**Invitation to Quote**

|  |
| --- |
| **Name of Council:**Gosport Borough Council |
| **Invitation to Quote (ITQ) for:**Consultancy Services: Blockhouse Modal Shift Transport Study |
| **Invitation to Quote for Return Date and Time (Deadline)**Noon – 16th May 2023 |

**GOSPORT BOROUGH COUNCIL/ DEFENCE INFRASTRUCTURE ORGANISATION**

**Blockhouse Modal Shift Transport**

**Study Brief**

**CONTENTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.0 Introduction and Context | 4 |
| 2.0 Project Scope and Requirements | 9 |
|  3.0 Timetable | 15 |
|  4.0 Quote Completion Information | 17 |
|  5.0 Quote Evaluation Model | 22 |
| 6.0 Evaluation Process | 23 |
| **Appendices (included within this ITQ)** |
| Appendix 1: Plan of Blockhouse within the Haslar Peninsula, Gosport | 24 |
| Appendix 2: National and Local Planning Policy Context: Overview | 25 |
| See also attached:* Quotation response document, including
	+ Schedule 1: Commercially Sensitive Form
	+ Schedule 2: Form of Quote
* Contract Draft
 |

**Summary**

Gosport Borough Council (GBC) and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) are issuing a joint ‘Invitation to Quote’ (ITQ) to better understand the opportunities in relation to traffic and transport as part of the likely site wide redevelopment of Fort Blockhouse (FBH) (referred to herein as ‘Blockhouse’) in Gosport.

The prime purpose of the study is to explore solutions to reduce the use of private cars associated with new development arising from the planned regeneration of Blockhouse, and to explore the use of more sustainable forms of transport and reduce the number of additional trips by private vehicles over the Haslar Bridge which is a traffic signal controlled, single carriageway linking the Haslar Peninsula including Blockhouse with most of Gosport and beyond.

It is envisaged that this study will inform the proposed Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan and a comprehensive masterplan for the site which will comprise a mixed-use development including residential, employment and commercial/community uses with associated open spaces and public realm.

We would be grateful if you would submit a quotation in accordance with the following brief.

The work the GBC and DIO wish to commission is set out in Section 2.1 which identifies the following components:

1. Outline the background context in relation to the Blockhouse site including a consideration of currently available information;
2. Consideration of current transport and travel challenges and constraints and how these can be overcome through modal shift;
3. Consideration of each of the modal shift and other transport interventions including the following information:
	* capital and ongoing costs;
	* management issues;
	* land use requirements (ownership, planning, costs);
	* timescales associated with delivery; and
	* any other potential issues/considerations.
4. Conclusions- The selected consultant to make recommendations on which mix of solutions have a viable long-term future within the context of likely development at Blockhouse development either planned or under construction on the wider Haslar peninsula.

The remainder of the ITQ sets out all the requirements in relation to submitting an ITQ, how it will be evaluated and various contractual requirements.

**1.0 INTRODUCTION and CONTEXT**

**1.1 Introduction**

Gosport Borough Council (GBC) and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) are issuing a joint ‘Invitation to Quote’ (ITQ) to better understand the opportunities in relation to traffic and transport as part of the likely site wide redevelopment of Fort Blockhouse (FBH) (referred to herein as ‘Blockhouse’) in Gosport.

The prime purpose of the study is to explore solutions to reduce the use of private cars associated with new development arising from the planned regeneration of Blockhouse, and to explore the use of more sustainable forms of transport and reduce the number of additional trips by private vehicles over the Haslar Bridge which is a traffic signal controlled, single carriageway linking the Haslar Peninsula including Blockhouse with most of Gosport and beyond.

Consequently the need to address modal shift at the proposed Blockhouse allocation sites, as set out in the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2038 Consultation Draft (Regulation 18) (September 2021), is considered essential as part of the masterplanning of the Blockhouse site.

The study will therefore need to include the following (see Section 2.1 for further details):-

1. Outline the background context in relation to the Blockhouse site including a consideration of currently available information
2. Consideration of current transport and travel challenges and constraints and how these can be overcome through modal shift
3. Consideration of each of the modal shift and other transport interventions including the following information:
	* capital and ongoing costs;
	* management issues;
	* land use requirements (ownership, planning, costs);
	* timescales associated with delivery; and
	* any other potential issues/considerations.
4. Conclusions

The selected consultant to make recommendations on which mix of solutions have a viable long-term future within the context of likely development on the Haslar peninsula.

We would be grateful if you would submit a quotation in accordance with the following brief.

**1.2 Background**

Blockhouse is located at the end of the Haslar peninsula and has been in the defence ownership since the 1500’s. Part of the site – Blockhouse 1 – was scheduled for closure in 2016 and it is anticipated that it will be formally closed in 2025.

As the landowner, the DIO has appointed a Project Team to advise on the disposal strategy associated with the site. This includes JLL (commercial and planning advisors); WSP (technical and environmental advisors); PRP (masterplanners); as well as a range of relevant expertise from within DIO and MOD.

The Project Team is engaging with GBC (as Local Planning Authority (LPA)) in relation to the future plans of this site which includes actively participating in the Regulation 19 / Local Plan review. The emerging GBC Local Plan 2038 states that that the ‘*Gosport Waterfront and the Haslar Peninsula will aim to be world-class locale for marine industries and sailing and be redeveloped to provide new mixed-use neighbourhoods and marine employment’.*

In parallel with this, JLL is advising the DIO on the disposal strategy. This includes considering the potential mix of uses which Blockhouse 1 could accommodate. This work needs to be mindful of a number of challenges the site has (which includes Listed buildings such as the Submarine Escape Training Tower (SETT) and other heritage issues; sea wall; enduring operational requirements; and access) as well as seeking to maximise the opportunities the site offers (which include waterfront position and access, and heritage).

**1.3 Gosport context**

Gosport is a large urban town located within the South Hampshire sub-region serving a population of over 84,000. Covering over 27.6 square kilometres (10.6 square miles or 2,761 hectares)[[1]](#footnote-1), Gosport Borough is the twelfth smallest district in England and the smallest in Hampshire. The Borough sits on a peninsula adjacent to Fareham Borough and is surrounded on three sides by the Solent and Portsmouth Harbour, with 39 kilometres (24 miles) of coastline.

