

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD
Head of Finance and Governance Services

Contact: Graham Thrussell on 01243 534653
Email: gthrussell@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House
1 East Pallant
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1TY
Tel: 01243 785166
www.chichester.gov.uk



Notice of Meeting

To All Members of Chichester District Council

You are hereby summoned to attend a **special** meeting of **THE COUNCIL** in the Council Chamber East Pallant House East Pallant Chichester West Sussex PO19 1TY on **Wednesday 27 September 2017** at **14:00** for the transaction of the business set out in the agenda below

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Diane Shepherd'.

DIANE SHEPHERD
Chief Executive

Tuesday 19 September 2017

AGENDA

1 **Approval of Minutes**

The Chairman will welcome everyone present and read the emergency evacuation procedure.

There are no minutes for approval at this meeting.

The minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council which took place on Tuesday 19 September 2017 will be presented for approval at the Council's next scheduled meeting on Tuesday 21 November 2017.

2 **Late Items**

The Chairman will announce any late items which due to special circumstances are to be dealt with under agenda item 7 (Late Items).

3 **Declarations of Interests**

Members and officers are reminded to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary, personal and/or prejudicial interests they may have in respect of matters on the agenda for this meeting.

4 **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman will make any specific announcements.

Apologies for absence will be notified at this point.

5 **Public Question Time**

In accordance with Chichester District Council's scheme of public question and with reference to standing order 6 in Part 4 A and section 5.6 in Part 5 of the Chichester District Council *Constitution*, consideration will be given at this point in the meeting to questions which have been submitted by members of the public in writing by 12:00 on the previous working day. The total time allocated for public question time is 15 minutes but this is subject to the chairman's discretion to extend that period for each member of the public (five minutes) or the total time for public questions (15 minutes).

6 **A27 Chichester Bypass Improvement Scheme** (pages 1 to 7)

The Council is requested to consider the agenda report and appendix for this item and to determine the position of the Council in respect of a scheme to improve the A27 at Chichester.

7 **Late Items**

Items added to the agenda papers and made available for public inspection.

Items which the chairman has agreed should be taken as matters of urgency by reason of special circumstances to be reported at the meeting and recorded in the minutes.

8 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There are no restricted items for consideration at this meeting.

NOTES

- (1) The press and public may be excluded from the meeting during any item of business wherever it is likely that there would be disclosure of 'exempt information' as defined in section 100A of and Schedule 12A to the *Local Government Act 1972*.
- (2) The open proceedings of this meeting will be audio recorded and the recording will be retained in accordance with the council's information and data policies. If a member of the public enters the committee room or makes a representation to the meeting, they will be deemed to have consented to being audio recorded. If members of the public have any queries regarding the audio recording of this meeting, please liaise with the contact for this meeting at the front of this agenda.

(3) Subject to the provisions allowing the exclusion of the press and public, the photographing, filming or recording of this meeting from the public seating area is permitted. To assist with the management of the meeting, anyone wishing to do this is asked to inform the chairman of the meeting of their intention before the meeting starts. The use of mobile devices for access to social media is permitted, but these should be switched to silent for the duration of the meeting. Those undertaking such activities must do so discreetly and not disrupt the meeting, for example by oral commentary, excessive noise, distracting movement or flash photography. Filming of children, vulnerable adults or members of the audience who object should be avoided.

MEMBERS

Mrs E Hamilton	Mrs J Kilby
Mrs N Graves	Mrs E Lintill
Mrs C Apel	Mr S Lloyd-Williams
Mr G Barrett	Mr L Macey
Mr R Barrow	Mr K Martin
Mr J Brown	Mr G McAra
Mr P Budge	Mr S Morley
Mr J Connor	Caroline Neville
Mr A Collins	Mr S Oakley
Mr T Dempster	Mr C Page
Mr A Dignum	Mrs P Plant
Mrs P Dignum	Mr R Plowman
Mrs J Duncton	Mr H Potter
Mr M Dunn	Mrs C Purnell
Mr J F Elliott	Mr J Ransley
Mr J W Elliott	Mr J Ridd
Mr N Galloway	Mr A Shaxson
Mr M Hall	Mrs J Tassell
Mrs P Hardwick	Mrs S Taylor
Mr R Hayes	Mr N Thomas
Mr G Hicks	Mrs P Tull
Mr L Hixson	Mr D Wakeham
Mr F Hobbs	Mrs S Westacott
Mrs G Keegan	Mr P Wilding

Chichester District Council

THE COUNCIL (SPECIAL)

27 September 2017

A27 Chichester Bypass Improvement Scheme

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Steve Carvell - Executive Director

Telephone: 01243 534569 E-mail: scarvell@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Tony Dignum - Leader of the Council

Telephone: 01243 538585 E-mail: tdignum@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

John Connor - Cabinet Member for the Environment Services

Telephone: 01243 604243 E-mail: jconnor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

The Council is recommended to consider the following report and determine the position of the Council in respect of a scheme to improve the A27 at Chichester.

