

Public Document Pack

Tony Kershaw
Director of Law and Assurance

If calling please ask for:

Lisa Etchell on 033 022 23597
Email: lisa.etchell@westsussex.gov.uk

www.westsussex.gov.uk

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



28 November 2018

Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee

A meeting of the committee will be held at **10.30 am** on **Thursday, 6 December 2018** at **County Hall, Chichester**.

Tony Kershaw
Director of Law and Assurance

Item no 7 has now been withdrawn

Item no's: 1 to 6 on the agenda will be available to view live via the Internet at this address:

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

Agenda

Part I

10.30 am 1. **Declarations of Interest**

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

2. **Minutes of the 14 November meeting** (Pages 7 - 14)

The Committee is asked to agree the minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2018 - attached (cream paper).

3. **Urgent Matters**

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

4. **Part II Matters**

Members are asked at this stage if they wish the meeting to consider bringing into Part I any Part II items on the agenda.

5. **Cabinet Member Response to the Committee's Recommendations on the Littlehampton to Bognor Regis Cycle Path (NCN2) - Lessons Learnt** (Pages 15 - 16)

The Committee is asked to note the Cabinet Member's Response to the Committee's Recommendations on the Littlehampton to Bognor Regis Cycle Path (NCN2) – Lessons Learnt – attached.

10.35 am 6. **Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018** (Pages 17 - 40)

Report by Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment – attached.

This report outlines the County Council's draft response to the Gatwick Airport Draft Masterplan 2018 consultation.

The Committee is asked to scrutinise and give comment on the draft response.

11.55 am 7. **Proposed Savings for Fire Service Operations and Public Protection 2019/20** (Pages 41 - 44) – **Withdrawn**

Report by Executive Director Communities and Public Protection – attached.

This report sets out the proposals for achieving the portfolio savings target for 2019/20.

The Committee is asked to scrutinise the proposals.

The Committee will break

1.00 pm 8. **On-Street Parking to Support Traffic Management** (Pages 45 - 70)

Report by Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment and Director of Highways and Transport – attached.

Road Space Audits are now being used to identify where there is a need to implement better settlement wide parking solutions that support the County Council's aspirations in terms of economic development, improved safety and sustainable transport. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure will be asked to agree a strategic parking management plan programme to implement on-street parking controls in various locations across the county and to review the operation of the

parking service county-wide, including charges.

The Committee is asked to scrutinise the proposals.

1.45 pm

9. **Requests for Call-in**

There have been no requests for call-in to the Select 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.

10. **Forward Plan of Key Decisions** (Pages 71 - 86)

Extract from the Forward Plan dated 23 November – attached.

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

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

11. **Possible Items for Future Scrutiny**

Members to mention any items which they believe to be of relevance to the business of the Select 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. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee will be held on 14 January 2019 at 10.30 am at County Hall, Chichester. Probable agenda items include:

- Updated Guidance on Parking in New Developments
- Savings Proposals
- Highways Maintenance Contract - Options Appraisal
- Velo South
- Major Events Protocol

Any member wishing to place an item on the agenda for the meeting must notify the Director of Law and Assurance by 2 January 2018.

1.55 pm

13. **Bus Strategy 2018-2026 and Financial Changes to the Non-Commercial Bus Network** (Pages 87 - 110)

Report by Executive Director of Economy, Infrastructure and Environment and Director of Highways and Transport – attached.

This report presents the final draft of the West Sussex Bus Strategy 2018 to 2026 together with recommended changes to financial support to the non-commercial bus network.

The Committee is asked to consider and give feedback on the revised Bus Strategy 2018-2026 and the findings and overall approach of the Task and Finish Group; along with the recommendations for changes to financial support for the non-commercial bus network.

If required this item will continue in Part II.

Part II

14. **Exclusion of Press and Public**

The Committee is asked to consider in respect of the following item whether the public, including the press, should be excluded from the meeting on the grounds of exemption under Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as indicated against the item and because, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

15. **Bus Strategy 2018-2026 and Financial Changes to the Non-Commercial Bus Network**

The Committee is asked to consider and give feedback on the revised Bus Strategy 2018-2026 and the findings and overall approach of the Task and Finish Group; along with the recommendations for changes to financial support for the non-commercial bus network.

Exempt: paragraph 3, financial or business affairs of any person (including the authority).

To all members of the Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee

Webcasting

Please note: this meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the County Council's website on the internet - at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be filmed. 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.

This page is intentionally left blank

Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee

14 November 2018 – At a meeting of the Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee held at 10.30 am at County Hall, Chichester.

Present: Mr Barrett-Miles (Chairman)

Mr Baldwin	Mr Jones, arrived at	Mr Purchase
Lt Col Barton, left at	10.45am	
12.15pm	Mr McDonald	
Mrs Bridges	Mr Patel	

Apologies were received from Mr S J Oakley, Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Oppler and Mrs Purnell

Part I

32. Declarations of Interest

32.1 No interests were declared.

33. Part 1 Minutes of 21 September Meeting

33.1 Resolved – that the Part I minutes of the Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee held on 21 September 2018 be approved as a correct record, and that they be signed by the Chairman.

34. Part II Minutes of 21 September Meeting

34.1 Resolved – that the Part II minutes of the Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee held on 21 September 2018 be approved as a correct record, and that they be signed by the Chairman.

35. Responses to Recommendations

a) Fire Authority's Integrated Risk Management Action Plan 2018-22

35.1 The Committee noted the Cabinet Member's Response to the Committee's Recommendations on the Fire Authority's Integrated Risk Management Action Plan 2018-22.

b) Strategic Planning

35.2 The Committee noted the Cabinet Member's Response to the Committee's Recommendations on Strategic Planning.

35.3 Members made the following comments:

- Requested a more robust protocol as the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) process was potentially vulnerable for the County Council

to attain funds for infrastructure.

c) Highways Maintenance Contract Update

35.4 The Committee noted the Cabinet Member's Response to the Committee's Recommendations on the Highways Maintenance Contract Update

35.5 The Committee received a tabled letter from the Chairman of the Performance & Finance Committee (copy appended to signed minutes).

36. Littlehampton to Bognor Regis Cycle Path (NCN2) - Lessons Learnt

36.1 The Committee considered a report by Director of Highways and Transport and Head of Highways Engineering (copy appended to signed minutes).

36.2 Alex Sharkey, Manager Highways Projects, Guy Bell, Head of Highway Engineering and Hiong Ching Hii, Project Manager introduced the report which outlined the lessons learnt from the implementation and delivery of the NCN2 scheme. Key points were:

- Greater emphasis on early involvement with the County Council's Strategic Planning team when preparing future funding bids, in order to help challenge the timescale and cost of proposed delivery and to ensure that realistic targets were set.
- Ensuring adequate resourcing during the construction phase for future major projects, to include a dedicated County Council site supervisor to be on site throughout the duration of the construction period.
- The implementation of an appropriate governance structure in place to ensure a successful delivery of highways schemes from concept to completion.
- The importance of keeping the public informed by providing timely information using pro-active press releases, social media and variable messaging signs.

36.3 Mrs Pendleton, Local Member for Middleton was invited to address the Committee, giving her views on the scheme.

36.4 She welcomed the new cycle path, giving cyclists a safe route, but believed that managing the public's perception had been compromised. In her view there had been operational issues with ensuring safe delivery on the ground. These included:

- A lack of co-ordination of traffic flow through the temporary traffic lights which caused traffic disruption, with no notification of potential disruption further afield on the route to allow drivers to seek alternative routes.

- A lack of communication and unity between contractors, with the public perception being that there were multiple contractors on site working on three different sections of the road, with regular users observing long periods of inactivity.
- Poor communication to the public over the works and the dramatic increase in length of the programme of works.
- Works not being carried out during the quieter night time period. She understood the increased costs and safety issues associated with this, but believed that it should have been allowed for in the original budget.

36.5 She respectfully requested that these observations were taken onto account for future works.

36.6 Mr Sharkey advised that the A259 was a demanding and challenging route in dealing with the dynamics of this scheme. Although the County Council didn't account for all the challenges that arose, it was agreed that the public should have been better informed. In respect to night works, there were often difficulties over costs, safety and noise which could be intrusive to residents and road users.

36.7 Mr Ching Hii advised that one contractor was working on the three sections of the road at the same time due to the busy nature of the road. Appropriate concerns over the co-ordination of the works were justified, but the sheer volume of traffic on the A259 didn't help the build-up of congestion during the works.

36.8 The Committee made comments including those that follow. It:

- Welcomed the cycle path and the encouragement of cycling, but queried the spiralling costs which rose from the original estimate of the project and questioned why these weren't more carefully considered at the early stages. Also highlighted that the original Business Case didn't adequately capture the benefits of the scheme and queried which consultant was used, what due diligence was undertaken, and what the costs were to the County Council. Mr Sharkey advised that the Business Case was provided by consultants 'CH2MHill' but that the estimate itself was produced in-house. The Business Case was fully populated, but estimates of the costs at that time gave no detailed explanation. All other procedures were robust and checks and balances now installed should prevent any future issues.
- Highlighted the governance of the project and the process of selection for Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) funding. Mr Davey advised that there had been a short window to come up with a list of schemes for the LEP and Local Government funding (LGF) to be eligible for funds. The funding requirement was that it needed to be spent within 12 months to be eligible. The Business case was submitted, allocated and then scored. It was now understood that a lack of appropriate investigation and prep work wasn't carried out sufficiently and that some things hadn't been taken into account,

such as moving of utility equipment which could be expensive. Additionally, if costs from night work had been considered then the scheme wouldn't have been deliverable. The County Council would now ensure that the right level of investigation be carried out before any future works and that relevant business cases were put in place. In addition, the County Council was considering using stakeholder panels working alongside the project team throughout the process for better communication and engagement.

- Queried the length of time the project ran over and questioned whether a lack of communication at strategic and operational level had led to the project taking several years to complete after originally being scheduled for a year. Also raised concerns that coping with more complex and multiple projects strategically would be a challenge for future projects. Mr Davey advised that the County Council understood the frustrations and concerns raised by these works and that mistakes were made over costings and timescales, but were confident with the delivery of future major schemes. Lessons learnt would be applied to future projects.
- Highlighted the high level of traffic congestion caused by multiple temporary traffic lights during the works and the inadequate signage causing the public to be misinformed. More emphasis was needed on 'engagement' messaging rather than just 'broadcast' messaging. Mr Sharkey advised that the temporary traffic lights were monitored on a daily basis by the site team and the contractor, but the nature of the works made disruption unavoidable. Although the messaging was kept simple, this could be improved upon for future works. Mr Bell advised that there were some challenges around costs linked to perception and timescale and how the information was shared to the public.
- Questioned the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure over whether he thought what had now been put in place was adequate for future major projects and whether it was robust enough to stop it happening again. *The Cabinet Member thanked officers for providing the background information in the report and advised he would give it due consideration and had been assured that plans were now in place to ensure better delivery of projects and significant schemes in the future.*

36.9 Resolved – That the Committee:

- 1) Supports findings of the review and their implementation for future highways schemes.
- 2) Requests that more examination be done on future communications in respect of such projects with the emphasis on 'engagement' messaging rather than 'broadcast' messaging.
- 3) Requests a letter of assurance from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure ensuring that the implementation of this project had been investigated and that the necessary

organisational changes have been put in place so that the same issues do not arise again.

37. Procurement of a New Highways Maintenance Contract

37.1 Matt Davy, Director of Highways and Transport gave a verbal update outlining the Cabinet Member's proposed way forward on a procurement process for the new Highways Maintenance Contract. Key points were:

- The previous procurement process had been halted by an ongoing legal challenge, but in the interim, a new contract had been created with current provider Balfour Beatty whose original contract term ended in June 2018. This new contract started in July 2018 with an initial term due to expire in March 2019. There was an option to extend this to June 2019, although a further extension of this until March 2020 was also under consideration.
- There had been slight proposed changes to the governance surrounding the new procurement process which included a dedicated 'non highways' Project Manager and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) working groups. The project board consisting of senior officers, the Director of Highways and Transport and the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure would also continue.
- An options appraisal, which included the work of an independent consultant, had been commissioned in August 2018 to look at how best to deliver the service going forward. The draft report received in October 2018 was currently under consideration and would be key in the model used going forward.
- The next steps involved two key decisions by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure by December, followed by market/bidder engagement in March/June, tender submissions in June /July and tender evaluations in August to October. The Committee would be given further opportunity for scrutiny as things were progressed and major milestones reached.

37.2 The Committee made comments including those that follow. It:

- Supported the improved governance but queried whether it was adequate enough and whether lessons had been learnt from the first procurement. *The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure advised there was now a more robust way forward and the outcome of the legal challenge was not yet known to determine the full lessons.* Mr Davy added that the new governance structure showed a scrutiny role for the Committee and agreed the work programme should include a regular update. The Chairman agreed that at the next meeting of the Business Planning Group (BPG) on 20th December the process could be looked at.
- Raised concerns that as the County Council was making further financial cuts, the costs of the procurement continued to spiral and questioned who was ultimately responsible and what the costs

were, requesting that when information on the previous procurement was ready that it be made publically available.

- Queried whether an in-house option for service provision had now been dismissed. Mr Davey advised that all options were being considered, including in-house and would be shared once the options appraisal had been completed. *The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure advised that this could be December or January.*

37.3 Resolved – That the Committee:

- 1) Requests that when information becomes available on the previous procurement it be made publically available.
- 2) Requests scrutiny of the options appraisal report
- 3) Agreed to work with Highways senior officers to develop a scrutiny programme for the new procurement.

38. Business Planning Group

a) Membership

38.1 The Committee agreed the appointment of Mr Oppler to the Business Planning Group membership.

b) BPG Report

38.2 The Committee considered a report by the Chairman of the Business Planning Group (copy appended to the signed minutes).

38.3 Resolved – That the Committee endorses the contents of the report and particularly the Committee's Work Programme for 2018/19, revised to reflect the Business Planning Group's (BPG's) discussions.

38.4 Members requested that other areas as well as prevention such as the resilience and emergencies teams be looked at in the Fire & Rescue Service report

39. Forward Plan of Key Decisions

39.1 The Committee considered the Forward Plan dated 1 November (copy appended to signed minutes).

39.2 Resolved – That the Forward Plan be noted.

40. Possible Items for Future Scrutiny

40.1 Members requested that the BPG consider the current system of calling a moderation panel of officers in relation to Community Highways Schemes.

41. Date of Next Meeting

The Committee noted that its next scheduled meeting will take place on 6 December 2018 at 10.30am at County Hall, Chichester.

