

# **City Centre Action Plan**

Port  
Background Paper

Draft for Consultation

**September 2013**





# City Centre Action Plan

## Port Background Paper

This background document accompanies the Submission Document and outlines some background in relation to the section on the Port. This document is not on deposit for consultation and is background evidence.

**Any queries regarding the document should be sent to:**

**Address:** Planning Policy  
Planning & Sustainability Division

**Email:** [city.plan@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:city.plan@southampton.gov.uk)

**Contacts:** Graham Tuck / Phil Marshall

**Website:**



## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 Purpose of the document**

1.1.1 The document explains the approach set out in the City Centre Action Plan (CCAP) on the Port. The relevant policies are:

- AP4 : The Port;
- AP18: Transport;
- AP20: Major Development Zone (MDZ);
- AP23: Western Gateway
- AP24: Royal Pier.

These policies seek to manage the relationship between the growth of the city centre and the Port. The document has been prepared by the Council and will be reviewed in the light of any comments from the Port and others.

### **1.2 Structure of the document**

1.2.1 The document sets out the national and local policy context, and describes the Port Master Plan. It then explains the evolution of the CCAP and justifies its approach, in terms of three main issues:

- The relationship between vehicular access to the port and creating 'city streets' with a positive pedestrian environment;
- Noise / light sensitive uses close to the Port (eg residential)
- The potential for links to the cruise terminals, and views of the cruise liners / general port.

1.2.2 There are two parts of the Port which are potentially directly affected by the city centre:

- a. The whole of the eastern docks, which is accessed through the city centre.
- b. A small part of the overall western docks, which is adjacent to proposed development sites in the city centre. (This part can be accessed via the city centre via Gate 10, and also from the west without entering the city centre via Gate 20).

The remainder of the western docks (ie the whole of the container port and a large part of the general cargo port) is not directly affected by the city centre as it is accessed via Gate 20, about 2 miles to the west.

## **2. The policy framework**

### **2.1 National Policy Statement for Ports (2012)**

2.1.1 The Statement explains that port capacity will remain essential for the sustainable growth of the UK economy (para. 3.1.3). It promotes sustainable port development and a competitive port sector. The decisions on when to propose port development should be made by the port sector based on commercial factors (para. 3.3.1). The forecasts suggest a major increase in port trade through to 2030. The recession has led to a severe downturn but this will delay rather than reduce growth (paras. 3.4.3 to 3.4.4). If all consented port proposals are built (including intensification within the existing Port of Southampton), this will meet pre-recession forecasts for 20 years. However the capacity needed is likely to be greater to provide

competition, flexibility and resilience (para. 3.4.9). Capacity is needed at a wide range of locations (para. 3.4.11). Resilience is important to avoid economic disruptions as a result of short term demands, accidents and operational difficulties (para 3.4.15). The Government believes there is a compelling need for substantial additional port capacity (consented and as yet un-consented) in the next 20 – 30 years. If this were not provided it would limit national, regional and local economic growth, and be strongly against the public interest (para 3.4.16). There should be a presumption in favour of port development unless the policies in this statement indicate otherwise (para. 3.5.2).

2.1.2 The Statement also explains that wherever possible port development should support sustainable transport, which is more efficient and has lower external costs (para 3.3.5). Economic growth must be aligned with environmental protection and social enhancement wherever possible (para 3.3.6). The benefits of a port proposal will have to be weighed against the adverse impacts (para 4.2.2), including a Council's local impact report (para. 4.2.4). Substantial weight should be given to the positive impacts of economic development set out in the Statement (para. 4.3.5). Transport congestion has economic and environmental impacts (para. 4.3.7). Road traffic can lead to congestion, noise and emissions (para. 5.4.2). Major new ports may have substantial impacts on surrounding infrastructure, and this should be mitigated (para. 5.4.9). Demand management, such as lorry booking to avoid peak times, and modal shift, should be considered (paras. 5.4.11 – 5.4.21). Good port design is fundamental to mitigating adverse effects (para 3.3.8). It means using appropriate technologies to limit impacts such as noise (para. 4.10.2). Some impact on local communities is likely to be unavoidable, it should be kept to a minimum and acceptable level, using management and mitigation schemes (eg layout, operating times, quieter machinery, containment within buildings, improved sound insulation for dwellings etc) (para. 5.8.3, 5.8.7 – 5.8.11, 5.10.2, 5.10.3, 5.10.8). The effects of preventing any proposed development on neighbouring sites should be considered (para. 5.13.5). The effects on proposed uses can be mitigated through good design and layout (para. 5.13.19).

## 2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

2.2.1 The Framework sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) (paras. 7. and 14.). Planning should support sustainable economic development; seek a good standard of amenity; and promote non car modes of travel (para. 17). Significant weight should be placed on economic growth (para. 19). Existing business sectors should be supported (para. 21). Planning should promote city centres, their management and growth, recognising they are at the heart of their communities and encourage residential development on appropriate sites (para. 23). Sustainable transport should be promoted to reduce emissions and congestion. Strategies should be developed for infrastructure to support sustainable development, including the investment necessary for the growth of ports (paras. 29 – 31). Developments should be designed to accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and people, give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and create safe and secure environments which minimise conflict between traffic and cyclists / pedestrians (para. 35). Planning can play an important role in facilitating inclusive communities (para. 69). Planning should seek to achieve the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and significant adverse impacts on any aspect should be

avoided (para. 152). Local plans should promote the retail, transport and community infrastructure needed, planning positively for infrastructure (paras. 156 – 157), and taking account of the need for nationally significant infrastructure (para. 162).

## 2.3 Other National Statements

2.3.1 Through *Delivering a Sustainable Transport System* (DaSTS) (2008), the Government identified that the Port of Southampton:

- is one of the country's key International Gateways (ten ports and seven airports), through which most people and goods enter and leave this country; and
- should be served by two Strategic National Corridors (London to Southampton and South Coast Ports to the Midlands).

2.3.2 Having identified the corridors, DaSTS identified the road and rail infrastructure/services that provide the connectivity between strategic destinations, based on those routes used predominantly by longer distance business and freight. In relation to the Port of Southampton, this included reclassifying roads from Regional to National / International Importance from 2014:

- M27 (east of J3), M271, and A33 Western Approach into Southampton as far as the West Quay Road / Southern Road (A3057) junction (ie on the western edge of the city centre);
- A34 from M3 (J9) to M40 (J9)

2.3.3 These proposals were confirmed by Government in Spring 2009, in its response to the consultation on the DaSTS proposals.

