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Portsmouth City Council declared a Climate Emergency on the 19 March 2019, pledging to achieve net zero carbon emissions in Portsmouth by 2030. The development of the new Portsmouth Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan comes at a time when the focus is already on decarbonising the city.

The plan proposes creating a strategy for infrastructure improvements in the short, medium and long term that will increase walking and cycling in the city whilst reducing cycle accidents on the roads. It is essential that the appropriate infrastructure is in place to make walking and cycling an attractive, safe and healthy alternative to polluting motor vehicles. We also want to encourage more active travel to combat rising obesity and greater participation in walking and cycling will help with this.

This plan is important in contributing to improving air quality as there are significant air pollution hot spots across the city that must also be addressed in line with the ministerial direction in the shortest possible time. Air pollution affects everybody, but it’s worse for children, older people and individuals with existing heart and lung conditions. Exposure to air pollution can cause lung damage in children, impair their development and worsen existing conditions like asthma.

This forms part of our emerging Local Transport Plan 4 that sets out our vision and policy direction for transport in Portsmouth until 2036.

This LCWIP shows how we will work towards delivering ambitious plans to increase walking and cycling usage in Portsmouth. The strategy will help to achieve the targets in our emerging Local Plan, setting out housing and employment growth to 2036, and our emerging Climate Change Strategy and Local Transport Plan, including a carbon neutral Portsmouth by 2030.

Our LCWIP highlights how our existing cycle routes and comprehensive footway network can be transformed in order to better connect people to places, including strategic development sites set out in our new Local Plan, and encourage people of all abilities to cycle and walk.

By expanding the travel choices for those in Portsmouth, we will be providing clear benefits to both individuals and communities alike, helping to overcome issues associated with inactivity and social isolation.

This Plan will aid in the future-proofing of the city to ensure that it is ‘…cleaner, greener and safer…’ for generations to come.

Councillor Lynne Stagg
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

This report is a sub-strategy to the emerging Local Transport Plan (LTP4) and provides the first iteration of the joint cycling and walking strategy and implementation plan for Portsmouth. As outlined in the Government’s Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS)\(^1\), the ambition is “…to make walking and cycling the natural choices for shorter journeys or as part of longer journeys.”

In order to support this, Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) have been developed. LCWIPs provide a new, strategic, long-term approach to developing walking and cycling networks for local authorities across the country following guidance from the Department for Transport (DfT).

The Portsmouth LCWIP was developed using Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan Technical Guidance for Local Authorities, issued by the DfT (see figure 1), and also considers best practice examples from the UK. Technical support was provided by DfT’s appointed consultant, WSP.

---

### Figure 1: LCWIP Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Determining scope</td>
<td>Establish the geographical extent of the LCWIP, and arrangements for governing and preparing the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gathering information</td>
<td>Identify existing patterns of walking and cycling and potential new journeys. Review existing conditions and identify barriers to cycling and walking. Review related transport and land use policies and programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Network planning for cycling</td>
<td>Identify origin and destination points and cycle flows. Convert flows into a network of routes and determine the type of improvements required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Network planning for walking</td>
<td>Identify key trip generators, core walking zones and routes, audit existing provision and determine the type of improvements required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prioritising improvements</td>
<td>Prioritise improvements to develop a phased programme for future investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Integration and application</td>
<td>Integrate outputs into local planning and transport policies, and delivery plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This process culminates in three key outputs, which collectively form the LCWIP:

Cycling and walking network plans\textsuperscript{2} which identify preferred routes and core zones for further development;

A prioritised schedule of infrastructure improvements\textsuperscript{3} for future investment; and

A report setting out the underlying analysis and the narrative which supports the rationale for the identified network and prioritised improvements – the Background Report\textsuperscript{4}.

This report sets out the key highlights from these three outputs.

Information on the methodology used is located in the Background Report.
The first Portsmouth LCWIP has been developed by Portsmouth City Council with support from WSP. Additionally, a working group was formed with several local stakeholders.

The aim of the Portsmouth LCWIP is to encourage modal shift by creating a comprehensive walking and cycling network that is safe, inclusive, accessible, convenient and attractive, enabling people to get from A to B in the most direct way possible when making utility trips. These are everyday journeys made for a specific purpose, such as commuting to work, trips to the shops or the doctor, or to school, college and university.

Due to the resourcing required to establish a comprehensive Network Plan for Portsmouth, the LCWIP is intended to be developed through a phased approach, with the initial LCWIP covering a 10-year period that is subject to periodic updates as funding opportunities become available.

The LCWIP is an ambitious plan that proposes significant investment over the next 10 years that look to transform the city for both walking and cycling.

The principles of the LCWIP, such as the audit methodology used, will be embedded in to the emerging Local Transport Plan 4, where Active Travel will be of particular focus.

This initial phase of the LCWIP focuses on several specific routes for both walking and cycling, forming a primary network (see figures 3 and 4). Secondary and Tertiary networks will be developed in future iterations of the LCWIP.

Further details regarding this can be found in the Background Report. 
1.3 WHY INVEST IN CYCLING AND WALKING?

In establishing an LCWIP, Portsmouth City Council are setting out our approach, based on a clear methodology, for improvements to walking and cycling networks that have a wide range of benefits.

**Increases accessibility**
By making it easier for residents and visitors to both walk and cycle in Portsmouth, we can make the city far more inclusive and accessible for all.

**Improves health**
Walking and cycling directly contribute towards a range of physical, mental and neurological health benefits, such as reducing the risk of all-cause mortality, fewer symptoms of depression and improved quality of life.6

**Creates cleaner air and reduces congestion**
By improving walking and cycling routes we are encouraging a modal shift away from single car occupancy vehicle, thus reducing car travel which in turn leads to a reduction in air pollution, carbon dioxide emissions and congestion.
Increases productivity

Those that walk or cycle to work report to have greater job satisfaction and feel far more productive than those who travel by different modes.\(^7\)

Promotes future growth

By building a network of walking and cycling routes, we are increasing the range of transport options that respond to areas of current and future development.

Improvements to the local economy

Investing in walking and cycling projects provides a ‘Benefit Cost Ratio’ of 13:1, so for every £1 spent, £13 is returned to the economy.\(^7\)

Additionally, those who cycle and walk will take more trips to the high street over the course of a month.\(^7\)
2 LCWIP SCOPE

2.1 AREA COVERED

The Plan covers the whole of the Portsmouth authority area, including trip origins and destinations that are located in neighbouring authorities, as can be found in figure 2.

In order to ensure sufficient continuity of provision across boundary, Portsmouth City Council has been working in conjunction with neighbouring authorities such as Hampshire County Council and the Isle of Wight Council, throughout the LCWIP process.

Figure 2: LCWIP area coverage
3 EXISTING CONTEXT AND CHALLENGES

3.1 DATA AND EVIDENCE COLLECTED FOR LCWIP

Through the LCWIP process, a wide range of data and information has been gathered and referenced. This has influenced and shaped the planned future cycling and walking network, proposed interventions and design standards for infrastructure.

Plans, policies and strategies

Improvements to walking and cycling are a concurrent theme across a number of Portsmouth City Council policies and strategies that have been adopted or are in a process of consultation. This highlights the important link that the LCWIP holds when being considered as part of the wider context.

Examples of this are shown in the diagram opposite.

A full list, and further information can be found in the Background Report.
Existing cycling and walking network

The current network available for cycling and walking is illustrated on the city council’s Active Travel Map, with public rights of way plans also published online.

As part of the LCWIP process, the information gathered via audit, stakeholder engagement and site visits has helped to identify severance points, where options to continue walking or cycling are limited or cut off completely and inform network planning.

An assessment of the quality of the network based on suitability for walking and cycling was also undertaken, with the following key findings:

Cycling – low scores
- Shared-use paths scored poorly where insufficient width for different cyclists and pedestrians exist.
- Many paths are unlit, or have no passive surveillance.
- Many on-road sections score poorly against safety and comfort criteria. This is usually due to them having high traffic volumes, 30mph speed limits and no infrastructure to physically protect cyclists from motor traffic.

Cycling – high scores
- Residential streets with low traffic volumes and 20mph speed limits tended to score well.
- Some off-carriageway routes score well where they are sufficiently wide to comfortably accommodate all users.
Walking - network issues

Absence of street trees or planting in the highway to enhance the walking environment, provide shade or shelter and absorb carbon dioxide;

Extensive bollards or guard railing impacting on the quality of the streetscape.

No formalised pedestrian priority when crossing side roads. Road crossings without dropped kerbs or tactile paving to assist blind, partially sighted and mobility impaired pedestrians.

Footways in poor condition, damaged paving slabs and uneven surfaces, creating potential trip hazards;

Further details of this can be found in the Background Report\textsuperscript{11}
Travel patterns

Car or van use for travel to work still remains the most popular method of transport in Portsmouth based on 2011 Census data, with those travelling by foot and by bike having fairly low representation.

Despite evidence suggesting that we travel far less, “… with 16% fewer trips made in 2018 than in 1996.” It is anticipated that there will be a “… 41% increase in inbound traffic … by 2026.”

The most commonly used mode of transport to work by Portsmouth residents are as follows:
The proportion of adults in Portsmouth that either walk or cycle are as follows:

**Walking**
- 22.3% walk five times per week for travel vs 63.9% walk at least once per month for travel
- 14.7% walk five times per week for leisure vs 60.9% walk at least once per month for leisure

**Cycling**
- 5.3% cycle five times per week for travel vs 17.7% cycle at least once per month for travel
- 1.0% cycle five times per week for leisure vs 17.8% cycle at least once per month for leisure

This highlights challenges faced, but also the potential for modal shift away from single-occupancy vehicles, and the importance of the proposals outlined in the LCWIP in order to increase the number of people cycling and walking to meet government targets.
Although car and van use represent a high proportion of trips in Portsmouth, the distance travelled for journeys to work still remains low.

With walking having the greatest potential to replace trips currently made by other modes up to 2km in length, this shows that there is significant potential to increase the number of those walking in the city.

In order to support this, a network of walking routes have been proposed using employment sites from the 2011 census, along with other key destinations and based on guidance using Core Walking Zones (CWZs) and Key Walking Routes (KWRs), where CWZs consist of major trip generators that are clustered together such as Commercial Road and Guildhall Walk, and KWRs being the main pedestrian routes across the remaining areas of the city.

The top 5 KWRs leading to the city centre and the top 5 KWRs outside the city centre are included in figure 3.

This network of walking routes is believed to have the most potential when looking at increasing the number of journeys made by foot in Portsmouth.

Each route has been audited based on the criteria of attractiveness, comfort, directness, safety and coherence. As the quality of some of these routes are poor, they may not currently have high numbers of people travelling on foot, but the potential for increasing the number of short journeys are high if they are found to be easy, convenient and safe to do so.

Please visit the Background Report for further analysis, and the methodology used, including a map highlighting CWZs in Portsmouth.

---

* In the context of the LCWIP, walking includes people using wheelchairs or mobility scooters and people with pushchairs.
Figure 3: Prioritised key walking routes
4.2 CYCLING

The LCWIP guidance suggests that cycling has the potential to replace trips currently made by other modes, typically up to 10km in length. Additionally, a 5km threshold has been applied to represent short distance utility journeys which could be made by new or returning cyclists.

A network of main corridors and several east-west routes have been identified based on the greatest potential to increase cycling.

Approximate home and work locations have been mapped to form ‘as the crow flies’ information using 2011 census data, along with the Propensity to Cycle Tool (PCT), with key destinations as part of the walking network also being considered.

This has been mapped onto the existing network, and discussed with stakeholder groups.

Figure 4 highlights the primary network, those routes having the greatest potential to increase cycling journeys that lead or go past key destinations and employment sites. As with each walking route, there are unique identifiers for each cycling route that have been used.

The primary network has been audited (see Section 3) based on a criteria of directness, gradient, safety, connectivity and comfort. Further detailed information about the audit process, including the scores of each section of routes against this criteria, can be found in the Background Report.

As initial audits have been focused on routes with the greatest potential to increase the number of people cycling, none of the proposed secondary network has been audited – see Background Report. Further work will be undertaken to address both the Secondary and Tertiary network of routes, where proposed recommendations for improvements may differ to those outlined in this document.

With 64% of current journeys below 10km
Figure 4

Western cycle corridor
Route refs 307, 307a, 405, 503

Eastern cycle corridor
Route refs 108, 205, 301

East-West Portsea
Island cycle routes
Route refs 601, 602, 801
In order to prioritise accordingly, a balanced set of criteria were chosen to inform infrastructure improvements. The criteria covered the following themes:

- Existing and potential future cycling demand;
- Strategic transport projects and priorities e.g. AQMA areas;
- Economy;
- Education;
- Housing; and
- Public health

These helped establish an investment programme of short, medium and long-term investment for the primary walking and cycling network, as summarised in the three categories below:

- **Shorter-term (0–3 Years):** improvements which can be implemented quickly or are under development;
- **Medium term (3–5 Years):** improvements where there is a clear intention to act, but delivery is dependent on further funding availability or other issues (e.g. detailed design, securing planning permissions, land acquisition, etc); and
- **Longer-term (5–10 Years):** more aspirational improvements or those awaiting a defined solution.

This investment programme will feed into the Local Transport Plan (LTP4) strategy and future LTP implementation plans as part of a range of works, along with wider infrastructure proposals such as those that are being developed for the South East Hampshire Rapid Transit network.

For further details regarding the methodology for prioritisation, please see the [Background Report](#).
Prioritising cycle route improvements

Outlined in Figure 5 are the short, medium and longer-term indicative prioritisation of cycling improvements for Portsmouth, with each route split into relevant sections to help support this process.

For site specific information, please visit Appendix B.
Prioritising walking route improvements

*Figure 6 maps the short, medium and longer-term indicative improvements for walking infrastructure in the city. As with cycling, this has been split into sections to aid prioritisation.*
In order to set a baseline for walking and cycling infrastructure, an established set of principles have been used to inform improvements and associated cost estimates. Examples of these can be found below.

**6.1 TYPES OF IMPROVEMENT**

All potential improvements are subject to further study, feasibility and consultation, each of which has the potential to change cost estimates. For further information regarding this, please refer to the Background Report.

- **Raised Tables**
  A section of the carriageway that is raised to the same height as the adjacent footway to improve crossing.

- **At-grade crossing facilities**
  A crossing point for potentially both cyclists and pedestrians at the same level as the carriageway.

- **Parklets**
  A public space that provides an extension of the footway incorporating seating, greening and bicycle parking. These are usually placed in former parking-bays.

