

# Public Document Pack

**Tony Kershaw**  
Director of Law and Assurance

If calling, please ask for

Jenna Barnard on 033 022 24525  
Email:  
jenna.barnard@westsussex.gov.uk

www.westsussex.gov.uk

 @DemService

 <https://www.facebook.com/southchichestertalkwithus>



CLC Development Team  
Room 102  
County Hall  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1RQ



24 February 2020

**A meeting of the South Chichester County Local Committee will be held at 7.00 pm on Tuesday, 3 March 2020 at County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RQ**

**Tony Kershaw**  
Director of Law and Assurance

## Your local County Councillors



## Invite you to come along to the South Chichester County Local Committee

County Local Committees consider a range of issues concerning the local area, and where relevant make decisions. It is a meeting in public and has a regular 'talk with us' item where the public can ask questions of their local elected representatives.

### Agenda

#### 7.00 pm 1. **Welcome and Introductions**

Members of the South Chichester County Local Committee are Jamie Fitzjohn, Louise Goldsmith, Jeremy Hunt, Pieter Montyn, Simon Oakley, Mike Magill and Carol Purnell.

This meeting was originally due to consider a Traffic Regulation Order proposal for changes to vehicle movements at the A27/Oving Road junction. This was consulted upon by the County Council as it was assumed part of the affected road is within the Council's control as highway authority. It later became clear that all of the affected road space is controlled by Highways England. The Council's plans for Traffic Regulation Order were therefore withdrawn.

7.02 pm 2. **Declarations of Interest**

Members and officers must declare any pecuniary or personal interest in any business on the agenda. They should also make declarations at any stage such an interest becomes apparent during the meeting. Consideration should be given to leaving the meeting if the nature of the interest warrants it. If in doubt contact Democratic Services before the meeting.

It is recorded in the register of interests that:

- Mr Fitzjohn is a Substitute Member of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy
- Ms Goldsmith is a Member of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy
- Mr Hunt is a member of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy, Goodwood Aerodrome Consultative Committee, Goodwood Education Trust and the Goodwood Motor Circuit Consultative Committee
- Mr Montyn is a member of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy and the Goodwood Aerodrome Consultative Committee
- Mr Oakley is a member of Chichester District Council and Tangmere Parish Council
- Mrs Purnell is a member of Selsey Town Council and Chichester District Council.

These interests only need to be declared at the meeting if there is an agenda item to which they relate.

7.03 pm 3. **Minutes** (Pages 5 - 10)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday 5 November 2020 (cream paper).

7.05 pm 4. **Urgent Matters**

Items not on the agenda that the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency because of special circumstances.

7.05 pm 5. **Community Highways Schemes - 2019/20 update** (Pages 11 - 16)

Information Report attached that details the outcomes of the 2019 Community Highway Scheme applications and assessments.

7.10 pm 6. **West Wittering Experimental Traffic Regulation Order update** (Pages 17 - 42)

The Committee to receive an update on the [experimental Traffic Regulation Order](#) from Chris Dye, Area Highways Manager, in relation to the attached.

- 7.20 pm 7. **Community Team update** (Pages 43 - 46)
- An update from Peter Lawrence, Partnership Area Manager (South) on the work completed by the Communities Team since the last meeting of the County Local Committee, as attached.
- 7.25 pm 8. **Talk With Us Open Forum**
- To invite questions from the public present at the meeting on subjects other than those on the agenda. The Committee would encourage members of the public with more complex issues to submit their question before the meeting to allow a substantive answer to be given.
- 7.45 pm 9. **Chichester City Parking Management Plan consultation update**
- The Committee to receive an update on the Parking Management Plan.
- 7.55 pm 10. **Community Initiative Funding (SC06(19/20))** (Pages 47 - 56)
- Report by the Director of Law and Assurance.
- The report summarises the Community Initiative Funding applications received. The Committee is invited to consider the applications and pledge funding if appropriate.
- 8.10 pm 11. **Items for Future Meetings**
- Parking Management Plan update
  - Community Team presentation
  - Growth update
  - Chichester City Northern Gateway
- 8.15 pm 12. **Date of Next Meeting**
- The next meeting of the Committee will take place at 7.00 pm on Monday 15 June 2020 in Committee Room 3, County Hall, West Street, Chichester, PO19 1RQ.
- Members wishing to place an item on the agenda should notify Jenna Barnard via email: [jenna.barnard@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:jenna.barnard@westsussex.gov.uk) or phone on 033 022 24525.

**To: All members of the South Chichester County Local Committee**

### **Filming and use of social media**

During this meeting the public are allowed to film the Committee or use social media, providing it does not disrupt the meeting. You are encouraged to let officers know in advance if you wish to film. Mobile devices should be switched to silent for the duration of the meeting.

## **South Chichester County Local Committee**

5 November 2019 – At a meeting of the Committee at 7.00 pm held at Committee Room 3, County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RQ.

Present:

Mr S J Oakley (Chairman) (Chichester East;), Mrs Purnell (Selsey;), Mr Fitzjohn (Chichester South;), Ms Goldsmith (Chichester West;), Mr Hunt (Chichester North;) and Mr Montyn (The Witterings;)

Officers in attendance: Jenna Barnard (Democratic Services Officer), Chris Dye (Area Highways Manager) and Peter Lawrence (Partnerships Area Manager (South))

### **16. Welcome and Introductions**

16.1 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members and Officers introduced themselves.

### **17. Declarations of Interest**

17.1 None declared.

17.2 Members noted the list of their relevant interests on the agenda.

### **18. Minutes**

18.1 Resolved – that the minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **19. Urgent Matters**

19.1 None.

### **20. Progress Statement**

20.1 The Committee considered the progress statement on matters arising from previous meetings (copy appended to the signed minutes).

20.2 Resolved – That the Committee notes the progress statement.

20.3 Mr Jamie Fitzjohn let the committee and members of the public know that there was a live petition for the removal of the lights at the Hornet should anyone wish to sign.

### **21. Talk With Us Open Forum**

21.1 The Chairman introduced the item and advised that the open forum was an opportunity for comments and questions to be raised on items not already on the agenda, and over which the County Council has jurisdiction. The following issues were raised and responses made.

21.2 There were 2 written questions in advance:

- Mr Mike Dicker regarding free parking on remembrance Sunday; Miles Davey (Parking Manager) replied in advance saying that all West Sussex County Council on-street parking is already free on Sundays and if Mr Dicker was referring to Car Parks, this would be a matter for Chichester District Council.
- Mr Dean regarding the Hornet Traffic Lights which was responded to by Roger Elkins; please see attached.
  
- Mrs Jenny Bentall-Morris attended the meeting to ask for the Committees support for a blanket 20mph in Bosham; Ms Louise Goldsmith said she would go back to Mrs Bentall-Morris to discuss taking this forward.

21.3 Further questions asked at the meeting were:

- Mr Mike Dicker also asked a question regarding the A27/BABA campaign and the next steps, what are the committee, as the most local members, going to do about the issue. The members agreed to lobby and push together as a committee and as individual members to drive this forward after the election.
  
- Mr Alan Carr attended to ask the committee about street lighting in the Whyke area of Chichester, over the Whyke Lane and Grove Road Railway bridges. Particularly the northern end of the Whyke Lane bridge as there was a heritage lamp that has not been replaced and does not light up as well as the rest of the bridge. Mr Jamie Fitzjohn agreed to follow through with the City/District council to confirm if it is them or WSCC who would be responsible for this. He also agreed to ask them to write to the resident of 192 Whyke Lane to see if they are able to maintain their vegetation to reduce the obstruction of the lamps.
  
- A representative from King George Gardens attended to thank the Committee and the highways teams for all their support and work on the recent scheme implemented there.
  
- Mr Tupper attended to give an update on the recent Passenger Benefit Fund to the Committee, as the county had been allocated 1.5million from the fund and informed the committee and those in attendance that this had been spent on the improvements of seating, lighting, bottle holders and station improvements. The committee thanked Mr Tupper for all of his hard work on the scheme.

## 22. **Prioritisation of Traffic Regulation Orders (SC03(19/20))**

22.1 Community requests for Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) that cost under £3,000 to implement are considered annually by County Local Committees (CLCs). More complex TROs are considered for progression as a Community Highways Scheme and so fall outside the process.

22.2 The TRO requests received since July 2018 have been assessed and scored and the results are attached for the CLC to consider and prioritise in line with the Cabinet Member Report for Traffic Regulation Orders – Assessment and Implementation Process (see link in Background Papers) for progression in the 2010/21 works programme.

22.3 At its meeting on 05 November 2019 the South Chichester County Local Committee agreed to progress the highest TRO from the list attached at Appendix A.

The following TRO was agreed for progression:

- Selsey Road, Hunston – Speed Limit

22.4 Mrs Carol Purnell did not feel that it was correct that the other TRO (North Road, Selsey) did not go forward as it was only on the border of being scored a 10 and should have been progressed on safety grounds.

22.5 Mrs Carol Purnell requested that the Committee as a whole lobby the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure via letter to request that this be taken forward under exception. Not all members agreed on this request which led to a vote.

22.6 It was agreed on a 5 to 1 (Mrs Purnell) vote by the Committee that Mrs Carol Purnell should re-visit this TRO application to gather more community support and submit it with the applicant in the 2020-2021 round for consideration and scoring.

22.7 As the Committee had only used 1 of its allocated TRO allowances, it was agreed that the Committee would write to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure to request that they could roll over any unused allowance to the next round of TRO prioritisation.

## 23. **Highway Service Level Update: New Community Opportunities**

23.1 Chris Dye, Area Highways Manager, introduced the report and made the following comments:

23.2 Following Scrutiny at Select Committee the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport & Planning approved the revised service levels that are contained within the new [Infrastructure Maintenance Plan](#).

23.3 Mr Dye explained that, as set out on page 20, specifically points 1.2-1.4, the main reasons for introducing the new Infrastructure Maintenance Plan and revised service levels, was as a result of the reduced revenue budgets that have been given and as well as this there has been introduction of a new Code of Practice which was released by the Department for Transport. We have been, and in some cases are still operating on the new replacement Code of Practice “well maintained highways”, we need to ensure that we align all our processes and services to becoming more intelligence led and risk based.

