

Public Document Pack

Tony Kershaw

Director of Law and Assurance

If calling please ask for:

Jack Bacon on 033 022 25075

Email: jack.bacon@westsussex.gov.uk

www.westsussex.gov.uk

County Hall

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 1RQ

Switchboard

Tel no (01243) 777100



11 January 2022

Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee

A virtual meeting of the Committee will be held at **10.30 am** on **Wednesday, 19 January 2022**.

Note: In response to the continuing public health measures, this meeting will be held virtually with members in remote attendance. Public access is via webcasting.

The meeting will be available to watch live via the Internet at this address:

<http://www.westsussex.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

Tony Kershaw

Director of Law and Assurance

Agenda

10.30 am 1. **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 please contact Democratic Services before the meeting.

2. **Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee** (Pages 5 - 10)

The Committee is asked to agree the minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2021 (cream paper).

3. **Urgent Matters**

Items not on the agenda which the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency by reason of special circumstances, including cases where the Committee needs to be informed of budgetary or performance issues affecting matters within its terms of reference, which have emerged since the publication of the agenda.

4. **Responses to Recommendations** (Pages 11 - 14)

The Committee is asked to note the responses to

recommendations made at the 24 November 2021 meeting from the Leader of the County Council, Cabinet Member for Community Support, Fire and Rescue, Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change and the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport.

5. **Appointment to the Business Planning Group**

The Labour Group to confirm its new representative on the BPG, in replacement of Cllr Caroline Baxter.

10.40 am 6. **Final Report of the Northern Runway Task and Finish Group** (Pages 15 - 22)

A Task and Finish Group of this Committee met to scrutinise the Council's draft response to Gatwick Airport Limited's consultation on its Northern Runway Project. Due to the time constraints presented by the consultation period, the Group's agreed recommendations were presented to Cabinet at its meeting on 16 November 2021 where the proposed response was approved.

The Committee is asked to note the Group's report and its recommendations, and consider the response to the recommendations.

11.00 am 7. **Final Report of the On-Street Parking Management Task and Finish Group** (Pages 23 - 30)

A Task and Finish Group of this Committee met to scrutinise proposals to amend the Council's On-Street Parking Management Strategy. The Group's agreed recommendations were considered by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport ahead of her decision to adopt the revised Strategy, published on 22 December 2021.

The Committee is asked to note the Group's report and its recommendations, and consider the response to the recommendations.

11.20 am 8. **Forward Plan of Key Decisions** (Pages 31 - 46)

Extract from the Forward Plan dated 7 January 2022 – attached.

An extract from any Forward Plan published between the date of despatch of the agenda and the date of the meeting will be tabled at the meeting.

The Committee is asked to consider whether it wishes to enquire into any of the forthcoming decisions within its portfolio.

9. **Work Programme Planning and Possible Items for Future Scrutiny** (Pages 47 - 50)

Members to mention any items which they believe to be of relevance to the business of the Scrutiny Committee, and suitable for scrutiny, e.g. raised with them by constituents arising from central government initiatives etc.

If any member puts forward such an item, the Committee's role at this meeting is just to assess, briefly, whether to refer the matter to its Business Planning Group (BPG) to consider in detail.

10. **Requests for Call-in** (Pages 51 - 54)

The Monitoring Officer received a request for call-in of the proposed decision by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport concerning On Street Parking Management in West Sussex HT14 (21/22) – decision published on the Executive Decision Database on 22 December 2021. The Monitoring Officer declined the request and the decision became effective on 6 January 2022.

11.35 am 11. **Date of Next Meeting**

A special meeting of the Committee will be held on 24 February 2022 at 10.30am at County Hall, Chichester. Confirmed agenda items will include:

- A27 Arundel Bypass project
- West Sussex Transport Plan

Any member wishing to place an item on the agenda for the meeting must notify the Director of Law and Assurance by Monday 14 February 2022.

To all members of the Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee

24 November 2021 – At a hybrid meeting of the Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee held at 10.30 am at County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RQ.

Present: Cllr Oakley (Chairman)

Cllr Britton, virtual attendee	Cllr Baxter	Cllr Patel, left at 3.01pm
Cllr Albury	Cllr Greenway	Cllr Quinn
Cllr Ali	Cllr Kenyon	
Cllr Baldwin	Cllr Milne, arrived at 10.37am	

Apologies were received from Cllr Oppler

Also in attendance: Cllr Bence, Cllr Crow, Cllr J Dennis, Cllr A Jupp, Cllr Urquhart and Cllr Wall

Part I

23. Declarations of Interest

23.1 No declarations were made.

24. Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee

24.1 In reference to page 6, 14.3, Cllr Quinn spoke in support of the pilot booking system at Crawley household waste recycling centre and reported that it has been well-received by local residents. It was suggested that the arrangement should be monitored and feedback sought from the local authority every six months.

24.2 The Chairman advised that this should be raised as a regular item at the Committee's Business Planning Group and any subsequent emerging trends could be considered as a main agenda item.

24.3 Resolved - that the minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2021 be approved as a correct record, and that they be signed by the Chairman.

25. Responses to Recommendations

25.1 In reference to page 3, point 5, it was questioned why the response specifically focuses on riparian ownership and not address drainage systems within the County Council's remit.

25.2 The Chairman clarified that the County Council is the Local Lead Flood Authority for general drainage and riparian ownership, as well as being responsible for its own drainage infrastructure.

- 25.3 The Committee noted the response to recommendations made at the 30 September 2021 meeting from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change and the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport.

26. Domestic and Sexual Violence and Abuse

- 26.1 The Committee considered a report and presentation on the County Council's partnership approach to Domestic and Sexual Violence and Abuse (DSVA) (copies appended to the signed minutes).

- 26.2 Summary of responses to members comments and questions: -

- Measuring the effectiveness of ongoing outreach work includes; asking victims and survivors questions about their safety and security, visibly improved trust and confidence among victims coming forward and seeking support and a reduction in the number of repeat victims that use the service.
- Communication channels were made more accessible during lockdown through; extended service hours on weekdays, weekends and bank holidays, closer partnership-working with the police and children's social care colleagues and virtual sessions held with GPs and referred patients. Partners have also developed remote ways of working with clients to continue support and be more available for those seeking help.
- The West Sussex Education for Safeguarding (E4S) curriculum is voluntary and not a statutory requirement (56% take-up among schools). The Safer West Sussex Partnership (SWSP) has identified the 44% of non-participating schools and has prioritised working with them to adopt the curriculum. Members were encouraged to engage with schools in their divisions and help promote E4S.
- Operation Encompass is a police-led awareness initiative which urgently notifies schools of reported incidents of domestic abuse involving their pupils.
- Information-sharing agreements and respective duties are clearly understood by agencies and partners without barriers.
- SWSP can work with and support providers to reduce the demand on partners working over-capacity, but unable to commission or fund services.
- There is a risk that children who are exposed to domestic abuse become victims or perpetrators themselves in adulthood or become involved in other types of criminality.
- SWSP is working proactively to engage with ethnic minority communities and build trust and confidence to overcome language barriers and cultural differences with the aim of making services more accessible.
- It was suggested that, in liaison with district and borough councils, public sector vehicles should be utilised to promote public service messaging more frequently.
- The Domestic Abuse Act's newly imposed duty to provide safe accommodation will have resource implications on the service.

The findings of the draft needs assessment consultation and the final strategy will be published in January.

- Services reliant on short-term funding have contingency/exit plans in place to ensure delivery is met by working collaboratively with other service providers.
- SWSP local services do support male victims and give the option of working with a male Independent Domestic Violence Advocate (IDVA) if they prefer. The County Council does not provide a dedicated service for male victims.
- Pharmacies are recognised nationally as safe spaces and Sussex Police is working to identify and visit popular public places to determine their suitability for safe space status and grow the number of locations countywide.

26.3 Resolved – that the Committee: -

- i. Approved of the scope and range of work being carried out to address the issues of DSVA and reduce harm.
- ii. Approved of the range and scope of work to engage with all sections of our communities.
- iii. Asked Cabinet Members to identify and raise issues of short-term funded services (particularly in respect of early intervention and step-down services) in their respective portfolio areas and describe what contingency plans are in place to prolong service delivery or mitigate its termination at the end of funding periods.
- iv. Agreed that public messaging is being disseminated adequately across the expected communication channels and suggests that the service explores utilising public sector vehicles, town & parish noticeboards and GP surgeries.

26.4 The Committee recommended that an all-member Member Development Session is held within the next one or two years to receive an update on the progress made and further challenges arising from SWSP's arrangements for DSVA.

26.5 The Cabinet Member for Adults Services suggested that the Health and Wellbeing Board would be the appropriate forum for determining how best the cross-portfolio implications of the Domestic Abuse Act are taken forward.

27. Energy Strategy 2030

27.1 The Committee considered a report and presentation on the County Council's draft Energy Strategy 2030 (copies appended to the signed minutes).

27.2 Summary of responses to members' questions and comments: -

- The strategy is a high-level document and action points will be included and expanded upon in detail in the subsequent action plan following consultation with district and borough councils.

