

Hampshire Joint Services Headquarters (SHQ) Leigh Road, Eastleigh Travel Plan Update & Monitoring 2017

Scott White and Hookins LLP
Harman House
Andover Road
Winchester
Hampshire
SO23 7BS

T +44 (0)1962 844855
info@swh.co.uk

Partners

Michael Weaver
Douglas Alcock
Jason Daniels
Richard Hemming
Ian Llewellyn
Ann Raybould

Principal Associates and Directors

Jonathan Baker
Graham Barber
Paul Boshier
Kevan Carter
John Hawkins

Associates

Michael Lakey
Sameer Mannick
Julian Marshall
Tom Stewart

Prepared By:
.....

Julian Hudson MA(Oxon) MSc MCIHT

Approved By: ...
Richard Hemming BEng MEng CEng MICE

JH/W00837
March 2017

	Structural Engineering
	Civil Engineering
	CDM Consultants
	Sustainability and BREEAM
	Traffic and Transport
	Flood Risk Assessments
	Highway Engineering
	Event Engineering

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	3
2.0	Site Audit.....	4
3.0	Travel Surveys.....	8
4.0	Objectives.....	11
5.0	Targets.....	12
6.0	Measures	13
7.0	Management & Monitoring.....	16
8.0	Action Plan.....	17
9.0	Funding.....	19
10.0	Appendix A.....	20

Travel Survey Questionnaire

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The SHQ site currently benefits from the Travel Plan produced in September 2015, which was written by Scott White and Hookins with regard to the data produced by the June 2015 travel surveys.
- 1.2 A new Travel Survey was carried out in February 2017, and so this Travel Plan Update is now put forward as both a form of monitoring report and also as the basis for ongoing Travel Planning work at the site. It seeks to continue the promotion and encouragement of alternative, more sustainable modes of travel to the site among existing and future staff and visitors.

2.0 Site Audit

2.1 Local Highway Network

- 2.1.1 The site is located on the northern side of Leigh Road, a major road leading from Eastleigh to Chandlers Ford. The site is well served by road transport with very close access to the M3 motorway approximately 150m to the west of the site.
- 2.1.2 Leigh Road provides dual-carriageway access to the site between the motorway junction and the junction with Woodside Avenue/Passfield Avenue to the east of the site. A right-turn lane into the site is also available approaching the site from the east, travelling west along Leigh Road.
- 2.1.3 The Leigh Road/Passfield Avenue/Woodside Avenue crossroads is a major junction within Eastleigh's strategic road network. It serves both east-west and north-south movements within the town and connects the town centre to M3 Junction 13. Passfield Avenue also provides a link to M27 Junction 5, which is necessary because Junction 13 does not facilitate movements to M27 eastbound, and Woodside Avenue can be used to reach M3 Junction 12.
- 2.1.4 The junction is signal controlled on all arms following upgrade works carried out by Hampshire County Council in 2016. All four approach roads are traffic sensitive streets and strategic routes, involving Highways England diversionary routes.
- 2.1.5 Traffic count data available from the Department for Transport suggests traffic flows along Leigh Road past the site of 12,137 vehicles per day (2015 survey data), with flows of 14,610 on the motorway side of the signal junction with Passfield Avenue. Traffic flows are relatively high on all arms of the junction and congestion and delays to traffic do cause issues at peak times.

2.1.6 At present the HFRS site benefits from off-street car parking for a total of 366 parking spaces. A significant proportion of this existing parking is reserved for operational (emergency) vehicles however.

2.1.7 The main vehicular access to the site is from Leigh Road, however there is also a barrier-controlled secondary access at the rear of the site which runs onto Woodside Avenue to the east of the site.

2.2 **Public Transport Accessibility**

2.2.1 There are bus stops for the Xelabus X6 and X7 services approximately 100m to the east of the site. The X6/7 route passes twice per hour throughout Mondays to Fridays, and runs along the following route: Eastleigh Bus Station > < Leigh Road > < Chandlers Ford Precinct > < Toynbee School > < Fryern Hill Waitrose.

