

**Portsmouth City Council's Response to the
Inspectors' questions for
Matter 5
Plan level infrastructure and strategic
transport**



Matter 5: Plan level infrastructure and strategic transport

Issue 1: Whether the approach to plan level infrastructure provision is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

This issue includes detailed consideration of Policy PLP50.

- 1) **Have the impacts of the development anticipated by the Plan on supporting infrastructure, including healthcare, early years, education, leisure and sports facilities, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, and wastewater, been adequately assessed and evidenced?**
 - 5.1.1 Yes, the impacts of the development anticipated by the Plan on supporting infrastructure have been adequately assessed and evidenced. Paragraph 10.60 of the Plan provides reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) [IN16], which identifies the infrastructure required to support the scale and distribution of development proposed in the Plan.
 - 5.1.2 The IDP contains a comprehensive assessment of infrastructure needs. It refers to the evidence base for infrastructure requirements, identifies delivery mechanisms and considers the potential impacts of planned development. As such, the IDP provides the detailed evidence underpinning the Plan's infrastructure policies and demonstrates that the infrastructure implications of growth have been appropriately assessed.
- 2) **To what extent does the development supported by the Plan rely on strategic flood defences? In particular:**
 - a. **What is the current and future programme of flood defence schemes in the city, what is their funding and delivery status, and would the schemes come forward irrespective of the development supported by the Plan?**
 - 5.2.1 The City's flood defence programme comprises two major schemes: the North Portsea Coastal Scheme (NPCS) and the Southsea Coastal Scheme (SCS). Four of the five phases of the NPCS have been completed, with the remaining phase under construction. The SCS is being delivered across seven frontages, with one frontage currently under construction and two further frontages programmed for delivery. Further details of the schemes, including their funding and delivery status, are set out in Appendix 2 of the IDP [IN16]. Both schemes have established delivery programmes and would be implemented irrespective of the development proposed in the Plan.
 - b. **Which sites identified and allocated in the Plan depend on the delivery of flood defence schemes, and are applications for development of those sites anticipated or required to include, directly provide or financially contribute towards the provision of specific flood defences?**
 - 5.2.2 Table 5.1 below sets out the allocations and identified sites which depend on the delivery of flood defence schemes. The specific scheme is referenced together with anticipated funding sources.

Table 5.1 Flood defence schemes

Site	Flood Defence Scheme	Provision/Funding
Allocations		
PLP3 Tipner West	Flood defences along the peninsula edges of Tipner West in line with Solent	IDP [IN16] reference FM14. Critical infrastructure to be funded by development and

	Shoreline Management Scheme (criteria 1c. of PLP3).	secured through planning permission. Funding and maintenance are responsibility of the developer.
PLP4 Tipner East	Flood defences in line with robust climate change scenarios (criterion 1d. of PLP4)	IDP [IN16] reference FM13. Critical infrastructure to be funded by development and has been secured through planning permission. Funding and maintenance are responsibility of the developer. IQR [PCC06] Q8 PLP4d. confirms flood defences near completion (July 2026).
PLP8 St James' and Langstone Campus	Milton Common formed part of the North Portsea Island (NPI) scheme of flood defences. The site is also at risk from Flood Cell 3: Eastney Lake (Portsea Island Coastal Strategy 2011) which is outside the project boundary for NPI.	The northern part of the site will benefit from the NPI scheme which is fully funded and due for completion in 2027. Remaining risk will be developer led. Funding and maintenance are responsibility of the developer (IDP reference FM11).
PLP11 Port Solent	Flood management measures to reduce risk of flooding to strategic and allocated sites (IDP reference FM16), criterion 2f. of PLP11 and paragraph A176.	Developer led. Funding and maintenance are responsibility of the developer.
PLP13 Fraser Range	Construction of new sea wall flood defence (IDP reference FM15 and criterion 1b. and 2h. of PLP13).	IDP [IN16] reference FM15. IQR (PCC06) Q8 PLP13d. confirms completion of the NPI scheme will provide protection to the access route along Eastern Road. The NPI scheme is fully funded (see IQR [PCC06] Q8 PLP13d). The site does not directly benefit from the NPI scheme. Funding and maintenance are the responsibility of the developer to be secured via S106 agreement.
PLP14 The News Centre, Hilsea	NPI flood defence scheme (see IQR [PCC06] Q15 PLP14).	IQR [PCC06] Q16 Table 16.1 confirms funding secured for all stages of NPI scheme. Due for completion in 2027.
Identified Site		
H13 Territorial Army Centre, Peronne Road	NPI flood defence scheme.	NPI is fully funded and due for completion in 2027.
ST12 Cathedral House	The site benefits from the 2005 Old Portsmouth Flood Protection Scheme.	There is no public funding guaranteed for upgrading the existing defences. Flood