The meeting ended at 12.57 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

**Roger Elkins**

Cabinet Member for Highways and
Infrastructure

03302 223619 (Cabinet Office)

roger.elkins@westsussex.gov.uk
www.westsussex.gov.uk

Cabinet Office
County Hall
West Street
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1RQ

Mr Andrew Barrett-Miles
Chairman
Environment, Community & Fire Select Committee

27 November 2018

Dear Mr Barrett-Miles

**Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee – Littlehampton
to Bognor Regis Cycle Path**

At its meeting on 14 November 2018, the Committee made the following recommendations:

- 1) Supports findings of the review and their implementation for future highways schemes.
- 2) Requests that more examination be done on future communications in respect of such projects with the emphasis on 'engagement' messaging rather than 'broadcast' messaging.
- 3) Requests a letter of assurance from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure ensuring that the implementation of this project had been investigated and that the necessary organisational changes have been put in place so that the same issues do not arise again.

I am content to support the Committee's findings of the review and can confirm that they are already being implemented on highway schemes.

The Corporate Communications Team is fully integrated within the project teams to ensure that messages during construction of highway schemes are relayed to the stakeholder and community in an appropriate and timely manner.

The Director of Highways and Transport is working to ensure that the governance which has been put in place (which includes ensuring teams submitting financial bids for external funding engage fully with the project delivery team, through the submission of business cases to the Highways Capital Hub) is functioning as it should be, reducing the risk of the same issues arising again.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "R Elkins", written in a cursive style.

Roger Elkins
Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

This page is intentionally left blank

Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee

6 December 2018

Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018

Report by Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment

Summary

Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) are revising their non-statutory Gatwick Airport Master Plan, which sets out their vision about how the airport could develop and grow, balancing economic growth and environmental impact. The draft of the new Master Plan was published for comment on 18 October 2018 for 12 weeks until 10 January 2019.

The new Master Plan, which will replace the current 2012 Master Plan, sets out the plan for the next five years together with three growth scenarios looking 5-15 years ahead to 2032. The scenarios, which could be taken forward separately or in combination, are (a) to increase throughput using the existing main runway; (b) to bring the existing standby runway into routine use for departing flights only alongside the main runway; and (c) to continue to safeguard land for an additional runway to the south (while not actively pursuing one at this stage).

GAL consider that their proposals are in line with the Government's policy support for making best use of existing runways and that they will deliver highly-productive, incremental new capacity with minimal environmental impact, to complement expansion schemes at other airports across the South East (including a third runway at Heathrow).

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure will be asked to approve the County Council's response to the consultation in early January 2019.

The focus for scrutiny

It is suggested that Members consider:

- the key matters in the draft Master Plan (Section 2);
- the key issues for the County Council to consider in relation to the draft Master Plan and growth at Gatwick (Section 3); and
- the suggestions in Section 4 about how the County Council should respond to the consultation. In particular, Members should consider the options relating to the Existing Standby Runway and the Safeguarded Additional Runway to the South scenarios.

Proposal

1. Background and Context

- 1.1 In January 2015, after a Notice of Motion debate, the County Council agreed that it is opposed to a new runway to expand Gatwick Airport because "*the environmental damage is without question, whereas the economic benefit is unproven and may well be negative*". This was in response to the Airports Commission's consultation on the shortlisted options for future airport capacity, which included a second runway at Gatwick and two options for a third runway at Heathrow.
- 1.2 In October 2016, the Government announced that it supported the provision of additional airport capacity in the South East at Heathrow; this was in line with the recommendation made by the Airports Commission. Subsequently, the Airports National Policy Statement (NPS) was approved by Parliament in June 2018, effectively granting outline planning permission for a north-west runway at Heathrow Airport and allowing the planning process to move onto detailed work around scheme design.
- 1.3 In June 2018, alongside the publication of the NPS, the Government published a report on the future of UK aviation, '*Aviation Strategy: making the best use of existing runways*', which sets out its policy support for airports (beyond Heathrow) '*making best use of their existing runways*', subject to related economic and environmental considerations being considered.
- 1.4 In the light of revised aviation forecasts, the Government is preparing a National Aviation Strategy (NAS) that will address how to make best use of existing runways in the period to 2030 and, assuming that a third runway at Heathrow is delivered by 2030, it will also set out a long-term vision for the period to 2050. However, the NAS will not address the issue of new runways (as that was addressed by the Airports Commission). Consultation on the NAS is likely to commence through the publication of an Aviation Green Paper before the end of 2018. The NAS will then be finalised in 2019.
- 1.5 Against this background, Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) consider that Gatwick will need to grow to meet future demand for air travel and to deliver global connections into the early 2030s. Accordingly, GAL are revising their non-statutory Gatwick Airport Master Plan, which sets out their vision about how the airport could develop and grow, balancing economic growth and environmental impact.
- 1.6 The draft of the new Master Plan was published by GAL for comment on 18 October 2018 for 12 weeks until 10 January 2019. The full draft Master Plan is available on GAL's [website](#). The Consultation Document is attached as Appendix A to this report. A number of questions have been posed by GAL as part of the consultation (see page 11 of the Consultation Document).
- 1.7 The new Master Plan, which will replace the current 2012 Master Plan, sets out the plan for the next five years together with three growth scenarios

looking 5-15 years ahead to 2032. The scenarios, which could be taken forward separately or in combination, are:

- to increase throughput using the existing main runway;
- to bring the existing standby runway (also known as the emergency or northern runway) into routine use for departing flights only alongside the main runway; and
- to continue to safeguard land for an additional runway to the south (while not actively pursuing one at this stage).

- 1.8 GAL consider that their proposals are in line with the Government's policy support for making best use of existing runways and that they will deliver highly-productive, incremental new capacity with minimal environmental impact, to complement expansion schemes at other airports across the South East (including a third runway at Heathrow).
- 1.9 The draft Master Plan also contains environmental information as well as information on economic and employment strategies and community engagement strategies.
- 1.10 The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure will be asked to approve the County Council's response to the consultation in early January 2019.
- 1.11 Following consideration of the consultation responses and the Aviation Green Paper, the new Master Plan will be finalised by GAL in 2019. GAL will also update the Airport Surface Access Strategy alongside the new Master Plan.

2. Draft Master Plan

- 2.1 The following section summarises the key matters within the draft Master Plan.

Gatwick Today

- 2.2 Gatwick is the busiest single-runway airport in the world serving over 200 destinations. It is the second largest airport in the UK by passenger volume and the seventh busiest airport in Europe with the twelfth largest long-haul network. Over 42% of passengers are from the South East with 6.7% from West Sussex.
- 2.3 The airport is accommodating significantly more flights and passengers than was previously thought possible. In the late 1970s, when the North Terminal was being planned, the maximum airport capacity was thought to be 25mppa and since 2000, estimates have suggested 40-45 million passengers to be the maximum potential. However, it is important to note that the throughput of the airport is not limited. In 2013, the Department for Transport (DfT) estimated that Gatwick would accommodate 34m passengers in 2017 and the DfT's 2017 forecast update projects that there will be 45m passengers by 2030.

- 2.4 However, the airport handled 45.7m passengers in 2017/18, almost 12m more than in 2012, and GAL consider that the airport has potential to continue growing.
- 2.5 The demand for air traffic has resulted in higher levels of traffic due to: (a) more passengers per flight, increasing from 140 in 2011/12 to 163 in 2017/18; (b) 'peak spreading', that is, making use of spare capacity in the traditionally quieter periods of the year; and (c) growth in peak runway throughput, increasing from 53 movements an hour (in 2012) to 55 an hour today.
- 2.6 There have also been major changes in the industry including the introduction of new generation long-haul aircraft and the introduction of low-cost long-haul services. The growth in long-haul flights, which accounted for 17% of passengers in 2017/18, has been mirrored by an increase in cargo volumes, with Gatwick handling over 100,000 tonnes in 2017/18 (an increase of 24% on the previous year).

Policy and Market Developments in the Aviation Industry

- 2.7 GAL expect the trend towards low-cost airlines to continue, including the recent extension of the low-cost model to long-haul destinations; low-cost airlines account for around 62% of the airport's throughput. They also anticipate the new generation aircraft (currently 3% of the fleet) will become the largest part of the fleet (86%) by 2032. As well as being more fuel efficient, they are also quieter than the previous generation. New routes, particularly to Asia, India and Africa, and increases in long-haul flights are also likely to be accompanied by increases in the volumes of freight handled at the airport.
- 2.8 Demand for air travel is forecast to continue growing. The DfT's most recent forecasts (October 2017) show demand for air travel in the UK rising from 267mppa in 2016 to 355mppa by 2030 and 435m in 2050 with a new runway at Heathrow. However, DfT calculate that the underlying, unconstrained demand is 495mppa by 2050.
- 2.9 Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) are preparing a co-ordinated strategy for the modernisation of UK airspace up to 2040. It is unlikely to be implemented before 2024 but it could help to address noise pollution, for example, by enabling aircraft to climb more steeply and continuously to their cruising altitudes.

Master Plan for the Next Five Years – 2018 to 2022

- 2.10 Gatwick handled over 280,000 air traffic movements (ATM) and 45.7 million passengers in 2017/18 through a combination of greater use of the airport in the off-peak periods, more intensive use of the runway at the peak periods, and a shift to larger aircraft and higher load factors.
- 2.11 GAL consider that the same factors (including increasing from 163 to 176 passengers per ATM between now and 2022) will enable the airport to grow over the next five years to handle 300,000 ATMs and 53mppa by 2022, increases of 20,000 ATMs (7.1%) and 7mppa (15.3%). To support that level

of growth, GAL plan to spend £1.11bn on capital infrastructure projects during that period, including the upgrade to the rail station.

- 2.12 In May 2018, GAL published the new Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS), which sets out a vision, targets and actions for sustainable access to and from Gatwick. Key targets include achieving 48% public transport share for airport passengers by 2022, a 40% rail mode share by 2022 (with the aim of 45% by 2030), and a 5% year on year increase in bus use by staff and passengers.

Growth Scenarios – Looking 5 to 15 Years Ahead

- 2.13 Assuming that Gatwick grows over the next five years to handle 300,000 ATMs and 53mppa by 2022, GAL have considered how the airport could meet demand for air travel in the medium and longer term, hence the identification of the three, not mutually exclusive, growth scenarios. GAL state that Gatwick could transition from one to another within the timeframes discussed in the draft Master Plan.
- 2.14 GAL's forecasts for the scenarios assume that the third runway at Heathrow opens in 2030 and that it will have a relatively minor adverse impact on traffic at Gatwick for a few years. They also assume that there are no changes to the levels of flying permitted during the night quota period and that new generation aircraft will replace the majority of the current fleet over the next 15 years.

Existing Main Runway Scenario

- 2.15 If the airport continues with the existing single runway operation, GAL consider that Gatwick could be processing up to 340,000 ATMs and 61mppa by 2032, increases of 40,000 ATMs (13.3%) and 8mppa (15.1%) from 2022. This level of throughput would be possible, in part, if new air traffic management technologies and processes allow some additional peak hour capacity to be released. Growth would also result from further increases in the average size of aircraft (from 176 to 180 passengers per ATM). The total tonnage of freight would increase from 102,000 in 2018 to 220,000 in 2032/33.
- 2.16 GAL suggest that most of the growth would be outside the current peak times and, therefore, that the need for additional infrastructure (beyond that planned to 2022) would be relatively modest. No details are provided about the scope or timing of a number of the indicative future investment projects identified in the draft Master Plan.
- 2.17 With regard to surface access, GAL consider that if sustainable transport mode share targets are achieved, alongside delivery of proposed improvements to the North and South Terminal roundabouts over the next five years and the M23 Smart Motorway improvements, the road network could accommodate growth at Gatwick up to 60mppa without significant deterioration in highway performance. GAL also suggest that the upgraded rail station will be able to accommodate demand, even allowing for an increase in rail share to around 45%.

- 2.18 With the introduction of quieter aircraft, GAL consider that Gatwick's noise footprint would continue to reduce despite an increase in aircraft movements (see also paragraphs 2.35-2.39).
- 2.19 It should be noted that this scenario would not require any approvals or permissions under the planning system.

Existing Standby Runway Scenario

- 2.20 At present, the standby runway is only used when the main runway is temporarily closed for maintenance or in emergencies. GAL consider that a higher level of growth at Gatwick would be possible by bringing the standby runway into regular use (for departing flights only).
- 2.21 A 1979 legal agreement between the County Council and BAA, the owners of Gatwick at that time, precludes the simultaneous use of both runways. Although this agreement expires in August 2019, the routine use of the standby runway is also prevented under a 1979 planning permission. Therefore, if GAL decide to take the Existing Standby Runway scheme forward, it would be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and permission would need to be obtained from the Secretary of State through the Development Consent Order (DCO) process.
- 2.22 The County Council would be a statutory consultee in the DCO process, which would probably start in 2019 with formal consultations by GAL based on "a more complete understanding of the implications than is available at this stage" (paragraph 11). Submission of a formal DCO application would probably follow in 2020 and if consent is subsequently granted, GAL consider that the standby runway could be brought into use alongside the main runway in the mid-2020s.
- 2.23 GAL suggest that bringing the Existing Standby Runway into routine use for departing flights only would add between 10 and 15 additional ATMs in the peak hours, which would result in the airport handling up to 390,000 ATMs and 70 million passengers by 2032. The total tonnage of freight would increase from 102,000 in 2018 to 325,000 in 2032/33. It should be noted that the increase in throughput is relatively modest because the two existing runways are in close proximity and it would be much less than could be achieved by a full additional runway (as was considered by the Airports Commission).
- 2.24 Importantly, it should be noted that the suggested increase of 90,000 ATMs (30.0%) and 17mppa (32.1%) from 2022 to 2032 only relate to the 'Existing Standby Runway' scenario and they do not include the projected increases of 40,000 ATMs and 8mppa under the 'Existing Main Runway' scenario. Therefore, if both scenarios were to come forward, the total throughput of the airport is expected to be 430,000 ATMs and 78mppa, increases of 130,000 ATMs (43.3%) and 25mppa (47.2%) from 2022.
- 2.25 Although they have not completed all the technical studies, GAL expect that the development would stay within the airport's existing footprint and the airport would remain a two-terminal operation. Also, although they consider that the airfield would need some reconfiguration and that some additional

support infrastructure would be required, they state that the scale of change would not be as great as that associated with the full additional runway scheme previously submitted to the Airports Commission.