23.4 He the referred the committee to page 21, point 2.4, that summarised the changes in the various service levels, some of which have been in operation for a number of months.

23.5 The Committee requested that, in light of the reduction in winter gritting, West Sussex County Council promote organisations and websites that provide information on safe driving in icy conditions and the need to get the West Sussex County Council gritting route webpage up to date as soon as possible.

**24. City Wide Parking Management Plan**

24.1 The Committee noted the update from Miles Davey (Parking Manager) and requested further clarification on whether the Chichester City Parking Management Plan could come to the 3 March 2020 County Local Committee meeting given the short period between the current planned end of the statutory consult period and the next meeting.

**25. Chichester District Council - Infrastructure Business Plan: Project 353**

25.1 The Committee noted the update and highlighted their concerns regarding the complexity and risk of this scheme and await further information.

**26. Community Initiative Funding (SC04(19/20))**

26.1 The Community Initiative Fund is a County Local Committee (CLC) administered fund that provides assistance to local community projects. Bids should show evidence of projects that have the support of the community and make a positive impact on people's wellbeing and support The West Sussex Plan.

26.2 At its meeting on 05 November 2019 the South Chichester County Local Committee considered the Community Initiative Funding applications received via the West Sussex Crowd as set out in Appendix A.

(a) The following pledges were approved:

415/SC – Chichester Forest Schools CIC, 'Ecotherapy training and equipment', £650.49 – towards providing woodland wellbeing therapy sessions for young people and adults with mental health difficulties.

421/SC – Arts Dream Selsey, 'Equipment purchase', £711.80 – towards purchasing energy-saving production and recording equipment for community use.

422/SC – Chichester Community Development Trust, 'Children in the chapel; interactive play, up to £2000.00 – towards purchasing equipment and seating for a new interactive play area within Graylingwell Chapel.

389/SC – Selsey Community Forum, 'Shop Talk', £750.00 – towards the cost of premises hire at The Selsey Hub to hold inclusive social gatherings for vulnerable residents.

437/SC – Royal Artillery Equestrian Centre, 'Saddle for disabled



riders', up to £1,500.00 – towards purchasing an adaptable saddle supportive of all riding standards to facilitate disabled people's access to horse riding.

**27. Nominations for Local Authority Governors to Maintained Schools and Academy Governing Bodies (SC05(19/20))**

27.1 The Committee considered a report by the Director of Education and Skills (copy appended to the signed minutes).

27.2 Resolved – that the following nominations for (appointment & reappointment) under the 2012 Regulations be approved:

Nomination for reappointment:

- Mr Nigel Bloodworth to Southbourne Junior School for a four-year term.

Nominations for appointment:

- Rev'd Graham Steel to West Wittering Primary School for a four-year term
- Mr Richard Murfitt to Singleton C.E Primary School for a four-year term

**28. Items for Future Meetings**

28.1 The Chairman referred the members to the list of items that were proposed for the next meeting.

28.2 The Chairman request that the City Wide Parking Management Plan is added to the future items.

**29. Date of Next Meeting**

29.1 The Committee noted that the next meeting would take place on Tuesday 03 March 2019 (not the printed agenda date of 09 March), in Committee Room 3 at County Hall, Chichester.

Chairman

The meeting closed at 8.55 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Community Highway Schemes – Update November 2019**

### **Introduction**

The current prioritisation process for Community Highway Schemes (community-led improvement schemes) was established in 2016. This process is a 'prioritised approach' where community requests are considered by assessment against a scoring matrix and the resulting priority scores are used as a basis to establish a forward programme for these works. The programme is subject to funding availability (county council capital funding and developer contributions secured under s106 agreements) and resources.

### **Evaluation of Submitted Schemes**

In line with the agreed process, a moderation team, comprising of officers from Highways Operations (Area Teams), Highways Improvements and an Independent officer met in September and November 2019 to consider all applications for improvements schemes received by 31 July 2019. Over 36 applications were submitted.

It has previously been determined that a minimum score of 40 points is required for a scheme to meet the set criteria appropriate to deliver a sustainable and beneficial highways improvement that aligns with the County Council priorities.

It should be noted a score of over 40 in this process does not always guarantee a scheme will be programmed as it depends on the available budget set on an annual basis.

### **Results of Evaluation**

The 14 schemes achieving the 40 point minimum score and recommended for progression to the next stage of the process are shown in Appendix A, the schemes not achieving the 40 point score and not recommended for progression are shown in Appendix B.

Schemes in Appendix A will form the proposed community schemes programme which will be included on the WSCC Annual Delivery Programme for design in 2020/21. The Annual Delivery Programme is subject to final budget allocations and programme approval. It is planned to start delivering these schemes as part of the WSCC Annual Delivery Programme from 21/22 onwards (again subject to feasibility & availability of funding).

Some schemes of a more complex nature involving a greater degree of public consultation or legal orders may need to be constructed in subsequent years.

As part of all scheme design and feasibility, there may be issues identified in more detailed investigations and surveys which demonstrate that a scheme is no longer viable.

Schemes in Appendix B will not be progressed. However, should additional supporting information become available they could be resubmitted in the future. For example, if there is a material change to circumstances since the original application that could alter the scoring of the application such as a new

external funding opportunity has arisen or a new consultation exercise has been undertaken and provides new supporting evidence.

### **Future Applications**

We would like to encourage online applications for new Community Highway Schemes to be considered for possible inclusion in the 2021/22 annual works programme for design and feasibility. To ensure we meet the new timetable for budget setting and approval, applications need to be received by the end of June 2020.

<https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/leisure-recreation-and-community/supporting-local-communities/apply-for-a-community-highways-scheme>

### **Appendices**

Appendix A – Community Highway Schemes Approved - November 2019

Appendix B – Community Highway Schemes Rejected - November 2019

**Appendix A - Community Highway Schemes Approved for Progression - November 2019**

Division	Parish	Local Member	Scheme Name	Description	Approx Cost	CLC	Moderation Panel Comments	
*	Chichester North	Chichester City	Jeremy Hunt	Winterbourne Road Shared Cycleway Facility	To provide a shared use facility	£30,000	South Chichester	Community scheme has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budget and Annual Delivery Programme, this will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme, consultaion etc.
	Lancing		Ann Bridges	Lancing Business Park - TRO	TRO- Parking	£6,000	Adur	Community scheme has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budget and Annual Delivery Programme, this will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme, consultaion etc.
*	Chichester North	Boxgrove	Jeremy Hunt	A285 Halnaker Improvements	Various improvements to the A285 through the village.	£50,000	South Chichester	A Reduced scheme based on village gateways , dropped crossings & parking area improvement has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budget and Annual Delivery Programme, this will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme, consultaion etc .
	Langley Green & Ifield East	Crawley	Brenda Smith	Southwater Close Footway	Approx 15m of missing footway to connect housing estate to the network	£20,000	Crawley	Community scheme has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budget and Annual Delivery Programme, this will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme, consultaion etc.
*	Chichester West	Fishbourne	Louise Goldsmith	Blackboy Lane footway proposals	provide new footway along western verge to join community centre with the A259 and link up with new footpath PC are providing within their own land.	£120,000	South Chichester	Community scheme has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budget and Annual Delivery Programme, this will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme, consultaion etc.
	Midhurst	Rogate (Rake and Hill Brow)	Kate O'Kelly	B2070 Improvements / traffic calming	A range of proposals which include improve pedestrian and cycle facilities, change in speed limit and other community funded proposals	£175,000	North Chichester	A reduced scheme based around Bull Hill junction improvements, speed limit, dropped kerbs and footway improvements near the pub has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budgets and Annual Delivery Programme these will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme
	Bramber	Woodmanco te	David Barling	Brighton Road, Woodmancote - new footway	Request for footway "missing link".	£50,000	Chanctonbury	Community scheme has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budget and Annual Delivery Programme, this will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme, consultaion etc.
	Holbrook	Horsham	Peter Catchpole	Warnham Road, Horsham - pedestrian crossing facility	Request for a pedestrian crossing facility near the Riverside Walk and Warnham Nautre Reserve	£30,000	North Horsham	Community scheme has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budget and Annual Delivery Programme, this will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme, consultaion etc.

## Agenda Item 5

### Appendix A

Division	Parish	Local Member	Scheme Name	Description	Approx Cost	CLC	Moderation Panel Comments
Horsham Riverside	Horsham	Morwen Millson	Blackbridge Lane - Provision of pedestrian crossing facility	Either a pedestrian refuge or controlled crossing	£55,000	North Horsham	Community scheme has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budget and Annual Delivery Programme, this will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme, consultaion etc.
Tarring	N/A	Bob Smytherman	Tarring Area Traffic Calming	Tarring Area Traffic Calming	£70,000	Worthing	Community scheme has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budget and Annual Delivery Programme, this will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme, consultaion etc.
Bramber	Bramber	David Barling	Clays Hill Steyning - footway improvement	Regrade footway to provide better accessibility	£25,000	Chanctonbury	Community scheme has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budget and Annual Delivery Programme, this will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme, consultaion etc.
Arun East	Findon	Deborah Urqhart	Speed reduction 50 to 40mph	Reduction of speed limit from 50 to 40, including VAS replacement	£20,000	Joint Eastern Arun	Community scheme has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budget and Annual Delivery Programme, this will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme, consultaion etc.
East Grinstead	East Grinstead	Liz Bennett	A264 Holtye Road , footway near hospital	Construct missing section of path	£5,000	North Mid Sussex	Community scheme has been reviewed and accepted as meeting the criteria for progression. Subject to approval of budget and Annual Delivery Programme, this will be designed in 20/21 with delivery 21/22 onwards. Delivery date will be subject to the complexity of the scheme, consultaion etc.