2.2.2 Xelabus route X4 passes within 600m of the site, once per hour. Its route is: Eastleigh Bus Station > < Barton Peveril College > < Airport Parkway Station > < West End > < Hedge End.

2.2.3 All of the above bus routes call at the Eastleigh Bus Station, which is approximately 100m from the Eastleigh Mainline Railway Station, providing services calling at stations to Poole, London Waterloo, Salisbury, Portsmouth Harbour and Romsey.

2.3 **Cycling and Walking**

2.3.1 National Cycle Network Route 23 also runs south-to-north to the east of the site, along Passfield Avenue / Woodside Avenue, within approximately 250m of the site. NCN Route 24 also passes close to the site, and has a junction with Route 23 adjacent to Fleming Park, to the south of the HFRS site. These are top quality cycle links which greatly enhance the accessibility of HFRS by active modes.

2.3.2 In terms of pedestrian infrastructure, there are suitable footways on either side of the Leigh Road carriageway, a signalised pedestrian crossing at the western end of the site frontage and a pedestrian stage in the traffic lights at the junction between Leigh Road, Passfield Avenue and Woodside Avenue east of the site. It is possible to walk through Fleming Park, to the south of the Civic Offices (Eastleigh Borough Council) and then cross at the signalised crossing at the western end of the site frontage, as this is a designated pedestrian and cycle route.

2.4 In summary therefore, the site is accessible by a range of sustainable and active transport modes as well as being easily accessible via the highway network.

2.5 **Highway Safety Review**

2.5.1 Personal injury collision data was sourced from Hampshire Constabulary on Leigh Road and the surrounding area for the three-year period from 2011-2014. This demonstrated that a total of 21 incidents occurred within the search area during the search period, most of which were clustered around the junctions between roads, including the slip-road on/off the M3, Villeneuve St George's Way and Woodside Avenue junctions with Leigh Road, and Kipling Road and Judd Close junctions with Woodside Avenue. These have been analysed in the previously submitted Transport Statement dated September 2015.

- 2.5.2 The online database "Crashmap" was consulted in order to examine new data from the period 2015-2016 in the same location. A total of four collisions causing serious injury were recorded and a further seven collisions caused slight injuries. Three of the serious incidents took place on Leigh Road, and one on Woodside Avenue.
- 2.5.3 None of the more recent incidents involved pedal cycle users or motorcyclists. Two of the serious incidents on Leigh Road involved "young drivers" and the other involved a bus. Three of the incidents, including one of the serious incidents involved child casualties.
- 2.5.4 The serious casualty incidents all involved more vulnerable road users; this is not unexpected and there are no reasonable measures which could have been taken in engineering and road safety terms to prevent the collisions which have been recorded in this locality.

3.0 Travel Surveys

- 3.1.1 In order to update the baseline statistics, and in order to enable Travel Plan monitoring, a new survey was carried out in February 2017. On this occasion, a total of 216 employees completed the survey, including 140 HFRS staff, 72 Hampshire Constabulary staff and 4 Hampshire County Council staff.
- 3.1.2 A total of 10 staff on this occasion stated that they experience health issues which affect their choice of transport. This is fewer than the 2015 total, and of the 2017 total two staff explained that they are unable to drive. The current plans show that eight DDA-compliant bays are currently provided within the site, which do cater sufficiently for existing blue-badge holders; the provision is reviewed regularly. The overall car parking provision was reduced by 2 spaces in order to create additional DDA-compliant parking, as a result of the initial Travel Plan.
- 3.1.3 A total of 28 staff currently benefit from company lease vehicles, of whom 20 are permitted to use these for personal as well as business travel. These individuals work for all three organisations who have staff at the site.
- 3.1.4 The number and proportion of respondents travelling up to 5 miles to reach the site has changed relatively little since 2015; there have been increases in the 6-20 miles category and the 41 miles plus category.