- **Grade-separated crossings**
  A crossing point for potentially both cyclists and pedestrians at a different level to the carriageway.
**Shared-use or segregated cycle paths**
A shared-use path is used by both pedestrians and cyclists, either through delineation (segregated) or without (unsegregated).

**Bus by-pass / Floating bus stop**
The routing of a cycle lane behind a bus stop in order to maintain the separation of people cycling from motor traffic.

**Bus-gates**
A short section of road that has been closed off to all traffic except buses, cyclists and in some instances, taxis. These can include movable bollards to permit entry.
Mandatory or advisory cycle lanes
These are lanes designated for use by cyclists, either marked by a solid white line or dashed white line. A solid white line indicates that it is exclusively for the use of cyclists, while a dashed white line may be crossed if necessary.

Wider pedestrian refuge islands
An area in the carriageway to aid the crossing of both cyclists and pedestrians.

Footway buildouts with pedestrian priority across junctions
Amendments to the geometry of side roads to provide shorter crossing distances, along with give way lines set-back to aid pedestrians crossing.
6.2 EXAMPLES OF IMPROVEMENTS: CYCLING

To help visualise the suggested improvements, a sample of short, medium and longer-term prioritised cycling infrastructure changes have been developed to map the current and potential future vision, for further details please see the Background Report:

*Please note, these are illustrative with any proposals taken forward requiring detailed feasibility and design.*

**Short-term:**
- Route 405: Allaway Avenue
- Route 301: Crookhorn Lane

**Medium-term:**
- Route 802: Festing Road
- Route 503: Isambard Brunel Road, Alec Rose Lane junction

**Longer-term:**
- Route 307: London Road
- Route 307: Pier Road
- Route 503: Southampton Road
Short-term

Route 405: Allaway Avenue

CURRENT VIEW
1 NEW raised table continuous footway
2 NEW 4.5m segregated cycle and foot path
3 NEW bollards to prevent parking obstructions
Short-term

Route 301: Crookhorn Lane

CURRENT VIEW
1 Wider share-use foot and cycle path
2 NEW signalised toucan crossing
3 Wider crossing facility
Medium-term

Route 802: Festing Road

CURRENT VIEW
NEW bus gate to allow access for buses and cycles
Medium-term
Route 503: Isambard Brunel Road, Alec Rose Lane junction

CURRENT VIEW
1. NEW Priority road crossing
2. NEW Continuous footway – raised table
3. NEW 2m wide protected cycle lanes
4. Removal of roundabout
Longer-term
Route 307: London Road

CURRENT VIEW
1  NEW 2m segregated cycle track
2  NEW floating bus stop
3  Reduce carriageway to 2 lanes + bus stop
Longer-term

Route 307: Pier Road

CURRENT VIEW
Proposed improvements to Route 307:

1. NEW crossing facilities
2. NEW protected cycle tracks
3. Additional give-way markings to identify crossing facilities
Longer-term
Route 503: Southampton Road

CURRENT VIEW
Proposed improvements to Route 503:

- **Southampton Road**
  - **Blue**: Raised Table with priority for cyclists and pedestrians
  - **Orange**: Grade-separated crossing for pedestrians and cyclists
  - **Yellow**: Widen existing shared use path
  - **Green**: Improved at-grade crossing facilities
6.3 EXAMPLES OF IMPROVEMENTS: WALKING

As with cycling, a range of short, medium and longer-term prioritised walking infrastructure changes have been developed to map the current and potential future vision, for further details please see the Background Report:

Please note, these are illustrative with any proposals taken forward requiring detailed feasibility and design.

**Short-term:**
- Route 22: Lake Road

**Medium-term:**
- Route 33: Arundel Street

**Longer-term:**
- Route 79: Middle Street
Short-term

Route 22: Lake Road

CURRENT VIEW
Proposed improvements to Walking route 22 Lake Road:

- **Key**
  - **Blue**: Raised Table with priority for cyclists and pedestrians
  - **Red**: New crossing facility
  - **Yellow**: Widen existing shared use path
  - **Purple**: Improved at-grade crossing facilities
Medium-term

Route 33: Arundel Street

CURRENT VIEW
1 NEW tighter junctions for easier crossing
2 NEW crossing facility
3 IMPROVED crossing facility
4 NEW continuous footway – raised table
Longer-term

Route 79: Middle Street
1. NEW 'parklet' in former parking bay
2. NEW crossing facility - raised table, continuous footway
3. NEW tighter junctions for easier crossing
The LCWIP will be used to inform, contribute and provide a basis for the following (see diagram):
For further information, please visit the Background Report.

Several elements identified in the LCWIP will be dependent upon available funding, with identified infrastructure being delivered by Portsmouth City Council through planning proposals, master plans and local transport plans where feasible.

Where external funding opportunities are presented, the Council will submit relevant bids in order to supplement delivery of the Plan.
We will continue to undertake before and after monitoring of our schemes and feed them into the developing Portsmouth transport data system.

As the LCWIP process is iterative, future versions and revisions will follow a similar process, with further auditing and feasibility studies in order to respond to opportunities as they arise.
APPENDIX A  KEY WALKING ROUTE NETWORK WITH KEY DESTINATIONS
APPENDIX A  CYCLING ROUTE PLANS

Note: All routes go via the city centre apart from 603.
### Indicative Prioritisation of Cycling Improvements – Shorter Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Cycle Corridor Reference and Description</th>
<th>Stage 1 Prioritisation Rank</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>307 Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Cosham &amp; City Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Section C: Nelson Avenue, North End Avenue &amp; Penrose Close (Northern Parade to Twyford Avenue) Section H: A288 Hampshire Terrace (King Richard I Road to St. Michael’s Road (southern end))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503 Fareham to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre &amp; Southsea Town Centre</td>
<td>=2</td>
<td>Section 1: Southampton Road (Portsdown Road to Watersedge bus stop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802 Southsea Seafront to Naval Dockyard via City Centre</td>
<td>=2</td>
<td>Section 3: Andrew’s Road, Cottage Grove and Grosvenor Street (Elm Grove to Brougham Street) Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 Eastney to Naval Dockyard</td>
<td>=2</td>
<td>Sections A, B &amp; 4: Frensham Road and Goldsmith Avenue (Devonshire Avenue to Fratton Bridge roundabout)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) &amp; City Centre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Section 1: Crookhorn Lane (authority boundary to Portsdown Hill Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 DSTL / North Portchester to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre &amp; Southsea Town Centre</td>
<td>=6</td>
<td>Section 2: Allaway Avenue shared-use path (Castle View Academy to Bourne Road) Section 4: Marsden Road (Allaway Avenue to Paulsgrove Adventure Playground)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602a Gosport to Portsmouth College via City Centre (southern route)</td>
<td>=6</td>
<td>Sections B to D: Eastern Road shared-use path (Tangier Road to Langstone Road junction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601b Gosport to St. James' Hospital / Langstone Campus development sites</td>
<td>=9</td>
<td>Section B: Ironbridge Lane, Maurice Road and Dunbar Road (Locksway Road to Milton Road) Section 4: Goldsmith Avenue (Priory Crescent to Frensham Road)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indicative Prioritisation of Cycling Improvements – Medium-Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Cycle Corridor Reference and Description</th>
<th>Stage 1 Prioritisation Rank</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 307 Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Cosham & City Centre | 1 | Sections A & B: A3 Northern Parade (London Road to Nelson Avenue)  
Sections E & F: Rudmore Roundabout and A3 Mile End Road (Twyford Avenue / Stamshaw Road to Church Street Roundabout) |
| 503 Fareham to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre & Southsea Town Centre | =2 | Sections 2: A27 Southampton Road (Watersedge bus stop to Compass Road)  
Sections 3: A27 Western Road (Southampton Road junction underpass to Portsbridge Roundabout underpass)  
Section 12: Commercial Road (south) and Isambard Brunel Road (Station Street roundabout to Winston Churchill Avenue)  
Section G: Winston Churchill Avenue shared-use footway / cycleway, St. James' Street and Brougham Road (Isambard Brunel Road to Grosvenor Street)  
Section 16: Avenue de Caen (Clarence Parade to Clarence Esplanade) |
| 802 Southsea Seafront to Naval Dockyard via City Centre | =2 | Section 1: Festing Road (Eastern Parade to Albert Road)  
Section 6: Unicorn Road (Bishop Crispian Way to Naval Dockyard) |
| 801 Eastney to Naval Dockyard | =2 | Section 6: Canal Walk, Bridport Street and East Surrey Street (Sydenham Terrace to Station Street) |
| 301 Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) & City Centre | 5 | Section 2: Gillman Road (Portsdown Hill Road to Eveleigh Road)  
Sections B & 6: Eastern Road (Havant Road to Farlington Interchange)  
Sections 8 & 9: Anchorage Road, Robinson Way, Airport Service Road, Dundas Lane and former busway (Eastern Road to Moneyfield Avenue)  
Section C: George Street, Glencoe Road / Daulston Road, Hampshire Street, Shakespeare Road and Manor Road (New Road to Fratton Road)  
Section 13: Fratton Road and Lake Road (Manor Road to City Centre) |
| 405 DSTL / North Portchester to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre & Southsea Town Centre | =6 | Section 3: Allaway Avenue (Bourne Road to Marsden Road)  
Section 5: Racecourse Lane (Paulsgrove Adventure Playground to Southampton Road) |
## Indicative Prioritisation of Cycling Improvements – Longer-Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Cycle Corridor Reference and Description</th>
<th>Stage I Prioritisation Rank</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 307 Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Queen Alexandra Hospital (307a), Cosham & City Centre | 1 | Sections 1-3: A3 London Road and Northern Road (Authority boundary to Cosham Health Centre)  
Section 5: A3 Portsbridge Roundabout and London Road (Western Road underpass to Northern Parade junction)  
Section D: A3 Twyford Avenue (northbound) and Stamshaw Road (southbound) (Penrose Closer to Rudmore Roundabout)  
Section G: Guildhall Square & Guildhall Walk (Commercial Road to St. Michael’s gyratory)  
Sections 14 & 15: A288 Hampshire Terrace, Landport Terrace, King’s Terrace, Jubilee Terrace, Bellevue Terrace & Pier Road (St. Michael’s Gyraotory to Clarence Pier) |
<p>| 307a Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Queen Alexandra Hospital, Cosham &amp; City Centre | 1 | Section 1: B2177 Southwick Hill Road (Queen Alexandra Hospital Entrance to London Road) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>length</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Fareham to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre &amp; Southsea Town Centre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Section 3: A27 Southampton Road (Compass Road to Western Road underpass) Sections 14 &amp; 15: Grosvenor Street, Green Road, Cottage Grove, Grove Road North &amp; Grove Road South, Kent Road, Portland Road, Osborne Road and Palmerston Road (Grosvenor Street to Clarence Parade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>Southsea Seafront to Naval Dockyard via City Centre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Section 2: Albert Road, Victoria Road South and Elm Grove (Festing Road to St. Andrew’s Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Eastney to Naval Dockyard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Section 1: Prince Albert Road, Landguard Road, Maxwell Road, Aston Road, Haslemere Road, Pretoria Road and St. Augustine Road (Highland Road to Devonshire Avenue) Section 5: Fratton Bridge and Sydenham Terrace (Goldsmith Avenue to Canal Walk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Waterloo to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) &amp; City Centre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Section 3: Gillman Road (Eveleigh Road to Havant Road) Section A: Havant Road (Gillman Road to Eastern Road) Section 7: Eastern Road (Farlington Interchange to Anchorage Road) Section 11: Tangier Road, Milton Road, Copnor Bridge &amp; New Road (Folkestone Road to George Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>DSTL / North Portchester to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre &amp; Southsea Town Centre</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Section 1: Westfield Road path, Jubilee Avenue &amp; Allaway Avenue (Portsdown Road to Castle View Academy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Havant to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) &amp; City Centre</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sections 1 &amp; 2: National Cycle Network route 22 (Farlington Marshes route from authority boundary to Farlington Interchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Gosport to Portsmouth College via City Centre</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Section 6: St. Mary’s Road (Prison Roundabout to Kingston Cemetery entrance) Section G: Stamford Street, Clifton Street and Arundel Street (Fratton Road to 20mph limit west of Holbrook Road) Section 10: Arundel Street (20mph limit west of Holbrook Road to Buckingham Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602a</td>
<td>Gosport to Portsmouth College via City Centre (southern route)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Section 5: Langstone Road (Eastern Road to Prison Roundabout)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602b</td>
<td>Gosport to Portsmouth College via City Centre (northern route)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Section 3: Neville Road and Hayling Avenue (Tangier Road to Baffins Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Leigh Park to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) &amp; City Centre</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Section 1: Havant Road (authority boundary to Lower Farlington Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Gosport to Southsea Seafront via University and Albert Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Section 1: The Hard (Hard Interchange to Ordnance Row) Section 4: King’s Road and Elm Grove (King’s Roundabout to St. Andrew’s Road)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicative Prioritisation of Key Walking Route Improvements – Shorter and medium term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritisation category</th>
<th>Key Walking Route Description</th>
<th>Key Walking Route Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shorter-term</td>
<td>Arundel Street (Holbrook Road to Fratton Road)</td>
<td>KWR 33 section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fratton Bridge and Fawcett Road (Selbourne Terrace to Manners Road)</td>
<td>KWR 27 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingston Road (Kingston Crescent to Lake Road)</td>
<td>KWR 53 sections 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Road (entire length)</td>
<td>KWR 22 sections 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Road (Kingston Crescent to Stubbington Avenue / Gladys Avenue)</td>
<td>KWR 68 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Road (Hewett Road and Gladys Avenue)</td>
<td>KWR 11 section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-term</td>
<td>Isambard Brunel Road (Commercial Road and Greetham Street)</td>
<td>KWR 80 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somers Road (Raglan Street to Sydenham Terrace)</td>
<td>KWR 80 section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sydenham Terrace (Somers Road to Fratton Bridge)</td>
<td>KWR 80 section 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King Henry I Street (Guildhall Square to Anglesea Road)</td>
<td>KWR 37 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park Road (Anglesea Road to St. George's Road)</td>
<td>KWR 37 section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elderon Street and Norfolk Street (Sackville Street to King's Road)</td>
<td>KWR 79 section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Road (Merrivale Road to Hewett Road)</td>
<td>KWR 11 section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fawcett Road (Manners Road to Addison Road)</td>
<td>KWR 27 section 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicative Prioritisation of Key Walking Route Improvements – Longer-term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritisation category</th>
<th>Key Walking Route Description</th>
<th>Key Walking Route Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longer-term</td>
<td>Greetham Street and Raglan Street (Isambard Brunel Road to Somers Road)</td>
<td>KWR 80 section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unnamed walkway from Guildhall Square to Winston Churchill Avenue</td>
<td>KWR 79 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Street (Winston Churchill Avenue to Sackville Street)</td>
<td>KWR 79 section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Road (Northwood Road to Merrivale Road)</td>
<td>KWR 11 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence Road (Addison Road to Albert Road)</td>
<td>KWR 27 section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grove Road South (Elm Grove to Palmerston Road)</td>
<td>KWR 77 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palmerston Road (entire length)</td>
<td>KWR 77 sections 1-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossary Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AQMA</td>
<td>Air Quality Management Areas. Declared by local authorities for locations which are recorded to have levels of nitrogen dioxide which exceed the limits outlined in the National Air Quality Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfT</td>
<td>Department for Transport. The UK ministerial department which inter alia provides policy and guidance to English local authorities for local transport, including on cycling and walking. Published the LCWIP technical guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSTL</td>
<td>Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, a major employment destination on Portsdown Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCWIP</td>
<td>Local Cycling &amp; Walking Infrastructure Plan, a new, strategic, long-term approach to identify the improvements to cycling and walking networks which are required in each local area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSOA</td>
<td>Census output areas were. Mid-layer super output area. MSOAs were chosen to represent journey origins from existing residential areas in the LCWIP methodology. These are statistical areas created by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) which had populations of between 5,000 and 15,000 at the time of the 2011 census. The ONS choose output area boundaries to ensure each one has a similar population and are as socially homogenous as possible based on tenure of household and dwelling type. 25 MSOAs cover Portsmouth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONS</td>
<td>Office for National Statistics, the body charged with the collection and publication of statistics related to the economy, population and society of the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT</td>
<td>Propensity to Cycle Tool. A website analysis tool which forecasts the potential future growth of cycle trips under different scenarios for travel to work and travel to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RST</td>
<td>Route Selection Tool. An Excel spreadsheet which assesses and compares the suitability of different routes for inclusion in a cycle network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Supplementary Planning Document. Planning policy which adds further detail to the policies in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAT</td>
<td>Walking Route Audit Tool. An Excel spreadsheet for auditing existing condition of walking routes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