**Appendix B - Community Highway Schemes 2019 - Rejected Schemes**

Division	Parish	Local Member	Scheme Name	Description	CLC	Moderation Panel Comments
Tilgate & Furnace Green	Crawley	Duncan Crow	Hawth Avenue Ped Crossing	Ped Crossing	Crawley	More evidence required, we will undertake further survey to establish demand and will be reconsidered next year. Estimated cost £150000
Horsham Hurst	Horsham	Nigel Dennis	New Street Horsham	20 mph zone	North Horsham	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process. limited benefit due to average speeds
East Worthing	N/A	Roger Oakley	Ham Road One way plug	Ham Road One way plug	Worthing	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process. Concerns about increase in journey time and effect on local residents, suggest investigate HGV ban .
Holbrook	North Horsham	Peter Catchpole	North Heath Lane, North Horsham	Request for a pedestrian crossing facility to aid crossing busy road. Adjacent to Riverside Walk, parish church and pub nearby.	North Horsham	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process. Check with signals team if feasible
Haywards Heath	Haywards Heath	Sujan Wickremaratchi	Harland School	coloured crossing	Central & South Mid Sussex	No practical scheme identified.
Bramber	Ashurst	David Barling	Horsham Road, Ashurst	Request for VAS to control speeding	Chanctonbury	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Henfield	Shermanbury	Lionel Barnard	A281 Brighton Road footway provision	Provide a footway linking new development to existing infrastructure	Chanctonbury	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Bramber	Steyning	David Barling	High Street Steyning - Planters	Provide and install planters to improve street scene	Chanctonbury	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Storrington	Storrington	Paul Marshall	Manleys Hill, Storrington	Request to signalise and provide ped crossing facility junction Manleys Hill with School Hill and High Street.	Chanctonbury	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Northgate West Green	Crawley	Karen Sudan	London Road Ped Crossing	Controlled crossing outside leisure park	Crawley	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Pound Hill	Crawley	Richard Burrett	The Ridings - Crossing	Controlled Crossing	Crawley	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Three Bridges	Crawley	Brenda Burgess	Stephenson Way Traffic Calming	Traffic Calming	Crawley	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Arun West	Yapton	Jacky Pendleton	New Cycling facilities to existing carriageway	Upgrade existing, no through route section of carriageway to include cycling facilities	Joint West Arun	Awaiting planning application , check with Cycle Team if this is on the cycle network prog
Billingshurst	Billingshurst	Amanda Jupp	Adversane Crossroads	Village speed limit reduction to 30mph with Gateway or other engineering features.	North Horsham	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Tarring	N/A	Bob Smytherman	Wiston Ave & St Lawrence Road School Wig Wags	Wiston Ave & St Lawrence Road School Wig Wags	Worthing	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Broadwater	N/A	Bryan Turner	Congreve Road Traffic Calming	Congreve Road Traffic Calming	Worthing	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Northbrook	N/A	Sean McDonald	Fulbeck Avenue Traffic Calming	Fulbeck Avenue Traffic Calming	Worthing	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Worth Forest	Balcombe	Bill Acraman	Balcombe Village enhancements	Village Enhancements	North Mid Sussex	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Hurstpierpoint & Bolney	Hurstpierpoint	Joy Dennis	High street Complex TRO	High street Complex TRO	Central & South Mid Sussex	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Hurstpierpoint & Bolney	Albourne	Joy Dennis	B2116 complex TRO	Tro Speeding/ HGVs	Central & South Mid Sussex	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Hassocks & Burgess Hill South	Hassocks	Kirsty Lord	Keymer Road Ped Crossing	Ped Crossing	Central & South Mid Sussex	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.
Hassocks & Burgess Hill South	Hassocks	Kirsty Lord	Lodge Lane Cycleway	Provision of cycleway	Central & South Mid Sussex	Community Scheme has been reviewed and it did not meet criteria threshold for progression under this process.

This page is intentionally left blank



<b>South Chichester County Local Committee</b>
<b>March 2020</b>
<b>West Wittering –Chapel Lane, Acre Street and Piggery Hall Lane</b>
<b>Experimental Traffic Regulation Order - Update</b>
<b>Update report by Chris Dye, Area Highway Manager for Chichester District</b>

### **Summary**

As the majority of the Committee will be aware, in November 2018 a series of proposals were presented by West Wittering Estate (WWE) and West Sussex Highways in relation to a suggested Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) which proposed to prohibit vehicular access to specific roads within the peninsula that have suffered for many years with the volume of traffic trying to access the West Wittering Beach. In March 2019 the finalised plans were presented and it was agreed by the Committee that the ETRO could be implemented for the full 18 month period.

During 2019 the closures on Chapel Lane, Acre Street, Elms Lane, Piggery Hall Lane as well as the traffic control at the junction of Rookwood Road with Pound Road, were partially trialled on 4 full days, with the closure of Piggery Hall Lane not being implemented as it was felt that there was not enough evidence to support the need for this. The proposals implemented achieved what they were intended to, with a significant reduction in queuing cars, fly parking and anti-social behaviour on the aforementioned roads.

A small number of residents from Piggery Hall Lane have voiced concerns with the increased traffic flow and highway related issues being experienced on Piggery Hall Lane, as a result of the closures to Chapel Lane, Elms Lane and Acre Street. Some of the issues were acknowledged and addressed expediently by WWE during the course of 2019 but as referenced above, it was not felt that a road closure on Piggery Hall Lane was required.

Supporting this update report is a summary of the 2019 operations of the ETRO from a WWE perspective (Appendix A), the representations made during the formal public consultation window including officer responses (Appendix B) and the previous report that was presented to the Committee back in March 2019 (Appendix C).

Although the Committee agreed at the March 2019 meeting to trial the ETRO for the full and maximum 18 month period, recent advice from our Legal Team is that the committee should be requested to agree to implement the order for the remainder of the 18 month period, to encompass those high volume traffic days in 2020.

### **Officer Recommendation.**

That the South Chichester County Local Committee approves to the continued use of the ETRO to be utilised and implemented in 2020, when it is considered to be required by WWE and West Sussex Highways.

This page is intentionally left blank



The objectives of the experimental TRO were to:

- ensure the single-track carriageway of Elms Lane, Chapel Street and Acre Street remained clear and that the severe congestion seen over the past three years no longer happened.
- prevent cars joining Rookwood Road from Elms Lane, to speed traffic flow along Rookwood Road.
- manage the entrance to the Beach Car Park at the Pound Road junction by operating a stop-go system
- speed up entry into the West Wittering Estate (WWE) car park on peak days.

The TRO was operated over the 2019 summer period and proved successful in meeting these objectives.

Specifically:

- The TRO was used in full on 4 days. On each of these temperatures reached record highs, attracting record numbers of visitors to the coast.
- Elms Lane, Chapel Street and Acre Street remained clear. Residents and pedestrians could access their properties safely and emergency service access was maintained throughout.
- Previously, approximately 500 – 800 cars would have been abandoned on the public highway. Instead these made it into the car park.
- The Stop/Go operation at the Pound Road junction improved the flow rate into the car park.
- Although substantial queues still occurred on Rookwood Road, generally these were not as long, nor as long-lived, as was usual without the TRO in place. On two of the days with the TRO in place there were no queues at all from the east and western queues stayed south of the Birdham Roundabout.
- Even on two days when the number of cars parked by WWE exceeded previous records, queues were no worse than they have been in the past, despite the extra 15% in the volume of traffic.

One negative impact was noted, specifically increased incidence of queuing traffic in Piggery Hall Lane. Additional operatives and signage at the Stocks Lane junction will be added to the scheme to ameliorate this issue.

WWE established an email mailing list which was used, along with social media and the WWE website, to advise residents and locals when the TRO would be implemented.

Along with resident passes initially issued to those living within the roads affected by the TRO closures, over 50 were handed out to medical staff, carers, local business and other locals who also needed to access these roads.

In conclusion, the implementation of the TRO made a substantial improvement across the area both in terms of safety and general traffic management. With the increase in the frequency of extreme weather patterns and popularity of the beach, the TRO is now a vital element of ensuring the safety of residents, visitors and the community in general. For this reason, WWE would suggest that the scheme is extended when the term expires in September 2020.

WW Estates plc

This page is intentionally left blank

Consultation Response Summary

	<b>Objection/Comments</b>	<b>Comments from Director of Highways Transport &amp; Planning</b>
1	<p>Resident of Chichester Road</p> <p>As a local resident and owner of adjacent land which boundaries on Piggery Hall Lane with access off Piggery Hall Lane the proposed hard closure at the junction of Piggery Hall Lane and the B2179 would be a considerable inconvenience when going about their day to day business with access to their land and access to East Wittering Village.</p>	<p>Summer traffic heading for the beaches during good weather, particularly on bank holidays, causes congestion across the national road network. The Manhood Peninsular is not immune from this phenomenon and with the improvement of Sat Navs and advance mapping traffic it is easier for motorists to find their way to the coast, diverting from main roads onto roads unsuitable for high traffic volumes.</p> <p>The proposed experimental order put in place road closures at times of peak traffic flow on the more minor roads, of which Piggery Hall Lane could have been one.</p> <p>It is important to note that when the Experimental Order was being considered the report presented to Chichester South County Local Committee referenced, Piggery Hall Lane was only included to “provide a contingency measure which will <b>only</b> be activated if there if there is robust evidence that the proposals in Appendices A and C (Chapel Lane, Acre Street Closures and 3 way traffic control at Pound Road) are having a significant detrimental impact on the Piggery Hall Lane residents.”</p> <p>In the event, through active management of the network during summer 2019, a need for closing Piggery Hall Lane was not identified and therefore not implemented.</p> <p>However in future years should the need be identified, and Piggery Hall Lane is closed, access will be maintained at all times via the diversionary routes.</p>
2	<p>Resident of Earnley Manor Close</p> <p>The proposed closure of local</p>	<p>Summer traffic heading for the</p>