## 2.4 Sub regional guidance

2.4.1 The South Hampshire Strategy was approved by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire in 2012. It is a non-statutory policy document which helps meet the statutory 'duty to co-operate'. The Solent Local Enterprise Partnership's (LEP's) statement for this strategy recognises the gateway role of the Port of Southampton (page 4). The strategy's vision is to promote prosperity, sustainable growth, dynamic city centres, and quality places where the benefits of growth are shared by all communities (page 5). The spatial planning principles promote sustainable development in the cities; improvements in transport infrastructure to enhance both economic performance and the quality of life (ensuring the impacts of development can be mitigated); important sectors (including marine); and the vitality of city centres (maximising accessibility to facilities) (pages 6 / 7). The importance of the transport / logistics sector, including the ports, to economic growth is recognised (para. 2.11).

2.4.2 Quality places should be created, with sensitively designed streets (policy 5, page 14). Priority should be given to transport infrastructure linking key development sites (policy 13, page 31). The motorway network is used for long distance movements to the Port of Southampton (para. 8.1). There is a need for further transport interventions to manage congestion and the consequent economic / environmental effects (para. 8.2). These interventions will include managing and

investing in the highway network, and improving the quality and permeability of the public realm to encourage walking and cycling (para. 8.3).

- 2.4.3 The city centres should be enhanced, including with improvements to the public realm and pedestrian / cycle links between central areas and surrounding residential areas, parks and the waterfront (policy 10, pages 25 / 26). The environmental quality of the cities should be enhanced so that more people wish to live there. (Improvements to transport and the public realm should respect this approach) (policy 2, page 10).
- 2.4.4 Southampton should enhance its regional role with new development, including an expansion in the west of the city centre (policy 10, pages 25 / 26). Southampton should capitalise on its accessibility and international gateways to promote major development, public realm enhancements and continued growth of the cruise and cargo ports (policy 2, page 10).

## 2.5 Core Strategy (2010)

- 2.5.1 The Spatial Vision promotes Southampton as a major regional centre for economic growth (including the Port), and supports improvements to transport (including walking and cycling) (para 3.2.1).
- 2.5.2 The Strategic Objectives support economic growth and the importance of the Port (S1, S4); a vibrant high quality city centre which connects to the waterfront (S3); appropriate and inclusive infrastructure provision (S5); public spaces which take priority over car dominated roads, are safe / accessible, allow communities to flourish, and create a high quality public realm (S7, S15); sustainable neighbourhoods (S9); tackling deprivation (S11); high quality / accessible parks (S12); walking / cycling and the management of road space to control congestion (S20).
- 2.5.3 The city centre will be the focus of major development, including a major development quarter. Links to the parks, waterfront and surrounding residential communities will be improved (Policy CS1). Access around the city centre by walking and cycling, including links to local communities such as St Mary's, will be improved (paras. 4.4.2 and 4.4.9).
- 2.5.4 The major development quarter in the western city centre (including the area north of the port) will deliver a comprehensive high density mixed use quarter. It will include retail, office and leisure uses, as well as some residential uses (although these should not dominate). (Policy CS2).
- 2.5.5 The Council will promote and facilitate the growth of the Port, support an increase in freight movements to / from the Port by rail and coastal shipping, and appropriate road improvements having regard to the transport needs of the city centre as well as the port (policy CS9). The Port is of national and local economic importance (para. 4.6.14). Access improvements need to seek a practical and complementary balance between the needs of the Port and the city centre (para. 4.6.17). There is support for a visitor destination as part of a city centre cruise line terminal. (Policy CS9 and para. 4.6.16).



- 2.5.6 Development on waterfront sites should achieve greater integration between the city centre and waterfront in terms of connections (where practical) and views (policy CS12). Public access within the Port cannot be achieved (para. 4.8.1). Views of the Port are important (para. 4.8.3).
- 2.5.7 Safe, secure, functional and accessible streets and quality public realm are promoted (policy CS13).
- 2.5.8 The approach to transport is to support the regional economy and Southampton's role as an international gateway, enhance air quality, and achieve a modal shift to sustainable transport; support freight movements to and from the Port (favouring rail / coastal shipping); not to prejudice access to the Port along the key road corridors; support infrastructure for walking / cycling / and to create a high quality street scene, particularly in the city centre; and an upgrade of the West Quay Road – Town Quay / Platform Road – Terminus Terrace – Marsh Lane route to improve access to the Port at Dock Gate 4 and accommodate city centre travel demands. (Policy CS18).
- 2.5.9 The Inspector's report into the Core Strategy explains that policy CS9 (the Port) is consistent with the South East Plan (RE2, RE3, T10, para 8.33, SH3, SH7, SH8) and the New Forest Core Strategy (IR para. 3.17). He states that "I further agree that the necessity for taking into account the transport needs of the city centre, as well as those of the Port, when considering the various transport improvements in the city listed in policy CS18, whilst fairly obvious, is worthy of mention [in the policy]" (IR para. 4.70).

## 2.6 Local Plan Review

- 2.6.1 The saved policies / text recognise the importance of the Port. The policy safeguarding the port has been deleted and replaced by policy CS9.

## 2.7 Port of Southampton Master Plan 2009 – 2030

[...] indicates the relevant paragraph numbers in the master plan.

The summary below focuses on those aspects of the Port most closely related to the city centre. The statistics and trends were established in 2009 and the Council will update this section with any more recent trends once ABP have had the chance to respond.

- 2.7.1 In 2008 the Port of Southampton handled 41 million tonnes of cargo, making it one of the largest ports in the U.K [1.4]. It handles 20% of the U.K.'s trade with non EU countries (by value, the largest in the UK); 40% - 45% of its sea trade with China and the Far East [1.3, 3.2, page 70]. It is the U.K.'s largest cruise port handling nearly 1 million passengers in 2008; and its second largest container port. Southampton is one of the U.K.'s leading port for vehicles [7.26 – 7.29]. It handles around 700,000 vehicles per annum accounting for 16% of the U.K.'s car trade via ports, and between 30% and 50% of its car exports [5.2, 5.52]. This includes car trade with the Far East and onward shipping around Europe.

