

# ATF4 Extension Funding Application Form

## Authority name

Q1. Name of authority submitting the bid?

Southampton City Council

Q2. Name of authority delivering the scheme?

Southampton City Council

## Key bid requirements

Q3. This scheme must be developed in consultation with local communities. This does not mean that the bid itself needs to be put out to consultation. Effective consultation is a condition of funding and may result in the downgrading of your authority's self-assessment tier rating if not fulfilled.

Are you able to confirm your authority's commitment to consultation?

Yes

Q4. Are you able to confirm that you will give due regard to the needs of protected groups defined by The Equality Act 2010, and your commitment to undertaking an equality impact assessment of the measures outlined in your scheme?

Yes

Q5. Please describe how you intend to identify the protected groups who may be impacted by the scheme outlined in your bid, and how you intend to consult and implement feedback from these groups.

How will you ensure that you have fully assessed the impact of the scheme on protected groups, and that accessibility requirements will be met? (Max 500 words)

Southampton's ATF4 Programme, which this additional scheme forms part of, has an overarching Communications and Engagement Plan which builds up on the previous version generated for ATF2. We have found that the approaches set out in this including significant pre-scheme perception surveys and co-design results in lower levels of objection to a scheme. The ATF4 Plan includes a consistent approach for how we engage effectively with protected groups.

#### Community Identification

- Generate insights into the communities and protected groups for each scheme through our Insights and Research Team and platforms such as Southampton Data Observatory. Through the recent schemes, such as co-design on Woolston, Bedford Place and St Mark's Active Travel Zones we worked with a wide range of groups and this has provided us with insight into those who might be impacted by the scheme.
- Use community champions, including those representing people with protected status, via Stronger Communities Team.
- Use recently established Southampton Accessibility Forum, which engages with disability charities as well as transport and accessibility advocates to get feedback and involvement in scheme design, implementation and activation.

#### Consultation, Communications and Engagement Approach

This follows a 3-stage approach

1. Pre-Implementation – perception surveys and co-design, in a range of accessibility formats, to engage with key communities and groups affected, particularly for ATZ interventions, using Connecting Southampton formats (social media, newsletters, website) to disseminate information about the consultation, and Engagement HQ to host online consultation plans alongside physical events (that are accessible) to ensure everyone can participate.
2. During Implementation – managing overall demand for travel with narrative but also keeping people informed, listening to concerns, make changes if necessary.
3. Activation – promote the completed schemes across the community through schools, workplaces & communities including marketing campaigns powered by Mosaic and the My Journey Southampton platforms.

#### Scheme Assessment

For each scheme we will carry out an Equalities & Safety Impact Assessment (EqSIA) at the start and continually review through the process, and through the Accessibility Forum and Child Friendly City team directly engage with these areas to help validate our approach and assessments. The assessments will draw on a wide range of data sources and aim to be

#### Accessibility Requirements

To ensure that accessibility is included in the whole scheme process we are including these points in our Gateway process:

- Peer-design reviews with designers and neighbouring authorities
- Use of tools such as Cycle Level of Service, Pedestrian Level of Service, and Route Audits to ensure that schemes meet LTN1/20 standards
- Design reviews with users through Accessibility Forum and Child Friendly City
- Where a scheme has potential to divert traffic the wider area is assessed to ensure that negative impacts are minimised – e.g. school street means traffic diverts via an unsuitable road – mitigated by looking at the wider area and safer routes to school
- Construction information, and
- Diversion routes are suitable for all.

Q6. Does this scheme have specific support from the authority's political leader?

Yes

## Overview of scheme

Q7. What type of scheme are you seeking funding for?

Construction

**Q8. What is the name of the scheme?**

Please provide a clear scheme name in the following format. The name should include a description of the scheme, relevant phase, and its location, e.g., 'Station Road School Street, Fakeham,' 'Station Road segregated cycle path phase 2, Fakeham High Street to Fakeham Railway Station,'

If resubmitting an ATF4 scheme with a revised name, please provide the scheme name and scheme reference provided to you.

**ATF4 scheme name** -

**ATF4 scheme reference** -

**ATF4 Extension scheme name** ATF4 Southampton – Safer Routes to School (SRtS) - Fairisle Schools

**Q9. Please provide a description of the scheme, including how this scheme relates to the objectives of the Active Travel Fund and local strategies and plans, other projects and to local trip attractors. If this scheme is outside of the list of intervention types in the ATF4 guidance, explain why it has been prioritised. (Max 500 words).**

Safer Routes to School (SRtS) - Fairisle Schools project aims to connect the cycle network in the Lordshill area of Southampton to improve safety, legibility and quality of the active travel networks around Fairisle Primary Schools.