- The strategy promises to strengthen the partnership working set out in the 2016 strategy and involves local authorities promoting energy efficient schemes and funding streams for low-income households in fuel poverty.
- The County Council works closely with the West Sussex Fuel Poverty Co-ordinator at Arun District Council to ensure public messaging is joined up and consistent between all tiers of local government.
- 70 local schools were identified to undergo structural roof surveys with the aim of installing photovoltaics (PV) and battery systems. The County Council will explore alternative options if survey results find certain schools unsuitable.
- In reference to page 41, the Service welcomed the suggestion of including a section on Training and Skills. The County Council has an adopted approach with its existing solar farms where local education institutions are invited to teach awareness of public-owned assets as learning resources.
- The Service gave reassurance that they are working to ensure the County Council's own future joint venture developments will be retrofitted where necessary.
- The County Council is an advocate of embedding indicators, criteria and specifications within its procurement process when going out to tender for service providers.
- The Service is aware of some County businesses leading in design and development in their field and the County Council aims to work with local suppliers and service providers where possible.
- The strategy is in line with the Local Electricity Bill in terms of procuring electricity generators to become local energy suppliers.
- The strategy is not intended to influence or steer local planning authority policy.

27.3 Resolved – that the Committee: -

- i. Agreed that the rationale for the chosen scenario is justified and therefore the best fit for the County.
- ii. Agreed that the County Council's climate change priorities have evolved to a degree since its 2016 strategy in response to the ever-developing international and national landscape.
- iii. Noted future concern of potential funding cuts to local authorities in recognition of the challenges faced by central government in balancing varying priorities.
- iv. Agreed that the strategy is significantly ambitious and that its deliverability will need to be assessed following the provision of further detail about its implementation and at the conclusion of the consultation period in early 2022.

28. Review of Community Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs)

- 28.1 The Committee considered a report and presentation on the County Council's review of community Traffic Regulation Orders (copies appended to the signed minutes).
- 28.2 Summary of responses to members' questions and comments: -

- As part of the new TRO Assessments, credit is awarded to applications when external funding is available for the delivery of TRO works. This is likely to help applications that, in the past, might not have been progressed as they didn't quite meet the threshold score. All schemes must be assessed as safe and make sense in terms of traffic management. Assurance was given that the rolling programme option eliminates queue jumping as applications would instead be assessed as and when they are submitted.
- A six-month review has been factored in by the service for the rolling programme option in order to monitor workload capacity and any arising delays.
- As part of the rolling programme, any underspend in the annual TRO budget allocation can be rolled over to the following financial year (subject to capital programme governance).
- The service clarified that applicants are required to gain the support of their local town, parish or neighbourhood council. It was deemed unreasonable to request district or borough council support.
- The service confirmed that there are no geographical restrictions in place for individuals wishing to object to a proposed scheme.
- Proactive communications will be carried out with town and parish councils after the Cabinet Member decision is taken in January 2022 to make them fully aware that their support is required at the beginning of the application process in order to expedite a scheme. This information would also be made publicly available on the County Council's website.
- Records are kept of all reported damage to street furniture and repairs are covered under the service's budget for general maintenance. Partial costs are collected from damage caused by third parties where there is a police record.

28.3 Resolved – that the Committee: -

- i. Agreed that their preferred option is the rolling programme.
- ii. Agreed that the existing number of five objections is a reasonable threshold at which the decision to proceed with a TRO would be referred to the Cabinet Member.
- iii. Agreed that the new timeframes for delivering a community TRO are realistic.

29. (Quarter 2) Quarterly Performance and Resources Update

- 29.1 The Committee considered the end of September (Quarter 2) Quarterly Performance and Resources report (copy appended to the signed minutes).
- 29.2 Summary of responses to members' questions and comments: -
 - What impact does the repairs works at the A285 at Duncton have on Highway's budget for the remainder of 2021/22? The Director of

Highways and Transport was not present but will provide a retrospective answer in due course.

29.3 Resolved – that the Committee noted the report.

30. Forward Plan of Key Decisions

30.1 Resolved – that the Committee noted the Forward Plan of Key Decisions.

31. Work Programme Planning and Possible items for Future Scrutiny

31.1 The Committee considered its work programme and possible items for future scrutiny.

31.2 Resolved – that the Committee agrees the following changes to its work programme: -

- Ninesh Edwards, Senior Advisor, informed the Committee that two additional items concerning the final reports of the Gatwick Northern Runway Project and On-Street Parking Management Task and Finish Groups will be heard at the next meeting of the Committee in January 2022.
- Ninesh Edwards informed the Committee that a further item has been added to the agenda for the March 2022 meeting which will allow members an early opportunity to influence the Road Safety Strategy.
- The Chairman highlighted to the Committee that the next potential opportunity to debate the County Council's proposed response to National Highways' A27 Arundel Bypass project may be arranged during the statutory public consultation period, between January and March 2022.

32. Date of Next Meeting

32.1 The next meeting of the Committee will be held virtually via Microsoft Teams on 19 January 2022 at 10.30 am.

The meeting ended at 3.23 pm

Chairman

Cabinet Member Responses

Response from Cabinet Member for Community Support, Fire and Rescue – Cllr Duncan Crow		
Agenda item	Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee recommendations (24 November 2021)	Response
Domestic and Sexual Violence and Abuse	i. Approved of the scope and range of work being carried out to address the issues of DSVa and reduce harm.	Noted.
	ii. Approved of the range and scope of work to engage with all sections of our communities.	Noted.
	iii. Asked Cabinet Members to identify and raise issues of short-term funded services (particularly in respect of early intervention and step-down services) in their respective portfolio areas and describe what contingency plans are in place to prolong service delivery or mitigate its termination at the end of funding periods.	Response from the Leader of the County Council, Cllr Paul Marshall: I have referred the matter to the Cabinet Member for Adults Services (Cllr Amanda Jupp) and Cabinet Member for Public Health and Wellbeing (Cllr Bob Lanzer) and suggest that, as discussed at your meeting on 24 November 2021, that the topic be considered by the West Sussex Health and Wellbeing Board. The Health and Wellbeing Board seems the most appropriate forum in the first instance as it comprises both elected councillors and key leaders from the health and social care system. This includes district and borough councils, the NHS, acute community and mental health trusts, and the voluntary and community sector, all working collaboratively to improve the health and wellbeing of our residents. It is clear from your Committee's deliberations that this is a multi-agency effort. I have also passed the minutes

Cabinet Member Responses

		and recommendations from this discussion to Cabinet colleagues to consider if and how they can support and promote any initiatives relative to their portfolio areas.
	<p>iv. Agreed that public messaging is being disseminated adequately across the expected communication channels and suggests that the service explores utilising public sector vehicles, town & parish noticeboards and GP surgeries.</p>	<p>The partnership in West Sussex will always seek to identify as many opportunities as possible to engage with our communities and to inform them of the support available to anyone seeking help. Our response to domestic abuse during the pandemic highlighted the need to raise awareness of support in a different way. Some of the ways in which we did this included advertising on 34 refuse vehicles and through the use of pharmacy bags. While it is difficult to evaluate the success of this, what we do know is that we have received positive comments from at least two members of the public who say that seeing the refuse vehicles prompted them to seek help. The campaign also received positive comments on social media and as a result of this positive feedback the advertisements remain on these vehicles. We will continue to develop our methods of engagement with the communities of West Sussex with all our partners including health providers, our fire and rescue service, local community groups and elected members.</p>
	<p>v. The Committee recommended that an all-member Member Development Session is held within the next one or two years to receive an update on the progress made and further challenges arising from SWSP's</p>	<p>Response from the Leader of the County Council, Cllr Paul Marshall:</p> <p>I wholeheartedly support the Committee's recommendation that an all-member</p>

Cabinet Member Responses

	arrangements for DSVAs.	development session is held at the appropriate time to receive an update on the Safer West Sussex Partnership's achievements and challenges, to further widen the reach of this important discussion.
Response from Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change – Cllr Deborah Urquhart		
Energy Strategy 2030	i. Agreed that the rationale for the chosen scenario is justified and therefore the best fit for the County.	Noted.
	ii. Agreed that the County Council's climate change priorities have evolved to a degree since its 2016 strategy in response to the ever-developing international and national landscape.	Noted.
	iii. Noted future concern of potential funding cuts to local authorities in recognition of the challenges faced by central government in balancing varying priorities.	Noted.
	iv. Agreed that the strategy is significantly ambitious and that its deliverability will need to be assessed following the provision of further detail about its implementation and at the conclusion of the consultation period in early 2022.	Noted.
Response from Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport – Cllr Joy Dennis		
Review of Community Traffic	i. Agreed that their preferred option is the rolling programme.	The support from CHESC to implement a rolling programme approach to community Traffic Regulation Orders is noted and welcomed. It will

Cabinet Member Responses

Regulation Orders (TROs)		be reflected in the Cabinet Member decision scheduled for January 2022.
	ii. Agreed that the existing number of five objections is a reasonable threshold at which the decision to proceed with a TRO would be referred to the Cabinet Member.	
	iii. Agreed that the new timeframes for delivering a community TRO are realistic.	

Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee**19 January 2022****Northern Runway Consultation Task and Finish Group****Report by Chairman of the Task and Finish Group**

Summary

Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) proposes alterations to bring the existing Northern Runway at Gatwick Airport into routine use alongside the main runway, enabling the dual operation of both runways. The proposal, the Northern Runway Project (NRP), is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, ultimately requiring a Development Consent Order (DCO) from the Secretary of State. The County Council is a statutory consultee in the DCO process.

In advance of an application for consent being submitted, GAL undertook formal consultation from 9 September to 1 December 2021 on a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), which identified the likely significant impacts of the NRP and any required mitigation. It was decided that the County Council would make a formal response.

A Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee Task and Finish Group met once and scrutinised the Council's draft response.

The recommendations, once agreed by the Group, were verbally presented to Cabinet at its meeting of 16 November, by the Chairman, and are published herein.

Recommendations

See section 2.

Focus for Scrutiny

The Committee is asked to consider the recommendations of its Task and Finish Group, which informed Cabinet's decision to approve the authority's consultation response on 16 November.

The Committee is further asked to consider the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change's response (on behalf of the Cabinet).

1 Background and context

Agenda Item 6

- 1.1 Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) launched a public consultation on proposals to bring the Northern Runway into routine use for flight departures, to which the County Council decided to submit a response.
- 1.2 The Business Planning Group (BPG) of Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee determined that scrutiny of the proposed response would best be undertaken by a scrutiny Task and Finish Group (TFG). A TFG was duly established, and cross-party membership of five councillors appointed. The BPG decided that Chairman David Britton should act as Chairman of the TFG.
- 1.3 The TFG met on 10 November. Members in attendance were:
 - David Britton (Ch)
 - Jay Mercer
 - Simon Oakley
 - Brian Quinn
- 1.4 At its meeting, the Chairman first invited the Group to consider a written submission from Cllr Natalie Pudloff (Northgate & West Green), and the extent to which her comments had been addressed within the draft consultation response.
- 1.5 The Group received a comprehensive presentation on the draft consultation response. Officers answered questions raised by the members about a range of technical matters. Subjects covered included:
 - Demand forecasts
 - Project delivery timeline
 - The Development Consent Order Process
 - Role of the County Council
 - Need/alternatives
 - Infrastructure needs
 - Impacts
 - Landscape/Townscape/Visual
 - Ecology and Nature Conservation
 - Traffic and Transport
 - Air Quality
 - Noise and Vibration
 - Climate Change and Carbon
 - Socio-economic
 - Health/Wellbeing/Recreation
- 1.6 Members scrutinised the evidence and the assumptions within both the consultation documentation, and the authority's proposed response.
- 1.7 At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chairman summarised the high-level recommendations, for agreement by the Group. These were further refined and agreed, following the meeting, via email.
- 1.8 The Chairman verbally presented the Group's recommendations at the public meeting of the Cabinet on 16 November, which informed Cabinet's deliberations ahead of the consultation response being approved, upon the rise of Cabinet.

- 1.9 The Group also raised points concerning relatively minor details, which were passed to the officers for their separate consideration. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change (on behalf of the Cabinet) responded to the Group's recommendations (as identified below).

2 Recommendations and Responses

- a) The Group was in broad agreement with the thrust of the draft consultation response and recognises the significant economic benefits Gatwick brings to West Sussex.
- Cabinet Member (CM) response: Support welcomed.
- b) The lack of evidence underpinning the consultation proposal is disappointing, as is the reliability of the evidence that was included. For example:
- The air quality assessment – the lack of base data and quality of the modelling.
 - The socio-economic assessment - the number and type of jobs created and benefits to the local economy.
 - The traffic and transport assessment – there are no suggested impacts beyond the need for highway improvements in the immediate Gatwick area.
- CM response: Agreed. The response identifies where there are concerns about the NRP because of poor quality, incomplete, late, or missing evidence.
- c) Many of the assumptions are optimistic and may prove to be unrealistic. For example:
- The proposal relies upon the implementation of strategic road and rail improvements by third parties – but these might not be forthcoming.
 - Planned housing development might not all be realised
- CM response: Agreed. The response identifies where there are concerns about the assumptions that GAL has made.
- d) More detail is needed on the forecast impact of the Northern Runway proposals, over and above forecast impacts resulting from best use being made of the main runway. For example, the nature and duration of the job opportunities forecast to be created.
- CM response: Agreed. The response identifies where GAL need to identify the 'without project' impacts separate from the 'with project' impacts.
- e) In respect of paragraph 2.40, Cabinet should consider whether the words "...cannot support the Northern Runway Project..." are appropriate, or if more neutral wording might be appropriate at this stage, given the highlighted concerns. The Group did not agree a view on this issue.
- CM response: The Cabinet considered the wording "*The County Council cannot support the Northern Runway Project because there are a number of*

matters of significant concern that need to be satisfactorily addressed by GAL” to be consistent with the Notice of Motion to County Council on 22 October 2021.

- f) The Group was disappointed that GAL seemed to be adopting a ‘do minimum’ approach to mitigation i.e. only seeking to do what is required by statute rather than being an exemplar and looking to go over and above the statutory minimum, in line with the Government’s direction of travel (e.g. in respect of ecological enhancements).
 - CM response: Agreed. The County Council will encourage GAL to take a positive and proactive approach to the mitigation of adverse impacts, including delivering over and above the statutory minimum.
- g) The consultation response should highlight WSCC’s view (as expressed in the Full Council motion) on the safeguarded land to the south of the existing runway (the need for the Government to remove the requirement to safeguard this land).
 - CM response: The Notice of Motion requires representations to be made to the Government, not to GAL, about the safeguarded land. Furthermore, the Cabinet considered that the suggested addition would complicate the clear message to GAL in Paragraph 2.42 of the decision report (which requests that GAL does not pursue a southern runway).
- h) GAL needs to consider and report on the worst-case scenarios. This will ensure that the scheme is ‘future-proofed’ in the event the assumptions underpinning the proposal are not met/delivered.
 - CM response: Agreed. The response identifies where GAL need to identify the worst-case scenario and ensure that adverse impacts are fully mitigated.

3 Other options considered (and reasons for not proposing)

- 3.1 Given the timing of the consultation window, the establishment of a TFG was deemed to be the most effective means of undertaking scrutiny of the consultation response, the scrutiny of which being considered essential due to the far-reaching significance of the NRP.

4 Consultation, engagement and advice

- 4.1 Advice was provided by officers from Planning Services and a local member submitted views, which were also considered by the Group.

5 Finance

- 5.1 The cost of the TFG was met from existing service budgets.

David Britton

Chairman, Northern Runway Consultation Task and Finish Group

Contact Officer: Ninesh Edwards: ninesh.edwards@westsussex.gov.uk

Appendices

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

Background papers

[Gatwick Northern Runway - Approval of consultation response \(CAB09 21/22\)](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

CHESC Scrutiny Task and Finish Group

Northern Runway Consultation

Terms of Reference

Scope

Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) are undertaking a public consultation on a proposal to bring the Northern Runway into routine use for certain flight departures. The consultation closes on 1 December 2021.

The Northern Runway Project is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) requiring a Development Consent Order (DCO) from the Secretary of State (rather than planning permission from the local planning authority). The County Council is a statutory consultee in the DCO process; one of its responsibilities is to respond to the consultation.

Accordingly, consideration is being given to the likely significant impacts of the proposal and whether those impacts are considered to be positive, negative, or neutral. Consideration is also being given to whether further work could be undertaken by GAL, including mitigation measures, to address issues identified as being significantly negative.

A Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee (CHESC) Task and Finish Group (TFG) will meet informally to act as a critical friend prior to approval of the consultation response.

Methodology

The TFG will meet once, during w/c 8 November. Officers will present the draft consultation response and assist members in understanding the assessment of the proposal and the conclusions that have been reached.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chairman will summarise the Group's main recommendations for the agreement of the Group, and note any dissenting views.

Timetable

The draft consultation response will be sent to the TFG in w/c 1 November, provisionally on 4 November.

The proposal is for the TFG to meet once, in w/c 8 November.

The Cabinet plans to approve the County Council's response to the consultation when it meets publicly on 16 November.

The Chairman will address this Cabinet meeting, to inform Cabinet's deliberations on the findings of the TFG prior to the decision being taken.

Membership

David Britton (Ch)
Simon Oakley
Carson Albury
John Milne
Brian Quinn

Reporting arrangements

Given the preparation timeline, the Chairman will report directly to the Cabinet at its meeting on 16 November, but the Group's final recommendations will be published on the agenda of the next convenient formal CHESC meeting on 19 January 2022.

**Key decision: Not applicable
Unrestricted**

Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee**19 January 2022****On-Street Parking Management Strategy Task and Finish Group****Report by the Chairman of the Task and Finish Group**

Summary

The strategic management of on-street parking remains important for the County Council as the level of development and number of vehicles in West Sussex continues to increase.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport has taken a decision to introduce a revised policy framework and parking management programme to replace the County Council's Road Space Audit Programme and associated decision-making process.

The Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee's Business Planning Group set up a Task and Finish Group (TFG) to consider the proposals and make recommendations to the Cabinet Member ahead of the decision.

This report outlines the discussion that took place during the TFG meeting and the recommendations that were submitted to the Cabinet Member for consideration.