- 2.7.2 The Port is at the heart of the Solent maritime economy which in total supports 77,000 jobs and GDP of £5.5 billion [1.48].
- 2.7.3 The Port has a number of competitive advantages [3.1, 4.5, page 70]:
- 2.7.4 Relative to other major U.K. ports, it is very well related to the main international shipping lanes to northern Europe. It is the closest to these lanes (involving the least deviation for ships continuing to other ports in northern Europe), and is the first / last major U.K. port as ships arrive / leave along these sea lanes from elsewhere in the world.
- 2.7.5 A deep water channel and double tide (allowing access by larger ships for longer periods during the tidal cycle).
- 2.7.6 Good road and rail links across the U.K. (The rail gauge to the north of England has recently been enhanced to be capable of handling larger containers). It is close to London / the south east, and airports (eg Southampton, Heathrow, Gatwick, Southampton), so is well placed to serve the cruise market.
- 2.7.7 Between 1980 and 2007 total traffic increased by 83% [1.15, 5.6]. Significant growth is forecast in the future. The table sets out the projections for the most significant trade [1.17]:

	'000s	2005	2020	2030	% 2005 – 2030
Cruise	Passengers	702	1,498	1,917	173%
Containers	TEU*	1,382	2,694	4,204	204%
Vehicles	Units	724	702	844	17%
Dry bulks	Tonnes	1,357	1,786	2,166	60%

\*Twenty foot equivalent units

- 2.7.8 The forecasts in the table take account of the DfT's national forecasts (2007), are adjusted for the recession to 2009, assume that growth will return by 2010, and take account of Southampton specific factors such as location, marine and terrestrial links. [5.12, 5.65] (The Council assume that the ongoing recession delays the timing but not necessarily the scale of this overall growth. The master plan points out that the previous strong growth occurred despite two recessions).
- 2.7.9 To cater for the predicted growth over the medium term the existing port will increasingly specialise on its key trades, intensify activities, and fully eliminate non-port uses [7.15]. The growth in the container terminal will involve the relocation of other trades such as cars to different parts of the port [7.16 – 7.18, 7.35].
- 2.7.10 In 1998 the Port handled 0.25 million cruise passengers. By 2008 this had reached 1 million passengers, a four fold increase. This related to 278 cruise ship calls [5.77] (or an average of 3,600 passengers per call – SCC). The Port have invested £22 million in refurbishing the Mayflower and QEII terminals and opening of the City Cruise terminal (about 10 years ago), and £19 million in building a 4<sup>th</sup> cruise terminal (opened 2009) [5.79, page 66]. Southampton is the home port of Cunard and P&O, and 8 other cruise lines use the port [5.80 – 5.81]. The master plan's forecasts are based on those of the cruise lines, with growth returning from 2011

and continuing at a slower rate after 2020 as the market matures. The growth creates the need for the 5<sup>th</sup> terminal, and multi deck car parking [5.83, 7.46].

- 2.7.11 The forecast growth in car trade, at 17%, is higher than the national forecast of 10%, due to Southampton's transshipment abilities. The Port has excellent vehicle handling facilities [7.26 – 7.29]. At present the Port's car trade is split one third imports and two thirds exports. The growth is anticipated to incorporate an increased proportion of imports, which need more storage for cars prior to being called by dealers [5.66, 5.68, 5.72]. Vehicle trade will be handled more intensively with the construction of multi storey car decks in the eastern and western docks.
- 2.7.12 To accommodate predicted growth, the anticipated changes to those parts of the Port with a direct relationship to the city centre are set out below [from p12 figure 1.2; p75 figure 7.3; p78 figure 7.4].

	Eastern Docks	Western Docks (eastern end)
Existing facilities	Dock Gate 4	Dock Gates 8 and 10
	Multi deck vehicle storage terminal (MDVST) (eg a 'multi storey car park')	City Cruise Terminal
	Rail terminal (cars)	
	QEII Cruise Terminal	
	Ocean Cruise Terminal	
	National Oceanography Centre	
Proposed by 2020	1 additional MDVST	One additional MDVST
	The intensification of the eastern and western docks will be reaching its practical limits [1.31]	
Proposed by 2030	1 additional MDVST	Possible 5 <sup>th</sup> cruise terminal

- 2.7.13 In terms of the modal share for containers being transported to / from the Port to the rest of the U.K; at present 70% are by road, 25% by rail, and 5% by coastal shipping. The aspiration is for 40% to be by rail and 15% by coastal shipping. (This leaves 45% to come by road. This a reduced proportion of a higher total, meaning the actual number of road container movements would nearly double – SCC). The aspiration is also for more sustainable modes for vehicle trades. [1.41, 1.43]. The current rail share for containers of 25% is relatively low (in the recent past it has been 35%). The share should rise again as the gauge enhancement is completed. (At 2013 it had risen back to 36%). [8.10 – 8.13]. Up to 49% could be by rail with more rail connected distribution centres around the U.K. [8.29]. Works are currently underway to address the Reading rail bottleneck [8.40 – 8.47]. The eastern docks car terminal can currently handle 3 trains a day [8.20 – 8.26]. (By 2013 rail infrastructure investment in the eastern docks means it can now handle at least 5 trains a day). The main road access for HGVs is via the M271 and A35, in accordance with the lorry routeing agreement [8.14 – 8.19]. (The master plan does not refer to any secondary road access – SCC). The container port generates 4,000 two way HGV movements per day, a significant proportion of all port movements (with the peak time between 12pm and 4pm). A short berth has recently been introduced for coastal shipping feeder services [8.48 – 8.56].

### **3. Emerging CCAP, SEA/SA and comments received**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

3.1.1 The 'Preferred Approach' CCAP was published for consultation in January – March 2012.

3.1.2 ABP made comments at this time, and met with the Council in October 2012 to discuss them in more detail.

3.1.3 The 'Proposed Submission' CCAP was published for consultation in August – October 2013.

3.1.4 The CCAP's initial approach, ABP's comments, the main changes to the CCAP made in response, and the outstanding issues are set out below for the key issues.

#### **3.2 Overall Approach**

*'Preferred Approach' CCAP:*

3.2.1 This includes 'lower case' text on the Port (paras. 4.23 – 4.26). It explains the importance of the Port and the need to maintain good access (by rail and sea where possible but recognising the need for major movements by road). A modal shift for workers / shoppers / visitors travelling to the city centre will help maintain road access to the Port. The remodelling of city centre roads to support pedestrian movements will help encourage this modal shift but also needs to be balanced with the access needs of the Port. In considering development adjacent to (eg within 50 metres) of the Port, account will be taken of the impact on the Port.