- 2.26 With regard to surface access, although GAL acknowledge that the road network would require some further upgrades, most likely to the roundabouts serving the North and South Terminals, no details are provided. The 'optimum highway solution' would be identified through further modelling and through discussion with Highways England and the Local Highway Authorities, including the County Council.
- 2.27 With regard to rail, GAL state that the capacity of services to and from Gatwick has more than doubled in the last five years, providing adequate capacity to increase rail share. This has been achieved through the infrastructure and service improvements associated with the Thameslink programme and a programme of rolling stock replacement on Thameslink and Gatwick Express. With the delivery of the rail station upgrade, GAL consider that there will be no constraints to growth in rail demand to 2032.
- 2.28 A detailed Transport Assessment, identifying surface access improvements, would support any future DCO application.
- 2.29 GAL's initial work suggests that aircraft noise generated by the scheme would be broadly similar to today's level and that there would be no breach of air quality limits in the local area (see also paragraphs 2.35-2.39).

Safeguarded Additional Runway to the South Scenario

- 2.30 Even with the development of a third runway at Heathrow, GAL consider that it is the national interest that land for an additional runway should continue to be safeguarded to meet longer-term demand growth. This is because they believe that capacity constraints at UK airports will be apparent by 2030 and in subsequent years.
- 2.31 GAL consider that an additional runway could be delivered within approximately ten years of starting the planning process and that it would add 40-50 movements per hour to enable Gatwick to handle up to 98mppa within 20 or 25 years from opening the runway, an increase of 20mppa (25.6%) from 2032. The draft Master Plan does not suggest what this would mean for air traffic movements but it could be an additional 112,000 ATM (based on 180 passengers per ATM).
- 2.32 It should be noted that these figures assume that the 'Existing Main Runway' and the 'Existing Standby Runway' scenarios have already been implemented to deliver additional capacity at the airport. Therefore, if all three scenarios come forward, the total increase would be 45mppa (84.9%) from 2022.
- 2.33 GAL accept that delivery of an additional runway is a much higher capacity scheme, requiring more significant changes to the airport and surrounding roads and with increased environmental impacts. Accordingly, given the Government's support for expansion at Heathrow, in publishing the draft Master Plan, GAL are signalling a change of approach because they are not actively pursuing the scheme at this time.

Environmental Strategies

- 2.34 GAL plan to continue the approaches identified in their Sustainability Strategy to drive efficiency improvements and reduce Gatwick's environmental footprint.
- 2.35 With regard to the key issue of noise, Gatwick's noise footprint reduced sharply from the late 1980s to the early 2000s due to the introduction of significantly quieter aircraft. Since then the overall trend has been for a gradual reduction in the contour area despite an increase in annual aircraft movements. GAL expect the 2022 noise footprint, in terms of population within the contours, to be smaller than in 2017, with the shift to quieter aircraft off-setting the increase in movements.
- 2.36 With regard to the Existing Main Runway scenario from 2022 onwards, GAL expect noise levels to reduce by 2028 with a downward trend generally continuing through to 2032 due to the introduction of quieter 'new generation' aircraft.
- 2.37 With regard to the Existing Standby Runway scenario, GAL have not completed a full assessment of the environmental impacts. However, they expect that the number of people affected by day-time noise in 2028 and 2032 to be broadly comparable to today; this is because the increase in flights would be by quieter aircraft, resulting in little overall change in the number of people living within each noise contour.
- 2.38 GAL consider that there would be a more apparent reduction in night-time noise because they assume that there would be no traffic growth in the night quota period and, therefore, the positive impact of quieter aircraft types would be more pronounced.
- 2.39 If the Existing Standby Runway scheme is taken forward, GAL would prepare a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to support the DCO application. At this stage, however, GAL have not completed enough work to establish the impacts of the scheme or the appropriate mitigation measures.

Economic and Employment Strategies

- 2.40 GAL calculate that Gatwick contributes £4.1bn to the UK economy, with net economic benefit to the Gatwick Diamond area of £1.44bn in 2017 with a further welfare net benefit, including shorter travel times for workers and residents, of £30m. The airport supports 71,000 jobs in the UK, of which 43,000 are in the Gatwick Diamond area (with 24,000 located at the airport itself).
- 2.41 Under the Existing Main Runway scenario, GAL calculate that the benefit (in Gross Value Added) to the UK economy would be £5.06bn, with net economic benefit to the Gatwick Diamond area of £1.71bn in 2028 and the further welfare net benefit increasing to £44m. Total employment generated by the airport would be 79,000 jobs.

- 2.42 With the implementation of both the Existing Main Runway and Existing Standby Runway scenarios, GAL's preliminary analysis suggests that the total benefit to the UK would be £5.79bn, with net economic benefits to the Gatwick Diamond area increasing to £1.9bn in 2028 and wider welfare benefits increasing to £60m. Total employment generated by the airport would be 91,000 jobs.
- 2.43 If the Existing Standby Runway scheme is taken forward, GAL would prepare a more detailed assessment of economic benefits to support the DCO application.

Community Engagement Strategies

- 2.44 GAL plan to continue their current approach to community engagement including, for example in relation to noise, through the consultative committee (GATCOM), the Noise Management Board, the Noise and Track Monitoring Advisory Group (NaTMAG), and meeting and briefing events.

3. Key Issues

- 3.1 The following section summarises the key issues for the County Council to consider in relation to the draft Master Plan and growth at Gatwick.

General

- 3.2 It should be noted that the only fully worked-up element of the draft Master Plan is for the first five years, 2018 to 2022. In effect, it is 'business as usual' based on GAL doing more with the existing main runway and taking forward their current capital investment programme and approaches to sustainability, etc.
- 3.3 With regard to the scenarios for the 5-15 years period (2022-2032), GAL are only setting out ideas or concepts based on initial technical work. It should be noted that, before the publication of the draft Master Plan, there were no formal discussions with the County Council about the scenarios or the work undertaken to date by GAL. The Master Plan is short on detail about how the scenarios might be taken forward, their likely impacts, and about how adverse direct and indirect impacts would be addressed, including through appropriate mitigation measures. Therefore, it is a very different from four years ago when the Airports Commission were considering the merits of GAL's detailed plans for a full second runway to the south.
- 3.4 GAL are clear that further technical work is required, especially if the Existing Standby Runway scheme is taken forward as a NSIP. If a DCO application is made, the County Council will be a statutory consultee in that process and it will need to formally respond at that time and, as required, to appear at an examination to present its case (before the final decision is made by the Secretary of State).
- 3.5 Accordingly, the County Council is not in a position to comment on the merits or demerits of much of what GAL are proposing because their ideas are not fully-formed and no evidence has been provided in support of the draft Master Plan. Furthermore, until GAL undertake and share the necessary

technical work that is required, it is not possible for the County Council to understand the likely impacts of each scenarios and to identify what mitigation may be required, over and above that generally suggested by GAL in the draft document.

- 3.6 Therefore, in the absence of any details in the draft Master Plan about the scenarios, it is suggested that, other than in relation to GAL's plans for the first five years, the County Council only responds to the consultation on those matters in general terms.

Passenger Forecasts

- 3.7 As identified at paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4, passenger demand forecasts have previously underestimated the rates of growth at Gatwick. With the exception of Heathrow, all other major UK airports are growing at a faster rate than Gatwick.
- 3.8 It is unclear whether there is any evidence for the forecast increase in the number of movements of 10-15 per hour in relation to the Existing Standby Runway scenario. This is only an 18-27% increase on the current number of air traffic movements (55 per hour). Therefore, it may prove to be an underestimate and if so, passenger growth could exceed forecasts.
- 3.9 Furthermore, forecasts assume that the number of passengers per ATM reach around 180 in the mid-2020s and remain static thereafter. However, this does not appear to be evidence-based and it is not consistent with recent trends and is also unlikely given the commercial case for increasing load factors.
- 3.10 Accordingly, it is suggested that GAL's forecasts about future throughput under the scenarios, are considered to be one possible future outcome, the accuracy of which depends on the veracity of the various assumptions. Actual throughput may exceed these forecasts and it would be advisable for GAL to consider other possible future forecasts to ensure that all potential outcomes are understood and can be planned for.

Economic Impacts

- 3.11 Growth at Gatwick could result in economic benefits and the creation of jobs in four main ways: directly through jobs at the airport, indirectly through airport-related activity off the airport; induced activity, that is, jobs created by the direct and indirect workforce through the purchase of goods and services in the local economy; and catalytic employment, that is, job creation through companies, due to the presence of Gatwick, choosing to locate or invest within a wide area around the airport and growth through businesses choosing to start, locate or invest within a wide area around the airport due to its presence, including in the visitor economy.
- 3.12 In 2016, GAL established the Gatwick Growth Board (GGB) to provide an independent consideration of the wider economic and social impacts of recent and future growth on the local area, the South East region and on the economy of the UK as a whole. The Board considered the general economic impact of Gatwick Airport (set out earlier in the report), and the more

specific impact on the visitor economy (with an estimated 5.5m of the 45.5m passengers in 2017 being inbound visits to the UK by overseas visitors, with 11.5% staying in the Coast to Capital area) and on trade and investment (with £7.5 billion of international goods passing through Gatwick in 2017 in trade that supported 113,800 UK jobs).

- 3.13 The Gatwick Diamond Initiatives 'Economic Geography of the Gatwick Diamond' report (2017) by Centre for Cities highlighted current economic performance and key considerations around future growth (the Gatwick Diamond includes Crawley Borough, Horsham District and Mid Sussex District in West Sussex, and parts of Surrey). The report highlighted that the economy is generally performing strongly, with Crawley having the most jobs led by large concentrations in the Manor Royal business district and neighbouring Gatwick Airport.
- 3.14 In order to support future growth, including through potential airport growth, the report particularly highlighted: the role of urban and town centres; attracting investment in higher-skilled jobs; ensuring there is high-quality business space to meet business needs; a sufficient supply of new homes to help manage the affordability challenge, while noting the planning constraints; and an adequate supply of workers, including through encouraging a greater proportion of Gatwick Diamond residents to work closer to home.
- 3.15 The current and potential role of Gatwick Airport in supporting the economy of West Sussex has been highlighted in the County Council's Economic Growth Plan (EGP) 2018-2023, adopted in June 2018. The EGP, which is a key plan to achieve the West Sussex Plan's 'prosperous place' outcomes, highlights how the County is not fully capitalising on the airport, its international connectedness, and its role in attracting industries that see it as an advantage.
- 3.16 Key considerations largely reflect those in the Gatwick Diamond Initiative's report, including the need for a clear proposition for businesses to start, locate, invest or grow in the area; for additional business space to meet the needs of higher-value companies that could be attracted to being close to an international airport; for innovation centres and clusters to help stimulate the knowledge economy; for supporting vibrant town centres that are attractive to residents and visitors; and for enabling and supporting a workforce for the future.
- 3.17 One of the five priority themes within the EGP is to maximise opportunities from Gatwick by creating and supporting higher-value employment in a wide zone of opportunity around the airport. The County Council is working with a range of partners to progress this priority, including through town centre and business space initiatives with the district and borough councils through the Growth Deals; plans for the redevelopment of the former Novartis site in Horsham for high-quality business space including an innovation centre, and some new homes; and working collaboratively with Gatwick Airport and partners to drive greater economic value to the local area from international visitors through Experience West Sussex and other destination brands.

- 3.18 Gatwick Airport is central to the recently-published 'Gatwick 360', the Coast to Capital (C2C) Local Economic Partnership's Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) 2018-2030. The vision to 2030 is *"for our towns and cities to be known around the world as fantastic places to live, to grow and to succeed. We will become the most dynamic non-city region in England, centred around a highly successful Gatwick airport"*. The Plan states that a vibrant and successful airport is essential to the area's competitiveness, and to attracting businesses from London and elsewhere. Gatwick is seen as key to attracting investment, driving exports to global markets, and nurturing innovation across economic sectors.
- 3.19 The County Council's EGP and C2C's SEP highlight the potential to secure additional benefits for the local economy from Gatwick Airport in its current state. In particular, Gatwick is not maximising its potential for high-level, added-value jobs, and is potentially underperforming in terms of its benefits to the West Sussex economy. Therefore, growth at Gatwick could realise benefits in support of the County Council's key objectives, including the strategic focus on the knowledge economy, the provision of new high quality business and innovation space, ensuring vibrant town centres, and growth in an all year round visitor economy.
- 3.20 However, it should be noted that only high-level data about the economic benefits of the various scenarios is presented in the draft Master Plan, including assumptions about increases in job numbers. There is no detail about the type of jobs that could be created and no supporting evidence has been provided (although it is noted that if the Existing Standby Runway scheme is taken forward, a more detailed assessment of economic benefits will be undertaken).
- 3.21 Similar to the assumptions about air traffic (including both passengers and freight), the accuracy of GAL's estimates about increases in GVA and jobs depend on the veracity of the various assumptions. Therefore, actual changes could be higher or lower and it would be advisable for GAL to consider other possible future forecasts to ensure that all potential outcomes are understood and can be planned for.
- 3.22 Furthermore, the type of jobs that come forward and the location of them will be market-led and, therefore, there is a question about whether the County Council and other key partners are happy for the market to dictate or whether a more interventionist approach is required, for example, through the allocation of land for particular employment uses.

Environmental Impacts

- 3.23 Impacts on air quality and noise are identified in the draft Master Plan as two of the key environmental issues to be addressed. GAL's assumptions about the potential impacts of their scenarios for the longer-term are not supported by any detailed evidence, either within the draft Master Plan or in separate documentation. GAL acknowledge that they have not completed enough work to establish the impacts of the scheme or the appropriate mitigation measures. It is also noted that if the Existing Standby Runway scheme is taken forward, a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) would be undertaken to support a DCO application.

- 3.24 Reigate and Banstead Borough Council and Crawley Borough Council provide technical expertise on noise and air quality respectively to the local authorities around Gatwick. With regard to air quality, the advice provided is that some of the statements in the draft Master Plan are potentially misleading, for example, because the modelling of emissions can differ from readings on the grounds. In short, it is too early for any conclusions to be drawn in the absence of GAL's evidence to date being made available for scrutiny.
- 3.25 With regard to noise, Government policy is to limit or, where possible, reduce the number of people significantly affected by aircraft noise. The potential impact of the Existing Standby Runway scenario is that the number of people likely to be affected would not change greatly but there would be more concentrated periods of noise with fewer quieter periods. Accordingly, frequency of events is important when assessing the impacts of noise, not just the level of noise generated. Therefore, in addition to mapping noise contours, different measures need to be used that address how people experience noise.
- 3.26 Again, the advice is that some of GAL's statements are potentially misleading and their assumptions may prove to be incorrect, for example, because the introduction of quieter aircraft by the airlines may not happen as quickly as GAL have presumed. Overall, it is also too early for any conclusions to be drawn on this important matter in the absence of any evidence being made available for scrutiny.