Focus for Scrutiny

The Committee is asked to consider the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group, which informed the Cabinet Member's On-Street Parking Management decision, published on 22 December 2021.

The Committee is further asked to consider the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport's response.

Proposal**1 Background and context**

- 1.1 In December 2018, the then Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure considered revised principles for managing on-street parking in West Sussex and agreed a revision to the decision making process for Road Space Audits (RSA) as well as a strategic parking management plan programme to implement on-street parking controls in various locations across the county.
- 1.2 In March 2020, members of the Environment and Communities Scrutiny Committee (ECSC) were updated on the progress of the Strategic Parking Management Plan programme and subsequently raised concerns about whether there was the staffing capacity to deliver the programme and manage the

expectations of the community. It was resolved that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure should review the RSA principles as well as the programme to confirm it remained deliverable, with regard to its resourcing and funding.

- 1.3 The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport announced an intention to publish a new Parking Management Strategy in December 2021. In response to this the Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee's Business Planning Group set up a Task and Finish Group (TFG) to scrutinise the proposals and make recommendations to the Cabinet Member ahead of the decision.
- 1.4 The TFG met on 2 November 2021 and comprised of Councillors Carson Albury, Andrew Baldwin, Caroline Baxter, John Milne and Simon Oakley. Simon Oakley was appointed as the Chairman of the TFG.

2 TFG Discussion

- 2.1 At the TFG, members were given a presentation by Miles Davy, Parking Manager, and Andy Ekinsmyth, Head of Transport and Network Operations, which outlined the current parking processes and the details of the proposed strategy.
- 2.2 The TFG members spoke through the proposals and the details of the new strategy. Concerns were raised where the strategy stipulates that all schemes were required to achieve a 50% response rate to a consultation, and of those responses 50% needed to be in support. Members felt that 40% would be a sensible level to ensure that schemes would progress, and also proposed further caveats to low response rates that would allow local councillors to comment on the proposals and potentially recommend them for progression.
- 2.3 The catchment areas for consultations needed clarity and how they would cover roads (including private roads) in the area and other stakeholders such as landlords and business owners.
- 2.4 The TFG members also felt that greater clarity was needed on how the new proposals would interact with existing schemes and other reviews not covered by the proposed Parking Management Strategy. It should also be established how the new policy would interact with other existing processes such as Community Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs), Community Highway Scheme and the existing CPZ Review processes. The TFG members agreed it was important that there were no gaps in the process.
- 2.5 Members felt that the rise in electric vehicles may need to be considered as part of the policy, along with the requests for dropped curbs.

3 Recommendations and Responses

- 3.1 The Group agreed on the following recommendations that were to be submitted to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport on 15 November 2021. The Cabinet Member responses are included below after each recommendation.
 - a) Clarity needs to be provided on the existing parking scheme designs and reviews that are not covered by the proposed New Parking Management Strategy. Any impact from the new Strategy on existing designs should be made clear.

- Cabinet Member (CM) response: The initial three-year programme for CPZ development is outlined in Appendix B and the main report (section 2.2) outlines the reasons why particular projects have been included in the programme.

It is proposed that the projects forming the initial programme would not be subject to the initial trigger stage, the assessment stage and the prioritisation stage, as they are either already underway or are long-standing priorities. However, any other project would be subject these stages before it could be added to the programme.

Tier 1 projects would also not be subject to the 'consultation thresholds' outlined in the new framework. This is because Chichester and Horsham are reviews of existing CPZs and Manor Royal is at the final consultation stage. Tier 2 projects are classified as 'new' and therefore would be subject to the consultation thresholds.

- b) The proposed 50% thresholds are considered too high, with 40% being considered a more appropriate aspirational level for both overall and in favour responses. Caveats should be included in the policy to allow consideration of schemes with a lower response, with judgement from local County Councillors to be part of the consideration throughout the process. Flexibility to take into account specific circumstances is considered necessary.

- CM response: It is not considered necessary to lower the aspirational thresholds as long as the CPZ Policy Framework allows consideration of schemes with a lower response rate and/or other specific circumstances. It should also be stressed that as the Policy Framework/Programme will be reviewed regularly by the Director for Highways, Transport and Planning, there will be an opportunity to change the aspirational thresholds, based on the actual response rates from 'in-progress' schemes. So, for example, if initial rates are particularly low, the aspirational threshold could subsequently be lowered to 40%.

The framework has therefore been re-drafted as follows:

'Accepting that unanimity is extremely unlikely, a consultation response rate of 50% will therefore be the aspiration.

Where the initial response rate is lower than 50% or where less than 50% of those who responded supported the idea of a CPZ and its progression, the responses may be judged on their own merits and the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning will decide whether to make an exception and allow the project to progress to the next stage. As part of this decision making process, consultation will take place with the Cabinet Member and the relevant County Councillors.'

- c) Clarity is needed for consultation catchment areas and how these relate to roads (including private roads) in the area and other stakeholders such as landlords and business owners.
- CM response: A consultation catchment area (or 'study area') would consist of those roads initially forming part of the submission to WSCC as well as some peripheral roads, to account for potential displacement etc. The final extent of the study area would be agreed with the relevant

County Councillors before any engagement with residents/businesses begun. Engagement would primarily consist of letters being sent to all individual properties, including commercial premises, within the study area and including private roads.

Residents/businesses in private roads would be advised, as part of this initial engagement, of the options for future parking management. For example, WSCC could consider yellow lines in private roads for safety/access purposes but not permit controls or pay and display facilities.

Letters would be sent to individual properties and thereby the current occupants/residents would be expected to respond. Landlords are not considered to be residents/occupants of a property and would not be contacted separately. Landlords and business owners would be classified as 'non-residents' but would still be eligible to apply for particular types of permit such as Traders Permits or Visitors Permits.

- d) The Strategy needs to include consideration for dropped curb and kerbside EV charging requests.

- CM response: It is not considered necessary to include specific information on Vehicle Cross Overs (VCOs) in the CPZ framework as WSCCs existing VCO policy already sets out an approach regarding requests for EV charging facilities. Any potential changes to this approach should therefore be considered in the context of the VCO policy rather than the CPZ framework.

Officers will ensure that the TFG are consulted on any potential changes to the VCO policy.

- e) The relationship between this policy and the Community TRO, Community Highway Scheme and existing CPZ Review processes needs to be considered against the five-road threshold limit to ensure there are no gaps in the process. Transitions from one policy to another need to be considered, taking into account the Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee's recommendations regarding the Community TRO process arising from its 24 November meeting.

- CM response: It is accepted that the CPZ framework can be amended in order to clarify the relationship between CPZs and other TROs. The framework has therefore been re-drafted as follows:

'It is also preferable that a submission refers to an area comprised of at least 5 roads, all of which must be public highway, that are either adjoining or in close proximity. In the majority of cases, it would be inefficient for the County Council to consider taking action in a smaller number of isolated roads as such schemes could have a disproportionate cost in terms of enforcement and administration, may create expectations that the Council is unable to meet and have limited traffic or parking management value for the surrounding area.

Operational guidance issued to Local Authorities via the Traffic Management Act (2004) states that a typical CPZ (sub-zone) should not exceed 12 roads so a submission that refers to an area comprised of between 5 and 12 roads is considered most appropriate. Submissions

comprised of less than 5 roads may still be considered in exceptional circumstances but a submission from an individual household or road will not trigger an investigation.

In cases where a request for a CPZ has been submitted by an individual household or road, or has no County Councillor and Local Council support, or has not been considered an exceptional circumstance, representatives will be advised to obtain further evidence and support from residents in surrounding roads in order to submit another request. Alternatively, they may be referred to the County Council's Community TRO or Community Highways Scheme application process if it is considered that access and/or safety in a single road or small number of roads could be improved by a physical measure, such as build outs, or the introduction of waiting restrictions such as yellow lines or another restriction that does not involve the use of on-street permits.'

- f) Parish/Neighbourhood Councils need to be included in the trigger and consultation stages to ensure involvement of the local representative body.
- CM response: A District, Borough, Parish, Town, City or Neighbourhood Council will be contacted as standard practice in any CPZ consultation exercise.

The framework has also been re-drafted as follows:

'Evidence of initial support from the relevant County Councillor(s) and representative(s) of a 'Local Council', including a District, Borough, Parish, Town, City or Neighbourhood Council, will also be required as part of a submission.'

- g) The scoring level assessment should not use actual numbers of responses as a measure, due to the different demographics in each area.

- CM response: The framework has been re-drafted as follows:

Level of Support (Resident/Stakeholder)	Less than 10% of the total households form part of the initial submission	10-20% of the total households form part of the initial submission	20-50% of the total households form part of the initial submission and/or identified in local policy	Over 50% of the total households form part of the initial submission and/or identified in local policy

4 Other options considered (and reasons for not proposing)

- 4.1 Given the timing of the decision, the establishment of a scrutiny TFG was deemed to be the most effective means of undertaking scrutiny of the decision before it was required to be taken.

5 Consultation, engagement and advice

- 5.1 Highways Officers delivered a presentation during the TFG and also assisted members with responses and information to all queries.