*ABP Comment:*

3.2.2 ABP cannot support policies that could prejudice or undermine the competitiveness of the Port, which operates in a highly competitive global market. There should be a policy for the nationally important Port in the Plan. This should state that development proposals should have no significant adverse implications for the Port. The Plan refers to balancing the needs of pedestrians and city centre development with those of access to and the successful operation of the Port (para 4.24). However the Plan does not indicate where the balance lies. If there is any conflict it must be resolved in favour of the nationally significant Port.

*The following changes have been made to the CCAP at 'Proposed Submission' stage.*

3.2.3 A specific policy has been introduced for the port, to manage its relationship with the city centre.

3.2.4 The policy states that:

“The Council will support the growth and overall competitiveness of the Port of Southampton; and the growth and enhancement of the city centre. Where there is a need to balance these aims, the Council will do so recognising the national significance of the Port, the local and regional significance of the city centre, and the relative strength of positive and negative effects on the Port and city centre from specific measures.” It explains that this approach will be applied, for example, in terms of pedestrian / cycle improvements on access routes to the Port and residential uses at Royal Pier and the Western Gateway close to the Port.

- 3.2.5 The text explains that “Where there is a balance to be struck between the needs of the Port and the city centre, this will involve a qualitative judgement between different types of effect. The strength of positive benefit to an objective for the locally / regionally important city centre will need to be greater, and sufficiently so to outweigh, the strength of negative effect to the nationally important Port. Careful assessment of the likely effects on the Port will be important, to ensure the growth and enhancement of the city centre is not unnecessarily restricted.”
- 3.2.6 The Council considers that this addresses much of ABP’s comment. First, by introducing a policy. Second, by recognising in this policy the national importance of the port, and setting out a framework for balancing these issues in a way which gives strong support for the nationally important port. The remaining difference is that ABP believe any conflict must always be resolved in favour of the Port, whereas the Council take a more nuanced approach which it considers more accurately reflect the overall policy context (eg ‘strong support for ports with some caveats’). In any case, in relation specifically to the strategic access route to the Port, the Council’s approach gives even stronger protection, similar to that advocated by the Port (see below).

### 3.3 Transport / Access

*‘Preferred Approach’ CCAP:*

- 3.3.1 Policy 16 (Transport and Movement) and Policy 17 (Strategic Links) promote high quality pedestrian / cycle links. A number of these cross / traverse the strategic or secondary access route to the port.
- 3.3.2 Policies 16, 18 and 21 (Transport and Movement, MDQ, Western Gateway) promote an enhancement of the West Quay Road – Platform Lane – Threefield / Marsh Lane gyratory link which delivers pedestrian / public realm enhancements and maintains or improves access to the Port.

*ABP Comment:*

- 3.3.3 National Policy (PPG13, draft NPS / NPPF) highlight the importance of Ports and access to them. Core Strategy policy CS18 requires development not to prejudice access to the Port. The Plan’s “Easy to get about” section makes no direct reference to the importance of access to the Port. Policy 16 (Transport) should refer to maintaining good access generally to the Port (not just the Platform Road scheme), and the supporting text should include a reference (paragraph proposed).

- 3.3.4 In addition to the changes above in terms of the overall approach, the following changes have been made to the CCAP.
- 3.3.5 The supporting text to the transport chapter adds references to maintaining appropriate access to, and the competitiveness of, the Port (paras. 4.175 and 4.188).
- 3.3.6 Policy AP18 (Transport) and Policy AP23 (Western Gateway) continue to give strong protection to the strategic access to the Port, ensuring that any enhancements on the main route to the Port (ie via West Quay Road to Dock Gate 4) does not significantly adversely affect access to the Port of Southampton.
- 3.3.7 The supporting text to the new port policy:
- Identifies the strategic and secondary road routes into the port (para 4.26).
  - Explains the importance of enhancing streets for pedestrians / cyclists but that the traffic movement functions of these streets for both the port and the city centre should be recognised (para 4.28).
  - Cross refers to policy AP18, which gives added protection for the main route to the Port (para. 4.28)
- 3.3.8 Policy 20 (MDZ) adds a cross reference to Policy 18 (Transport) and Policy 4 (the Port) in respect of remodelling West Quay Road for pedestrian / cycle movements.
- 3.3.9 The supporting text to policy 19 (strategic links), at para. 4.190, cross refers to policy 4 (the Port) and recognises that the strategic links will have a major benefit to the city centre.
- 3.3.10 The Council considers that the original approach and the changes address many of ABP's comments. The new port policy refers to access to the Port in general, and the text refers to the strategic and secondary access routes. The approach recognises that there should be no significant adverse effect to the strategic access route to the Port. An element of flexibility is introduced, by ensuring no significant adverse impact. The secondary access to the Port is covered by the slightly more nuanced general port policy. This is considered to more accurately reflect the overall policy context.

### 3.4 Sensitive Land Uses Close to the Port.

*'Preferred Approach' CCAP:*

- 3.4.1 Policy 21 (Western Gateway) promotes residential development provided an appropriate level of amenity is created in relation to port operations. The text explains the need for detailed assessment of the location / design of residential development (para. 5.42). Policy 22 (Royal Pier) also promotes residential development.

*ABP Comment:*

3.4.2 The Port is operational land (in terms of permitted development) so can be used 24 hours a day 7 days a week for any port purpose. During the plan period priorities might change and the City Cruise terminal might be replaced by a less benign port use which generates heavy freight movements day and night. The Council must assume this may happen. ABP are extremely concerned about, and object in principle, to residential development in any part of the Western Gateway. Current national policy seeks to encourage the full use of ports and avoid incompatible development nearby (PPG13 Annex B para. 11). These issues extend beyond 50 metres from the Port.

3.4.3 In addition to the changes above in terms of the overall approach, the following changes have been made to the CCAP to elaborate on this issue at the 'Proposed Submission' stage.

3.4.4 The supporting text to the new port policy explains that an appropriate level of amenity should be created for residential occupiers (in the context of a city centre environment). It adds that the port's overall competitiveness should not be significantly constrained (due to pollution legislation), taking into account:

- the variety / flexibility of port uses (possible / realistic future port uses, the 24 hour nature of the port);
- the need for good design (layout, distance, barriers, detailed measures); and
- a recognition of the benefits of residential development in the city centre.

(The reference to this issue only applying within 50 metres of the port is deleted).