Surface Access

- 3.27 The 2018 Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS) includes objectives, targets and actions to enable an increase in the sustainable transport mode share for passenger and employees travelling to the airport through to 2022. In general, the 2018 ASAS includes sufficient plans to accommodate Gatwick growth on the Existing Main Runway to 2022 on the proviso that actions and planned improvements, crucially including the Gatwick Railway Station upgrade, are delivered. The Gatwick Railway Station upgrade is expected to be completed in 2022/23 but the scheme is not currently fully-funded.
- 3.28 A programme of transport improvements such as the Thameslink programme and M23 smart motorway scheme are being delivered that will improve connectivity and capacity of strategic rail and road connections to Gatwick. These improvements are sufficient to cater for forecast throughput associated with the Existing Main Runway scenario to 2022. Although further improvements to strategic transport infrastructure, such as the Brighton Main Line upgrades and improvements to the M23/A23 corridor, have the potential to come forward, the Government has not yet committed to these improvements through the relevant investment strategies. A firm commitment and implementation funding should be sought from Government to help deliver these improvements to support Gatwick growth on the Existing Main Runway beyond 2022.
- 3.29 The strategic rail and road corridors that provide access to Gatwick are also heavily used by other users such as commuters who, for example, live in

West Sussex but work in London. Growth in non-airport related traffic is expected to take place on these corridors alongside growth in air passengers, freight, and employees. Therefore, increasing the rate of growth at Gatwick through delivering either the Existing Standby Runway or Full Additional Runway schemes would bring forward the point at which further improvements to strategic rail and road infrastructure are needed in order to address congestion and overcrowding.

- 3.30 Although the 2018 ASAS does not provide a plan to mitigate the Existing Standby Runway scheme, GAL state that the objectives could be applied to a future ASAS designed to cater for this scheme. However, at the present time, no detailed assessment of the transport impacts of the Existing Standby Runway scenario has been carried out. As no ASAS has been developed, the infrastructure improvements needed to facilitate the associated increase in throughput (of passengers and freight) and employment have not yet been identified. This work would need to take place before a future DCO application.
- 3.31 Therefore, at this stage, it is unclear whether the impacts of the Standby Runway Scheme on the transport network would be acceptable or that an ASAS for this scheme would be deliverable or effective at mitigating the impacts to a satisfactory level. The commitment to take account of the needs of non-airport related traffic in developing the ASAS for this Existing Standby Runway scheme is welcome.
- 3.32 With regard to safeguarding land to the south, such a designation would prevent development, such as a new road, that could compromise delivery of a full additional runway. Therefore, the proposed safeguarding area could potentially affect the deliverability of a Crawley Western Relief Road (CWRR), which would link the A264 and A23. In order to deliver a CWRR and avoid the area of land that is proposed to be safeguarded, it is likely that land would need to be acquired, potentially through a Compulsory Purchase Order.
- 3.33 A CWRR has potential to support future development west of Crawley, although this does not currently feature in either the Horsham District Planning Framework or the Crawley Local Plan. In 2014, the County Council agreed, following a Notice of Motion debate, to work with developers to secure a CWRR. Therefore, although a CWRR is not currently planned, to ensure that it is deliverable in the future, the County Council should seek assurances in the Master Plan that GAL will work with the local authorities to identify a deliverable alignment that does not compromise delivery of a Full Additional Runway and also minimises the need for land to be compulsorily purchased.
- 3.34 The focus for the draft Master Plan is on future growth in passengers that could be accommodated in each of the scenarios. The transport impact of additional freight throughput is currently unknown. Also, very little information is provided about the impacts of additional employees travelling to and from Gatwick. As employee trips typically originate locally and are made twice daily, five days per week, employee trips have a disproportionate effect on the local transport network. Therefore, greater consideration should have been given in the draft Master Plan to the impacts of additional

freight and employee trips and schemes to mitigate the impacts of these trips on the transport network.

Wider Impacts – jobs, homes, and infrastructure

- 3.35 The current influence of the airport on the local economy and its implications for housing are reflected in the overall employment, population and household forecasts for the area. These forecasts inform policy making, especially the preparation of local plans by the district and borough councils. They also inform other policy decisions, for example, with regard to planning for strategic infrastructure and the delivery of services.
- 3.36 The Department for Transport's 'Guidance on the Preparation of Airport Master Plans' (2004) suggests that airports should report the key impacts of major development projects, including their "*local, and in the case of larger airports, regional economic, housing and employment implications*".
- 3.37 Although GAL have suggested the likely levels of employment that would be generated under the scenarios, there is no discussion in the draft Master Plan about where the jobs should be located or about when they might come forward. Also, there is no discussion about how their proposals could impact on employment and commuting patterns.
- 3.38 Furthermore, there is no discussion about the additional demand that would be generated for homes, about where they should be located, or about when they might be needed. Planning for airport-related population increases, in addition to expected and forecast background growth in population, will be very challenging given policy and environmental constraints, such as Green Belt, and current levels of unmet need within the wider area.
- 3.39 Similarly, there is no discussion about the potential need for new or improved physical and social infrastructure off the airport, including County Council services, to support the delivery of new jobs and homes across a wide area. Also, there is no suggestion within the draft Master Plan of any commitment by GAL to look at the wider, indirect impacts of its proposals or to fund or contribute to the provision of such infrastructure.
- 3.40 The 'Gatwick Diamond Post 2030 Infrastructure Study' (January 2016), jointly commissioned by the County Council and Surrey County Council, is a heavily-caveated, high-level, desk-based assessment of the potential infrastructure requirements associated within longer-term growth in that area from 2030 to 2050. It considered a baseline scenario, that is, a continuation of planned growth at that time and two scenarios building on the baseline but with additional housing growth (9,300 and 14,000 extra homes) associated with a second runway at Gatwick. In summary, the Study identified that the cost uplift generated by a second runway could be an additional £344m of supporting infrastructure (a significant amount of which would be within the West Sussex part of the Gatwick Diamond). Most of this cost would be for improvements to road and rail, but there would also be a need for other infrastructure, in particular for education, health and social care, and utilities.
- 3.41 Although the Standby Runway Scheme would not generate the same level of need for additional homes and supporting infrastructure, there would still be

significant demands placed on the wider area resulting from a potential increase in throughput at the airport from c.45mppa today to c.78mppa in the early 2030s. Furthermore, if an additional runway to the south were to come forward, there could be an additional 20mppa, which would result in a total of c.98mppa at the airport in the longer-term (which would be very similar to the throughput of the second runway scheme). Therefore, if all three scenarios were to come forward, the demands for additional homes and infrastructure would be similar to those identified in the Post 2030 Infrastructure Study.

- 3.42 In summary, the draft Master Plan only refers to the direct impacts of GAL's plans and scenarios, and it does not make any reference to potential indirect impacts on the wider area and any commitment by GAL to fully-fund or contribute towards mitigating them. Furthermore, it makes limited reference to how GAL's plans and proposals would work with or complement those of other organisations, agencies or bodies for growth or development within the wider area. More generally, other than referring to environmental and economic impacts, it is silent about the airport's relationship with, and contribution to, 'place'.

4. Consultation Response

- 4.1 Although question 11 provides the opportunity for other comments to be made, GAL's first 10 questions in the Consultation Document potentially limit the scope of responses. Therefore, the following paragraphs suggest how the County Council should respond to the consultation. With regard to the Existing Standby Runway and the Safeguarded Additional Runway to the South scenarios, there are a number of possible ways in which the authority could respond; the options are identified below.

General

- 4.2 The County Council should welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft Master Plan. However, it should be made clear that the County Council is not able to comment on the merits or demerits of much of what GAL are proposing because, other than in relation to plans for the first five years, the ideas in the draft Master Plan are not fully-formed and no evidence has been provided in support of them. Therefore, in the absence of any details in the draft Master Plan about the scenarios, the County Council can only respond to the consultation on those matters in general terms.
- 4.3 Given the acknowledgement by GAL that more works needs to be undertaken before it can put detailed plans in place, in particular to take forward a scheme for the Existing Standby Runway, the County Council (both members and officers) should engage positively and proactively with GAL to help shape its plans for the future. This will help to ensure that the key issues identified in this report are fully addressed, including maximising opportunities for the residents and businesses of the County that could result from growth at Gatwick.
- 4.4 The County Council recognises Gatwick Airport is a significant asset in terms of its contribution to the local economy, including: through job opportunities; direct business with local companies and their supply chains; and by acting

as a catalyst for growth, through businesses choosing to start, locate or invest due to the presence of the airport, and through world class connectivity and access to global markets.

- 4.5 Therefore, the County Council should, in principle, welcome sustainable growth at the airport where it would be consistent with the West Sussex Plan, the authority's Economic Growth Plan, and the C2C Strategic Economic Plan - Gatwick 360°. In particular, it should welcome plans that would see Gatwick maximising its potential in contributing to the County Council's key economic objectives, including: the strategic focus on the knowledge economy and high-level, added-value jobs; the provision of new high quality business and innovation space; and growth in an all-year round visitor economy.
- 4.6 However, it should be made clear that this general support for growth at the airport should not be interpreted as support regardless of the impacts on the local and wider area.

Passenger Forecasts

- 4.7 The County Council should express concern that GAL's assumptions about forecast growth in passenger numbers may be underestimates that result in unplanned for direct and indirect adverse impacts. Therefore, the County Council should suggest that GAL consider a range of forecasts for passenger numbers (high/medium/low) to ensure that all potential outcomes are understood and can be planned for.

Economic Impacts

- 4.8 The accuracy of GAL's estimates about increases in GVA and jobs resulting from the scenarios depend on the veracity of the various assumptions. Therefore, actual changes could be higher or lower and the County Council should suggest that GAL consider a range of forecasts of economic impacts (high/medium/low) to ensure that all potential outcomes are understood and can be planned for.
- 4.9 The County Council considers that the Master Plan should address the type of jobs that would be created (directly, indirectly, through induced activity, or through catalytic employment), where they should be located, and when they might come forward. Also, it should address how GAL's proposals could impact on employment, commuting patterns, and the movement of freight.
- 4.10 Similarly, the County Council considers that it should address the additional demand that would be generated for homes and commercial development, where they should be located, and when they might be needed.
- 4.11 Therefore, it is suggested that the County Council should seek a much stronger commitment from GAL to (a) identifying the direct and indirect economic impacts of their plans and scenarios and (b) to avoiding, reducing, mitigating, or compensating for any adverse impacts.

Environmental Impacts

- 4.12 The draft Master Plan makes reference to continuing the existing approach to sustainability, including addressing the key issues of surface access, noise and air quality, which should be welcomed.
- 4.13 However, it is suggested that the County Council should express its concern that no evidence has been provided to support GAL's assumptions about the impact of the scenarios on the key issues of air quality and noise.
- 4.14 Therefore, it is suggested that the County Council should seek a much stronger commitment from GAL to (a) identifying the direct and indirect environmental impacts of their plans and scenarios and (b) to avoiding, reducing, mitigating, or compensating for any adverse impacts.

4.15 ***Surface Access***

- 4.16 The draft document makes reference to continuing the approach in the current ASAS to 2022, which should be welcomed. The County Council should highlight the importance of the Gatwick Railway Station Upgrade to achieving the targets set out in the current ASAS. The County Council should also welcome GAL's intention to prepare a new ASAS, possibly with the same objectives, in support of their plans for the longer-term. The specific commitment by GAL to take account of the needs of non-airport related traffic when it develops the ASAS should also be welcomed.
- 4.17 Growth beyond 2022 is dependent on the delivery of strategic transport infrastructure, such as the Brighton Main Line upgrades and improvements to the M23/A23 corridor beyond those that are already committed. Therefore, the County Council should seek assurance from GAL that it will work with this authority and other key partners to obtain a firm commitment and implementation funding from Government to help deliver such enabling schemes.
- 4.18 The County Council should express concern that greater consideration has not been given in the draft Master Plan to the impacts of additional freight and employee trips and to the identification of schemes to mitigate the impacts of these trips on the transport network.

Supporting Infrastructure

- 4.19 The draft document makes reference to the current capital investment programme and suggests that additional investment is likely to be required, which should be welcomed.
- 4.20 However, the County Council should express concern that there is no discussion in the draft Master Plan about the potential need for new or improved physical and social infrastructure off the airport, including County Council services, to support the delivery of new jobs and homes across a wide area.
- 4.21 It is suggested that the County Council should seek a much stronger commitment from GAL to (a) identifying the infrastructure within the wider area that is required to directly and indirectly support the delivery of their plans and scenarios and (b) to funding the delivery of such infrastructure,

either in full or in part (depending upon the extent to which the need can be attributed to growth at Gatwick).

'Place'

- 4.22 The County Council should express its concern that the draft Master Plan is narrow in focus because it does not make any reference to potential indirect impacts on the local and wider area, for example, through the creation of new jobs, the resulting need for new homes (over and above background growth), commercial development, and the need for supporting infrastructure.
- 4.23 The County Council should seek a commitment from GAL (a) that it will work with this authority and other organisations to understand Gatwick's current and future relationship with, and contribution to, 'place' and (b) that it will take a holistic approach, including taking account of the plans and proposals of others, that addresses the direct and indirect implications of the Master Plan for 'place'.

Growth Plans and Scenarios

- 4.24 In addition to the comments made above, in particular, those about GAL identifying and addressing the direct and indirect economic, social and environmental impacts of their plans and scenarios on the local and wider area (including the need for supporting infrastructure), the following paragraphs suggest how the County Council could respond with specific regard to the plan for the next five years and the three growth scenarios.

Master Plan for the Next Five Years – 2018 to 2022

- 4.25 It is suggested that the County Council supports GAL's plans for the next five years, provided that the necessary supporting infrastructure is put in place. This includes delivery of the actions and planned improvements identified in the current ASAS, in particular, the Gatwick Railway Station upgrade (which is not currently fully-funded).

Existing Main Runway Scenario

- 4.26 Making best use of the main runway is consistent with national policy. Therefore, it is suggested that the County Council supports, in principle, the Existing Main Runway Scenario, subject to:
 - (a) GAL identifying the infrastructure that is required to directly and indirectly support its delivery; and
 - (b) GAL funding the delivery of such infrastructure, either in full or in part.

Existing Standby Runway Scenario

- 4.27 GAL are likely to take forward a scheme to bring the standby runway into routine use, which will require the County Council to formally respond to a DCO application and, as required, to appear at an examination to present its case. Therefore, comments should be made on a 'without prejudice' basis.

