

# Public Document Pack

**Tony Kershaw**  
Director of Law and Assurance

If calling please ask for:

Ann Little on 033 022 22654  
Email: [ann.little@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:ann.little@westsussex.gov.uk)

[www.westsussex.gov.uk](http://www.westsussex.gov.uk)

County Hall  
Chichester  
West Sussex  
PO19 1RQ  
Switchboard  
Tel no (01243) 777100



30 May 2022

## **Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee**

A meeting of the Committee will be held at **10.30 am** on **Friday, 10 June 2022** at **County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RQ**.

**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**

10.31 am 1. **Election of Chairman**

The Committee's membership is set out below:

Cllr Albury  
Cllr Ali  
Cllr Baldwin  
Cllr Britton  
Cllr Greenway  
Cllr Kenyon  
Cllr Milne  
Cllr Oakley  
Cllr Oppler  
Cllr Oxlade  
Cllr Patel  
Cllr Quinn

The Committee is asked to elect a Chairman for 2022-23. If the election is contested, a secret ballot will be held in accordance with Standing Order 2.17.

10.36 am 2. **Election of Vice-Chairman**

The Committee is asked to elect a Vice-Chairman for 2022-23. If the election is contested, a secret ballot will be held in accordance with Standing Order 2.17.

10.41 am 3. **Business Planning Group** (Pages 5 - 6)

Report by the Director of Law and Assurance.

The Committee is asked to review the membership of the Business Planning Group in view of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman appointments. For the last year the membership has been Cllr Britton (Chairman), Cllr Oakley (Vice-Chairman) and Cllrs Carson, Milne and Oxlade.

10.46 am 4. **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.

10.49 am 5. **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.

10.51 am 6. **Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee** (Pages 7 - 20)

The Committee is asked to agree the minutes of the meetings held on 24 February and 2 March 2022 (cream paper).

11.01 am 7. **Responses to Recommendations** (Pages 21 - 28)

The Committee is asked to note the responses to recommendations made at the 24 February and 2 March 2022 meetings from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change, Cllr Urquhart, and the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, Cllr Joy Dennis.

11.06 am 8. **Bus Enhanced Partnership Plan TFG** (Pages 29 - 36)

The Committee to consider the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport's response to the TFG's recommendations, which were reported direct to the Cabinet Member in time to inform her work.

Members will additionally be updated on any developments since the preparation of the TFG report.

Members will be invited to consider the need for, and timing of, any further work for the TFG which can be identified at this time.

- 11.36 am 9. **Integrated Parking Strategy** (Pages 37 - 100)
- Report by Assistant Director of Highways, Transport and Planning.
- Following a review, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport plans to publish an updated Integrated Parking Strategy in summer 2022. The Committee is asked to scrutinise the draft Strategy and make recommendations to the Cabinet Member.
- 12.36 pm 10. **Work Programme Planning and Possible Items for Future Scrutiny**
- The Committee is asked to review its current draft work programme taking into account the Forward Plan of Key Decisions and any suggestions from its members for possible items for future scrutiny. The programme reflects discussions and decisions arising from April's BPG meeting.
- (a) **Forward Plan of Key Decisions** (Pages 101 - 110)
- Extract from the Forward Plan dated 27 May 2022 – attached.
- Any 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.
- (b) **Work Programme** (Pages 111 - 114)
- The Committee is asked to review its draft work programme which reflects the outcome of discussions at the Committee's Business Planning Group meeting on 25 April 2022.
- 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.
- 12.41 pm 11. **Requests for Call-in**
- There have been no requests for call-in to the Scrutiny Committee and within its constitutional remit since the date of the last meeting. The Director of Law and Assurance will report any requests since the publication of the agenda papers.

12.44 pm 12. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee will be held virtually on 8 July at 2.15pm to review the Performance and Resources Report for Quarter 4, January to March 2022.

The following meeting will be on 21 September 2022 at 10.30 am at County Hall, Chichester. Probable agenda items include:

- Performance and Resources Report Quarter One, April-June 2022
- Speed Limit Policy
- Transport for the South-East Strategic Investment Plan Consultation
- Climate Change Strategy Delivery Interim report

Any member wishing to place an item on the agenda for the meeting must notify the Director of Law and Assurance by 9 September 2022.

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

**Webcasting**

Please note: this meeting is being filmed for live and subsequent broadcast via the County Council's website on the internet. The images and sound recording may be used for training purposes by the Council.

Generally the public gallery is not filmed. However, by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.

## **Community, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee**

**10 June 2022**

### **Report by Director Law and Assurance**

#### **Appointment of the Committee's Business Planning Group**

##### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 As set out in the County Council Constitution, each Scrutiny Committee must set up a business planning group (BPG) to oversee the Committee's work programme and prioritise issues for consideration by the Committee.
- 1.2 BPGs should have five members, be cross-party (three members from the majority political group on the County Council and two from the minority group(s)) and include the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee. Other members of the committee may be invited to attend individual meetings as appropriate. The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee will be the Chairman of the BPG. Membership is reviewed annually. Members should not serve on more than one BPG.
- 1.3 The BPG membership will be agreed at the meeting on 10 June 2022.
- 1.4 BPGs meet approximately quarterly, but they also carry out their work outside meetings (e.g. reviewing and discussing issues via e-mail; virtual meetings using teleconferencing facilities).
- 1.5 The Committee is asked to agree the appointment of five members to the BPG (with the membership as set out in paras 1.2 and 1.3 of this report).

##### **2. Role of Business Planning Group (BPG)**

- 2.1 BPG responsibilities include:
  - Overseeing the work programme for the Committee and prioritising issues for consideration by the Committee, including the proposed methodology and time tabling.
  - Agreeing objectives and planned outcomes for agenda items, and any witnesses to be invited and/or any visits or further information required by the Committee prior to its formal scrutiny of an issue.
  - Establishing Scrutiny Task and Finish Groups (TFGs)

##### **3. Implications**

- 3.1 There are no resource, risk management, social value, Crime and Disorder Act or Human Rights Act implications arising directly from this report.

**Tony Kershaw**

Director Law and Assurance

**Contact:** Ninesh Edwards, Senior Advisor, 03302 222542

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee**

24 February 2022 – At a meeting of the Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee held at 10.30 am at County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RQ.

Present: Cllr Britton (Chairman)

Cllr Oakley	Cllr Greenway, left at 12.15pm	Cllr Patel, left at 12.15pm
Cllr Albury	Cllr Kenyon	Cllr Quinn
Cllr Ali, left at 12.25pm	Cllr Milne	
Cllr Baldwin	Cllr Oxlade, left at 2.35pm	

Apologies were received from Cllr Oppler

Absent:

Also in attendance: Cllr Bence, Cllr J Dennis, Cllr Markwell and Cllr Urquhart

### **Part I**

#### **44. Chairman's Introduction**

44.1 The Chairman apologised for the short, 10-minute delay to the start of the meeting and gave assurance that the meeting audio would be recorded, while issues with the webcasting technology were being resolved.

#### **45. Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee**

45.1 Resolved – that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 19 January be approved as a correct record, and that they be signed by the Chairman.

#### **46. Responses to Recommendations**

46.1 The Committee noted the responses to recommendations made at the 19 January meeting from Democratic Services.

#### **47. Proposed Response to the National Highways Consultation on A27 Arundel Bypass**

47.1 The Committee considered a report and presentation on the County Council's draft proposed response to National Highway's (NH) consultation on the A27 Arundel Bypass (copies appended to the signed minutes).

47.2 The local County Councillors representing Fontwell and Arundel & Courtwick divisions, Cllrs Bence and Markwell respectively, individually addressed the Committee for five minutes each.

47.3 Summary of responses to members comments and questions: -

- Members praised the level of detail contained within the officer report.
- It is proposed that the County Council gives support in principle to the scheme, on the basis that it is consistent with Our Council Plan and the top priority within the West Sussex Transport Plan.
- Members shared concerns over the proposed scheme's reduction in access and exit points.
- The local member expressed concern for Fontwell, Walberton and neighbouring villages that are likely to be directly impacted by the scheme. The Street in Walberton was highlighted to be at risk of being used as a rat-run.
- Members agreed that NH's consultation material does not contain sufficient information and supporting evidence on key issues.
- As part of the development consent order process, the Planning Inspectorate will appoint a planning inspector who will: assess the material presented by NH and hear from objectors and statutory bodies before making a recommendation to the Secretary of State.
- As part of a transport assessment, NH are expected to present a future traffic forecast reference case as the basis for assessing comparative scenarios with the bypass, and this has been requested of NH.
- Arun District Council's Local Plan, adopted in 2018, highlights a number of improvements necessary to mitigate the impact of development at Arundel, but it does not require an A27 Arundel bypass.
- The traffic impacts on the Local Road Network (LRN) are unknown at this stage, based on the information provided to date, and more evidence has been requested of NH.
- LRN issues need to be assessed and if mitigation measures are required, the costs should be apportioned based on the traffic impacts.
- NH need to provide a detailed understanding around the issues requiring mitigation and the associated level of funding in order to understand what can be covered by the project budget.
- If the County Council is required to deliver any mitigations, then it would do so via the capital programme.
- The A27/B2233 'Crocker hill' junction has already been flagged as one of the locations of concern due to potential increase in usage.
- More evidence of the design plans for the Yapton Lane options have been requested.
- Details of the traffic modelling assumptions have been requested of NH.

47.4 The Chairman thanked those members of the public for submitting written representations in advance of the meeting.



- 47.5 On behalf of the Committee, the Chairman thanked Mr. Hemmings and his officer team for provision of the comprehensive report.
- 47.6 The following points were raised for consideration by Cabinet – that the Committee:
1. Recognises the importance of residents having confidence in the process, and the transparency of the process.
  2. Expresses strong concerns around the lack of access and exit points on the proposed bypass.
  3. Is disappointed by the lack of evidence provided by National Highways.
  4. Acknowledges the deep concerns from local members about the impact of the proposed bypass on local villages (for example, Fontwell and Walberton) and the natural habitat.
  5. Raises concerns about the financial consequences to the County Council of the potential impacts of the proposed bypass on the LRN.
  6. Feels that the proposed bypass might only move the traffic congestion, from Crossbush to Fontwell.
  7. Raises concerns about the traffic modelling assumptions, in particular the projections for the number of new houses, which seem to be well below the ambition set out in local plans.
  8. Acknowledges that the Council’s policy is to have the bypass but questions the choice of route selected (the grey route). The Committee has strong concerns about the wording in the draft response around the Council expressing “in principle” support for the grey route. Different views were expressed, as follows:
    - Although the Council should support a bypass that complements Council policies, it should not support the proposed route, having previously supported a different route, and given the lack of information provided for the grey route by National Highways.
    - The Council should support a bypass in principle, but support for the proposed route should be contingent on the concerns raised in the draft consultation response being adequately addressed, despite it not being the Council’s preferred route.
    - The Council should support a bypass in principle, but the information provided by National Highways does not allow the Council to reach an informed view on the grey route.
    - The Council should support a bypass in principle, but reiterate that the grey route is not its preferred option. There remain a number of significant questions with the proposed route, as set out in the consultation response.

#### **48. West Sussex Transport Plan**

48.1 The Committee considered a report and presentation on the draft West Sussex Transport Plan, to be adopted at Full Council on 1 April (copies appended to the signed minutes).

48.2 Summary of responses to members comments and questions: -

- The Plan's Rail Strategy sets out that the development of new rail stations should be industry-led and assurance was given that local County Councillors would be consulted prior to a County Council decision.
- The Chairman sympathised with some members' inability to properly scrutinise the item's report, due to the late dispatch and explained the reasoning for the delay. He and the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport accepted joint responsibility for its lateness. The Chairman asked that members copy in Committee members to any offline comments submitted to the Cabinet Member, for transparency.
- The use of the word 'ensure' throughout the Plan was challenged as overly ambitious.
- Suggestion was given that a maintenance section be incorporated into the Plan.
- Network Rail conducted a modular study which identified potential for improvements to the West Coastway services which are to some extent, contingent on changes to the rail infrastructure.
- Real-time passenger information screens were acknowledged as one example of a revenue implication as a result of proposed changes to the network. These will be taken into account before decisions are made to invest.
- The annual monitoring report will document the corporate key performance metrics, such as the target to deliver new cycling infrastructure.

48.3 Resolved – that the Committee: -

- Raises concerns around the cycling network, which has sections of cycling route which do not connect, and as such does not constitute a coherent network.
- Acknowledges the vision of the Plan, and the importance of applying for grants and working with stakeholders to ensuring successful delivery of the Plan.
- Suggests that that the impact of bus guideways on other road users should be taken into account
- Questions whether the Plan takes sufficient account of settlements which will become towns or villages once planned development has taken place, and resilience in the face of climate change and flooding.

- Suggests that road-based vehicular transport is likely to remain the primary mode of transport throughout the term of the Plan, and questions whether the Plan will achieve the right balance between the different modes of transport.

48.4 The Chairman thanked Mr Hemmings and his team for their contributions in developing the Plan and providing the report.

**49. Possible Items for Future Scrutiny**

49.1 Resolved – that the Committee agreed for the Business Planning Group to receive a future update on National Highways' adequacy of consultation response regarding the A27 Arundel Bypass.

**50. Date of Next Meeting**

50.1 The next meeting of the Committee will be held on 10 June at 10.30am at County Hall, Chichester.

The meeting ended at 2.53 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee**

2 March 2022 – At a meeting of the Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee held at 10.30 am at County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RQ.

Present: Cllr Britton (Chairman)

Cllr Oakley, Arrived 11.50am	Cllr Greenway, Left 1.25pm	Cllr Patel Cllr Quinn
Cllr Albury, 11am- 12.30pm	Cllr Milne Cllr Oppler, Left 1.25pm	
Cllr Ali Cllr Baldwin	Cllr Oxlade	

Apologies were received from Cllr Kenyon

Also in attendance: Cllrs Dennis and Urquhart

### **51. Declarations of Interest**

51.1 In accordance with the County Council's code of conduct, the following declarations of interest were made:

- Cllr Oxlade declared a personal interest as he was employed by the Manor Royal Bid which the Manor Royal recycling centre comes under.
- Cllrs Baldwin and Milne declared personal interests as a members of Horsham District Council.
- Cllr Ali declared a personal interest as a member of Crawley Borough Council.
- Cllr Oppler declared a personal interest as a member of Arun District Council who had been running a food waste trial.
- Cllr Oakley declared a personal interest as a member of Chichester District Council.

### **52. Urgent Matters**

52.1 No urgent matters were raised.

### **53. Strategic Options for Processing of Separate Food Waste and Other Waste Disposal Services and Update on Joint Strategic Approach**

53.1 The Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change, Cllr Urquhart, introduced the item giving some background for newer members on the committee. She reported that recent Government

strategies on food waste and incineration tax changes had led to a review to find the best solution for waste disposal going forward.

53.2 The Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection), Mr Read, shared a presentation which summarised the culmination of work by officers, including in finance, procurement and legal.

53.3 Members of the Committee then asked questions and a summary of those questions and answers follows:

- There was a statutory requirement under the Environment Act 2021 to provide **food waste collection services** and this responsibility fell to district and borough councils within West Sussex. The County Council, as disposal authority, is responsible for disposing of those collections.
- The level of **funding for food waste collection services** from the Government was not yet known and was being keenly awaited by authorities and professional groups nationally. The Cabinet Member was encouraged to keep up pressure for an announcement. It was anticipated that there could be capital support to increase fleet to cope with collections as well as possible revenue support. The trial in Arun had been supported by County Council funding.
- The introduction of food waste collection services generally led to **higher recycling rates** because people realised how much they were wasting and worked harder at being less wasteful. It was suggested that residents needed to be made aware of the benefits of the scheme prior to schemes starting, to improve their perception of the process. Particular attention needed to be given to areas of multiple occupancy eg blocks of flats.
- Changes in behaviour meant that a weekly collection of food waste and absorbent hygiene products eg nappies, with a fortnightly recyclables collection and a three weekly residual waste collection could make a real difference to recycling and waste disposal rates. Reductions in collections would also assist with targets to be carbon neutral.
- The cost of dealing with waste in West Sussex was higher than some neighbouring authorities because many of them used options such as incineration. Residents had historically not wanted such disposal options in West Sussex. However, technology had moved on since then and there were now a greater range of options available.
- The glossary of terms was welcomed but there was a request to use full terms in reports instead of abbreviations.

53.4 Resolved – That the Committee:

1. Accepted the premise of the report and understood and supported Option 2 – variation of the MRMC and modification of the site at Warnham.
2. Noting that the new duty to collect food waste falls to Waste Collection Authorities, stressed the importance of residents' perceptions, and of making residents aware of the need for, and benefits of, separate food waste collection, prior to its introduction.
3. Acknowledged that recycling rates improve in areas where separate food waste collection has been implemented, and that food waste tends to reduce over time in such areas.
4. Encouraged the Cabinet Member to keep pressure on Government to confirm the timing of, and funding for, implementation of the new duties arising under the Environment Act 2021.

#### **54. Proposals to Permanently Adopt the Booking Scheme Piloted at some Recycling Centres**

54.1 The Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change, Cllr Urquhart, introduced the item, giving some background on the trial that had been brought in during March 2021, due to concerns about congestion over the Christmas period, prior to the usual spring surge in usage usually seen at recycling centres.

54.2 The trial booking system allowed residents to book online up to 14 days in advance with call facilities available at the County Council's contact centre. Initially residents were allowed to book one slot a week but that had been increased to 5 slots a month. Data showed that 98% of bookings were made online with 2% via the contact centre. A consultation with users had been run in November 2021, by directly contacting online bookers, using flyers, social media and the press. The response rate had been very high and very positive for continuing the booking system. As an outcome of the consultation, from 1 March 2022 a trial had been set up at Worthing recycling centre, offering same day booking up to five minutes before a booking time, assuming availability. Any cancelled bookings would be freed up for use on the day.

54.3 Members of the Committee then asked questions and a summary of those questions and answers follows:

- Previous **usage patterns** at recycling sites showed people came often with small amounts of waste. The booking scheme encouraged the processing of more waste, less often. Residents were also encouraged to use their kerbside recycling where they could. There was sufficient capacity across the recycling sites and the booking system had helped spread demand across the day rather than it being focussed on some peak times. The configuration of sites would also be reviewed to make any improvements.