Consultation Response Summary

	<p>residential roads will only exacerbate the traffic problems experienced on the Manhood Peninsula.                  Traffic last year was queuing back onto the A27 at both Stockbridge and Hunston roundabouts.                  Traffic for the West Wittering beaches ran through every single road, from West Wittering, East Wittering , Bracklesham, Earnley, Almodington, Birdham, Sidlesham...                  Closing roads is not the solution. Believe WW Estates need to invest in pay on exit and or prepaid number plate recognition entry.                  WSCC and Hampshire Highways need to invest in appropriate live traffic news on The A3, A29, A27 advising of delays and queuing times.                  Believe the road closures will make matters worse.</p>	<p>beaches during good weather, particularly on bank holidays, causes congestion across the national road network. The Manhood Peninsular is not immune from this phenomenon and with the improvement of Sat Navs and advance mapping traffic it is easier for motorists to find their way to the coast, diverting from main roads onto roads unsuitable for high traffic volumes.</p> <p>The experimental order is put in place to keep the bulk of traffic on the major access roads, which does reduce traffic flow on the more the minor roads. This is part of a more comprehensive traffic management package proposed by West Wittering Estates (WWE) supported by variable message signs on the A27 and radio travel bulletins. WWE is also looking further at options including ticketing to speed up entry into the car park.</p> <p>The feedback from WWE, supported by a photographic log, is that queuing in Elms Lane, Acre Street and Chapel Lane has been significantly reduced and instances of anti-social behaviour similarly reduced.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>Resident of Florence Close</p> <p>Objects to this proposal on the grounds that it is pointless and does not solve the underlying issue, which is the long queues of traffic into the car park owned by West Wittering Estate. It does allow residents of these roads clear access from their properties by preventing the build up of rat run traffic through the roads, but the nature of the closures then prevents those same residents from getting home again without having to sit in the queue of traffic all the way to the elm lane junction A diversion time of an hour at peak traffic conditions.</p> <p>Believes that the traffic issue would be fully solved instead by way of a no right turn into the WW Estate feeder road. Modelling of this option might</p>	<p>Summer traffic heading for the beaches during good weather, particularly on bank holidays, causes congestion across the national road network. The Manhood Peninsular is not immune from this phenomenon and with the improvement of Sat Navs and advance mapping traffic it is easier for motorists to find their way to the coast, diverting from main roads onto roads unsuitable for high traffic volumes.</p> <p>All the main routes on the Manhood Peninsular carry traffic to the beaches and each must carry its</p>

Consultation Response Summary

	<p>well draw a conclusion that closures on piggery hall lane and chapel lane would still be needed, but the diversion routes would then take significantly less time, as the beach traffic would all have turned left at the Birdham Garage roundabout. With traffic being delivered to west Wittering beach only by way of a left turn, it would be delivered significantly faster. WW Estate have consistently told us that they are easily dealing with traffic flow at the car park gates, and have said that the traffic is simply not being delivered to them fast enough. My alternative proposal delivers traffic to them faster.</p> <p>In addition, by having beach traffic flow in one direction only it would allow the buses to choose to travel only anticlockwise during these busy summer months. This would allow them to travel almost unimpeded from the Birdham roundabout all the way through the loop and back to chichester, significantly improving the bus service and perhaps even making it a viable alternative to the car park.</p> <p>They object to this proposal on the grounds that they need a proposal which tackles the problem of the traffic and not a proposal which only applies a sticking plaster to the symptoms of it.</p>	<p>share. The traffic management plan associated with the road closures includes alternative route signs directing traffic southwards via Bell Lane and Bracklesham Lane and feedback from local residents suggests this is being used.</p> <p>It will always be the case that not all drivers will, or be able to, follow the alternative route. A physical barrier prohibiting right turns at the junction of Pound Road with the B2179 Cakeham Road would push right turning traffic southwards further along Cakeham Road where it would need to find somewhere to turn and re-join the westbound access traffic to the car park, thereby impeding this traffic flow.</p> <p>The active traffic management introduced by STOP/GO boards at the Pound Road junction provides an optimal solution to control vehicle manoeuvres at this junction.</p>
4	<p>Resident of Shalbourne Crescent</p> <p>Regarding the proposal by West Wittering Estate about closing the junction on Piggery Hall Lane to ease congestion in the summer months. While they fully understand why the proposal has been made they feel that West Wittering Estate have a far easier solution themselves. Currently, they have a pay on arrival system that causes the slowness of the traffic. If they were to change the system to pay on exit it would allow for faster entry and a greater traffic flow.</p>	<p>WWE has been looking at ways to improve ticketing and access to its car park and has introduced contactless card payment and vehicle number plate recognition for annual passes. It has considered "Pay on Exit" and concluded that currently at peak times it can take up 22:30 to clear the car park. Pay on exit would increase this time greatly. Given the volume of cars wanting to access the beach at West Wittering and the traffic capacity of the roads, any impact would be minimal.</p> <p>The experimental order is put in place to keep the bulk of traffic on</p>

Consultation Response Summary

		<p>the major access roads, which does reduce traffic flow on the more the minor roads. This is part of a more comprehensive traffic management package proposed by West Wittering Estates (WWE) supported by variable message signs on the A27 and radio travel bulletins. WWE is also looking further at options including ticketing to speed up entry into the car park.</p> <p>Traffic volumes are such that ticketing alone is unlikely to resolve capacity issues on the road network and short term closures will still be needed to effectively manage traffic flow.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Resident of Sandpiper Walk</p> <p>All the residents living in this area will be negatively affected. It means they will have to take a long route through East Wittering and Bracklesham to reach Birdham and Chichester instead than using Piggery Hall Lane, adding to the congestion.</p> <p>Beside, the residents won't know about the closures until driving to the end of Piggery Hall Lane and Chapel Lane.</p>	<p>The proposed experimental order put in place road closures at times of peak traffic flow on the more minor roads, of which Piggery Hall Lane could have been one.</p> <p>As explained for point 1 above, the Piggery Hall Lane closure was only included as a contingency if the other proposals caused an unforeseen issue.</p> <p>In the event, through active management of the network during summer 2019, a need for closing Piggery Hall Lane was not identified and therefore not implemented.</p> <p>However in future years should the need be identified, and Piggery Hall Lane is closed, access will be maintained at all times via the diversionary routes.</p> <p>Most local residents will be aware that good weather results in increased traffic flow to the Manhood Peninsular. The weather forecast should raise awareness of potential for road closures and up to date advice is given out on the West Witterings Estate's web site, local radio travel bulletins and West Sussex roadworks information.</p>



Consultation Response Summary

	<p>Asks how can emergency services and doctors and nurses go through?</p> <p>Believes it would be easier to create a traffic restrictor with a sign stating this route is only for residents or a camera tracking the car plates and sending fines to the non-residents if going through.</p>	<p>The Experimental Traffic Regulation Order includes an exemption for emergency vehicles and the active traffic management associated with the road closures would facilitate emergency access.</p> <p>Camera tracking can only be effectively delivered through a congestion charging scheme which is currently geared to a permanent scheme such as that delivered in London and not designed for short term operation such as that required for the Manhood Peninsular. In 2019 it would have been put into use on four days only.</p>
6	<p>Resident of Chichester</p> <p>Does not believe the scheme will work. They agree with stopping beach traffic using these back roads as they use the roads as a car park to abandon cars and walk to the beach however, residents need access from both ends.</p> <p>They live in Chichester, keep livestock on elms lane and work in Itchenor and use the junction of chapel lane and Chichester road every day. They believe that manned gates would be the best option, it will cost more but they understand that west wittering car park charges over £8 per car, with the thousands of cars that travel down they believe that they should be partly responsible for the costs.</p>	<p>The experimental order put in place is road closure at times of peak traffic flow on the more minor roads that have been severely affected in previous years.</p> <p>There are manned gates at the junction of Acre Street with Piggery Hall Lane which allows access to Chapel Lane and Elms Lane for permit holders. A manned gate at Chapel Lane would result in queues forming on the B2179 Chichester Road, whilst permits are checked, adding unnecessarily to the general queuing contrary to the aims of the proposal.</p> <p>The issuing of permits is restricted to manageable numbers and is confined principally to residents, land owners and businesses within the road closure. Additional permits have been issued to residents within the Parish of West Wittering, to family members, carers and the like. Applications for permits should be made to WWE office.</p> <p>West Wittering Estates (WWE) are managing and fully funding the scheme.</p>

Consultation Response Summary

	<p>Maybe with some communication between train companies and buses there may be the opportunity to reduce the traffic travelling from further afield. The traffic issue will not be resolved locally without making people further afield aware of the issues faced with heading to west wittering beach.</p>	<p>It is unlikely that visitors travelling by train and bus will make a significant contribution to the vehicular traffic, bound for the beaches on the Manhood Peninsular. Wider travel information is provided by way of radio travel bulletins and variable message signs on the A27. Travel information is also provided on WWE website and West Sussex roadworks information.</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Resident of Longlands Road</p> <p>Believes the proposal is simply going to add to the traffic in the area as local residents will be forced to drive further to get to and from Itchenor, or if living in Piggery Hall Lane to go south to get to Bracklesham Lane.</p> <p>Also, there is no indication of what sort of notification there will be that West Wittering Estate plan to implement the restriction on a particular day and for what period of time.</p>	<p>Summer traffic heading for the beaches during good weather, particularly on bank holidays, causes congestion across the national road network. The Manhood Peninsular is not immune from this phenomenon and with the improvement of Sat Navs and advance mapping traffic it is easier for motorists to find their way to the coast, diverting from main roads onto roads unsuitable for high traffic volumes.</p> <p>The experimental order is put in place to keep the bulk of traffic on the major access roads, which does reduce traffic flow on the more the minor roads. This is part of a more comprehensive traffic management package undertaken by West Wittering Estates (WWE) supported by variable message signs on the A27 and radio travel bulletins. WWE is also looking further at options including ticketing to speed up entry into the car park.</p> <p>Most local residents will be aware that good weather results in increased traffic flow to the Manhood Peninsular. The weather forecast should raise awareness of potential for road closures and up to date advice is given out on the West Witterings Estate’s web site, local radio travel bulletins and West Sussex roadworks information.</p>

