

# 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 Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on **Tuesday 11 January 2022 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mrs E Lintill (Chairman), Mrs S Taylor (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Briscoe, Mr A Dignum, Mrs P Plant, Mr A Sutton and Mr P Wilding

## SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

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

Public Question and Answer Sheet.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Chichester District Council

Cabinet

11 January 2022

### Public Questions and Answers Sheet

#### Question from Ian Sumnall:

1. Can you explain why you are supporting the National Highways proposals when they actually increase the amount of road space for the exclusive use of motorised vehicles at the expense of active travel users? This is being proposed by removing cycle lanes on both sides of the road for instance in Chidham and many parts of Southbourne. This will only increase vehicles use and speed. How will this improve safety and the environment for communities alongside the A259?
2. Reference is made in Section 10 to the Equality Impact of the proposals. How can it be stated that the combining of pedestrians and cyclists moving both ways on one pavement is an improvement. Has an Equality Impact Assessment been carried out to be able to make this statement?

#### Answer from Cllr Plant:

1. *Chichester District Council supports the proposed scheme and the significant investment for local infrastructure because National Highways have provided reassurance that it presents a coherent, consistent and safer route than exists at present. It is not within Chichester District Councils remit to consider road safety aspects and therefore the Council does not have the expertise in-house to consider such matters in detail. In such circumstances, the Council looks to partner organisations, whose remit it is, to provide technical advice. National Highways and locally WSCC Highways are the authorities whose remit includes road safety and Chichester District Council has sought assurances from these agencies on road safety matters. WSCC will separately be considering the National Highways proposals. Chichester District Councils has not designed the scheme but is being consulted by National Highways. The Councils remit remains to consider the proposals against proposed Local Plan policies around sustainable transport and other relevant corporate policies and strategies as outlined in the report to Cabinet.*
2. *NH confirms that it has carried out an Equality Impact Assessment on the scheme. That assessment will form part of the Preliminary Design Report which will be publicly available for review in due course.*

#### Question from Andrew Gould on behalf of Chichester Cycling Forum (read by Democratic Services):

The National Highways proposals involve removing 3000m of existing cycle lane and replacing them with a shared pavement plan. It also involves the removal of cyclist's existing priority over motorists at 22 minor side roads. The Chichester and District Cycle Forum believes this will result in a downgrade to cycling facilities along the

A259 and the majority of cyclists will remain on the road where they have priority. Given that the loss of priority at side roads will result in severe delays to cyclists' journey times, does the cabinet believe that the majority of cyclists will actually use this new facility?

**Answer from Cllr Plant:**

*Following assurances from National Highways, the Council is comfortable that the proposed scheme is compliant with Local Transport note 1/20, which sets out five principles representing the essential requirements to achieve more people travelling by cycle or on foot. WSCC and National Highways state that the route aims to create a high-quality and inclusive walking and cycling infrastructure between Chichester and Emsworth where shared sections occur only where physical and operational constraints determine this. Individuals will decide whether or not to use the route and given the various types of cyclists such as leisure or commuting, it is not possible to predict which will be the majority group. However, the public engagement responses indicates that the route will be an improvement to many cyclists in encouraging modal-shift for shorter journeys in particular.*

**Question from Mark Record:**

Why are our local authorities wasting public money on a scheme that departs entirely from national highway standards and follows a design strategy that is universally acknowledged to be unsuccessful wherever it has been implemented?

**Answer from Cllr Plant:**

*The Council's understanding, informed by discussions with professional officers at NH and WSCC is that, despite the constraints to developing the route, it is compliant with LTN1/20 which is the current DfT guidance for cycling infrastructure. The District Council does not employ highways qualified professionals but takes all such advice (not just on this occasion) from either WSCC, NH or external consultants. The Council's role here is as a consultee to this proposal and is seeking to indicate to NH whether it supports the scheme in principle or not. The design and its success are in the domain of both NH and WSCC but officers of CDC are supportive of the principle of improving the safety, coherency and consistency of the route in line with the NH design and as per both NH and WSCC's indication to the Council.*