There are two main settlements, Gosport and Lee-on-the-Solent, which are separated by the rural Alver Valley. The Borough is predominantly urban in character, with over 80% ‘built on’[[2]](#footnote-2). Space is at a premium so must be used effectively. Significant natural assets, a prime waterfront location, plus a large stock of vacant heritage buildings provide a strong platform for ‘economic ‘re-invention and repositioning’, allowing Gosport to ultimately make a much greater contribution towards both the regional and UK economy.

Spatial challenges arising from its peninsula location restrict Gosport’s efforts to diversify its economy or attract significant inward investment, driving a need to develop a bespoke and innovative approach towards future economic development. Social challenges and health issues, affect parts of the Borough.

Despite these challenges, Gosport benefits from a strong local community, a belief that it has an economic asset base capable of increased, sustainable exploitation, plus the support of national, regional and sub-regional partners encouraging and supporting the Borough to make the transition towards becoming a modern, forward-looking local economy.

**1.4 Site description**

Blockhouse is located on the Haslar peninsula located in the south-east part of Gosport. Other neighbouring sites of note include the Haslar Hospital development and the former MOJ site which has recently been identified as an Immigration Centre. Other sites which may come forward in the future, include the Gunboat Sheds and Piggeries sites.

Blockhouse is located, approximately a 10 minute walk from Gosport town centre via Haslar Road / Haslar Bridge. The most convenient access to Portsmouth is via passenger ferry. The site is bound by Haslar Lake and Portsmouth Harbour to the north and east. The Solent is located to the south and the building associated with the former Royal Haslar Hospital is to the west.

Blockhouse comprises one site but is split into three distinct land parcels. These are known as Blockhouse 1, 2 and 3 (Appendix 1). Further description of the three parcels is as follows:

* **Blockhouse 1.** Formerly known as HMS Dolphin, this part of the site is not currently in substantial use. It previously accommodated a former training facility which was then reused more recently to support a Field Hospital base. A proportion of the buildings are in poor condition, many of which are redundant. This part of the site also accommodates several Listed Buildings.
* **Blockhouse 2.** This site is currently occupied by the Army as well as accommodating the Submarine Museum, the Hornet Sailing Club and the Joint Services Adventurous Sailing Training Centre (JSASTC).
* **Blockhouse 3.** This site is currently occupied by the Army and located on the northern side of Haslar Road. The site is used to store JSASTC and Hornet Sailing Club yachts and is home to the Gosport Sea Cadets.

All three parcels benefit from access to the water.

* + **Blockhouse 1** – This parcel benefits from five existing jetties. These are Pierhead, Trot 1, 2 and 3; and Petrol Pier. None of the jetties are currently in active use. It is anticipated they will be subject to condition surveys (which will likely include underwater assessments) as part of the ongoing Site Closure works.

* **Blockhouse 2** – This parcel benefits from a number of small jetties and pontoons which are the responsibility of the various occupational interests related to marine leisure users.
* **Blockhouse 3** – This parcel benefits from a slipway which provides direct access to Haslar Marina.

The response to this brief should consider all three parcels i.e. Blockhouse 1, 2 and 3.

**1.5 National and Local Policy**

It will be necessary to consider national and local policy when undertaking this study. This includes national guidance included in the NPPF (July 2021) and associated Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), various Hampshire County Council (the local highway authority) transport planning documents including the emerging Local Transport Plan (LTP4) and Gosport Borough Council’s adopted and emerging Local Plans. An overview of these documents are contained in Appendix 2.

**1.6 Key drivers for encouraging modal shift**

There are a number of key considerations behind the Council’s aim of encouraging more journeys to be made by sustainable travel modes other than the private car. For this particular study the Blockhouse site has significant accessibility constraints relating to the signalled single carriageway over Haslar Bridge which connects the Haslar Peninsula with the Town Centre as well as limitations on the road network to the west along Fort Road and Clayhall Road. Consequently the Council together with the DIO and HCC would like to explore options at an early stage. Potential measures could therefore deliver a number of benefits including:

*Improving accessibility and connectivity*:-

Facilitating modal shift to cycling, walking and public transport could provide greater levels of connectivity between communities and areas of economic activity and could open up parts of the Borough by making them more accessible to all (e.g. the Gosport Waterfront).

*Sustainability benefits*:-

Reducing the number of journeys made by car would contribute to reducing CO2 levels and consequent impacts on the environment, such as climate change.

*Air quality benefits:-*

Air pollution has been described as the second-biggest public health threat after smoking. Car exhaust gases can include Carbon Monoxide (CO), Nitrogen Oxide and Nitrogen Dioxide (NOx), Particulate Matter (PM) and Hydrocarbons (HC). Whilst dirty air does not directly kill people, it is estimated in the UK to contribute to the shortening of the lives of around 40,000 people a year, principally by undermining the health of people with heart or lung problems. It also compromises the health of people suffering from ailments like asthma and hay fever.

It is acknowledged that this may change over time, with the introduction and growth in more hybrid and wholly-electric vehicles that do not have the same polluting impacts at location of use.

There are potential concerns that queued / idling vehicles at the Haslar Bridge traffic lights could also have the potential to cause localised air quality issues and therefore an additional reason that it is imperative to consider modal shift options.

*Health benefits*:-

Both from reduced air pollution (see above) and from encouraging greater levels of exercise (e.g. walking, cycling, and even walking to the bus stop).

*Reducing congestion*:-

Encouraging a greater proportion of journeys to be made by other travel modes, especially via public transport, could make a meaningful contribution towards reducing congestion levels in the town, particularly at peak times. There is currently very limited, if any, capacity within Gosport’s main road network. Traffic congestion is most acute on the A32, the main route between Gosport Town Centre and Fareham. This means that it is difficult to support further growth and development without suitable mitigation, in the form of enhanced modal shift measures, being delivered to assist in freeing up some of this capacity.