6 Finance

6.1 The cost of the TFG was met from existing service budgets.

Cllr Simon Oakley

Chairman of the Task and Finish Group

Contact Officer: Ninesh Edwards, Senior Advisor, 033 022 22542 -
ninesh.edwards@westsussex.gov.uk

Appendices

Appendix A – Terms of Reference

Background papers

None

Scrutiny Task and Finish Group

On-Street Parking Management Strategy

Terms of Reference

Scope

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport intends to adopt a new On-Street Parking Management Policy Framework, in 2021. The framework will include rules for the consideration, implementation, review and removal of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ); the governance process relating to individual proposals; and incorporate an initial three-year programme for CPZ development.

The Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee (CHESC) has agreed to establish a Task and Finish Group (TFG) to provide County Councillor input to the Policy Framework preparation.

Methodology

The TFG will meet once. Members will be briefed on how on-street parking management is undertaken currently, before learning about the present proposals and being given the opportunity to help shape these. Further details will be sent to all Members in advance of the meeting.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chairman will summarise the Group's main recommendations for the agreement of the Group. However, all comments made by the Group during the course of the session will be passed back to the Cabinet Member by service officers, for their consideration.

It is proposed that the TFG focus on the key revisions to the framework. The key revisions are;

- The County Council, rather than actively seek out areas where CPZs may be introduced, will maintain a responsive position to parking problems and will be guided by concerns and expressions of interest from communities before committing to undertaking CPZ investigations.
- The consideration of new CPZs will consist of three stages, which are the trigger stage, the assessment stage and the prioritisation stage.
- In order to manage community expectations as well as its own resources, the County Council will maintain a three-year CPZ programme, enabling three projects to be progressed at any one time. The Director of Highways, Transport and Planning will be responsible for reviewing the programme, further to consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport;
- For the initial public consultation and outline design phases of a project, an overall response rate of 50% or higher will be expected/required. Of those who respond, over 50% will be required to be in support of the project, including it progressing to the next stage. Should a project not achieve these figures, it may be removed from the programme and another project promoted.
- The responses from a statutory/final design consultation will be shared with County Councillors and then all comments will be reported to the Director of

Highways, Transport and Planning, who will make a decision on whether to implement the CPZ. There is no expected response rate or a required level of support at this stage.

- Reviews of established CPZs will also consider new restrictions in a particular road if there is evidence of displacement and if over 50% of residents in that road support the introduction of further parking restrictions.

Timetable

The proposal is for the TFG to meet once on 2 November 2021.

Membership

The Chairman will be appointed by the Group at the outset of its first meeting.

Membership currently comprises:

Carson Albury
Andrew Baldwin
Caroline Baxter
John Milne
Simon Oakley

Reporting arrangements

Given the preparation timeline, the TFG will report directly to the Cabinet Member, but its final recommendations will be published on the agenda of the next convenient formal meeting of CHESC, likely in January 2021. The Chairman of the TFG will be expected to summarise the discussion and outcomes to the Committee.



Forward Plan of Key Decisions

The County Council must give at least 28 days' notice of all key decisions to be taken by councillors or officers. The Plan describes these proposals and the month in which the decisions are to be taken over a four-month period. Decisions are categorised according to [Cabinet Member](#) portfolios.

The most important decisions will be taken by the Cabinet. Due to the continuing public health measures, there will be limited public access to the meeting. Admission is by ticket only, bookable in advance via: democratic.services@westsussex.gov.uk. The meetings will be available to watch online via our [webcasting website](#). The [schedule of monthly Cabinet meetings](#) is available on the website. The Forward Plan is updated regularly and key decisions can be taken on any day in the month if they are not taken at Cabinet meetings. The [Plan](#) is available on the website. [Published decisions](#) are also available via the website.

A key decision is one which:

- Involves expenditure or savings of £500,000 or more (except treasury management); and/or
- Will have a significant effect on communities in two or more electoral divisions in terms of how services are provided.

The following information is provided for each entry in the Forward Plan:

Decision	A summary of the proposal.
Decision By	Who will take the decision - if the Cabinet, it will be taken at a Cabinet meeting in public.
Date added	The date the proposed decision was added to the Forward Plan.
Month	The decision will be taken on any working day in the month stated. If a Cabinet decision, it will be taken at the Cabinet meeting scheduled in that month.
Consultation/Representations	How views and representations about the proposal will be considered or the proposal scrutinised, including dates of Scrutiny Committee meetings.
Background Documents	The documents containing more information about the proposal and how to obtain them (via links on the website version of the Forward Plan). Hard copies are available on request from the decision contact.
Author	The contact details of the decision report author
Contact	Who in Democratic Services you can contact about the entry

Finance, assets, performance and risk management

Each month the Cabinet Member for Finance and Property reviews the Council's budget position and may take adjustment decisions. A similar monthly review of Council property and assets is carried out and may lead to decisions about them. These are noted in the Forward Plan as 'rolling decisions'.

Each month the Cabinet will consider the Council's performance against its planned outcomes and in connection with a register of corporate risk. Areas of particular significance may be considered at the scheduled Cabinet meetings.

Significant proposals for the management of the Council's budget and spending plans will be dealt with at a scheduled Cabinet meeting and shown in the Plan as strategic budget options.

For questions contact Katherine De La Mora on 033 022 22535, email katherine.delamora@westsussex.gov.uk.

Published: 7 January 2022

Forward Plan Summary

Summary of all forthcoming executive decisions in Cabinet Member portfolio order

Page No	Decision Maker	Subject Matter	Date
5	Director of Environment and Public Protection	Award of design and build contract at the Halewick Lane battery storage site	January 2022
5	Director of Highways, Transport and Planning	Maintenance of Pagham Harbour Local Nature Reserve	January 2022
6	Director of Environment and Public Protection	Award of Demand Side Response Management contract at the Halewick Lane Battery Storage site and Westhampnett Solar and Battery Farm	January 2022
7	Director of Environment and Public Protection	Procurement and Award: Street Sweeping Contract	February 2022
7	Director of Environment and Public Protection	Extension of Refuse Derived Fuel Contract	February 2022
8	Director of Highways, Transport and Planning	Adur and Worthing Councils Agency Agreement for Parking	January 2022
9	Director of Highways, Transport and Planning	A284 Lyminster bypass (north) - Construction Contract Award	January 2022
9	Director of Highways, Transport and Planning	Endorsement: West Sussex Public Bus Service Procurement via Surrey County Council Dynamic Purchasing System	January 2022
10	Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport	Future Ways of Working re Community Traffic Regulation Orders	January 2022
11	Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport	A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor Enhancement Scheme	January 2022
12	Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport	Highways and Transport Delivery Programmes 2022/2023	January 2022
12	Director of Highways, Transport and Planning	Award of Highway Improvement Contracts - phase 2 (Lots 4, 5 & 6)	January 2022
13	Director of Highways, Transport and Planning	Award of Contract for Highways Core Professional Services	January 2022
14	Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport	A24 Findon to Findon Valley cycleway/walkway scheme	January 2022
15	Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport	West Sussex Transport Plan	February 2022
15	Director of Highways, Transport and Planning	Delivery of the Ash Dieback Action Plan - Contract Award	February 2022
16	Executive Director Place Services	Endorsement of Procurement and Award of Contract Manor Royal Highways Improvement Phase 2	January 2022

Environment and Climate Change

Director of Environment and Public Protection

Award of design and build contract at the Halewick Lane battery storage site	
<p>The Halewick Lane Battery Storage project proposes the re-development of the previously derelict North Sompting Waste Management Site into an income generating battery storage project.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Environment delegated authority to the Director of Environment and Public Protection to approve the design and build contract award.</p> <p>When the procurement process has concluded, the Director of Environment and Public Protection will be asked to award the design and build contract.</p>	
Decision by	Steve Read - Director of Environment and Public Protection
Date added	19 August 2021
Month	January 2022
Consultation/Representations	<p>Director of Law and Assurance Director of Finance and Support Services</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Director of Environment and Public Protection, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	David Robinson Tel: 033 022 26995
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Director of Highways, Transport and Planning

Maintenance of Pagham Harbour Local Nature Reserve	
<p>Pagham Harbour Local Nature Reserve (PHLNR) receives over 200,000 visits per annum and is an internationally important site for wildlife as well as an important amenity for local communities. The County Council has a statutory duty to ensure PHLNR is maintained as a protected environment.</p> <p>On 1 February 2012, the County Council entered into a 99-year lease with the RSPB and a Service Level Agreement for maintenance services.</p> <p>The current Service Level Agreement with the RSPB expires on 31 January 2022. The Director of Highways, Transport and Planning will be asked to award a replacement Service Contract commencing on 1 February 2022 for a period of 5 years, with the option to extend for a further 5 years.</p>	
Decision by	Matt Davey - Director of Highways, Transport and Planning

Agenda Item 8

Date added	30 September 2021
Month	January 2022
Consultation/ Representations	Director of Law and Assurance Director of Finance and Support Services Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Neil Vigar Tel: 033 022 26698
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Director of Environment and Public Protection