3.4.5 A cross reference to the Port policy is included in the Western Gateway policy.

3.4.6 The Council considers that this addresses some of ABP's concerns. The Council considers it is inappropriate in light of the overall policy context and site circumstances to automatically preclude residential development. It is likely that appropriate solutions can be found to deliver some residential uses as part of mixed use development. The new port policy's general approach gives strong support to the Port without automatically precluding residential development prior to further consideration. The CCAP has also been amended to add more emphasis to, and a fuller description of, this issue.

### 3.5 Links to and Views of Cruise Liners and the Port in General

#### *'Preferred Approach' CCAP:*

3.5.1 Policies 17, 18 and 21 (Strategic Links, MDQ, Western Gateway) refer to the Station Avenue leading "towards the City Cruise terminal" (as well as Royal Pier). The supporting text refers to the City Cruise terminal becoming a waterfront destination should the Port wish to facilitate this (para. 5.34) and the Western Gateway maintaining a link through to this waterfront destination (para. 5.39).

- 3.5.2 Policy 19 and 21 (MDQ and Western Gateway) refer to maintaining or creating views of the waterfront / cruise liners. The supporting text explains that the Station Avenue should be orientated, and the Station Quarter designed to achieve this (para. 5.15 and p83 / p87 'design guidance').

*ABP Comment:*

- 3.5.3 We are concerned about references to making the City Cruise terminal, adjacent to the Western Gateway, a waterfront destination. It is not possible for ABP to facilitate this due to safety and custom requirements. ABP object to that part of Policy 17 (Strategic Links 'Station Avenue') which refers to linking 'towards the City Cruise terminal' and connecting to the waterfront; and to references to maintaining and creating views of the cruise terminal / port.

*The following changes have been made to the CCAP at 'Proposed Submission' stage.*

- 3.5.4 The policy references to the Station Avenue leading 'towards the City Cruise terminal' are deleted (Policies AP19 Strategic Links, AP20 MDZ, AP23 Western Gateway).
- 3.5.5 Policy references are changed to refer to a local link and destination (Policy AP23 – Western Gateway, para. 5.35 and 5.40).
- 3.5.6 The supporting text to the MDZ / Western Gateway broadens out the references about views of cruise ships to also include other ships and port infrastructure. It recognises that views of all these features adds to the distinctiveness of the city centre, and that where practicable create views of them should be created. (Paragraph 5.14).
- 3.5.7 Policy 21 (MDZ) replaces reference to maintaining / creating views of the waterfront and cruise liners with references to creating appropriate long and local views of the waterfront, and port more generally (eg port and cruise liners). Long views should be over the tops of other buildings, rather than along a 'grand avenue', just in case the City Cruise terminal does relocate. Local views should be confined to within the Western Gateway.
- 3.5.8 Policy AP16 (Design) adds a reference to "appropriate" views of cruise liners / port, and broadens this out to public spaces in general, rather than specifically in relation to the City Cruise terminal, Western Gateway and Watermark WestQuay.
- 3.5.9 Policy AP16 (Design) also continues to protect the view from the town walls to the River Test. (The Watermark West Quay proposal reflects this, creating an avenue aligned to the view from the town walls to the City Cruise terminal).
- 3.5.10 The Council considers this addresses all of ABP's concerns.

### 3.6 Royal Pier

*'Preferred Approach' CCAP:*



3.6.1 This included little reference to the Port.

*ABP Comment:*

3.6.2 The Royal Pier policy should include criteria to ensure development does not adversely impact on the Port (residential uses will only be acceptable on this basis) and maintaining good access for port traffic (including traffic between the eastern and western docks). Detailed text changes are proposed.

*'Proposed Submission' CCAP:*

3.6.3 The policy is amended to support the creation of spaces from which to view the cruise liners. The text is amended to identify that the Port is adjacent, and to cross refer to policy AP 4 (the Port) with respect to the range of uses.

### 3.7 Sustainability Appraisal

3.7.1 The appraisal identifies there may be the following:

- Positive effects:
  - flood defences (raising the quay wall) (note – the defence is likely to be at the rear of the port)
  - social inclusion (employment)
  - energy (eg the Port receives electricity from the CHP plant)
- Uncertain effects:
  - sustainable consumption, use of local products
  - water quality
- Negative effects:
  - congestion (causing air pollution and climate change) - need to promote sustainable transport

## 4. **Justification for the policy**

### 4.1 National Policy and the Core Strategy

4.1.1 The relative economic importance of the Port of Southampton and Southampton city centre can be described as follows. The Port is one of the largest in the U.K, handling 20% of our trade with 'non EU' countries (40% - 45% with the Far East); is the largest port for cruise passengers, the second largest for containers, and a leading port for the vehicle trade. Southampton city centre is the largest of two city centres serving the South Hampshire conurbation of approximately 1.5 million people. It is amongst the largest city centres in south east and south central England (outside of London). It is ranked 14<sup>th</sup> of UK shopping destinations (Experian, 2009).

4.1.2 Both the Port and the city centre have major growth plans. The Port is of significant national economic importance. The success of Southampton city

centre is of some national economic relevance, and is of significant regional and local importance in terms of sustainable economic growth and social cohesion.

- 4.1.3 The National Ports Strategy sets out the economic importance of, and presumption in favour of port growth; and also the ways in which ports should be designed and operated to mitigate their adverse effects (for example relating to transportation and residential amenity). In other words, it sets out a strong support for ports, with caveats.
- 4.1.4 The National Planning Policy Framework reflects this, and also sets out strong support for economic growth focussed on city centres, sustainable transport, prioritising pedestrian and cycle movements by creating safe environments which minimise conflicts with traffic, facilitating inclusive communities and creating a good standard of amenity for the users of development.
- 4.1.5 The Core Strategy supports the growth of the Port of Southampton and of the city centre, sustainable transport, access routes to the Port (which should not be prejudiced), enhanced pedestrian connections within the city centre and enhanced links with St Marys priority regeneration area.
- 4.1.6 The City Centre Action Plan conforms with these documents. It recognises the greater (eg particular national) importance of the Port. Therefore 'all things being equal' the needs of the Port should predominate. However the Plan is also in conformity by providing caveated support to the Port and support to city centre objectives as well. A measure which would have a minor effect on the Port and a major benefit to the city centre could be appropriate in the light of the strategic guidance, and the CCAP reflects this.
- 4.1.7 ABP have pointed to the Core Strategy policy criterion that states that port access should not be prejudiced. The City Centre Action Plan no longer needs to be in conformity with the Core Strategy. Planning Advisory Service guidance explains that "A core strategy is no longer the primary DPD; supporting or other DPDs don't have to be in conformity with it – any existing policy can be changed via a new DPD" (1st paragraph, page 5, PAS "Successful plan-making" – July 2013). In any case it is considered that the CCAP is consistent with the Core Strategy as a whole. The purpose of the CCAP is to take forward the strategic framework set by the whole Core Strategy by creating a practical plan for implementing a range of objectives. The CCAP provides strong protection for the strategic route to the Port. It is considered there will be no net prejudice to the overall route identified by the Core Strategy. A slightly more nuanced approach is taken for the secondary route to reflect all Core Strategy objectives. It should also be noted that the Core Strategy 'no prejudice' wording reflected the South East Plan (Policy T10 explained that policies and proposals for infrastructure should 'maintain and enhance' the role of the Port). This Plan is now deleted, and the NPS for Ports takes a slightly more nuanced approach.