*Social benefits*:-

Whilst Gosport’s demographic means that car ownership levels in the Borough are relatively high – like most of Southern England - the cost of owning and running a car (insurance, tax, rising fuel prices, etc.) means that this option is out of reach for some residents. Local plan evidence also suggests that Gosport’s demographics are changing towards an older population overall with a potentially less mobile population. It is therefore important that other realistic modes of travel, such as good and reliable public transport are available.

**2.0 PROJECT SCOPE AND REQUIREMENTS**

**2.1 Scope of the Project**

The purpose of this exercise is, having regard to the historic, current and potential future position in relation to traffic and transport on the Haslar peninsula, to establish what the opportunities could be to develop multi-modal transport options which provide links to Gosport, Portsmouth and the surrounding area.

The report will help inform GBC’s wider transport strategy as well as the DIO’s work on the disposal strategy for the Blockhouse site. This includes helping to inform discussions between DIO and GBC about the potential future use of the site.

To deliver these objectives, the successful consultancy will be asked to provide a desk-based report which addresses the points set out below.

**Background Context.** The consultant is to provide:

1. **Background information**

This includes the following elements

* A summary of the existing available baseline information and which will be made available to the successful tenderer. This should include:
	+ DIO’s Stantec Study.
	+ Previous planning applications relating to Haslar Hospital and HCC’s comments.
	+ Systra Modelling commissioned by the Council for its Regulation 18 Local plan consultation in 2021.
	+ Reference to the Gosport LCWIP and GBC Living List of cycle and pedestrian improvements.
* A consideration of recent major development consents on the Haslar peninsula including Haslar Hospital and whether there is any synthesis or critical mass arising to support modal shift.
* Liaising with DIO, GBC and HCC on two assumed development scenarios, which this study should be based on. The growth figures to be modelled will be provided at the inception meeting, but will be based on the Regulation 18 version of the emerging Local Plan and figures derived from the current masterplanning for the site. This includes agreeing trip generation assumptions associated with other sites on the peninsula which have not yet come forward. Where sites have already been granted planning permission but have not yet been delivered, the consultant should refer to the Transport Assessment which formed part of the planning application.
1. **Modal shift**
* Outline what current challenges and constraints are in relation to transport and travel on the Haslar peninsula.
* Outline potential barriers to modal shift and how these can be overcome. This section should consider the existing as well as potential new populations on the Haslar peninsula.
1. **Potential transport interventions**
* The selected consultant is to consider each of the transport modes identified below in relation to the two assumed development scenarios outlined in Section 1 above.
* Each option should consider the opportunities and constraints relating to each potential solution including:
	+ capital and ongoing costs;
	+ management issues;
	+ land use requirements (ownership, planning, costs);
	+ timescales associated with delivery; and
	+ any other potential issues/considerations.

***Bus Transport***

Selected consultant to review existing bus provision which provides links from the Haslar peninsula to the Gosport Transport Interchange. It is noted that current timetabling and routing see no buses currently utilising Haslar Road, therefore there are no buses directly passing the site. Considerations should include:

* The operational and commercial feasibility of extending the Eclipse services E1 and/or E2 route to include Blockhouse/Haslar Hospital Loop.
* Potential extension of the existing subsidised 11 service which is currently limited and currently does not utilise Haslar Road / go past Blockhouse.
* Providing a new regular shuttle service between the Blockhouse site / the wider Haslar peninsula area and the Gosport transport interchange.
* Bus Stop at main entrance, and within site with good quality shelter from adverse weather, together with real time information.
* Review of the existing community bus Dial-A-Ride which is operated by Community First is available to book between 9:00-16:00 Mon-Fri cover trips in Gosport/Fareham area.

As part of this work it will be necessary to liaise with First Bus and other appropriate bus service operators on potential options.

***Water transport***

Selected consultant to explore the potential of water transport options. This should include consideration of:-

* The existing link which the National Museum of the Royal Navy already provide between Historic Dock Yard and the Submarine Museum.
	+ For example, could a service be expanded to include the main pontoon on the Portsmouth side adjacent the railway station as well as a link to the Gosport Ferry pontoon on the Gosport side?
* The potential for a water taxi from Fort Blockhouse site to the Gosport ferry terminal and Portsmouth destinations and realistic assumptions about potential user profiles and passenger numbers.
* Review of the outcome of the recent Park and Float pilot scheme for the Gosport ferry.

***Land train***

Selected consultant to explore the feasibility of linking the site to a wider strategic route from Priddy’s Hard-RCY-Town Centre- Haslar as well as a service which reduces car use within the Blockhouse site itself.

***Non Residential Park and Ride***

Selected consultant to explore the potential for employees and visitors to park in the main Walpole Park car parks and travel by non-car modes to access the Blockhouse site.

***Pedestrian access / walking***

Selected consultant to consider the role of Creekside Walk between Haslar Bridge and the Town Centre to improve connections to the west side of Town Centre. This should include considering:

* What has been funded so far e.g. Haslar Marina proposal.
* What may be funded by external funding sources - such as Government grants for infrastructure and heritage.
* To consider if any pedestrian refuges are required - e.g. on proposed Gosport Lines walk between Bastion No.1 and Walpole Park/Car Park?
* Improved aligning, surfacing and wayfinding to/from and along walking routes

***Cycling***

In recognition of the need to provide improved cycle infrastructure and facilities, the selected consultant to consider the potential for:

* Improved cycle provision across bridge. For example:
	+ a head start at traffic lights
	+ a warning sign to vehicles re cycle usage across bridge
* Improved route between Haslar Bridge and Gosport transport interchange.
* A cycle route to be created along the existing access road between Blockhouse and Fort Road Car Park.
* A link to the new bus interchange and cycle proposals for Mumby Road and South Street.
* The provision of a mobility hub(s) and bicycle share schemes (e.g. Beryl Bikes)
* Improvements to the cycle route to Stokes Bay and local schools.
* Refer to the Gosport LCWIP (and GBC living list of cycle and pedestrian improvements) for suggested improvements in the area to improve the links to the LCWIP routes and NCN cycle routes
* Solent Mobility Zone-cycle zone scheme as mentioned in the Stantec-Transport and Movement Strategy-section 5.2 p5.18).
	+ This should focus on Portsmouth and Southampton but with an extension on the Eclipse BRT Corridor in Gosport.