	However, the defences may require upgrading to maintain the existing standard of protection due to the effects of climate change.	protection to the site from future flood risk will be developer-led.
--	---	--

c. Have the viability implications of flood defence schemes been appropriately considered for each of the sites allocated and identified in the Plan?

- 5.2.3 The Council's response to the Inspectors' Initial Questions [PCC06] addresses this question in response to Q18 at paragraphs 18.1 to 18.3.
- 5.2.4 The Development Viability Assessment (DVA) [HO15] is based on the typology approach, in line with guidance from the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) paragraph 10-003-20180724 and as such does not reflect the costs of infrastructure identified for each of the sites allocated and identified in the Plan. The Council is aware that the introduction of specific infrastructure costs would further reduce the viability of any individual scheme in the City. Statements of Common Ground with site promoters [SCG29 to SCG52] have been prepared, confirming they are of the view that schemes are deliverable notwithstanding infrastructure costs. Additionally, Portsmouth has a strong track record delivering sites which are not considered viable, supported by external, grant or public funding. New opportunities for external funding will be sought to continue to support delivery in the City.
- 5.2.5 The IDP [IN16] sets out the costs of flood defence schemes required to support development. Where flood defence works are required, this is specified in the relevant allocation policy and agreed with the site promoter through Statements of Common Ground [SCG37 Tipner East] [SCG39 St James and Langstone Campus] [SCG42 Tipner East] [SCG43 Fraser Range] [SCG46 News Centre] [SCG49 Tipner West] and [SCG 52 Port Solent].
- 5.2.6 Section 2 of the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between the Council and the Environment Agency [SCG25] confirms that the EA has no objection to the allocation of PLP3, PLP4, PLP11, PLP13 and that these allocations are sound.

d. For each of those sites that would depend on flood defence schemes, when would the defences need to be completed for the construction of housing and other development to begin? Have the processes for the funding, design, approval and construction of flood defences, and associated flood mitigation measures identified in the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment [CE04] such as land raising, been appropriately reflected in the Monitoring and Delivery Frameworks for the site allocations and in the housing trajectory

- 5.2.7 Each of the sites in question is considered in Table 5.2 below:

Table 5.2 Flood defence scheme and housing delivery

Allocations
PLP3 Tipner West
Flood defence completion required: Prior to the commencement of development (Table 4.2 of Monitoring and Development Framework) Flood defence scheme and status: The coastal defences constructed as part of Phase 3 of the North Portsea Island Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Scheme at Tipner Lake (completed in Autumn 2019) do not cover the full extent of the proposed development area at Tipner West (para 2.6.7 L2 SFRA [CE04a]). Provision of new flood defences required (IDP [IN16] reference FM14) to be funded by development and secured