Consultation Response Summary

	<p>Why should local residents suffer because WWE aren't willing to invest in a faster method of getting people in and out of the car park, such as pay on departure. Why can there not be better notification on the A27 than the current "check our website" to indicate the length of traffic queues towards the beach and hopefully deter people from coming.</p>	<p>Traffic volumes are such that that ticketing alone is unlikely to resolve capacity issues on the road network and short term closures will still be needed to effectively manage traffic flow</p>
8	<p>Resident of Nab Walk</p> <p>Asks about what arrangements are being made for residents who want to get around, expects them to have free and easy access and asks, if not why not</p>	<p>Summer traffic heading for the beaches during good weather, particularly on bank holidays, causes congestion across the national road network. The Manhood Peninsular is not immune from this phenomenon and with the improvement of Sat Navs and advance mapping traffic it is easier for motorists to find their way to the coast, diverting from main roads onto roads unsuitable for high traffic volumes.</p> <p>As a consequence, at these times, local residents in the wider community of the East and West Wittering parishes, have expressed the view that they do not have free and easy access to their properties during periods of high traffic flow, and have raised the issue with all local council's and West Wittering Estates .</p> <p>The feedback from WWE, supported by a photographic log, is that queuing in Elms Lane, Acre Street and Chapel Lane has been significantly reduced and instances of anti-social behaviour similarly reduced.</p>
9	<p>Resident of Elmstead Park Road</p> <p>Ask if it is proposed to issue permits to residents of the road affected as they make 2 journeys each day to visit a Care Home on the Chichester Road and need to have access via Chapel Lane to Elms Lane.</p>	<p>The issuing of permits is restricted to manageable numbers and is confined principally to residents, land owners and businesses within the road closure. Additional permits have been issued to residents within the Parish of West Wittering, to family members, carers and the</p>

## Consultation Response Summary

		<p>like. Applications for permits should be made to WWE office.</p> <p>However access to Chichester Road could be by way of the alternative route for traffic provided via Rookwood Road.</p>
10	<p>Resident of Sandpiper Walk</p> <p>Asks if we close Piggery Hall Lane on hot days how they are supposed to get to their homes?</p> <p>Believes this will cause more congestion if they have to go along the Bracklesham Road or use the West Wittering Road.</p>	<p>The proposed experimental order put in place road closures at times of peak traffic flow on the more minor roads, of which Piggery Hall Lane could have been one. As referenced in response 1 above, the proposed Piggery Hall Lane closure was only included as a contingency option and was never anticipated that there would be a need to enact it.</p> <p>In the event, through active management of the network during summer 2019, a need for closing Piggery Hall Lane was not identified and therefore not implemented.</p> <p>However in future years should the need be identified, and Piggery Hall Lane is closed, access will be maintained at all times via the diversionary routes.</p> <p>Whilst local access would add to traffic flow on the diversionary route it would be comparatively small percentage of the total traffic flow and its effect would be negligible.</p>
11	<p>Resident of Locksash Close</p> <p>The following may be of help in future assessment of the TRO. Locksash Close was identified in the Village Design Statement 2006 as a problem area for residents and their car parking. The 27th August 2019, once again suffered from inconsiderate parking from beach visitors. It is becoming dangerous and impossible to walk on the pavement as this is now reserve for cars.</p>	<p>On-street parking is beyond the scope of this proposal. Residents can apply to the County Council for parking restrictions. An application form can be found on the West Sussex County Council website.</p>
12	<p>Resident of Selsey</p> <p>Asks if the temporary TRO for West</p>	<p>The temporary road closures were</p>

Consultation Response Summary

	<p>Wittering beach was in place Saturday 29 June 2019 and if so, was this responsible for the total chaos on the Selsey-Chichester Road B2145.</p> <p>They had to get to Bognor Regis on Saturday, and although we had no trouble getting there but it took two hours to get back to Selsey, no matter what route we tried to take. The B2145 was one continuous traffic jam from round about the Anchor Inn on B2145, through Hunston and on to the A27. It also continued through North Mundham right to the Bognor Regis turn off past the garden centres. Chichester was gridlocked by traffic trying to get to the Manhood. It was absolutely ridiculous. It appeared that the whole situation was caused by traffic attempting to reach the West Wittering beach and using satnavs to do it by whatever means possible. Consequently, they were using the lanes accessible from the Selsey road to go the back way, and in doing so gridlocked the whole Selsey Road. Intolerable!!</p> <p>They understand that the TRO is to help alleviate problems for Wittering residents but it has caused a nightmare for Selsey</p>	<p>in place on the 29<sup>th</sup> June. It cannot be confirmed one way or the other whether it resulted in increased traffic on the B2145 to Selsey or whether it was a factor of the good weather attracting holiday makers is in greater numbers to the Selsey beaches.</p> <p>The TRO when in place at Wittering is designed to keep traffic on the main roads and prevent the minor roads being used to avoid the main road accesses to the beach. There is no signposting or travel advice that would direct vehicles to the B2145 to Selsey Road. Travel bulletins informing of queues to West Wittering may lead some drivers to seek alternative locations.</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>Chichester Resident</p> <p>Rather than implement a road blocking service suggests West Wittering Estate beach management should install Pay &amp; Display machines and then with REG recognition they can pay/automate the barrier on exit. This system works in chichester car park, barrier automatically opens on exit , when paid and receipt entered Or like Dartford tunnel just have a car reg recognition and send fines - they can manage - they are creating the local traffic problem and need to take full ownership to resolve without impacting local residents by closing roads</p>	<p>The experimental order is put in place to keep the bulk of traffic on the major access roads, which does reduce traffic flow on the more the minor roads. This is part of a more comprehensive traffic management package undertaken by West Wittering Estates (WWE) including variable message signs on the A27 and radio travel bulletins. WWE is also looking further at options, including ticketing, to speed up entry into the car park.</p> <p>WWE has been looking at ways to improve ticketing and access to its car park and has introduced contactless card payment and vehicle number plate recognition for annual passes. It has considered</p>

Consultation Response Summary

		<p>“Pay on Exit” and concluded that currently at peak times it can take up 22:30 to clear the car park. Pay on exit would increase this time greatly. Given the volume of cars wanting to access the beach at West Wittering and the traffic capacity of the roads, any impact would be minimal.</p> <p>Camera tracking can only be effectively delivered through a congestion charging scheme which is currently geared to a permanent scheme such as that delivered in London and not designed for short term operation such as that required for the Manhood Peninsular. In 2019 it would have been put into use on four days only.</p> <p>Consequently such measures are unlikely to resolve capacity issues on the road network generally and short term closures will continue to be needed at peak times to effectively manage traffic fl.</p>
<p>14</p>	<p>Resident of Piggery Hall Lane</p> <p>Wishes to comment on the effect the recent TRO (29/06/19) has had on traffic flow and its impact on residents.</p> <p>With the new TRO in place, Piggery Hall Lane experienced a day of sudden and continuous solid stacked traffic that extended from the Chichester Road/Itchenor crossroads southwards to Acre Street, where some of it tried to turn right but was stopped from doing so.</p> <p>In addition to that southward going traffic, there was even more traffic coming up from East Wittering heading north to the Itchenor crossroads.</p> <p>This came to a standstill outside their house. Such congestion has never occurred before and is a direct consequence of the TRO. This was exactly as they had predicted except for the fact that there was more traffic coming from the south than we had</p>	<p>The proposed experimental order put in place a road closures at times of peak traffic flow on the more the minor roads, of which Piggery Hall Lane could have been one.</p> <p>As referenced in response 1 above, the proposed Piggery Hall Lane closure was only included as a contingency option and was never anticipated that there would be a need to enact it.</p> <p>In the event, through active management of the network during summer 2019, a need for closing Piggery Hall Lane was not identified and therefore not implemented, although some northbound queuing was observed.</p> <p>As a result the advance signing at the junction of Piggery Hall Lane and Stocks Lane was reviewed and amended and additional traffic marshals positioned at the Stocks Lane to advise motorists that there</p>

Consultation Response Summary

<p>expected.</p> <p>Believes this is to the detriment of local business, the danger to horse riders posed by the heavy, continuous traffic, cyclists and walkers was obvious and alarming. No one is used to or expects such traffic in Piggery Hall Lane.</p> <p>The new TRO has negatively impacted Piggery Hall Lane through the creation of new traffic jams, heavier traffic flow, heightened noise and increased pollution through static idling traffic along the lane, for the whole duration the TRO was in place. The problem of traffic jams in Chapel/Elms Lane and Acre Street has simply been shunted to a different location.</p> <p>Believes other local residents feel the same and this should be a strong point of evidence when re-assessing the suitability and future design of the TRO.</p> <p>UPDATE on the three-day TRO imposed for the Bank Holiday weekend just past (26th August 2019).</p> <p>Advises that Piggery Hall Lane became once again a cut-through for hugely frustrated drivers who just left one jam to join another - thereby ending up further back down the queue. In this way, the drivers involved actually ended up in a worse state than they were in when at a standstill in Elms Lane</p> <p>Sadly the partial gridlock worsened a great deal over the bank holiday weekend of three TRO days: day-long jams, appallingly dangerous driving down the wrong side of the road to turn right at the crossroads, horn blowing 'games' to pass the time, pollution from idling engines,</p>	<p>was no access to the beach via Piggery Hall Lane.</p> <p>Historically there have been complaints about congestion in Piggery Hall Lane and the proposals were in part designed to reduce the instance of congestion. A number of concerns were raised locally about the proposed closure of Piggery Hall Lane and in the event its closure was not implemented</p> <p>The feedback from WWE, supported by a photographic log, is that queuing in Elms Lane, Acre Street and Chapel Lane has been significantly reduced and instances of anti-social behaviour similarly reduced.</p> <p>Of the objections received, only one refers to worsened traffic conditions in Piggery Hall Lane as a result of the TRO. A greater number raised objections to the proposed closure.</p> <p>As referred to above feedback suggests that there was a noticeable improvement in traffic flows and queuing</p>
---	---