***Land use options***

Selected consultant to consider the impact of land use on modal shift:

* Parking - Consideration of different types of residential dwellings and how this might impact the requirement for parking on and off site and how this relates to GBC’s existing Car Parking SPD.
* Uses - Consideration of the potential impact that a local neighbourhood centre on the Haslar peninsula could have on reducing potential need for car trips.
* Potential creation of a mobility hub on the peninsula including bike hire.

***Other transport and/or land use options / scenarios***

Selected consultant to consider:

* The Solent Future Transport Zone’s proposals for micro mobility solutions and how these could be applied to journeys to and from Fort Blockhouse

<https://www.solent-transport.com/solent-future-transport-zone/>

* Consideration of an extension of the Driving Force scheme for over 55’s operated by Gosport Voluntary Action (GVA) to access medical appointment, social clubs and friends/family.
* Outline the travel planning required to work with new residents which includes links with the Haslar travel plan, issue of bus taster tickets and cycle equipment vouchers.
* Whether there is potential for the use of developer contributions from the Haslar Hospital scheme relevant to access and transport improvements.
* Best practice initiatives to reduce car ownership which could be incorporated into the site design, such as car clubs.

The scope of this brief is not exhaustive. The selected consultant to advise if there are any other innovative and creative options based on their knowledge of best practice elsewhere.

1. **Conclusions**

The selected consultant to make recommendations on which mix of solutions have a viable long-term future within the context of likely development on the Haslar peninsula.

**2.2 Outputs**

Following the considerations outlined in Section 2.1 above, the consultant’s report should address all matters included in the ‘Scope of the Report’ in Section 2 above.

At the completion of the project, the consultant shall provide both the GBC and DIO with an electronic copy of the report.

Copyright for all documentation shall be given to GBC and DIO.

**2.3 Project Team Skills**

This invitation is open to consultancies which are believed to have, or be able to call upon the relevant skills.

Your fee proposal will need to demonstrate your firm has the following knowledge and understanding of the following:

* Technical ability and knowledge of requirements to consider and advise on multi-modal transport options.
* General south coast and Solent specific knowledge of opportunities and challenges associated with traffic and transport.

The names and qualifications of the team who would be carrying out the work, along with their committed hours and their hourly rate, and of any sub-consultants that you would engage to provide specialist input, together with a brief résumé of their relevant experience; their fee etc., is also required.

**2.4 Contract Term**

The Council proposes to enter into a Contract for a period of approximately 4 months with the successful consultant.

The anticipated service commencement date is week commencing 12th June 2023

|  |
| --- |
| Insurance Requirements |
| Professional Indemnity: (for the life of the contract) | £1 million |
| Public Liability | £10 million |
| Employers Liability | £5 million |

**2.5 Purpose and Scope of this Invitation to Quote**

This Invitation to Quote (ITQ):

* Asks respondents to submit their Quotes in accordance with the instructions set out in the remainder of this ITQ. The budget for the this study being £30,000 - £40,000
* Sets out the overall timetable and process for the procurement to respondents
* Provides respondents with sufficient information to enable them to submit a compliant Quote (including providing templates where relevant)
* Sets out the Award Criteria and the Quotation Evaluation Model that will be used to evaluate the Quotes
* Explains the administrative arrangements for the receipt of Quotes

**2.6 Clarifications about the Services or ITQ**

Any clarifications relating to this ITQ must be submitted to the procuring officer Andrew Broster (GBC Traffic and Transport Manager) or Jayson Grygiel (GBC Planning Policy Manager) at Gosport Borough Council, via the Proactis portal.

The Council will respond to all reasonable clarifications as soon as possible via Proactis. If a respondent wishes the Council to treat a clarification as confidential and not issue the response to all respondents, it must state this when submitting the clarification. If, in the opinion of the Council, the clarification is not confidential, the Council will inform the respondent and it will have an opportunity to withdraw it. If the clarification is not withdrawn, the response will be issued to all respondents.

The deadline for receipt of clarifications relating to the Services or this ITQ is set out at 3.1-3.2 below.

Respondents are advised not to rely on communications from the Council in respect of the ITQ unless they are made in accordance with these instructions.

The Council reserves the right (but is not obliged) to seek clarification of any aspect of a Respondent’s quote during the evaluation phase where necessary for the purposes of carrying out a fair evaluation. Respondents are asked to respond to such requests promptly. Vague or ambiguous answers are likely to score poorly or render the quote non-compliant.

**3.0 TIMETABLE**

**3.1 Key Dates**

 This procurement will follow a clear, structured and transparent process to ensure a fair and level playing field is maintained at all times, and that all respondents are treated equally.

 The key dates for this procurement (Timetable) are currently anticipated to be as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Event** | **Date** |
|  |  |
| Issue Invitation to Quote | 17.04.2023 |
| Deadline for receipt of clarifications | 01.05.2023 |
| Deadline for receipt of Quotes | 16.05.2023 noon |
| Evaluation of Quotes | 17.05.2023 to 25.05.2023 |
| Notification of contract award decision | 26.05.2023 |
| Confirm contract award | 05.06.2023 |
| Target commencement date | w/c 12.06.2023 |

 Any changes to the procurement Timetable shall be notified to all Respondents as soon as practicable.

**3.2** **Deadline for receipt of clarifications**

Between 17th April 2023 and 16th May 2023 please contact Andrew Broster (GBC Traffic and Transport Manager) or Jayson Grygiel (GBC Planning Policy Manager) via the message facility on Proactis.

**3.3 Deadline for receipt of Quotes**

Responses to this ITQ must arrive at the address and in the manner prescribed under Paragraph 4 .1 no later than the Deadline, noon, 16th May 2023. Any Quote received after the Deadline shall not be opened or considered. The Council may, however, in its own absolute discretion extend the Deadline and in such circumstances the Council will notify all Respondents of any change.