- 4.28 Although making best use of the standby runway would be consistent with national aviation policy, there is a lack of detail in the draft Master Plan about the Existing Standby Runway scenario, its impacts and appropriate mitigation measures. However, it is acknowledged that GAL will undertake detailed economic, environmental and transport assessments in support of any future DCO application, which should be welcomed. Therefore, it is suggested that the County Council should offer to support the preparation of such assessments and seek assurances from GAL that it will involve this and other authorities at an early stage in their development.
- 4.29 In general, it is suggested that there are three options available to the County Council with regard to commenting on the Existing Standby Runway scenario:
- A. object, in principle, because:
 - (i) the economic benefits of growth under this scenario are currently unproven;
 - (ii) the level of additional throughput generated, over and above that under the Existing Main Runway Scenario, would be likely to result in adverse social and environmental impacts that could not be avoided, reduced, mitigated, or compensated for to an acceptable level; and
 - (iii) there would be adverse impacts on the wider area due to the need for additional homes, commercial development, and supporting infrastructure.
 - B. support, in principle, subject to:
 - (i) any adverse impacts identified through the economic, transport, environmental and any other necessary assessments being avoided, reduced, mitigated, or compensated for to an acceptable level; and
 - (ii) GAL identifying and funding (in full or in part) the infrastructure that is directly and indirectly required to support the delivery of a detailed scheme.
 - C. neither support nor object but maintain a neutral position at this stage pending the completion of the detailed economic, transport, environmental and any other necessary assessments.

Safeguarded Additional Runway to the South Scenario

- 4.30 Although GAL are only seeking to safeguard land for a new runway, they suggest that, subject to Government approval at some point in the future, additional throughput of 20mppa could be accommodated (over and above that delivered under the other scenarios). Therefore, given the possible need for the County Council to formally respond in the future to a proposal for an additional runway to the south, comments should be made on a 'without prejudice' basis.
- 4.31 An additional runway would not be consistent with current national aviation policy and there is a lack of detail in the draft Master Plan about its impacts and appropriate mitigation measures. However, it is noted that the issue of

safeguarding is likely to be addressed by the Aviation Green Paper (see paragraph 1.4).

4.32 In general, it is suggested that there are two options available to the County Council with regard to commenting on the Safeguarded Additional Runway scenario:

- A. object, in principle, because:
 - (i) it would be consistent with the County Council's formal position from 2015 that it is opposed to a new runway because "*the environmental damage is without question, whereas the economic benefit is unproven and may well be negative*"; and
 - (ii) removal of safeguarding would free up land for a CWRR and employment and other uses, including to meet needs generated under the Existing Main Runway Scenario and, possibly, the Existing Standby Runway Scenario.
- B. accept that there may be a national need for an additional runway in the future and support, in principle, the continued safeguarding of land to the south of the airport. However, it should be made clear that this does **not** mean that the County Council:
 - (i) accepts that there is a need for an additional runway at Gatwick at this time;
 - (ii) supports, in principle, the future delivery of an additional runway regardless of the impacts on the local and wider area; and
 - (iii) agrees that the area identified in the draft Master Plan is necessarily the right area to be safeguarded (because more work needs to be undertaken on this matter, including with Crawley Borough Council).

4.33 Regardless of which response option is selected, it is suggested that the County Council should seek to enter into a new legal agreement with GAL (along the same lines as the current 1979 agreement) that prevents the construction of an additional operational runway to the south of the current airport. As a minimum, such an agreement should cover the period of the Master Plan, that is 15 years, but a longer timeframe may be appropriate; the National Aviation Strategy may provide some direction on this matter if, as expected, it addresses the issue of safeguarding.

4.34 The County Council should seek assurances in the Master Plan that GAL will work with the local authorities to identify a deliverable alignment for a CWRR that (a) does not compromise delivery of an Additional Runway at some point in the future and (b) minimises the need for land to be compulsorily purchased to deliver the new road.

5. Resources

5.1 There are no resource implications in responding to the consultation.

Factors taken into account

6. Issues for consideration by the Select Committee

- 6.1 It is suggested that Members focus their attention on the key issues identified in Section 3 and the suggestions in Section 4 about how the County Council should respond to the consultation. In particular, it is suggested that Members consider the options about how the authority could respond to the Existing Standby Runway and the Safeguarded Additional Runway to the South scenarios.

7. Consultation

- 7.1 Internal discussions about the key matters and issues have taken place with officers and members.
- 7.2 External discussions have taken place with other local authorities through the Gatwick Officers' Group (GOG). This includes matters relating to noise and air quality, where technical advice to GOG is provided by Crawley Borough Council and Reigate and Banstead Borough Council respectively.

8. Risk Management Implications

- 8.1 Given that GAL are likely to take forward the scheme to bring the standby runway into routine use, formal approval will be required through the DCO process. The County Council will be a statutory consultee in that process and it will need to formally respond to the DCO application and, as required, to appear at an examination to present its case (before the final decision is made by the Secretary of State). Accordingly, there is a risk at this stage of the County Council pre-determining its position on any future DCO application (and on any other matters where a formal response from the County Council is required in the future). Therefore, it is suggested that the County Council only responds on this matter in general, without prejudice, terms.
- 8.2 Although GAL are only seeking to safeguard land for a new runway to the south, they suggest that, subject to Government approval at some point in the future, additional throughput of 20mppa could be accommodated. Given the potential need for the County Council to formally respond to any future proposal for an additional runway, it is suggested that the County Council only responds on this matter in general, without prejudice, terms.

9. Other Options Considered

- 9.1 The only other option is to not respond to the consultation on the draft Master Plan. However, given the issues addressed in the draft document and the importance of Gatwick to the County and the wider area, it is considered appropriate that the County Council should make a formal response.

10. Equality Duty

- 10.1 Not applicable.

11. Social Value

- 11.1 Not applicable.

12. Crime and Disorder Implications

12.1 Not applicable.

12. Human Rights Implications

13.1 Not applicable.

Lee Harris

Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment

Contact: Michael Elkington, 0330 22 26463

Appendices

[Appendix A: Gatwick Airport Master Plan 2018 Consultation Document](#)

Background Papers

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee
6th December 2018
Proposed Savings for Fire Service Operations and Public Protection for 2019/20
Report by Executive Director Communities and Public Protection and Director of Operations and Director of Public Protection

Summary

It is proposed to save £600,000 from Fire Service Operations budget in 2019/20 and £100,000 from the Public Protection budget to contribute to the West Sussex County Council (WSCC) savings requirements £145m by 2021.

The proposals will be subject to staff consultation from 13th December 2018. Following the close of consultation on 10th January 2019 a final decision will be made by the Executive Director of Communities and Public Protection on the impacts, outcomes and whether to proceed with the current or modified proposals following consultation with staff and representative bodies.

If approved any service changes would be implemented by June 2019.

Focus for Scrutiny

- (1) The Committee is asked to consider the proposals and their potential impact, in the light of the evidence, and the other options considered.

Proposal

1. Background and Context

In order to achieve the savings required by the County Council each of the Directorates has been asked to review their spending and identify areas where potential savings can be made. The Operations and Public Protection directorate has reviewed the services that are delivered and the supporting functions and have developed a set of proposals to deliver savings in 2019/20.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 Proposed reduction in Intervention and Prevention activities saving £400,000. Details are in paragraph 4 below.
- 2.2 Proposed review and restructure of the Technical Rescue Unit saving £200,000. Details are in paragraph 4 below.
- 2.3 Restructure of Resilience and Emergencies Team saving £100,000

3. Resources

- 3.1 The savings will require resources to plan, coordinate and deliver the action plans through an agreed period and will be managed through the Fire and Rescue Service savings board which is part of the Customer Centred Value for Money Board. This is one of the four boards that support the delivery of the Fire & Rescue Service's Integrated Risk Management Plan.

Factors taken into account

4. Issues for consideration by the Select Committee

- 4.1 The Committees views on the possible outcomes from the proposals:

Operations

- Restructure of Intervention and Protection team. This would result in the following reduction in delivery:
 - Cessation of FireBreak courses
 - Cessation of Safe Drive Stay Alive courses
 - Reduction in Schools education visits
 - Cessation of working with local cadets
 - Cessation of working with National Citizens Service
 - Cessation of electric blanket testing
- Restructure of Technical Rescue Unit terms, conditions and operations. This may result in a reduction in the delivery of some specialist capability.

Public Protection

- Reduction in the number of posts in the Resilience and Emergencies Team. This would result in the following reduction in delivery:
 - Removal of 'Duke of Cornwall' courses
 - Removal of 'What If' community resilience training to parishes
 - Reduction in assistance to WSCC Directorates in terms of business continuity plan preparations
 - Reduction in assistance to the Sussex Resilience Forum

5 Consultation

- 5.1 Initial communications with staff and representative bodies has taken place. Formal staff consultation will begin 13th December. Consultation to close 10th January 2019.
- 5.2 Debate and discussion at Environment, Communities and Fire Services Select Committee 6th December 2018. The meeting will be webcast.

6 Risk Management Implications

- 6.1 Reduction of discretionary services to residents. Following risk analysis we will remain able to deliver our statutory duties to a reasonable and safe level.

7 Other Options Considered

- 7.1 The decision to propose these savings was based upon an assessment of the Fire & Rescue portfolio and the planned reviews within the Integrated Risk Management Plan. This considered the following functions and ruled them out for any reductions in this round:
- a. Emergency response: There is a planned review of the emergency response standard commencing early 2019. This will enable the Fire Authority to articulate any proposed change to the current standard with the associated assessment of the resources required to deliver that standard.
 - b. Business Fire Safety: Following the Grenfell Tower disaster there has been a significant additional workload placed on the Fire Safety enforcement team and it is not appropriate to consider any reduction in the team at this time.
 - c. Collaboration/Partnerships: The improvement of existing and development of new collaborative opportunities will continue is expected to yield efficiencies. To date the efficiencies gained have already been considered and there are none available to consider for this period.

8 Equality Duty

- 8.1 The equality impact risk assessment has been carried out for each area, there are no negative impacts indicated.

9 Social Value

- 9.1 In terms of environmental sustainability the reduction of activity will mean a reduction in the environmental impact of operations.

10 Crime and Disorder Implications

- 10.1 There are no implications identified.

11. Human Rights Implications

- 11.1 There are no implications identified

Nicola Bulbeck

Executive Director

Communities and Public Protection

Gavin Watts

Director of Operations and Chief Fire Officer

Neil Stocker

Director of Public Protection and Deputy Chief Fire Officer

Contact: Neil Stocker: 07734126786

Background Papers:

None

Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee

6 December 2018

On-Street Parking to Support Traffic Management
--

Report by Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment and Director of Highways and Transport
--

Summary

Providing on-street parking in a well-managed way helps to support local businesses, residents and communities. Road Space Audits are now being used to identify where there is a need to implement better settlement wide parking solutions that support the County Council's aspirations in terms of economic development, improved safety and sustainable transport.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure will be asked to agree a strategic parking management plan programme to implement on-street parking controls in various locations across the county and to review the operation of the parking service county-wide, including charges. Specific proposals for each place will be put to the Cabinet Member as they arise from the programme of Road Space Audits which is already underway. Road Space Audits will be progressively rolled out to the majority of urban areas across the County.

Any proposals will be driven by operational rather than financial considerations but there is an expectation that implementation of proposals will deliver additional revenue to the On-Street Parking Reserve, which can be reinvested in the Highways and Transport Service.

Recommendation(s)

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) That the decision to consult upon and /or formally advertise Road Space Audit parking management proposals is taken by the Director for Highways and Transport following consideration by the relevant County Local Committee. (2) That the decision to implement Road Space Audit parking management plans, any subsequent changes to parking arrangements contained with the plans, and any changes to the on-street parking charging structure is taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure following consideration of any objections. |
|--|

Proposal

1. Background and Context

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 West Sussex County Council's approach to parking management is set out in the Integrated Parking Strategy. Parking in many towns and villages across West Sussex is currently characterised by limited supply in those areas of |
|---|

greatest demand as well as associated access and safety problems caused by indiscriminate parking. In many areas, the introduction of waiting restrictions, including Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), has facilitated some degree of traffic management but invariably, the parking problems have merely been moved into an adjacent unrestricted area.

- 1.2 Beyond this, the level of new residential and commercial development across West Sussex is likely to exacerbate parking problems in many towns and villages. A more progressive approach, known as a Road Space Audit (RSA) has been piloted in Chichester to determine if there are other, more strategic ways for the County Council to consider existing and future parking demands.
- 1.3 In October 2016, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure convened an Executive Task and Finish Group (TFG) to determine whether the Chichester pilot RSA was more generally applicable across West Sussex.
- 1.4 The findings of the TFG are outlined in Appendix A. The TFG saw the value of RSAs as a tool in parking management and their ability to be applied elsewhere in West Sussex. It was accepted that:
 - RSAs provide vital technical data that informs decision making around parking and broader place-based transport policy.
 - By considering the whole place, both off and on-street now and in the future, RSAs may be used to determine parking management plans that balance the needs of residents, businesses and visitors. In doing so, comprehensive parking plans can be created that do not simply move a problem from one place to another.
 - A longer-term plan linked to potential development will help to manage the impacts of additional demand and feed into infrastructure planning.
 - The County Council needs to advise District/Borough Councils in greater depth on parking and road use issues in their local plans. This approach may be a useful tool for this purpose.
- 1.5 Typically in West Sussex, commuter parking is seen as a problem where it is un-managed. Our responses to date, e.g. introducing CPZs, are increasingly being viewed by councillors and officers alike as too reactive and enhance the impression that our action is a response to a perceived problem. This results in commuter and other 'problem' (i.e. non-residential) parking being displaced from place to place. Comprehensive place wide parking management plans created via RSAs are central to a more holistic and proactive approach to parking management which can limit commuter displacement from the outset.
- 1.6 The TFG proposed the following three tier programme for RSAs:
 - Priority Growth Areas (Chichester, Crawley, Burgess Hill, Worthing)
 - Pipeline Areas (e.g. Shoreham, Haywards Heath, Horsham)
 - Locally Identified Areas (e.g. Barnham, Hassocks)

- 1.7 Feasibility work is underway in each of the priority growth areas and funds have already been allocated for the three pipeline areas highlighted above. It is expected that RSAs will be rolled out to most other urban areas across the County in the next 2-3 years and it is likely that in each area, proposals for a comprehensive parking plan will be a key part of the overall study.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure will be asked to agree a strategic parking management plan programme to implement on-street parking controls in various locations across the County and annually to review the operation of the County Council parking service county-wide, including on-street charges. The Cabinet Member will consider specific proposals for each settlement as they arise from the programme of RSAs, beginning in Chichester in early 2019.