- The percentage of bookings not used varied due to season, weather and site, which was why booking on the day would be a more flexible option. There had been some migration of visits from sites which had introduced the booking system to those without. Data on visits would be reviewed.
- The Cabinet Member reported that whilst there may have been an increase in **fly-tipping** incidents since the introduction of the booking system, the volume of waste had not increased. Fly-tipping generally tended to be commercial waste from un-reputable traders or people who did not engage with the booking system. The Cabinet Member reported that the district and borough councils in West Sussex were increasing resources to run a new scheme called "Let's scrap fly-tipping", along with Sussex Police, to monitor and enforce rules to reduce fly-tipping rates. Members would be kept informed on how the scheme was progressing. The pandemic had seen a large rise in the use of skips for waste removal, a trend which may continue. Lobbying of Government would continue on waste crime in general.
- There were no reductions in **staffing levels** through the new system, although some sites were running with vacancies due to recruitment difficulties and long-term sickness.
- Despite requests from some Committee Members, for there to be a public consultation on sites recommended to move to a booking system, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change, Cllr Urquhart, report that public consultation was not always possible if changes were needed to be made quickly. However, Cllr Urquhart undertook to ensure that local Members were updated on any proposed changes at recycling sites in their area. Some smaller sites would not have the booking systems introduced.

54.4 Resolved – That the Committee:

1. Favoured having a flexible system, with some sites having the booking system, and others not.
2. Noted that some members felt the booking system was only required because of a reduction in opening hours.
3. Was concerned about fly-tipping around the County, and wanted efforts to tackle it to be strengthened.
4. Welcomed that the numbers of available bins and slots have increased, now that covid-related restrictions have been lifted.
5. Welcomed the roll-out in Worthing of the same-day booking system, and looks forward to this being introduced more widely as soon as possible.



6. Welcomed that the system is flexible enough to allow residents to access sites numerous times in a day, if a need can be demonstrated.
7. Acknowledged that the booking system has significantly reduced congestion at several sites, to the benefit of local residents and businesses.

54.5 The Committee voted on the recommendations in the draft decision report:

- On Recommendation 1 (That the pilot booking system is made permanent at the Bognor Regis, Crawley, Horsham, Littlehampton, Shoreham and Worthing Recycling Centres) the Committee voted in favour of the recommendation, by a majority of votes.
- On Recommendation 2 ((That there be) Delegation of authority to the Director of Environment and Public Protection, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change, to extend the booking system on a site-by-site basis to Billingshurst, Burgess Hill, East Grinstead, Midhurst and/or Westhampnett Recycling Centres, on a temporary or permanent basis should this be needed to manage congestion or other issues in the future) the Committee voted by a majority of votes that the word "permanent" be removed from the last sentence.

## **55. Highways Improvement Programme Review**

55.1 The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, Cllr Joy Dennis, introduced the item, saying that she had listened to Members' and residents' experiences and observations of the Highways Improvement Programme of the past had been listened to. The intention was to clarify the process so decisions could be made more quickly, and investment made in schemes which benefitted the entire County.

55.2 Ms Weller, Service Improvement Lead, introduced a presentation on the Highways Improvement Programme Review and a summary of questions and answers follows:

- Previous schemes in-process would be reviewed against the new assessment framework on a case-by-case basis.
- Section 106 funds would be reviewed to make sure when triggers are hit the funding comes forward for use.
- Perception of safety was an important area to be considered. The service reported that it reviewed information on near-misses, and correspondence, to highlight problem areas.
- It was intended to make information available online for applicants to help with their bids.

- The programme would help the overview of longer-term funding and projects could be programmed into the future years' funding.
- Litter picking teams had an agreed level of support for health and safety reasons. Officers would set out the arrangements for Committee members.

55.3 The Committee agreed with the recommendations in the report and resolved that -

1. Members welcomed and supported the idea of a quicker, consistent and simpler system for residents.
2. Members wished the assessment framework to be explained clearly to residents to enable more schemes to be agreed.

## **56. Quarterly Performance and Resources Update (Quarter 3)**

56.1 The Assistant Director (Communities) reported that quarter three had been about recovery from the pandemic and getting people back into services and continuing to overcome challenges faced during pandemic where activities had ceased or had not been delivered in the same way. Two indicators highlighted were the use of the virtual and digital library which was still in high use even though libraries were now open, and the number of people reached and supported by the Community Hub, which did not include local tracing partnership work delivered by hub.

56.2 The Assistant Director (Environment and Development) highlighted that energy solar farms continued to perform above expectation due to increased electricity production and higher prices, the community Solar Together project had received an unprecedented take up this round and the service had appointed a strategic lead on climate change to accelerate our thinking on how the County Council could meet the target of carbon neutrality by 2030.

56.3 The Assistant Director (Highways, Transport and Planning) highlighted that the Works Delivery Programme of over 500 projects was making good progress against its capital programme of £57 million and the service was expected to exceed the KPI on active travel. He also flagged that performance for the KPI on the repair of highway defects within the required timescale had been addressed with the contractor and there should be an upturn in performance in the next quarter data. Additionally, there had been a significant increase in the reporting of defects in the year and the service was looking into why that might be. Poor performance on road safety was being addressed by a new group working on a Road Safety Strategy to deliver improvements.

56.4 Members of the Committee then asked questions and a summary of those questions and answers follows:

- Data is collected from operators on **bus route usage** via their digital ticketing systems and is used along with planning decisions, particularly on housebuilding, to inform future

requirements. The data is also used to reimburse bus companies for senior citizen travel. During the pandemic the County Council reimbursed bus operators at the pre-pandemic usage levels to prevent bus operators from ceasing to run routes. This would be reviewed during the coming year.

- **Birth rates** are monitored from information collated by the Insights Team and Communities use then for the registration of births. Information is fed through to other departments for school places, planning etc. The 2021 census will also provide good quality information once it is released.
- **Road gully defects** had been on an upward trend over the last few years and policy was being reviewed on the frequency of gully emptying. The new contract was producing better data and reporting, and the Service would work with the contractor to develop a more proactive and effective programme.

56.5 The Committee welcomed the largely positive report and looked forward to receiving updates on quarter four in the summer.

## **57. Bus Enhancement Plan Task and Finish Group**

57.1 The Committee was briefed on the proposed establishment of a Task and Finish Group (TFG) on the Bus Enhancement Plan. The Bus Back Better national strategy had required the County Council to submit an improvement plan to Government and to seek funding. The outcome of the bid was still awaited. The County Council needed to create an Enhanced Partnership Plan and an Enhanced Partnership Scheme. The TFG would look at the Enhanced Partnership Plan, and concessionary and Government funding to see if there were suitable items for scrutiny.

57.2 The Chairman reported that the TFG would meet once in mid-April 2022 and was seeking no more than seven cross-party members. Councillors Albury, Milne and Quinn volunteered to join the TFG.

57.3 The Chairman reported that other Members would be contacted to see if they wished to join the TFG.

## **58. Work Programme Planning and Possible Items for Future Scrutiny**

58.1 The Committee agreed the draft work programme and suggested that there be a BPG update on the A27 Arundel By-Pass consultation in autumn 2022.

## **59. Requests for Call-in**

59.1 There had been no request for call-in to the Scrutiny Committee within its constitutional remit since the date of the last meeting.

## **60. Date of Next Meeting**

60.1 The next meeting would be held on 10 June 2022 at 10.30am.

## Agenda Item 6

The meeting ended at 3.25 pm

Chairman

## Cabinet Member Responses

<b>Responses from Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change – Cllr Urquhart</b>		
<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Environment &amp; Communities Scrutiny Committee recommendations (24 February 2022)</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p><b>Proposed Response to the National Highways Consultation on A27 Arundel Bypass</b></p>	<p>The following points were raised for consideration by Cabinet – that the Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recognises the importance of residents having confidence in the process, and the transparency of the process.</li> <li>2. Expresses strong concerns around the lack of access and exit points on the proposed bypass.</li> </ol>	<p>I express my thanks to the Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee for its consideration of the County Council’s draft response to National Highways’ consultation on the A27 Arundel Bypass.</p> <p>On behalf of the Cabinet, I would like to respond to the points that were raised by the Committee at its meeting on 24 February 2022.</p> <p>Agreed. Paragraph 2.46 of the approved consultation response expressed disappointment that National Highways had not done more to engage with the public, including the preparation of consultation material (such as visualisations, photomontages, etc) that would have helped local residents to understand the scheme and its impacts, both positive and negative. Local concerns raised with the County Council during the consultation period about the methods of engagement will, in due course, be considered as evidence for inclusion in the County Council’s post-submission ‘adequacy of consultation’ response.</p> <p>Noted. Paragraph 2.56 identified that there was insufficient information about the impacts of the scheme on the transport network to confirm whether the proposed scheme was acceptable to the County Council from a transport perspective, including access</p>

## Cabinet Member Responses

	<p>3. Is disappointed by the lack of evidence provided by National Highways.</p> <p>4. Acknowledges the deep concerns from local members about the impact of the proposed bypass on local villages (for example, Fontwell and Walberton) and the natural habitat.</p> <p>5. Raises concerns about the financial consequences to the County Council of the potential impacts of the proposed bypass on the LRN.</p>	<p>to and from the bypass itself. This is one of a number of matters that will be the subject of dialogue with National Highways in the post-consultation/pre-submission period.</p> <p>Agreed. Paragraph 2.45 expressed disappointment that insufficient technical information had been provided to the County Council and other stakeholders in advance of the consultation and that a more comprehensive evidence base had not been provided in support of the consultation material to enable a better understanding of the scheme and its impacts.</p> <p>Noted. Paragraph 2.56 identified that there was insufficient information about the impacts of the scheme on the transport network to confirm whether the proposed scheme was acceptable to the County Council from a transport perspective and paragraph 2.58 specifically addressed the potential impact on local villages, which was unclear and required further investigation. This is one of a number of matters that will be the subject of dialogue with National Highways in the post-consultation/pre-submission period.</p> <p>Agreed. The response was strengthened by including references in the Executive Summary and paragraph 2.43 to concerns about the adequacy of funding to mitigate the adverse impacts of the scheme (including on the local road network).</p>
--	--	--

## Cabinet Member Responses

	<p>6. Feels that the proposed bypass might only move the traffic congestion, from Crossbush to Fontwell.</p> <p>7. Raises concerns about the traffic modelling assumptions, in particular the projections for the number of new houses, which seem to be well below the ambition set out in local plans.</p> <p>8. Acknowledges that the Council’s policy is to have the bypass but questions the choice of route selected (the grey route). The Committee has strong concerns about the wording in the draft response around the Council expressing “in principle” support for the grey route. Different views were expressed, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the Council should support a bypass that complements Council policies, it should not support the proposed route, having previously supported a different route, and given the lack of information provided for the grey route by National Highways.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 2.56 identified that there was insufficient information about the impacts of the scheme on the transport network to confirm whether the proposed scheme was acceptable to the County Council from a transport perspective and paragraph 2.59 specifically addressed the potential impact on the Fontwell junction. This is one of a number of matters that will be the subject of dialogue with National Highways in the post-consultation/pre-submission period.</p> <p>Agreed. The response was strengthened by including references in paragraphs 2.57 and 2.60 to the transport assessment taking account of all planned development (both permitted development and the development of sites allocated in the adopted Arun Local Plan).</p> <p>The different views expressed by the Committee are noted. Cabinet considered that support ‘in principle’ for the scheme <b>and</b> raising matters of concern (that need to be satisfactorily addressed by National Highways in advance of submission of the DCO application) to be the right approach for the County Council for the reasons outlined in the report, that is, primarily because strategic improvements to the A27 at Arundel are a priority for the County Council as identified in the Corporate Plan (‘Our Council Plan 2021-2025’), the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2026, and the Economy Plan 2020-2024.</p> <p>Thanks again to you and the Committee for your scrutiny of the draft consultation response.</p>
--	--	--

## Cabinet Member Responses

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council should support a bypass in principle, but support for the proposed route should be contingent on the concerns raised in the draft consultation response being adequately addressed, despite it not being the Council’s preferred route.</li> <li>• The Council should support a bypass in principle, but the information provided by National Highways does not allow the Council to reach an informed view on the grey route.</li> <li>• The Council should support a bypass in principle, but reiterate that the grey route is not its preferred option. There remain a number of significant questions with the proposed route, as set out in the consultation response.</li> </ul>	
<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Environment &amp; Communities Scrutiny Committee recommendations (2 March 2022)</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Strategic Options for Processing of Separate Food Waste and Other Waste Disposal Services and Update on Joint Strategic Approach</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Accepted the premise of the report and understood and supported Option 2 – variation of the MRMC and modification of the site at Warnham.</li> <li>2. Noting that the new duty to collect food waste falls to Waste Collection Authorities, stressed the importance of residents’ perceptions, and of making residents aware of the need for, and benefits of, separate food waste collection, prior to its introduction.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Whilst it is the Waste Collection Authorities that will be mandated to collect food separately, it falls upon the County Council to also dispose of it separately in a manner that increases recycling rates and benefits the environment.</p>



## Cabinet Member Responses

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Acknowledged that recycling rates improve in areas where separate food waste collection has been implemented, and that food waste tends to reduce over time in such areas.</li> <li>4. Encouraged the Cabinet Member to keep pressure on Government to confirm the timing of, and funding for, implementation of the new duties arising under the Environment Act 2021.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member has received a response from The Minister to her letter requesting clarity of timing and funding stating that Government are looking at a 2025 implementation date but no details on funding. We will continue to push for clarity.</p>
<p><b>Proposals to Permanently Adopt the Booking Scheme Piloted at some Recycling Centres</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Favoured having a flexible system, with some sites having the booking system, and others not.</li> <li>2. Noted that some members felt the booking system was only required because of a reduction in opening hours.</li> <li>3. Was concerned about fly-tipping around the County, and wanted efforts to tackle it to be strengthened.</li> <li>4. Welcomed that the numbers of available bins and slots have increased, now that covid-related restrictions have been lifted.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The West Sussex Waste Partnership - formed of the County Council and all the district and borough councils in West Sussex - is working alongside the Police and Crime Commissioner, the Environment Agency, the National Farmers Union, the Environment Agency and others, in order to highlight the problems that fly tipping causes. To support this the partnership has jointly employed a Fly-Tipping Partnership Manager for two years.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

## Cabinet Member Responses

	<p>5. Welcomed the roll-out in Worthing of the same-day booking system, and looks forward to this being introduced more widely as soon as possible.</p> <p>6. Welcomed that the system is flexible enough to allow residents to access sites numerous times in a day, if a need can be demonstrated.</p> <p>7. Acknowledged that the booking system has significantly reduced congestion at several sites, to the benefit of local residents and businesses.</p>	<p>Same day bookings were made available to the remaining five sites on 24 March 2022, this has proved very popular with residents.</p> <p>Residents are able to book up to five slots a month, should a resident need to use a site five times on one day they are able to do this by making five bookings.</p> <p>The recognition from CHESC to the reduction in congestion is noted and welcomed. The booking system was fully tested during the recent strike at Adur and Worthing the site was fully booked for a number of weeks, with congestion and queuing kept to a minimum.</p>
<b>Responses from Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport – Cllr Joy Dennis</b>		
<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Environment &amp; Communities Scrutiny Committee recommendations (2 March 2022)</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>West Sussex Transport Plan</b>	<p>Raises concerns around the cycling network, which has sections of cycling route which do not connect, and as such does not constitute a coherent network.</p> <p>Acknowledges the vision of the Plan, and the importance of applying for grants and working with stakeholders to ensuring successful delivery of the Plan.</p>	<p>Agreed. The approach to active travel outlined in paragraph 6.11 of the WSTP has been changed to include 'network function' as one of the considerations that should be taken into account when deciding priorities for active travel infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Noted. Section 8 of the WSTP mentions the importance of partnership working and securing third party funding to deliver the Plan.</p>

## Cabinet Member Responses

	<p>Suggests that that the impact of bus guideways on other road users should be taken into account</p> <p>Questions whether the Plan takes sufficient account of settlements which will become towns or villages once planned development has taken place, and resilience in the face of climate change and flooding.</p> <p>Suggests that road-based vehicular transport is likely to remain the primary mode of transport throughout the term of the Plan, and questions whether the Plan will achieve the right balance between the different modes of transport.</p>	<p>Noted. The approach to shared transport outlined in paragraph 6.17 of the WSTP identifies 'impacts on all road users' as one of the considerations that should be taken into account when considering opportunities for bus priority measures, which includes bus guideways.</p> <p>Agreed. The key issues outlined in section 4 of the WSTP have been changed to incorporate this issue which can lead to accessibility challenges by placing additional demands on existing routes and services which are not always adequate.</p> <p>Noted. The WSTP is a holistic strategy that plans for all the main modes of transport in West Sussex which balances the County Council's environmental, social and economic objectives. The approach to the road network outlined in paragraph 6.31 of the WSTP specifies that the County Council would like to avoid new road building and improve existing roads as a first preference. The County Strategic Road Network will be given priority for road improvements and shared transport and active travel modes will be prioritised and encouraged on non-strategic roads. The performance of the WSTP will be monitored as it is implemented and reviewed every five years which will provide opportunities to reconsider whether the balance between objectives remains appropriate.</p>
<p><b>Highways Improvement Programme</b></p>	<p>1. Members welcomed and supported the idea of a quicker, consistent and simpler system for residents.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

## Cabinet Member Responses

<b>Review</b>	2. Members wished the assessment framework to be explained clearly to residents to enable more schemes to be agreed.	Updates to the WSCC website will provide clear information to the public.
---------------	--	---

---

## **Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee**

**10 June 2022**

### **Bus Enhanced Partnership Plan Task and Finish Group**

#### **Report by the Chairman of the Task and Finish Group**

---

#### **Summary**

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport expressed an intention to support that West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) works in partnership with bus operators through a draft Enhanced Partnership Plan (EPP) from April 2022.

Following discussion by the Business Planning Group, the Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee (CHESC) agreed to establish a Scrutiny Task and Finish Group (TFG) to act as a critical friend in the drafting of the Plan, and to consider in particular:

- The draft Enhanced Partnership Plan prior to its submission to the Department for Transport (DfT) at the end of April 2022
- The impact of changes to Department for Transport (DfT) funding for buses – the outcome of WSSCC Bus Services Improvement Plan and the Bus Recovery Grant
- Plans for public consultation on the bus EPP

...and make recommendations directly to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport.