**3.4 Contract Award**

The Council may award Contract(s) on the basis of a Quote submitted in accordance with the instructions below. Contract award is subject to the formal approval process of the Council. Until all necessary approvals are obtained no Contract will be entered into. Once the Council has reached a decision in respect of a contract award, it will notify all bidders of that decision via proactis and before entering into any Contract(s).

**3.5 Programme Dates and Proposed Meetings**

The Council will expect a draft study report by early September 2023 and a completed report by mid-October 2023 in order to inform the emerging masterplanning process and the next stage of the Council’s Local Plan

The consultants will need to provide a detailed work programme to meet this target date which outlines when the key tasks will be undertaken. It will also need to allow for appropriate liaison meetings with the Council and DIO officers on the draft findings of the study as well as input from Hampshire County Council. The consultant and Council, HCC and DIO officers will hold meetings as and when necessary but as a minimum will include the following:

* Introductory project meeting to confirm the project process, timetable and to establish information needs and sources – w/c 12th June 2023. This is likely to be face to face and include a site visit.
* Progress meeting to discuss any emerging issues or clarify requirements – early to mid-July 2023; and
* Meeting to discuss the findings of draft report – mid September 2023

Consequently your fee proposal should include an allowance for a minimum of three meetings. If you consider that additional meetings will be required, please include details of this within your proposal.

**4.0** **QUOTE COMPLETION INFORMATION**

All submissions must be uploaded via the South East Business Portal, also known as Proactis before the deadline stated in the timetable in this ITQ.

Link to the portal: <https://sebp.due-north.com/>

Your response must include:

* Completed Quotation Response Document including;
	+ Completed Schedule 1 Commercially Sensitive Information (if applicable)
	+ Completed Schedule 2 – Form of Quote
* Equality and Diversity Policy
* Data Protection Policy and Procedures
* Supporting documentation (to support the answers to quality questions)

**4.1 Formalities**

All documents comprising the Quote must be submitted through the portal and will remain sealed until the deadline has passed.

The following requirements must be adhered to when submitting Quotes:

* A clear statement confirming that your firm does not have any conflicts of interest in relation to this site.
* A detailed timeline and milestones for the completion of the work must be included
* Confirmation of the availability of the proposed study team
* CV’s of the members of the proposed study team, including experience of relevant / similar work undertaken etc.
* References from previous work
* A table of Consultants individual time to be spent on the project, day rate and overall cost must be provided.
* Details of any sub-consultants that you would seek to engage with to provide specialist input. This should include a brief resume of their relevant experience, fee etc.
* Any additional pre-existing material which is necessary to support the Quote should be included as schedules with cross-references to this material in the main body of the Quote. Cross-references to this ITQ should also be included in the Quote whenever this is relevant.
* Where documents are embedded within other documents, Respondents must upload separate copies of the embedded documents.
* The Quote must be in English and drafted in accordance with the drafting guidance set out in this ITQ.
* A table of contents must be provided.
* The Quote must be fully cross-referenced.
* A list of supporting material must be supplied.
* **The Equality and Diversity and Data Protection need to be included with the ITQ.**

 The Quote must be clear, concise and complete. The Council reserves the right to mark a Respondent down or exclude them from the procurement if its Quote contains any ambiguities, caveats or lacks clarity. Respondents should submit only such information as is necessary to respond effectively to this ITQ. Quotes will be evaluated on the basis of information submitted by the Deadline.

 The Respondent must download, complete and include a duly executed Form of Quote (Schedule 2).

 Where the Respondent is a company, the Quote must be signed by a duly authorised representative of that company. Where the Respondent is a consortium, the Quote must be signed by the lead authorised representative of the consortium, which organisation shall be responsible for the performance of producing the work set out in the successful quote proposal. In the case of a partnership, all the partners should sign or, alternatively, one only may sign, in which case he must have and should state that he has Council to sign on behalf of the other partner(s). The names of all the partners should be given in full together with the trading name of the partnership. In the case of a sole trader, s/he should sign and give his/her name in full together with the name under which s/he is trading.

**4.2 Executive Summary**

 Each Respondent must also provide an executive summary of its Quote and include within it:-

* An outline of the way in which the Council’s requirements are to be met by its proposal.
* A summary of all the services offered by the Respondent in response to the ITQ.
* Proposed timeline, clearly indicating the Respondents approach towards minimising the effect of their work on any electoral period that may occur during the lifetime of this project.
* An overview of the Respondent’s overall costs and proposals in relation to pricing.
* A clear statement of whether it is a consortium or a group of companies with one supplier.
* A clear statement of its commitment to meet the Council’s requirements and the pricing, payment and performance model.
* Confirmation that the Quote(s) will remain open for a period of 90 days.

 If changes subsequently occur in relation to the statements set out in the executive summary, the applicable Respondent must promptly notify the Council of them. The Council reserves the right to disqualify any Respondent that fails to duly notify the Council.

**4.3 Submission of Quotes**

 Each Respondent must submit a quote meeting the Council’s minimum requirements, operating as a standalone bid and not be dependent on any other bid or any other factors external to the Quote itself. That is, the Quote must be capable of being accepted by the Council in its own right. Please see section 5.1 regarding mandatory requirements.

**4.4 Warnings and disclaimers**

 While the information contained in this ITQ is believed to be correct at the time of issue, the Council, its advisors and any other awarding authorities will not accept any liability for its accuracy, adequacy or completeness, nor will any express or implied warranty be given. This exclusion extends to liability in relation to any statement, opinion or conclusion contained in or any omission from, this ITQ (including its appendices) and in respect of any other written or oral communication transmitted (or otherwise made available) to any Respondents. This exclusion does not extend to any fraudulent misrepresentation made by or on behalf of the Council.

 Neither the issue of this ITQ, nor any of the information presented in it, should be regarded as a commitment or representation on the part of the Council (or any other person) to enter into a contractual arrangement.

**4.5 Confidentiality and Freedom of Information**

 This ITQ is made available on condition that its contents (including the fact that the Respondent has received this ITQ) is kept confidential by the Respondent and is not copied, reproduced, distributed or passed to any other person at any time, except for the purpose of enabling the Respondent to submit a Quote.