Through the School Travel Planning process, LCWIP and available S106 Fairisle Schools was identified and prioritised for a SRtS scheme.

SRtS aims to implement localised measures that make it easier and safer for pupils, parents and staff to walk, wheel or cycle to school instead of driving. This complements SCC's wider Schools Travel Planning (STP) activities.

Current active travel networks

Fairisle Road is between Southampton Cycle Network (SCN) Routes SCN3 (City to Romsey via Shirley) and SCN4 (City to North Baddesley via and Lordshill). SCN connects via the Lordshill Quietways network to residential areas, amenities at the Lordshill District Centre, Oaklands Community Pool, and Fairisle, Oasis Academy Lordshill and Sinclair Primary Schools.

LWIP and STP issues:

- Fairisle Road traffic volumes during school hours combined with illegal and inconsiderate parking negatively affects road safety – particularly pedestrian visibility;
- Abusive parents and perceived lack of enforcement of parking restrictions;
- Lack of safe connectivity and conflict points in Lordshill Quietways network at Fairisle Road between Lordshill Centre and the northern parts of Lordshill & Oasis Academy
- Damaged surface of Quietways affects journey comfort for people cycling, walking or wheeling.

Fairisle Schools Travel

Fairisle Infant and Junior Schools are on Fairisle Road, which despite being a cul-de-sac suffers from significant school parking and congestion at school times. These have led to road safety concerns being raised from both the school and local community. To manage the parking the schools benefit from frequent camera & warden enforcement of the School Keep Clear Zigzags, however there remains issues with visibility and safe crossing points.

The schools participated in SCC's Child Friendly Streets trial co-designing potential safety infrastructure to create a safer environment at the school gates. Workshop events identified travel issues and trialled solutions using Sustrans' Street kit and a timed road closure. Following the trials, Child Friendly changes were made which included pencil shaped bollards, a giraffe text print crossing and more seating.

Both schools have engaged with the STP process, with the Junior School taking part in Bikeability activities. However, car trips to school remain high – 32% of Fairisle Infants travel by car (2022) and active travel rates are considerably lower than the city's average (Fairisle 54% Southampton 64%). School survey results indicate most pupils want to travel actively – 82% of Fairisle Juniors pupils wishing to walk, cycle or scoot to school.

Proposals

ATF4E proposals to resolve the issues on Fairisle Road with a parallel crossing, cycle path resurfacing works, 20mph zone, parking restrictions, wayfinding and relocation of Keep Clear Zig-Zags.

To complement this SCC will upgrade the Lordshill Quietways utilising S106 funding to improve routes to Oasis Academy, and leisure and retail facilities in Lordshill.

## Scheme cost

Q10. How much ATF4 Extension funding are you requesting to deliver this scheme in the 2023/24 financial year?

67200

## Scheme location

Q11. Provide the approximate midpoint of the scheme using latitude and longitude.

This midpoint can be obtained by right-clicking on a point in Google Maps and selecting the latitude and longitude shown. The approximate midpoint is described as the geographic middle of all of the interventions you are proposing within the scheme.

**Latitude** 50.94165

**Longitude** 1.45367

Q12. Upload an ATIP file(s) to map where the scheme will be implemented.

ATE strongly encourages you to use Active Travel Infrastructure Programme (ATIP) to map your scheme. Please download the file, sketch your scheme and upload it on Smart Survey. You can access ATIP using the following link: <https://atip.uk>. There are instructions at the top left corner of the tool and you can watch the following videos for more guidance: 10 minute introductory video: <https://youtu.be/o2Vwk3BqwLQ> 20 minute detailed demonstration: <https://youtu.be/5j0GOOwZxsA> If you need to use another GIS tool like Felt.com or GeoJSON.io there is a geojson specification here, [https://github.com/acteng/atip/blob/main/docs/data\\_spec.md](https://github.com/acteng/atip/blob/main/docs/data_spec.md). If you use a non-ATIP tool, please make sure your output conforms to this specification. Additionally, you will have to manually change the file format to '.txt' to upload it to this survey.