Members of the Committee were invited to volunteer to serve on the TFG in the first instance, membership of which must be cross-party and comprise no more than seven. Group leaders were consulted before the final membership was agreed.

The Committee and members of the TFG agreed that the Group should meet informally, and in person.

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

This report will be updated to include the Cabinet Member's response to the recommendations, and published with the papers for the CHESC meeting on 10 June 2022.

---

## **1 Background**

- 1.1 The Group met once, on 11 April 2022. Councillors Carson Albury, Andrew Baldwin, John Milne, Simon Oakley, and Brian Quinn attended. Councillor Simon Oakley was appointed as the Chairman of the TFG. Councillor Sarah Payne sent

apologies, but was briefed at a separate meeting, and supported the recommendations of her fellow Group members.

## **2 Discussion**

2.1 Members heard evidence from Andy Ekinsmyth (Head of Transport and Network Operations), Bill Leath (Transport Coordination Manager), Steve Doole (BSIP Project Manager), and Andy Warton (Senior Passenger Transport Planner).

2.2 In particular, the following themes were discussed:

### **2.3 The Impact of Funding Changes**

Members considered a presentation about the impact of changes in the funding arrangements for buses and options for the Enhanced Partnership Plan (EPP), with discussion including the following points:

2.3.1 WSCC's indicative three-year funding arrangement was announced by DfT on 4 April 2022 - £17.4m was earmarked (£12 capital/£5.4m revenue) for the County Council, although the Council's bid was for £90m. DfT gave no reasons for the disparity. Many local authorities will receive no funding, despite having submitted similar Bus Services Improvement Plans (BSIPs).

2.3.2 Receipt of funding depends upon proposals in the Enhanced Partnership Plan

2.3.3 The deadline for submission of new ambitions to DfT (including key priorities from the BSIP) of 2 May 2022.

2.3.4 Bus recovery funding ends in October 2022

### **2.4 The Draft Enhanced Partnership Plan**

Members considered the following documents:

- Bus Services Improvement Plan (BSIP)
- Draft Bus Enhanced Partnership Plan (EPP)
- Letter from the Department for Transport dated 4 April

Discussion included the following points:

2.4.1 The Government's 'Bus Back Better - A National Bus Strategy for England' requires Local Transport Authorities and bus companies to work in partnership to help recovery and improve bus services.

2.4.2 In June 2021, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport took a [key decision](#) to enter into an Enhanced Partnership with bus operators and, in October 2021, made a further [key decision](#) and submitted a BSIP to the DfT including a bid for funds.

2.4.3 Officers have compiled documents for a draft EPP based on the BSIP, including considerable flexibility to handle separate funding awards for multiple topics e.g. de-carbonisation, reduced fares, more Sunday services, etc as well as Covid recovery impact.

2.4.4 Major bus operators have informed the authority that patronage levels are still considerably lower than pre-pandemic, although varying between different bus routes. The lowest patronage currently seems to be 55%, and some are higher than 80%. (Lowest during Covid lockdowns was below 10%).

2.4.5 The EPP required redrafting following receipt of the indicative funding arrangements and guidance from DfT. Funding will be dependent on large-scale visible interventions, lower fares on a temporary basis, and decarbonisation of buses. Funding must be spent by March 2025, but this will be challenging for complex capital projects.

## 2.5 Capital Proposals

The Group considered the proposals and made recommendations and observations set out in section 3 of this report.

## 2.6 Revenue Proposals

The Group considered the proposals and made recommendations and observations set out in section 3 of this report.

## 2.7 EPP Public Consultation Plan

EPP statutory consultation will take place in May 2022. Statutory stakeholders include the police, Traffic Commissioners, bus operators, D&Bs, South Downs National Park Authority, Transport Focus, Competition and Markets Authority etc.

The Group considered the Consultation Plan and made recommendations and observations set out in section 3 of this report.

# 3 Recommendations and Observations

## 3.1 The Impact of Funding Changes

The Group expresses concerns about:

- a) The Department for Transport's lack of clarity about the priorities for the County Council
- b) The lack of a consistent, countrywide approach to local authority funding
- c) the implications for bus services in the county when bus recovery funding is no longer available (from October 2022)

➤ **CM Response:** Agreed.

The Department for Transport wrote on 4 April that councils are to prioritise bus priority schemes i.e. those which accord buses a clear advantage over other traffic such as a bus lane. Our proposed Spending Plan reflects this. Unfortunately most bus priority schemes and certainly those that are currently being considered will take more than the 3 years of the current funding period to deliver. Such schemes can therefore only be promoted in this funding period as those under development where at most we may be able to deliver accommodation works such as moving utilities. Elsewhere we will be able to focus on upgrades to traffic

signals (non-bus lane priority), real time bus information and bus stop improvements.

According to the most recent timeline from DfT, officers expect DfT to engage before mid-June to finalise the BSIP Spending plan, and in particular to discuss timeframes for delivery for each spend proposed. It is hoped at this time we will be able to determine whether our suggested priorities match DfT's ambitions.

DfT indicated that funding is unlikely to be allocated to WSCC before September, and should not be used to subsidise the costs of running existing bus services.

### 3.2 Capital Proposals

The TFG considered the options proposed by officers and recommends to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport that the capital proposals contained within the draft EPP are based on the following priorities and in this order

- 1 **Crawley Bus Station Interchange.** The Bus Station design already exists and much investigative work has been undertaken. Consultation is planned for June/July, with completion due by summer 2025. The Bus Station would be a significant improvement for Crawley and bus lanes would speed up bus journey times.

➤ **CM Response:** Agreed.

The proposed investment will enhance the travel experience of all people using the bus station, particularly when changing between one route and another. As the rebuild is already planned and consultation lead by Crawley Borough Council is expected this summer, it meets DfT criteria for BSIP funds.

- 2 **Bus lane on the A259 Bognor Road** approaching the roundabout (from Drayton roundabout to A27 roundabout). Stagecoach has supported this option for many years as it could significantly improve bus journey times and reliability. It sits on County Council land so would be permitted development. Some further work is required to confirm deliverability. The scheme idea has been outlined over the years and few people live adjacent.

➤ **CM Response:** Agreed.

Consultation has not occurred for this scheme, which unfortunately is likely to take more than the 3 years of the current funding period to deliver.

Recent appraisal suggests that likely cost will be over £10m due to major utility assets underground, and could involve the full DfT major scheme process (including Strategic Outline Case, Outline Business Case, Full Business Case, etc) leading to delivery well beyond the current funding period.

Officers expect DfT to engage in June to discuss the timeframe for delivery for this scheme, and whether DfT will approve the scheme for



funding in this funding period to assist with accommodation works in advance of the main scheme being constructed.

- 3 **Traffic signals** - potential for increased value for money; would improve journey times (as traffic lights would turn green when buses approach). Further work needs to be undertaken to add detail to this proposal.

➤ **CM Response:** Agreed.

Four controller devices for traffic signal junctions in Crawley have had better systems installed, and officers are planning to trial prioritising bus movements through those junctions to target improvements in journey time reliability. Assuming success, another 30 signal controls around the county will be upgraded however it is not yet confirmed which signalised junctions would benefit most from this intervention and hence further work to detail this proposal would commence when the trial is complete. We plan to implement upgrades progressively over the term of the funding period alongside existing signal priority upgrade and maintenance schemes.

- 4 **Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI)** (these are signs at bus stops displaying bus arrival times). The most popular response in the BSIP consultation. Would enable purchase of approx 145 screens. Very deliverable and visible and supported by the bus operators. However, there would be future additional revenue costs

➤ **CM Response:** Agreed.

RTPI signs were seen as the most useful aid by all age groups during the engagement for BSIP last year, and in research completed by DfT, so I propose spending the amount in the BSIP bid. It is true that additional screens will require more revenue funding to maintain and a further capital investment if they are to be replaced at the end of their useful life (up to 14 years). This revenue maintenance funding will need to be identified as part of the revenue programme albeit officers will discuss the potential of future funding from DfT for this purpose.

Also the **Roadside Infrastructure Audit** - there are approx. 5,200 active bus stops in the county of which 3,500 are flagged. An audit would identify who provides what facilities (eg bus company, County Council, district/borough councils, parish councils etc.) and establish where investment needs to be directed in future years (including RTPI).

➤ **CM Response:** Agreed.

Bus stop facilities are typically maintained by district / borough and parish / town councils. WSCC typically maintains the pole, hardstand, and RTPI where applicable. It is not our intention to amend this arrangement. Whilst we have record of bus stops we do not have record of their facilities. Therefore an audit of bus stops to determine where many passengers wait for buses, and which bus stops have more than one bus route calling is currently under development. This audit is a first step in determining what facilities and information exists at bus stops. It

may be that BSIP funding is made available to improve facilities at those most in need.

A further audit for those passengers with mobility, sensory or hidden disabilities is proposed next year.

## 5 **Mobility hubs/interchanges**

- 6 **Hop Oast Roundabout Bus Priority.** Outline designs are in place (lane markings, not segregation). Not identified in the BSIP. The scheme could enable Metrobus to keep buses running frequently. Metrobus see this as a lower priority compared to Crawley bus station.

While the above proposals total more than £12m, all could be presented to the DfT together with risk profiles and, if there is any further opportunity for funding, or if a scheme isn't feasible, further options/projects will be ready to be promoted.

- **CM Response:** Agreed.

Hop Oast bus priority has been removed from the Spend Plan total and relegated to a 'possible' for funding should DfT not approve other schemes.

While the above proposals total more than £12m, all have been presented to the DfT in the draft submission together with risk profiles and, if there is any further opportunity for funding, or if a scheme isn't feasible, further options/projects will be ready to be promoted.

## 3.3 **Revenue proposals**

The TFG considered the options proposed by officers and recommends to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport that the following revenue proposals be contained within the draft EPP.

- a) **Short-term and targeted fare reduction trials** with an emphasis on supporting young people with schemes that are clear and simple.

- **CM Response:** Agreed.

Officers have proposed to DfT that we will work alongside East Sussex County Council and Brighton and Hove City Council to develop in so much as is possible, a Sussex-wide reduced fare price offer for 16- to 19-year-olds.

- b) **A new service** - 55x Littlehampton to Chi Express, subject to it becoming commercially viable in the longer term. This route extension would benefit new housing developments in Arun and provide a link to rail hubs. Prior to the pandemic, Stagecoach indicated that it wished to run this service commercially.

- **CM Response:** Agreed. This proposal has been put forward to DfT in our draft spending plan.

### c) **Digital Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT)**

- DDRT pilots - DRT (community transport) schemes have been operating for many years for people who cannot use conventional transport (for example, people with disabilities). Now they can be used by anyone who is socially isolated. DfT has indicated its support for DDRT. Flexibility is inherent, a mixture of vehicle types/services being possible, and deviation from fixed routes permitted. Pilots schemes will be operated from mobile phones/tablets/laptops.

➤ **CM Response:** Agreed.

This proposal has been put forward to DfT in our draft spending plan.

- In Barnham, Eastergate, Westergate - where settlements aren't connected by bus services to train stations/schools etc, creation of pilot Test and Learn schemes, which could ultimately replace conventional buses.

➤ **CM Response:** Agreed.

- The number 54 service, serving north-west Chichester, was previously operated by a bus company, but the County Council now funds the service. Discussions are underway with Stagecoach and Community Transport Sussex regarding its future. Could be a flexible on-demand service or linked with school minibuses.

➤ **CM Response:** Agreed.

- Employment of a project manager jointly with East Sussex County Council to link all the above and run a flexible service which is unlikely to have the potential to operate on a commercial basis.

➤ **CM Response:** Agreed.

### 3.4 **Public Consultation Plan**

EPP statutory consultation will take place in May 2022. Statutory stakeholders include the police, traffic commissioners, bus operators, district and borough councils, South Downs National Park Authority, Transport Focus, Competition and Markets Authority etc. The TFG agrees the following position:

- a) That there is no requirement to undertake a further public consultation exercise (an extensive public consultation had been undertaken to inform the BSIP) due to the short timescale allowed by the DfT and officer capacity. Ongoing public engagement will be undertaken via #WestSussBus

➤ **CM Response:** Agreed.

- b) That officers should discuss opportunities for engaging with parish councils (recognising that not all the County has parish/town councils) with the West Sussex Association of Local Councils

➤ **CM Response:** Agreed.

#### **4 Further Work**

- 4.1 Members agreed that a further meeting may be required towards the end of May, in case:
- a) of significant developments which affect the priorities supported above. The meeting could be in-person/virtual or an update could be circulated via email.
  - b) a redesign of the network is under consideration
- 4.2 Members will look at the proposals in the EPP and return any comments to officers.

#### **5 Other options considered (and reasons for not proposing)**

- 5.1 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.

#### **6 Consultation, engagement and advice**

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

#### **7 Finance**

- 7.1 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](mailto:ninesh.edwards@westsussex.gov.uk)

#### **Background papers**

None

**Key decision: Yes**  
**Unrestricted**  
**Ref:**

**Report to Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee (CHESC)**

**10 June 2022**

**West Sussex Integrated Parking Strategy Review 2022 - 2027**

**Report by Assistant Director of Highways, Transport and Planning**

**Electoral divisions: All**

As the Highway Authority for West Sussex, the County Council has an Integrated Parking Strategy (IPS) that sets out its approach to managing parking. This mainly includes the management and enforcement of on-street parking controls and regulations but it also sets out the County Council's view and role in off-street parking provision, primarily provided by district and borough councils, as well as how its approach to parking management relates to other policies and strategies.

The IPS was last updated in 2014 and this latest review, covering the period from 2022 to 2027, seeks to ensure that the County Council's approach to managing parking remains appropriate and effective at meeting the needs of local communities as well as its other objectives.

**Focus for Scrutiny**

- 1.** Members are asked to scrutinise the draft IPS and, focussing on the objectives set out in part 3, and consider:
  - Whether these are the right objectives
  - The extent to which these objectives are addressed within the Strategy

Traffic Management  
 Community  
 Economic  
 Health and Wellbeing  
 Location  
 Enforcement  
 Financial

- 2.** Members are also invited to consider whether the proposed parking management policies set out paragraph 2.2 of this covering report are appropriate, and achievable.

## **Proposal**

### **1 Background and context**

- 1.1 As the Highway Authority for West Sussex, the County Council has an Integrated Parking Strategy (IPS) that sets out its approach to managing parking. This mainly includes the management and enforcement of on-street parking controls and regulations but it also sets out the County Council's view and role in off-street parking provision, primarily provided by district and borough councils, as well as how its approach to parking management relates to other policies and strategies.
- 1.2 The IPS was last updated in 2014 and this latest review, covering the period from 2022 to 2027, seeks to ensure that the County Council's approach to managing parking remains appropriate and effective at meeting the needs of local communities as well as its other objectives.
- 1.3 The aim of the IPS review is to ensure that the supply, regulation, enforcement and cost of all types of parking in West Sussex continues to be managed and controlled in ways which are consistent with the County Council's other transport, economic and environmental policies.
- 1.4 Policies to manage the demand for car use through the control of on-street parking need to be integrated with and supportive of measures to tackle congestion and pollution, promote alternative modes of transport, enhance the economic viability and vitality of town centres and improve road safety and residential amenity.
- 1.5 As a strategic document the IPS will not set out each and every decision or action that will affect car parking in West Sussex but rather set out the basis on which the County Council will make future decisions and what these should achieve.

### **2 Proposal details**

- 2.1 The specific objectives of the IPS review 2022-2027 are to:
  - Collate and review the national/local policies and guidance that influence the County Council's approach to parking management in West Sussex. These are outlined in the Appendix of the draft IPS in Appendix 1.
  - Refine and set out a number of the County Council's parking management policies for the period 2022 - 2027. These are outlined (in detail) in Part 3 of the draft IPS in Appendix 1.
- 2.2 The County Council's proposed parking management policies for the period 2022-2027 are summarised as follows:
  1. Service Integration - The County Council, together with the district and borough councils, will take all reasonable steps to provide a cost-effective and efficient parking service.
  2. Effective Enforcement - Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) will be quality based and information readily available to help road users understand that enforcement is as fair, accurate and expeditious as possible.

3. Asset Maintenance - Parking signing and lining defects will be corrected as soon as possible after being reported.
4. Parking Management - Management of all on-street parking spaces will complement other transport and planning policies to discourage car use in congested urban areas, balance the needs of various competing user groups and maintain the economic viability of those areas.
5. Parking Charges - On-Street parking charges will be reviewed regularly and set at an appropriate level to cover operating costs and influence parking demands, consistent with traffic management and environmental objectives.
6. Controlled Parking Zones - A new Controlled Parking Zone policy framework will set out an appropriate set of rules for the consideration, implementation, review and removal of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ).
7. Verge/Pavement Parking - The County Council will maintain a locally responsive approach towards verge and pavement parking, enabling it to draw on a range of options to manage issues in local communities.
8. Blue Badge Scheme - The County Council will promote improved access for Blue Badge holders through the provision of designated on-street spaces and the detection and investigation of Blue Badge misuse.
9. Additional Enforcement Powers - The County Council will consider widening its parking enforcement powers, including for moving traffic, in order to improve compliance, improve road safety, reduce public transport journey times and reduce congestion.
10. Technology and Innovation - The County Council will embrace technological innovations which help customers to better access services and aid the efficiency of parking operations.
11. Financial and Operational Accountability - The County Council and the District/Borough Councils will be open and transparent about how the CPE Service works and how decisions are made.
12. Best practice and Lobbying - As a member of the British Parking Association, the County Council will continue to add its voice to those of other local authorities when lobbying Government or responding to government consultations on parking issues.

### **3 Other options considered (and reasons for not proposing)**

- 3.1 There is clear need to ensure that a consistent and strategic approach to the management of parking is taken. The County Council faces particularly challenging financial circumstances and there is a need to ensure accountability for how investment is allocated and spent. It is therefore appropriate that the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport has close oversight of the IPS and any measures arising from it. In so doing it is recognised that local Members have a key role to play in delivering successful outcomes for our communities.