 As a public body, the Council is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) in respect of information it holds (including third-party information). Any member of the public or other interested party may make a request for information.

 Respondents should be aware that, in compliance with its transparency obligations, the Council routinely publishes details of its contract(s), including the values and the identities of its suppliers on its website without consulting the provider of that information.

 The Council shall treat all Respondents’ responses as confidential during the procurement process. Requests for information received following the procurement process shall be considered on a case-by-case basis, applying the principles of FOIA, which permits certain information to be withheld, for example where disclosure would be prejudicial to a party’s commercial interests, and in accordance with the Council’s transparency obligations.

 Therefore, Respondents are responsible for ensuring that any confidential or commercially sensitive information, the disclosure of which would be likely to diminish the Respondents competitive edge, has been clearly identified to the Council in the template provided at Schedule 1.

**4.6 Publicity**

 No publicity regarding the Services or the award of any quote will be permitted unless and until the Council has given express written consent to the relevant communication. For example, no statements may be made to the media regarding the nature of any Quote, its contents or any proposals relating to it without the prior written consent of the Council.

**4.7 Respondent conduct and conflicts of interest**

 Any attempt by Respondents or their advisors to influence the award process in any way may result in the Respondent being disqualified. Specifically, Respondents shall not directly or indirectly at any time:

* Devise or amend the content of their Quote in accordance with any agreement or arrangement with any other person, other than in good faith with a person who is a proposed partner, supplier, or provider of finance.
* Enter into any agreement or arrangement with any other person as to the form or content of any other Quote, or offer to pay any sum of money or valuable consideration to any person to effect changes to the form or content of any other Quote.
* Enter into any agreement or arrangement with any other person that has the effect of prohibiting or excluding that person from submitting a Quote.
* Canvass the Council or any employees or agents of the Council in relation to this procurement.
* Attempt to obtain information from any of the employees or agents of the Council or their advisors concerning another Respondent or Quote.

Respondents are responsible for ensuring that no conflicts of interest exist between the Respondent and its advisers, and the Council and its advisors. Any Respondent who fails to comply with this requirement may be disqualified from the procurement at the discretion of the Council.

**4.8 Council’s rights**

 The Council reserves the right to:

* Waive or change the requirements of this ITQ from time to time without prior (or any) notice being given by the Council.
* Seek clarification or documents in respect of a Respondent’s submission.
* Disqualify any Respondent that does not submit a compliant Quote in accordance with the instructions in this ITQ.
* Disqualify any Respondent that is guilty of serious misrepresentation in relation to its Quote, expression of interest, or the ITQ process.
* Withdraw this ITQ at any time, or to re-invite quotations on the same or any alternative basis.
* Choose not to award any quote as a result of the current procurement process.

Make whatever changes it sees fit to the Timetable, structure or content of the procurement process, depending on approvals processes or for any other reason.

**4.9 Bid costs**

 The Council will not be liable for any bid costs, expenditure, work or effort incurred by a Respondent in proceeding with or participating in this procurement, including if the procurement process is terminated or amended by the Council.

**5.0 QUOTE EVALUATION MODEL**

**5.1 Award Criteria and Evaluation Criteria**

 Any quote(s) awarded as a result of this procurement will be awarded on the basis of the offer is the most economically advantageous to the Council. The Award Criteria are:

* 75% technical or quality
* 25% cost

Scores are arrived at following the application of the Evaluation Criteria set out below to the Respondent’s Quote.

 Respondents are required to submit a Quote strictly in accordance with the requirements set out in this ITQ, to ensure the Council has the correct information to make the evaluation. Evasive or unclear Quote may be discounted in evaluation and may, at the Council’s discretion, be taken as a rejection by the Respondent of the terms set out in this ITQ.

 The Quote Evaluation Model showing the Evaluation Criteria and the maximum scores attributable to them is set out below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Criteria** | **Sub-Criteria** | **Weighting** |
| Quality  | Technical Quality  | A full statement of methodology of how the required work will be delivered (25%) and evidence of a clear understanding of the full requirements of the brief (20%) | 45% |
| Quality  | Experience and Management | Evidence of the experience of the main consultant (and any sub-consultant). This should include evidence and examples of similar / appropriate work previously undertaken elsewhere. | 20% |
| Quality  | Resources | A resource schedule identifying the personnel who will undertake the work and a detailed programme of works (5%) and evidence of the timely availability of the study team (5%) | 10% |
| Cost | Cost | Clear indication of the total cost of the study and a full breakdown of costs.  | 25% |
| Total  | 100% |
| Equality and Diversity  | The organisation submitting the quote will need to demonstrate they have a policy which complies with GBC’s requirements. **Failure to demonstrate this will result in the quote being rejected.**  | Pass/fail  |
| Data Protection  | The organisation submitting the quote will need to demonstrate they have a policy and procedures in place for processing personal data and meeting their statutory obligations laid down by The Data Protection Act 1998. **Failure to demonstrate this requirement will result in the quote being rejected.**  | Pass/fail  |

**6.0 EVALUATION PROCESS**

**6.1 Technical Evaluation**

 The technical evaluation will be scored in accordance with the table below.

**6.2 Scoring Models – Methodology and Innovations**

For assessing the quality elements each sub criteria will be scored out of 4 (see table below) and weighted accordingly.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Assessment | Allocated Score |
|  |  |
| **Very poor** – [completely fails to demonstrate that it will meet the criteria | 0 |
| **Poor** – [some, but very limited evidence of that it will meet the criteria] | 1 |
| **Satisfactory** – [provides evidence that it will meet the criteria sufficiently]  | 2 |
| **Good** – [shows attributes in a number of areas that area in excess of the criteria] | 3 |
| **Very good** – [in excess of the criteria in all areas] | 4 |

 All Prices shall be stated in pounds sterling and exclusive of VAT.

For assessing the cost element the following formula will be applied:

* Lowest price/bidder’s price x 25 = score

**APPENDIX 1:** 

**APPENDIX 2: National and Local Planning Policy Context: Overview**

National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, July 2021) sets out (Paragraph 104) that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:

a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;

b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;

c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;

d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and

e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.