- 2.2 The following decision making process is being proposed:

- The relevant County Local Committee members be regularly apprised of the progress of RSA studies for their area and have the opportunity to report any comments to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure.
- Within certain parameters to ensure a consistent approach, the relevant County Local Committee agrees the nature and degree of consultation to be undertaken once an initial design for a parking management plan has been prepared.
- The relevant County Local Committee considers the report outlining the responses received during the informal design consultation and feeds back to officers.
- The decision formally to advertise and/or re-advertise detailed proposals for a parking management plan be taken by the Director of Highways and Transport.
- The decision on whether to implement detailed proposals for a parking management plan be taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure subject to consideration of any objections.
- Reviews of each parking management plan (as well as existing CPZs) be undertaken annually. These reviews might involve maximising the number of on-street parking spaces, potential alterations to specific restrictions due to changes in need, and ensuring that all restrictions are enforceable and reflected accurately on the associated Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). Local Members would be consulted as part of the preparation of proposals but the decision to formally advertise detailed proposals would again be taken by the Director of Highways and Transport.
- Any changes to existing on-street charges (i.e. residents' permits) associated with any parking management plan be considered directly by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure if it is not possible to consider these within the annual Fees and Charges Report.
- On-street charges associated with any existing parking management plan or CPZ be reviewed annually as part of the Fees and Charges Report, in a decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and

Infrastructure (as set out in the Review of On-Street Parking Charges and related policy, June 2018)

3. Resources

3.1 The revenue consequences of the proposals are as follows:

	Current Year 2018/19 £m	Year 2 2019/20 £m	Year 3 2020/21 £m	Year 4 2021/22 £m
Revenue Budget (net budget, expenditure funded by income)	0	0	0	0
Road Space Audit – Feasibility and Design (estimated)	0.145	0.495	0.270	0.140
Funded by Mid-Sussex District Council		-0.120		
Funded by On-Street Parking Reserve	-0.145	-0.375	-0.150	-0.330
Remaining Budget	0	0	0	0

3.2 The costs of RSA feasibility studies (£0.060m per settlement) and parking management plan design (£0.050m per settlement) will be met from the County Council’s On-Street Parking Reserve. The total estimated cost is £1.210m across the eleven locations already identified. Mid Sussex District Council will fund the feasibility studies for Burgess Hill and East Grinstead.

3.3 The one-off costs of implementing any parking management plans (e.g. signs and lines) would be met from the following sources;

- Capital Funding
- Additional income generated from new parking controls implemented
- Section 106 funds
- Community Infrastructure Levy
- Local Enterprise Partnership Growth Programme Funding

3.4 The additional on-going enforcement and back office costs associated with any parking management plan would be met from the additional income generated from the implementation of new parking controls.

3.5 The proposals are driven by operational rather than financial considerations but there is an expectation that implementation of the proposals will deliver additional revenue to the On-Street Parking Reserve which can be reinvested in the Highways and Transport service. The exact amounts generated will depend on the proposals implemented but it is expected that all proposals will make a net revenue contribution. Where possible income targets will be included in the 2019/20 budget.

3.6 There are no capital consequences linked to this proposal.

Factors taken into account

4. Issues for consideration by the Select Committee

- 4.1 Members are invited to note and comment on the proposals set out in Section 2 of this report.
- 4.2 A parking management plan programme will set out the intended County Council priorities for the financial years 2018/19 and 2019/20. It is expected that in 2020/21, the programme will be rolled out to areas such as Bognor Regis, Littlehampton and Arundel. However, it is possible that throughout this period, RSAs will be progressed (and funded separately) in locally identified areas such as Barnham, Hassocks, Midhurst and Lancing. Any additions to the programme would be subject to approval by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure.
- 4.3 The principle of the parking management plan should be that each single plan is implemented as a whole and not incrementally. This should ensure that current and future parking demands are met and that strategic parking policies complement infrastructure planning. There will be objections to particular proposals but the focus should be to ensure the policy removes or reduces indiscriminate and unsafe parking.
- 4.4 The Committee may wish to consider the scope and approach to the involvement of local members and County Local Committees. The decisions on plan implementation will be for the Cabinet Member to ensure a consistent approach and timetable. CLCs will however be regularly apprised of the progress of RSA studies and have the opportunity to reflect any comments to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure. They will also be able to agree the nature and degree of informal consultation to be undertaken once an initial design for a parking management plan has been prepared as well as consider the outcome of that consultation.
- 4.5 Further to 4.4, CLCs may also wish to consider deferring or re-prioritising any requests for changes to the Traffic Regulation Order (i.e. new waiting restrictions) in a particular area pending the outcome of a RSA study. Exceptions to this might include Traffic Regulation Orders proposed for safety reasons.
- 4.6 It is suggested that once a parking plan is in operation, any requests for changes to waiting restrictions be considered as part of the annual review of that plan rather than as stand-alone requests considered by the County Local Committee. Accordingly, the decision on whether to advertise and implement any changes, in the light of any objections received during the statutory objection period, would rest with the Director for Highways and Transport and Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure.
- 4.7 Were a parking management plan set to be implemented mid-year, any changes to on-street parking charges associated with that plan would be considered directly by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure rather than as part of the annual Fees and Charges Report. This would prevent delay in the implementation of plans. However, these charges would

then be subject to an annual review as part of that Fees and Charges Report although consideration would be given to whether charges should be reviewed twice in one area within the same year.

5. Consultation

- 5.1 The principle of RSAs has already been considered by a TFG and the findings of that group, subsequently agreed by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure are outlined in Appendix A.
- 5.2 The principles outlined in this report were also considered at the County Local Committee Chairman's Meeting on the 12th November 2018. Members understood the difficulties that the draft implementation programme together with the size and complexity of each potential RSA presented. However members felt that taking the decision on whether to implement an RSA was achievable and practical at CLC meetings. Members were not therefore supportive of the proposed removal of the decision making powers from the County Local Committees.
- 5.3 Each RSA has/will have its own comprehensive communications strategy. From an early stage, the relevant County Councillors, as well as officers and other key stakeholders play a key role in determining the scope of the study. Once an initial study is complete, the findings are shared with all parties above as well as the general public.
- 5.4 As and when a detailed design has been prepared, it is subject to at least two public consultations, one of which involves public exhibitions/events and an online engagement process. A detailed design will only progress to a three week statutory advertisement subject to the approval of the Director of Highways and Transport.
- 5.5 Final proposals will only be implemented subject to the approval of the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure after consideration of any objections.

6. Risk Management Implications

- 6.1 The risk with not proceeding (in full or in part) with the proposed changes identified within a particular parking management plan is resident and stakeholder dissatisfaction. As part of the engagement process, a large number of residents and stakeholders may have indicated that the parking situation in their area is getting more difficult and that they would like the County Council to take action. There is also a significant risk that cases of inconsiderate or dangerous 'displacement' parking could increase in unrestricted roads/areas.
- 6.2 The risk with proceeding with proposals of this scale is that many residents and businesses within a particular area find the measures unacceptable as their normal parking habits are affected. A number of respondents are likely to object to any form of County Council intervention and express a wish for things to remain as they are.

7. Other Options Considered

- 7.1 The alternative option is to retain the existing decision making arrangements where the CLC continue to approve the decision to advertise proposals and / or decide upon implementation. The scale of each scheme means that each part of the decision making process will require detailed discussion. The draft RSA programme and timing of CLC meetings are not necessarily compatible. In addition the likely scale of debate required for each scheme means exceptional CLC meetings will be required.
- 7.2 The proposal within this paper seeks to address these issues given that for this programme there is a need to maintain consistency of approach to implementation, adherence to the agreed programme and to reduce additional requirements on Members and officers.

8. Equality Duty

- 8.1 Councillors should be aware that the Equality Act 2010 bans unfair treatment and seeks equal opportunities in the workplace and in wider society. It also imposes a Public Sector Equality Duty which requires the Council to have regard to the requirements of that duty when considering decisions. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage/civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation
- 8.2 In this case, a comprehensive communications strategy for each RSA (see 5 above) will ensure that all groups have an opportunity to comment on any proposals that come out of it and to have any potential impact in terms of the Equality Duty included in the consideration of any decision.

9. Social Value

- 9.1 There are no significant social value issues arising from these proposals
- 9.2 Any parking management plans that are introduced will be closely monitored and an opportunity to make minor amendments will be available during an annual review process

10. Crime and Disorder Implications

- 10.1 The County Council does not consider parking management plans to create any crime and disorder issues. Officers have previously consulted with Sussex Police, who share this view. It is considered this will not change if implementation of any parking management plan takes place

11. Human Rights Implications

- 11.1 There are not considered to be any Human Rights Act implications.

Lee Harris
Executive Director

Matt Davey
Director

Economy, Infrastructure and
Environment

Highways and Transport

Contact: Miles Davy (miles.davy@westsussex.gov.uk)

Appendices:

Appendix A – Executive Task and Finish Group Report on RSAs

Background Papers:

West Sussex Integrated Parking Strategy 2014 - 2019

Roger Elkins, Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

Road Space Audits

Report by Executive Task and Finish Group Chaired by Andrew Barrett-Miles

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of the Executive Task and Finish Group (TFG) into the potential for the expanded use of Road Space Audits (RSA) across West Sussex and the latest developments in respect of verge parking.

Recommendation(s)

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport is asked to consider the following recommendations.

- (1) That RSAs can be made available as an approach to parking management across West Sussex
- (2) That WSCC adopts a priority programme for funding and resource allocation according to the County's Economic Growth Strategy. Priority locations are proposed to be Crawley, Burgess Hill and Worthing.
- (3) That WSCC develops a toolkit that allows RSAs to be progressed by other authorities outside of the priority programme albeit at their own expense.
- (4) That WSCC should await the outcome of the Government's consideration of verge parking before taking action on a countywide basis. However consideration should be given to a localised trial.

1. Background and Context

- 1.1 West Sussex County Council's approach to parking management is described in the Integrated Parking Strategy. Parking in many towns and villages across West Sussex is characterised by limited supply in those areas of greatest demand as well as associated access/safety problems caused by indiscriminate parking. In many areas, the introduction of waiting restrictions, including Controlled Parking Zones, has facilitated some degree of traffic management but invariably, the parking problem is merely moved into an unrestricted area.
- 1.2 Beyond this, the level of new development across West Sussex is likely to exacerbate parking problems in many of our towns. A more progressive approach, known as a Road Space Audit (RSA) is currently being piloted in Chichester to determine if there are other ways to consider existing and future parking demands.

1.3 In order to determine whether the Chichester pilot RSA was more generally appropriate across West Sussex, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport requested that an Executive Task and Finish Group be convened. The membership and terms of reference of the TFG can be found in Appendix 1.

1.4 The TFG met on three occasions between October and December 2016 and considered evidence from various officers and the final written RSA report for Chichester. This report represents the output of that work and makes a number of recommendations to the Cabinet Member.

2. Road Space Audits

2.1 In order to ensure that local parking policies take into account the whole place both now and in the future, a RSA considers wider place/locality based planning. The outcome of a RSA is to inform the production of a strategic blueprint for a particular place that defines how parking, various alternative travel solutions (bus, rail, cycling, walking etc), infrastructure improvements, safety considerations and future development (e.g. housing) can be integrated so that the road network is used and managed in the most efficient way possible.

2.2 RSAs seek to provide essential technical data that identifies and assesses the current demands upon the road network and parking stock (i.e. how it is currently being used), whether these demands are actually being met as well as residents and users views. RSAs identify potential future demands/pressures and may make recommendations for improvement. RSAs may also assess what measures and resources might be required in order to meet these challenges, adjust supply and ultimately optimise the efficiency of the road network and parking stock.

2.3 Following a review of the Chichester RSA trial, the TFG saw the value of RSAs as a tool in parking management and their ability to be applied elsewhere in West Sussex. It was accepted that:

- RSAs provide vital technical data that informs decision making around parking and broader place based transport policy.
- By considering the whole place, both off and on-street now and in the future, RSAs may be used to determine parking management plans that balance the needs of residents, businesses and visitors. In doing so, revised parking plans can be created that do not simply move a problem from one place to another.
- A longer term plan that might be linked to development will help to manage the impacts of additional demand and feed into infrastructure planning.
- The County Council's needs to advise the District/Borough Council's in greater depth on parking and road use issues in their local plans and this approach may be a useful tool for this purpose.

- 2.4 The TFG accepted that there was a risk that RSAs could be seen as a panacea to all of an area's problems. Whilst a RSA can seek to identify an approach for remedying parking/transport problems at a strategic level, it must be recognised that more localised issues require more detailed consideration; conceptual design, feasibility assessments and modelling etc.
- 2.5 A RSA is an enabling document and the locality in question has to be of the opinion that existing and future parking demand needs broader study and be willing to consider the proposals made.
- 2.6 There are key determinants that should decide whether, and at what level of detail, a RSA might be made available as a tool for parking management across West Sussex. These are:
- RSAs should only be progressed where local authorities and key stakeholders are in agreement.
 - The ability to define and agree a study area
 - RSAs may be staged with data collection being the first step and the consideration and implementation of specific measures taking place when as and when required/ready.
 - County Council resources are limited and so there needs to be a priority programme and the opportunity via a toolkit enables Districts and Boroughs / Parish Councils and other interested parties to undertake an RSA at their own expense.
 - RSAs can identify the potential impacts of development within the constraints of planning guidance.
 - RSAs are more appropriate where high levels of growth are expected albeit elements of the approach would be suitable for smaller places.
 - The RSA is an enabling document and the locality has to have a view of what future parking will look like and be ready to accept the proposals and changes in order that it might work successfully.
- 2.7 On considering the above, the TFG concluded that the core components of the RSA methodology should be applicable to all types of settlements across West Sussex. These core components include (full list can be found in Appendix 2):
- Data collection;
 - Development of a range of concepts, informed by the baseline data and the forecast impact of any planned future development;
 - Stakeholder consultation, to invite feedback on the emerging concepts and capture local knowledge;
 - Options development and recommendations.
- 2.8 There is a minimum level of survey data and consultation that should be carried out as part of an RSA to ensure the robustness of the audit.

However there should be no maximum limit assuming funds are available. Therefore expenditure on RSA's could vary significantly between areas.

3. Priority Programme

3.1 It is accepted that the need for RSAs and other parking studies exceeds the Council's ability to meet concurrently in terms of both funding and staff resources. The TFG considered that the council therefore needed to develop a method by which the resources of the Parking Team is focused on priority locations whilst also allowing other Council teams or external authorities to also progress such studies. The TFG therefore considered potential prioritisation criteria for RSAs and agreed that priority places would have the following characteristics:

- Greater priority should be afforded to larger urban areas as defined in the County's Economic Growth Strategy.
- The extent to which an area has a clear vision for how the residents and businesses want a place to evolve, as a RSA can then serve to enable that vision and make the case for reallocating road space.
- High level of agreement and support from local authorities and key stakeholders.

3.2 A three tier programme of RSAs is therefore proposed for West Sussex.

Priority Growth Areas

Crawley, Burgess Hill, Worthing – significant growth programmes for these areas have now been prioritised for further capital investment and form a key part of the County Council's forward economic vision. RSAs are seen as integral to the development of each growth programme beginning in the financial year 2017/18.