NB: we are asking for a high-level overview of geographic location of the key interventions within each scheme, not for detailed geographic data. For example, it is not necessary to provide detail of each modal filter or bollard included within a scheme. For a scheme including a route composed of multiple interventions, an overview of the affected traffic management area and the route outline would be sufficient, for example. See the detailed video for a demonstration of sketching a scheme. This level of detail, which should take no more than around 20-30 minutes per scheme, is sufficient to communicate the location of the scheme.

Upload .txt files only.

- File: Southampton\_Safer Routes to Schools - Fairisle (1).txt

## Scheme design

Q13. Provide a summary of the key scheme objectives. (max 250 words)

The SRtS – Fairisle Schools scheme objectives are:

- To provide the school and local community with a safe cycle-pedestrian crossing that connects the Lordshill Quietways cycle network together;
  - Improved safety perceptions for people walking, cycling & wheeling/scooting at Fairisle Road,
  - Improve the Lordshill Quietways network quality, connectivity & accessibility, and
  - Increase active travel to schools – building on the desire from pupils to travel more actively to school (cycling, walking & scooting) to see over 80% of Fairisle pupils doing so.
- This will be complemented by the S106 funded works to continue the upgrades towards Oasis Academy Lordshill secondary school so that pupils there can travel actively and safely particularly across A3057 Romsey Road.

Q14. A design must be submitted for the schemes. Please upload relevant plans to demonstrate the scheme design(s) below.

The supplementary guidance note 'Design evidence requirements for ATF4 Extension funding' sets out what evidence is required.

For schemes under £150,000, where a General Arrangements drawing is not available, clear designs showing the nature and scale of the interventions, which provide enough information for ATE to ensure compliance with LTN 1/20, should be submitted.

For schemes over £150,000, a detailed General Arrangements drawing should be submitted that clearly shows widths for facilities and appropriate carriageways, junction treatments and other proposed interventions.

Note - construction schemes above £150,000 must submit designs.

Please use the following format when naming files: [Local authority name] (as in Q2; [Scheme name] (as in Q9); [ATF4E Scheme Design]

- File: Southampton City Council Safer Routes to School (Fairisle School) ATF4E Scheme Design.pdf

## Scheme type and outputs

Q15. Please select the main scheme type from the list below.

### Scheme

**Main scheme type** New road crossings

-

Q16. Please select the complexity of the capital scheme type from the list below.

Please refer to the ATF4 guidance note for a definition of complexity.

Low

Q17. Please provide details of all the expected outputs and cost estimates for your scheme. Please ensure you are inputting the relevant units, as shown in brackets. If the type of infrastructure or measure is not applicable, please leave blank .

	Number	Cost estimate (£)
<b>New segregated cycling facility (miles)</b>	-	-
<b>New segregated cycling facility (number of junctions treated)</b>	-	-
<b>New junction treatment not part of a segregated cycleway (number of junctions treated)</b>	-	-
<b>New permanent footway (miles)</b>	-	-
<b>New shared use (walking, wheeling &amp; cycling) facilities (miles)</b>	-	-
<b>Improvements to make an existing walking/cycle route safer (miles)</b>	0.851	82620
<b>Improvements to make an existing walking/cycle route safer (number of junctions treated)</b>	-	-
<b>Area-wide traffic management (including by TROs (both permanent and experimental)) (size of area in square miles)</b>	-	-
<b>Bus priority measures that also enable active travel (e.g. bus gates) (miles of road improved)</b>	-	-
<b>Provision of secure cycle parking facilities (number of parking spaces)</b>	-	-
<b>New road crossings (number of new crossings)</b>	1	94855
<b>Restriction or reduction of car parking availability (e.g. controlled parking zones), usually only as a component of other schemes (miles)</b>	-	-
<b>Restriction or reduction of car parking availability (e.g. controlled parking zones), usually only as a component of other schemes (number of car parking spaces removed)</b>	-	-
<b>School streets (number)</b>	-	-
<b>None</b>	-	-

Q18. If the intervention type is not listed above, please provide below the intervention type, the number of relevant outputs (e.g. miles, number) and a cost estimate.

	Scheme type	Outputs (miles or number)	Cost estimate (£)
<b>Intervention type</b>	20mph speed limit	0.625miles	7226

## Scheme timeline

Q19. Please provide an estimate of when this scheme will reach each design stage, or, if a scheme has already reached one or more of these stages, please specify the actual date(s). The actual dates will tell us what stage your design is at so please ensure that you add these in for all completed design stages so that we can be ready to offer you the appropriate type of support at design surgeries.