through planning permission. IQR [PCC06] Q 20 para 20.3 confirms there is approximately £16m of City Deal Grant remaining to support delivery. It is anticipated that this will be utilised for the new site sea defences which are in the process of detailed design. Other Level 2 SFRA measures: Raising land levels (para 2.6.8 and 2.6.9 L2 SFRA [CE04a]) Monitoring and delivery framework: Table 4.2 timescale: 2025-30 Trajectory: First completions 2032/33 Summary: Details of funding and delivery of flood defences and other measures remain outstanding. Funding, delivery and maintenance of defences over the lifetime of the development is the responsibility of the developer. There is no public funding available for the construction of new defences to protect new properties. The defence scheme and timescale are appropriately reflected in the Monitoring and Delivery Framework and aligns with first completions in the housing trajectory.
PLP4 Tipner East Defence completion required: Prior to commencement of development. Flood defence scheme and status: New sea wall including tie-in to the M275 embankment and Tipner Lake defences constructed during Phase 3 of the North Portsea Island Scheme (IDP [IN16] reference FM13). IQR (PCC06) Q8 PLP4d) confirms flood defences nearing completion as of July 2026. Other Level 2 SFRA measures: Raising land levels (para 3.6.8 and 3.6.9 L2 SFRA [CE04a]) Monitoring and Development Framework Table 4.3: timescale for sea defence wall 2023-2025 Trajectory: First housing completions 2028/29 Summary: The sea defences are funded and in place ahead of first completions. Requirements for raising land levels to be addressed through planning applications.
PLP8 St James' and Langstone Campus Defence completion required: Prior to occupation of residential dwellings. Flood defence scheme and status: IQR [PCC06] Q8 PLP8d. and land supply template (Q15) confirm Phase 2: Milton Common of the North Portsea Island scheme was completed in 2016, with the new defences offering a 1 in 500-year (0.2% AEP) standard of protection. These works partially extend along the eastern boundary of the site and provide partial protection. Any protection required to be provided to the remainder of the site is the responsibility of the developer. Other Level 2 SFRA measures: Raising land levels and future proofing defences (para 7.6.10 L2 SFRA [CE04a]) Monitoring and Development Framework: Flood defences not referenced. Trajectory: First housing completions 2026/27 Summary: The site is partially protected along the eastern edge by the Milton Common defences, which aligns with first completions. Any future defences to be constructed to facilitate development at this site will be developer-led. Funding, delivery and maintenance of defences over the lifetime of the development is the responsibility of the developer. There is no public funding available for the construction of new defences to protect new properties.
PLP11 Port Solent Defence completion required: Prior to occupation of residential dwellings (Table 5.3 of Monitoring and Development Framework) Flood defence scheme and status: Developer led and funded (IQR [PCC06] Table 16.1. Funding not yet determined (see IQR [PCC06] Q15 land supply template PLP11. Other Level 2 SFRA measures: Raising land levels, including access and future proofing defences (para 9.6.11 L2 SFRA [CE04a]) Monitoring and Development Framework: Replacement and refurbishment of flood defence structures and provision of safe access and egress routes to be provided prior to occupation of residential dwellings. Date not specified. Trajectory: First housing completions 2033/34

Summary: Any future defences constructed to facilitate development at this site will be developer-led. Funding, delivery and maintenance of defences over the lifetime of the development is the responsibility of the developer. There is no public funding available for the construction of new defences to protect new properties.
PLP13 Fraser Range Defence completion required: 2025-30 Flood defence scheme and status: Provision of new sea wall and delivery of a beach management and asset maintenance plan to align with Southsea Coastal Scheme (IDP [IN16] reference FM15) to be funded, implemented and maintained over the lifetime of the development by developer. Other Level 2 SFRA measures: Raising land levels, including access and future proofing defences (para 11.6.8 L2 SFRA [CE04a]) Monitoring and Development Framework: Timescale for new sea wall and flood defence works 2025-30. Trajectory: First housing completions 2029/30 Summary: Any future defences constructed to facilitate development at this site will be developer-led. Funding, delivery and maintenance of defences over the lifetime of the development is the responsibility of the developer. There is no public funding available for the construction of new defences to protect new properties.
PLP14 The News Centre, Hilsea Defence completion required: Not specified. Flood defence scheme and status: Coastal defences constructed as part of Phase 3 of the NPI scheme at Tipner Lake (completed in Autumn 2019) protect the frontage nearest to The News Centre allocation (para 12.6.2 L2 SFRA [CE04a]). Defences being constructed as part of Phase 5: Ports Creek will provide protection to the north of the site on completion. The NPI scheme is fully funded (IQR [PCC06] Q16, Table 16.1 PLP14. and will deliver a 0.2% AEP (1 in 500 year) standard of protection for 100 years. On completion, this will protect the Eastern Road access and the A3 London Road (para 12.6.7 L2 SFRA [CE04a]). Completion is programmed for 2027. Other Level 2 SFRA measures: N/A Monitoring and Development Framework: Flood defences not referenced Trajectory: First housing completions 2033/34 Summary: Defences are in place and align with first completions.
Identified Sites
H13 Territorial Army Centre, Peronne Road Defence completion required: Not specified. Flood defence scheme and status: IQR [PCC06] Q8 Paragraph 8.493 confirms that sea defences are being put in place. The defences being constructed as part of Phase 5: Ports Creek of the NPI scheme will provide protection to the site on completion - programmed for 2027. The NPI scheme is fully funded (IQR [PCC06] Q16, Table 16.1 PLP14. and will deliver a 0.2% AEP (1 in 500 year) standard of protection for 100 years. Other Level 2 SFRA measures: N/A Monitoring and Development Framework: N/A Trajectory: First housing completions 2039/40 Summary: The completion of defences by 2027 aligns with first completions in 2039/40 as set out in the housing trajectory.
ST12 Cathedral House Defence completion required: Not specified. Flood defence scheme and status: The site is located between Flood Cell 1: Southsea and Flood Cell 7: HM Naval Base of PICSS. However, the site is not located within the scheme benefit area for the Southsea Coastal Scheme. Existing defences at Old Portsmouth comprise flood gates installed in 2005, which may require upgrading to maintain the existing standard of protection due to the effects of climate change. There is currently no public funding guaranteed. Any future defences to be constructed to facilitate