Pipeline Areas

Horsham, Bognor Regis, Littlehampton and Shoreham – growth plans for potential investment and the progression of strategic development locations will continue for these areas and in due course, a prioritised programme will emerge. RSAs would be appropriate as required to feed into this overall programme. In addition and depending on local development requirements RSAs may be considered for those towns where there is a train station and attempts to address parking issues at one station, may have knock-on effects at nearby stations

Locally Identified Areas

Ad hoc RSAs or Parking Management Plans** to be undertaken by District/Borough/Parish Councils e.g. Barnham, East Grinstead.

** Smaller towns or villages present a different set of issues and could be better suited to a light touch version of RSA process, which could incorporate the core components but the level of detail for the data

collected, range of solutions available and scale of consultations would need to be commensurate to the study area. In this respect population, local employment, attractors, place function, extent of parking stress and transport issues would be important criteria for scoping the study. It may be that in some cases more localised issues can be resolved through a single scheme (e.g. a parking management plan) without requiring a more comprehensive strategy.

4. Resourcing RSAs

- 4.1 The following funding and resourcing approaches are recommended for each tier as follows:

Priority Growth Areas - the On-Street Parking Fund would fund the highest priority study in each financial year. Funding for other tier 1 locations should they need to be progressed in advance of available parking account funds would need to be fully/part funded by other contributions e.g. S106/DC/BC contributions

Pipeline Areas - the parking account may begin to fund such studies following the completion of tier 1 studies. Should these schemes need to be funded in advance other sources of funding will need to be identified.

Locally Identified Areas - to be fully funded by relevant DC/BC/PC or other funding

- 4.2 For all tiers, funding for on-street modifications and other infrastructure improvements will need to be found from a combination of the parking account / WSCC capital funding / external funding from other authorities and developers.
- 4.3 The Parking Strategy Team would be available to provide a toolkit / guidance on tender specification as well as periodic support on particular elements of the study e.g. stakeholder consultation.
- 4.4 Irrespective of who was project managing a particular RSA, the funding and implementation of the provisional outcomes from any study are not guaranteed to occur. Any such recommendations would require full approval from the relevant members of the County Council and specific measures would be subject to the necessary prioritisation and funding criteria.

5. Verge and Pavement Parking

- 5.1 The TFG considered the current issues and concerns in relation to verge and footway parking in West Sussex. All members were of the view that parking on a footway/verge can cause considerable damage as well as other problems;
- Obstructs vulnerable road users who use the verge or footway;
 - Obstructs road users entering and leaving properties;

- Can cause access issues for emergency service vehicles;
 - Causes congestion by parking on narrow streets without suitable provision (i.e. half on the footway, half on the carriageway);
 - Reduces visibility at junctions, bends and narrow roads;
 - Is unsightly and can cause environmental damage;
 - Causes damage to underlying drainage and utility services networks;
 - Parking prevention measures (e.g. bollards) require maintenance and add to street clutter and can also impact upon grass cutting.
- 5.2 It was agreed that the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process remains the most effective way to prevent footway/verge parking. Where a TRO is in place on the carriageway of a road, adjacent to the area where verge or footway parking takes place, and if the order prohibits or restricts waiting in any way (e.g. yellow lines), then a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) can be issued against a vehicle parked on the adjacent verge or footway. This is because the power of a yellow line applies not just to the carriageway, but to the back of the highway boundary.
- 5.3 Members noted that it was also possible for WSCC to promote a TRO for footway and/or verge parking bans within a specified area. One authority that has implemented such a TRO is Brighton and Hove and further details from this case study are contained in Appendix 3.
- 5.4 Some local authorities have also tried to overcome the problem through the use of byelaws. Authorities can request the provision of warning signs and posts to deter verge parking at specified locations, supported by a byelaw prohibiting parking but the reliance on a byelaw means that enforcement is very difficult as it involves the authority taking action on a case by case basis and comes at considerable financial cost.
- 5.5 At a national level, there has been a Private Members Bill (Car Parking on Pavements Bill 2015-16) submitted to Parliament that seeks to prevent footway parking in the same way as it currently happens in London, whereby all footway parking is restricted unless signs/markings indicate otherwise. This Private Members Bill was withdrawn at second reading on the understanding that the Department for Transport would investigate the issues associated with footway parking and report back over the summer of 2016. Although no report has yet been forthcoming, the previous Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport received the following communication in October 2016:

'The Department believes that local authorities are in the best position to decide where and whether pavement or verge parking should or should not be permitted. They should take account of all road users when taking decisions on pavement parking restrictions or permission.

Following a roundtable with stakeholders in March 2016, the Department does not wish to impose a blanket ban on pavement

parking outside of London. The Department is instead considering the general improvement of the traffic regulation order (TRO) making process, including whether more can be done to make it easier for local authorities to tackle problem areas in a consistent way. Work is ongoing and no decisions have been taken at this stage'.

5.6 In sum, the TFG considered it appropriate to wait for the DFT to report before looking at strategic work on footway/verge parking. This was to make sure that local work would not quickly be superseded by national legislation. However the TFG accepted that a number of issues still needed to be clarified/discussed and considered that these are best tested by way of a trial.

- If parking were to be made permissible on a particular footway or verge, it is likely that underlying statutory apparatus would need to be relocated and/or the footway or verge strengthened in order to take the weight of vehicles. This is likely to have a substantial cost.
- How the public be made aware of which footways have a ban upon them and which do not.
- Imposing a footway parking ban could potentially have a significant effect in a number of residential streets, as residents would be forced to park elsewhere. Not only might this prove extremely unpopular but it could create safety/access issues in other areas.
- The added street clutter created by any new signage &/or bollards.
- The amount of officer time required to prepare, advertise and consult on possibly many new TROs (introducing footway parking bans) at a time when resources are already stretched. There was also the cost of manufacturing and installing the required new signage.

6 Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 RSAs do not offer a speedier resolution to parking problems across the county, nor will they necessarily result in the introduction of new parking schemes. A RSA is essentially intended as an advisory/enabling document that complements existing statutory plans and emerging studies in respect of transport infrastructure, parking policy and spatial planning. It must be recognised that even after the completion of an audit, localised parking/traffic issues will require more detailed consideration, conceptual design, feasibility assessments/modelling and funding.

6.2 The TFG has considered the evidence provided by officers and concludes that there are key determinants that should decide whether, and at what level of detail, a RSA should be conducted. Furthermore there are core components of the RSA methodology that should be applicable to all types of urban area across West Sussex.

6.3 The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport is therefore asked to consider the following recommendations of the TFG.

- 1) That RSAs can be made available as an approach to parking management across West Sussex.
- 2) That WSCC adopts a priority programme for funding and resource allocation according to the County's Economic Growth Strategy. Priority locations are proposed to be Crawley, Burgess Hill and Worthing.
- 3) That WSCC develops a toolkit that allows RSAs to be progressed by other authorities outside of the priority programme albeit at their own expense.
- 4) That WSCC should await the outcome of the Government's consideration of verge parking before taking action on a countywide basis. However consideration should be given to a localised trial.

7 Financial Impact

- 7.1 The methodology contained within RSAs ties in with a number of existing County Council policies, including the Integrated Parking Strategy. Managing the demand for car use and parking also supports measures to tackle congestion and pollution, improve alternative modes of transport, particularly public transport, and improve road safety and residential amenity.
- 7.2 Experience from the pilot RSA in Chichester suggests that a typical study in a large urban area could cost between £30K and £60K. The total cost of the pilot RSA was £31,200 although a number of 'optional extras' were not taken up. It should be noted that expenditure on data collection, in addition to other activities such as stakeholder consultation, would be a matter for partners to agree in advance of the RSA being progressed and could therefore vary significantly between areas.
- 7.3 For smaller rural towns/villages, it is recognised that a lighter touch RSA approach and/or parking management plan would require a smaller financial outlay of between £10K - £30K.
- 7.4 For any RSAs directly commissioned by the County Council's Parking Strategy Team (e.g. Crawley), funding would be available from the County Council's On-Street Parking Account. The account also caters for any on-going review/maintenance costs.

Appendices

1. The membership and terms of reference of the TFG
2. RSA Core Components
3. Brighton and Hove Footway Parking Case Study

Terms of Reference

Appendix 1

Aim

Having considered the initial results of the pilot study in Chichester, The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport wishes to appoint an Executive Task and Finish Group (TFG) to help him determine if/how RSAs might be refined, prioritised and applied in the future to other towns and villages within the rest of West Sussex.

Purpose

The TFG will be supported by the Head for Transport and Countryside as well as the Lead Professional in the Parking Strategy Team.

The TFG will assist officers in the following actions:

- Consider the evidence, issues, and options identified in the Chichester Pilot Study and whether/how these can be applied to other towns and villages across the county.
- Consider the prioritisation criteria for RSAs and provide recommendations to the Cabinet Member to inform the drafting of a potential RSA programme.
- Establish the potential for having an online tool kit for external providers to carry out their own RSA
- In carrying out its deliberations, work alongside officers to review the lessons learnt from the Chichester Pilot Study.
- If applicable, consider how future engagement with all stakeholders should best be undertaken.
- How verge and pavement parking might best be managed

In support of this work consultants working on the Chichester Pilot Study have already been commissioned propose a criteria and method by which a RSA could be applied to other areas as well to review the lessons learnt from the pilot study.

Timescale

The TFG will meet on a minimum of two occasions between October and December 2016. It will present its findings and recommendations to the Cabinet Member in early 2017.

Membership

The TFG will consist of up to seven members of the County Council, be cross-party if possible, with the final membership decided by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport.

Notes/Terminology

RSA – Road Space Audit

CPZ – Controlled Parking Zone (AKA Residents Parking Scheme)

1. Data Collection

- An outline of the current number and type of on-street parking bays within a pre-defined study area (including free limited waiting, pay and display, coach/mini bus/community transport/motorcycle/taxi).
- If a Residents' Parking Scheme (RPS) is in existence, reference should also be made to residents only/shared use bays, the number of permits currently taken up by residents and other users within the RPS, parking compliance/turnover data, permit waiting lists, tariffs and numbers/locations of non-residents permits within the RPS.
- An outline of the number/types of off-street spaces (including coach/mini bus/community transport/lorry/motorcycle parking) the District/Borough Council currently owns and manages within the study area as well as any data on usage (including seasonal fluctuations), season tickets, tariffs and waiting lists.
- As above but applied to car parks run by other/private organisations e.g. Hospital.
- An outline of any workplace parking strategies/travel plans developed by major employers (e.g. hospital, university or retail units) located within the study area.
- An outline of County/District/Borough (and neighbourhood plan) parking standards currently applied to new residential and business developments within the study area.
- An outline of existing car ownership/use and travel habits as well as alternative transport provision and patronage within the study area e.g. bus/rail services/routes, car club bay locations and membership, taxi provision and pedestrian/cycle links.
- Pedestrian/Cycling Environment Review Systems and Bus Route Audits. These are a nationally recognised approach for undertaking qualitative assessments of pedestrian/cycling environments to a consistent format against a set range of criteria. The outputs are a series of scores that attribute a quality rating for each defined area. Bus route audits would entail a review of the core bus corridors throughout a study area, including passenger waiting infrastructure provision and quality, bus priority measures and key bottlenecks or causes of poor journey time reliability.
- A detailed site appraisal of the study area in order to identify any accesses, build-outs, road alignments and any other features that could determine the nature of a future review of waiting restrictions and/or potential infrastructure improvements (e.g. verge replacement or new cycle routes). The appraisal should also identify key attractors such as retail outlets, hospitals, education or leisure facilities as well as areas of road space which could potentially be subject to improvement and/or used differently.
- Link and Place Classifications. These provide a tool for planning and designing streets, recognising both their function as a link (for people to pass through) and as a place (a destination in their own right). The approach considers how streets have a differing balance between link

and place status, which in turn shapes the priorities for different parts of the network, reflecting the different requirements of users.

- On-street vehicle/use surveys in a number* of roads within the study area (including the existing RPS) in order to identify specific types of parking demands/durations as well as occupancy. It is recommended that at least two separate surveys be undertaken (one during term time and another during the summer holidays), each to be on two weekdays as well as a Saturday, preferably at three-hourly intervals between 7am and 7pm (the final survey being at 7pm).

number* - officers would suggest no fewer than 30 pre-determined roads within the study area (including the RPS) although this figure could be revised for smaller studies such as in villages.

- An outline of the expected future transport/travel trends, including parking, within the study area as outlined in existing studies and documentation e.g. the Local Transport Plan, relevant place/development plans.
- An outline of any potential/planned changes in off-street regulations, tariff structures and overall capacity e.g. introduction of evening charges, car park expansions, park and ride.
- An outline of planned/anticipated development scenarios/proposals (residential, business and retail) and the parking/wider transport demands and provision associated with them as well as any known infrastructure/transport improvements already identified in the Integrated Works Programme (e.g. cycle network) or any of the District/Borough/Parish Council's forward plans as well as neighbourhood plans.

2. Development of a range of concepts

To include an appraisal of whether the current road network, parking stock and wider transport provision in the study area is operating efficiently and meeting the demands placed upon it.

3. Stakeholder consultation

To include a comprehensive public/stakeholder engagement and communications strategy, in order to obtain and analyse the views of stakeholders, interest groups and members of the public on the current use and efficiency of the road network in the study area as well as what future measures/concepts are desired. The information collected as part of the public/stakeholder engagement will be integrated with the technical data and comparisons and conclusions drawn from all of this information.

4. Options development and recommendations

To include realistic (i.e. financially viable) and fully reasoned recommendations for potential changes and improvements to the road space, car parks and alternative transport provision in particular areas and the management of it. These recommendations may be split into three sections, namely short term gains (i.e. quick wins or relatively minor measures that could reasonably be implemented within a 5 year period), medium term gains (i.e. more substantial measures that could be implemented within a 10 year period) and long term gains (i.e. large scale projects that could be implemented within a 15 year period).

ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE
Agenda Item 30

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: Verge & footway parking restrictions

Date of Meeting: 8 October 2013

Report of: Executive Director Environment Development & Housing

Contact Officer: Owen McElroy Tel: 293693

Ward(s) affected: North Portslade, Patcham & Withdean

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1 The purpose of this report is to address representations and objections to the draft traffic regulation order detailed below.

1.2 The strategic city wide parking review (the review) commissioned by the Cabinet Member for Environment in October 2011 examined a wide range of parking issues raised by residents and other stakeholders including parking on grass verges and footways.