Distance to Work	Number	Proportion	Cumulative %
0 to 5 miles	42	20%	20%
6 to 20 miles	109	51%	71%
21 to 40 miles	51	24%	95%
41 miles or more	11	5%	100%

Travel to Work Distances – Police & Fire Staff (June 2017)

- 3.1.5 In terms of the bid to increase flexible and remote working the following results were found:

Working Hours	Number	Proportion
"Office" 08:00-18:00	171	80%
Shift Pattern	20	9%
Other (please specify)	24	11%

3.1.6 The "other" category includes a number of staff who start work between 06:00 and 07:30; in addition some of these staff stated that flexible hours allow them to start and finish work earlier. **This is very valuable in reducing overall peak traffic demand.**

3.1.7 Perhaps unsurprisingly, there have not been enormous changes in the usual travel patterns to the site by mode; the following results were found:

Mode	Number	Proportion	% Change (+/-)
Car by Myself	175	81.0%	+0.5%
Car Sharing	8	3.7%	+0.7%
As car passenger	4	1.8%	-0.3%
Bus	5	2.3%	+1.4%
Train	4	1.8%	-1.2%
Walk	5	2.3%	-1.1%
Cycle	6	2.8%	-0.2%
Other	9	4.2%	0%

Usual Travel Mode – Police and Fire Staff Survey Respondents (February 2017)

3.1.8 In addition to the above results, 36 staff who specified a usual mode of travel also ticked one or more alternative modes, whilst approximately 48% of all respondents occasionally use an alternative mode to their main travel choice. **This is very positive.**

3.1.9 The reasons for current travel choices do not greatly vary from those previously set out in the 2015 Travel Survey; 35% of respondents stated they used a car in order to make linked trips (combine with other responsibilities e.g.: school run); 38% said that they see no practical alternative to driving. Similar proportions again noted the speed and reliability of driving in preference to other modes.

3.1.10 At the time of the 2015 Travel Survey, it was noted that: *"Winchester and its surrounding area is not home to a large proportion of staff, and the 2015 survey included the data of Hampshire Constabulary staff who have since relocated. Eastleigh and surrounding settlements including Chandlers Ford and Fair Oak account for much higher proportions of staff, and in this context the proposed move of Hampshire*

Constabulary staff to the HFRS Eastleigh premises can be seen as potentially more sustainable and will potentially reduce the need to travel."

This assertion has now been tested with the updated Travel Data as follows;

Settlement/Region	Number	Change +/-	Proportion	Change +/-
Basingstoke & NE Hants	20	+5	9.5%	+3.2%
Andover & West Hants etc.	8	-8	3.8%	-3.0%
Winchester & Environs	13	-1	6.2%	+0.3%
Romsey & Chandlers Ford	16	-4	7.6%	-0.8%
Eastleigh & Fair Oak etc.	32	-6	15.2%	-0.8%
Southampton & IOW	69	-2	32.8%	+2.8%
Fareham & Gosport	17	-3	8.1%	-0.3%
Portsmouth & East Hants	17	-17	8.1%	-6.2%
New Forest & Dorset	11	+2	5.2%	+1.4%

3.1.11 It is evident that of the 210 respondents to the current survey, most do fall within the same broad geographical zones as previously; there is no evidence that the relocation of some Hampshire Constabulary staff to Eastleigh has significantly affected where staff are travelling from. In addition, the columns above indicating "change" should be treated with caution as there is no guarantee that the same staff who completed the 2015 survey also completed the 2017 one.

3.1.12 Outlying results continue to suggest that some staff are commuting significant distances to work; postcode responses include Bletchley, Cardiff, Devises and Swindon. It is however assumed that the postcode in Fort William is probably an error or someone who does a weekly commute before heading back at the weekends.

3.1.13 The site does not generate a large number of deliveries; fleet servicing takes place on-site, however these vehicles are also stored on-site. Occasional visitor traffic is accommodated within the existing car parks; it can be implied from this that there are not large numbers of visitor trips as generally the car parks are observed to be mostly full, and further evidence for this is demonstrated by the survey results above.