development will be developer-led. Funding, delivery and maintenance of defences over the lifetime of the development is the responsibility of the developer.

Other Level 2 SFRA measures: N/A

Monitoring and Development Framework: N/A

Trajectory: 2034/35

Summary: There is currently no funding or provision of upgrades planned to facilitate completions in 2034/35. Delivery is shown in the later part of the plan period providing sufficient time for funding to be secured.

e) Would any allocated or identified sites require flood defences to be provided that differ from the measures supported by the North Solent Shoreline Management Plan and subsequent strategies informed by it?

5.2.8 No. The Council's position is as per its answer to question 8 of Matter 1, i.e. 'no policies in the Local Plan require the alteration of the North Solent Shoreline Management Plan (NSSMP) recommendations. Policy PLP26: Coastal Zone requires development in the coastal zone to be consistent with the SMP.' Therefore, no allocated or identified sites require flood defences to be provided that differ from the recommendations of the NSSMP and subsequent strategies informed by it (Portsea Island Coastal Strategy Study, 2011 and Portchester Castle to Emsworth Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Study, 2012). However, it is noted that recommendations to 'Hold the Line' do not guarantee the availability of funding required to do so. Shoreline Management Plans and strategies are also non-statutory documents.

5.2.9 It is also worth referencing the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between the Council and the Environment Agency [SCG25]. Following modifications made in response to the Regulation 19 consultation response, Section 2 of the SoCG confirms that the EA has no objection to the allocation of PLP3, PLP4, PLP11, PLP13 and that these allocations are sound.

5.2.10 In addition, paragraph 2.25 of the SoCG confirms that:

"The SFRA Levels 1 and 2 provide a robust and up to date assessment of the risks at a strategic level and were used to inform the sequential and exception tests. The EA were satisfied that no strategic or allocated sites could be omitted from the Local Plan on grounds of flooding due to the very limited development options within Portsmouth. After allocation of these sites within the Local Plan (along with identified sites and expected windfall development) Portsmouth still does not meet its housing need in full as defined by the Standard Methodology. This is a primary contribution to the agreement that Portsmouth will need to allocate land that is in areas at risk of flooding".

3) Is it clear how contributions toward the infrastructure identified in the Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan [IN16] ('IDP') are intended to be calculated for development proposals? Are the policy requirements that specify that development should deliver or contribute 'proportionally' to infrastructure sufficiently clear, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to a proposal?

5.3.1 Calculations for contributions towards infrastructure are not provided for all types of infrastructure in the Plan or the IDP. Where specific, evidence-based standards apply, for example open space, this is specified (Policy PLP45). However, it is more appropriate for contributions towards other types of infrastructure to be calculated on a case-by-case basis. This includes health and education where it is important to consider changing demographics as well as cumulative and in combination effects over time. The criteria of Policy PLP50 provide an appropriate basis for the costs and/or provision of infrastructure to be informed by up-to-date evidence at the planning application stage.