1.1.1. The Cycling & Walking Investment Strategy\(^1\) sets out government’s ambition to make cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys, or as part of longer journeys, and increase the number of trips made by these modes. The government considers that Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) are a vital part of this strategy. LCWIPs are a new, strategic, long-term approach to identify the improvements to cycling and walking networks which are required in each local area. LCWIPs require an understanding of existing and future travel patterns, plus evidence on the barriers preventing people currently cycling and walking, and factors which would enable more people to make more cycling and walking journeys.

1.1.2. This report sets out the methodology used, and describes the development of, the first iteration of the Portsmouth LCWIP.

1.1.3. Throughout the preparation of the Portsmouth LCWIP reference was made the Department for Transport (DfT) document LCWIPs Technical Guidance for Local Authorities\(^2\). The guidance identifies that there are three key outputs from the LCWIP process:

- Cycling and walking network plans which identify preferred routes and core zones for further development;
- A prioritised schedule of infrastructure improvements for future investment; and
- A report setting out the underlying analysis and the narrative which supports the rationale for the identified network and prioritised improvements (this Background Report).

The Background Report does not seek to provide a comprehensive description of baseline conditions but instead describes the processes by which the cycling and walking network plans and schedule of infrastructure improvements were developed.

1.1.4. The LCWIP aims to create a walking and cycling network which will enable people to get from A to B in the most direct way possible when making utility trips. These are everyday journeys made for a purpose, such as commuting to work, trips to the shops or the doctor, or to school, college and university, for example. Directness and journey times are usually important factors when considering making utility journeys. Cycling and walking trips which are made purely for leisure (i.e. no destination) are not within the scope of the LCWIP, although more of these journeys may be encouraged with the improvements identified.

1.1.5. In the context of LCWIP walking includes people using wheelchairs or mobility scooters and people with pushchairs. It also considers all types of cycle typically in use, including adapted cycles, tricycles and cycles with trailers. The LCWIP guidance suggests that cycling has the potential to replace trips currently made by other modes, typically up to 10km in length, whilst walking has the potential to replace trips currently made by other modes up to 2km in length. A network of routes which caters for these shorter-distance journeys is also likely to cater for longer-distance or leisure cycle trips.

\(^1\) https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycling-and-walking-investment-strategy
1.1.6. To inform the LCWIP three DfT-recommended tools were also used, as follows:

- The Propensity to Cycle Tool (PCT): a website analysis tool\(^3\) which forecasts the potential future growth of cycle trips under different scenarios for travel to work and travel to school. The scenarios are based on journey to work data from the 2011 census and 2011 school census data respectively;
- The Route Selection Tool (RST), which assesses and compares the suitability of different routes for inclusion in a cycle network; and
- The Walking Route Audit Tool (WRAT), for auditing existing condition of walking routes.

1.2 LCWIP SCOPE

1.2.1. The Plan covers the whole of the Portsmouth authority area. As the urban area straddles authority boundaries and significant trip origins and destinations are located in neighbouring authorities, the Plan also considers movements to and from adjacent parts of Fareham, Gosport and Havant Boroughs and from the Isle of Wight. This is discussed further in Sections 2.3 and 2.5.

1.2.2. In line with the guidance, the Portsmouth LCWIP will cover a 10-year period and be subject to periodic updates.

1.3 LCWIP GOVERNANCE

1.3.1. The governance arrangements for the LCWIP are as follows:

- Portsmouth City Council Senior Responsible Officer – Felicity Tidbury;
- Portsmouth City Council Project Manager – Andrew Di Marco;
- Consultant Project Manager – James Purkiss, WSP;
- Portsmouth City Council technical expertise – Jo Hamment;
- Portsmouth City Council planning policy inputs – Dan Young and Tom Bell;
- Portsmouth City Council public health inputs - Dominique le Touze; and
- Portsmouth City Council technical support – Dan Hughes.

A working group, principally comprising those listed above, has met periodically to discuss progress and agree the approach at each stage of the LCWIP development.

\(^3\) [https://www.pct.bike/](https://www.pct.bike/)
2 EXISTING CONTEXT

2.1 DATA AND EVIDENCE COLLECTED FOR LCWIP

INTRODUCTION

2.1.1. The DfT technical guidance states that LCWIPs should be evidence-led. This chapter briefly summarises the current context in respect of:

- Plans, policies and strategies – these set out proposals for the future location of development and supporting infrastructure across the city;
- Significant current and future journey origins and destinations – this forms the basis for considering cycling and walking networks which can cater for anticipated travel demands;
- Existing cycling and walking network – summarising the infrastructure available and strategic physical barriers; and
- Existing cycling and walking travel patterns – publicly available data on journeys currently undertaken.

2.2 PLANS, POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

PLANNING POLICY

Adopted Planning Policy

2.2.1. The Portsmouth Plan is the city’s principal adopted planning policy document and was adopted in 2012. The Plan contains policies for a series of strategic sites for major development:

- Tipner – 1,250 new homes and 25,000sqm gross of B1 office development;
- Port Solent – approximately 500 new homes and 3.4ha for marina related operations;
- Horsea Island – approximately 500 new homes and new country park (the latter of which is now under construction);
- City Centre – at least 50,000sqm net of retail development, a minimum of 10,500sqm of office floorspace and supporting town centre uses; and
- North Harbour – around 69,000sqm of new B1 office floorspace.

2.2.2. The Portsmouth Plan is supported by other adopted planning policy. This includes Area Action Plans covering Southsea Town Centre and Somerstown & North Southsea and a series of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD), some of which cover specific parts of the city. The Seafront Masterplan SPD was adopted in 2010 and the City Centre Masterplan SPD was adopted in 2013.

2.2.3. A revised version of the Seafront Masterplan SPD is in preparation, with two rounds of public consultation taking place in 2018 and 2019. Walking and cycling is one of seven identified themes covered by the document. One of the identified opportunities is the creation of a fully segregated cycle route from Hayling ferry to Clarence Pier.

---

5 https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/development-and-planning/planning/area-action-plans
Replacement Portsmouth Plan

2.2.4. The review of the Portsmouth Plan is in progress and an Issues and Options Consultation was issued in 2017. It identified potential strategic sites expected to accommodate more than 250 dwellings or significant new employment floorspace, as follows:

- Strategic Site 1: Tipner (Tipner West, Tipner East and Tipner Firing Range) for significant levels of new housing;
- Strategic Site 2: Port Solent and Horsea Island, for employment floorspace;
- Strategic Site 3: St. James’ Hospital and Langstone Campus for new housing; and
- Strategic Site 4: Lakeside North Harbour for additional employment floorspace.

2.2.5. The consultation also identified six opportunity areas with the potential to accommodate additional development over the medium to long term. The identified areas were the City Centre, Cosham, North End, Fratton, Somerstown and The Seafront.

2.2.6. The 2017 consultation was followed in early 2019 with a consultation on the Future of Tipner & Horsea, which represents the largest area of undeveloped and underused land in the city. This noted that Tipner has the potential to deliver at least 1,200 to 2,200 dwellings, depending on development options. It also noted that Horsea Island may be more suitable for up to 25,000sqm of employment land rather than housing. The consultation identified the need for:

- new walking and cycling links throughout the surrounding area and to key destinations; and
- a new road and pedestrian bridge to link Tipner with Horsea Island, with measures to prevent rat running from Port Solent to the M275.

2.2.7. The regeneration of the Tipner Peninsula will represent the most ambitious expansion of the city in over a century. The concept masterplan is due to be completed in December 2019, with the full masterplan finalised by summer 2020. Recent indications are that the site could accommodate 1 million square feet of marine employment land and approximately 4,000 homes. The masterplan is intended to focus on creating a greener, walkable, new district for the city, with health and well-being at its core, supported by bespoke community, retail, and leisure facilities. Development is expected to commence in summer 2023.

2.2.8. Comments were also invited on a summary of evidence and supporting evidence papers during February and March 2019. The Transport Modelling and Transport Assessment Evidence Review published in 2018 considered the potential impacts of new development on congestion and traffic flow. It identified junctions where mitigating works may be required to address traffic impacts generated by new development. It also concluded that a bridge connecting Tipner and Horsea Island is feasible.

---

9 http://bidstats.uk/tenders/2019/W34/709361666
2.2.9. The *Health and Wellbeing Background Paper*\(^\text{11}\) identified transport and accessibility as one of the four health themes to be addressed in the new local plan. It noted that safe, attractive, convenient walking and cycling routes were a means by which the built environment can have a positive influence on creating healthy lifestyles and overcoming factors which would otherwise lead to obesity.

2.2.10. The *Green Infrastructure Background Paper*\(^\text{12}\) suggested that the new local plan should include a specific green infrastructure policy. It also recommended that green corridors should be identified across the city which link existing greenspaces and encourage more sustainable forms of transport. The paper included a plan illustrating a draft green grid of these corridors. The identified corridors are shown in Figure 2.1.

---


Figure 2.1 – Draft Green Grid

Note: This map is likely to be updated as the Local Plan progresses, with additional corridors identified or amended in response to consultation feedback.
Air Quality Local Plan

2.2.11. The City Council has declared five Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) for locations which are recorded to have levels of nitrogen dioxide which exceed the limits outlined in the National Air Quality Strategy. In response to this, an Air Quality Local Plan is being prepared\(^\text{13}\) to address the identified areas of poor air quality within the city.

2.2.12. The latest modelling data identifies two local road sections in central Portsmouth where modelled nitrogen dioxide concentrations are forecast to exceed the European Union limit (of 40.49 micrograms\(^\text{14}\) per square metre) in 2022. These are A3 Alfred Road (Unicorn Road to Queen Street) and A3 Commercial Road (south of Church Street). However, the Air Quality Local Plan study area covers the whole of Portsea Island.

2.2.13. The Air Quality Local Plan Outline Business Case\(^\text{15}\) was approved for submission to government at a special meeting of the Cabinet held on the 29\(^{\text{th}}\) October 2019. It proposes the following actions be taken to reduce levels of nitrogen dioxide and comply with at least the legal limit value in the shortest possible time:

- \text{A Class B Clean Air Zone, targeting taxis and private hire vehicles, buses, coaches and heavy goods vehicles which do not meet certain vehicle emissions standards, and covering a small area in the southwest of Portsea Island, along with:}
- Improvements to cycling infrastructure on LCWIP corridors assessed as being of most relevance to reducing vehicle emissions at exceedance locations and near exceedance locations;
- Amendments to Alfred Road / Anglesea Road / Bishop Crispian Way / Queen Street traffic signals;
- Parking measures; and
- A package of financial support, marketing and engagement activity.

TRANSPORT POLICY

Joint Strategy for South Hampshire

2.2.14. Local Transport Plan strategy and policy covering the sub-region is set out in the Joint Strategy for South Hampshire\(^\text{16}\). It was developed jointly by the three local transport authorities of Portsmouth City Council, Hampshire County Council, and Southampton City Council. The vision of the Solent Transport authorities is to create “A resilient, cost effective, fully-integrated sub-regional transport network, enabling economic growth whilst protecting and enhancing health, quality of life and environment”.

\(14\) A microgram is one millionth of a gram
\(15\) https://democracy.portsmouth.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=126&MID=4402#AI12234f
\(16\) http://www.southampton.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s5162
2.2.15. This vision will be delivered through the set of fourteen transport policies. Policies relevant to LCWIP and their delivery options are set out below:

- To deliver improvements in air quality;
- To improve road safety across the sub-region;
- To promote active travel modes and develop supporting infrastructure;
- To develop and deliver high-quality public realm improvements; and
- To safeguard and enable the future delivery of transport improvements within the Solent Transport area –
  - Investigating feasibility for provision of a bridge link from Tipner to Horsea Island (for all modes); and
  - Safeguarding land for new railway stations at certain locations, for example at Farlington.

2.2.16. The City Council produces annual Implementation Plans which set out how capital resources allocated to transport will be spent. The 2019/20 Implementation Plan\textsuperscript{17} includes citywide expenditure on Early Release Low Level Cycle Signals, Milton Rd / Priory Crescent Junction / crossing improvements and junction improvements at Guildhall Walk / Alec Rose Lane.