Award of Demand Side Response Management contract at the Halewick Lane Battery Storage site and Westhampnett Solar and Battery Farm	
<p>The appointed Demand Side Response (DSR) Management operator acts on behalf of the County Council to manage and create revenue from the County Council's battery assets by engaging in the DSR markets with the National Grid, selling energy to create revenue and support grid stability.</p> <p>The current contract expires on 31 March 2022 and a procurement process for a new supplier will be undertaken through the Crown Commercial Services RM3824 – Heat Networks and Electricity Generation Assets (HELGA) framework.</p> <p>Upon the conclusion of the procurement process, the Director for Environment and Public Protection will be asked to award a Demand Side Response management contract at the Halewick Lane Battery Storage site and Westhampnett Solar and Battery Farm.</p>	
Decision by	Steve Read - Director of Environment and Public Protection
Date added	23 September 2021
Month	January 2022
Consultation/ Representations	Director of Law and Assurance Director of Finance and Support Services Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Director of Environment and Public Protection, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	David Robinson Tel: 033 022 26995

Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052
----------------	---------------------------------

Director of Environment and Public Protection

Procurement and Award: Street Sweeping Contract	
<p>In October 2017 the County Council entered into a contract with Biffa Waste Services Limited for the provision of street sweeping services (reception into facility, recycling, treatment and disposal). The three-year contract and its two-year extension will come to an end on 01 October 2022.</p> <p>The Director of Environment and Public Protection will be asked to endorse the procurement process for the provision of street sweeping services (reception into facility, recycling, treatment and disposal) from 01 October 2022 and award of the contract based on the most advantageous bid after technical and financial evaluation.</p>	
Decision by	Steve Read - Director of Environment and Public Protection
Date added	7 January 2022
Month	February 2022
Consultation/Representations	District and Borough Councils Representation can be made via the officer contact.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Gareth Rollings Tel: 033 022 24161
Contact	Judith Shore Tel. 033 022 26052

Director of Environment and Public Protection

Extension of Refuse Derived Fuel Contract
<p>In February 2017, the Cabinet Member for Finance (on behalf of the Cabinet Member for Residents' Services) delegated authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Infrastructure and Environment to award the Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) Contract. Decision RS14(16/7).</p> <p>The RDF Contract was procured with an initial contract term of five years with an option to extend the RDF Contract in minimum increments of whole calendar years, for up to a further five calendar years.</p> <p>The initial five-year term is not due to expire until April 2023. West Sussex County Council can extend the RDF contract on the same terms and conditions and there is a contractual requirement to inform the contractor, no later than 12 months prior to expiry, whether or not the contract will be extended.</p> <p>The Director of Environment and Public Protection will be asked to extend the RDF Contract by 12 months from April 2023.</p>

Decision by	Steve Read - Director of Environment and Public Protection
Date added	7 January 2022
Month	February 2022
Consultation/ Representations	Representation can be made via the officer contact.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Gareth Rollings Tel: 033 022 24161
Contact	Judith Shore Tel. 033 022 26052

Highways and Transport

Director of Highways, Transport and Planning

Adur and Worthing Councils Agency Agreement for Parking	
<p>The current Agency Agreement with Adur and Worthing Councils for the provision of parking services: <i>Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) services and operational management of the Worthing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)</i> is due to expire on 31 March 2022. Approval is sought to continue with the existing arrangements by way of putting in place a new agreement, set to commence from 1 April 2022, for a period of five years.</p> <p>As part of the process of agreeing a new contract, the opportunity has been taken to make some minor improvements and variations so that it best reflects current working practices, not only in Adur and Worthing but across the County.</p> <p>The Director of Highways, Transport and Planning will be asked to agree a new Agency Agreement with Adur and Worthing Councils for a five-year period until 31 March 2027 for the procurement, management and operation of Civil Parking Enforcement in Adur and Worthing and operational management of the Worthing Controlled Parking Zone, under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Authorities (Arrangements for the Discharge of Functions) (England) Regulations 2000/2851.</p>	
Decision by	Matt Davey - Director of Highways, Transport and Planning
Date added	11 October 2021
Month	January 2022
Consultation/ Representations	<p>Director of Law and Assurance Director of Finance and Support Services Adur and Worthing Councils Parking Services and Legal Teams</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the</p>

	decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Miles Davy Tel: 033 022 26688
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Director of Highways, Transport and Planning

A284 Lyminster bypass (north) - Construction Contract Award	
<p>The A284 Lyminster Bypass is an important north-south link between the A27 at Crossbush and Littlehampton and the County Council is delivering the northern section. Jackson's Civil Engineering was awarded the design and build contract and the scheme was granted planning permission on 26 March 2019.</p> <p>The Compulsory Purchase Order was confirmed by the Secretary of State on 16 September 2021 following a Public Inquiry.</p> <p>The Department for Transport has previously approved the Outline Business Case and will be asked to contribute additional funding on review and approval of the Full Business Case, to be submitted in December 2021.</p> <p>As the final stage of the scheme, the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning will be asked to award the construction contract for the A284 Lyminster bypass (north).</p>	
Decision by	Matt Davey - Director of Highways, Transport and Planning
Date added	21 October 2021
Month	January 2022
Consultation/Representations	<p>Director of Law and Assurance Director of Finance and Support Services</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Mark Martin Tel: 033 022 25922
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Director of Highways, Transport and Planning

Endorsement: West Sussex Public Bus Service Procurement via Surrey County Council Dynamic Purchasing System

In 2017, following decision [HT01 15-16](#), the County Council joined the Surrey County Council (SCC) Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) to procure socially necessary bus services in West Sussex. The current DPS is due to end on 31 January 2022. SCC intends to extend the DPS in the light of the ongoing pandemic-related market situation and it is proposed that West Sussex County Council continues to use the SCC DPS.

The Director of Highways, Transport & Planning will be asked to agree to extend the current arrangement to procure socially necessary bus services for West Sussex via the SCC DPS.

Decision by	Matt Davey - Director of Highways, Transport and Planning
Date added	30 December 2021
Month	January 2022
Consultation/ Representations	West Sussex County Council Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport; Surrey County Council Representation can be made via the officer contact.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Bill Leath Tel: 033 022 25438
Contact	Judith Shore Tel. 033 022 26052

Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

Future Ways of Working re Community Traffic Regulation Orders	
<p>Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are legal orders that support the enforceable restrictions and movements on the public highway. In West Sussex, requests for TROs are received from communities to deal with matters such as speed limits, parking controls and moving offences, for example width restrictions and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) restrictions. These requests are known as Community TROs.</p> <p>Community TRO requests were previously considered and prioritised by County Local Committees after they had been technically assessed using an agreed framework. The Cabinet Member was then able to add a further 15 TROs to the programme resulting in a programme of up to 38 Community TROs per year.</p> <p>A review has been commissioned to examine the way Community TRO requests are assessed, prioritised and delivered to ensure it is fit for purpose and responds the community demand.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport will be asked to consider and approve recommendations for future ways of working with regard to Community TROs.</p>	
Decision by	Cllr J Dennis - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport
Date added	1 December 2021
Month	January 2022

Consultation/ Representations	Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee – 24 November 2021 Representation can be made via the officer contact.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Charlotte Weller Tel: 033 022 26001
Contact	Judith Shore Tel. 033 022 26052

Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor Enhancement Scheme	
<p>The A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor enhancement scheme was identified by the County Council as a priority scheme in the Strategic Transport Investment Programme in 2019/20. It is considered by Transport for the South East one of the top ten priority schemes in the South East.</p> <p>The proposed scheme involves improvement to a series of key junctions along the corridor, including junction capacity, non-motorised and bus users' infrastructure provision and was subject to a public consultation in summer 2021.</p> <p>The Department for Transport (DfT) has approved the Strategic Outline Business Case submission and the next stage of the scheme preparation is to prepare and submit an Outline Business Case (OBC) to the DfT.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport will be asked to approve the budget allocation and to agree the arrangements for the preparation and submission of the OBC to the DfT.</p>	
Decision by	Cllr J Dennis - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport
Date added	1 December 2021
Month	January 2022
Consultation/ Representations	Public consultation undertaken in summer 2021 Representation can be made via the officer contact.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Hiong Ching Hii Tel: 033 022 22636
Contact	Judith Shore Tel. 033 022 26052

Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

Highways and Transport Delivery Programmes 2022/2023

The Highway and Transport Delivery Programmes identify capital highways infrastructure maintenance and transport improvement schemes for delivery during 2022/23 and beyond. Capital funding for the Delivery Programmes is predominantly received from the Government for roads maintenance (the Local Highway Maintenance Block), and transport improvements (the Integrated Transport Block) supported by additional funding from developer agreements and contributions.

The indicative forward programmes for Highway Infrastructure Maintenance, Local Transport Improvements (LTIP) and Community Highway Schemes (CHS), have informed the 2022/23 Highways and Transport Delivery Programmes. These provide transparency of the maintenance and improvement investment needs and the funding priorities prepared and selected for review and approval in this decision.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport will be asked to -

1. Approve the Highway and Transport Delivery Programmes 2022-23; and
2. delegate authority to the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning to adjust the 2022/23 Delivery Programmes to take account of budgetary pressures and any changes in priority arising as a result of network availability, emergencies, or other operational circumstances, in consultation with the Cabinet Member.

It should be noted that the above will be subject to confirmation of funding at a Full Council meeting. Also, that the timetable for confirmation of central government funding is not currently known.