#### **4 Consultation, engagement and advice**

- 4.1 The six district and borough councils in West Sussex operate CPE and manage CPZs, under Agency Agreements, on behalf of the County Council. Officers from these authorities meet regularly to monitor the management of on-street parking and to discuss any short/long term issues.
- 4.2 The IPS does not identify all of the individual measures that the County Council intends to undertake over the next five years but establishes the framework within which future parking management will be developed and reviewed. Most measures, such as development of CPZs, will be the subject to a communications strategy and wide ranging public consultation and County Councillor consideration before a decision is made by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport and/or Assistant Director of Highways, Transport and Planning.
- 4.3 Potential impacts of measures arising from the IPS in terms of the Equality Duty will also be considered when decisions are made.
- 4.4 Officer comments received on the draft IPS have been collated and will be considered, as will any comments received from members of CHESC. Any outcomes will be shared with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport.

#### **5 Finance**

- 5.1 The IPS review 2022-2027 does not have any direct or immediate revenue or capital implications.
- 5.2 The majority of costs and expenses associated with introducing, managing and maintaining on-street parking for the period 2022-2027, as outlined in the draft IPS, will be drawn from the County Council's On-Street Parking Account. On-street parking charges, which include pay & display and permit charges as well as revenue from Civil Parking Enforcement (Penalty Charge Notices) all accrue to this account. The account is managed in accordance with the requirements of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which sets out the purposes for which the County Council may levy on-street parking charges and how revenue, and any surplus, may be spent.
- 5.3 As a Highway Authority, the County Council's responsibilities are strategic as well as local and they extend across the entire county. As such, it manages a single On-Street Parking account and invests strategically across the county, irrespective of where revenue may have originated.
- 5.4 Some future measures arising from the IPS, such as CPZ implementation will incur capital costs which will be met from the following sources - Section 106 funds, Community Infrastructure Levy, Local Enterprise Partnership Growth Programme Funding, Capital Funding.



## 6 Risk implications and mitigations

Risk	Mitigating Action (in place or planned)
<p>The management of a finite resource, such as parking space, requires that a balance be struck between the interests of the various user groups that compete to use that resource and any measure that balances or prioritises the interests of one group over others will, inevitably, affect those users to varying degrees of benefit or dis-benefit.</p> <p>Even within a given user group there will be many conflicting views on whether parking management has a positive or negative impact</p>	<p>The IPS provides the framework within which these competing and conflicting needs will be identified, assessed and prioritised.</p> <p>Decisions regarding the implementation or amendment of any individual measures will be made by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, in consultation with the relevant County Councillors and will be subject to the appropriate decision-making process.</p>

## 7 Policy alignment and compliance

- 7.1 The appropriate and effective management of parking, delivered by the IPS, aligns with the West Sussex County Plan 2021-2025 (A sustainable and prosperous economy).
- 7.2 It is considered that the policies contained within the IPS will contribute to the increased safety of all road users and the wider community and that these benefits will mitigate any likely Human Rights Act Implications. Similarly, there are not considered to be any significant social value or legal issues arising from the IPS review
- 7.3 The County Council does not consider parking management to create any crime and disorder issues. Officers have previously consulted with Sussex Police, who share this view.

Matt Davey

**Assistant Director of Highways, Transport and Planning**

Contact: Miles Davy

**Parking Manager**

0330 2226688 miles.davy@westsussex.gov.uk

### Appendix 1

Draft Integrated Parking Strategy 2022 - 2027

**Background papers**

[Integrated Parking Strategy 2014](#)



# **West Sussex County Council**

# **Integrated Parking Strategy**

## **2022 – 2027**

# Contents

<b>Item</b>	<b>Page</b>
Introduction	5
Aims & Objectives	6
<b>Part 1</b>	7
The IPS in Context	7
Parking Management in West Sussex	9
<b>Part 2</b>	10
Parking Policy Context	10
• National Policy and Legislation	10
• Local Policy	10
• West Sussex Parking Policies and Operational Guidance Documents	11
<b>Part 3</b>	12
An IPS for West Sussex 2022 -2027	12
The Aim of the IPS	12
The Objectives of the IPS	12
• Traffic Management	12
• Community	13

- Economic 13
- Health and Wellbeing 13
- Location 13
- Enforcement 14
- Financial 14

IPS Policies 2022 - 2027 14/15

- Service Integration 16
- Effective Enforcement 17
- Asset Maintenance 19
- Parking Management 19
- Parking Charges 21
- Controlled Parking Zones 22
- Verge and Pavement Parking 24
- Blue Badge (Disabled Persons Parking) Scheme 25
- Additional Powers within the Traffic Management Act 28
  1. Use of Automatic Number Plate Recognition 28
  2. Double Parking and Dropped Kerbs 29
  3. Vehicle Removal 30
  4. The Continuing Role of Sussex Police 30

• Technology and Innovation	31
1. Pay and Display	32
2. Mobile Phone Payments	32
3. Digital Permits	33
4. Back Office Centralisation	33
5. Ultra-Low Emission Vehicles	34
6. Car Clubs	34
7. Variable or Demand responsive Charging	35
• Financial and Operational Accountability	35
• Best Practice and Lobbying	38
IPS Action Plan 2022 – 2027	40
Appendix A – National/Local Policy, Legislation and Guidance	45

# Introduction

***The average car is parked at home for 73% of the time, parked elsewhere for about 23% of the time and only used 4% of the time. Source – RAC Foundation: Standing Still July 2021***

Parking is a big part of all our lives. It affects where we go, how we choose to get there and how long we stay there.

Well managed parking can enable a more mobile society and help our local economies grow but poorly managed parking can cause congestion and road safety problems by encouraging more car use as well as impact adversely on the local economy and the environment.

As the Highway Authority for West Sussex, the County Council has an Integrated Parking Strategy (IPS) that sets out its approach to managing parking. This mainly includes the management and enforcement of parking controls and regulations on the public highway, often referred to as 'on-street'. but it also sets out its view and role in off-street parking provision, primarily provided by the six District and Borough Councils in West Sussex. The IPS also sets out how the County Council's approach to parking management relates to its other policies and strategies.

The West Sussex IPS was last updated in 2014 and this latest review, covering the period from 2022 to 2027, seeks to ensure that the County Council's approach to managing parking remains appropriate and effective at meeting the needs of local communities as well as its other objectives.

## Aims & Objectives

The aim of the IPS review is to ensure that the supply, regulation, enforcement and cost of all types of parking in West Sussex continues to be managed and controlled in ways which are consistent with the County Council's other transport, economic and environmental policies.

Managing the demand for car use through the control of on-street parking will continue to be integrated with and supportive of measures to tackle congestion and pollution, promote alternative modes of transport, enhance the economic viability and vitality of town centres and improve road safety and residential amenity.

As a strategic document the IPS will not set out each and every decision or action that will affect car parking in West Sussex but rather set out a basis on which the County Council will make future decisions and what these should achieve.

The specific objectives of the IPS review are to:

1. Collate and review the national/local policies and guidance that influence the County Council's approach to parking management in West Sussex.
2. Refine and set out the County Council's parking management policies for the period 2022 - 2027.



# Part 1

## The IPS in Context

The county of West Sussex sits on the south coast of England, bordering Hampshire, Surrey and East Sussex. It covers an area of 1990 square kilometres and is predominantly rural in character but with some large towns. West Sussex is made up of seven Districts and Boroughs and operates under a two-tier system of local government. In terms of size, West Sussex County is the 31<sup>st</sup> largest authority in England and Wales.

Latest population estimates from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) show that West Sussex is now home to a little under 859,000 people. This population is projected to grow to just under 1 million people in 2039, an increase of over 20%.

The majority of the county's resident population lives in the ten largest towns yet 42%, and over half of its businesses are located in rural areas. 87% of the rural population live in small towns and villages, with 13% living in hamlets and dispersed farms and houses. In West Sussex, the main coastal urban areas are, from west to east; Bognor Regis, Littlehampton, Worthing and Shoreham-by-Sea. Chichester is located in the south-west of the County. Development in the east of the County is concentrated around Haywards Heath and Burgess Hill close to the boundary with East Sussex and in the north-east of the County around Horsham, Crawley, and East Grinstead close to the boundary with Surrey.

The largest centres of population are Crawley and Worthing with around 110,000 people each. Bognor Regis has almost 65,000 people and Horsham has a population of about 50,000 people. Burgess Hill, Chichester, East Grinstead, Haywards Heath, Lancing/Sompting, Littlehampton, and Shoreham/Southwick have populations of between 25,000 and 45,000 people.

Over half of the land area of West Sussex is designated as protected countryside, due to a large part of the county falling within the South Downs National Park, which cuts a large swathe right across the area, and two other designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty: Chichester Harbour and the High Weald.

The county has good transport links with London. Mainline rail services between Brighton, Southampton and Portsmouth run through West Sussex with direct links to London Victoria and London Bridge. Other direct services to the west link the county with Bath, Bristol and Cardiff.

The M23/A23 corridor runs down the eastern side of the county connecting Brighton with London and the A27 provides east/west links through the coastal towns. Gatwick Airport offers excellent national and international links for residents and is a major source of employment. While the towns of West Sussex are generally well connected, some rural parts of the county remain relatively isolated from the main transport networks of the South-East.

The National Strategic Road Network (SRN) comprised of motorways and trunk roads is managed by Highways England. In West Sussex this includes the M23, A27 and most of the A23. The A27 is the only part of the National SRN running east – west south of the M25. Due to its location, it serves both a strategic role as well as being heavily used as a local distributor road with short trips and heavy cross flows at junctions. The local road network in West Sussex comprises of the County Strategic Road Network (CSRN) and most other local roads. In 2021, the County Council’s carriageway assets were made up of 4,034km (2,506miles) of road of which approximately 840km (522miles) is classified A and B class, 7.5million sqm of footways, 726 road bridges, 34 subways and 60 footbridges.

In 2021, there were 75km of cycleway and 7497km of footway in West Sussex. National Cycle Network (NCN) routes 2, 20, 21, 82, 88, 223, 228 are located fully or partially in West Sussex. There are over 4,000km (2,500 miles) of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) in West Sussex, which includes footpaths (1717 miles), bridleways (733 miles), restricted byways (81 miles) and byways open to all traffic (BOATs) (8 miles). There are also long-distance trails which partially follow PRoW such as the South Downs Way and Downs Link. In the near future, the planned England Coast Path will be a new long-distance trail through the County.

2011 Census records indicate that there are 413,000 cars and vans in West Sussex compared to 346,000 households. 18% of households have no car or van, 43% have one car or van and 39% have two or more cars or vans. Across West Sussex the average number of cars or vans per household stands at 1.34. The car remains the dominant mode of transport for journeys to work with nearly two thirds of people in employment travelling to work by car and the average distance travelled to work being 17km.

Currently, there are around 24,500 designated parking spaces in West Sussex, including over 6,000 which are free. Approximately 15,000 of these spaces are provided within 7 on-street parking schemes, located in Billingshurst, Bognor Regis, Chichester, Crawley, East Grinstead, Horsham and Worthing.

### **Parking Management in West Sussex**

In the 1980s the County Council's approach towards on-street parking was based upon two main criteria:

- (a) that action should be justified on grounds of road safety and/or traffic flow; and
- (b) that parking regulations should be mainly self-enforcing and require minimal supervision.

In effect, whilst parking problems in residential areas were recognised, the difficulties in resolving them were considered to out-weigh the benefits in taking action. This all changed following a major consultation and policy making exercise held in 1988, where a number of issues were raised:

- (i) there was a pressing need for better enforcement of waiting restrictions;
- (ii) the most constructive approach would be better facilities rather than more waiting prohibitions;
- (iii) comprehensive parking plans were urgently required in most towns; and
- (iv) environmental/amenity (i.e. residential) problems should be considered and tackled.

Accordingly, a more strategic approach to parking was agreed upon, whereby parking plans would address these issues by "having regard to the customer in the vehicle, whether moving or parked, and the needs of other road users and the environmental effects". This would require "the appropriate level and means of enforcement, to create a sufficient risk of detection to deter offenders." This approach formed the basis for the first on-street parking schemes in West Sussex, subsequently implemented in Chichester (1990), Bognor Regis (1992), Horsham (a small residents-only scheme, in 1994), and Worthing (1996).

In 1997, a review of the County Council's On-Street Parking Policies led to the development of the first IPS in July 2000. Incorporated within the Local Transport Plan for West Sussex, the IPS sought to reflect national, regional and local policies as well as establish a forward programme for more effective parking management throughout West Sussex at all levels.

## Part 2

### Parking Policy Context

A wide range of national and local policy and guidance documents have helped the County Council to develop its approach to parking management since the first IPS was produced in 2000. These documents enable it to understand the current situation, the challenges it faces and the options it has for tackling them. Whilst the County Council is careful to recognise the particular needs of communities within West Sussex, these documents are important as they provide it with the broader tools it needs to produce the right parking management approach for West Sussex as a whole.

A summary of each of the documents listed below can be seen in Appendix A

#### National Policy and Legislation

- The Future of Transport White Paper 2004
- Full Guidance on Local Transport Plans (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) 2004
- The Traffic Management Act 2004
- The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984
- The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016
- Towards a Sustainable Transport System 2007 and Delivering a Sustainable Transport System 2008
- Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon – Making Sustainable Transport Happen White Paper 2011
- The Climate Change Act 2008
- The Portas Review 2011
- Planning Policy Statements and Guidance Notes
- National Planning Policy Framework 2019

#### Local Policy

- The West Sussex Plan
- West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2026 (LTP3)

- West Sussex County Council Guidance on Parking at New Developments 2019
- Climate Change Strategy 2020
- Healthy and Well in West Sussex - West Sussex Public Health Plan 2012-2017
- Breathing Better Air Quality Plan 2018 (updated 2019)
- Electric Vehicle Strategy 2019

### **West Sussex Parking Policy and Operational Guidance Documents**

- WSCC Parking Policy 2018
- WSCC Controlled Parking Zone Policy 2021
- WSCC Controlled Parking Zone Management Guide

DRAFT

## Part 3

### An IPS for West Sussex 2022 - 2027

#### The Aim of the IPS

**To bring together a number of different policy influences to commission a joined-up parking service in West Sussex that reflects the objectives of Government, the County Council and Stakeholders as well as meet the needs of local communities.**

The County Council is committed to an active role in the overall management of public parking throughout West Sussex. 'Integrated', in the case of the IPS, refers to the coming together of various parking functions that are the separate responsibility of the County Council and the District and Borough Councils, and the close liaison between those authorities to provide a coordinated and joined-up parking service.

#### The Objectives of the IPS

By definition, the objectives of the IPS are broad, encompassing a range of policy influences, namely; Traffic Management, Community, Economic, Health and Wellbeing, Location, Enforcement and Financial.

##### Traffic Management

1. To manage the free flow of all traffic on the highway and to maintain road safety for all road users.
2. To share out limited kerb space amongst competing user groups, fairly and transparently.
3. To maintain town centre parking charges and controls that provide effective demand management to:

- protect the needs of residents and their visitors;
- encourage the turnover of on-street parking of short duration;
- support local businesses
- encourage long-stay parking to take place in off-street car parks and/or designated on-street locations; and
- minimise the effect of circulating traffic 'searching' for spaces.

### Community

1. To prioritise parking in residential areas for use by residents and their visitors.
2. To ensure that the parking and transport needs generated by new development are adequately provided for by the development and do not have adverse impacts upon local communities.

### Economic

1. To provide sufficient on-street car parking in town and district and village centres to maintain economic vitality and viability without encouraging unnecessary or excessive car use.

### Health and Wellbeing

1. To reduce levels of car ownership and reliance on the private car as the principle mode of choice through the promotion and support of alternatives, including car clubs, car sharing, non-car modes and active travel.
2. To facilitate the adoption of less polluting technology, such as electric vehicles, through the development of appropriate support infrastructure.

### Location

1. To positively encourage the location of activities in well-served and accessible areas.
2. To locate long-stay parking spaces in off-street car parks or less central on-street areas, subject to the safeguarding of residents' parking needs.
3. To support the provision of out-of-town Park and Ride schemes that reduce long-stay town centre parking.

## Enforcement

1. To provide a single integrated parking service, combining on-street and off-street management and enforcement that will be accessible, at a local level within the Districts and Boroughs.
2. To provide the effective enforcement of parking controls.

## Financial

1. For parking schemes to be self-financing. Individual schemes should, preferably, recover their set-up costs over a period of time and return a surplus to the On-Street Parking Account to provide for on-going maintenance, monitoring, enforcement, review and extension, where necessary.
2. To review parking charges regularly and to set those charges at levels that cover operating costs and influence short and long stay parking demands, consistent with traffic management and demand management objectives.
3. The County Council's On-Street Parking Account, to which all expenditure and income is assigned, to operate in surplus, as required under Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Any surpluses should be used, in the first instance, to implement or support parking schemes, and subsequently to improve parking facilities and approved transport and environmental improvement schemes, strategically across the County irrespective of where they originated.

## **The Policies of the IPS**

Within the IPS sit a set of priorities and policies that, when applied together, will help deliver the aims and objectives outlined above. Many of these are cross-cutting and the headings under which they are grouped are only intended to aid the narrative and flow of this document and are not intended to limit their application to a particular use or area.



<b>Policy No:</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Policy Statement</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Service Integration</b>	<b>The County Council, together with the District and Borough Councils, will take all reasonable steps to provide a cost-effective and efficient parking service.</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Effective Enforcement</b>	<b>Civil Parking Enforcement will be quality based and information readily available to help road users understand that enforcement is as fair, accurate and expeditious as possible.</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Asset Maintenance</b>	<b>Parking signing and lining defects will be corrected as soon as possible after being reported.</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Parking Management</b>	<b>Management of all on-street parking spaces will complement other transport and planning policies to discourage car use in congested urban areas, balance the needs of various competing user groups and maintain the economic viability of those areas.</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Parking Charges</b>	<b>On-Street parking charges will be reviewed regularly and set at an appropriate level to cover operating costs and influence parking demands, consistent with traffic management and environmental objectives.</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Controlled Parking Zones</b>	<b>A Controlled Parking Zone policy framework will set out an appropriate set of rules for the consideration, implementation, review and removal of Controlled Parking Zones</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Verge/Pavement Parking</b>	<b>The County Council will maintain a locally responsive approach towards verge and pavement parking, enabling it to draw on a range of options to manage issues in local communities.</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Blue Badge Scheme</b>	<b>The County Council will promote improved access for Blue Badge holders through the provision of designated on-street spaces and the detection and investigation of Blue Badge misuse</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Additional Enforcement Powers</b>	<b>The County Council will consider widening its parking enforcement powers, including for moving traffic, in order to improve compliance, improve road safety, reduce public transport journey times and reduce congestion.</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Technology and Innovation</b>	<b>The County Council will embrace technological innovations which help customers to better access services and aid the efficiency of parking operations.</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Financial and Operational Accountability</b>	<b>The County Council and the District/Borough Councils will be open and transparent about how the CPE Service works and how decisions are made.</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Best practice and Lobbying</b>	<b>As a member of the British Parking Association, the County Council will continue to add its voice to those of other local authorities when lobbying Government or responding to government consultations on parking issues.</b>

**IPS Policy No 1: Service Integration**

**The County Council, together with the District and Borough Councils, will take all reasonable steps to provide a cost-effective and efficient parking service.**

The Department for Transport (DfT) has issued operational guidance which sets out the policy framework within which it believes that all English Local Authorities should be setting their parking policies and, if appropriate, enforcing those policies.