Note that all construction schemes are expected to have reached the stage 'completed' by 31 March 2025.

	<b>Estimated date (DD/MM/YYYY)</b>	<b>Actual date (DD/MM/YYYY)</b>
<b>Completion date of feasibility design (exploration of potential solutions to the problem statement identified)</b>	31/01/2024	-
<b>Completion date of preliminary design (development of the selected option)</b>	-	-
<b>Completion date of detailed design (development of a design to a level that can be built from, and costings confirmed)</b>	30/06/2024	-
<b>Start date of construction (commencement of physical works on site)</b>	20/07/2024	-
<b>Completion date of construction (all works on site completed, and all snagging items resolved)</b>	31/08/2024	-

## Scheme value for money

Q23. Please set out your justification or rationale for the value for money assessment of this scheme. (Max 300 words)

For those schemes appraised using AMAT, please provide the justification for the value for money category or range given.

For schemes not using AMAT, please provide details of the cost effectiveness of the intervention using the accompanying value for money guidance alongside justification.

Please also set out any other supporting information using local evidence or the alternative tools outlined in section 1.6 of the accompanying value for money guidance.

The SRtS programme is anticipated to provide high value for money based on experience from other similar Safer Routes to School projects in Southampton. Costs are benchmarked against other SCC schemes delivering parallel crossings – this site already has dropped kerbs providing cost efficiencies.

A cost effectiveness assessment has been carried out – 0.01831 (5dp)

The total number of pupils per school is based on SCC admissions data. The proportion of children who walk, wheel or cycle to school is based on hands-ups surveys for current way of travelling to school in Fairisle Infants & Junior schools in 2022 and 2023.

Total number of pupils at both schools is 682.

The proportion of children of children who (from hands-up survey):

Walk – 44% (301)

Cycle – 3.5% (24)

Scoot/Skate – 6.5% (44)

Total number of pupils walking and cycling per day is 369.

The increase in trips calculated from the hands-up surveys asking how would pupils like to travel to school, and the multiplier was calculated in line with assumptions suggested in ATF4 Annex B for 'School Street' interventions.

Q24. How many walking, wheeling, or cycling trips are currently undertaken per day in the area where the scheme will be implemented?

Trips per day

408

Q25. How many additional walking, wheeling, or cycling trips will this scheme generate per day?

Additional trips per day

165

Q26. Are you planning to use matched funding with this scheme?

Yes

Q27. If yes, please provide detail of the funding stream including name and amount of matched funding.

**Name of funding stream** Section 106 Developer Contributions

**Amount of matched funding** 117501

## End of submission declaration

Q28. Please provide the name and email address for the following contacts at your authority.

<b>Reporting officer name</b>	Iain Steane
<b>Reporting officer email address</b>	iain.steane@southampton.gov.uk
<b>Senior Responsible Officer name</b>	Pete Boustred
<b>Senior Responsible Officer email address</b>	pete.boustred@southampton.gov.uk
<b>Section 151 Officer (or equivalent) name</b>	Mel Creighton
<b>Section 151 Officer (or equivalent) email address</b>	mel.creighton@southampton.gov.uk



Q29. Do you agree with the following declaration? I confirm I have read and understood all the details in the accompanying letter, including the terms and conditions. I confirm that the Senior Responsible Officer and the Section 151 Officer (or equivalent with delegated authority) have also read and understood the letter. I declare that the information given is, to the best of my knowledge, correct. I understand that funding is conditional on the Section 151 Officer's confirmation that the schemes offer value for money. I confirm that the authority will have all the necessary statutory powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised. I declare that the cost estimates are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that the authority: has allocated sufficient budget to deliver the scheme(s) on the basis of its proposed funding contribution; accepts responsibility for meeting any costs over and above the Active Travel England contribution requested, including potential cost overruns and the underwriting of any funding contributions expected from third parties; accepts responsibility for meeting any ongoing revenue and capital requirements in relation to the scheme(s) accepts that any additional funding required to complete the scheme will be subject to approval via the Active Travel England change control process; and confirms that the authority has the necessary governance/assurance arrangements in place. I also understand Active Travel England may request further details as to the scheme(s) and costs therein.

Yes

Q30. You are about to submit your response. Please confirm you are happy to submit.

Yes