**Portsmouth Rights of Way Improvement Plan**

2.2.17. This statutory plan\textsuperscript{18} contains 33 potential actions grouped around five issues. In terms of cycling and walking infrastructure, it identifies the following actions (references in brackets):

- Improve directional signs for key routes and destinations (2.2);
- Work with Network Rail to ensure that railway bridges are suitable for all user groups when they are renewed or replaced (3.1);
- When road bridges are renewed or replaced, work to ensure that access for all user groups is considered (3.2);
- Review road crossing facilities to determine where improved crossings can be created and make improvements (3.3)
- Consult and respond to planning documents to investigate improved crossing facilities and bridges, such as that proposed to link Tipner and Port Solent, and promote access for all user groups (3.4);
- Continue to develop Portsmouth’s 20mph speed limits to reduce traffic speeds and make road crossing safer (3.5);
- Work with user groups and land managers to identify priority routes that can be improved and developed (4.1);
- Work with users and user groups to identify barriers, problems and opportunities for improving existing routes (4.3);
- Investigate whether gaps in the rights of way network can be improved to enhance continuity (4.5); and
- Investigate how improved access to the seafront can be created for the benefit of all user groups through the seafront strategy (5.5).

2.2.18. Version 2.0 of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan is currently in development, with the current document based on a plan period ending in 2017.

\textsuperscript{17} https://democracy.portsmouth.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=176&MId=4224&Ver=4
\textsuperscript{18} https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/trv-rightsofway-improvementplan.pdf
INVESTMENT PLANS

Solent Transport Delivery Plan

2.2.19. The Transport Delivery Plan was prepared by the four Solent Transport authorities and was published in 2013. It was developed from the Sub-Regional Transport Model Evidence Base. It identifies the prioritised transport schemes and interventions needed to support economic growth over the period to 2026.

Solent Strategic Transport Investment Plan

2.2.20. The Solent Strategic Transport Investment Plan was published by the Local Enterprise Partnership in 2016. It covers the period to 2040 and prioritises economically transformative strategic transport and longer-term investment projects.

Transforming Cities Fund

2.2.21. Portsmouth City Council and Hampshire County Council were one of twelve city regions shortlisted to bid for a share of the DfT’s £1.28 billion Transforming Cities Fund, for public transport improvements across South Hampshire. The authorities were successful in winning £4m of Tranche 1 funding. £2.6m of this will be invested in three junction improvements in Portsmouth and Real Time Information installation at bus stops across Portsmouth, Havant and Waterlooville. A further £1.4m will be used to support the extension of the existing Eclipse bus route in Gosport. A further, larger funding bid for Tranche 2 monies will be submitted in November 2019.

Future High Streets Fund

2.2.22. Portsmouth City Council submitted two expressions of interest to government for money from this £1bn national fund to regenerate the Commercial Road and Fratton retail areas. It was announced on the 26th August 2019 that both areas have been shortlisted. Shortlisted locations will each receive up to £150,000 to support the development of detailed project proposals that can be submitted for capital funding of up to £25m per location.

Coastal Defence Schemes

2.2.23. A series of coastal defence schemes are being progressed to implement the Portsea Island Coastal Strategy Study and defend the city from flooding. The planning application for the Southsea Coastal Defence Scheme was submitted in August 2019. The submitted scheme proposes to widen the majority of the pedestrian promenade, and relocate, amend or install new pedestrian crossings. In broad terms it also proposes a two-way cycle lane on Eastney Esplanade segregated from traffic by a kerbline, a contraflow cycle lane adjacent to the landward side of Clarence Esplanade and advisory cycle lanes on South Parade.

---

19 Hampshire County Council, Isle of Wight Council, Portsmouth City Council and Southampton City Council
23 http://publicaccess.portsmouth.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&key=PUQYOMOHVP00
2.2.24. Phase 4a North Portsea Island Coastal Defence Scheme, granted planning permission in 2019\textsuperscript{24}, includes the construction of an earth embankment with footway on the crest adjacent to Kendall's Wharf on Eastern Road. Phase 4b will include the construction of a seawall along 2.4km of the Eastern Road and is also understood to include pedestrian routes, with a planning application submitted in September 2019.

**OTHER DOCUMENTS**

2.2.25. The City Council has five corporate priorities as follows:

- Make Portsmouth a city that works together, enabling communities to thrive and people to live healthy, safe and independent lives;
- Encourage regeneration built around our city’s thriving culture, making Portsmouth a great place to live, work and visit;
- Make our city cleaner, safer and greener;
- Make Portsmouth a great place to live, learn and play, so our children and young people are safe, healthy and positive about their futures; and
- Make sure our council is a caring, competent and collaborative organisation that puts people at the heart of everything we do.

2.2.26. At the Full Council meeting on the 19\textsuperscript{th} March 2019 councillors adopted a notice of motion to declare a climate emergency in Portsmouth\textsuperscript{25}. On 24\textsuperscript{th} July 2019 the Cabinet approved proposals to respond the declaration of the climate emergency.

2.2.27. The *A City to Share* was published by Portsmouth Cycling Campaign in 2014\textsuperscript{26} and subsequently adopted by the City Council. It has the vision for Portsmouth to become the pre-eminent cycling city of the UK. It sets five objectives: a safer city; improved health outcomes; a stronger local economy; a better environment and a fairer, more liveable city - with a series of short and long-term actions against each objective.

2.2.28. The strategy included the following infrastructure-related actions:

- Develop protected superhighways for cyclists serving the major routes into the city in the West, Centre and East of the Island following or mirroring the A-roads that provide access for motorists, providing similar direct and uninterrupted connectivity that motorists enjoy. These will offer physical measures to prevent collisions between cyclists, motorists and pedestrians;
- Develop the north-south cycle superhighways into network of direct, high capacity, joined-up consistent cycle tracks. These will provide connectivity to residential streets giving safe cycle access to every property. This will include Dutch-style fully segregated lanes and junctions; mandatory cycle lanes, semi-segregated from traffic; and a network of direct back street Quietway routes on our 20mph residential streets;
- Implement a network of direct, high capacity, joined-up consistent cycle tracks designed to safely accommodate the young, the old and the less able-bodied as well as fit adult cyclists;
- Develop visitor hubs for cyclists with provision for cycling storage and designated cycle paths suitable for all in green areas e.g. Baffins Pond, Hilsea Lines;

\textsuperscript{24} [http://publicaccess.portsmouth.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=PQTZJMOG1H00&activeTab=summary](http://publicaccess.portsmouth.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=PQTZJMOG1H00&activeTab=summary)
\textsuperscript{26} [https://acitytoshare.org/](https://acitytoshare.org/)
- Develop quietways and greenways following the city’s coastlines and connecting to visitor destinations. As flood defences are renewed cycle routes will be integrated along the coast of the island; and
- Consult on Mini-Holland schemes in Town Centres (e.g. Southsea, North End, Cosham) to become hubs for visitors walking, cycling and arriving by bus.

2.2.29. Stakeholders have also published documents outlining their vision for walking and cycling in the city, as follows:
- London Road Cycle Inspiration Study (Cycling UK 2018)\(^{27}\); and
- Streets for People (Portsmouth Friends of the Earth, 2019)\(^{28}\).

2.3 **SIGNIFICANT CURRENT AND FUTURE JOURNEY ORIGINS AND DESTINATIONS**

2.3.1. The LCWIP technical guidance notes that:
- identifying demand for a planned cycle network should start by mapping the main origin and destination points; and
- the first recommended step for mapping a future walking network involves identifying and clustering origin and destination points.

**ORIGINS**

2.3.2. The LCWIP technical guidance notes that trips usually originate from the main residential areas. Census output areas were chosen to represent journey origins from existing residential areas. Output areas are an existing category of statistical geography created by the Office for National Statistics (ONS)\(^{29}\). The ONS choose output area boundaries to ensure each one has a similar population and are as socially homogenous as possible based on tenure of household and dwelling type.

2.3.3. Mid-layer super output areas (MSOAs) were chosen for the LCWIP methodology. These are statistical areas which had populations of between 5,000 and 15,000 at the time of the 2011 census. 25 MSOAs cover Portsmouth (see Figure 2.2). For each output area the ONS creates a single node point known as population-weighted centroids. These centroids form part of an existing ONS dataset, and are nodes located to reflect where the majority of people live within the output area. The centroids were used to represent the start location of journeys from all homes within an output area.

2.3.4. Additional node points were created to represent journeys from homes proposed to be developed in growth areas identified in the adopted and emerging local plan, as follows:
- Horsea Island;
- Port Solent;
- Tipner;
- Langstone Campus / St. James’ Hospital sites; and
- City Centre.

\(^{27}\) [https://issuu.com/witteveenbos/docs/portsmouth_cycling_uk](https://issuu.com/witteveenbos/docs/portsmouth_cycling_uk)
\(^{28}\) [https://portsmouthfoe.files.wordpress.com/2019/03/report-streets-for-people.pdf](https://portsmouthfoe.files.wordpress.com/2019/03/report-streets-for-people.pdf)
\(^{29}\) [https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/geography/ukgeographies/censusgeography](https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/geography/ukgeographies/censusgeography)
2.3.5. As highlighted in section 1.2, there was also a need to consider cross-boundary journeys from neighbouring authorities, particularly in respect of cycling journeys. There are significant numbers of movements made from origins in Fareham, Gosport and Havant authority areas and from the Isle of Wight to destinations in Portsmouth. Travel into the city from surrounding authorities were represented in the LCWIP methodology by seven additional origin nodes for different directions of travel, as follows:

- From the Isle of Wight via Wightlink;
- From Gosport via the Gosport Ferry;
- From Fareham and Portchester via road connections north of Portsmouth Harbour;
- From Waterlooville and other settlements along the A3 corridor;
- From Leigh Park and northern Havant;
- From south Havant; and
- From Hayling Island via the Hayling Ferry.

2.3.6. These seven nodes were used to represent all journeys from a surrounding hinterland up to 5km from the City Council boundary. 5km was considered to be a suitable threshold to represent short distance utility journeys which could be made by new or returning cyclists.

2.3.7. Table 2.1 sets out the hinterland output areas whose cross-boundary journeys into Portsmouth were represented by each node.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin Node</th>
<th>Constituent output areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gosport</td>
<td>Gosport 001 to 010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareham and Portchester</td>
<td>Fareham 008, 010 and 012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterlooville</td>
<td>Havant 003, 004, 005, 007 and 011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Park</td>
<td>Havant 006, 008, 009, 010 and 018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Havant</td>
<td>Havant 014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayling Island</td>
<td>Havant 015, 016 and 017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>Isle of Wight 001, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 010 and 014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.2 - Origins used in the LCWIP methodology
DESTINATIONS

2.3.8. A number of destination categories were chosen to represent a range of journeys made by different people in the city. The DfT guidance identifies that when planning cycle networks for larger geographical areas, it may be appropriate to include only the most significant trip generators. Destinations were therefore chosen on the basis of their likely significant trip generation potential. The schedule of chosen destinations used for the network planning is shown in Table 2.2 overleaf. More local destinations such as primary schools, GP surgeries and shopping parades tend to be located in each neighbourhood, and are represented by the residential origins. Potential neighbourhood-level measures to enable more walking and cycling to local destinations are summarised in paragraph 7.3.16.

2.3.9. In similarity to journey origins, consideration was also given to cross-boundary journeys made by Portsmouth residents to strategic destinations in neighbouring authorities, particularly in respect of cycling journeys. These were represented in the LCWIP methodology by seven additional destination nodes for different directions of travel, as follows:

- To the Isle of Wight via the ferries and hovercraft;
- To Gosport via the Gosport Ferry;
- To Fareham and Portchester via road connections north of Portsmouth Harbour;
- To the Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (DSTL) and associated employment on Portsdown Hill in the Winchester authority area;
- To Waterlooville and other settlements along the A3 corridor;
- To Leigh Park and northern Havant;
- To south Havant and Langstone Technology Park.
### Table 2.2 – Schedule of Destinations within Portsmouth authority area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Employment Areas</th>
<th>Centres and Other Major Retail</th>
<th>Leisure attractions</th>
<th>Transport interchanges</th>
<th>Major education facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Oak Business Park</td>
<td>City Centre (Commercial Road)</td>
<td>Clarence Pier</td>
<td>Cosham Rail Station</td>
<td>Portsmouth University (city centre campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzherbert Road industrial area, Farlington</td>
<td>Gunwharf Quays</td>
<td>Fratton Park (Portsmouth Football Club)</td>
<td>Fratton Rail Station</td>
<td>Portsmouth College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fratton Park / St Mary’s Hospital area</td>
<td>Southsea Town Centre (Palmerston Road)</td>
<td>Guildhall</td>
<td>Hilsea Rail Station</td>
<td>Highbury College (two campuses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre including Civic Offices and Guildhall Square</td>
<td>District Centres – Albert Road &amp; Elm Grove, Cosham, Fratton, North End</td>
<td>Horsea Island Country Park (proposed)</td>
<td>Portsmouth Harbour Rail Station</td>
<td>Secondary Schools:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Road / Castle Trading Estate, Portchester</td>
<td>Fratton Park retail area</td>
<td>Mountbatten Centre</td>
<td>Portsmouth Harbour Rail Station / Gosport Ferry / Isle of Wight Ferry</td>
<td>- Charter Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton Road</td>
<td>Ocean Retail Park</td>
<td>Portsmouth Historic Dockyard</td>
<td>Portsmouth &amp; Southsea Rail Station</td>
<td>- Admiral Lord Nelson School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilsea Industrial Estate</td>
<td>Sainsbury’s Farlington</td>
<td>Old Portsmouth</td>
<td>The Hard Interchange</td>
<td>- Mayfield School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside North Harbour / HMRC</td>
<td>Tesco Cosham</td>
<td>Southsea Common</td>
<td>Hayling Ferry</td>
<td>- Miltoncross Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth Naval Base</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southsea Seafront / Southsea Castle / Blue Reef / D Day Museum</td>
<td>Clarence Pier (Hoverport)</td>
<td>- Priory School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qinetic Technology Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Parade Pier</td>
<td></td>
<td>- The Portsmouth Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Alexandra Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Portsmouth Grammar School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton Park / Railway Triangle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- St. Edmund's Catholic School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whale Island Naval Base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- St. John's College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Trafalgar/UTC Portsmouth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.3 – Destinations used in the LCWIP methodology
2.4 EXISTING CYCLING AND WALKING NETWORK

EXISTING NETWORK

2.4.1. In broad terms the network of routes available for cycling is comprised of:
- the carriageways of the city’s roads and streets, either mixed together with other vehicles or with cycle lanes delineated by road markings;
- routes parallel to and physically protected from motor traffic, such as by kerbs, and sometimes shared with pedestrians; and
- traffic-free routes, such as across open spaces, and again, sometimes shared with pedestrians.