5.3.2 Yes, the policy requirements are sufficiently clear. Where an allocation is expected to "deliver or contribute proportionally" the policy refers to relevant measures or the evidence base, for

example the Strategic Transport Assessment. This provides a robust basis for determining the level of contribution at a project level and provides sufficient flexibility to assess new evidence from the applicant or relevant stakeholders.

- 5.3.3 Although the Plan is being examined under the 2024 Framework it is relevant to note that this approach aligns with the approach set out in National Decision Making Policy HC3 of the NPPF 2026 [PCC08] which links development which will give rise to a "significant number of additional people" to the provision of infrastructure. HC3 states:

"Proposals for housing, employment or other development which would give rise to significant numbers of additional people living in, working in or visiting an area should ...

- a) Provide for new or improved community facilities and public service infrastructure which are necessary for the development to be acceptable in planning terms, whether by direct provision or a contribution to off-site improvements (which may be through Community Infrastructure Levy payments, where applicable)" (PCC underline for emphasis).

- 4) **Should Policy PLP50 refer to the viability of development, particularly in relation to the potential inability for new development proposals to provide all infrastructure requirements?**

- 5.4.1 Yes, viability considerations should be referenced in Policy PLP50. A modification is proposed in the Supplementary Modifications Schedule [PCC15] as follows:

Demonstrate that appropriate, necessary and reasonable infrastructure investment has been secured either in the form of suitable on-site or off-site works, and/or financial contributions to mitigate its impact subject to viability;

- 5) **Is Policy PLP50 otherwise positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

- 5.5.1 Yes, Policy PLP50 provides a criteria-based approach to ensure infrastructure is provided as evidenced by infrastructure providers, the Local Plan evidence base and if appropriate, evidence provided at the planning application stage. The policy is informed by the IDP, the Local Plan evidence base, individual site allocation requirements and topic specific development management policies. This is consistent with paragraph 11a) of the Framework which states that plans should seek to align growth and infrastructure to promote a sustainable pattern of development.

Issue 2: Whether the Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to strategic transport implications.

- 6) **Does the Strategic Transport Assessment ('STA') and its accompanying addendums [IN01, 02, 03a, 03b, 04, 05], including the February 2026 STA Addendum [IN05] that was prepared following the consultation of the Plan, contain sufficiently accurate assumptions? In particular:**

- a. **What housing and employment growth assumptions underpin the Council's transport evidence, and are those assumptions justified?**

- 5.6.1 The Strategic Transport Assessment Addendum (STAA) [IN05] contains sufficiently robust assumptions to test the impact of the Local Plan targeted housing and employment growth. The STA uses the Solent Sub-Regional Transport Model (SRTM) to assess the impacts of the targeted growth on the highway network. During the development of the STA, the development

assumptions for the modelling scenarios were discussed and agreed with PCC and National Highways, as set out in the 'Model Assumptions for SRTM' in Appendix B of the STA.

- 5.6.2 The housing and growth numbers which underpin the transport evidence base align with the Local Plan allocations and committed developments up to the period where the SRTM Baseline and Reference Case Models were run in 2023. It is noted that as part of the Local Plan Addendum assessment base, an exercise to review the additional committed developments in 2024/ 2025 was undertaken and there were no additional committed developments over 100 dwellings or employment sites which required factoring in the SRTM modelling updates as these were already captured within the modelling assessment (such as through included HELAA sites or Local Plan allocations).
- 5.6.3 Whilst there has been an update on the housing/ employment committed development numbers published in September 2026 the adjustments in total housing/ employment figures are distributed across Portsmouth and the growth is of a scale that would not have an impact on the overall conclusions of the STA.

b. Is the infrastructure identified in the IDP accurately reflected in the transport evidence, particularly in respect of the timings for delivery?

- 5.6.4 The STAA [IN05] includes reference to the following transport mitigation schemes proposed across the local and strategic road network. These correspond to the mitigation measures proposed within the IDP [IN16] and have been tested as part of the Do Something Strategic Modelling Assessment. The table below sets out how the schemes align with the IDP and flags those schemes which are not captured within the transport modelling.
- 5.6.5 It was agreed with PCC Highways in advance of running the Local Plan model scenarios which transport schemes would be captured in the Do Something Model run. These relate to the transport network improvements, which are to be funded by Local Plan development and are therefore also represented in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Additionally, committed highway schemes which are appropriate to capture in the SRTM strategic model have been captured within the 2041 Reference Case and taken forward into the Do Minimum and Do Something models.
- 5.6.6 Schemes included in the IDP but not referenced below are not included in the assessment due to the strategic nature of the Solent Sub-Regional Transport Model (SRTM).