Paragraph 105 sets out that:

The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.

Paragraph 107 sets out that:

If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account:

1. the accessibility of the development;
2. the type, mix and use of development;
3. the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
4. local car ownership levels; and
5. the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.

Paragraph 108 sets out that (emphasis added):-

Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport (in accordance with chapter 11 of this Framework). In town centres, local authorities should seek to improve the quality of parking so that it is convenient, safe and secure, alongside measures to promote accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.

The NPPF also sets out in Paragraphs 110-112 “Considering development proposals” that:

In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;

b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;

c) the design of streets, **parking areas**, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code; and

d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Within this context, applications for development should:

a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;

b) **address the needs of people with disabilities** and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;

c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;

d) allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and

e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.

Paragraph 120 sets out that (emphasis added):

Planning policies and decisions should, inter alia, promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively (for example converting space above shops, and building on or above service yards, **car parks**, lock-ups and railway infrastructure).

Planning Practice Guidance

The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) – a website based resource – set out additional guidance on transport planning issues. The following sections of the PPG relate specifically to modal shift (emphasis added).

*Why establish a transport evidence base for Local Plans?***[[3]](#footnote-3)**

It is important for local planning authorities to undertake an assessment of the transport implications in developing or reviewing their Local Plan so that a robust transport evidence base may be developed to support the preparation and/or review of that Plan. A robust transport evidence base can facilitate approval of the Local Plan and reduce costs and delays to the delivery of new development, thus reducing the burden on the public purse and private sector.

The transport evidence base should identify the opportunities for encouraging a shift to more sustainable transport usage, where reasonable to do so; and highlight the infrastructure requirements for inclusion in infrastructure spending plans linked to the Community Infrastructure Levy, section 106 provisions and other funding sources.

Local planning authorities should also refer to the Department for Transport’s Circular 02/2013: The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development

*What is the purpose of a transport evidence base to support the Local Plan?***[[4]](#footnote-4)**

A robust evidence base will enable an assessment of the transport impacts of both existing development as well as that proposed, and can inform sustainable approaches to transport at a plan-making level. This will include consideration of viability and deliverability.

A robust assessment will establish evidence that may be useful in:

* improving the sustainability of transport provision
* enhancing accessibility
* creating choice amongst different modes of transport
* improving health and well-being
* supporting economic vitality
* improving public understanding of the transport implications of development
* enabling other highway and transport authorities/service providers to support and deliver the transport infrastructure that conforms to the Local Plan
* supporting local shops and the high street

### *What key issues should be considered in developing the transport evidence base to support the Local Plan*?**[[5]](#footnote-5)**

The key issues, which should be considered in developing a transport evidence base, include the need to:

* assess the existing situation and likely generation of trips over time by all modes and the impact on the locality in economic, social and environmental terms
* assess the opportunities to support a pattern of development that, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport
* highlight and promote opportunities to reduce the need for travel where appropriate
* identify opportunities to prioritise the use of alternative modes in both existing and new development locations if appropriate
* consider the cumulative impacts of existing and proposed development on transport networks
* assess the quality and capacity of transport infrastructure and its ability to meet forecast demands
* identify the short, medium and long-term transport proposals across all modes

The outcome could include assessing where alternative allocations or mitigation measures would improve the sustainability, viability and deliverability of proposed land allocations (including individual sites) provided these are compliant with national policy as a whole.

### *What baseline information should inform a transport assessment of a Local Plan?*

The following list indicates the key aspects that should be addressed in the transport assessment. This list is not exhaustive, and there may be additional issues that are important to consider locally.

* all current transport issues as they affect all modes and freight covering, for example, accessibility, congestion, mobility, safety, pollution, affordability, carbon reduction across the whole Plan area and, within relevant areas of the Plan, including existing settlements and proposed land allocations
* the potential options to address the issues identified and any gaps in the networks in the short, medium and longer term covering, for example, accessibility, congestion, mobility, safety, pollution, carbon reduction
* the locations of proposed land allocations and areas/corridors of development and potential options for the provision of sustainable transport and transport networks to serve them
* solutions to support a pattern of development that, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport
* the scope and options for maximising travel planning and behavioural change.
* accessibility of transport nodes such as rail/bus stations to facilitate integrated solutions

The transport assessment should be produced at a Local Plan level in partnership with all relevant transport and planning authorities, transport providers and key stakeholders, for example, the Local Economic Partnership. It may be appropriate for the transport assessment to cover an area wider than the Local Plan at least initially given the size of some travel to work areas (this would be similar to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment). This process should help to identify any potential measures that may be required to mitigate negative impacts.

GBC Comment: The Study being proposed here is more detailed than that required at a Local Plan level and will consider viable solutions to inform the eventual Masterplan.

**County and** **Local Planning Policy Context**

Hampshire County Council Local Transport Plan

Hampshire County Council (HCC) has a statutory requirement to have a Local Transport Plan (LTP) which sets out its vision for future transport and travel infrastructure. The current Local Transport Plan (LTP3) was developed in 2011. Over the last two years HCC has been developing a new draft Local Transport Plan (LTP4) which

* **describes the transport vision for 2050, the key transport outcomes HCC are seeking to achieve, and the principles that would guide future investment and decision making in relation to transport and travel;**
* **sets out transport polices covering all aspects of transport planning, delivery, and operation;**
* **presents our approach to delivering the Plan – 'making it happen', setting out a roadmap to 2050 and how we would prioritise, fund and deliver interventions, and monitor our progress; and**
* **supports the County Council’s wider strategies, plans and priorities**

Further detail on the draft LTP4 can be found on the HCC website. A particularly important theme of the emerging LTP4 for this study is a shift away from the traditional approach of planning for vehicles, which the emphasis firmly towards planning for people and places, and a reduced reliance on the private car. This is to ensure transformational change and support sustainable economic development and regeneration, promote active lifestyles and meet national priorities to decarbonise the transport system:-

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/localtransportplan>

Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029

**Policy LP21** (Improving Transport Infrastructure) sets out that development proposals that are likely to generate significant levels of travel demand will be permitted, provide that:

1. The Borough Council will work with the Highway Authority, Highways England, Fareham Borough Council, transport providers, developers and other stakeholders where necessary to promote and provide a transport system that supports development within the Borough and enables sustainable economic growth through a policy of reduce, manage and invest.
2. Development proposals will need to contribute to the delivery of an integrated and sustainable transport network including, where appropriate, measures outlined in the latest Local Transport Plan and Transport Delivery Plan (or equivalent) and supporting documents.
3. Development proposals will not be permitted which prejudice the delivery of transport improvements as identified in the latest Local Transport Plan (or equivalent) and supporting documents.