2.4.2. A range of factors determines the suitability of a route for cycling and the current suitability of routes varies by location. Chapter 7 describes how the suitability of the LCWIP prioritised cycle routes was assessed against criteria.

2.4.3. The network of routes available for walking comprises footways adjacent to carriageways, plus traffic-free routes, such as routes through parks, pedestrianised streets and links within residential estates. It includes the 8km of public rights of way which exist within the authority. In some locations space is shared with cyclists. The quality and suitability of the walking network varies by location; Chapter 7 describes how the suitability of walking routes was assessed as part of the LCWIP.

2.4.4. The network available for cycling and walking is illustrated on the City Council’s Active Travel Map. Public rights of way plans are also published online.

PHYSICAL BARRIERS TO CYCLING AND WALKING MOVEMENT

2.4.5. A high-level mapping exercise was undertaken in consultation with City Council officers to identify the strategic physical barriers to cycling and walking movements across the city and key missing links. These are shown in Figure 2.4. The plan also identifies existing locations where the barriers may be crossed, differentiating between those crossing points which are step-free and those which are not.
Figure 2.4 – Strategic Barriers to Walking and Cycling Movement
2.5 EXISTING CYCLING AND WALKING TRAVEL PATTERNS

2.5.1. The main publicly available datasets on cycling and walking travel patterns are described below.

CENSUS 2011 DATA

2.5.2. The census collects data on mode of travel to work, plus home location and employment destination. The ONS aggregated this data and it is reported for journeys between each MSOA\(^{32}\). Whilst the data is now eight years old it provides a comprehensive dataset.

2.5.3. The PCT website\(^{33}\) displays the cycle to work flow data interactively. It indicates that in 2011 the highest reported cycle commuting flows were radial journeys to and from neighbourhoods on Portsea Island to the city centre and Naval Base (see Table 2.3). In terms of cross-boundary flows, the census also recorded 1,096 cycle to work trips into Portsmouth from Gosport Borough, 329 from Havant Borough, 300 from Fareham District and 58 from the Isle of Wight. As the census required respondents to name their main mode of travel, this may under-report levels of cycling to work which are part of a longer journey, such as by ferry.

Table 2.3 – Census 2011 Cycling to work flows of greater than 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination MSOA (key employment in MSOA in brackets)</th>
<th>Origin MSOA (main residential areas in brackets)</th>
<th>Number of recorded journeys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth 016 (City Centre, Portsea and Naval Base)</td>
<td>Portsmouth 012 (Copnor / Buckland (Powerscourt Road area))</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portsmouth 014 (Baffins)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portsmouth 015 (Between Fratton Road and railway line)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portsmouth 016 (City Centre and Portsea)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portsmouth 017 (Milton)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2011 Table WU03EW

2.5.4. The Datashine Commute website\(^{34}\) displays MSOA level travel to work data interactively for each mode. This indicates that the highest recorded levels of walking were to the city centre and naval base, with other important flows to Gunwharf Quays and key employment in Cosham.

---

\(^{32}\) https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/wu03ew

\(^{33}\) http://pct.bike/m/?r=hampshire

\(^{34}\) https://commute.datashine.org.uk/
Table 2.4 – Census 2011 Walking to work flows of greater than 250

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination MSOA (key employment in MSOA in brackets)</th>
<th>Origin MSOA (main residential areas in brackets)</th>
<th>Number of recorded journeys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth 002 (Queen Alexandra Hospital, Cosham district centre and Southampton Road employment areas)</td>
<td>Portsmouth 002 (East Paulsgrove)</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth 015 (Between Fratton Road and railway line)</td>
<td></td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth 016 (City Centre and Portsea)</td>
<td></td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth 018 (Somers Town)</td>
<td></td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth 019 (between Goldsmith Avenue and Highland Road)</td>
<td></td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth 020 (Southsea north of Albert Road)</td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth 022 (Southsea south of Elm Grove)</td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth 024 (Gunwharf Quays and Old Portsmouth)</td>
<td></td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth 024 (Gunwharf Quays and Old Portsmouth)</td>
<td>Portsmouth 024 (Gunwharf Quays and Old Portsmouth)</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2011 Table WU03EW

SCHOOLS CENSUS 2011

2.5.5. Until 2011 the statutory schools census collected information on pupils’ usual, main mode of travel to school\[35\]. The Department for Education collated this data to identify origin-destination flows at Lower Super Output Area scale. These are smaller areas of statistical geography which had populations of between 1,000 and 3,000 at the time of the 2011 census. The PCT was further developed during 2019 to display this travel school data; however the network planning for the Portsmouth LCWIP was already completed by this stage.

2.5.6. The most significant cycling flows to schools (greater than 50 pupils) are summarised below:

- Admiral Lord Nelson School: 121 pupils usually cycling to school, with the greatest share originating from residential areas west of the railway, via Burrfields Road;
- City of Portsmouth Boys’ School (now Trafalgar School), Hilsea: 81 pupils usually cycling to school, mostly originating to the south, in neighbourhoods either side of London Road; and
- Springfield Secondary School, Drayton: 72 pupils usually cycling to school, mostly from the Drayton and Cosham areas.

\[35\] ‘Usual’ mode of travel was defined as that used most frequently by the pupil throughout the year, and ‘main’ mode defined as that used for the longest distance
COMMENTARY

2.5.7. The data sources referred to above represent the most comprehensive publicly available information on cycling and walking flows. However, the data is now eight years old and does not cover journeys made for purposes other than travel to work and travel to school. Therefore it excludes travel to shops, local facilities, to visit friends and family, trips made as part of work and so on.

2.5.8. The National Travel Survey 2018\textsuperscript{36} indicates that:

- In respect of cycling, commuting and travel to school (including adults accompanying children) accounted for 35% and 6% of travel respectively. Leisure trips (visiting friends at home and elsewhere, entertainment, sport, holiday and day trip) were equally as important a trip purpose as popular as commuting; and
- In respect of walking, commuting and travel to school (including adults accompanying children) accounted for 8% and 19% of travel respectively. The greatest proportion of trips were made for shopping (22%) and leisure (visiting friends at home and elsewhere, entertainment, sport, holiday and day trip).

OTHER DATA SOURCES

2.5.9. Traffic counts are undertaken on selected roads across the city. They tend to be carried out either by the DfT as part of a national data collection exercise, by the City Council, usually to inform specific studies, or by planning applicants preparing planning applications.

2.5.10. Annual average daily flow data for the year to date\textsuperscript{37} on the numbers of cyclists at selected count points in the city are reported below (two-way flows):

- A2030 Eastern Road: 336;
- A27 Southampton Road west of Port Way: 254;
- A288 South Parade, Southsea: 254;
- A3 London Road, north of Military Road: 144;
- Eastern Road shared-use path (South of Sword Sands Path): 443;
- Eastern Road shared-use path (south of waterbridge): 472;
- Sydenham Terrace shared-use path: 887; and
- Unicorn Road underpass: 198

2.5.11. Traffic counts tend not to survey numbers of pedestrians. Many are carried out on more major roads, which may be avoided by some cyclists and pedestrians. In addition, as there may be several route options available to cyclists between any given origin and destination, a single traffic count may not capture all cycle journeys.

\textsuperscript{36} NTS 0409
\textsuperscript{37} 2019 data for the period up to and including 19 November 2019
2.5.12. Some data on footfall (pedestrian counts) is collected for the retail centres of Commercial Road, Palmerston Road (Southsea) and High Street, Cosham. This is reported in the Portsmouth Retail & Town Centres local plan background paper published in 2019. Annual footfall figures for the financial year 2017/2018 were as follows:

- Commercial Road (Primark): 10,128,304;
- Palmerston Road (northern end): 4,783,530; and

Data for the last three years indicates that footfall on Commercial Road and Palmerston Road has declined but in Cosham footfall showed a slight increase between 2016/2017 and 2017/2018.

3 NETWORK PLANNING FOR CYCLING (DESIRE LINES)

3.1 METHODOLOGY

3.1.1. The DfT technical guidance states that identifying demand for a planned network should start by mapping the main origin and destination points across the geographical area to be covered by the LCWIP.

ORIGINS

3.1.2. The cycle network planning used the origins shown on Figure 2.2.

DESTINATIONS

3.1.3. The cycle network planning used the destinations shown on Figure 2.3. To simplify the origin-destination analysis, destinations located in close proximity to each other were clustered. The resulting clusters are shown on Figure 3.1. Each cluster had a single node to represent journeys to and from all the constituent destinations within the cluster.

3.2 DESIRE LINES

3.2.1. In order to identify a network of strategic cycling corridors covering the whole of the plan area, origins and destinations were connected with desire lines. Desire lines are crow-fly straight line connections between origins and destinations and are not initially mapped to existing roads or cycle routes (see chapter 6 for this step in the process). Three different methods were used to identify these, as follows:

- Method 1 – corridors with highest forecast future cycle commuting flows;
- Method 2 – corridors with significant demand for short distance trips to a range of destinations; and
- Method 3 – additional corridors which would provide network coverage across the plan area.

These methods were used as a guide and not an absolute in considering the draft cycle network.
METHOD 1

3.2.2. The PCT’s Government Target (Equality) scenario was used to identify the highest forecast future cycle commuting flows within the plan area. The government target is to double the number of cycling stages made per year over the period between 2013 and 2025. The PCT models how the number of commuting cycling trips might increase across England, based on the length and hilliness of commuting journeys recorded in the 2011 census. The growth in cycling is evenly distributed by age group, by gender, and other socio-demographic factors. This method identified a series of radial routes from neighbourhoods on Portsea Island into the city centre as having the highest forecast future cycle flows.

3.2.3. This method has a number of limitations. As it is based on 2011 census travel to work data, it does not consider trips for any other purposes, such as to education or shops. Additionally, trips to development which has taken place since 2011 or future development will not be included. Lastly, two-stage trips, such as to rail stations, will not be included.

METHOD 2

3.2.4. Origins and destinations were connected to each other with straight ‘desire lines’ to identify key trends in demand. A 5km threshold was applied to the desire lines to focus on short-distance utility trips. Origins were connected to all the destinations listed in Table 2.2 within 5km. The exceptions were district centres or other major retail area (retail parks and supermarkets), where each origin was only connected to the nearest example of that destination category.

METHOD 3

3.2.5. Having identified a series of corridors using the two methods above, the final approach considered a coherent strategic network for the full plan area. This process ensured that connections to key destinations were provided from each residential neighbourhood.

PROPOSED STRATEGIC CYCLING NETWORK

3.2.6. The proposed strategic cycling network is a composite of the three methods, based on forecast future commuter cycling flows, corridors with likely high demand for short-distance cycle trips to a range of destinations and ensuring balanced network coverage. The result of this is shown in Figure 3.2.
Figure 3.2 – Proposed Strategic Cycling Network (Straight Line Corridors)
4 NETWORK PLANNING FOR WALKING

4.1 CORE WALKING ZONES AND KEY WALKING ROUTES

4.1.1. The LCWIP guidance states that, in planning for walking, local authorities should identify:

- Core Walking Zones; and
- Key Walking Routes.

The guidance gives authorities flexibility in the way they define these zones and routes. The process adopted for Portsmouth referred to the footway hierarchy concept outlined in the Roads Liaison Group document entitled *Well-Managed Highway Infrastructure*.40

4.1.2. Table 4.1 describes how the Code of Practice categories informed the choice of Core Walking Zones and Key Walking Routes. Figure 4.1 illustrates the chosen Key Walking Routes and Core Walking Zone boundaries. These boundaries and routes were developed in consultation with City Council officers.

4.1.3. The extent of the Core Walking Zones were based on the city, town and district centre boundaries identified in adopted development plan policies PCS4, STC2 and PCS8. The services sports grounds at Burnaby Road were excluded from the Tier 1 Core Walking Zone boundary. Routes which connected major residential areas to the strategic destinations were chosen as the Key Walking Routes.

Table 4.1 – Identification of Core Walking Zones and Key Walking Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated Core Walking Zone</th>
<th>Centres and retailing</th>
<th>Equivalent Code of Practice Hierarchy Category and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 Core Walking Zone</td>
<td>City Centre (Commercial Road, University, Gunwharf Quays)</td>
<td>Prestige Walking Zones - Very busy areas of towns and cities with high public space and streetscene contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2 Core Walking Zone</td>
<td>Southsea town centre (Palmerston Road) Albert Road / Elm Grove district centre Cosham district centre Fratton district centre North End district centre</td>
<td>Primary Walking Routes - Busy urban shopping and business areas and main pedestrian routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Walking Routes</td>
<td>Main pedestrian routes across the rest of the city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 4.1 – Core Walking Zones and Key Walking Routes
5 PRIORITISING ROUTES FOR DEVELOPMENT

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1. The maps in Chapters 3 and 4 indicate a strategic network of routes for walking and cycling respectively covering the whole city. The LCWIP guidance states that these routes should be audited to determine where improvements are required. A prioritisation process was used to determine an initial list of routes for auditing.

5.1.2. A balanced set of prioritisation criteria were chosen. The criteria covered the following themes:

- Existing and potential future cycling demand;
- Strategic transport projects and priorities;
- Economy;
- Education;
- Housing; and
- Public health.

The criteria, the data used and parameters applied are set out in Table 5.1.

5.1.3. Reference numbers were assigned to the cycling corridors for the prioritisation process. As the chosen criteria for cycling routes included existing and potential cycling flows, the prioritisation process needed to be able to capture all relevant origin-destination travel flows. A single reference was therefore given to each desire line corridor (e.g. from Hayling Ferry to Gosport), rather than shorter sections of route. Many of the corridor references overlap with each other for part of their length.

5.1.4. Each Key Walking Route was disaggregated into sections, usually from the connection point with one key walking route to the connecting point with another, and not more than 2km in length. This aligned to 2km distance threshold for Key Walking Routes in LCWIP guidance. These sections were also assigned a reference number.

5.1.5. Each cycling corridor or section of Key Walking Route was then scored against the criteria. The cycling desire line corridors varied in length significantly. To ensure that the prioritisation process did not favour longer distance routes (which would tend to intersect with more homes, key employment areas, and so on), the results were reported on a ‘per kilometre’ basis for the majority of the criteria. Where the criteria resulted in low numbers or binary results (e.g. yes / no answers) these were scored for the route as a whole. The Key Walking Routes were of more consistent lengths and so were considered as a full route.