Table 5.3: Transport Schemes from IDP Referenced within the STAA

Transport Scheme Identified within the IDP	Summary Description	Is the scheme included in the Transport Modelling informing the STAA?	Justification for not including in STAA modelling, if applicable.
T1 - Horsea/ Tipner Link Bridge	Bridge to provide a public transport / active modes link between Tipner and Horsea Island.	No – referenced in the STA at para 4.5.2 and STAA at Table 5.	The bridge is not included in the modelling as it does not serve private vehicles as it is a public transport link and therefore its inclusion would not materially alter the overall conclusions of the STAA, with any shift having a positive impact on the highway network.

			At the point of the assessment no detail on the scheduling of new and re-routed bus services and therefore the assessments presented are robust as it could result in further mode shift in the future once the link/bridge comes forward for delivery.
T3 – STA Mitigation – Portsbridge Roundabout	Signalisation of A397 Northern Road, bus gate and opposing circulatory and Western Road arm. Removal of left turn slip from A27 Western Road.	Yes	N/A
T4 – City Centre Roads	Scheme to realign / reconfigure A3 Marketway/Commercial Road (north) and adjacent roads, as well as improved transport/cycle/pedestrian infrastructure and public space.	Yes	N/A
T19 – STA Spur Road Roundabout	Circulatory reduced to two lanes (with hatching), with-flow cycle lane added to Spur Road (segregated) and Southampton Road cycle track improved to be segregated (stepped track), with a cycle crossing on A397 Northern Road arm.	Yes	N/A
T20 – STA Rudmore Roundabout	Signalisation of Kingston Crescent and east circulatory, alongside increases to cycle time.	Yes	N/A
T21 – STA New Lakeside Access	Introduction of a secondary access to serve the development.	Yes	N/A
T22 – STA London Road/ Southwick Hill Road	Amendments to signal staging and reallocation of right-turn lane allocations.	Yes	N/A
T23 – STA Museum Road/Landport Terrace/ Kings Road/ Kings Terrace	Cycling link to connect Kings Road to the new active travel corridor.	Yes	N/A
T45 -Tipner Transport Hub scheme	The delivery of the Tipner Transport Hub scheme,	No	The outline planning permission for the Transport Hub scheme

	including expanded P+R (up to 2,650 spaces) plus other transport hub functions.		(22/00024/OUT) expired 6 July 2025. Alongside this there were challenges in relation to funding for the scheme as well as limited detail on the bus service improvements and schemes. Consequently, it was agreed with PCC that the scheme would not be factored in the modelling to not represent an over reliance on the scheme and reflect a robust assessment.
--	---	--	--

5.6.7 In terms of timings, as set out in the IDP [IN16] the proposed transport mitigation schemes are typically tied to the development for which they serve or have the greatest impact on delivery. The timing of the mitigation schemes being required will therefore be linked to delivery of the relevant development. Regarding the Portsbridge Roundabout mitigation scheme, in order to comply with information requests from National Highways for this larger scale intervention a trigger point test has been undertaken. This is detailed within chapter 6 of the STAA [IN05] and has determined that mitigation would be required after 2030 but by or before 2035 (with the 2030 and 2035 years used for the trigger point tests).

7) **With regard to the mitigation measures identified in paragraph 8.1.7 of the February 2026 STA Addendum to address impacts on the road network arising from the Plan's proposed growth:**

- a. **When are the identified mitigation measures required to be delivered?**
- b. **What interdependencies exist between the mitigation schemes?**

5.7.1 The mitigation schemes have been developed to respond to localised impacts and they have been designed within minimal interdependencies in order to not represent a blockage to delivery with no scheme precluding others from coming forward. It is noted that some schemes have financial interdependencies by being funded via several developments, however, this is generally for lower scale and lower cost interventions which can be jointly funded via S106/ CIL contributions.

