under regulations are not allowed to plan for future growth so can only require sub stations as and when the need arises. |

| Estimated Timescale: | Notes on Timescale: |

### Combined Heat and Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Relates to Strategic Sites</td>
<td>The city council’s Carbon Management Board is keen to progress a Combined Heat and Power project for the city. The Board agreed in April 2010 to invest in a feasibility study. The city council would drive the project in partnership with a commercial provider, who is also likely to have access to funds for delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Estimated cost: |  |
| Potential Sources of Funding: | PCC; Commercial Provider; CIL |
| Delivery Partners: |  |
| Funding and Delivery Notes: | Feasibility Study £10k to be funded or part funded from the Carbon Management Reserve (PCC) |

| Estimated Timescale: | Notes on Timescale: |
### Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Details</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Funding and Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Notes on Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter Storage Reservoir at Havant Thicket</strong></td>
<td>Winter Storage Reservoir at Havant Thicket - Portsmouth Water's demand forecasts and hence the need for Havant Thicket are being considered as part of the current inquiry into their business plan.</td>
<td>£53M</td>
<td>Portsmouth Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>consider for PUSH level CIL</td>
<td>2016 - 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washwater Recovery Plant at Farlington WTW</strong></td>
<td>This will decrease operational losses. Part of a package of schemes designed to ensure adequate availability of water supply to 2035.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portsmouth Water via Ofwat</td>
<td>Portsmouth Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011 - 2016</td>
<td>To be completed 2012/13 in (Portsmouth Water Plans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electricity Main stations</strong></td>
<td>Mary Rose Station at capacity. Solution could be to supply some of the sub stations from the Wymering site instead of the Mary Rose site. This should be sufficient to cope with the additional development in Portsmouth to 2026.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>SSE have confirmed this would be done at SSE cost</td>
<td>2011 - 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Waste Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste disposal facilities</th>
<th>Project Details:</th>
<th>Planning for waste facilities to meet future needs takes place through the Minerals and Waste Development Framework for Hampshire, which includes identifying waste sites needs and setting the direction for their location. This work takes into account the development strategy for the area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Estimated cost:**

**Potential Sources of Funding:**  Project Integra

**Delivery Partners:**

**Funding and Delivery Notes:** Waste facilities are provided and paid for by the Project Integra Partnership. Funding for project Integra comes from partner authorities contributions, income from the sale of recyclables, as well as external funding when it is available

**Estimated Timescale:**

**Notes on Timescale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Capacity at Budds Farm</th>
<th>Project Details:</th>
<th>Additional capacity may be needed at Budds Farm treatment works beyond 2020 to deal with the anticipated growth in Portsmouth and Havant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Estimated cost:**

**Potential Sources of Funding:**  Ofwat

**Delivery Partners:**  Southern Water

**Funding and Delivery Notes:** Additional capacity can be funded and provided as the need arises, through the water industry’s periodic review process.

**Estimated Timescale:**  2021 - 2026

**Notes on Timescale:** Southern Water consider that sufficient process capacity existis until 2020.