While non-metropolitan District and Borough Councils in England are not able to apply for Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) powers the guidance stipulates that there should be very close co-operation between District and Borough Councils and their County Council. The guidance goes on to suggest that a District or Borough Council might, under an agency agreement, carry out parking duties, including enforcement, on behalf of a County Council.

In most areas with two tiers of local government it is the District or Borough Council that own and operate most local authority off-street car parks. Where a District or Borough Council also acts as an agent for their County Council, there should be significant efficiency gains in having a unified CPE operation.

Accordingly, the County Council has followed this model when introducing CPE in West Sussex between 2006 and 2010 and on-going operations in each District and Borough focus upon the provision of a unified parking service, combining on-street and off-street management and enforcement that is accessible and effective, at a local level.

West Sussex is divided into seven Civil Enforcement Areas (CEAs), which are contiguous with the District and Borough boundaries. The County Council is the Enforcement Authority for the enforcement of all decriminalised on-street parking regulations within the CEAs. The Police remain responsible for parking enforcement in those roads and areas that are excluded from the CEAs and for some other areas of enforcement. The County Council is also the Enforcement Authority for any off-street parking areas and car parks that it operates or controls.

The District and Borough Councils are the Enforcement Authorities for off-street car parks and parking areas that they operate or control. Through the use of Agency Agreements, they have also been delegated the responsibility for the on-street enforcement service and provision of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) management service. Under these joint working arrangements, the County Council is not responsible for the issuing or determination of Penalty Charge Notices (PCN) and any appeal against the issue of a PCN is made to the relevant District or Borough Council.

The County Council is confident that the current CPE service in West Sussex is being delivered fairly and transparently and in accordance with legislative requirements and industry standards. A number of operational processes have been refined since the introduction of CPE and the service is under continuous review in order to ensure that every opportunity is taken to reduce costs and improve its efficiency. Despite this, the County Council remains keen to identify areas for wider strategic and organisational improvement where necessary. Areas of intended improvement for the period 2022 – 2027 include a reduction of management costs and other overheads, a more streamlined set of processes and therefore lower administrative costs, and more cost-effective deployment of staffing resource and thus reduced staffing costs.

In sum, the County Council will continue to explore whether its current CPE service can be improved so that parking provision is delivered and organised in the most efficient and cost-effective way.

### **IPS Policy No 2: Effective Enforcement**

**Civil Parking Enforcement will be quality based and information readily available to help road users understand that enforcement is as fair, accurate and expeditious as possible.**

When it comes to the enforcement of on-street (and off-street) parking regulations, there are a number of principles that the DfT endorses and that underpin the Statutory and Operational guidance issued to local authorities. These are:

- The public have a right to expect fair and efficient enforcement
- There is a need for public confidence in a CPE scheme

- Authorities must have appropriate back office systems in place including properly trained staff
- Notice to Owner backlogs must be avoided
- Representations must be dealt with quickly and efficiently
- Mitigating circumstances must be properly considered
- Properly reasoned decisions must be given in response to representations
- Local Authorities must be sure of their ground before they contest appeals

The primary aim of parking enforcement in West Sussex is to achieve the following;

- To encourage a high level of compliance by motorists with the parking controls and waiting and loading restrictions.
- To integrate traffic management policies with effective on-street enforcement.
- To ensure the equitable distribution and management of the availability of parking space.
- Be responsive to changing priorities, local factors and demand.
- Provide parking permits, exemptions, dispensations and waivers for residents and businesses, the disabled, and others as appropriate.

A good CPE regime is one that uses quality-based standards that the public understands, and which are enforced fairly, accurately and expeditiously. Parking enforcement in West Sussex will therefore be 'fair but firm' and community support for or acceptance of parking controls is conditional upon achieving this balance in the enforcement operation.

A West Sussex Parking Policy assists in this objective and establishes the "ethos" of CPE. Available for the public to view on the County Council's website, it seeks to minimise the potential for misunderstanding and dispute over specific parking issues by reflecting the latest national legislation and guidance while recognising local needs and conditions across the county. The policy will be subject to periodic review, variation and amendment as it is appreciated that parking patterns and other circumstances may change.

Enforcement activity in West Sussex will continue to comply with the following general principles –

- Fairness in applying the legislation and securing compliance.
- Focusing enforcement action where necessary.
- Consistency of approach.

- Transparency about what enforcement action is taken and why.
- Recognition that an effective relationship between all areas of the enforcement operation is needed.

### **IPS Policy No 3: Asset Maintenance**

**Parking signing and lining defects will be corrected as soon as possible after being reported.**

Key to the successful enforcement of on-street parking is ensuring the correct lining and signing of the parking restrictions as they appear on the public highway and the expeditious correction of any faults to the lines and signs, as soon as possible after they occur.

The County Council has developed a framework protocol that forms part of the Agency Agreements with the District and Borough Councils, enabling them to log faults and undertake remedial work on all on-street parking lines and signs on behalf of the County Council. This framework will be kept under continuous review so that the provision of the service is delivered and organised in the most efficient and cost-effective way.

### **IPS Policy No 4: Parking Management**

**Management of all on-street parking spaces will complement other transport and planning policies to discourage car use in congested urban areas, balance the needs of various competing user groups and maintain the economic viability of those areas.**

The management of parking, in particular in built up areas, has become increasingly important for the County Council as the number of vehicles in West Sussex continues to increase. Residential areas, town/city centres and areas close to railway stations, local attractions or hospitals all experience varied levels of parking pressure and this can lead to conflict between competing user groups, for example between residents, shoppers, deliveries and workers.

The majority of issues raised with the County Council concern either a lack of available parking space or inconsiderate parking, or a combination of the two. Increasing the amount of on-street parking space is rarely possible and so the council has to try and find ways to make the best use of the limited space, providing parking for those that most need it while not ignoring the broader requirements of all road users. By restricting on-street parking where demand exceeds supply and providing alternative means of access to such areas, the pressure on the space available can be better controlled.

The County Council has no direct control over the provision of off-street parking in West Sussex as this is a matter for the District and Borough Councils as well as private operators. Nevertheless, all parties need to work together in order to ensure that on-street and off-street parking provision complement each other. In many circumstances, the purpose of this is to encourage motorists to park off street, particularly when parking for a long time i.e. while at work.

The cost of off-street parking should therefore be set below that of comparable on-street parking with a similar level of accessibility to facilities, such as shops and services. This creates a pricing mechanism whereby the off-street facilities are used in the first instance, increasing the availability of on-street parking for stays of the shortest duration and/or those trips that require the greatest accessibility. This mechanism makes the most efficient use of both on and off-street parking capacity, generates a turnover of spaces to support the local economy, minimises the effect of circulating traffic, 'cruising' for spaces and maximises on-street access for activities such as the loading and unloading of goods.

Overall, it is important to recognise that on and off-street parking management offers one of the main means of regulating the total flow of traffic to and from or within a built-up area. Whilst policies can be adapted to local circumstances; the underlying principles that will be followed by the County Council are widely applicable. These are:

- parking policies should positively encourage the location of activities in well-served and accessible areas;
- management of all public parking spaces should complement transport and planning policies to discourage car use in congested urban areas;
- tight parking control regimes should be the norm for town centres to enable charges and restrictions to be used as effective demand management tools;
- effective enforcement of on-street parking regulations is required and there is a general recognition that CPE is the most suitable mechanism;

- greater priority should be given to short stay shopper and visitor demand which add most value to the viability of the town centre;
- emphasis should be on ensuring rapid turnover of spaces in most convenient shopper car parks by a more consistent approach to parking charges;
- where possible, the needs of residents and their visitors should be given the highest priority
- restrictive parking management regimes are likely to be acceptable only if there is seen to be investment in public transport alternatives;
- parking standards for new development provide a consistent level of provision across the County.

### **IPS Policy No 5: Parking Charges**

**On-Street parking charges will be reviewed regularly and set at an appropriate level to cover operating costs and influence parking demands, consistent with traffic management and environmental objectives.**

Demand management is perhaps best understood when described in terms of the 'carrot and stick' approach to transport planning. Much of the County Council's Local Transport Plan is about improving travel alternatives and encouraging people to change their travel habits as a matter of personal choice - this is the 'carrot' part of demand management. However, there is widespread agreement that transport capacity is increasingly a scarce resource and an argument that private car use that is virtually free at the point of use can be controlled best by charging. Many people believe that with traffic levels continuing to rise there will come a time when charging is preferable to the costs of ever-increasing congestion – this is the 'stick' part of demand management.

The County Council's overall approach to managing demand utilises a mix of 'soft' measures such as road improvements and bus priority schemes, and 'harder' measures such as some form of road user charging. The IPS provides the platform for the introduction of the 'harder' type demand management measures.

On-Street parking charges enable the County Council to deliver its wider objectives for parking. Amongst other things, the availability and cost of on-street parking is important in supporting the economic vitality of town centres and reducing traffic

congestion. Achieving the correct level of charges is not an exact science, and there is no 'one size fits all' approach. Instead, many factors need to be balanced in order to arrive at an appropriate level of charging.

- Parking charges can help to curb unnecessary car use where there is adequate public transport or where car-sharing, walking and cycling are realistic alternatives, for example, in town centres;
- Charges can reflect the value of kerb-space, encouraging all but short-term parking to take place in nearby off-street car parks where available. Charges at a prime parking space in a busy town centre should normally be higher than those either at nearby off-street car parks or at designated places in more distant residential areas. Such a hierarchy needs to be as simple as practicable and applied consistently so that charge levels are readily understandable and acceptable to both regular and occasional users;
- Charges should be set at levels that encourage compliance with parking restrictions. If charges are set too high they could encourage drivers to risk non-compliance or to park in unsuitable areas, possibly in contravention of parking restrictions. In certain cases they could encourage motorists to park in a neighbouring area which may not have the capacity to handle the extra vehicles. In commercial districts this may have a negative impact on business in the area;
- If on-street charges are set too low, they could attract higher levels of traffic than are desirable. They could discourage the use of off-street car parks and cause the demand for parking spaces to exceed supply, so that drivers have to spend longer finding a vacant space. This will also inevitably lead to increased congestion and reduce the accessibility of the area.

On-Street parking charges will continue to be reviewed annually to ensure that they remain in balance with off-street charges, that all operational costs are met and that wider parking and environmental objectives are being met.

Also, to support its Climate Change Strategy the County Council will develop, implement and operate a differential parking charges mechanism that will encourage the ownership, take-up and use of zero and low emission vehicles, while discouraging the ownership and use of noxious and high emission vehicles. The emission-based charging mechanism will be consulted on in accordance with the emergence of the enabling technologies to assess its applicability and impact on residents and road users within West Sussex with a view to promoting the use of low or zero emission vehicles.



## **IPS Policy No 6: Controlled Parking Zones**

**A Controlled Parking Zone policy framework will set out an appropriate set of rules for the consideration, implementation, review and removal of Controlled Parking Zones**

In addition to the progression of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) are a vital component of the County Council's approach to on-street parking management and are a key demand management tool, in that they can control and manage parking over a wide area. CPZs are designed to prevent or manage all day on-street parking by non-residents, make it easier for residents, shoppers and visitors to park, enhance road safety and reduce congestion and pollution.

It is appreciated that in many cases, parking on the highway may best be managed informally by local communities and/or by small scale TROs, such as yellow lines on bends and junctions, and therefore the County Council will not actively seek out areas where new CPZs can be introduced. Many roads in West Sussex will generally remain unrestricted, so that the available on-street parking can serve a range of needs for residents, visitors and other community service providers.

The County Council will maintain a responsive position to parking problems and will be driven by complaints and expressions of interest before committing to undertaking CPZ investigations. The consideration of new CPZs will therefore only be favoured in situations where there is clear evidence of residents and other road users experiencing difficulties in parking and where any intervention on the part of the County Council, namely the use of on-street parking permits, has the initial support of the local community. It is often the case that CPZs actually reduce overall parking space in an area, as well as requiring residents etc to pay to park, so the County Council is keen to ensure that by its approach, it is not seen to be imposing such schemes upon local communities.

As demographics and local attractions change over time, the County Council will ensure that it is adapting to these changes and carry out a programme of CPZ reviews. These will typically be prioritised based on resident, business and stakeholder requests, changes to existing infrastructure as well as any significant developments in an area. All reviews will seek to ensure that established CPZs are achieving the desired effect and responding adequately to any changes in parking activity that may have arisen since their introduction or the last time they were reviewed.

A CPZ policy framework will set out an appropriate set of rules for the consideration, implementation, review and removal of CPZs and an outline on how decisions will be made by the County Council on whether particular proposals should be progressed. As with the County Council’s Parking Policy, the CPZ policy framework will be available for the public to view on the County Council website. A CPZ works programme will accompany this framework and both will be subject to regular review.

**IPS Policy No 7: Verge and Pavement parking**

**The County Council will maintain a locally responsive approach towards verge and pavement parking, enabling it to draw on a range of options to manage issues in local communities.**

Many pavements and verges are only designed and constructed to take the weight of pedestrians, mobility scooters and wheelchairs. The weight of a car or goods vehicle parking on a pavement or verge can cause considerable damage as well as other problems such as obstructing other road users.

In cases where the County Council wishes to take action in a particular area, TROs, such as yellow lines, will continue to be the most effective way to enforce pavement or verge parking as such restrictions apply not just to the carriageway, but to the back of the highway boundary.

It is also possible to deter pavement and verge parking and clearly indicate where people can park through a variety of physical measures such as guard rails, bollards or fixed/movable planters. The choice between these measures will depend on desired effect, location, access requirements and the need to consider requirements of disabled people, safety factors, aesthetic considerations and the funds available.

The County Council will discourage indiscriminate verge and pavement parking where it can but also recognises that in some situations where on-street parking capacity can’t meet demand, verges and footways are often utilised as overflow parking.

Whilst this is not ideal, it is often necessary to prevent roads from being obstructed by vehicles. In cases where no serious damage is being caused the County Council may choose not to take any action.

If a pavement is wide enough, TROs may be considered to allow parking partly or wholly on defined sections of pavement. A variety of alternative treatments, such as converting a verge to hardstanding, may also be considered in some areas. Works of this nature can be expensive, but there may be opportunities to introduce them when maintenance schemes are undertaken e.g. carriageway widening.

The issue of pavement and verge parking is also being considered at a national level and in the summer of 2020 the DfT launched a consultation to seek views on some additional options to help local authorities tackle this problem.

To further develop its understanding of the pavement parking problem, the DfT sought views on:

- whether its ongoing work to improve the TRO process, under which local authorities can already prohibit pavement parking, is sufficient and proportionate to tackle pavement parking where it is a problem; or if not:
- which of 2 specific options might be preferred. These options involve either (1) legislative change to allow local authorities with CPE powers to enforce against 'unnecessary obstruction of the pavement' or (2) legislative change to introduce a London-style pavement parking prohibition throughout England.

The DfT recognises that there are pros and cons for each of the options, and the responses on each will hopefully inform how this issue should be addressed. The County Council will continue to monitor this national situation whilst maintaining a locally responsive approach towards specific issues.

### **IPS Policy No 8: Blue Badge (Disabled Persons Parking) Scheme**

**The County Council will promote improved access for Blue Badge holders through the provision of designated**

**on-street spaces and the detection and investigation of Blue Badge misuse.**

The Equality Act 2010 protects disabled people from direct or indirect discrimination. Sections 20-22 of the Act, imposes a duty to make reasonable adjustments to ensure that a disabled person is not put at a disadvantage in comparison with persons who are not disabled.

The Blue Badge Scheme is a National Concession, managed by the Department for Transport and administered in West Sussex by the County Council. The scheme is governed by legislation and eligibility criteria set by central government. The Scheme provides a range of national on-street parking concessions for eligible disabled people with visible and non-visible ('hidden') disabilities to assist them to access goods and services, by allowing them to park close to their destination. Blue Badge holders may travel as either the driver or passenger in accordance with the rules of the scheme.

The County Council attaches particular importance to catering for disabled people. The Department for Work and Pensions reports that 44% of state pension adults, 19% of working age adults and 8% of children are disabled and so it will continue to be an important part of the County Council's parking policy that disabled people who severely struggle to access the community, should be able to travel with the minimum of difficulty.

The County Council will support Blue Badge holders by:

- Facilitating free and time unlimited parking in its on-street pay-and display spaces;
- Facilitating time unlimited parking in its limited waiting parking bays, unless there is a traffic regulation order in place specifically time-limiting parking for Blue Badge holders;
- Permitting parking on single or double yellow lines for up to three hours except where there is a ban on loading and unloading.
- Issuing a free first residents' parking permit if the holder lives within a CPZ
- Providing mandatory on-street disabled bays (backed up by a TRO and enforceable by CEOs), subject to an application process.

- Providing advisory on-street disabled bays (also subject to an application process) but also investigating whether more of these bays can be made mandatory so that they can be enforced.
- Not immobilising (clamping) vehicles and only removing them if there is an emergency, security or ceremonial reason, or where the vehicle is causing a serious safety hazard or obstruction.
- Investigating cases of Blue Badge misuse (see below)

In 2019, 99% of prosecutions for Blue Badge misuse in the UK were non-badge holders using another person's badge. There are several ways in which Blue Badges can be misused. These include:

- Misuse of a valid badge by a friend or relative, with or without the badge holder's knowledge or permission;
- Misuse of a badge issued to a person who has since passed away;
- Fraudulently altering a badge in order to make it appear valid (such as altering the expiry date);
- Use of a badge that has been reported lost or stolen – possibly to obtain another badge for a friend or relation; and
- Use of a badge that is no longer valid.