## 4.2 The Port's Overall Competitiveness

- 4.2.1 The Port's competitiveness (eg the propensity of shipping / freight companies, cruise lines and their passengers to use the Port) depends on a judgement 'in the round' of all factors. The location of the Port within the city inevitably brings some

advantages (labour supply, public transport connections, etc) and some disadvantages (ie urban traffic). However the Port is the U.K.'s first / last major port of call, is close to international shipping lanes, benefits from a deep channel / double tide, good national rail / road connections, and proximity to London and the south east. Taking in the round the Port enjoys some key advantages, many of which are geographically unalterable and some of which are distinct to Southampton. This gives the Port a durable and significant competitive edge. The CCAP gives strong general support for the Port. Its slightly more nuanced approach in specific areas is considered to be unlikely to significantly counter these key advantages. Furthermore, competitiveness is a relative concept. The potential for a slight impact on the Port should be considered against the likelihood of related or indeed other impacts being experienced by other of the U.K.'s ports.

### 4.3 Vehicular access

- 4.3.1 Access is considered in terms of the two key trades likely to be affected by the city centre: cruise and vehicles.
- 4.3.2 The Port will experience an erosion of its competitiveness if access to / from the rest of the U.K becomes significantly worse in terms of speed, reliability and resilience.
- 4.3.3 The relative importance of changes in journey times as a result of changes in Southampton city centre should be seen in the following context.
- 4.3.4 First, the Port of Southampton has competitive advantages across a range of important factors as set out above, of which land access is one. This puts into some perspective the impact of any change to one factor, particularly where it is a modest change.
- 4.3.5 Second, there are a range of transport issues, in terms of handling both existing and an increase in custom:

#### *General*

- 4.3.6 The U.K. is a highly urbanised country. The ports competing with Southampton for cruise passengers and vehicle trade are all likely to experience existing and growing traffic congestion. This is likely in terms of general economic / development / traffic growth on the national strategic road network leading to all ports. It is also likely in terms of the immediate vicinity of ports. Whilst the Port of Southampton is accessed through the city, this is also true of one of its main cruise competitors (Liverpool). In terms of vehicle trade, competing ports are affected by wider conurbations nearby (eg the Thames and the Tyne – Tees ports).
- 4.3.7 The Port of Southampton enjoys alternative means of transport, which places it in a robust position. Whilst vehicular access will still play a major role, the Port would be able to respond to further congestion by tipping the proportion further towards rail / coastal shipping. In other words, some of the additional growth can be handled without depending on vehicular access. The Port is actively seeking to increase the proportion of trades moved by rail / coastal shipping, and significant

improvements have or are being implemented for both modes. Recent investment in rail infrastructure has significantly increased the proportion of car and container traffic travelling by rail.

4.3.8 The Port also enjoys secondary access routes immediately from the dock gate.

4.3.9 Many port operations do not coincide with peak periods on the surrounding road network. For containers, the Port operates a booking system to help manage these flows and this has significantly reduced congestion associated with container traffic.

#### Vehicles

4.3.10 The Port handles significant numbers of vehicles (724,000 in 2005). The Port Master Plan projected this to grow modestly, by 17% over 25 years, although the Port has been successful in attracting additional business in recent years. ABP has invested in rail infrastructure in the Eastern Docks and this has resulted in a significant increase in the proportion of new vehicle traffic travelling by rail. This should mean no or reduced impact on the road network from extra car trade and there may also be scope for back loading of car transporters.

4.3.11 The overall journey times for freight movements are long. Movements to the rest of the world by ship can take many days, and movements by land across the UK can take many hours. See Appendix 1. For example, from Southampton it takes 21.5 days to sail to / from China; and 6.6 days to / from the eastern seaboard of the U.S. From Southampton it takes over 2.5 hours to drive to Birmingham and over 4 hours to drive to Manchester.

4.3.12 Comparing Southampton to Tilbury (for example), it takes about the same time to travel by road from either to the Midlands (eg Birmingham) and north west England (eg Manchester); but ships traversing the main sea route to northern Europe (ie the English Channel) reach Southampton almost 8 hours before Tilbury. Again, see Appendix 1. There could therefore be significant delays on the road journey from Southampton to the Midlands and the north, and the goods would still arrive quicker than had they been shipped via Tilbury.

#### Cruise

4.3.13 The Port handles significant numbers of cruise passengers (around 1 million in 2008), and this is projected by the Port Master Plan to nearly double (to 1.9 million) by 2030. In reality, the increases in cruise traffic have exceeded the Master Plan predictions and the Port is likely to handle 1.9 million passengers long before 2030.

4.3.14 Cruise ships usually operate to a similar pattern. They arrive in the Port early morning, with people disembarking after breakfast. Embarkation usually takes place from late morning to mid afternoon, with a peak arrival period between 12:00 and 14:00. The ships then depart early evening.

4.3.15 The Port of Southampton offers many cruise passenger parking spaces within the port very close to the ships. This enables cruise passengers to easily bring

significant amounts of luggage, and is a significant benefit in competing against fly – cruise options where passenger luggage is limited by the flight leg of the journey.