Decision by	Cllr J Dennis - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport
Date added	15 September 2021
Month	January 2022
Consultation/ Representations	Director of Law and Assurance Director of Finance and Support Services Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Gary Rustell Tel: 033 022 26397
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Director of Highways, Transport and Planning

Award of Highway Improvement Contracts - phase 2 (Lots 4, 5 & 6)

West Sussex County Council is a designated Highways Authority under the Highways Act 1980 and has a duty to maintain highways maintainable at public expense.

In [January 2019](#), the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure approved the commencement of a procurement process for a new Highways Maintenance Term Contract or set of contracts and delegated authority to the Director of Highways and Transport to finalise the terms of and award the Highway Maintenance Term Contract, or set of contracts at the conclusion of the procurement process.

In November 2019, the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning [appointed contractors](#) to a four-year Framework Agreement to commence 1 April 2020 for capital works for highways.

Lots 4, 5 and 6 (carriageways, footways and infrastructure works) are procured annually and a formal procurement process will be undertaken in the autumn for the delivery of highway works in 2022-23.

At the conclusion of the procurement process, the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning will be asked to award the highway improvement contracts - phase 2.

Decision by	Matt Davey - Director of Highways, Transport and Planning
Date added	15 September 2021
Month	January 2022
Consultation/ Representations	Director of Law and Assurance Director of Finance and Support Services Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Gary Rustell Tel: 033 022 26397
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Director of Highways, Transport and Planning

Award of Contract for Highways Core Professional Services	
<p>The supply of professional design services and client support is critical to ensuring the County Council can meet its statutory duty to maintain the highways and to ensure that, in constructing new roads, the authority takes such measures as appropriate to reduce the possibilities of accidents. The contracts awarded for these services in 2016 are due to end in 2022 and new contracts are required.</p> <p>A competitive procurement process will be undertaken and, when concluded, the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning will be asked to award the contract for Highways Core Professional Services in accordance with the County Council's Standing Orders on Procurement and Contracts.</p>	
Decision by	Matt Davey - Director of Highways, Transport and Planning
Date added	5 October 2021

Month	January 2022
Consultation/ Representations	Executive Director for Place Services Director of Finance and Support Services Director of Law and Assurance Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Gary Rustell Tel: 033 022 26397
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

A24 Findon to Findon Valley cycleway/walkway scheme	
<p>The A24 Findon to Findon Valley cycleway/walkway scheme is a priority in the West Sussex Walking and Cycling Strategy 2016 – 2026.</p> <p>In November 2020, the County Council was awarded £2.35m through the Department for Transport's Active Travel Fund to support the implementation of walking and cycling schemes in the county. Proposed improvements along the A24 formed part of the funding allocation.</p> <p>Public engagement exercises on the 2km-long scheme took place in spring and in summer 2021.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport will be asked to approve the route for the scheme including the proposed on-road route between May Tree Avenue and Cissbury Avenue.</p>	
Decision by	Cllr J Dennis - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport
Date added	22 December 2021
Month	January 2022
Consultation/ Representations	Public engagement in spring and summer 2021 Local elected representatives Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Andy Ekinsmyth Tel: 033 022 26687

Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052
----------------	---------------------------------

Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

West Sussex Transport Plan	
<p>The West Sussex Transport Plan (the County Council's main policy on transport and a statutory document) is being reviewed to update the County Council's strategic approach to investment in the transport network up to 2036.</p> <p>The new Transport Plan will build on the three previous Plans and take account of the current policy context and creation of new funding streams and strategic partners. The Transport Plan is also expected to build on the Local Plans prepared by the Local Planning Authorities which guide decision-making on new developments.</p> <p>Consultation on the Draft West Sussex Transport Plan took place between July and October 2021. Amendments are being made to the Transport Plan in response to consultation feedback and policy changes.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport will be asked to recommend the West Sussex Transport Plan for adoption at full council on 1 April 2022.</p>	
Decision by	Cllr J Dennis - Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport
Date added	15 December 2021
Month	February 2022
Consultation/ Representations	<p>Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee – 19 January 2022</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Darryl Hemmings Tel: 033 022 26437
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Director of Highways, Transport and Planning

Delivery of the Ash Dieback Action Plan - Contract Award
<p>Ash Dieback is a disease that is likely to kill 95% of the county's ash trees over the next 10–20 years and will have a major impact on the county's landscape, the wildlife it supports, other ecosystems that trees provide and climate change.</p> <p>It will also have a high impact on the county and the County Council, posing a significant risk to people, property (including schools) and the delivery of services (including highways). Therefore, a corporate Ash Dieback Action Plan has been prepared to manage the impact of the disease.</p>

Agenda Item 8

The aim of the Plan is to effectively address the risks presented by the impact of ash dieback (which will require a programme of reactive and proactive tree removal and replanting), conserve the ecosystems in which ash trees are found across the county, and prepare for a positive regeneration phase with a net biodiversity gain.

In September 2021, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport approved the commencement of a procurement process for a tree felling contract for Ash Dieback infected trees and delegated authority to the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning to award the contract to the successful bidder.

Upon the conclusion of the procurement process, the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning will be asked to appoint a tree felling contractor.

Decision by	Matt Davey - Director of Highways, Transport and Planning
Date added	20 December 2021
Month	February 2022
Consultation/ Representations	Director of Law and Assurance Director of Finance and Support Services Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Director of Highways, Transport and Planning, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Michele Hulme Tel: 033 022 23880
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Executive Director Place Services

Endorsement of Procurement and Award of Contract Manor Royal Highways Improvement Phase 2

Manor Royal Highways Improvement package is a key project within the approved Crawley Growth Programme that will provide sustainable transport infrastructure and highway upgrades to boost overall transport capacity and enable significant modal shift from car usage to bus, rail, cycling and walking alternatives. It will also deliver public realm transformation to upgrade the quality of the living environment and business environment and so attract higher quality new jobs and homes.

The project is to be delivered over two phases as set out in decision report [OKD74 20-21](#). Phase 2 includes highway alignment alteration for the Manor Royal bus lane, Metcalf Way traffic calming and Gatwick Road/ Manor Royal junction improvements

The Executive Director Place Services will be asked to endorse the procurement process and agree an award of contract for delivery of the Manor Royal Highways Project Phase 2.

Decision by	Lee Harris - Executive Director Place Services
Date added	1 November 2021
Month	January 2022
Consultation/ Representations	Local member. Cabinet Member for Support Services and Economy. Representation can be made via the officer contact.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Marie Ovenden Tel: 033 022 23854
Contact	Suzannah Hill Tel: 033 022 22551

This page is intentionally left blank

CHESC Work Programme 2021/22 – Future Meetings

Select Committee Meeting date	Subject/Theme	Objectives/Comments
19/01/22	Final report of the Northern Runway Project Consultation TFG	Including the Cabinet Member's response to the recommendations
	Final report of the On-Street Parking Management TFG	Including the Cabinet Member's response to the recommendations
24/02/22	Local Transport Plan	Prior to Cabinet Member's recommendation to adopt (ultimately adoption decision to be taken at April's County Council). Key decision preview
	Proposed Response to the National Highways Consultation on the A27 at Arundel	Key decision preview. Special/additional meeting
02/03/22	Managing Demand at HWRSSs	To preview a key decision on plans for the wider service, following the pilot.
	Enhanced Partnership Plan	The 2022/23 annual plan and bid for funding for the 1st year of our Bus Services Improvement Plan (BSIP). Decision Preview
	Highways Improvement Programme Review	Looking at the prioritisation process for the Highways Improvement Programme
	Review of Road Safety Strategy	Opportunity for the Committee to influence development of the Strategy, at an early stage in its preparation.
	Adoption of a Joint Waste Strategy for West Sussex and Strategic Options for Waste Disposal	<p>New duties for waste collection and disposal authorities outlined in the Government's Resources and waste Strategy are now set out in the Environment Act 2021. These require West Sussex Councils to take a fresh look at the strategy for managing household waste and recycling in the county in particular the management of food waste as separate stream.</p> <p>With district and borough councils responsible for collecting this material and the county council responsible for processing it, coordination of action is essential to ensure compliance and value for Council Taxpayers. The Joint Strategy aims to set out an agreed approach and timeframe.</p> <p>In addition, WSCC has investigated its options to ensure it can deliver appropriate waste processing solutions to meet the new duties, in particular the management of food waste as separate stream. The opportunity has been taken to review other aspects of the existing residual waste disposal arrangements to ensure value for money and fitness for purpose in relation to current and future challenges.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

CHESC Work Programme 2021/22 – Issues yet to be timetabled

Select Committee Meeting date	Subject/Theme	Objectives/Comments - is item linked to corporate priorities?
Spring 2022	Electric Vehicle Strategy Progress	At its November 2019 meeting, the Committee asked for an update once the Strategy had been in place for a year.
TBC	Highways and Transport Improvement Schemes	To review progress in harmonising the way different highways schemes are prioritised and processed
TBC	Active Travel Strategy (formerly Walking and Cycling Strategy)	Key decision preview
TBC	Highways Maintenance Contract Performance Report	
Spring 2022	National Highways Consultation - A27 Arundel	Format and timing TBC, dependent on final consultation dates
TBC	Traffic-free School Route	Progress report on their implementation
Autumn 2022	Transport for the South East Strategic Investment Plan Consultation	Preview of the proposed consultation response
Autumn 2022	Lane Rental	Progress report of a policy due for implementation in April 2022 to allow the authority to charge works promoters for the time that street and road works occupy the highway
Jun-22	Review of Speed Limit Policy	Scrutiny of the Road Safety TFG recommendations, following a review of the speed limit policy
TBC	Review of Road Safety Strategy	Opportunity for the Committee to influence development of the Strategy, at an early stage in its preparation.