**Policy LP22** (Accessibility to New Development) sets out that development proposals that are likely to generate significant levels of travel demand will be permitted, provide that:

1. The site is located where convenient public transport services exist or there is a commitment by the developer and public transport providers to deliver such service.
2. The site is, or will be made, accessible to pedestrians and cyclists.
3. Any new or improved road access and the traffic generated would not have any unacceptable environmental implications nor significantly prejudice the safety, function and capacity of the road network.
4. Local and strategic transport improvements will be provided, where necessary, to support the development and mitigate adverse impacts on the safety, function and capacity of the transport network.
5. Transport Statements or Transport Assessments are submitted in support of the planning application to evaluate transport impacts, and demonstrate that transport improvements to be provided will meet the needs of the development and mitigate adverse impacts.
6. A Travel Plan is provided in support of a planning application where appropriate in relation to the scale and type of development.

Improving accessibility to and from the Peninsula is a key objective of the Local Plan. The Borough needs an efficient multi-modal transport system that will meet everyone’s travel requirements, support new development and promote economic growth. Reducing car use and promoting alternative modes will play an important part in alleviating congestion and enabling more sustainable travel including minimising emissions.

The Local Plan aims to ensure residential areas have good access to employment, health, education, recreation, and retail opportunities. Development should be located on sites where they are, or will be, well connected by public transport, walking and cycling in order to provide travel choices and reduce the reliance on the car. The provision of more employment in the Borough is critical to reducing out commuting and congestion

|  |
| --- |
| **Box 10.1: Summary of key transport issues*** **There are high levels of out-commuting and a history of falling local employment in the Borough, particularly in relation to the rationalisation of Ministry of Defence sites;**
* **There is significant congestion on key routes over extended peak periods which is exacerbated by a limited road network serving the Haslar peninsula such as the Haslar Bridge**
* **Public transport choices are limited although this has considerably improved by the first phase of the Bus Rapid Transit. There is no railway station on the Peninsula and bus reliability to parts of the Borough is affected by road congestion. The Ferry is a major public transport provider and the main link to national railway services in Portsmouth; and**
* **Cycling remains a significant mode of transport for commuting and other journeys.**
 |

The promotion of Smarter Choices and Travel Planning will contribute to the reduce strategy by improving awareness of travel choices and encouraging non car modes. Travel Planning will be promoted to discourage single occupancy car use and to encourage travel by non-car modes. Travel Plans may restrict and / or charge for car parking and encourage walking, cycling, bus and rail use. Car sharing can also make a significant contribution to trip reduction. For occasional drivers car clubs can provide access to a car in their neighbourhood without having to own it. Other methods of reducing the need to travel will be encouraged including increased home working through the application of technology such as broadband and cable networks.

It is the policy of HCC and Solent Transport to work with bus operators to encourage provision of better bus services to make them a more viable alternative to the private car for everyday journeys. A modal shift to public transport will also reduce the carbon footprint and help prevent further congestion and deterioration in journey time reliability on the main routes.

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is being promoted by HCC and Solent Transport. Phase1a of a dedicated busway on the disused railway line between Gosport and Fareham has been completed and will form part of a wider quality bus network for South East Hampshire. HCC and Solent Transport envisage additional off-road sections towards Gosport Town Centre as well as a number of future routes extending to the proposed Fareham Strategic Development Area (SDA) known as Welborne, Queen Alexandra Hospital and Portsmouth. It is proposed that these routes will be supported by a range of bus priority measures, high quality vehicles, bus stop infrastructure and information facilities. The viability and the priorities for the future phases of the BRT network are currently being considered by HCC and Solent Transport. The priority for the Borough is to extend the BRT towards the centres of Fareham and Gosport to improve connections with rail, bus and ferry services accessing a wider area beyond the peninsula.

In order to encourage more sustainable travel, the interchange between modes should be made as comfortable and convenient as possible. There is scope to improve the interchange facilities in Gosport Town Centre between the bus and ferry services as part of the regeneration proposals for Gosport Waterfront.

Gosport already has good ferry links with Portsmouth and the cross harbour ferry is a major public transport service. The StAG study proposes that new ferry services be considered in the longer term between Portsmouth and Southampton, serving intermediate communities, to widen travel choice and reduce peak hour congestion.

BRT Phase 1a is a shared bus / cycle route extending the existing off road cycle track towards Fareham and offering an alternative to the A32. The future extension of the off road BRT route utilising the Fareham to Gosport disused railway line will continue to provide for cycles. There is a need to incorporate improved cycle routes as part of new development including Daedalus, the Gosport Waterfront and the Haslar Peninsula. Cycling infrastructure between Lee-on-the-Solent and Fareham Town Centre via Newgate Lane is a priority, along with the extension of the existing coastal route westward through Lee-on-the-Solent to Daedalus, which would also contribute to the National Cycleway Network, Route 2. There is also potential for developing recreational routes to the countryside which are included as initiatives in the PUSH Green Infrastructure Strategy and HCC’s Countryside Access Plans (CAP).

1. Source: ONS Standard Area Measurements (SAM) 2019. Total extent includes land area to mean high water. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Made up of 61% discontinuous urban fabric and 20% industrial or commercial units. Source and land cover breakdown available from: A Land Cover Atlas of the UK: <https://doi.org/10.15131/shef.data.5219956> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 54-001-20141010 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 54-002-20141010 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 54-003-20141010 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)