CEOs will continue to play an important part in identifying lost, stolen and fraudulent badges as part of their daily enforcement regime. Specialist Blue Badge Investigators will also be employed by the County Council to detect and investigate misuse on specific enforcement action days. These will involve checking Blue Badges in use and where misuse is suspected, retaining badges for further investigation and possible legal action. CEO's and local parking teams will support these operations to share knowledge and knowhow.

Where this is a clear problem (and there is a business case for tackling it) District and Borough Councils will, either individually or as a group, be able to set up a specialist Blue Badge enforcement team to carry out undercover surveillance work. The team may identify suspected systematic abuse and apply for permission to carry out further undercover surveillance in order to build up evidence that can later be used to prosecute the individual in the Magistrates Court.

The County Council will continue to work alongside Sussex Police to monitor Blue Badge misuse including working on joint enforcement operations and using Community Resolutions as an educational tool to deal with low level misuse.

Currently the UK has reciprocal arrangements with all European Union Member States for use of Disabled Person’s Blue Badges. These give badge holders the right to parking concessions provided in the host country by displaying a badge issued under their own national scheme.

Although the County Council currently does not know whether these or new national reciprocal agreements will be in place after the UK leaves the EU, in West Sussex, CEOs will continue to treat vehicles displaying the Blue Badge of a participating EU country as if it were displaying a UK Blue Badge. If a vehicle displays a Blue Badge equivalent from a country outside of the EU, then the Blue Badge exemptions need not apply unless the County Council has agreed to recognise badges from that country. However, it is acknowledged that the general obligation in the Equality Act still applies if a vehicle is believed to be used by a disabled person. The County Council will take great care to ensure that it meets its obligations.

Separate guidance exists to inform decision makers of the requirements of disabled people when considering planning proposals for new developments.

**IPS Policy No 9: Additional Enforcement Powers within the Traffic Management Act**

**The County Council will consider widening its parking enforcement powers, including for moving traffic, in order to improve compliance, improve road safety, reduce public transport journey times and reduce congestion.**

Automatic Number Plate Recognition

In 2021 the Traffic and Technology Division of the Department for Transport published an advice note to all local authorities in England asking for applications of interest from those who may wish to seek a Designation Order, under the Traffic Management Act, for part 6 powers on their highway network. This would permit authorities to monitor their road networks and enforce a number of ‘moving traffic’ contraventions via the use of Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras.

As part of a wider programme of measures to reduce congestion and pollution and to improve the reliability and punctuality of public transport, the County Council has already enacted the powers to enforce bus gate contraventions in West Sussex using

ANPR cameras and four bus gate camera enforcement trial sites are currently being considered. The aim of enforcement at such sites is to give priority to public transport by excluding other road users during prescribed hours. Evaluation of these sites will be undertaken during their operation to better inform and empower the County Council to plan next actions in the use or not of ANPR camera enforcement on the county's highway.

Should the County Council wish to consider extending its part 6 powers in the future, policies and procedures will need to be developed to identify ANPR enforcement sites and to ensure all necessary actions and considerations have been undertaken at each site. The objectives behind it and the rules by which it would be operated will need to be made absolutely clear to stakeholders and the public. A Code of Practice will need to be prepared that ensures that issues such as privacy, integrity and fairness are properly dealt with. This will also set a minimum standard to be adhered to by the County Council for enforcing TROs using CCTV cameras to ensure public confidence.

One particular area where the County Council will examine the feasibility of ANPR enforcement is in relation to parking contraventions outside of schools, for example parking in bus stops and on school keep clear markings. School parking enforcement builds upon the work delivered through Safer Routes to School, Road Safety Education and School Travel Planning as part of the County Council's wider approach to Behavioural Change. The main objectives are to build confidence in sustainable travel for the journey to and from school by protecting key access points to schools, improving visibility and reducing the potential of casualties. Most importantly, enforcement is used to deal with poor parking behaviours around school gates at drop off and pick up times, which directly addresses common issues raised by school communities.

The County Council will also explore the use of pan tilt zoom cameras on the highway network to support its efforts in minimising disruption to the travelling public. With the ongoing consideration of Lane Rental Powers for the County Council, if applied for and granted by Secretary of State, this could lead to the greater use of such cameras for the monitoring and enforcement of Lane Rental Powers on the busiest roads in the county. The use of pan tilt zoom cameras will bring with it GDPR concerns that must be considered and addressed. This will involve working with Sussex and Surrey Police as well as a probable linking of the County Council's potential camera network with the Police's existing network.

Double Parking and Dropped kerbs

The TMA also enables authorities with CPE powers to enforce prohibitions of double parking and parking at dropped footways without the need for a TRO or traffic signs. The purpose of these powers are to help prevent inconsiderate and selfish parking causing congestion and road safety problems.

Parking more than 50cm from the edge of the carriageway may not cause problems for smaller vehicles, but can obstruct the passage of ambulances, fire engines, buses, waste collection vehicles and other essential vehicles. The contravention of double parking applies when a vehicle parks on any part of the carriageway and no part of the vehicle is within 50 cm of the edge of the carriageway, subject to the exemptions in part 6 of the TMA.

Parking alongside a drooped footway can cause considerable inconvenience to vehicles trying to enter/leave a premises but it can also put vulnerable road users at greater risk of being involved in a road traffic accident.

The contravention of parking adjacent to a dropped footway applies where a vehicle parks on the carriageway next to a place where the footway, cycle track or verge has been lowered to the level of the carriageway (or where the carriageway has been raised to the level of the footway, cycle track or verge) to assist pedestrians crossing the carriageway, cyclists entering or leaving the carriageway or vehicles entering or leaving the carriageway across the footway, cycle track or verge.

The County Council will examine the feasibility of double parking and dropped kerb enforcement. If the powers are to be applied, they will need to be clearly communicated to the public and used reasonably and with circumspection. Ideally, they would only be taken if a vehicle was causing or likely to cause a road safety hazard or obstruction to other road users or pedestrians. Restrictions on the situations in which an authority can use these powers mean that they may be more suitable for tackling persistent problems than occasional ones.

#### Vehicle Removal

The County Council has the power, under the TMA, to operate the removal of vehicles that are parked in contravention of the parking regulations but has decided not to enact these powers to date.



Consideration will be given to vehicle removal in cases where a vehicle is causing a serious hazard or obstruction or where it is preventing essential highways works (i.e. resurfacing) from being undertaken. Vehicle removal could also be considered in cases where a vehicle is subject to numerous PCNs (i.e. a persistent evader) or where it is untaxed.

Other agencies, including the Police, the DVLA and Enforcement Agents acting under the jurisdiction of a County Court, may operate removal of vehicles under separate powers and without the need for the County Council's consent or approval.

#### The Continuing Role of Sussex Police

Under CPE the police service has been specifically excluded from yellow line parking enforcement although it retains responsibility for certain non-yellow line parking offences:

- Those offences for which a motorist can receive endorsements on their driving licence, such as dangerous parking, obstruction, and for failure to comply with police 'no parking' signs placed in emergencies;
- Moving traffic offences and infringements, including bus lane enforcement;
- Acting against any vehicle where security or other traffic policing issues are involved, including parking enforcement at Gatwick Airport and the need to close roads or set up diversions; and
- All parking restrictions on roads outside CEAs (including the trunk roads and high speed roads).

The County Council will continue to work closely with Sussex Police on all matters related to parking and traffic enforcement

#### **IPS Policy No 10: Technology and Innovation**

**The County Council will embrace technological innovations which help customers to better access services and aid the efficiency of parking operations.**

We are now considered to be a 'Smartphone Society' with Ofcom reporting that 76% of adults own a Smartphone. Smartphones have overtaken laptops as the most popular device for getting online with faster 4G connections helping change

the way people make transactions and communicate. In-car technology and connectivity have also seen unparalleled growth in recent times with industry experts predicting that over the next 5 to 10 years vehicle transport will change more than it has in the last 100 years.

This surge in technology has extended to the parking industry which has resulted in convergence, development and innovation. Customers now expect to be able to access flexible and convenient services on-line and be able to make quick and easy parking transactions when using parking facilities

Technological developments have the potential to improve the service that is offered to customers as well as the effectiveness of managing that service. A number of developments are currently being implemented by the County Council and/or being considered for the next five year period.

#### Pay & Display

Pay & Display (P&D) is not new in itself, but the on-going development in technology is improving the customer interface, payment systems and the quality of data that is available for parking management. The County Council currently operates P&D in all of its CPZs and has established a replacement/upgrade programme (whereby existing cash only machines will be upgraded to take cash/card/contactless payments) in order to improve the accessibility and transparency of its on-street parking, reduce cash collection and on-going upgrade/repair costs as well as give customers a better experience

As processing power and screen technology improves, it becomes easier to present instructions and information on larger and clearer screens and in a range of languages. So newer machines will benefit users in West Sussex, where the population demographic varies and where there is a developed tourist economy.

The development of the internet, of .net computer platforms and mobile phone networks has already led to much easier networking of on-street equipment across mobile phone networks. This has allowed all P &D machines in West Sussex to be linked to their operational base and for the machines to send data reports and alerts. The management of the equipment becomes much more effective as an operator may respond to an alert (i.e. to empty a machine's cashbox or to refill its ticket roll) when it is necessary to do so rather than check each machine on a daily (or more frequent) basis. This also creates a log of any mechanical breakdown enabling a faster response time and thereby reducing lost revenue. A record of breakdowns can also be cross-referenced to provide evidence to defend parking appeals when it is claimed that a machine was not operational.

Networking also allows a flow of data that can be analysed to determine parking patterns and to identify parking trends. This becomes a powerful modelling tool when the data from the on-street and off-street environments are combined in a single back-office system. Integrating on-street systems with those of the District and Borough Councils enables the County Council to gain a more comprehensive understanding of parking behaviour across a town centre and to understand patterns in more detail i.e. parking bay turnover. In the future, this data will provide a better tool for modelling changes in parking controls or parking charges.

### Mobile Phone Payments

There is little doubt that a significant proportion of the population have mobile phones that are able to make payments for parking and that many are willing to do so. However, the rapid growth in mobile phone payments has predominantly been in off-street car parks and on-street in London. In both of these situations, the parking charges are of a level that justifies the payment of a transaction fee by the customer. To date, the County Council has been of the view that payment of a transaction charge would not be attractive in West Sussex where charged parking is predominantly short stay (e.g. 1 hour maximum stay) and the associated charges are relatively low.

However, Covid-19 has had a profound effect upon consumer parking preferences and while there may still be uncertainty around the long-term impact of the pandemic, the County Council is expecting to see phone-based parking payments take priority, coupled with a reduced use of parking machines. Accordingly, the County Council will examine options to bring forward the introduction of mobile phone payment technology in its on-street pay and display locations as well as any off-street assets.

In addition to the potential migration from machine to cashless payments, the County Council will look to make more data driven decisions, specifically to track sessions and income.

### Digital Permits

These can be issued to customers who submit an online permit application and attach scanned supporting documentation. Once an online authorisation has been granted for the permit and payment has been made, the permit can be added to a database of current digital or 'virtual' permits. On-street enforcement staff are then able to interrogate the database to check whether a vehicle holds a valid permit.

The benefits of digital permits are the ease of application and rapid authorisation of a live permit without requiring a bureaucratic administrative process and the necessity for customers to wait for a physical permit to arrive in the post. The ease of holding data on a database removes problems of permits that fall of windscreens or get stolen, changing permits when changing vehicles and updating details when residents change addresses.

The County Council has already introduced digital on-street permits in some areas and will seek to roll these out into all of its CPZs, and some off-street assets by 2027.

#### Back Office Centralisation

Developments in 'cloud' computing provide the opportunity for greater centralisation of the back office systems used by the District and Borough Councils for the management of CPE. Centralisation can provide a single system, hosted by the system provider – on a 'cloud' – and accessed via the internet. Partitioning the system protects each council's data whilst the County Council has access to view headline data across all sites. This greatly improves access to data for monitoring and reporting and facilitates the unification of equipment, such as handheld computers, and stationery – providing greater purchasing power, increasing efficiency and reducing costs.

The County Council will ensure that a single cloud based back office system is in place across West Sussex.

#### Ultra-Low Emission Vehicles (ULEV)

The Government sees ULEVs as 'a vital part of the government's plans for a modern transport system that promotes economic growth whilst benefiting the environment'. Whilst ULEVs in themselves do not contribute to reducing congestion on the network they can impact positively on lowering emissions and pollution in cities.

Vehicles include hydrogen fuel cell and electric (plug in) vehicles for both private and commercial use. Key to developing ULEV use, particularly in households without access to off road parking will be access to convenient, reliable public charging. West Sussex County Council, in its Electric Vehicle Strategy has committed, amongst other things to providing a comprehensive and cohesive public charging solution on public land. This should include three main types of charging infrastructure - residential charging, rapid hub charging and destination (top Up) charging.

The Strategy also makes it clear that any solution must be at zero cost to the Council. The County Council has worked in partnership with many of the district and borough councils across the county to secure a market based supplier that will be responsible for planning, funding, building, marketing and operating publicly accessible chargepoint network across West Sussex, as well as providing an on-going 24/7 service (including the management of payments and support), maintenance and repair to ensure the network is fully operational at all times.

### Car Clubs

Car Clubs have been established in Chichester and Horsham. Car Clubs enable people to make use of a vehicle when they need to rather than maintaining a personal vehicle. Car Club vehicles are parked in dedicated bays on-street thereby removing the need to search for a parking space. Short and long term hire options are available.

West Sussex County Council is committed to encouraging the development of car clubs, both on-street and in new developments. In this way the numbers of vehicles seeking to park in already oversubscribed areas can be reduced. There is also evidence to suggest that car club members make more use of public transport, walking and cycling than people who own their vehicle.

### Variable or Demand Responsive Charging

Technology for variable pricing of parking has been explored, developed and piloted in San Francisco. The 'SFpark' system uses new technologies and policies to improve parking in San Francisco. The benefits are cited as follows:

- More parking availability makes streets less congested and safer.
- Meters that accept credit and debit cards reduce frustration and parking citations.

Smart pricing enables drivers in San Francisco to quickly find open spaces. To help achieve the right level of parking availability, SFpark periodically adjusts meter and garage pricing up and down to match demand. This 'demand-responsive pricing' encourages drivers to park in underused areas and garages, reducing demand in overused areas

and helps to readjust parking patterns in the city so that parking is easier to find. The changes in pricing are always advertised in advance and the system works using an app/website so that drivers can plan ahead.

This approach to charging for parking may be considered in parts of West Sussex at an appropriate time. Should such a scheme be considered in the future it will be subject to full consultation in line with government advice

**IPS Policy No 11: Financial and Operational Accountability**

**The County Council and the District/Borough Councils will be open and transparent about how the CPE Service works and how decisions are made.**

CPE in West Sussex is a means of achieving transport policy objectives. Raising revenue is not an objective of CPE, nor will West Sussex CPE authorities set targets for revenue or the number of PCNs they issue. For good governance, West Sussex enforcement authorities need to forecast CPE revenue and expenditure in advance.

If a surplus is generated, the legislation does allow authorities to fund certain activities from a prescribed list and the County Council’s practices are consistent with this legislation. The judgement in *R v LB Camden (ex parte Cran)* makes clear that the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 is not a revenue raising Act and this is a useful reminder in times of financial strain on local authority budgets.

West Sussex enforcement authorities will run their CPE operations (both on and off-street) as efficiently, effectively and economically as possible. The purpose of penalty charges is to dissuade motorists from contravening parking restrictions. The objective of CPE should ultimately be for 100 per cent compliance, with no penalty charges, however it is unlikely that it will ever reach this position. Parking charges and penalty charges are aimed to be proportionate, and so authorities seek not to set them at unreasonable levels. Any penalty charge payments received (whether for on-street or off-street enforcement) must only be used in accordance with section 55 (as amended) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and again this is a useful reminder in times of financial strain.

The Secretary of State will not expect either national or local taxpayers to meet any deficit and for this reason all CPE schemes in West Sussex have clear mechanisms to manage any projected deficits.

### The On-Street Parking Account

On-street parking charges, which include P&D and permit charges as well as penalties from CPE accrue to the County Council's On-Street Parking account. The costs and expenses associated with introducing, managing and maintaining on-street parking are all drawn from this account.

This account is managed in accordance with the requirements of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which sets out the purposes for which the County Council may levy on-street parking charges and how any surplus may be spent. It is important to note that parking charges may be levied for traffic management objectives and they are not to be made for the purpose of raising revenue. If a surplus is generated, the legislation does allow authorities to fund certain activities from a prescribed list. The County Council's practices are consistent with the legislation.

As a Highway Authority, the County Council's responsibilities are strategic as well as local and they extend across the entire County. As such, the County Council manages a single On-Street Parking account and it invests surpluses strategically across the County, irrespective of where they originated.

### Reporting

Clearly, reporting is an important part of accountability. The transparency given by regular and consistent reporting will help the public understand and accept CPE. Monitoring also provides the West Sussex CPE authorities with management information for performance evaluation and helps to identify where they might need to improve the CPE regimes. It provides a framework for performance comparisons between councils and this report includes a section showing the benefits that any net parking income has helped to pay for through the WSCC On-Street Parking Account.

In addition to providing regular performance reports to the County Council, West Sussex CPE enforcement authorities will produce an annual report about their enforcement activities. The report will be published and as a minimum it will cover the

financial, statistical and other data necessary to illustrate the performance of the respective CPE schemes. The annual report will be developed over time to ensure that it is fully 'fit for purpose', transparent, easily understood and above all informative.

West Sussex CPE enforcement authorities will make annual returns to the Government about the number and speed of payment of PCNs. All West Sussex CPE authorities use the Traffic Penalty Tribunal which is an independent adjudication service and so they will also advise the adjudication service in a timely fashion how many PCNs they have issued.

West Sussex CPE authorities are seeking to develop and include information that will allow their performance to be assessed over time and measured against each other and also against other comparable authorities. Each authority will publish the report on their website and place copies in civic offices and local libraries.

West Sussex CPE authorities expect benefits from collecting and comparing management information on other aspects of civil parking enforcement operations. Examples include the grounds on which representations and appeals are made, the number of CEOs employed or deployed, and perhaps the average number of appeals per officer.

