

# Public Document Pack

## **JOHN WARD**

Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Democratic Services

Email: [democraticservices@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@chichester.gov.uk)

East Pallant House

1 East Pallant

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 1TY

Tel: 01243 785166

[www.chichester.gov.uk](http://www.chichester.gov.uk)



A meeting of the **Cabinet** will be held in the Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on **Tuesday 5 September 2023 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mr J Brown (Vice-Chairman), Mr A Moss (Chairman), Mrs T Bangert, Mr D Betts, Mr B Brisbane, Ms J Brown-Fuller, Mr M Chilton and Ms H Desai

## SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

3 **Public Question Time** (Pages 1 - 2)

Public Question and Answer Sheet

This page is intentionally left blank

## Chichester District Council

Cabinet

5 September 2023

### Public Questions and Answers Sheet

#### Questions to Cabinet 5 September on behalf of the Chichester and District Cycle Forum and Sustrans.

##### Question on Agenda Item 9

I am sure all Cabinet Members agree that developers, housebuilders and landowners should pay for the infrastructure which is needed as a consequence of the granting of planning permission for new housing.

So can you please explain why all the funds [ £43,300,000 ] for the mitigation required for the A27 Chichester By-Pass as proposed in this SPD is for increasing the capacity of the road infrastructure for the benefit of vehicles and none for active or sustainable travel infrastructure and their users who need to utilise or traverse the A27?

Especially when in your report , para 5.6, it is accepted that many of the new houses will be occupied by residents who do not own cars.

How will this SPD encourage modal shift and reduce air pollution ?

##### **Answer from Cllr Moss:**

Thank you for your question. The proposed SPD is specifically to secure funding for the mitigation needed for the A27 Chichester By-Pass through the use of S106 planning obligations. It reflects the approach taken in the current SPD but updates the proposed mitigation that is now required and affordable – based upon the evidence collected so far in the preparation of the emerging local plan. In due course, this local plan seeks to respond to future evidence and need through a monitor and manage process – which will consider the potential for spending of accrued funding under the proposed SPD toward alternative sustainable transport and active travel measures that may have the same or greater effect in creating capacity within the strategic (and associated local) highway network through modal shift. However, until the emerging local plan has been through examination, the identified and costed appropriate mitigation at this stage are the improvements identified at Fishbourne and Bognor junction. It is also noteworthy that these works themselves will allow for improvements to bus journey times in and out of Chichester.

It is important to note that this is a funding secured through the SPD is only part of the infrastructure provision that will be brought forward in the emerging local plan. The plan will support additional monies secured through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), which is the primary mechanism used to collect money for infrastructure to support development. The Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) sets out the infrastructure required to support the delivery of the Chichester Local Plan to 2029 and this includes active and sustainable transport schemes. These can be funded through CIL and/or through other funding sources or where appropriate delivered directly by developers, as identified in the IBP. Delivery of these schemes contribute towards modal shift and therefore reductions in air pollution

### **Question on Agenda Item 11**

Route K is an important part of the National Cycle Network, both NCN 2 from Dover to Totnes [ the major South Coast route ] and NCN 288 [ Centurion and Bill Way ] linking Midhurst to Selsey. It is very disappointing that your report omits its national and regional designation and significance.

The Chichester and District Cycle Forum and Sustrans [ responsible for promoting the National Cycle Network ] have commented on these proposals. Where we differ from your officers is in relation to that part of Westgate from the new Sherbourne Road junction to that with Parklands Road where it is our belief that Option 1, allowing cycling in the road carriageway [ in a 20 MPH zone with suitable traffic calming and planting] is preferable to a cycle path with yet more tarmac ! Option 1 means that cyclists need not cross the road as is needed in Option 2 if travelling westwards. It also provides a continual natural flow through the ' Narrows ' to and from the Orchard Street roundabout.

Could the Cabinet please take into consideration the view of experienced cyclists when forwarding your recommendations to the County Council ?

### **Answer from Cllr Brown:**

Thank you for your question and thank you for pointing out the regional and national designations of which Chichester City LCWIP Route K is a part. We absolutely agree that these designations only add to the importance of the possibility of an enhanced Route K for walkers, wheelers and cyclists.

Thank you also for informing us of the Cycle Forum and Sustrans' view on which of the consulted Route K options you prefer and the reasons why you prefer them. I confess personally I have found it hard to weigh up the pros and cons of each option and would emphasise that the recommendation in the report is to support a preference between two plausible ways of delivering the Route K concept. At this 'pre-consultation' consultation the most important thing is to show support for the concept of a cycle route. While a decision to prioritise making the route more attractive to those who currently don't cycle over experienced cyclists has led to a preference being expressed for option 2, we will definitely keep an open mind going forward as we see what else comes out of this consultation. This is a WS consultation, not ours – we need to see feedback in the round to inform our decision-making in future. I know you have concerns about how the route will integrate with proposals for the missing middle section. I share those concerns, but at this early stage it's important that we show support for the concept of the Route K cycle route.