Consultation Response Summary

<p>acrimonious exchanges and people needing to use toilets that of course do not exist in a semi-rural environment</p> <p>Most worryingly, the marshal guarding Acre Street was actually <i>driven at</i> and forced to let a couple of the most aggressive drivers through for their own safety.</p> <p>Having said that, by Bank Holiday Monday some clearer signage at the bottom of Church Road at least reduced the traffic coming from the South.</p> <p>It would seem that WWE cannot influence the satnav companies after all and therefore, the closed off roads are still coming up as open and clear - hence the desperate driving up Piggery Hall Lane. Suggest clearer signage is required</p> <p>There is no doubt that - also as predicted - daily overall usage of Piggery Hall Lane is regrettably also increasing- now that it is more familiar as a 'cut through'.</p> <p>They believe there still has to be consultation about a long-term alternative - or at least an attempt at finding one, since the indicators are that this area will get more popular, not less.</p> <p>There were more cars accommodated in more fields than ever before this past weekend. Locals seem to believe that it accommodated more than 10,000, although there is no information provided.</p> <p>Asks if highways endorse this approach of accommodating ever greater numbers and the risks this entails? Asks if from a road safety</p>	<p>It is acknowledged some drivers have directed their frustrations towards the marshals. The traffic marshals are trained to deal with such issues and the indications are that it is no worse than with more conventional highway work.</p> <p>Not all Sat Navs operate real time information but this is an area that is an improving situation. The effectiveness of the temporary signing will be kept under review by West Wittering Estates</p> <p>With rising car ownership and vehicle usage traffic flows may well have increased in Piggery Hall Lane, as it will have done on many other routes.</p> <p>Further consultation would be undertaken should alternative or longer term highway solutions be defined. However any further</p>
--	--



Consultation Response Summary

	<p>perspective, other ideas could be investigated?</p>	<p>proposal would need to be proportional to the problem identified which currently is short term and weather dependent.</p> <p>West Sussex County Council has no control over the numbers of vehicles lawfully permitted that use them. From a road safety perspective there is no evidence to support the notion that the roads are statistically less safe during holiday periods although the frustration caused by the congestion that occurs at these times is better understood.</p>
--	--	---

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>South Chichester County Local Committee</b>	<b>Ref No: SC13(18/19) CHS 9027</b>
<b>February 2019</b>	<b>Key Decision: No</b>
<b>West Wittering –Chapel Lane, Acre Street and Piggery Hall Lane</b>  <b>Experimental Traffic Regulation Order</b>  <b>Urgent Action</b>	<b>Part I</b>
<b>Report by Chris Dye, Area Highway Manager for Chichester District, on behalf of Matt Davey, Director of Highways and Transport</b>	<b>Electoral Division: The Wittering</b>

### Summary

The County Council has been approached by West Wittering Estate (WWE) for assistance in managing the traffic flow to and from the West Wittering Beach car park. The demand for access to the beach has always been high and with the improvement of satellite navigation systems (Sat Navs) and advanced mapping, traffic is navigating its way to the coast, diverting from the main access roads and using narrower single track roads that are unsuitable for high volumes of traffic.

As a result of the issues, WWE has brought forward plans to better manage peak traffic flow in West Wittering, which would need to be provided on the publicly maintainable highway. Consequently WWE need the Highway Authority's permission to do so, and where required, make the appropriate Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) to support the proposal which comprise of 2 principle phases; Phase 1 and 1A (Appendices A and C) which consists of a part time closure of Chapel Lane and a part time managed closure of Acre Street, including control of the Rookwood Road and Pound Road. Phase 1B and 1C (Appendices B and D) includes the closure of Piggery Hall Lane and the associated diversion route.

### Recommendation.

That the South Chichester County Local Committee approves the Director of Law & Assurance to make and advertise the Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders outlined in paragraph 2 for a maximum period of 18 months.

## **Proposal**

### **1. Background and Context**

- 1.1 The County Council has been approached by WWE for assistance in managing the traffic flow to and from the West Wittering Beach car park.
- 1.2 The demand for access to the beach has always been high. At peak times efforts have been made by WWE to manage the access by providing travel information via variable message signs and radio travel bulletins with a view to both inform drivers of the length of queuing, the likely time delays and with the hope of persuading some visitors to divert to alternative locations. WWE have also undertaken on-site works to improve the efficiency of processing customer payments and speed up access to the privately managed car parks.
- 1.3 In recent years, with the advent and improvement of satellite navigation systems (Sat Navs) and advanced mapping, traffic is trying to find its way to the coast, diverting from the main access roads and using narrower single track roads that are unsuitable for high volume traffic flows.
- 1.4 This is of concern to local community in West Wittering and WWE, acting as a "good neighbour", has engaged its own traffic management consultants to investigate measures that might aid and assist better access to the coast and reduce congestion. The current proposals would need to be provided on the publicly maintainable highway, consequently WWE need the Highway Authority's permission to implement the proposals and where required make the appropriate TROs.
- 1.5 Due to the complex nature of the traffic movements in the area, it is considered that any traffic management proposals requiring a TRO should be introduced by way of an Experimental TRO, for which Committee approval is required, but will be further supported by temporary traffic management for which Committee approval is not specifically required.
- 1.6 In November 2018, the South Chichester County Local Committee received a presentation from the WWE in relation to the Phase 1 and 1A (Appendix C) proposals, to establish if the principle of the operations were agreeable. The committee embraced the proposals and acknowledged that both the County Council and WWE were trying to improve the situation for the local community.
- 1.7 Since the presentation to the Committee, a residents group in Piggery Hall Lane have approached WWE and the County Council to discuss their concerns that Phase 1A could have by diverting traffic along Piggery Hall Lane which in turn could cause access issues and inappropriate parking, which has been experienced by the Elm Lane, Chapel Lane and Acre Street residents.

Piggery Hall Lane is not comparable to the aforementioned roads due to the carriageway being wider, and already takes a reasonable proportion of traffic due to the industrial estate situated in the vicinity and a higher number of residential dwellings.

It is also felt that the proposals set out in Appendices A and C will control the priority and queue lengths of traffic entering Pound Road and as such Piggery Hall Lane won't be significantly affected.

However, as a compromise it is felt that the proposals set out in Appendices B and D for Piggery Hall Lane should be included in the Order as a contingency measure, which will **only** be activated if there is robust evidence compiled to demonstrate the proposals in Phase 1 and 1A are resulting in demonstrable and significant road safety issues, comparable to those that have been experienced by the Elms Lane residents in previous years i.e. 'fly parking' and significant vehicles queues creating emergency access issues.

## **2. Proposals**

2.1 The proposals are as follows:

### **Phase 1A (Refer to Appendix C):**

**Chapel Lane;** Experimental Prohibition of Driving (Part Time) (1st April to 30<sup>th</sup> September), at its northern end with the junction of the B2179 Chichester Road, southwards for a distance of five metres.

The closure will be manned by an operative and implemented by way of a temporary barrier to operate at times of peak traffic flow. At off peak times the barrier will be secured open or removed.

The alternative route for traffic to access Chapel Lane during times of operation will be via B2179 Chichester Road, B2179 Rookwood Road and Elms Lane.

**Acre Street** - Experimental Prohibition of Driving (Part Time) with Limited Access, for residents of Chapel Lane, Elms Lane and Acre Street only, (1st April to 30<sup>th</sup> September) - at its junction with Piggery Hall Lane westwards for a distance of five metres.

This closure will be implemented through a "soft closure" by the provision of a manned gate, to operate at times of peak traffic flow and allow residents access. At off peak times the gate will be secured open or removed.

The alternative route for traffic, diverted by the closure, to access Acre Street during times of operation will be via Piggery Hall Lane, B2179 Chichester Road, B2179 Rookwood Road and Elms Lane

### **Phase 1B and 1C (Refer to Appendix Phase D):**

This includes all the proposals set out for Phase 1A above but with the inclusion of:

**Piggery Hall Lane;** Experimental Prohibition of Driving (Part Time) (1st April to 30<sup>th</sup> September), at its northern end with the junction of the B2179 Chichester Road, southwards for a distance of five metres.

The closure will be manned by an operative and implemented by way of a temporary barrier to operate at times of peak traffic flow. At off peak times the barrier will be secured open or removed.

## Agenda Item 6

### Appendix C

The alternative route for traffic to access Piggery Hall Lane during times of operation is as set out in Appendices B and D which is via Bell Lane, Bracklesham Lane, Stocks Lane and Church Road.

- 2.2 The lengths of road in Chapel Lane and Acre Street Lane which are the subject of the proposed Experimental Closure Order and associated diversion route, are shown in Appendix A, drawing number WW01.
- 2.3 The length of road in Piggery Hall Lane, which is subject to the proposed Experimental Closure Order, and associated diversion route, is shown on Appendix B, drawing number WW02.
- 2.4 As intimated in the summary above, Phase 1 (Appendix C) shows other supporting traffic management measures that do not require Committee approval and include temporary Stop/Go board installation at the junction of B2179 Rookwood Road and Pound Road, to facilitate and regularise access and egress from the West Wittering Beach car park, with the addition of advisory no parking cones in Elms Lane to ease congestion.
- 2.5 It is considered that the proposals will only need to be implemented during the summer months, at specific weekends and Bank Holidays and/or during periods of fair weather. The days and duration of operation will be determined by WWE based on the weather forecast and projected parking demand from WWE's parking statistics, only being implemented with prior approval from the County Council's Network and Traffic Manager or delegated officer.  
As referenced above, Phase 1 and 1A (Appendices A and C) will be the default arrangement when approval is provided by the Network and Traffic Manager, with Phase 1B and 1C (Appendices B and D) activated **only** if there is robust evidence compiled to demonstrate the proposals in Phase 1 and 1A are resulting in demonstrable and significant road safety issues, comparable to those that have been experienced by the Elms Lane residents in previous years i.e. 'fly parking' and significant vehicles queues creating emergency access issues.
- 2.6 The proposals intend to prevent the use of the aforementioned roads by any vehicle that is not considered to be a resident, in order to protect and allow emergency access, reduce community tensions from poor parking and driver practices, whilst removing the restrictions that some residents have experienced whereby they have been prevented from being able to leave their properties.
- 2.7 **Monitoring** – The Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders can only remain in place for a maximum period of 18months and can either be made permanent or withdrawn. Within this period the success or otherwise of the scheme will be assessed by review of the number of objections received, the level of local approval received, including the views of West Wittering Parish Council and Sussex Police.