**IPS Policy No 1: Best practice and Lobbying**

**As a member of the British Parking Association, the County Council will continue to add its voice to those of other local authorities when lobbying Government or responding to government consultations on parking issues.**

As the professional body representing the parking industry, the British Parking Association (BPA) represents both the public and private sector to inform and influence Government policy. As a member of the BPA, the County Council already supports the development of best practice within parking

The County Council will continue to be an enthusiastic supporter of the work that the BPA carries out not only on behalf of local authorities, but also the commercial sector. The resultant interface is vital in ensuring West Sussex remains up to date with developments particularly in technology and the industry as a whole.



The interface between the BPA and government, particularly with the DfT and the Home Office, is most valuable for it enables not only disparate local authorities to approach issues with one voice, but adds the weight of the business sector to representations. The inputs of the BPA to TMA operational guidance has proven valuable – work which continues today. Such lobbying causes government to consider matters presented to it with greater attention.

The County Council has been pleased to base its agency agreements on the BPA's model contract. Helpful in the case of Worthing which alone of all the districts and boroughs, decided to appoint a contractor to undertake enforcement (for which the model contract was originally designed), and elsewhere forming the core of service level agreements which detail the operational standards and responsibilities expected from each District and Borough.

The BPA has been instrumental in developing the City & Guilds course for the training of CEOs and the County Council requires each of its Districts and Boroughs to ensure their CEOs gain this qualification. There has also been an enthusiastic uptake in applications for Park Mark safer parking status in many of the off-street car parks operated by the District and Borough Councils.

As well as for its own interests, the County Council will continue to actively encourage its Districts and Boroughs to participate in the various exhibitions, seminars and workshops offered by the BPA. The Local Authority Special Interest Group (LASIG) is an excellent national forum for networking and exchanging news and views. The Regional Groups likewise provide opportunities for members at a more local level.

It is vital that all local authorities keep abreast of issues such as the fraudulent use Blue Badges, developments with the Traffic Enforcement Centre handling of registrations and warrants, and best practise with regard to bailiffs. The experiences of other authorities in having adopted cashless parking, ANPR and CCTV technologies are recent examples of important learning for the County Council.

The County Council is a champion of firm but fair enforcement and for transparency in all aspects of parking enforcement – qualities which it is pleased that the BPA also supports on behalf of all in the industry, for example, through its development of best practice guidelines on producing the CPE Annual Report and the consumer's guide to parking. The County Council will therefore continue to support the BPA's work and have no hesitation in recommending active membership to all those engaged in the parking industry.

DRAFT

## IPS Action Plan 2022 – 2027 (This action plan will be reviewed and updated annually)

IPS Policy		IPS Objectives Met	Specific Actions	Timescales	Review
<b>1.</b>	The County Council, together with the District and Borough Councils, will take all reasonable steps to provide a cost-effective and efficient parking service.	Traffic Management Community Economic Health & Wellbeing Location Enforcement Financial	Undertake a comprehensive review of the County Council’s CPE service  Introduction of a new back office case management system (Chipside)	CPE Review Report completed Spring 2020 and updated November 2021. Further feasibility work to continue throughout 2022/23. Next Agency Agreements due for renewal May 2024  Introduced countywide from April 2021	On-going. Gateway review April 2023  Client meetings every 6 months
<b>2.</b>	Civil Parking Enforcement will be quality based and information readily available to help road users understand that enforcement is as fair, accurate and expeditious as possible.	Traffic Management Community Economic Health & Wellbeing Location Enforcement Financial	Publication of the County Council’s IPS and Parking Policy as well as the District and Borough Council Annual Parking Reports	IPS Review to be undertaken in Spring 2022 with publication later in year  Parking Policy to be reviewed in February 2022 and published shortly after	Annual review of action plan  Procedural review every 3 years

			Production (internal) of CPE performance reports for each District/Borough. Key information to be fed into annual parking reports.	Annual Reports to be published by the District and Borough Councils by the end of October each year.  Operative from April 2022	Annually  Quarterly
<b>3.</b>	Parking signing and lining defects will be corrected as soon as possible after being reported.	Traffic Management Economic Enforcement	Review (internal) of sign/line defect expenditure as well as PCN cancellations attributed to sign/line defects	Operative from April 2021	Quarterly
<b>4.</b>	Management of all on-street parking spaces will complement other transport and planning policies to discourage car use in congested urban areas, balance the needs of various competing user groups and maintain the economic viability of	Traffic Management Community Economic Health & Wellbeing Location Enforcement Financial	Parking Standards Review  Review of internal processes related to Section 278 agreements  Review of IPS and CPZ	Completed 2020/21  Completed 2021/22  IPS review to be undertaken Spring 2022. Review of CPZ	Annual review of action plan and

	those areas.		operational guidance	operational guidance is on-going	continuous review of CPZ guidance.
<b>5.</b>	On-Street parking charges will be reviewed regularly and set at an appropriate level to cover operating costs and influence parking demands, consistent with traffic management and environmental objectives	Traffic Management Economic Location Enforcement Financial		Parking Charges reviews to be considered annually with any changes effective from October 1 <sup>st</sup> .	Annually
<b>6.</b>	A Controlled Parking Zone policy framework will set out an appropriate set of rules for the consideration, implementation, review and removal of Controlled Parking Zones	Traffic Management Community Economic Health & Wellbeing Location Enforcement Financial	Prepare new CPZ policy and incorporate forward programme for CPZ development and review.	Completion of policy January 2022. To be published Spring 2022.  CPZ Reviews to be undertaken as and when appropriate	Annually
<b>7.</b>	The County Council will maintain a locally responsive approach towards verge and pavement parking, enabling it to draw on a range of options to	Traffic Management Community Enforcement	Undertake feasibility study relating to a road specific or area wide footway parking ban (dependent on location)	Position paper completed 2021. Progress dependent on DfT announcement	On-going

	manage issues in local communities.				
<b>8.</b>	The County Council will promote improved access for Blue Badge holders through the provision of designated on-street spaces and the detection and investigation of Blue Badge misuse	Traffic Management Community Health & Wellbeing Location	Undertake feasibility study relating to supporting advisory disabled bays with traffic regulation orders	During 2022/23 and in accordance with CPZ programme.	On-going
<b>9.</b>	The County Council will widen its parking enforcement powers, including for moving traffic, in order to improve compliance, improve road safety, reduce public transport journey times and reduce congestion.	Traffic Management Health & Wellbeing Location Enforcement	Feasibility study relating to CCTV enforcement of School Keep Clears and Bus Stops outside schools (dependent on location)	TBC	TBC
			Adoption of further Pt 6 powers (moving traffic)	TBC	TBC
			Feasibility study relating to the enforcement of double/drop kerb parking	During 2022/23	On-going

<b>10.</b>	The County Council will embrace technological innovations which help customers to better access services and aid the efficiency of parking operations.	Traffic Management Community Economic Health & Wellbeing Enforcement Financial	Implementation of On-Street Pay and Display upgrade programme (incorporating card and contactless payments)	Replacement programme runs from 2020 – 2026	On-going
			Introduction of digital parking permits	Introduced in part of Chichester July 2021. Worthing in February 2022. Roll out to continue throughout 2022 and 2023, subject to Chipside resources	On-going
			Introduction of a new back office case management system (Chipside)	System introduced countywide from April 2021	Client meetings every 6 months
			Provision for car clubs will be provided where appropriate.	As per CPZ review programme	On-going
<b>11.</b>	The County Council and the District/Borough Councils will be open and transparent about how the CPE Service works and how decisions are	Traffic Management Financial	All District/Borough Councils to produce an Annual Report	By the end of October each year	Annually
			County Council to produce annual statement of parking	By June each year	Annually

	made.		accounts		
<b>12.</b>	As a member of the BPA, the County Council will continue to add its voice to those of other local authorities when lobbying Government or responding to government consultations on parking issues.	Traffic Management		On-going	Annually

DRAFT



# Appendix A

## National Policy and Legislation

### **The Future of Transport White Paper 2004**

This sets out a long- term strategy for a modern, efficient and sustainable transport system backed up by sustained high levels of investment over 15 years. Effective management of the road network is a key part of this.

### **Full Guidance on Local Transport Plans (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) 2004**

The guidance says that local authorities should have policies aimed at tackling congestion and changing travel behaviour, and these include restricting and/or charging for car parking on-street.

### **The Traffic Management Act 2004**

The Traffic Management Act (TMA) takes this a step further and sets out a statutory and network management duty for all local authorities to ensure the effective management of their road networks and details the mechanisms through which this is to be achieved. Of particular importance is Part 6 which provides for the civil enforcement of parking and traffic contraventions. This primary legislation came into effect in 2008 and determines the enforcement mechanisms that can be used by local authorities in order to effectively manage their road networks.

The County Council has adopted these powers for parking enforcement, countywide, through the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE).

### **The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984**

The Road Traffic Regulation Act is a piece of primary legislation that allows highway authorities to lawfully restrict and manage traffic (including cycling and walking - both considered 'traffic'). In particular it sets out (in Part I) how Traffic Regulation Orders (or Traffic Management Orders) can be employed to limit or prevent the use of the road by a particular form of traffic.

### **The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016**

The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (commonly abbreviated to TSRGD) is the law that sets out the design and conditions of use of official traffic signs that can be lawfully placed on or near roads in Great Britain (England, Scotland and Wales). The Traffic Signs Manual is a companion guide to the TSRGD which sets out dimensions and other details for using the authorised signs and markings.

### **Towards a Sustainable Transport System 2007 and Delivering a Sustainable Transport System 2008**

These documents represent a response to the Stern Review and Eddington Study. The Stern Review examines the potential cost of climate change to the economy and particularly the economic costs and benefits of reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. The Eddington Study explores the links between transport, the economy and the Government's commitment to sustainable development.

Five objectives for long term transport investment are put forward in the documents.

- To help our economy grow and compete internationally by providing reliable transport that makes the best use of all of our resources;
- Tackling climate change by reducing transport's emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases;
- Make transport safer and healthier by reducing deaths, illnesses and injuries caused by transport and promoting ways of travelling that are good for our health;
- To promote a fairer society and, through transport, allowing everyone to access the opportunities that will help them improve their lives; and

- To promote the aspects of transport that improve our quality of life by helping us access the goods, services and people that we value, whilst reducing the negative effects of these trips on the environment.

Clearly, managing demand for parking is one way of changing the travel choices people have to make, so it is a necessary element in reducing emissions as well as improving the reliability of the transport network and, therefore, the economy.

### **Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon – Making Sustainable Transport Happen White Paper 2011**

The White Paper sets out the need to focus on low-cost, high-value interventions. A package approach is advocated, giving people choice at a local level for short trips and 'nudging' them towards sustainable choices. The view is that for many longer distance trips there is no alternative to the private car; therefore, the paper proposes technological advancement as the major part of the policy to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from transport. It also encourages local authorities to provide electric vehicle charging infrastructure in new developments and suggests that they set aside some residential car parking spaces for car club vehicles.

#### Decarbonising transport: setting the challenge 2020

This Government wish to produce a clear Transport Decarbonisation Plan will set out in detail what government, business and society will need to do to deliver the significant emissions reduction needed across all modes of transport, to achieving net zero emissions across every single mode of transport by 2050.

This document is the first step to developing the policy proposals and a coordinated plan for decarbonising transport, and it sets out six priorities:

- Accelerating modal shift to public and active transport
- Decarbonisation of road vehicles
- Decarbonising how we get our goods
- Place-based solutions
- UK as a hub for green transport technology and innovation

- Reducing carbon in
- a global economy

### **The Climate Change Act 2008**

The Climate Change Act 2008 is the basis for the UK's approach to tackling and responding to climate change. It requires that emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases (e.g. via transport) are reduced and that climate change risks are prepared for. The Act also establishes the framework to deliver on these requirements.

The Act supports the UK's commitment to urgent international action to tackle climate change and sets out a target to significantly reduce UK greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 and a path to get there. In 2019 the Government amended the goals within this Act and committed the UK to achieving "net zero" greenhouse gases by 2050.

### **The Portas Review 2011**

This offers an independent review into the future of our high streets and provides a valuable insight into retailers' parking needs. It explains the role parking can play in making high streets more vibrant and competitive places. The review provides a useful counterpoint to other literature on the role of parking, that should form part of the evidence used when considering parking in (or for) high streets

### **Planning Policy Statements and Guidance Notes**

Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and their predecessors Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) are prepared by the Government to explain statutory provisions and provide guidance to local authorities and others on planning policy and the planning system. They also explain the relationship between planning policies and other policies, such as transport, that have an important bearing on issues of development and land use.

PPG13 provides the most comprehensive advice with regard to parking. The guidance aims to secure sustainable development from a transport perspective. PPG13 also places emphasis on the use of parking charges as a control mechanism. Again a co-ordinated approach is recommended so that appropriate charges and restrictions are established

that do not undermine the vitality of town centres. PPG13 is clear that any parking controls require comprehensive treatments and adequate enforcement measures for them to be a success.

PPS 3 (Housing) states that Local Planning Authorities should, with stakeholders and communities, develop residential parking policies for their areas, taking account of expected levels of car ownership, the importance of promoting good design and the need to use land efficiently.

PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth) looks to set out the background in which sustainable economic growth can take place. Key to this is supporting sustainable transport, which includes ensuring that parking standards are appropriate to achieve increased levels of non-car travel.

### **National Planning Policy Framework 2019**

Section 9 highlights the need to consider transport in plan-making and in the determination of planning applications. Paragraph 105 states that if local planning authorities set parking standards, they should take account of the following:

- a) the accessibility of the development;
- b) the type, mix and use of development;
- c) the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
- d) local car ownership levels; and
- e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.

Paragraph 106 places the onus on authorities to justify the use of maximum parking standards, stating that "Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport".

## Local Policy

It is important to recognise that the IPS and related parking policies do not exist in a traffic management 'vacuum', rather they sit within and contribute towards the County Council's wider transport, economic, community, environment, and health strategies.

### The West Sussex Plan

The West Sussex Plan covers the 5 years between 2017 and 2022 and outlines the County Council's vision for West Sussex and what it is trying to achieve for its residents and for the county. It also sets out how it will make those differences and how residents will know whether it has been successful in achieving them.

Within the plan, 5 corporate priorities are identified:

- giving our children and young people the best start in life
- ensuring West Sussex is a prosperous place
- our communities being strong, safe and sustainable
- supporting you in later life to remain independent
- being a council that works for our communities.

The IPS will support the corporate priorities by recognising that communities in West Sussex are very diverse both in terms of demography and geography. It will seek to provide flexible solutions to meet local objectives by understanding and balancing the differing needs of the many stakeholders. It will also continue to provide a unified framework and rationale for applying parking policies and practices to communities in a fair and consistent way.

### West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2026 (LTP3)

This sets the County Council's strategy for guiding future investment in its highways and transport infrastructure. It also sets a framework for considering transport infrastructure requirements associated with future development across the county.

The Plan includes four strategies that guide the County Council's approach to maintaining, managing and investing in transport and for meeting its main objective of improving the quality of life for West Sussex residents:

1. promoting economic growth
2. tackling climate change
3. providing access to services, employment and housing
4. improving safety, security and health.

The IPS will support LTP priorities by ensuring better traffic management which will maximise the efficiency of the existing network for the benefit of all users including managing parking to reduce obstructions and congestion.

### **West Sussex County Council Guidance on Parking at New Developments 2019**

This replaces the County Council's previous guidance 'Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology' (2003) and 'Guidance for Parking in New Residential Developments' (2010), and sets out its recommended approach to parking in new residential and non-residential developments.

The County Council's overall ambition for parking at new developments is to ensure that sufficient parking is provided to meet the needs of the development while maintaining highway network operations, protecting surrounding communities and pursuing opportunities to encourage use of sustainable modes of transport.

The following principles inform the design of new developments and decision-makers' consideration of proposals for new development. Unless clearly specified, the Guiding Principles apply to both residential and non-residential developments

- Accommodating Parking Demand - parking provision should be sufficient to accommodate parking demand while exploiting the potential for sustainable travel, minimising adverse effects on road safety, and avoiding increased on-street parking demand.
- Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure – ‘active’ charging points for electric vehicles should be provided at a minimum of 20% of all parking spaces with ducting provided at all remaining spaces where appropriate to provide ‘passive’ provision for these spaces to be upgraded in future. The number of active points will increase overtime in line with EV sales in West Sussex.
- Sustainable Transport - In some locations, limiting parking provision should form part of a strategy to exploit the potential for sustainable transport. In order to realistically promote lower levels of car ownership and use whilst avoiding unacceptable consequences, all of the following should be available or provided - travel plan measures, targeted at reducing vehicle ownership levels such as car clubs, high levels of accessibility to non-car modes of travel and to local amenities and facilities and comprehensive parking controls such as CPZs
- Traffic Regulation Orders - in some circumstances, it may be necessary to regulate on-street parking to manage or mitigate the impact of development. If TROs are required, developers will be expected to fund administration and works costs. It may also be necessary to prevent residents of new development within CPZs from qualifying for residents and visitors parking permits. Residents could qualify for permits, provided spare on-street capacity exists and the issue of permits will not undermine planning policies and travel plan measures.
- Design Considerations - developers will be expected to provide balanced, mixed, and flexible parking provision and ensure that all spaces are useable without creating highway safety issues. This should reflect best practice as set out in national guidance and best practise, such as ‘Manual for Streets’, and ‘Car Parking: What Works Where’ as well as the ‘Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (2016).
- Sustainable Drainage - parking areas should adopt sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) to minimise the risk of flooding in the County, as part of a drainage strategy for the development.

### **Climate Change Strategy 2020**

In July 2020 the County Council adopted a new Climate Change Strategy. This strategy sets out a vision that in 2030, West Sussex County Council is carbon neutral and climate resilient, using its limited resources wisely. West Sussex County Council has enabled positive actions and behaviours across our county to mitigate and adapt to climate change.



The Strategy sets out five commitments, each with a series of clear ambitions:

- mitigate the effects of climate change by reducing carbon emissions
- adapt and be resilient to a changing climate
- source and use resources sustainably
- support and grow our local green economy
- transform how we work

Transport issues largely sit under carbon reduction but clearly have links to all other commitments.

