

Appendix 1: Consultation response to WSCC’s draft Active Travel Strategy and Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan

Ancillary comments on the draft documents to be provided as part of the Council’s consultation response as follows:

Draft Consultation response:

The Council welcomes the advent of WSCC’s Active Travel Strategy and Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan. The documents helpfully provide context, transparency and a greater sense of WSCC’s intentions with regard to active travel.

The Council is keen to see related infrastructure come forwards in Chichester District at the earliest time both to support development and to meet broader Council policies on climate change, air quality and health and well-being. To that end the Council implores WSCC to ensure that its resourcing for this work is optimal to enable both Council’s ambitions to be met and for infrastructure to be delivered in a timely manner. Development and delivery of WSCC’s LCWIP should not be at cost of this Council’s LCWIP’s earliest delivery and that the delivery of schemes that facilitate modal-shift ‘in’ the city are important to make the strategic infrastructure coherent. ‘Resourcing’ should be read to include staffing and available capital.

The work is particularly important with regards to the draft Local Plan’s 5% modal-shift assumption and to ensure there is sufficient certainty of delivery within an early timeframe to support delivery of further development growth in a future local plan. We ask that schemes are sufficiently worked up such that this Council can collect Community Infrastructure Levy monies for their delivery.

We note the three strategic routes in the LCWIP and acknowledge the work undertaken towards delivery of those to date. Likewise we take WSCC’s LCWIP and the Council’s Chichester City LCWIP together as providing an indication of the priority routes for development in those documents’ lifetimes.

Whilst we are aware that there is planning gain related scheme being worked up for delivery east of Oving Road we suggest that a strategic route Chichester to Tangmere would support forthcoming development east of the City and especially given the likely life of WSCC’s LCWIP.

We look forward to working with WSCC on the delivery of active travel infrastructure under the auspices of these documents once adopted.

We have some minor comments about the content and wording of the documents as follows:

Draft West Sussex Active Travel Strategy 2023-2036:

The overall objectives refer to ‘e-scooters’ although they are not yet legal on West Sussex Roads.

page	Section	
4	Objective 1	The word ‘increasingly’ makes the Objective ambiguous. Is it possible to provide a more definitive commitment to assessing carbon as part of the scheme development process?
	Objective 2	The meaning of ‘we will ensure that active travel planning is advanced’ is not clear.
6	1.2.2	2 nd bullet-point: Should this be framed as ‘able bodied’ or similar? As worded it might include people who can’t achieve the target?
		2 nd and 3 rd bullet point: are these target based on any modelling or just an invented target figure?

8	2.1.10	Mention 'wheeling' too.
9	2.1.15	This para could reference ' <i>utility journeys</i> ' or could say 'means of introducing more physical activity into people's lives <i>by making it the natural choice to walk, wheel and cycle rather than take the car.</i> '
9	2.2.3	Add the words: 'In any case 'e' technologies such as ebikes, escooters, ebuggies will, over the life of this strategy continue to increase the attractiveness of such modes in hilly areas and across longer commute distances.
10	2.3	Current Walking And Cycling <i>Participation</i> levels.
12	2.3.7	Paragraph needs rewording to make sense.
15	2.3.13	Is it possible to say that 'fatal collisions involving pedestrians peaked in 2018'? ie is there a statistically valid downward trend?
16	2.3.16	Does LTN1/20 outline 'prescriptive standards' or 'prescriptive guidance'?
16	2.4.3	This paragraph could be read to be encouraging people to walk or cycle through areas of poor air quality.
23	4.1.6	Chichester DC's LCWIP is adopted to be a 10-year strategy. Will WSCC's commitment to the LCWIPs being updated every 5 years require CDC to update theirs earlier than the 10-year intended document life?
25	4.3	This section should mention the importance of systems (on-line etc) that allow members of the public to report the need for maintenance? To include soft issues such as hedgerows being cut-back and other issues such as pot-holes, defective lighting or defective signage etc.
25	4.4.2	This section could have more about secure bike parking. Maybe at transport hub points and in city centres. A separate section on secure bike parking might be helpful. Many people will not cycle to urban centres where there is no secure bike parking. Parking should be in a highly visible location. Bike theft in Chichester City Centre is an inhibiting factor in encouraging modal-shift.
26	4.4.7	e.scooters are already part of the urban travel landscape. Whilst they are not yet legal it seems a folly to ignore their presence and growing number. Perhaps it is possible to add more text to the document about escooters that would become 'live' in the event that the government legalises them more widely?
27	5.1.3	Sussex-air has also delivered behavioural change interventions contracted to the DnB's, unitary and Counties. This para should more correctly refer to that partnership work.
27	5.2.1	As for 5.1.3 above.
28	5.2.2	Name the DnB's and Sussex-air as a key partner?
29	5.6.3	The phrase 'increase roadway capacity' is not understood in the context. Surely roadway capacity could be reduced or increased? Should the phrase read 'increase <i>available</i> roadway capacity'?
29	5.6.3	'road improvements' are described as a soft measure and 'road user charging' are described as a hard measure. Is this correct?
31	7.2.2	Reword to: 'so that their views <i>inform the design</i> before implementing them'.
31	7.2.5	Delete 'creation' and replace with 'development and delivery'.
33	8.1.1	Add that the annual monitoring reports will be available in the public domain.
34	Tables 8.1, 8.2, 8.3	The data in these tables would be more easily understood in graphical form.

West Sussex draft LCWIP:

The Council is delighted to see (at 3.1.6 and elsewhere) three strategic routes with significant potential to impact positively on active travel in Chichester District.

Page	Section	
4	1.2.1	Text should mention Walking, cycling ' <i>and wheeling</i> '. This amendment should flow throughout the document.
7	2.3.4	Add reference to the 'Air quality strategy: Framework for local authority delivery'.
8	2.3.5	Add reference to the DnB Air Quality Action Plans.
13	3.1.6	Second bullet-point: add '(known as 'Chemroute')
25	Figure 10	Annotation at the east side of the plan incorrectly refers to 'Figure 7' – it should in fact refer to 'Figure 11'.
27	Figure 12	Text box 'County Boundary to Southbourne' refers to bidding for CIL monies to enable an alternative route, however no such route is currently in this Council's Infrastructure Business Plan so no such bid could be made until such a route is included in the IBP.
28 & 29		Both sections of the document have the same title but different numbers here?
29		Add mention of the potential for 20mph limits in the village sections.
26, 27		Add reference to the route being flat and desire line driven.
26, 27		Add reference to the potential for connection to the Chichester City LCWIP's Route K ('Complements the adopted Chichester City LCWIP' or similar) to connect to Chichester City Centre and the fact that WSCC has already carried out an initial public consultation on Route K.
34		6 th bullet point: Chichester DC has adopted its Chichester City LCWIP – amend text to reflect this.
35		2 nd bullet-point: add 'utility journeys'.
46		Some of these cost estimates look outdated.
51	Appendix A	'Route B': add 'Broadway' to the route description.