### 3. Resources

- 3.1 Making and advertising the Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders will not require funding as this would be carried out internally by the County Council if approved.

- 3.2 For info, WWE are intending to fund the operation and implementation of all the works if approved, as set out in Appendices A-D.

### **Factors taken into account**

#### **4. Consultation**

- 4.1 **Members** - At the original design stage, the local member for The Witterings Division was consulted and supported the proposals as outlined. The latest proposals have also been made aware to the local member who has confirmed his support.

As also touched on, the Chichester South County Local Committee were presented with the concept of the proposals set out in Appendices A and C, intimating their support for trailing the scheme, albeit the proposals evolved since the presentation.

- 4.2 **External** - Sussex Police has been consulted on the latest proposals and do not raise any objection on the understanding that the Experimental Order is managed and monitored in the manner outlined in historic correspondence with the County Council.

West Sussex Fire Service, South East Counties Ambulance Service and West Wittering Parish Council were also consulted and raised no objection.

- 4.3 **Public** – Experimental TROs require only informal consultation before they become operational and that has been confined to the local member and limited external consultees listed in paragraph 4.2. However the operational date is the start of a 6 month statutory consultation period, which can include objections, support or feedback to the proposals in relation to making the experimental provisions permanent. If objections are received to these proposals during the 18 month period that cannot be resolved, they will be reported to the Committee for its further consideration at a later date.

At the end of the 18 month period, Officers will report back to the Chichester South County Local Committee providing a transparent review of the operations when implemented, including the correspondence received during the consultation period, and the committee will decide whether the Experimental TRO should be made permanent.

#### **5. Risk Management Implications**

- 5.1 Should the proposed experimental TRO be made the risk to the County Council would be that some local residents will object to the proposal within the consultation period, which must be resolved before the Local Authority could proceed with any potential final and permanent scheme.

- 5.2 Should the proposed experimental TRO not be made, the risk to the County Council is that the concerns raised by the local community and local member will not have been addressed. However the experimental TRO cannot run for any longer than 18 months and must be made permanent or withdrawn by the end of that period.

#### **6. Other Options Considered**

Agenda Item 6  
Appendix C

- 6.1 No other options were considered as the proposed TRO is the only mechanism available to support traffic management by a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party i.e. WWE

**7. Equality Duty**

- 7.1 The protected characteristics as defined in the Equality Act were duly considered in the course of the development and design of this TRO proposal and no equality issues were identified.

**8. Social Value**

- 8.1 The proposals align with the County Council's policy on Social Value insofar as they are supporting traffic management proposals promoted by WWE in response to concerns raised by the local community with a view to improving traffic management on the network and the local road environment.

**9. Crime and Disorder Act Implications**

- 9.1 The County Council does not consider there to be any foreseeable Crime and Disorder Act implications associated with this proposal. The view of Sussex Police has been sought, who confirm they believe there are no issues in relation to the Crime and Disorder Act.

**10. Human Rights Implications**

- 10.1 It is unlawful for a public authority to act in a way that is incompatible with a convention right. The policy objective to avoid danger to all road users and reduce congestion should then be set against these rights. Taking these points into consideration it is believed that the introduction of this Traffic Regulation Order is justified.

**Matt Davey**

Director of Highways & Transport

**Contact:** Chris Dye, Area Highway Manager - Chichester District: 01243 642105

**Appendices**

Appendix A – TRO Tile Plan showing proposed traffic regulation orders for Chapel Lane and Acre Street, with supporting diversion route.

Appendix B – TRO Tile Plan showing proposed traffic regulation orders for Piggery Hall Lane and supporting diversion route, including proposals from Appendix A

Appendix C – Plans showing traffic management proposals for Phase 1 and Phase 1A

Appendix D – Plans showing traffic management proposals for Phase 1B and 1C

**Background Papers**

None



**Agreed**

.....  
**Katharine Eberhart**

Director of Finance, Performance  
& Procurement

.....  
**Simon Oakley**

Chairman  
South Chichester  
County Local Committee

---

**Action Authorised**

.....  
**Tony Kershaw**

Director of Law and Assurance  
Date.....

This page is intentionally left blank

## Partnerships & Communities Team Update

### South Chichester County Local Committee, 2 March 2020

#### 1. Community Led Support:

The team are the WSCC lead for creating 'Community Drop Ins' across the County. These are being created to support Adult Services transformation programme by providing a clear prevention offer that supports all adults to access appropriate information, advice and guidance when they need it. The team are working with partners at District and Parish level, the Voluntary Sector and Community Groups to make the offer as comprehensive as possible to meet localised need.

The team are managing the introduction of the drop ins and the Prevention Assessment Team (PAT), a service commissioned by Adult Services are providing the face to face interaction with residents. As the drop ins develop it is hoped other partners will join once there is appropriate levels of footfall.

The team have been extremely busy sourcing venues, holding discussions with partners and ensuring drop ins are complementary to existing services offering information advice and guidance already.

#### Chichester Drop Ins:

**Selsey** – In partnership with the Selsey Community Forum, Selsey Town Council, Selsey Works and other partners a drop in began in December at the Care Shop; alternative venues are also 'The Shop' and the Selsey Centre. The sessions run alternative Monday afternoons.

**Witterings** – Following discussions with East Wittering Parish Council there are also alternative Monday afternoon sessions at the Bracklesham Barn, linked timings wise to compliment the Selsey sessions. Both are possible due to the PAT worker being able to work in the locality 2 days a week, therefore establishing relationships.

**Chichester Library** - In collaboration with the Library Manager weekly sessions on a Thursday morning commenced in mid-January.

**Midhurst** – the team are working with Pathfinder to join their drop in sessions held at the Grange.

We are also working with Adult Services to identify locations for Talk Local Appointments which is also an initiative supporting Community Led Support, managed by Adult Services these appointments enable early assessment of residents contacting social care in local community venues.

Community Led Support is in its early stages and marketing and communications about the drop in's is also being carefully managed to ensure

## **Partnerships & Communities Team Update**

they grow slowly and find their place within the local community infrastructure.

### **2. Other areas of work:**

Support to Chichester District Council in setting up 'Technology doesn't Byte' sessions at Swanfield Community Centre as member of working group. This is a project tackling Digital inclusion.

Supporting Chichester and Bognor Dementia Action Alliance in developing awareness of Dementia issues and awareness

Ongoing support community groups with funding advice. Including 1-2-1 sessions with Selsey Sports Dream and SPRING plus regular email updates to potential applicants as part of CIF promotion.

Working with Chichester Community Development Trust to set up a Men's shed. The Chichester Partnership Officer currently manages the Men's Shed initiative across the County.

Working with Partners (Citizens Advice, Early Help, District & Boroughs) on Crisis Support Network to co-ordinate and develop crisis support along the coastal strip area.

Supporting Tangmere Youth Club Management Committee to create a sustainable business model in partnership with Sussex Clubs for Young People

### **3. Partnerships Supported:**

The team regularly attend:

Chichester in Partnership – Strategic partnership

Chichester Local Community Network – Health partnership

Chichester Early Help Advisory Board – Children First

Chichester Dementia Action Alliance – Supporting WSCC Dementia Strategy

Chichester Joint Action Group – Community Safety and Neighbourhoods Partnership

### **4. County wide Initiatives**

The team support:

Improving Places and Spaces – Highways Community Offer

## **Partnerships & Communities Team Update**

Operation Watershed and Parish and Town Council Relationships – Managed by Principal Theme Lead Community Initiatives based in the South Area Team

Community Volunteer Team – undertake regular work in localities across Chichester District as many Members will be aware.

Promotion of priority Public Health campaigns

Support and relationship work with local community organisations which enables the team to link services to community capacity.

### **Chichester Locality Team Contacts:**

Pete Lawrence – Partnerships Area Manager (South) incorporating Chichester Locality Lead, [Peter.lawrence@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:Peter.lawrence@westsussex.gov.uk)

Neil Cotton – Chichester Partnerships Officer, [Neil.cotton@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:Neil.cotton@westsussex.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

**South Chichester County Local Committee****Community Initiative Funding****03 March 2020****Report by Director of Law and Assurance****Ref: SC06(19/20)****Key Decision:  
No****Part I****Electoral Divisions:  
All in SC CLC area****Recommendation**

That the Committee considers the pitches and/or applications submitted for Community Initiative Funding as set out in Appendix A and award funding accordingly.

**1. Background and Context**

- 1.1 The Community Initiative Fund (CIF) is a County Local Committee (CLC) administered fund that provides assistance to local community projects. Bids should show evidence of projects which can demonstrate community backing, make a positive impact on people's wellbeing and support [The West Sussex Plan](#).
- 1.2 The terms and conditions, eligibility criteria and overall aim of the CIF have been agreed by all CLC Chairmen and these can be found on the County Local Committee pages of the West Sussex County Council website using the following link:  
[http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/your\\_council/meetings\\_and\\_decision-making/county\\_local\\_committees/community\\_initiative\\_funding.aspx](http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/your_council/meetings_and_decision-making/county_local_committees/community_initiative_funding.aspx)
- 1.3 For projects to be considered for funding they must upload their project idea to the West Sussex Crowd ([www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk](http://www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk)) funding platform and pitch to the Community Initiative Fund.
- 1.4 Effective from 8 February 2019, the County Council's Community Initiative Fund budget was reduced from £280,000 per year to £140,000 per year, following a decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities. It was approved that this proposal be included in the Governance Committee review of County Local Committees with implementation of savings to be delayed until the review has been completed. Therefore, it was agreed that the 2019/20 CIF budget be provisionally reduced to £140,000, subject to the outcome of the Governance Committee review of CLCs on 25 November 2019. This decision was supported by the Governance Committee.
- 1.5 Effective from 12 June 2019, the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities took a decision to introduce a Micro Fund following feedback received from groups relating to small projects. Applications to the Micro Fund are intended for projects with a total cost of up to £750 as an alternative to crowdfunding and pitching to CIF via West Sussex Crowd. As with crowdfunding pitches, Micro Fund applications are

considered the CLC meetings for a decision. CLCs were advised to allocate up to 30% of their budget to Micro Fund applications, although this is discretionary.