In 2011, the County Council committed to reducing its carbon footprint by 50% by 2022. By 2019/2020 it had achieved a reduction of 52.9%, means we have halved our carbon emissions 3 years ahead of schedule. it had achieved a 46% reduction in its carbon emissions from the original baseline.

The annual sustainability report shows how the County Council achieved this. It is envisaged that for 2019/20 the figures which will show a likely 52% reduction.

In April 2019 a Notice of Motion was passed, which commits the County Council to attempt to be carbon neutral by 2030. The Council has taken this opportunity to re-evaluate the scope of the emissions included with the target, and have re-baselined.

### **Healthy and Well in West Sussex - West Sussex Public Health Plan 2012-2017**

The Public Health Plan provides a framework for improving the health and wellbeing of the residents of West Sussex.

Transport policy contributes to the plan in a number of ways by creating and promoting social and environmental conditions that are favourable to health and encouraging lifestyles that promote health, for example promoting exercise through active travel.

### **Breathing Better Air Quality Plan 2018 (updated 2019)**

The County Council has worked with the District and Borough Councils to produce a county-wide air quality plan. This plan highlights good practice already in place and shows where District and Borough Councils will assess, deliver and review improvements.

Established under the Environment Act 1995, Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) places a duty on all local authorities to regularly review and assess air quality in their areas, and to determine whether or not the national air quality objectives are likely to be achieved. Where an exceedance is considered likely, the local authority must declare an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and prepare an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) which sets out the measures it intends to put in place in pursuit of the objectives. In West Sussex, there are currently 11 AQMA's.

### **Electric Vehicle Strategy 2019**

The County Council's overall transport vision for West Sussex remains one based on sustainable transport. It wants to reduce car use overall across the county in favour of public transport and active travel. However it recognises that, for certain activities, cars and vans remain an appropriate mode of transport. Moving these vehicles from petrol and diesel to electric is critical, to reduce the impact of those journeys.

The strategy sets out the County Council's vision for electric vehicles (EV) across the county, and the interventions it will be taking to deliver this vision. It looks forward to 2030, but as EV, and EV charging, is very much an emerging technology it is important for the County Council to be able to adapt to changes and ensure a flexible approach to delivery of the strategy. Therefore, the actions within the strategy focus on the period until 2024 and will be reviewed regularly to ensure adaptability to changes in technology, trends in mobility and financial considerations.

The County Council wants to support EV take up to reduce carbon emissions; improve air quality and generate revenue without risk. To achieve this vision it has three highly ambitious aims:

1. 70% of all new cars in the county to be electric by 2030, but as a minimum it wants to see at least 50% electric.
2. There is sufficient charging infrastructure in place to support the vehicles it predicts will be reliant on public infrastructure to charge.
3. Ensure a renewable energy source for all charging points it enables.

The solution is aimed at both encouraging a quick switch to EV, and addressing the barriers that are preventing the switch.

The solution has two strands:

#### Encouraging

- Communication and engagement - Ensure residents understand the options for and benefits of EV ownership, are aware of available grants, and where they can find charging points.
- Incentives - Offer incentives to encourage a switch to electric vehicles as soon as possible.

#### Enabling

- New development Ensure the future long-term sustainability of EV charging by integrating infrastructure into new development
- Provide a comprehensive and cohesive public charging solution on public land. This should include three main types of charging infrastructure - residential charging, rapid hub charging and destination (top Up) charging.

## West Sussex Parking Operational Guidance Documents

The County Council has a suite of operational documents that translate the aims and objectives of the IPS into various actions that shape the day-to-day management of parking operations in West Sussex.

### **WSCC Parking Policy 2019 (Updated 2022)**

The Parking Policy sets out how the County Council, working in partnership with the six District and Borough Councils in West Sussex, enforces on and off-street parking. It explains the guidelines under which Civil Enforcement Officers in West Sussex will operate and the criteria under which they may serve Penalty Charge Notices. It seeks to reflect the latest national legislation and guidance while recognising local needs and conditions across the county.

### **WSCC Controlled Parking Policy Framework 2021**

This sets out rules for the consideration, implementation, review and removal of Controlled Parking Zones, including how decisions will be made by the County Council on whether particular proposals should be progressed. The framework also incorporates a programme for CPZ development.

### **WSCC Controlled Parking Zone Management Guide**

The Controlled Parking Zone Management Guide is a guidance note issued by the County Council to the District and Borough Councils, and their contractors, outlining its recommendations on how to manage the seven CPZs (Bognor Regis, Billingshurst, Chichester, Crawley, East Grinstead, Horsham and Worthing). This is a working document that is reviewed regularly in order to ensure that best, and consistent, practice is followed.

DRAFT



## 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 sitting in public. The meetings are also 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:

<b>Decision</b>	A summary of the proposal.
<b>Decision By</b>	Who will take the decision - if the Cabinet, it will be taken at a Cabinet meeting in public.
<b>Date added</b>	The date the proposed decision was added to the Forward Plan.
<b>Month</b>	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.
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	How views and representations about the proposal will be considered or the proposal scrutinised, including dates of Scrutiny Committee meetings.
<b>Background Documents</b>	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.
<b>Author</b>	The contact details of the decision report author
<b>Contact</b>	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](mailto:katherine.delamora@westsussex.gov.uk).

**Published: 27 May 2022**

## Forward Plan Summary

### Summary of all forthcoming executive decisions in Cabinet Member portfolio order

Decision Maker	Subject Matter	Date
Assistant Director (Communities)	Allocation of Household Support Fund Grant	June 2022
Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection)	Award of Design and Build contract at the Halewick Lane Battery Storage site	June 2022
Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection)	Contract Award - Street Sweepings Processing	July 2022
Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection)	Contract Extension - Water, Wastewater and Ancillary Services	July 2022
Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection)	Procurement of energy supplies - corporate estate and maintained schools/academies	August 2022
Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection)	Contract award for Single Supplier Framework for delivery of Solar PV and Battery Storage Programme	September 2022
Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport	A284 Lyminster bypass (north) - funding allocation and award of construction contract	May 2022
Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport	Review of On-Street Parking Charges	June 2022
Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport	Bus Services Draft Enhanced Partnership Plan	June 2022

## Community Support

### Assistant Director (Communities)

#### Allocation of Household Support Fund Grant

In April 2022, the Government announced further monies would be made available to County Councils and Unitary Authorities through the Household Support Fund (HSF) Grant, which is intended to support those most in need and help with significantly rising living costs. This follows previous funding made available when the HSF was set up in Autumn 2021; the Cabinet Member for Community Support and Fire and Rescue approved the arrangements for distribution of the County Council's allocation of this funding in December 2021 (decision [CSFR02 21/22](#) refers).

Further to the announcement in April the County Council has been awarded £4,870,362.11 of HSF this covers the period April 2022 – Sept 2022.

The Assistant Director (Communities) will be asked to agree the distribution of funds within the parameters set out in the grant determination letter and approve the award of contract to a retail voucher scheme provider (following a compliant procurement process) that will support the distribution of some of the funds covered by the Household Support Fund Grant.

<b>Decision by</b>	Assistant Director (Communities) (Emily King)
<b>Date added</b>	27 May 2022
<b>Month</b>	June 2022
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made via the officer contact.
<b>Background documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	James Skilling Tel: 033 022 25432
<b>Contact</b>	Erica Keegan Tel: 033 022 26050

## Environment and Climate Change

### Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection)

<b>Award of Design and Build contract at the Halewick Lane Battery Storage site</b>	
<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>Following a review of the details previously approved by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change, a revised business case indicates that revisions to the scheme by using a first-life battery option will generate increased revenue from the project and expanding the scheme will provide better value for money. Therefore, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change has <a href="#">approved</a> a re-procurement process increasing the system size to 24MW with the specification of first life batteries.</p> <p>At the conclusion of the procurement process, the Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection) will be asked to award the pre-construction contract and design and build contract for the scheme.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection) (Steve Read)
<b>Date added</b>	1 April 2022
<b>Month</b>	June 2022
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	<p>Director of Law and Assurance Director of Finance and Support Services</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>

<b>Background documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Tom Coates Tel: 033 022 26458
<b>Contact</b>	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

**Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection)**

<b>Contract Award - Street Sweepings Processing</b>	
<p>In October 2017 the County Council entered into a contract with Biffa Waste Services Limited to process and recycle street sweepings.</p> <p>The contract allows the County Council to divert street sweepings from landfill and push the material further up the waste hierarchy to recycle 99% of the material. This has saved the Council around £2.6m over the life of the current contract to-date due to a significantly lower price per tonne for processing compared to other disposal routes.</p> <p>The initial three-year processing contract has already been extended to its maximum term of five years and will end on 1 October 2022.</p> <p>The Assistant Director of Environment and Public Protection will undertake the procurement process for the provision of street sweepings processing services (reception into facility, recycling, treatment and disposal). Upon the conclusion of that process, the Assistant Director will be asked to award the contract based on the most advantageous bid after technical and financial evaluation.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection) (Steve Read)
<b>Date added</b>	7 January 2022
<b>Month</b>	July 2022
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	<p>District and Borough Councils in West Sussex</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
<b>Background documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Gareth Rollings Tel: 033 022 24161
<b>Contact</b>	Judith Shore Tel. 033 022 26052

**Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection)**

<b>Contract Extension - Water, Wastewater and Ancillary Services</b>	
<p>Since deregulation of the non-domestic water/wastewater retail market in 2017, organisations have been able to competitively appoint their own water retailer (rather than using the traditional water wholesalers for billing).</p>	



In October 2019, the County Council [awarded a three year contract](#), with an option to extend for one year, to Scottish Water Business Stream for these services.

The current contract expires at the end of September 2022 and it is proposed to extend the contract for one year.

The Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection) will be asked to approve a 12-month extension of the water, wastewater and ancillary services contract.

<b>Decision by</b>	Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection) (Steve Read)
<b>Date added</b>	25 May 2022
<b>Month</b>	July 2022
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	No consultees currently identified  Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the decision maker, via the report author, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
<b>Background documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Steven Fall Tel: 033 022 23265
<b>Contact</b>	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

#### **Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection)**

##### **Procurement of energy supplies - corporate estate and maintained schools/academies**

The County Council currently uses the LASER flex contract to procure energy supplies (electricity & natural gas) for:

- the corporate estate (around 235 sites) and street lighting supplies
- around 250 West Sussex maintained schools and academies

The LASER framework agreement will renew in October 2022 and a 24-month termination notice is required to exit. A review of whether this is still the best way for the County Council to procure its energy was instigated in September 2021. A benchmarking exercise is being carried out to assess the LASER offering against the current market.

Upon the conclusion of the benchmarking review, the County Council will consider how the County Council procures energy supplies for the period from October 2024 – September 2028 and how to engage with the market for provision of ancillary energy services such as selling power from solar farms.

The Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection) will be asked to approve the County Council's recommended energy procurement route to market and route to the provision of ancillary energy services.

Agenda Item 10a

<b>Decision by</b>	Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection) (Steve Read)
<b>Date added</b>	13 April 2022
<b>Month</b>	August 2022
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	Schools Forum Director of Finance and Support Services Director of Law and Assurance  Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
<b>Background documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Steven Fall Tel: 033 022 23265
<b>Contact</b>	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

**Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection)**

<b>Contract award for Single Supplier Framework for delivery of Solar PV and Battery Storage Programme</b>	
<p>Following a market engagement exercise and technical and structural feasibility surveys, 31 corporate and 65 school sites have been identified as suitable for having Solar Photovoltaic (PV) and Battery Storage technology installed.</p> <p>The £7.7m programme, funded from an approved allocation in the capital programme, will support the council's commitment to achieving Net Zero emissions from its operations by 2030 (as set out in the council's Climate Change Strategy 2020-2030). It will also help meet the agreed priorities in the council's recently adopted <a href="#">2030 Energy Strategy</a> by reducing grid electricity consumption, increasing renewable energy generation in the county, and reducing carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions. In addition to electricity cost savings for the County Council, schools will also benefit from a reduction in electricity costs.</p> <p>The procurement process will allow for further phases of solar PV and battery storage to be fitted to the county council's buildings and the county's schools (subject to the authority to do so being granted) and for a Demand Side Response (DSR) provider to manage the charged status and market value from the battery storage installations.</p> <p>The recommendation will come forward subject to completion of the final stages of the corporate process for evaluating capital projects.</p> <p>Upon the conclusion of the procurement process, the Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection) will be asked to award the contracts.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Assistant Director (Environment and Public Protection) (Steve Read)
<b>Date added</b>	25 May 2022

<b>Month</b>	September 2022
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	No consultees currently identified  Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the decision maker, via the report author, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
<b>Background documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Nicola Stringer
<b>Contact</b>	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

## Highways and Transport

### Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

<b>A284 Lyminster bypass (north) - funding allocation and award of construction contract</b>	
<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 (DfT) has previously approved the Outline Business Case and has been asked to contribute additional funding on review and approval of the Full Business Case.</p> <p>As the final stage of the scheme, subject to the DfT approving the funding, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport will be asked to confirm the funding allocation and award the construction contract for the A284 Lyminster bypass (north).</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport (Councillor Joy Dennis)
<b>Date added</b>	21 October 2021
<b>Month</b>	May 2022
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	Director of Law and Assurance Director of Finance and Support Services  Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.

<b>Background documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Mark Martin Tel: 033 022 25922
<b>Contact</b>	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

**Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

<b>Review of On-Street Parking Charges</b>	
<p>The on-street parking charges review for 2022/23 will include all West Sussex permits, parking bay suspensions and pay and display charges.</p> <p>A decision will be taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport with a view to implementing the changes in October 2022.</p>	
<b>Decision by</b>	Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport (Councillor Joy Dennis)
<b>Date added</b>	9 May 2022
<b>Month</b>	June 2022
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	County Council Officers (Legal, Finance, Highways) District and Borough Council Officers  Representation can be made via the officer contact.
<b>Background documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Miles Davy Tel: 033 022 26688
<b>Contact</b>	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

**Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport**

<b>Bus Services Draft Enhanced Partnership Plan</b>	
<p>The Government's '<a href="#">Bus Back Better – National Bus Strategy for England</a>' requires Local Transport Authorities and bus companies to work in partnership to help recovery and improve bus services.</p> <p>In June 2021, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport took a <a href="#">key decision</a> to enter into an Enhanced Partnership (EP) with bus operators and, in October 2021, made a further <a href="#">key decision</a> and submitted a Bus Services Improvement Plan (BSIP) to the DfT including a bid for funds.</p> <p>Further to the submission of the BSIP, the DfT has offered an indicative funding allocation up to £17,401,596 (of which £11,982,180 is capital and £5,419,416 revenue) to commence delivery of the BSIP. This is total funding from 2022/23 to 2024/25.</p>	

Funding confirmation is conditional on the submission and implementation of an Enhanced Partnership which includes firmer and more detailed commitments from the County Council and local bus operators to deliver a package of prioritised and ambitious improvements to bus services.

By Monday 2 May, the County Council must complete and submit to the DfT a summary which sets out how the funding allocation will be used, including prioritised interventions, delivery timelines and costs and how it will be reflected in the EP. Due to the exceptionally tight timescale for the completion of this work, the Assistant Director (Highways, Transport and Planning) will complete the summary in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport.

By the end of June, the County Council must submit a Draft Enhanced Partnership Plan which shows how relevant aspects of the BSIP will be implemented.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport will be asked to approve the Draft Enhanced Partnership Plan for submission to the DfT.

<b>Decision by</b>	Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport (Councillor Joy Dennis)
<b>Date added</b>	26 April 2022
<b>Month</b>	June 2022
<b>Consultation/ Representations</b>	<p>Communities, Highways and Environment Scrutiny Committee – Task and Finish Group  Local bus operators  User representatives (include organisations representative of users of local services, those with protected characteristics, elected members, parish councils, local businesses)  District and Borough Councils  Traffic commissioner  Police  Transport Focus  Competition and Markets Authority</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
<b>Background documents</b> (via website)	None
<b>Author</b>	Bill Leath Tel: 033 022 25438
<b>Contact</b>	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

This page is intentionally left blank

**Future Meetings**

**Agenda Item 10 (b) - Appendix A**

Select Committee Meeting date	Subject/Theme	Objectives/Comments
<b>10/06/22</b>	Report of the Bus Enhanced Partnership Plan TFG	Committee to consider the response to the TFG's recommendations, which were reported direct to the Cabinet Member in time to inform her decision
	Integrated Parking Strategy	Pre-decision scrutiny
<b>08/07/22</b>	Q4 Performance and Resources Report	
<b>21/09/22</b>	Speed Limit Policy	Following the work undertaken by the Exec TFG
	Transport for the South East Strategic Investment Plan Consultation	Preview of the draft consultation response
	Climate Change Strategy Progress	High level report on progress to date, including proposed metrics for performance monitoring.
	Q1 Performance and Resources Report	
<b>18/11/22</b>	Digital Crime	Proposed community safety item for 2022
	Q2 Performance and Resources Report	
	Space-holder - 23/24 Savings Proposals	TBC
<b>23/01/23</b>		
<b>06/03/23</b>	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. To include detail on how Innovation Fund is being distributed and spent
	Q3 Performance and Resources Report	
	Road Safety Strategy	Following the work undertaken by the Exec TFG
	Active Travel Strategy (formerly Walking and Cycling Strategy)	Post-Consultation, Key Decision Scrutiny

This page is intentionally left blank



Select Committee Meeting date	Subject/Theme	Objectives/Comments - is item linked to corporate priorities?
<b>Sep-22</b>	Electric Vehicle Strategy Progress Report	Awaiting Cabinet Member confirmation on optimal timing
<b>TBC</b>	Highways Maintenance Contract Performance Report	
<b>BPG</b>		
<b>TBC</b>	Library Service	How the service responded to C19, and the future strategy.
<b>Autumn 2022</b>	Corporate Policy on Offsetting Emissions and REGOs	
<b>TBC</b>	Trading Standards	TBC
<b>Autumn 2022</b>	Energy Strategy 2030	Progress report on implementation
<b>TBC</b>	Vehicle Removals	Changes to the Council's policy towards abandoned vehicles
<b>TBC</b>	Safer School Streets	
<b>Summer 2023</b>	On Street Parking Management Strategy - Progress Report	Arising from discussion of TFG findings at CHESC 19/1/22
<b>TBC</b>	A27 Arundel Bypass Progress	Progress report, to identify where value could be added through to scrutiny

This page is intentionally left blank