5.7.2 The following mitigation schemes are outlined at paragraph 8.1.7 of the STAA [IN05] and have been taken forward as the identified mitigation to support the level of growth targeted in the Local Plan. The reference from the IDP is included in Table 5.4 below beside the junction reference used in the STAA.

Table 5.4: STAA Mitigation Measures – Timings and Interdependencies

Transport Mitigation Scheme Identified within the STAA para 8.1.7	Summary Description	When are the required measures required to be delivered?	What interdependencies exist between mitigation schemes?

Portsbridge Roundabout (IDP Reference T3, STAA Reference Junction 2)	Signalisation of A397 Northern Road, bus gate and opposing circulatory and Western Road arm. Removal of left turn slip from A27 Western Road.	Mitigation would be required by 2031-2035 (with the 2030 and 2035 years used for the trigger point test years). This has been informed by a trigger point assessment presented in Chapter 6 of the STAA.	The introduction of a secondary access at Lakeside development would help alleviate pressure at Portsbridge Roundabout, as a portion of vehicles route towards M27 J12 reducing the trips routing via the Portsbridge roundabout. It is not reliant on the secondary access but rather its development supports trip distribution away from Portsbridge Roundabout.
Spur Road Roundabout (IDP Reference T19, STAA Reference Junction 3).	Circulatory reduced to two lanes (with hatching), with-flow cycle lane added to Spur Road (segregated) and Southampton Road cycle track improved to be segregated (stepped track), with a cycle crossing on A397 Northern Road arm.	In line with emerging development timelines, as it's a safety led scheme it should be targeted for delivery by 2030.	None.
Church Street Roundabout, Marketway Roundabout, Hope Street Roundabout, Lake Road Roundabout (IDP Reference T4 – City Centre Roads, STAA Reference Junction 4, 6, 13 and 17)	Scheme to realign / reconfigure A3 Marketway/Commercial Road (north) and adjacent roads, as well as improved transport/cycle/pedestrian infrastructure and public space.	See response to PLP6: Portsmouth City Centre question 28a specifically on the timings of delivery for the City Centre Road Scheme.	The City Centre Road scheme needs to come forward as a full build out scheme in order to allow the re-direction of traffic and support the bus priority and bus only links through the scheme to operate. Tipner Transport hub is one of several sustainable transport mitigations which are expected to benefit the operation of the City Centre Road scheme. The City Centre Road scheme supports the wider bus strategy for the Portsmouth area through the bus priority elements of the scheme.
Rudmore Roundabout (IDP Reference T20, STAA Reference Junction 7).	Signalisation of Kingston Crescent and east circulatory, alongside increases to cycle time.	In line with emerging development timelines	None.
New Lakeside Access (IDP Reference T21, STAA	Introduction of a secondary access to serve the development.	In line with emerging development timelines at	As specified above, the secondary access helps to distribute a portion of Lakeside egress trips

Reference Junction 8)		Lakeside North Harbour.	towards M27 J12 reducing the trips via the Portsbridge Roundabout.
London Road/ Southwick Hill Road (IDP Reference T22, STAA Reference Junction 15)	Amendments to signal staging and reallocation of right-turn lane allocations.	In line with emerging development timelines	None.
Museum Road/Landport Terrace/ Kings Road/ Kings Terrace (IDP Reference T23, STAA Reference Junction 16).	Cycling link to connect Kings Road to the new active travel corridor.	In line with emerging development timelines.	None.

5.7.3 Additionally, whilst not referenced at paragraph 8.1.7 of the STAA [IN05], it should be noted that the Tipner Transport Hub will support the unlocking of growth associated with the City Centre and Tipner Developments. As set out in the response to Matter 5, Issue 2, Q6b, this is not modelled within the STAA and therefore the transport evidence base for the Local Plan is not reliant on its delivery, but it would support and encourage modal shift associated with these strategic sites.

8) Is the modelling contained within the Council's transport evidence robust?