4.0 Objectives

- 4.1 It is important that objectives set for a Travel Plan correspond with challenges and issues raised by the Staff Travel Survey. As such, the following objectives are set as being of particular relevance to the continuing challenges faced by Hampshire Constabulary and Hampshire Fire and Rescue;
- To reduce the number and proportion of single-occupancy car journeys to the SHQ site.
 - To increase the number and proportion of trips to the site made by sustainable and active travel modes.
 - To reduce the number of car trips to the site during peak traffic periods, in order to ease congestion on the network and consequently improve staff experiences of travelling to the site.
 - To proactively manage the car parking associated with the SHQ site.
 - To increase flexible working and use of staggered hours where possible.
- 4.2 It should be noted that deliveries to the SHQ site continue to be minimal and that therefore it is not deemed worthwhile to place delivery-related objectives.
- 4.3 In terms of fleet vehicle movements, the premises is a central hub for fleet maintenance which means that those vehicles are required to attend the site for servicing and maintenance work. There is no scope to reduce those trips therefore. All that can be said is that a central hub reduces the number of trips in comparison to the alternative which would be a network of disparate maintenance sites.

5.0 Targets

- 5.1 A good Travel Plan will set targets which are SMART, i.e. Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound.
- 5.2 According to Department for Transport (DfT) guidance, it is possible through pro-active travel planning to achieve a 15% shift away from single-occupancy car use. However, given that no significant change in the figures has been seen so far, the revised target is set as follows;
- To reduce single occupancy car journeys to the HFRS site by 10% from the baseline over the 5-year timescale of the current Travel Plan.*
- 5.3 Two sustainable modes have shown some degree of increase since the 2015 survey, and so the following targets are also set:
- Since car sharing has increased by 0.7% since 2015, it is resolved that a target to increase car sharing to an overall modal share of 6.5% by 2020 will be sought. This will represent an increase of 3.5% from the baseline, and in real terms will mean a need for up to 17 car sharing bays (33 staff) when achieved.
 - Since bus travel has increased by 1.4% since 2015, it is resolved that a target to increase bus travel to an overall modal share of 8% by 2020 will be sought. This will represent an increase of 7.1% from the baseline, and in real terms would mean a total of approximately 40 staff usually travelling by bus.
- 5.4 Following the completion of the 2017 Staff Travel Survey, it is apparent that the proportion of staff travelling by train, cycling, and walking have all declined. At this stage therefore a target to seek to increase use of each of these modes by 2% will be sought (approximately 10 staff for each mode) is considered reasonable and realistic.

6.0 Measures

6.1 Information Provision

As part of the induction information, all new starters with the HFRS HQ and the Hampshire Constabulary should be provided with sustainable travel information, which will promote and encourage travel to the site by non-car modes. This information should also be made available to existing staff via the staff intranet or website.

6.2 Awareness Raising

A programme of occasional events should be instituted, which will remind employees of the sustainable alternatives available for travel to the site and raise their profile in employees' minds.

6.3 Priority Parking for Car Sharers

In order to support and encourage car sharing, priority bays for car sharers have been introduced (12 bays). Since 8 respondents currently stated that they car-share, that would indicate existing demand for 4 bays. As there is a new target to increase car sharing up to a demand for 17 bays (34 staff) it will be important to continue to monitor use of the car sharing bays.

6.4 Incentivising Sustainable Travel

Interest-free loans to staff to cover rail season tickets or cycling equipment are currently available to incentivise modal change. Ten staff who left a comment on the bus travel question mentioned the cost of bus travel, twenty-two staff who left a comment on the rail travel question also mentioned the cost. This would indicate that loans alone may not be sufficient to generate modal change; however subsidies are unlikely to be possible to provide.

6.5 Car-share Partners

The biggest incentive to encourage staff to car-share was identified in the staff survey as simply helping staff to find potential car-sharing partners (24.5%). Hampshire has an existing "Hampshire Lift-share" website which can help identify partners from the local community. It is accepted that SHQ staff may prefer to share with work colleagues given the sensitive nature of some of their job roles, and for this reason it is worth investigating the setting up of a database on the staff intranet which can be used to find possible car-sharing partners. This would need to be carried out by HFRS/HC IT staff in consultation with management. Investigating a deal with local taxi companies in case of lifts becoming unavailable remains important (18.5% positive).