- 4.3.16 Cruise passengers are likely to aim to arrive with plenty of time before their ship departs, to allow for any delays, to avoid peak traffic times, and to benefit from the on ship facilities whilst in port.
- 4.3.17 Cruise passengers are unlikely to be deterred from taking a special holiday by modest (or even fairly significant) congestion, providing they are confident they will reach the Port in a timely manner to catch their ship. Beyond this, they will not undertake an analysis of the relative congestion levels around different ports in choosing their cruise port. It is recognised that the quality of their arrival experience is a part of their holiday experience, and is an opportunity to create a good image of the city in general. Cruise traffic tends to peak in the summer months, with Saturday usually the busiest day. On Saturdays, embarkation is most critical and can coincide with holiday traffic peaks on the Strategic Road Network and retail / leisure peaks within Southampton city centre. Weekdays are less of an issue. Disembarkation does not tend to cause traffic problem.
- 4.3.18 The extra cruise passenger car traffic passing through the city centre will depend in part on the physical capacity to provide extra car parking (eg multi storey formats) within the Port estate. Beyond this, any growth will inevitably be handled in particular by satellite car parks with feeder minibus services, lifts from family / friends, or by coach; and also (probably to a much smaller extent) , by direct rail to the port, or by rail / air via Central Station / the airport. These options involve limited additional infrastructure. For example luxury coaches from around the U.K. can drive straight to the port.
- 4.3.19 In short there are a range of factors which suggest that modest land access delays would not significantly affect the Port's competitiveness.
- 4.3.20 This does not suggest that delays are irrelevant. Delays, or the perception of a risk of delays, have the potential to affect competitiveness. This would be particularly so if these combined with delays on the national strategic road network approaching and into Southampton. However in relative terms any such strategic delays are likely to be a risk on the approach to alternative ports as well. The effect of the potential for any modest delay within the city centre should be kept in perspective.
- 4.3.21 The vehicular routes to the Port of Southampton will be affected by the CCAP as follows:
- The main route for Port traffic on the strategic road network is via the M3 and / or A34 via the M27 and M271. The M3 and M27 can suffer from congestion problems during the traditional weekday peaks and also on summer weekends, due to holiday traffic. The Government has recently confirmed their intention to fund a Managed Motorway scheme on both the M3 south of J9 and M27. This will improve capacity and provide better levels of journey time reliability on these important routes serving the Port.
  - Within Southampton itself, the main route serving the Port is from the M271 via the A33 Western Approach, West Quay Road, Town Quay and

Platform Road. This route enjoys continuous dual carriageway access off the national strategic road network (M271) through the city along the Western Approach (A33). Once the improvement works in Town Quay and Platform Road are completed in 2014, a comprehensive dual carriageway route will be provided from the M271 to serve all Dock Gates. Micro-simulation modelling undertaken to support the design of these road improvements has shown that they will deliver significant improvements during peak demands for cruise traffic. .

- 4.3.22 The CCAP recognises that this is the main access route to the Port. It includes policies to ensure that road remodelling will not lead to a significant adverse impact on the Port. It proposes development at the Western Gateway and enhanced pedestrian links to the city centre which would cross West Quay Road. However the supporting text explains that it is expected that West Quay Road will remain a dual carriageway. Many junctions on West Quay Road already incorporate pedestrian crossing facilities. These will need to be improved to provide high quality links into Western Gateway, but it will be possible to accommodate this without compromising West Quay Road's traffic function serving both the city centre and the Port.
- 4.3.23 A secondary route to and from the Port and particularly the Eastern Docks, is the A33 via Kingsway. This route comes off the Strategic Road Network at the southern end of the M3, continues south through the city via 'The Avenue' arterial route (mixed two / single lane). It passes through the city centre via Charlotte Place, Kingsway, Evans Street (dual carriageway); and the Threefield Lane / Marsh Lane gyratory, Terminus Terrace (partially two lane).
- 4.3.24 Whilst the Port Master Plan highlights the Western Approach as the main access for freight traffic, this alternative route does provide contingency to maintain access to and from the Port, if problems occur on the Western Approach. It also provides additional traffic capacity on busy cruise days, which are dominated by car traffic rather than freight movements.
- 4.3.25 The City Council is currently delivering an improved cycle link between the Itchen Bridge and city centre, which crosses Evans Street. This crossing forms part of improvement works in Evans Street in association with the redevelopment of the East Street Shopping Centre, which will create a new pedestrian link from East Street to St Mary's Street and Chapel Road. Micro-simulation modelling work has demonstrated that these works will not adversely impact on the traffic function of this route to the detriment of access to and from the Port.
- 4.3.26 It is important to provide high quality pedestrian and cycle links between different parts of the city centre and the regeneration proposed along the Itchen Riverside Quarter, and to do so in a way which is consistent with policy AP4 which recognises the importance of the Port.
- 4.3.27 The CCAP identifies this as the secondary route to the Port. The Threefield / Marsh Lane gyratory / Terminus Terrace section of the route in the immediate vicinity of the Port is included within the Plan's policy commitment for there to be no significant adverse impact. The remainder of the route falls under the general port policy, which refers to balancing the national needs of the Port and the regional needs of the city centre.

- 4.3.28 In summary, the proposed improved pedestrian crossings in the city centre would have significant benefits:
- Linking the Western Gateway into the city centre and Central Station, thus supporting major development in the longer term on this site.
  - Reconnecting the St Mary's priority community and future communities (eg at Town Depot and Itchen Riverside) to the city centre (via a reformatted East Street with the Morrisons proposal) and to the parks.
- 4.3.29 This also has transport benefits by encouraging a switch away from car journeys to multi mode train / bus and then pedestrian journeys, which will 'free up' capacity on the strategic road network to the port.
- 4.3.30 Given the benefits, and the likely limited impacts, this suggests that some changes to the highway network to benefit pedestrians to achieve other aspects of the CCAP can be achieved. In any case the CCAP sets the correct tests to balance these benefits against any impact to the Port.

#### 4.4 Sensitive Land Uses

- 4.4.1 The CCAP proposes mixed use development (including residential uses) at two locations close to the Port:
- 4.4.2 Western Gateway. This is a 13.8 hectare site. Its southern / western boundaries are immediately adjacent to the Port (currently the City Cruise terminal and long term container storage [this area is some distance from the container port and is not used for 'day to day' movements]). The Western Gateway site extends inland, up to a maximum of 250 metres away from the Port, fronting the busy West Quay Road.
- 4.4.3 Royal Pier. This is approximately an 8 hectare site. Its western boundary is adjacent to the Port's western docks (currently the City Cruise terminal area). ABP are one of the land interests and signatories to the Royal Pier development agreement. The development scheme proposes that the areas closest to the port continue to be used as open space, or for offices. The mixed use element of the scheme, incorporating residential development, would be around 350 metres from the western docks port boundary. Whilst it would be immediately adjacent to the current Isle of Wight car ferry terminal, the development scheme proposes that this is relocated.
- 4.4.4 The Port's concern is that any future residential occupiers would be able to use pollution control legislation to limit their operations.
- 4.4.5 The following points of context should be borne in mind.
- 4.4.6 The residential uses would be in a city centre environment, and in particular close to West Quay Road which is busy (at least during the day). The people who choose to live there are less likely to expect or be seeking a very quiet

environment (at least during the day / evening), and are more likely to be motivated by the benefits of city centre living.