3. Background

- 3.1 Most members will recall the report considered by the Cabinet and Council in September 2016 concerning the options proposed by Highways England to improve the A27 at Chichester. The report outlined the five options published for consultation, reviewed the consultation documents and considered the potential benefits and adverse effects of the different options, including how they might affect local communities, businesses and visitors to Chichester District.
- 3.2 Based upon the information made available by Highways England, the Council resolved to provide qualified support to option 2 and to approve the wider comments within the appendix to that report as the Council's formal response. However, the Council made it clear that it was only minded to support option 2 provided that Highways England gave serious consideration to the following:
 - (i) Strategic improvements to the Portfield roundabout to increase east-west capacity, possibly including an eastbound flyover for cars and light vans only using the A27;
 - (ii) The provision of good access for traffic going from the B2145 to the east of Chichester without impeding through east-west traffic (possibly by a slip road from the Whyke Road flyover down to the A27 or a right turn from the flyover down to the A27);

- (iii) The reduction of the length of the Stockbridge Link Road, either to only a section from the A286 to the Fishbourne roundabout or to the two sections from the B2201 via the A286 to the Fishbourne roundabout;
 - (iv) The provision of safe, segregated crossings of the A27 for cyclists and pedestrians at the Bognor Road, Whyke Road, Stockbridge Road and Fishbourne junctions;
 - (v) The installation of noise abatement screens on the flyovers;
 - (vi) The examination of the scope for lowering the roundabouts and flyovers at the Bognor Road and, especially, Fishbourne junctions to reduce visual impact; and
 - (vii) The use of Highways England's Designated Fund to finance the mitigation measures listed above.
- 3.3 In addition and importantly, the Council requested for purposes of transparency and community cohesion, that the Secretary of State for Transport provides the justification for discounting the previously prepared two offline routes to the north of the city.
- 3.4 Following this, in January 2017, the Council gave further consideration to the matter and resolved that the Secretary of State be requested to instruct Highways England, firstly, to undertake a new consultation on improvements to the A27 around Chichester, with an extended and reassessed range of options, including the two previously developed northern bypass options and, secondly, to publish without delay the results of the consultation held between July and September 2016.
- 3.5 Subsequently the Secretary of State wrote to Highways England on 28 February 2017 to announce that he had decided to cancel the scheme, noting that the scheme was controversial, the withdrawal of support by the local councils for the shortlisted options and the significant local campaigns. The Worthing and Lancing and Arundel Improvement Schemes remain within the current Highways England programme and have recently completed or are nearing completion of the public consultation stage.
- 3.6 In response to this announcement, West Sussex County Council convened a community meeting to try to develop a way forward. The Build A Better A27 initiative was launched by the County Council and supported by the District Council. A number of well attended workshops have been held and there continues to be an ongoing dialogue. At the same time the District and County Council's, together with the MP for Chichester, have continued to engage with Highways England to understand the viable options and to seek more time to enable the community led work to develop a way forward for the A27 at Chichester.
- 3.7 The culmination of the dialogue with Government and Highways England, supported by the District and County Councils and led by the MP, is set out in the attached letter dated 6 September 2017 addressed to Gillian Keegan MP.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1 Council determines a preference for pursuing a scheme to improve the A27 at Chichester to address issues of congestion and extensive queuing together with other related issues such as air quality. The aims and objectives for the improvement scheme were set out within the Highways England 2016 consultation document.

5. Proposal

- 5.1 The letter to Gillian Keegan MP from Highways England essentially outlines two possible approaches for taking forward a scheme to improve the A27 at Chichester:
 - A. RIS 1 (2015 – 2020). This requires an immediate announcement by the end of September (presumably by the Secretary of State) that one of the options from the 2016 consultation is now the preferred route and detailed design work will commence, including further discussions with the district and county council about potential mitigations and broader community and environmental benefits. Work can then commence within the RIS 1 timeframe i.e. by the end of March 2020.
 - B. RIS 2 (post 2020). This allows time for active community engagement around potential alternatives and is seen as bringing considerable benefits, however there are also risks as other national schemes may take priority and work is unlikely to commence before 2023.
- 5.2 The letter makes clear that within approach A (RIS 1) there is insufficient time to allow for broader community engagement in the development of an improved scheme.
- 5.3 The prospect of a northern route option has proved to be of interest to some in the community and it is worth noting what Highways England has to say about this. The letter says '*....this idea has almost no probability of success.*'
- 5.4 A further point to bear in mind is that strategic growth allocations within the adopted Chichester Local Plan (2014 – 2029) are dependent upon works to the A27 at Chichester to mitigate the impact of proposed development. The District Council is now collecting developer contributions (to be held by Highways England) to fund the necessary mitigation works. Furthermore, there is a strong likelihood that in the absence of a wider improvement scheme, the Review of the Chichester Local Plan will have implications for the A27 and potentially require yet further works to mitigate the impact. The complete absence of any improvement to the A27 does also have potential development implications as ultimately a point will be reached at which Highways England becomes concerned about the capacity of the existing route to safely and conveniently accommodate any increase in activity levels.
- 5.5 It has become clear that the government views both support from the local authorities and community support as significant considerations. The Council should therefore consider the two possible approaches outlined above and

determine which best meets the Council’s ambitions for an improved A27 bypass at Chichester.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 Positive and realistic approaches are outlined in this report. Alternatively the Council could of course decline to comment further.