---

41 As inferred in para. 2.5.9 and in common with many UK areas, there is currently limited available data on footfall across the city.
### Table 5.1 – Prioritisation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Data used</th>
<th>Threshold applied</th>
<th>Cycling prioritisation</th>
<th>Walking prioritisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current and future potential trip making</td>
<td>Existing number of cycle journeys (commuting)</td>
<td>Census 2011 travel to work by bicycle</td>
<td>Origin and destination pairs are within 800m of the route (based on population-weighted centroids)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential future additional cycle journeys (commuting)</td>
<td>Propensity to Cycle Tool Government Target (Equality) cycling growth scenario</td>
<td>Origin and destination pairs are within 800m of the route (based on population-weighted centroids)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing and potential future number of walking journeys</td>
<td>Walking network categories (Tier 1 Core Walking Zone, Tier 2 Core Walking Zone)</td>
<td>Route is within 400m of Tier 1 Core Walking Zone / Tier 2 Core Walking Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Proximity to AQMAs (as part of measures to reduce car use, and vehicle emissions, in areas with poor air quality)</td>
<td>Extent of AQMAs in the city</td>
<td>Number of AQMAs within 400m of route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving transport links to and from deprived communities</td>
<td>Number of MSOAs which are within the top 20% most deprived areas in England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>MSOAs which are wholly or partially within 400m of a route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addressing road safety issues</td>
<td>Recorded Numbers of Killed or Seriously Injured from road collisions</td>
<td>Number of Killed or Seriously Injured cyclists within 400m of a route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Killed or Seriously Injured pedestrians within 400m of a route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Data used</td>
<td>Threshold applied</td>
<td>Cycling prioritisation</td>
<td>Walking prioritisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Proximity to coastal defence schemes</td>
<td>Proposed extent of remaining elements of North Portsea Island Coastal Scheme (phases 4 and 5) and Southsea Coastal Scheme</td>
<td>Proposed coastal defence scheme is within 400m of route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-boundary routes</td>
<td>Local authority boundary</td>
<td>Route crosses local authority boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity to Future High Streets bid area</td>
<td>Future High Streets bid area (Commercial Road area and Fratton district centre)</td>
<td>Number of bid areas within 400m of route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity to South East Hampshire Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Proposed South East Hampshire Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Route is within 400m of South East Hampshire Rapid Transit proposed infrastructure scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity to transport hubs</td>
<td>Locations of rail stations, The Hard Interchange, ferries, hoverport and International Ferryport</td>
<td>Number of transport hubs within 400m of route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Proximity to businesses</td>
<td>All entries in the Local Land &amp; Property Gazetteer with Basic Land and Property Unit codes CI (industrial), CL (leisure), CM (medical), CN (animal centre), CO (office) and CS (storage).</td>
<td>Number of gazetteer entries within 400m of route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major Employers Map Five size categories – 50-99, 100-249, 250-499, 500-999 and 1000+</td>
<td>Number of major employers within 400m of the route (weighted by size)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Data used</th>
<th>Threshold applied</th>
<th>Cycling prioritisation</th>
<th>Walking prioritisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to retail units</td>
<td>Number of gazetteer entries within 400m of route</td>
<td>Number of gazetteer entries within 400m of route</td>
<td>Number of gazetteer entries within 400m of route</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure attractions served</td>
<td>Number of leisure attractions within 400m of route</td>
<td>Number of leisure attractions within 400m of route</td>
<td>Number of leisure attractions within 400m of route</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth International Port</td>
<td>Route is within 400m of Portsmouth International Port</td>
<td>Route is within 400m of Portsmouth International Port</td>
<td>Route is within 400m of Portsmouth International Port</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Number of pupils/students enrolled at establishments within 400m of the route</td>
<td>Number of pupils/students enrolled at establishments within 400m of the route</td>
<td>Number of pupils/students enrolled at establishments within 400m of the route</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing homes</td>
<td>Number of additional homes within 400m of route</td>
<td>Number of additional homes within 400m of route</td>
<td>Number of additional homes within 400m of route</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed additional homes</td>
<td>Net yield of forecast additional homes within 400m of route (where information available). Where no information available housing unit yield estimated by multiplying site area by likely development density.</td>
<td>Net yield of forecast additional homes within 400m of route (where information available). Where no information available housing unit yield estimated by multiplying site area by likely development density.</td>
<td>Net yield of forecast additional homes within 400m of route (where information available). Where no information available housing unit yield estimated by multiplying site area by likely development density.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 PRIORITISATION RESULTS – CYCLING DESIRE LINE CORRIDORS

5.2.1. Each cycling desire line corridor was ranked based on its score. Based on the prioritisation scores, it was decided that for this iteration of the LCWIP eleven cycling corridors would be taken forward for further development. These eleven corridors were considered to give a reasonable geographic coverage across the city and cater for a range of potential journeys. Table 5.2 below outlines the highest scoring cycling corridors taken forward for further development.

Table 5.2 – Schedule of Prioritised Cycling Desire Line Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Queen Alexandra Hospital, Cosham &amp; City Centre</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>Fareham to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre &amp; Southsea Town Centre</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Southsea Seafront to Naval Dockyard via City Centre</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>Eastney to Naval Dockyard</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) &amp; City Centre</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>DSTL / North Portchester to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre &amp; Southsea Town Centre</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Havant to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) &amp; City Centre</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>Gosport to Portsmouth College via City Centre</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9=</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Leigh Park to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) &amp; City Centre</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9=</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>Gosport to Southsea Seafront via University and Albert Road</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>Gosport to Hayling Island via City Centre, Fratton and St. James' Hospital / Langstone Campus development sites</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2. Figure 5.1 illustrates the location and distribution of the highest scoring cycling corridors taken forward for further development. It is intended that other corridors illustrated on Figure 3.2 will be developed and improved in subsequent iterations of the LCWIP, or as funding opportunities arise. There will also be a requirement to consider how other destinations can be served by the city’s cycle network, such as primary schools, health centres, other shopping parades and other facilities. Providing these connections may form a secondary and/or tertiary cycle network for the city.
Figure 5.1 – Highest Scoring Cycling Corridors For Further Development
5.3 PRIORITISATION RESULTS – KEY WALKING ROUTES

5.3.1. Each Key Walking Route was ranked based on its score when assessed against the prioritisation criteria. Table 5.3 outlines the outcome of this prioritisation and the Key Walking Routes to be taken forward for further development. To ensure a balance of locations, these comprised the five highest scoring Key Walking Routes within or connecting to the city centre area, and the five highest scoring Key Walking Routes elsewhere across the authority.

Table 5.3 – Prioritised Key Walking Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Commercial Road and Lake Road (Edinburgh Road to Fratton Road)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Arundel Street (Commercial Road to Fratton Road)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Isambard Brunel Road, Greetham Street, Raglan Street and Sydenham Terrace (Commercial Road to Fratton Road)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>King Henry I Street and Park Road (Guildhall Square to Gunwharf Quays entrance)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Walkway connecting library and courts, Middle Street, Eldon Street and Norfolk Street (Guildhall Square to King’s Road)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Kingston Road and Fratton Road (Kingston Crescent to Lake Road)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>London Road (Copnor Road to Angerstein Road)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fratton Bridge, Fawcett Road and Lawrence Road (Selbourne Terrace to Albert Road)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3=</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Grove Road South and Palmerston Road (Elm Grove to Clarence Parade)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>London Road (Angerstein Road to Kingston Crescent)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2. Figure 5.2 illustrates the location of the ten prioritised Key Walking Routes taken forward for audit. It is intended that other Key Walking Routes illustrated on Figure 4.1 will be developed in subsequent iterations of the LCWIP, or as funding opportunities arise.
Figure 5.2 – Location and Distribution of Prioritised Key Walking Routes
6 NETWORK PLANNING FOR CYCLING (ROUTE SELECTION)

6.1 INTRODUCTION

6.1.1. Following the prioritisation process, the cycling desire lines were mapped to existing roads and cycle routes. The LCWIP guidance highlights that the clear preference will usually be the most direct route between the origin and destination. It adds that in some cases there may be more than one potential route between origin and destination points or a reason why the most direct route is not suitable for cycling.

6.2 SELECTING ROUTES FOR AUDIT

6.2.1. A combination of online cycle route planning tools combined with City Council officers’ local knowledge were used to map desire lines to existing available routes across the city. In some cases a significant deviation was required to find the nearest available crossing over roads, railways or water. Due to the street layout in much of Portsmouth a balance also often had to be found between identifying the technically shortest route (which may zig-zag through residential streets and be confusing to follow) versus a slightly longer route (which may be easier to follow). The proposed routes for audit were presented to City Council officers and confirmed, or amended in line with their comments, as appropriate.

6.2.2. Figure 6.1 illustrates the outcome of mapping prioritised cycle routes to existing roads.

6.2.3. Many of the prioritised cycle corridors converge on the Commercial Road / rail station area in the city centre. In terms of cycling, this area contains heavily trafficked roads and junctions which create severance. It also has pedestrianised areas where cycling is not permitted; a deviation from the desire line is required to make cycle journeys across the city centre.

6.2.4. This area is anticipated to undergo substantial development and change, including revisions to the transport network and street layouts. These changes are however not yet confirmed.

6.2.5. As a result of the uncertainty regarding future city centre layouts the prioritised cycle corridors were not mapped to existing routes in this area. Further study is required to identify north-south and east-west routes which can be made suitable for cycling as part of wider city centre studies.

6.2.6. In line with the guidance, the most direct route was sought whilst also taking account of the route’s overall legibility. In the case of route 602 (Gosport to Portsmouth College) the street pattern meant no one single route was preferred and instead two route variants were taken forward for auditing. In the case of route 601 (Gosport to Hayling Island) the deviation from the desire line due to Eastney Lake meant that two routes were taken forward – 601a covering Gosport to Hayling Island and 601b covering Gosport to Langstone Campus / St James' Hospital.

43 www.cyclestreets.co.uk and www.maps.google.co.uk
Figure 6.1 – Prioritised Cycling Routes for Audit
7 AUDITING ROUTES, IDENTIFYING IMPROVEMENTS AND ESTIMATING COSTS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1. Once Key Walking Routes were selected, and the prioritised cycling corridors were mapped to existing roads and cycling routes, an auditing process was initiated.

7.1.2. The purpose of auditing routes is to understand whether they are of a suitable standard and appropriate, and if not, what needs to be improved. The auditing process followed the DfT guidance. This allowed a consistent approach to be adopted, and for reasons behind decisions to be documented. As these are new approaches developed and promoted by the DfT, WSP gave a training session to City Council officers and stakeholders on the use of the two tools.

7.2 WALKING ROUTE AUDITS

AUDIT METHODOLOGY

7.2.1. The walking audits used the DfT’s Walking Route Audit Tool (WRAT). This identified the standard of existing infrastructure along routes and identified where improvements were needed.

7.2.2. The audit comprises 20 criteria grouped into five themes (attractiveness, comfort, directness, safety and coherence). Auditors are required to give a score for each criterion of between 0 and 2, where 2 represents good provision and 0 represents poor provision. From these 20 criteria a total score was derived. The accompanying notes to the tool indicates that a score of 70% (i.e. a score of 28 out of a potential 40 points) should normally be regarded as a minimum level of provision overall. Routes which score less than this, and factors which are scored as zero should be used to identify where improvements are required.

7.2.3. Audits were carried out for the ten prioritised Key Walking Routes identified in Figure 5.2. The site visits involved walking the route in both directions, noting key issues and taking photographs. A separate audit was carried for each section with different characteristics, leading to results being collated for 24 route sections.

KEY FINDINGS FROM AUDITS

7.2.4. Nine of the 27 audited route sections scored less than 28 out of 40 (the suggested minimum level of provision). The poorly scoring sections comprised:

- Arundel Street, from Buckingham Street to Holbrook Road (KWR 33 section 2);
- Kingston Road, from New Road to Kingston Crescent (KWR 53 sections 1 and 2);
- Lake Road, entire length, from Fratton Road to Commercial Road (KWR 22 sections 1 and 2);
- London Road, from Northwood Road to Merrivale Road, from Hewett Road to Gladys Avenue and from Gladys Avenue to Kingston Crescent (KWR 11 sections 1 and 3 and KWR 68 section 1); and
- Fratton Bridge and Fawcett Road from Goldsmith Avenue to Manners Road (KWR 27 section 1).
7.2.5. The highest scoring route sections (scores of 35 out of 40 or above) were as follows:

- Arundel Street and Commercial Road pedestrianised sections (KWR 33 section 1 and KWR 22 section 3);
- Eldon Street and Norfolk Street (KWR 79 section 3);
- Fawcett Road from Manners Road to Addison Road (KWR 27 section 2);
- Palmerston Road pedestrianised section (KWR 77 section 2);
- Pedestrian walkway from Guildhall Walk to Winston Churchill Avenue (KWR 79 section 1); and
- Isambard Brunel Road from Commercial Road to Greetham Street (KWR 80 section 1).

It will be noted that these are generally areas with lower or no traffic levels, highlighting the impact of traffic on the scoring of routes in the WRAT.

7.2.6. Issues were identified for all 27 audited route sections, regardless of their score. Common issues included:

- Attractiveness category:
  - Sections with limited or no passive surveillance (overlooking from neighbouring land uses), such as in subways;
  - Streets which are within AQMAs (where levels of nitrogen dioxide has been recorded which exceeds the limits outlined in the National Air Quality Strategy), or are within Noise Important Areas, which is a designation based on modelled levels of road traffic noise;
  - Absence of street trees or planting in the highway to enhance the walking environment, provide shade or shelter and absorb carbon dioxide;
  - Uncoordinated or inconsistent paving styles; and
  - Extensive bollards or guardrailing impacting on the quality of the streetscape.

- Comfort:
  - Footways in poor condition, damaged paving slabs and uneven surfaces, creating potential trip hazards;
  - Overhanging vegetation;
  - Vehicles parked on footways;
  - Narrow footways, or footways where the usable space is reduced by direction signs, street lighting columns or bus stop shelters;
  - Requirements for pedestrians to divert to reach crossing points;
  - Significant distances between crossing points on busy roads; and
  - Pedestrian refuges which may not accommodate all pedestrians.

- Directness:
  - Wide roads which result in longer pedestrian crossing distances;
  - Delays associated with crossing busy main roads away from zebra or signal crossings; and
  - No formalised pedestrian priority when crossing side roads.

- Safety:
  - Pedestrians in close proximity to high traffic volumes or high traffic speeds, or coming into conflict with cyclists on a shared-use path;
Coherence:

- Road crossings without dropped kerbs or tactile paving to assist blind, partially sighted and mobility impaired pedestrians.