## **2. Proposal**

- 2.1 That the Committee considers the pitches and/or applications for Community Initiative Funding as set out in Appendix A.
- 2.2 Pledges can be considered in the preparation and fundraising stage. When considering pitches in the preparation stage, decisions are subject to the applicant receiving full verification from locality and starting fundraising by the end of the financial year.

## **3. Resources**

- 3.1 For the 2019/20 financial year, South Chichester CLC had a total of £13,300.00 available for allocation, of this **£5,937.71** is still available for allocation. Details of awards made in the current program and previous financial year are included in Appendix B.
- 3.2 There are six crowdfunding pitches and two Micro Fund applications for consideration by the Committee with a total project cost of £50,491.05.

Pitches are available to view at [www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk](http://www.westsussexcrowd.org.uk) and also outlined in Appendix B along with applications.

## **Factors taken into account**

## **4. Consultation**

- 4.1 Before a project can be added to the West Sussex Crowd it must be eligible for the [Spacehive](#) platform, and then before beginning crowd funding must be verified by [Locality](#). This involves inspecting the project to make sure it's viable and legitimate. The Democratic Services Officer, in consultation with the local County Councillor, will preview all projects that have then gone on to pitch to the Community Initiative Fund to ensure they meet the criteria.
- 4.2 District and Borough Council colleagues are consulted on whether applicants have applied to any funds they administer. In addition, some CLCs have CIF Sub Groups that preview pitches and make recommendations to the CLC.

## **5. Risk Management Implications**

- 5.1 There is a risk in allocating any funding that the applicant will not spend some or all of it or that it might be spent inappropriately. Therefore, the terms and conditions associated with CIF provide for the County Council to request the return of funds.



- 5.2 Projects that do not reach 95% of their funding target on The West Sussex Crowd within their project timescales, will not receive any funds. Any pledges made to unsuccessful projects will therefore be returned to the CLC CIF allocation and be detailed in Appendix B.

## **6. Other Options Considered**

- 6.1 The Committee do have the option to defer or decline pitches but must give valid reasons for doing so. If they defer a project they need to take into account the timescales for the project and whether a deferral would allow the CLC to pitch at the following meeting.

## **7. Equality Duty**

- 7.1 Democratic Services Officers consider the outcome intentions for each pitch. It is considered that for the following pitches, the intended outcomes would:

- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.

The CLC in considering any pitch should be alert to the need to consider any equality implications arising from the bid or the way the money is to be used if any are indicated in the information provided.

## **8. Social Value**

- 8.1 The Community Initiative Fund's eligibility criteria requires applicants to explain how their project will support one or more of the County Council's priorities as set out in [The West Sussex Plan](#).

## **9. Crime and Disorder Act Implications**

- 9.1 The applications for decision contain projects that will positively benefit the community and contribute toward the County Council's obligations to reduce crime and disorder and promote public safety in section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

## **10. Human Rights Act Implications**

- 10.1 The County Council's positive obligations under the Human Rights Act have been considered in the preparation of these recommendations but none of significance emerges.

### **Tony Kershaw**

Director of Law and Assurance

**Contact:** Rachel Allan, Senior Advisor – 033 022 28966

## **Appendices**

Appendix A – Current pitches for consideration by the Committee

Appendix B - Summary of awards made in 2019/20 and 2018/19

### **Background Papers:**

Micro Fund applications and crowdfunding pitches –

<http://www2.westsussex.gov.uk/ds/clc/sc/sc030320i12back.pdf>

Decision SSC8 18/19 -

<https://westsussex.moderngov.co.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=494>

Decision SSC02 19/20 -

<https://westsussex.moderngov.co.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=611>

## **Current applications for consideration by the Committee**

### **Micro Fund**

The following projects have applied to the Micro Fund since the last meeting:

- **463/SC - Stonepillow, 'A garden at our homeless hostel', £727.50 – towards improving the garden in forming a gardening group for the hostel's residents.**
- **468/SC – UK Harvest, 'Food storage shed', £674.00 – towards purchasing a food storage shed for the organisation.**

### **West Sussex Crowd**

The following projects have pitched to the Community Initiative Fund since the last meeting:

Fundraising Stage –

- **467/SC – The Academy of Gym, 'Please help mat our gymnastics club!', £6,599.00 – towards purchasing and fitting extra safety matting to help widen the club's member participation.**  
<https://www.spacehive.com/theacademyofgym>
- **495/SC – Bosham Parish Council, 'Bosham Daily Mile Track', £12,572.00 – towards the cost of laying a mile long running track.**  
<https://www.spacehive.com/bosham-daily-mile-track>
- **496/SC – CAOS Musical Productions, 'CAOS festival performance', £2,417.00 – towards the cost of costumes and props.**

Preparation Stage –

- **497/SC – Ovation Festival, a place to perform, £21,726.00 – towards the cost of equipment for the festival.**  
<https://www.spacehive.com/ovationmusic>
- **498/SC – Fishbourne Bowling Club, 'Renewing Fishbourne BC's ditch mats', £3,586.00 – towards the cost of new equipment.**  
<https://www.spacehive.com/renewal-of-ditch-mats>
- **503/SC – Fishbourne Playing Field Association, 'Carbon-free Fishbourne Centre', £2,190.00 – towards improving the centre's lighting efficiency by replacing 170 bulbs with LED.**  
<https://www.spacehive.com/carbon-free-fishbourne-centre>

This page is intentionally left blank

### Summary of awards for 2019/20 and 2018/19

The following applications have received funding during the 2019/20 financial year to date:

Applicant	Summary	Member	Awarded	Feedback
<b>WEST SUSSEX CROWD</b>				
<b>345/SC -</b> Building a legacy for our community	Towards upgrading disability access and improving the reception area's insulation	Jeremy Hunt	£1,750.00	
<b>MICRO FUND</b>				
<b>389/SC -</b> Shop Talk (Selsey Community Forum)	Towards Venue Hire of the Selsey Hub.	Carol Purnell	£750.00	No feedback received – refer to Member
<b>415/SC -</b> Ecotherapy training and equipment (Chichester Forest Schools CIC)	Towards equipment and training.	Louise Goldsmith	£650.49	No feedback received – refer to Member
<b>421/SC -</b> Arts Dream Selsey	Towards Equipment purchase.	Carol Purnell	£711.80	No feedback received – refer to Member
<b>WEST SUSSEX CROWD</b>				
<b>422/SC -</b> Children in the Chapel; interactive play (Chichester Community Development Trust)	Towards Equipment purchase.	Jeremy Hunt	<b>Fundraising Stage</b>  Pledged £2,000.00  Crowdfunding deadline: 17/03/2020	N/A
<b>437/SC -</b> Saddle for disabled riders (Royal Artillery Equestrian Centre)	Towards purchase of specialist saddle.	Vacancy	£1,500.00	

The following applications received funding during the 2018/19 financial year:

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Awarded</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
<b>205/SC</b> – Selsey Care Shop	Towards the cost of utilities, phone installation, decorative works and purchase of furniture	Carol Purnell	£2,000.00	<a href="#">Case study video</a>
<b>209/SC</b> – The Hidden Garden	Towards materials for community garden	Carol Purnell	£1,500.00	
<b>220/SC</b> – Grow Chichester Community Garden	Contribution towards garden improvements and public liabilities insurance to support delivery of weekly therapeutic gardening sessions	Jeremy Hunt	£500.00	
<b>274/SC</b> – Selsey Sea Bathing Society	Towards cost of website development, social media marketing and producing flyers	Carol Purnell	£600.00	<a href="#">Case study video</a>
<b>282/SC</b> – Dancing Together	Towards the cost of 4 dance workshops and filmmaking	Jeremy Hunt	£500.00 (Urgent Action)	<a href="#">Feedback received</a> (view via Google Chrome web browser)
<b>297/SC</b> – Go Gardening	To purchase an additional transit van	Jamie Fitzjohn	£2,500.00	<a href="#">Feedback received</a> (view via Google Chrome web browser)
<b>310/SC</b> – Little things make big differences	Towards purchasing red boxes and donation point	Jeremy Hunt	£96.00	
<b>317/SC</b> – Oving Scarecrow Day 2019	Towards advertising banners and new metal scarecrow	Simon Oakley	£200.00	<a href="#">Case study video</a>
<b>316/SC</b> – Discover Your Future: Get Girls Going!	Towards venue hire and IT equipment provision	Jeremy Hunt	£1,500.00	No feedback received

To note: The following applications received funding but subsequently failed to successfully reach their fundraising target.

- 204/SC - UKHarvest, £1,000.00 – Towards advertising, and purchasing kitchen utensils and other essentials.  
[www.spacehive.com/ukharvest--nourishing-our-nation](http://www.spacehive.com/ukharvest--nourishing-our-nation)
- 208/SC - City Angels, £500.00 – Towards van repairs and maintenance, and restocking consumables.  
[www.spacehive.com/city-angels](http://www.spacehive.com/city-angels)
- 218/SC – HEART (Homeless Empowerment and Relational Transformation), £500.00 – Towards volunteer recruitment and training, branding and administration.  
[www.spacehive.com/heartchichester](http://www.spacehive.com/heartchichester)
- 253/SC – Space to Breathe, £1,500.00 – Towards equipment, materials and publicity costs for outdoors wellbeing program to support teenagers.  
[www.spacehive.com/space-to-breathe](http://www.spacehive.com/space-to-breathe)

This page is intentionally left blank