6.6 Cycle Facilities Improvement

Almost 20% of staff mentioned improved cycle routes as the key incentive to encourage cycling. This is not within SHQ's gift, but publicising the available network of safe cycle routes which already exist within and beyond Eastleigh would be worthwhile.

6.7 Individual comments were provided by 52 staff at the end of their surveys; these bear further inspection as their experiences should be given due weight. Comments included the following points:

- Equipment needs dictate travel arrangements to a high degree.
This is accepted; in particular where equipment needs to be carried from site to site and cannot simply be stored at work.
- Remote working is available and could reduce the need to travel.
This is an important point; it should be investigated further how many staff could take advantage of occasional or regular remote working.
- Some facilities for cyclists exist but there remain further requirements.
All requests should be raised with the Travel Plan Coordinator (TPC); an action should be added to follow up particular issues raised by the survey.
- More motorcycle parking is needed and could encourage motorcycle use.
While motorcycling is generally favoured by a minority, there is merit in the TPC investigating demand and ways of catering for motorcycle users.

- Staff choose to live at a distance from their workplace, and then say driving is their only option.

While there may be some truth in this, the Travel Plan does not seek to tell staff where they should live; its aims are to encourage changes to travel behaviour where possible and practical.

- Cyclists and pedestrians are in conflict on some local shared foot/cycle ways.

The TPC should contact Eastleigh Borough Council to raise this issue and ask whether clearer marking of the shared routes can be carried out.

- Shift patterns and flexible hours make car sharing impractical

This emphasises the need for an internal database to help find car-sharing partners. In addition, it may be worth advertising Hampshire Liftshare to staff.

- More video conferencing would help

Again, a valuable point and one which should be investigated in terms of feasibility and cost impacts.

- Childcare affects travel choices. Any chance of on-site provision?

The feasibility of on-site childcare is an internal matter for SHQ to consider.

- More support services for cyclists (maintenance assistance etc)

There may be merit in setting up a Bicycle User Group if one does not already exist, in order to investigate issues such as these.

- Duplication of spaces as some staff have a personal vehicle and a work vehicle

It should be investigated whether on-call vehicles could be used as personal vehicles or not; in principle this point seems valid.

- A park and ride facility would be favourable

While Eastleigh in general might well benefit from a P&R facility, the Council appears not to be examining such a possibility at present. Ironically the best site in the local area would probably be across the road on the land formerly occupied by the Council Offices and Magistrates' Court.

- Charging to park on site would discourage people.

Absolutely, but it would need to be seen as a last resort as it would be likely to reduce goodwill; we are trying to change travel patterns more by persuasion than coercion.

7.0 Management & Monitoring

- 7.1 In large organisations it is beneficial to set up a Travel Plan Steering Group so that the Travel Plan Co-ordinator (TPC) has support. This support is crucial logistically in order to carry out the duties of their role.
- 7.2 **The TPC for SHQ is the Environmental Impact Project Co-ordinator**, whose role is specified as part of their job description. An EIPC has been in place at HFRS since at least 2008.
- 7.3 Monitoring should be carried out at 1, 3 and 5 years after the start of the Travel Plan, by carrying out follow-up surveys. The 2017 Travel Survey can be counted as the "Year 1 survey."
- 7.4 The monitoring surveys are used to measure progress against Travel Plan targets, and also provide a facility for revising targets, objectives and measures in response to changing circumstances and needs. Monitoring should be arranged by the TPC and Steering Group, and progress reports can be fed back to staff in team meetings.
- 7.5 It is important to realise and emphasise that the Travel Plan is not a one-off five-year process; once this plan expires in 2020 a new plan should be produced to supersede and continue the work to support and increase sustainable travel to/from the site over the next five years to 2025 and beyond.