7.2.7. Whilst each of the prioritised walking routes were located on Portsea Island, it can be assumed that the commonly identified issues also affect routes on the mainland. The same audit principles can be applied to any walking route to identify improvements.

IDENTIFYING IMPROVEMENTS

7.2.8. For every prioritised Key Walking Route, the audit results were used as a prompt to consider the broad types of intervention which have the potential to improve the quality of the pedestrian environment. They included the categories of improvement below:

- Identifying space for street trees or planters, or parklets (usually created from on-street parking spaces);
- Upgrading footway surfaces or paving materials;
- Redesigning side road junctions with tighter geometry, to reduce turning vehicle turning speeds;
- Redesigning major junctions to enable safer, more comfortable and more direct crossings for pedestrians, including reviewing the extent of pedestrian guardrails, and removing it where appropriate;
- Widening existing footways, relocating street furniture and redesigning or removing barriers to create comfortable walking conditions and enable all pedestrians to use the routes, including those using wheelchairs or mobility scooters, people with visual impairments or with pushchairs;
- Construct wider pedestrian refuges to enable pedestrians to comfortably wait between traffic lanes;
- Modifying existing or installing new controlled crossings (signal or zebra crossings) on busy roads, with pedestrian detection technology to amend crossing times;
- Constructing continuous footways over side road junctions, to give greater pedestrian priority
- Constructing new footpaths to satisfy pedestrian desire lines; and
- Installing tactile paving to assist blind and visually impaired pedestrians and constructing dropped kerbs to enable safe and comfortable pedestrian movements.

7.2.9. There are other complementary measures which can ensure that the pedestrian environment is welcoming and inclusive. These include seating to enable less mobile pedestrians to rest at intervals and extending the coverage of the existing wayfinding boards in the city centre and Southsea to other parts of the city.

7.2.10. Some of the identified issues, such as poor air quality, high traffic noise levels and proximity to heavy or fast traffic, are more complex to solve. They will require city-wide programmes (including but not limited to the LCWIP) to enable more cycling, walking and public transport use and less car use. Measures to calm vehicle speeds on urban roads should also be considered to reduce the incidence and severity of collisions involving pedestrians (and cyclists). This could potentially include 20mph speed limits on major roads, as has recently been introduced in other cities.
7.2.11. An audit summary sheet was prepared covering all the prioritised Key Walking Routes. This set out:

- the audit scores for each route section;
- the existing characteristics and key issues for each section which determine the audit scores; and
- key infrastructure improvements to address issues (subject to feasibility and deliverability considerations).

7.3 CYCLING ROUTE AUDITS

AUDIT METHODOLOGY

7.3.1. The cycling route audits assess the suitability of a route against core design outcomes. The objective was to identify the most direct route that was either already suitable, or could be made suitable, for cycling and the types of intervention required to achieve this.

7.3.2. The audits comprised a three-step process:

- Step 1: Pre-site visit preparation, collating relevant information for the audit;
- Step 2: Site visit to assess the existing route/conditions and validate the pre-site visit work; and
- Step 3: Complete (and amend as required) the audit results following the site visit.

7.3.3. The DfT’s Route Selection Tool (RST) was used for the cycle route audits. This assesses existing routes against five criteria to determine whether they already satisfy core design outcomes for cycling. The five assessment criteria are:

- Directness – a comparison of how direct the route is relative to the equivalent route for motor vehicles;
- Gradient – how steep the route is;
- Safety – whether there is physical protection from motor traffic, and if not, the speed and volume of motor traffic; in addition whether there is lighting and passive surveillance (from adjoining properties);
- Connectivity – the number of connections to the surrounding area;
- Comfort – how much space there is for cycling, the surface material, and whether the space is shared with substantial volumes of traffic or substantial numbers of pedestrians.

The RST enables the merits of different route variants to be compared, and a comparison to be made with the potential future state of the route if improvements were to be implemented.

7.3.4. Based on the information set out in the RST, each category was scored between 5 (the highest score) to 0 (the lowest score). The scores in the RST are based on parameters from selected UK cycle design guidance. The directness score was calculated for the route as a whole, whilst the scores for the other for categories was calculated for each individual section, with a combined score for the whole route. Where data was readily available, such as traffic flows for certain road links, or collected from site visits, then it informed the score. Where data was not readily available, such as traffic flows for many minor roads or recorded traffic speeds, then the score was based on assumptions. In most cases speed limits were used as a proxy for actual speed data. Further data will be required to confirm vehicle speeds and flows (and therefore the appropriate improvements) when cycle routes are developed.
7.3.5. The DfT technical guidance notes that the aim of audits is to identify routes which score 3 or above against each design criteria (or could be improved to score 3 or above), ideally with no critical junctions.

7.3.6. The scores for gradient and connectivity are the product of the area through which the route passes and are generally more fixed. In general terms, sections scoring poorly against the safety and comfort criteria are those which do not meet the recommended minimum provision outlined in recognised UK cycle design guidance.

7.3.7. An assessment was also made of the number of critical junctions. These are defined in the RST as those junctions which are considered to have characteristics hazardous to cycling (e.g. high traffic volumes, no segregation from motor traffic or priority over motor traffic, a requirement to cross high-speed slip roads or negotiate large roundabouts).

**KEY FINDINGS FROM AUDITS**

7.3.8. Of the 83 route sections audited, around 25% have scores of 3 or above for all criteria (20 sections) and around 75% have one more criteria scoring less than 3 (63 sections). The key findings in terms of suitability for cycling were as follows:

- **Low scores:**
  - Many on-road sections score poorly against safety and comfort criteria. This is usually due to them having high traffic volumes, 30mph speed limits and no infrastructure to physically protect cyclists from motor traffic;
  - Off-carriageway paths score poorly against the comfort criteria where there is insufficient width to comfortably accommodate different categories of cycle, or where there are barriers which prevent passage by certain types of cycle;
  - Shared-use paths score poorly against the comfort criteria where there is insufficient width to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists, and especially where there are high numbers of pedestrians;
  - Paths which are unlit or have no passive surveillance (not overlooked by neighbouring land uses); and
  - Sections of route which ascend Portsdown Hill or which cross the railway overbridges scored poorly against the gradient criteria.

- **High scores:**
  - Residential streets with low traffic volumes and 20mph speed limits tended to score well; and
  - Some off-carriageway routes score well where they are sufficiently wide to comfortably accommodate all users.

- **Critical junctions:** more than 100 critical junctions were identified on the prioritised cycle routes. Of these, approximately 50 were identified where cycle movements would be in potential conflict with heavy motor traffic flows (more than 5,000 vehicles per day) and approximately 40 locations which have wide or flared side road junctions.
IDENTIFYING IMPROVEMENTS OR ALTERNATIVE ROUTES

7.3.9. The audit results and the Route Selection Tool scoring guidance were used as prompts to consider the broad types of intervention which would make each route more suitable for cycling. There was a particular emphasis on sections which had safety and comfort scores of less than 3; however, improvements were identified for almost all sections. In some cases route variants were recommended which were currently, or had the potential to be, more suitable for cycling than the route initially audited.

7.3.10. At this early stage of planning, no particular design has been chosen to improve the cycle routes. Instead, the list of improvements is based around the required outcomes – e.g. infrastructure which protects cyclists from motor vehicles or a junction redesign which enables safer cycle crossing movements. Further study will be required to confirm what design options are possible.

7.3.11. Depending on the location and issues, improvements were identified to create more suitable conditions for cycling, such as those outlined below:

- Constructing cycle tracks which are physically protected from motor traffic, with priority across side roads;
- Widening existing off-carriageway paths, relocating street furniture and redesigning or removing barriers to create comfortable cycling conditions and enable all types of bike to access the routes;
- Upgrading surfaces and cutting back encroaching vegetation;
- Modifying existing controlled crossings (signal or zebra crossings) or installing new controlled crossings on busy roads;
- Replacing subways with surface crossings;
- Redesigning junctions to enable those on bikes to make safer and more comfortable crossings or manoeuvres;
- Redesigning side road junctions with tighter geometry, to reduce turning vehicle turning speeds;
- Introducing measures to reduce traffic levels on certain roads, including bus-only sections (bus gates) or road closures to prevent through traffic whilst retaining access for local residents, either at all times or between certain hours (see the description for low-traffic neighbourhoods overleaf);
- Introducing measures which create carriageway space for protected cycle tracks, such as one-way streets or shuttle traffic signals;
- Permitting two-way cycling in one-way streets (contraflow cycling) to shorten cycle journey distances;
- Modifying existing road closures to enable cyclists to comfortably move between two roads;
- Upgrading existing bridges or constructing new bridges across railways or watercourses to provide suitable path widths for cyclists and pedestrians; and
- Installing lighting on unlit routes; and
- Reduced speed limits and physical traffic calming features to slow traffic speeds.

There is an important role for trials to test the impacts of potential improvements before they are finalised, including with experimental traffic regulation orders.

44 see paragraph 7.3.12 for further details
Widths of protected cycle tracks

7.3.12. To achieve a RST comfort score of 3 or above, the space must be a minimum of 1.5m wide for one-way cycling and at least 2.5m wide for two-way cycling. The space for cycling must be physically protected from motor traffic and surfaced in smooth tarmac (if not additional width will be required to account for wobble room on less smooth surfaces). Physical protection can be by means of kerbs (stepped up from, or constructed at the same height, as the carriageway) or light segregation (where cyclists are protected by intermittently placed physical objects, such as planters or posts).

7.3.13. LCWIPs should plan for an increase in cycle trips, and accommodate all cycle designs commonly in use, including cargo bikes, cycles with trailers, handcycles, and adapted cycles. Additional width is likely to be required in many places to futureproof the infrastructure and meet growing demand. On that basis the City Council will aim to achieve a higher comfort score (4 out of 5) where anticipated cycle flows require it and where feasible to do so. This requires minimum standards of 1.8m wide one-way cycle tracks and 3m wide two-way cycle tracks.

7.3.14. The comfort score also assumes that the space for cycling is either not shared with pedestrians, or shared with limited numbers of pedestrians (fewer than 100 pedestrians per hour). Paths for two-way cycling with significant numbers of pedestrians (more than 300 per hour) would need to be at least 3.5m wide to have an RST comfort score of 3. Recent UK design guidance highlights that where space is available, separate infrastructure should be constructed for cyclists and pedestrians (including at junctions) to avoid conflict between different user groups. The LCWIP technical guidance notes that paths of sufficient width or separation to enable pedestrians and cyclists to travel side by side and to pass without conflict will cater for both user groups.

Balancing priorities

7.3.15. Road space is shared between different transport modes and uses. Catering for these different demands can be particularly challenging in dense urban environments. In some locations achieving a cycle route audit score of 3 or above would only be possible if (for example) protected cycle tracks of a suitable width were constructed using road space currently given to other uses. In certain instances it was considered that such a reallocation of space may not be deliverable. In some locations a range of different options were identified which each have the potential to improve the route score and make a route more suitable for cycling, each with different pros and cons. However, determining a suitable balance between space for different transport modes, or which option is most appropriate, is a decision for elected members taking into account evidence and stakeholder views.

45 https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/streets-toolkit#on-this-page-2
Complementary measures

7.3.16. Investment in a range of complementary infrastructure elements will support the strategic cycling corridor infrastructure. These including the following measures:

- **Low-traffic neighbourhoods**: these are networks of residential streets where through traffic is excluded to make the area safer and more pleasant, with consequential benefits for cycling and walking. One measure to achieve this is to close particular points on the road network to motor vehicles (but enabling cyclists, pedestrians and in some places buses to travel through and retaining access to properties). This is sometimes known as *filtered permeability*. The closure can either apply at all times or between certain hours. Low-traffic neighbourhoods can also be created by introducing a series of one-way streets for motor vehicles or banning turns for motor vehicles at certain junctions. This concept has been used extensively in the London Borough of Waltham Forest, in conjunction with street enhancements, planting and seating;

- **Additional secure cycle parking**: across the city to meet current and future demand, well-located to journey destinations and catering for different types of cycle and duration of stay. This could for example include cycle hubs at transport interchanges with a range of enhanced facilities. It could also include on-street cycle hangars, to provide safe places for residents to store bikes close to their homes in densely populated areas; and

- **Enhanced wayfinding**: Clear and consistent signage and road markings to ensure whole routes are easy to follow and are conspicuous, particularly to assist new and returning cyclists. Wayfinding can give directions ahead of and at decision points, confirm the route after junction decision points, and give reassurance of the correct route mid-link.

**SUMMARY SHEET**

7.3.17. An audit summary sheet was prepared for each prioritised cycle route. This set out:

- the audit scores for each route section;
- the existing characteristics and key issues for each section which determine the audit scores, such as traffic flows, speed limits and the presence or absence of cycle infrastructure physically protected from motor traffic;
- key infrastructure improvements to address issues (subject to feasibility and deliverability considerations) and commentary to support the proposed approach; and
- suggested alternative route sections, where it was considered that constraints would mean that it would not be possible to make the route suitable for cycling.
8 FUNDING, PRIORITISATION AND INTEGRATION INTO AUTHORITY WORKSTREAMS

8.1 COST ESTIMATION

8.1.1. High-level construction costs were estimated for each improvement to understand the broad scale of funding required to deliver all of the priority routes. Cost estimate information was supplied by the City Council for different categories of infrastructure. Costs are quoted in bands to reflect the variance in delivering similar types of infrastructure in different locations due to unique site-specific conditions. The estimates relate to construction costs only and do not allow for costs arising from inflation, utilities and third party land purchase (if required) or account for optimism bias or margin for error. All potential improvements are subject to further study, feasibility and consultation, each of which has the potential to change cost estimates.

8.1.2. Based on the information provided by the City Council, the broad approximate construction cost estimates\(^\text{46}\) for cycling and walking infrastructure are set out below:

- Western Cycle Corridor (Route Refs 307, 307a, 405, 503) = £23m-50m;
- Eastern Cycle Corridor (Route Refs 108, 205, 301) = £28m-78m;
- East-West Portsea Island Cycle Routes (Route Refs 601, 602, 603, 801) = £22m-54m; and
- Prioritised Key Walking Routes = £41m to £76m (of which between at least £17m to £29m were likely to be solutions to jointly address walking and cycling issues).

8.2 PRIORITISING IMPROVEMENTS

8.2.1. An indicative prioritisation exercise was undertaken to consider which interventions may form a short, medium and long-term investment programme. The LCWIP technical guidance describes three categories as follows:

- Shorter-term: improvements which can be implemented quickly or are under development;
- Medium term: improvements where there is a clear intention to act, but delivery is dependent on further funding availability or other issues (e.g. detailed design, securing planning permissions, land acquisition, etc); and
- Longer-term: more aspirational improvements or those awaiting a defined solution.