- 4.4.7 The City Cruise terminal is a relatively benign port use in terms of noise and light. Many people will be excited by the prospect of living next to cruise liners.
- 4.4.8 It is commercially important to the Port to have the flexibility to use their estate for different trades as demands change. The NPS supports this commercial flexibility. In any case the Port have permitted development rights, unless the activity is such that its effects (including any noise / light effects) trigger the need for an environmental impact assessment.
- 4.4.9 The Port is projecting a major increase in cruise traffic, and has made a significant investment in constructing the City Cruise terminal. The limited width of the Port estate at this point means it could not easily be used for the other major growth area, containers. In the highly unlikely event that rather than increase, cruise trade actually fell below current levels, it is possible that the port would retain the City Cruise terminal and close other cruise terminals whose location would be better suited to other trades. The Port has no plans to relocate the City Cruise terminal, and its relocation in the foreseeable future is considered unlikely.
- 4.4.10 If this area of the Port (berth 101) were used for general cargo, night time use could trigger an EIA and the need for planning permission. The NPS recognises that despite its strong support for ports, the potential need for controls on operating hours and other measures to mitigate the effects on residential amenity. It also recognises the need to consider the impact of ports on bringing forward future development sites. If planning permission were not required, ABP could still take a commercial decision to implement measures to reduce the risks to their operations (eg screening, etc). This would fit with the overall approach in the NPS.
- 4.4.11 The residential development will be part of a mix of uses across a large development site. This creates the ability to screen the port from residential uses by other less sensitive commercial buildings. This is particularly effective at reducing negative effects. Other measures are also available (eg orientation of aspect, secondary and high specification glazing, and passive ventilation systems).
- 4.4.12 The area of the Port most likely to be affected if no measures were taken is only a small part of the existing port estate (eastern and western docks). Development at the Western Gateway would not affect the vast majority of the Port. Careful design of development at Western Gateway, including the siting of different uses and screening, would minimise the impact on the remaining part of the Port.
- 4.4.13 It is considered likely that residential uses can be introduced as part of a mixed use development on Western Gateway and Royal Pier in a satisfactory way and with minimal risk to the competitiveness of the Port. The introduction of residential uses will have a substantial benefit to the city centre and wider city / sub region. It will add to the diversity of uses in the city centre, contributing to activity at different times of day and night, benefit the viability of city centre sites, locate development close to public transport and facilities, and reduce the need for greenfield sites. In any case the CCAP policy 4 (Port) contains the correct tests to balance the



potential impacts and the benefits, enabling a particular form of residential development to be refused where necessary.

#### 4.5 Strategic Links and Views

- 4.5.1 Southampton is known around the U.K. and the world as a port city. Residents often place significant emphasis during public consultation exercises on the desire for the city to have better links with the waterfront. Views of the Port give a strong sense of identity and distinctiveness to the city centre. The ability to see cruise liners is particularly exciting. The ability to see port infrastructure (eg cranes) and passing container ships is also interesting.
- 4.5.2 The Plan sets out the potential to create a local waterfront destination at the city cruise terminal.
- 4.5.3 The Port have advised that even if they wished to facilitate this, security and custom requirements would prohibit this. They are also concerned that streets and views should not be orientated towards a cruise terminal which may in the future be relocated. (As stated above, the Council consider it unlikely that the City Cruise terminal would relocate).
- 4.5.4 The Council has made changes to the Plan to reflect a pragmatic approach.
- 4.5.6 A waterfront destination does not need to be one where the general public can literally gain access to the quayside. It can be one where the destination draws its identity from general views of the waterfront. The Government's general approach is not to draw people towards the security fence. A building could be designed with secure 'land side' and 'sea side' areas (similar to the 'air side' divisions in an airport). There is no indication that the Port wish to pursue this at this stage, although this might change in the long term. The Western Gateway can be designed to create general views of the cruise liners, waterfront and any future port use. Indeed better views of cruise liners will be obtained from a more set back location.
- 4.5.7 References to a strategic link towards the City Cruise terminal have been deleted, but references to retaining the ability for a local link from within the Western Gateway are included. This ensures that the option of access to a cruise terminal building (either general access to a terminal building or restricted access for cruise passengers) is not precluded, should a Port owner wish to facilitate it.
- 4.5.8 References to orientating the Station Avenue to face the City Cruise terminal are deleted. (This would in any case be difficult to achieve in terms of land ownerships in the wider Major Development Zone). References are amended to provide general long views and more specific local views from within the Western Gateway.
- 4.5.9 References are added to creating views elsewhere (eg from Royal Pier / Town Quay).

## **5. Conclusions**

- 5.1 The CCAP policies provide strong support for the Port with carefully defined flexibility to support city centre growth where appropriate. In the light of national and local policies, the port master plan, the nature of the Port's trade, a proportionate view of the factors that contribute to the Port's competitiveness, city centre opportunities, and the potential to manage the relationship between the two, the CCAP's approach is considered appropriate.

## Appendix 1: Freight Journey Times

Sea Routes			
	Nautical miles	Days at sea*	
Southampton			
From Shanghai (via Suez Canal)	10,305	21.5	
From New York / New Jersey	3,156	6.6	
		Hours at sea*	
Additional sailing to Tilbury**	158	7hrs 54min	
Road Routes			
	Miles	Hours on road:	(Implied average speed):
Southampton (Terminus Terrace) to:			
London (Westminster)	82	1hr 52 min	(43.9 mph)
Birmingham city centre	133	2hrs 38min	(50.5 mph)
Manchester city centre	226	4hrs 14min	(53.4 mph)
Difference from Tilbury (Docks)***:			
London (Westminster)	-56	-47 min	
Birmingham city centre	+11	0min	
Manchester city centre	0	-7 min	

Source: sea-distances.com; The AA

\*Based on 20 knots. (1 knot = 1 nautical mile per hour). (Wikipedia: container ship sails at 21 – 25 knots).

\*\* eg (distance / time from overseas destination to Tilbury) minus (distance / time from overseas destination to Southampton)

\*\*\* eg (distance / time from Tilbury to UK destination) minus (distance / time from Southampton to UK destination)