8.0 Action Plan

Action	Objective	Responsibility	Timescale
Investigate demand for additional motorcycle parking and possible locations for provision	Raised via 2017 Travel Survey	TPC & Steering Group	Summer 2017
Raise issue of pedestrian & cycle conflict on shared routes with Eastleigh BC	Raised via 2017 Travel Survey	TPC	Summer 2017
Provide Sustainable Travel Information for New Starters and Existing Staff	Reduce car travel/ Increase sustainable travel	TPC & Steering Group	Ongoing – sustainable travel pack provided to PH1 new joiners.
Monitor use of priority Car-sharing parking spaces	Reduce solo car travel	TPC & Senior Management	Monthly
Continue to manage existing parking including use of permit system	Reduce peak car traffic	TPC & Senior Management	Ongoing
Promote staff loans for sustainable travel	Increase sustainable travel	TPC & Marketing Team	Ongoing
Creation of internal car-sharing database; also promotion of Hampshire Lift-Share website	Increase car sharing	TPC & IT Staff	Updated every 6 months
Investigate needs of cyclists including items raised in 2017 survey	Increase cycling	TPC & Steering Group	Ongoing
Continue to practise flexible working including shifts outside peak times.	Reduce peak car traffic	TPC & Steering Group	Ongoing
Investigate how frequently staff need to visit the site if on-call – are there opportunities for more remote working?	Reduce peak car traffic	TPC & Steering Group	Ongoing

Investigate potential for using video conferencing instead of site meetings	Reduce peak car traffic	TPC & Steering Group	Part of current ICT transformation scheme (2017)
Investigate whether provision of on-site childcare facilities are feasible and whether sufficient demand exists.	Raised via 2017 Travel Survey	TPC & Steering Group	Summer 2017
Attempt to set up a Bicycle Users Group (if one does not already exist) to discuss and work on cycling issues.	Raised via 2017 Travel Survey	TPC & Steering Group	Summer 2017

- 8.1 While the actions continue focus on staff travel, this is the largest proportion of site traffic and is the part most obviously within the control of the HFRS and Hampshire Constabulary management. Visitor traffic is low in relative and absolute terms, likewise Deliveries do not have a significant traffic generating profile. The requirements of the site to provide fleet maintenance facilities meanwhile cannot feasibly be mitigated through the travel planning process.
- 8.2 In the case of actions such as information provision and awareness raising, the content of these should be updated on a regular basis (at a minimum once per year) in order to check relevance and enable a sustained period of promoting the Travel Plan with correct, up-to-date information.

9.0 Funding

- 9.1 The role of the Environmental Impact Project Coordinator is permanent and funded, and thus represents a significant financial investment by HFRS. This role incorporates the role of Travel Plan Coordinator.
- 9.2 HFRS is committed to providing additional funding to support delivery of the Travel Plan; the extent of this funding will be agreed on an annual basis between the TPC and Steering Group. This currently falls under the remit of the HFRS Carbon Management Programme.
- 9.3 The service also has additional staff resources and budgets dedicated to internal communications which will be available for the production of internal marketing campaigns in support of travel plan activities, as well as for monitoring work.
- 9.4 Hampshire Constabulary also have a Corporate Communications team allowing for the same role in internal marketing as described for HFRS in 9.3 above.

10.0 Appendix A

Travel Survey Questionnaire

1. Where do you travel from (first part of postcode)?
2. Do you work for Hampshire Constabulary, Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service or Hampshire County Council?
3. Do you have a disability or health issue that affects your choice of transport?
4. Do you work full or part time?
5. What are your normal working hours?
6. Do you have a company lease / company provided vehicle?
7. How far is your commute to work?
8. How long does it normally take to commute to work?
9. How do you travel to work? (check all that apply)
10. Do you occasionally use a different method of travel to work? (check all that apply)
11. Why do you normally travel by car? (check all that apply)
12. If you don't currently, what would encourage you to car share? (check all that apply)
13. If you don't currently, would any of the following encourage you to travel by bus? (check all that apply)
14. If you don't currently, would any of the following encourage you to travel by train? (check all that apply)
15. If you don't currently, would any of the following encourage you to cycle? (check all that apply)
16. If you don't currently, would any of the following encourage you to walk? (check all that apply)
17. Please add any other comments relevant to your travel arrangements