- 5.8.1 The modelling within the STAA [IN05] uses a combination of the SRTM and local junction models which is compliant, fit for purpose and meets the test of soundness specified in the Framework. The approach is proportionate with no radical adjustments to agreed approaches used on several surrounding Local Plans and Transport Assessments to support development growth and assessment of impacts.
- 5.8.2 The requirements of the Framework have been the starting point for any model tests and the approach has been agreed at key stage gates and approved through the documented Model Assumptions Technical Note. The Framework highlights the need for emerging development strategies to align assessments with a decide and provide approach to support the sustainable vision for the City.
- 5.8.3 The development and assessment of the success of proposed transport mitigation have considered the requirements of DfT Circular 01/2022 'Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development' and the Framework through application of a sustainable transport hierarchy to scheme development.

9) Have transport impacts beyond the city boundary been appropriately assessed?

- 5.9.1 The SRTM model includes a significant geographic area outside of Portsmouth within the wider Hampshire area, allowing for assessment of impacts outside of the City to be assessed. Considering the island geography of Portsmouth, vehicles exiting the Island are directed towards key Strategic Road Network routes and then traffic increases quickly disperse reducing any impacts to below material. When selecting category 1 junctions which warrant further assessment, the STA has considered junctions with an uplift of flow in the context of increasing congestion and capacity issues over and above the Reference Case. The selected category 1

junction thresholds did not result in any junctions being selected outside of the Portsmouth boundary as they had not exceeded impact thresholds.

- 5.9.2 Additionally, the SRTM is managed on behalf of a consortium of authorities including boroughs adjacent to Portsmouth. In practice this therefore means that cross boundary matters are considered by ensuring that up to date permissions and completions are accounted for within the SRTM modelling and was set out within the Model Assumptions note.
- 10) **Do the outputs of the modelling include resilience to account for any delays or non-delivery of infrastructure identified in the IDP and any other mitigation measures anticipated by the Plan?**
- 5.10.1 The STA includes resilience as the Do Something modelling has excluded any mitigation schemes where there is uncertainty regarding funding potential for transport schemes. For example, the Tipner Park and Ride scheme (IDP Reference T45) was not captured within the assessment given the challenges associated with the planning permission for this scheme having lapsed and the challenges associated with the funding certainty of the scheme. Additionally, given the Horsea/ Tipner Link Bridge (IDP Reference T1) did not have sufficient detail on the scheduling of new and re-routed bus services via this bridge link and as it was public transport / active modes only, the impact of its inclusion on the highway network is not expected to be significant and any change would have a positive impact through increased public transport uptake. It is noted that the assessments presented are therefore robust as both schemes could result in further mode shift in the future once the scheme comes forward for delivery and offer support to the Local Plan targeted growth.
- 11) **Are the transport impacts arising from the growth supported by the Plan, as assessed in the Council's transport evidence, significant and, if so, would they give rise to unacceptable highway safety impacts or severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network at any stage during the Plan period?**
- 5.11.1 The growth envisioned in the Plan will produce a significant increase in demand for travel. The significance of the impacts associated with this demand is determined by the way in which the demand is to be met, which itself is a function of the Plan's transport strategy and policies.
- 5.11.2 The STAA [IN05] has followed a policy compliant approach to the assessment of transport impacts associated with Local Plan growth. Through the categorisation of junctions by a threshold approach, the strategic SRTM model outputs have been used in a way to establish what local junction models are required to test impacts and develop a mitigation strategy which mitigates any severe impacts.
- 5.11.3 The proposed mitigation schemes as set out in para 8.1.7 of the STAA, reduce any impacts of the growth to ensure that any transport impacts fall below a severe impact threshold as defined by the Framework. Mitigation development has considered safety as the highest priority, followed by capacity with some schemes such as the Spur Road Roundabout (IDP Reference T19, STAA Reference Junction 3) being brought forward on the grounds of safety over capacity, acknowledging in this location that an existing safety issue that could be exacerbated by growth. Specifically, at Portsbridge roundabout, a series of mitigation scheme layouts were prepared and the proposed mitigation arrangement (Signalisation of A397 Northern Road, bus gate and opposing circulatory and Western Road arm. Removal of left turn slip from A27 Western Road.) represents a significant capacity improvement on the junction operation compared to the 2041 Reference Case layout, with all arms forecast to operate below 80% Degree of Saturation in the AM and 100% in the PM. The conclusions of the STAA highlight that it is not considered that the Local Plan growth in conjunction with the mitigation gives rise to unacceptable impacts which would be considered severe in the tests of the Framework.