7. Resource and legal implications

- 7.1 The resource and legal implications were set out in the September 2016 report to the Cabinet and the Council.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 A community workshop meeting is to be held on 25 September 2017 and will be attended by Gillian Keegan MP. Feedback from the meeting is not available at the time of writing this report but will be provided as an update to Council.

9. Community Impact and Corporate Risks

- 9.1 Again, these were set out in the earlier report but it is worth noting the positive comments by Highways England about the potential benefits (and risks) of further community engagement provided by approach B.

10. Other Implications

Are there any implications for the following? If you tick “Yes”, list your impact assessment as a background paper in paragraph 13 and explain any major risks in paragraph 9		
	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder The Council has a duty “to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area”. Do the proposals in the report have any implications for increasing or reducing crime and disorder?		X
Climate Change Are there any implications for the mitigation of or adaptation to climate change? If in doubt, seek advice from the Environmental Strategy Unit (ESU).		X
Human Rights and Equality Impact You should complete an Equality Impact Assessment when developing new services, policies or projects or significantly changing existing ones. For more information, see Equalities FAQs and guidance on the intranet or contact Corporate Policy.		X
Safeguarding and Early Help The Council has a duty to cooperate with others to safeguard children and adults at risk. Do these proposals have any implication for either increasing or reducing the levels of risk to children or adults at risk? The Council has committed to dealing with issues at the earliest opportunity, do these proposals have any implication in reducing or increasing demand on Council services?		X
Other (please specify) eg Biodiversity		X

11. Appendices

11.1 Letter to Gillian Keegan MP from Highways England dated 6 September 2017.

12. Background Papers

12.1 Letter from Secretary of State for Transport to Highways England dated 28 February 2017.

12.2 Letter from Highways England to Chichester District Council dated 14 March 2017

12.3 Letter from Highways England to West Sussex County Council dated 11 April 2017

12.4 Notes of meeting held with Highways England on 7 July 2017

Gillian Keegan MP
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

Jim O'Sullivan
Chief Executive
Highways England
Bridge House
1 Walnut Tree Close
Guildford
GU1 4LZ

6 September 2017

Dear Gillian

Thank you for meeting us on Monday and updating us on the current views around the scheme for the A27 at Chichester.

As you will be aware RIS 1 is our first five year funding period. It mimics the practice in other regulated sectors of setting out a programme of work that must be delivered for the funding provided within the five years. Chichester was part of this programme. It had been allocated £120m but following detailed design and traffic analysis the cancelled scheme was funded at £230m, nett contributions. This is the highest amount we can allocate and still demonstrate to government that the scheme is a good investment and provides value for money.

To summarise the current position there are only 31 months of the current 5 year RIS left so we are very constrained in what can be achieved in that time. Within that constraint it should be possible to start work on a version of the current proposed scheme if a route announcement were made before the end of September. We could then enter a phase of more detailed discussion on how the impact of the scheme could be mitigated and what could be done in the surrounding area to provide some compensating measures that benefit the broader community and environs.

If we need to create a space for broader community engagement in the development of an improved scheme, say of around three months, then it becomes impossible to start the scheme in RIS 1 and it becomes a potential 'RIS 2' scheme.

Further time to consider the scheme and other possible alternatives has considerable benefits. Active stakeholder engagement generally brings greater support for the scheme and a more refined outcome that delivers enhanced user, community and environment outcomes. However there are a number of risks. The early years of RIS 2 are virtually full and focused on completing the schemes that are started at the end of the current RIS (of which the A27 at Chichester would have been one). That means that a new scheme for Chichester would most likely start in 2023 as opposed to the

current 2020 date. Secondly, it will be competing with many schemes nationally for funding and will need to be viewed by government as a priority for inclusion in RIS 2.


We use a technique called BCR (Benefit Cost Ratio) to value schemes. For RIS 2 we are expecting the schemes will average around 2.5 to 3, and on this measure the Chichester scheme should still present a good investment case for inclusion in RIS2 or for persuading the government to carry it forward as a previous RIS1 commitment. Nonetheless I cannot guarantee the outcome of that assessment or the regional investment priorities of the government at that time.

I think it is widely accepted that the manner in which the northern route was discussed and handled was not well communicated or managed. Such a route would heavily contravene current planning guidance due to impacts on the national park, incurs higher cost reducing the BCR and, contrary to popular belief, has had limited development and design work done. Against all the other schemes we are looking at across the country this idea has almost no probability of success.

At Highways England we still see the A27 as having strategic importance. It is important national and regional infrastructure. It is the only East West arterial road south of the M25 and we are keen to support economic growth in the region and to improve the safety and capacity of this route. Clearly the current situation of a cancelled scheme on a route of this nature is not where we want to be. This letter lays out the choices we face and the risks and opportunities that each of them presents.

We wish to work constructively with all of our stakeholders on enhancing the country's strategic road network and we will support you, the other elected officials, and the authorities and communities you represent in achieving the best outcome for the region and the national infrastructure.'

Yours sincerely,



Jim O'Sullivan
Chief Executive