8.2.2. The prioritisation process was a two-step process, devised in consultation with authority officers.

\(^{46}\) Rounded up to the nearest £million. Due to their site-specific nature, costs for options to construct new or replacement bridge structures across the railway line on St. Mary’s Road and at Eastern Road waterbridge, and to realign a section of the A3 Mile End Road southbound carriageway to provide space for a cycle track have not been included in the totals above.
PRIORITISING CYCLE ROUTE IMPROVEMENTS

8.2.3. For cycling the prioritisation process was as follows:

Step 1 Prioritisation

8.2.4. Each strategic cycle corridor was ranked by assessing its likely impact against a range of criteria, covering existing and potential future cycling demand, strategic transport projects and priorities, economy, education, housing and public health (see chapter 5). These covered the ‘effectiveness’ and ‘policy’ criteria categories in the example prioritisation illustrated in the LCWIP technical guidance. The top ranked corridor from this process was reference 307 (Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Cosham, North End and City Centre. The highest scoring cycling corridors taken forward for further development, including route auditing.

Step 2 Prioritisation

8.2.5. Each cycle route section was then assessed against:

° Deliverability and feasibility considerations:
  • Technical feasibility and complexity;
  • Stakeholder receptiveness;
  • Regulatory issues (planning consent, traffic regulation orders, bylaw amendments); and
  • Potential requirements for third party land; plus

° Fit with planned transport schemes, including those being developed for Transforming Cities Fund.

The outcome of the indicative step 2 prioritisation process is set out in Table 8.1 to Table 8.3. Where routes have common sections, the common section is included only once against the route with the highest ranking from the initial prioritisation process47.

8.2.6. It should be noted that the prioritisation is indicative and is intended to be flexible, to take account of available funding and changes in circumstances. An approach which prioritises whole corridors is likely to give greatest benefits, but this is reliant on securing large-scale funding. Where possible routes will be improved as part of a package approach to ensure coherent routes are created.

47 No infrastructure improvements were identified for route 301 section 10 (Moneyfield Avenue, Dover Road, Folkestone Road and Martin Road) and route 601b Section A (Locksway Road from the university campus to Ironbridge Lane. The City Council will work with planning applicants of major developments in the vicinity of route 601b section 1 to ensure the road is suitable for cycling.
### Table 8.1 – Indicative Prioritisation of Cycling Improvements – Shorter Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Cycle Corridor Reference and Description</th>
<th>Stage 1 Prioritisation Rank</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 307 Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Cosham & City Centre | 1 | Section C: Nelson Avenue, North End Avenue & Penrose Close (Northern Parade to Twyford Avenue)  
Section H: A286 Hampshire Terrace (King Richard I Road to St. Michael’s Road (southern end) |
| 503 Fareham to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre & Southsea Town Centre | 2 | Section 1: Southampton Road (Portsdown Road to Watersedge bus stop)  
Section 3: Andrew’s Road, Cottage Grove and Grosvenor Street (Elm Grove to Brougham Street) Section |
| 802 Southsea Seafront to Naval Dockyard via City Centre | 2 | Sections A, B & 4: Frensham Road and Goldsmith Avenue (Devonshire Avenue to Fratton Bridge roundabout) |
| 801 Eastney to Naval Dockyard | 2 | Section 1: Crookhorn Lane (authority boundary to Portsdown Hill Road) |
| 301 Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) & City Centre | 5 | Section 2: Allaway Avenue shared-use path (Castle View Academy to Bourne Road)  
Section 4: Marsden Road (Allaway Avenue to Paulsgrove Adventure Playground) |
| 405 DSTL / North Portchester to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre & Southsea Town Centre | 6 | Sections B to D: Eastern Road shared-use path (Tangier Road to Langstone Road junction) |
| 602a Gosport to Portsmouth College via City Centre (southern route) | 6 | Section B: Ironbridge Lane, Maurice Road and Dunbar Road (Locksway Road to Milton Road)  
Section 4: Goldsmith Avenue (Priory Crescent to Frensham Road) |
| 601b Gosport to St. James’ Hospital / Langstone Campus development sites | 9 | Section B: Ironbridge Lane, Maurice Road and Dunbar Road (Locksway Road to Milton Road)  
Section 4: Goldsmith Avenue (Priory Crescent to Frensham Road) |
### Table 8.2 - Indicative Prioritisation of Cycling Improvements – Medium-Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Cycle Corridor Reference and Description</th>
<th>Stage 1 Prioritisation Rank</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Cosham &amp; City Centre</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareham to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre &amp; Southsea Town Centre</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southsea Seafort to Naval Dockyard via City Centre</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) &amp; City Centre</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSTL / North Portchester to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre &amp; Southsea Town Centre</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosport to Portsmouth College via City Centre</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosport to Portsmouth College via City Centre (southern route)</td>
<td>602a</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosport to Portsmouth College via City Centre (northern route)</td>
<td>602b</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosport to Southsea Seafort via University and Albert Road</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosport to St. James’ Hospital / Langstone Campus development sites</td>
<td>601b</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.3 - Indicative Prioritisation of Cycling Improvements – Longer-Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Cycle Corridor Reference and Description</th>
<th>Stage 1 Prioritisation Rank</th>
<th>Route Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 307 Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Cosham & City Centre | 1 | Sections 1-3: A3 London Road and Northern Road (Authority boundary to Cosham Health Centre)  
Section 5: A3 Portsbridge Roundabout and London Road (Western Road underpass to Northern Parade junction)  
Section D: A3 Twyford Avenue (northbound) and Stamshaw Road (southbound) (Penrose Closer to Rudmore Roundabout)  
Section G: Guildhall Square & Guildhall Walk (Commercial Road to St. Michael’s gyratory)  
Sections 14 & 15: A288 Hampshire Terrace, Landport Terrace, King’s Terrace, Jubilee Terrace, Bellevue Terrace & Pier Road (St. Michael’s Gyratory to Clarence Pier) |
| 307a Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Queen Alexandra Hospital, Cosham & City Centre | 1 | Section 1: B2177 Southwick Hill Road (Queen Alexandra Hospital Entrance to London Road) |
| 503 Fareham to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre & Southsea Town Centre | ≈2 | Section 3: A27 Southampton Road (Compass Road to Western Road underpass)  
Sections 14 & 15: Grosvenor Street, Green Road, Cottage Grove, Grove Road North & Grove Road South, Kent Road, Portland Road, Osborne Road and Palmerston Road (Grosvenor Street to Clarence Parade) |
| 802 Southsea Seafront to Naval Dockyard via City Centre | ≈2 | Section 2: Albert Road, Victoria Road South and Elm Grove (Festing Road to St. Andrew’s Road) |
| 801 Eastney to Naval Dockyard | ≈2 | Section 1: Prince Albert Road, Landguard Road, Maxwell Road, Aston Road, Haslemere Road, Pretoria Road and St. Augustine Road (Highland Road to Devonshire Avenue)  
Section 5: Fratton Bridge and Sydenham Terrace (Goldsmith Avenue to Canal Walk) |
| 301 Waterlooville to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) & City Centre | 5 | Section 3: Gillman Road (Eveleigh Road to Havant Road)  
Section A: Havant Road (Gillman Road to Eastern Road)  
Section 7: Eastern Road (Farlington Interchange to Anchorage Road)  
Section 11: Tangier Road, Milton Road, Copnor Bridge & New Road (Folkestone Road to George Street) |
| 405 DSTL / North Portchester to Southsea Common via Lakeside North Harbour, North End, City Centre & Southsea Town Centre | ≈6 | Section 1: Westfield Road path, Jubilee Avenue & Allaway Avenue (Portsdown Road to Castle View Academy) |
| 108 Havant to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) & City Centre | ≈6 | Sections 1 & 2: National Cycle Network route 22 (Farlington Marshes route from authority boundary to Farlington Interchange) |
| 602 Gosport to Portsmouth College via City Centre | ≈6 | Section 6: St. Mary’s Road (Prison Roundabout to Kingston Cemetery entrance)  
Section G: Stamford Street, Clifton Street and Arundel Street (Fratton Road to 20mph limit west of Holbrook Road)  
Section 10: Arundel Street (20mph limit west of Holbrook Road to Buckingham Street) |
| 602a Gosport to Portsmouth College via City Centre (southern route) | ≈6 | Section 5: Langstone Road (Eastern Road to Prison Roundabout) |
| 602b Gosport to Portsmouth College via City Centre (northern route) | ≈6 | Section 3: Neville Road and Hayling Avenue (Tangier Road to Baffins Road) |
| 205 Leigh Park to Clarence Pier via Farlington, Hilsea Employment Area (South) & City Centre | ≈9 | Section 1: Havant Road (authority boundary to Lower Farlington Road) |
| 603 Gosport to Southsea Seafront via University and Albert Road | ≈9 | Section 1: The Hard (Hard Interchange to Ordnance Row)  
Section 4: King’s Road and Elm Grove (King’s Roundabout to St. Andrew’s Road) |
PRIORITISING WALKING ROUTE IMPROVEMENTS

8.2.7. For walking routes, a tailored approach was adopted, as follows:

Step 1 Prioritisation

8.2.8. Each prioritised Key Walking Route was ranked by assessing its likely impact against a range of criteria covering strategic transport projects and priorities, economy, education, housing and public health (see chapter 5). These covered the ‘effectiveness’ and ‘policy’ criteria categories in the example prioritisation illustrated in the LCWIP technical guidance.

Step 2 Prioritisation

8.2.9. Each prioritised Key Walking Route was prioritised according to:

- Proximity to AQMAs, where additional walking trips generated by enhanced pedestrian infrastructure has the potential to improve poor air quality;
- Fit with planned transport schemes, including those being developed for Transforming Cities Fund; and
- Proximity to the Future High Streets bid areas (covering the Commercial Road area and Fratton district centre).

The outcome of this indicative step 2 prioritisation process is set out in Table 8.4 and Table 8.5.
Table 8.4 - Indicative Prioritisation of Key Walking Route Improvements – Shorter and medium term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritisation category</th>
<th>Key Walking Route Description</th>
<th>Key Walking Route Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shorter-term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arundel Street (Holbrook Road to Fratton Road)</td>
<td>KWR 33 section 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fratton Bridge and Fawcett Road (Selbourne Terrace to Manners Road)</td>
<td>KWR 27 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingston Road (Kingston Crescent to Lake Road)</td>
<td>KWR 53 sections 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Road (entire length)</td>
<td>KWR 22 sections 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Road (Kingston Crescent to Stubbington Avenue / Gladys Avenue)</td>
<td>KWR 68 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Road (Hewett Road and Gladys Avenue)</td>
<td>KWR 11 section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium-term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arundel Street (Commercial Road to Holbrook Road)</td>
<td>KWR 33 sections 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isambard Brunel Road (Commercial Road and Greetham Street)</td>
<td>KWR 80 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somers Road (Raglan Street to Sydenham Terrace)</td>
<td>KWR 80 section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sydenham Terrace (Somers Road to Fratton Bridge)</td>
<td>KWR 80 section 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King Henry I Street (Guildhall Square to Anglesea Road)</td>
<td>KWR 37 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park Road (Anglesea Road to St. George's Road)</td>
<td>KWR 37 section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eldon Street and Norfolk Street (Sackville Street to King's Road)</td>
<td>KWR 79 section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Road (Merrivale Road to Hewett Road)</td>
<td>KWR 11 section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fawcett Road (Manners Road to Addison Road)</td>
<td>KWR 27 section 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.5 - Indicative Prioritisation of Key Walking Route Improvements – Longer-term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritisation category</th>
<th>Key Walking Route Description</th>
<th>Key Walking Route Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longer-term</td>
<td>Greetham Street and Raglan Street (Isambard Brunel Road to Somers Road)</td>
<td>KWR 80 section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unnamed walkway from Guildhall Square to Winston Churchill Avenue</td>
<td>KWR 79 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Street (Winston Churchill Avenue to Sackville Street)</td>
<td>KWR 79 section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Road (Northwood Road to Merrivale Road)</td>
<td>KWR 11 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence Road (Addison Road to Albert Road)</td>
<td>KWR 27 section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grove Road South (Elm Grove to Palmerston Road)</td>
<td>KWR 77 section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palmerston Road (entire length)</td>
<td>KWR 77 sections 1-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.10. All of the shorter-term Key Walking Routes identified to be progressed in the shorter-term are located within AQMAs.

8.3 FUNDING AND APPRAISAL

8.3.1. Funding for local transport improvements comes from a variety of sources, including – but not limited to - government departments and Local Enterprise Partnerships. In many cases funding from central government or Local Enterprise Partnerships is awarded following a competition to which the City Council can submit bids. The aims and objectives of each fund will vary and so some local transport improvements will be better suited to some funds rather than others.

8.3.2. In many cases the City Council will prepare a business case to demonstrate how well the proposals meet the objectives and the beneficial impact they will bring (known as transport appraisal). Some of the LCWIP identified improvements may come forward as part of two City Council funding bids currently being prepared for submission to central government, the Transforming Cities Fund and Clean Air Fund. Background work for the LCWIP is already being included in the transport appraisal for these two funding bids.

8.3.3. As it is not yet certain what funds will be targeted to deliver other elements of the LCWIP, no additional appraisal has been undertaken at this stage.
8.4 APPLICATION OF LCWIP AND INTEGRATION INTO AUTHORITY WORKSTREAMS

8.4.1. The LCWIP identifies networks of strategic cycling and walking networks and has identified infrastructure improvements for a selection of prioritised routes. It also outlines the other strategic cycling corridors and Key Walking Routes across the city which are to be developed when opportunities allow in future iterations of the LCWIP.

8.4.2. The LCWIP is intended to be applied in the following ways:

- Contributing the achieving the Council’s corporate priorities, and tackling the Climate Emergency;
- Bidding for funding – The City Council will use the LCWIP as the basis for future funding bids to improve walking and cycling infrastructure;
- Transport Policy – The LCWIP will inform the preparation of the new Local Transport Plan and the Rights of Way Improvement Plan;
- Planning Policy – The LCWIP forms part of the evidence base supporting the Replacement Local Plan, ensuring that walking and cycling infrastructure are given appropriate weight in future planning decisions; and
- Development Management – The local plan requires planning applicants to mitigate the transport impact of new developments. Planning applicants and the City Council’s development management officers will be able to use the LCWIP to ensure new developments deliver parts of the identified network of strategic cycle routes and Key Walking Routes.