CHESC Work Programme 2021/22 – Issues yet to be timetabled

BPG		
TBC	Third Sector, post C19	To assess the likelihood of community/voluntary networks and clubs being able to resume after lockdown, as this could have a potential impact on the services provided by the County Council and local communities, if they are unable to become active again.
Spring 2022	Digital Crime	Proposed community safety item for 2022
Autumn 2021	How the Communities Team responded to C19 emergency	
TBC	Library Service	How the service responded to C19, and the future strategy.
TBC	Trading Standards	TBC
Autumn 2022	Energy Strategy 2030	Progress report on implementation
TBC	Vehicle Removals	Changes to the Council's policy towards abandoned vehicles
TBC	Safer School Streets	

Decision on a call-in request relating to Cabinet Member Decision HT14 (21/22) - On-Street Parking Management in West Sussex

A request to call in the above proposed decision was received on 5th January 2022. The request was from County Councillors: Alison Cornell, Caroline Baxter, Chris Oxlade, Dawn Smith, Natalie Pudaloff, Brian Quinn, Henna Chowdhury, Rebecca Cooper, Kirsty Lord, Stuart Condie and Richard Cherry

Grounds for the Call-in request

The grounds for the call-in request are as follows

1. There are significant concerns about the proposed decision. Whilst it is acknowledged that a single meeting of an informal Task and Finish Group meeting took place, this was not held in public, meaning there has been no public scrutiny of this proposed decision, nor has there been any discussion in public by the Cabinet.

Whilst the proposed decision includes the Cabinet member's response to the recommendations made by the TFG, the members of the TFG did not have an opportunity prior to the publication of the proposed decision to consider or comment further on these.

In its introduction the decision states "The strategic management of on-street parking remains important for the County Council" it therefore stands to reason that if this is important for the County Council, it is important for our residents and therefore Councillors.

2. The way on-street parking is managed impacts the daily lives of residents in every community of West Sussex as well as having a major impact on the economy. In December 2018 the then Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure published a decision which introduced a programme of Road Space Audits (RSA) in various locations across the county. Since then some individual TROs have been unable to be progressed as a result of the road space audit programme. One example relates to Tangmere Road (situated close to Ifield railway station in Crawley) which scored highly on points regarding the installation of a new TRO scheme and was ranked in the top 3 TRO's to be agreed but the members of Crawley CLC were advised at a public meeting that the Tangmere Road TRO would form part of the new Crawley Road Space Audit and therefore would not need a separate TRO, hence the scheme was not progressed. The proposed decision indicates that a new Crawley CPZ scheme (which would replace the previously proposed road space audit scheme) would not commence until March 2024, a delay which we consider to be unacceptable

Outcome sought

For the proposed decision to be subject to scrutiny in public. This would at least provide some reassurance for members of the public. In our view a short delay in the decision-making process should not impact on this significant proposal which will affect residents for many years to come.

Consideration of the request

The call-in request must be considered by reference to the factors set out in Standing Order 7.29, the pre-conditions for the request set out in Standing Order 7.26 having been met as they have in this case. Those factors are:

- The matter has previously been considered by the scrutiny committee
- New information has come to light since such consideration
- It is a matter the committee would be expected to consider
- A delay to the decision would likely significantly damage the interests of the Council.

In relation to these factors the position or conclusion I adopt is:

1. Previous Scrutiny

The matter has previously been subject to scrutiny as the request states.

A Task and Finish Group (TFG) was set up in accordance with the established arrangements and at the instigation of the Communities Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee (CHESC). It was politically proportionate. The TFG was planned to be 'informal', meaning it would not meet in public and to report direct to the Cabinet Member. These arrangements were confirmed at the meeting of CHESC on 30th September 2021 and there were no objections to this approach to the scrutiny of the proposals.

The members met to consider the matter at a single meeting on 2nd November 2021. Its members were provided in early October with the material forming the proposal including the new Controlled Parking Zone policy and programme which became appendices to the final decision report.

The TFG arrived at a set of comments and recommendations. There was no request for the matter to be returned to the full Committee and no comment was made that the TFG had not had sufficient time or information to carry out their scrutiny work. A summary of their conclusions and recommendations was submitted to the Cabinet Member. The recommendations sought changes to the proposals. There were no recommendation to delay implementation or to ensure more extensive or public scrutiny.

The Committee's recommendations were incorporated into an appendix to the decision report planned for publication. This set out the how the proposals were altered to take account of the comments and recommendations of the TFG. This was published alongside the other material attached to the decision report. A copy of the final report including the TFG's report and how its recommendations had been addressed was sent both to the Chair of the TFG and to the chair of CHESC on 1st December in advance of the final decision being signed off.

In light of the above it cannot reasonably be asserted that the proposals have not been subject to adequate or effective scrutiny. The Cabinet Member was fully aware of the output from the Scrutiny Committee's TFG and its recommendations in sufficient time for the proposals to be amended to reflect them and to provide an explanation where recommendations of the TFG had not led to changes. This is a model of how scrutiny can work, using the flexibility of a TFG and having time in the process for its output to influence the final outcome. There is no requirement for the scrutiny process to take place in public. Neither the Committee nor the TFG members raised this as a matter of concern. The

arrangements for scrutiny would have been a matter for the committee which established the TFG.

The reference to there being no discussion in public at a meeting of the Cabinet is not a relevant consideration. This proposal was in the Forward Plan for a decision by the relevant Cabinet Member in December. It was never scheduled to be considered at a public meeting of the Cabinet.

2. New information since scrutiny

The call-in request does not identify any new information as coming to light since scrutiny of the proposal was carried out. In the second part of the request however a number of comments are made about the impact of the proposal on specific highway schemes. Those comments are therefore considered in the context of how they may be relevant to the adequacy of the scrutiny process.

The comments suggest that planned Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs – schemes for traffic and road use management) were affected by the reversal of the plans for Road Space Audit projects including Crawley and that both members and the public were not aware of these implications. It is also mentioned that the new proposals will mean further delay for specific schemes.

Having consulted with officers in the Highways Directorate it is confirmed that members in specific areas were kept informed of TRO project progress and potential outcomes. The principal impact was the effect of the national lockdown from Spring 2020. All Crawley members were advised directly that the Manor Royal project was being put on hold and that this would have a knock-on effect upon timescales for a related project covering the rest of Crawley. Updates on project progress were also provided to Full Council through the Cabinet Member. Following the May 2021 election new members were provided with all updating information.

In relation to the specific schemes referred to in the call-in request, proposals for Tushmore Avenue were included within the Manor Royal proposed parking plan and proposals for Tangmere Road were incorporated into a subsequent plan for the rest of Crawley. Both of these originally formed part of the Road Space Audit programme. Prior to the Crawley CLC meeting in November 2020, members had been advised of the Covid related delay to Manor Royal and the subsequent impact upon timescales for the wider Crawley proposals. At that time, a new CPZ policy/programme had not been developed and so there was no impact from this to advise members on – all of the impacts were Covid related.

In October 2021 the Council was contacted by the Manor Royal BID to see if work could re-start on the Manor Royal project, and work is now underway. Despite the delays brought about by the impact of the pandemic and associated lockdowns, Manor Royal and the subsequent project for Crawley have remained high priorities and this is reflected in the new CPZ programme. It is not evident that any delay in their being progressed is due to the formulation of a new CPZ policy and programme.

In light of the above summary of the position it does not appear that this information would have been relevant to the considerations of the TFG in relation

to the proposed CPZ policy and programme. Whatever may be the concerns of members to ensure residents are aware of TRO plans and delays the TFG for the scrutiny of the CPZ programme would not have provided a forum for this. I cannot therefore conclude that these comments add weight to the call-in request.

3. Expectation of scrutiny

The question of whether this is a matter the committee would expect to scrutinise does not need to be further considered. It has been scrutinised as arranged by the appropriate committee and its recommendations and presented to the Cabinet Member in time to influence the decision.

4. Urgency and risk to Council's interests

There is nothing in the decision report or in any other material or source of advice on the proposal to suggest urgency to the implementation of the decision such that delay would be likely to cause significant damage to the interests of the Council. The Council should however be seen to take and publish decisions in line with the published Forward Plan and the call-in request provides no grounds for delaying the decision other than to enable additional scrutiny.

For all of the above reasons I conclude that the request should be rejected as having not provided reasonable grounds for further consideration by the Scrutiny Committee. The decision will therefore take effect in line with the decision taken by the Cabinet Member.

Tony Kershaw
Director of Law and Assurance
Monitoring Officer

6th January 2022