1.3 The review confirmed existing policy that the council does not condone parking on verges and footways due to safety, maintenance, access and environmental impacts. The final report was approved by Transport Committee in January 2013 and identified two areas of the city where verge and footway parking was of particular concern.

1.4 In 2010 the Department of Transport authorised new area based signing which allows council civil enforcement officers (CEOs) to issue penalty charge notices (PCNs) to vehicles parking on highway verges and footways.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1 That having taken account of all duly made representations and objections Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee approve The Brighton & Hove (Various Roads) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verges and Footways order 20** (TRO-15-2013) subject to the following amendments.

2.2.1 Item 2 Schedule 1 shall be amend description to "From its junction with Surrenden Road to a point 88 metres south of the junction with Carden Avenue."

2.2.2 Delete item 9 schedule 1 Varndean Road

2.3 In response to safety audit recommendations officers are to prepare measures to mitigate any adverse effects that have been identified in that audit subject to monitoring and evaluation of these locations.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1 Verge and footway parking is mainly experienced in residential areas outside of controlled parking zones due to vehicle oversubscription.

3.2 Footway parking can be inconvenient for pedestrians and especially hazardous for disabled and elderly people, those who are visually impaired and people with pushchairs and double buggies. Rule 218 of the Highway Code says: "Do not park partially or wholly on the footway unless signs permit it".

3.3 Parking on grass verges can be obstructive and dangerous, particularly at junctions but objections are often made on environmental and aesthetic grounds. Persistent parking on verges is unsightly and can lead to significant erosion. The erosion can undermine the adjoining road or footway. Replacing verges with tarmac can have a negative impact on surface drainage and bollards can also be unsightly, require upkeep and impede verge cutting.

3.4 Every year the council receives dozens of complaints from residents about parking on footways and verges. Sixteen representations were received on this subject during the Review.

3.5 Driving on the footway or verge, except over a properly constructed crossover is also an offence under both section 72 of the Highways Act 1835 and section 34 of the Road Traffic Act 1988. Obstruction of the verge or footway can amount to a criminal offence if the passage of pedestrians is significantly impeded. All these offences can only be enforced by the police or by Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) whose resources are limited and priorities focused on other areas such as property crime.

3.6 The East Sussex Act 1981 is a local Act of Parliament containing provisions that allows local authorities in East Sussex to prohibit driving vehicles on grass verges. Notice must be given and traffic signs erected. A number of signs have been erected and maintained in areas of Patcham and Withdean including the proposed streets. This offence can again only be enforced by the police or PCSOs.

Physical survey

3.7 A site visit was conducted in the evening of 22nd October 2012 in the Mile Oak area accompanied by the ward councillors. Dozens of vehicles were found parked on grass verges in the area in particular in Chalky Road near the Sports Centre where vehicles were observed skidding across the verge onto the footway and mud was strewn over the footway and road. Several instances of obstructive footway parking were also noted in Mile Oak Road and Graham Avenue.

3.8 A site visit was conducted during the day in the Surrenden area on 3rd October 2012. Several dozen vehicles were parked on verges in the area; examples were near the school/college entrances in Surrenden Road, on verges in Surrenden Crescent and Braybon Avenue adjacent to properties with off road parking, and at the bottom end of Varndean Road where there was significant soil erosion.

Road safety audits

3.9 A combined stage 1 & 2 Road safety Audit has been carried out on the proposals to assess any negative impact and possible mitigation (Appendix F). The following issues have been highlighted

Mile oak area

3.10 Chalky Road is a bus route with reduced carriageway width. There are some areas of unrestricted parking at the eastern end near the junction with Broomfield Drive and Hamilton Close. Should vehicles displace from verge areas onto these sections two way traffic flow could be impeded leading to a possible increase in collisions. Consideration should be given to extending existing no waiting at any time restrictions. Officer's response: Post implementation the sites should be monitored and measures prepared for this eventuality.

Surrenden Area

3.11 In Braybon Avenue there is a risk of displacement of vehicles from the verges to the vicinity of the unrestricted junctions of Old Farm Road/Braybon Avenue & Woodland way/Greenfield Crescent & Braybon Avenue. There is a risk of vehicles parking on the highway reducing visibility and carriageway width increasing the likelihood of vehicle collisions. Consideration should be given to introducing no waiting at any time restrictions at the unrestricted junctions. Officer's response: Post implementation the sites should be monitored and measures prepared for this eventuality.

3.12 In Varndean Road at eastern end a number of vehicles are parked on the verge. The carriageway width is not sufficient to facilitate safe two way passing movements over a 250 metre length. Given the likelihood that vehicles would be displaced onto the street consideration should be given introducing a number of lengths of no waiting at any time close to uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points. Officer's response: The reduction in parking could amount to over 20 spaces further reducing the already scarce parking in the area. It is proposed that Varndean Road should be removed from the order with further consultation to take place with ward councillors with a view to finding an appropriate solution for this location, subject to resources and priorities.

Displacement

3.13 It is accepted that some displacement of vehicles will occur but officers do not believe this will have an unduly negative effect on surrounding roads. It is also believed that some vehicles will transfer to private parking or to other transport modes.

3.14 In Mile Oak area it is expected that vehicles currently parking on verges outside the Sports Centre, Chalky Road will use the college car park 200 yards away which is currently under capacity. In other streets there is either capacity on street, in adjacent roads or on private driveways.

3.15 In the Surrenden area much of the verge parking is discretionary particularly in Surrenden Crescent, Braybon Avenue and parts of Surrenden Road with off street parking available. The council is working with the schools and colleges in the area to promote more sustainable means of travel which the colleges encourage. Disabled parking places are available for staff and students on the college grounds. There is a greater potential for displacement in Varndean Road with up to 20 vehicles using the verges. In this road there is only limited off street parking and there is little capacity in adjacent roads. There is anecdotal evidence from residents that some vehicles are parked in order to make onward journeys by bus from London Road. Some of these vehicles may transfer to the Withdean Stadium Park and Ride or transfer the whole of their journey to public transport. However all of the objections to Varndean Road have come from local residents.

4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION

4.1 The first phase of the parking review consisted of officers attending 40 community meetings, addressing around 600 people such as resident groups, tenants associations and Local Action Teams. Parking on verges and footways was raised as an issue at several of these meetings.

4.2 The second phase comprised of an ongoing dialogue with stakeholders and ward members and this resulted in the two pilot areas being identified. The areas were selected on the basis of evidence of highway damage or obstruction, a long standing problem, significant evidence of community support and alternative parking being available whether on private drives, off street car parks or adjoining streets.

4.3 The principle of controlling verge and footway parking was discussed at two Overview and Scrutiny meetings and two special scrutiny panels in 2011/12. There were mixed views as to its impact across the city with some scrutiny members feeling it was a problem in their area and others not.

4.4 Parking on verges and footways was identified as a key issues raised by residents and resident groups at the October 2011 Environment Cabinet member meeting and in the Interim report on the city wide parking review at May 2012 Environment Cabinet Member Meeting.

4.5 The draft traffic regulation order was advertised on 30th July 2013 with the closing date for comments and objections of 21 August 2013.

4.6 The ward councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the statutory consultees such as the emergency services. The local PCSO for North Portslade notified officers of problem footway parking in Graham Avenue during school pick up/drop off and of problematic verge parking in the evenings in Chalky Road. .

4.7 There are a number of schools and colleges in the area and since the notice period was during the school holidays they were contacted in advance by officers to ensure that staff and students were aware and would have an opportunity to comment.

4.8 Notices were put on street and missing notices were replaced after one week. The notice was also published in the Argus newspaper on 30th July 2013. Detailed plans and the Traffic Regulation Order were available to view at Hove library, Jubilee Library, the City Direct offices at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall. A plan detailing the proposals is shown at appendix E.

4.9 The documents were also available to view and to respond to directly on the council website.

4.10 A total of 63 representations have been received over both areas. Representations are summarised in appendix D “summary table of representations to the draft traffic order”

Mile Oak area

4.10 A total of 8 representations were received, 4 in favour and 4 against. Three objections came from Mile Oak Road and one from Graham Avenue. The objections were mainly on perceived road safety grounds arguing that if the vehicles were to park wholly in the road rather than partly or wholly on the footway or verge they would cause a hazard to traffic (including buses). The road safety issues are addressed in paragraph *.

4.11 Two residents, the bus company and one of the local ward members wrote in support of the proposals. The bus company argued that car parking on the footway made it more difficult for passengers to access bus stops.

Surrenden area

4.12 A total 55 representations were received, 35 in favour (34 of which were from the area) and 20 against. Of the 209 against, 6 were mainly concerned with Braybon Avenue and stated that if vehicles were to park on the road then a hazard would be caused to traffic including buses. Two objectors were under the mistaken impression that this was a proposed clearway order.

4.13 13 objections have come from Grosvenor Court flats at the western end of Varndean Road. The main concern is the lack of alternative parking available. and this has also been expressed by two of the local ward councillors. Several years ago yellow lines were placed on the opposite side of the road and the wooden bollards installed to protect the verge but parking has now concentrated on the south side verges which are damaged after wet weather. Several residents have argued that these verges should be become formalised parking and two have asked for permit parking.

4.14 A local community group "Campaign to Save Grass Verges" have written in support of the measure as have the Surrenden Holt residents association. One local ward member from both Patcham and Withdean wards have also written in support. The local bus company has written in support.

General

4.15 Several representations have stated the lack of alternative parking and the possible impact on neighbouring streets of displaced parking as a reason not to proceed or instead to replace verges with tarmac suitable for vehicles or widen the carriageway. Displacement is dealt with in paragraphs 3.10 to 3.12 above. Replacing verges with tarmac can have a negative impact on surface drainage due to rapid run off. Also this would not meet the objective of preserving the amenity value of wide verges. "Grasscrete" or "meshcrete" has been suggested but this will not preserve the integrity of the verge and only works in areas of occasional use such as lay-bys for service vehicles and is not recommended for areas of regular parking.

4.16 Some objectors suggest cutting back footway or formalising parking on the footway with road markings. It is not recommended to proceed since this would significantly reduce the footway available to pedestrians.

4.17 Some objectors claim that they have acquired a right to park on the footway/ verge on account of long standing use without enforcement. It is not possible in law to gain adverse possession or an easement to park on a public highway through long use.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

5.1 February 2013 Budget Council approved a £125,000 one off revenue contribution in 2013-14 to support verge parking restriction pilot schemes. It is now estimated that the scheme will cost less than budgeted as it has been confirmed that there are reduced signing requirements and the physical scope of the scheme has been reduced. Any variance to the budget will be reported as part of the Targeted Budget Management reporting process.

5.2 Savings could be expected in terms of long term reductions in maintenance costs for highway verges and footways and the adjoining carriageway although this is difficult to quantify in advance.

Finance Officer Consulted: Steven Bedford

Date: 03/09/13

Legal Implications:

5.3 The Council has power to make traffic orders in order to secure traffic management objectives under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The orders have been advertised in accordance with the relevant procedure regulations. As there are unresolved objections they are now referred to this meeting for consideration.

5.4 Relevant Human Rights to which the Council should have regard are the right to respect for family and private life and the right to protection of property. These are qualified rights and there can be interference with them in appropriate circumstances.

5.5 Other legal implications are considered in the body of the report.

Lawyer Consulted:

Carl Hearsom

Date: 03/09/13

Equalities Implications:

5.6 An equalities impact assessment has not been carried out. However the measure is expected to assist vulnerable road users in particular pedestrians using the footways and verges by improving access to these areas.

Sustainability Implications:

5.7 By preserving wide grass verges the proposed measures will support sustainable drainage, protect existing trees and shrubs and promote biodiversity.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

5.8 If approved the proposed traffic order will provide an additional method to deter and enforce existing road traffic offences by making parking on the verges and footways liable to a penalty charge notice.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

5.9 Any risks have been identified and monitored as part of the overall project management

Public Health Implications:

5.10 There are no significant public health implications.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

5.11 The proposed verge and footway parking restrictions will contribute to the following priorities in the 2011-15 corporate plans; tackling inequality and creating a more sustainable city.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

6.1 The main alternative is to do nothing. However the proposals were a specific recommendation of the city wide parking review approved by transport committee in January 2013.

6.2 A further option in respect of grass verges is to replace them with tarmac/concrete mesh or to widen the carriageway. Officers do not recommend this for the reasons given in paragraph 4.15.

6.3 A further option in respect of footways is to legally allow parking on them or to widen the carriageway. Officers do not recommend this for the reasons given in paragraph 4.16.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 To seek approval of measures to manage verge and footway parking in the identified areas in accordance with the recommendations of the councils strategic city wide review of parking



Forward Plan of Key Decisions

Explanatory Note

The County Council must give at least 28 days' notice of all key decisions to be taken by members or officers. The Forward Plan includes all key decisions and the expected month for the decision to be taken over a four-month period. Decisions are categorised in the Forward Plan according to the [West Sussex Plan](#) priorities of:

- Best Start in Life
- A Prosperous Place
- A Safe, Strong and Sustainable Place
- Independence in Later Life
- A Council that Works for the Community

The Forward Plan is updated regularly and key decisions can be taken daily. Published decisions are available via this [link](#). The Forward Plan is available on the County Council's website www.westsussex.gov.uk and from Democratic Services, County Hall, West Street, Chichester, PO19 1RQ, all Help Points and the main libraries in Bognor Regis, Crawley, Haywards Heath, Horsham and Worthing.

Key decisions are those which:

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

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

Decision	The title of the decision, a brief summary and proposed recommendation(s)
Decision By	Who will take the decision
West Sussex Plan priority	See above for the five priorities contained in the West Sussex Plan
Date added to Forward Plan	The date the proposed decision was added to the Forward Plan
Decision Month	The decision will be taken on any working day in the month stated
Consultation/ Representations	Means of consultation/names of consultees and/or dates of Select Committee meetings and how to make representations on the decision and by when
Background Documents	What documents relating to the proposed decision are available (via links on the website version of the Forward Plan). Hard copies of background documents are available on request from the decision contact.
Author	The contact details of the decision report author
Contact	Who in Democratic Services you can contact about the entry

For questions about the Forward Plan contact Helena Cox on 033022 22533, email helena.cox@westsussex.gov.uk.

Published: 23 November 2018

A Prosperous Place

Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

Policy on Commuted Sums for maintaining infrastructure in association with S278 and S38 Highway Agreements

In association with development proposals, third parties enter into agreements with the Council under Section 278 and Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. These agreements enable them to make modifications to the existing public maintainable highway and also to offer up new highways for adoption by the County Council. Where this infrastructure will create an additional maintenance burden on the authority, commuted sums are secured for the future maintenance of the asset that is being adopted.

The policy on commuted sums provides clarity on the Council's approach and which assets will attract commuted sums. It will reflect current rates for maintenance of the various assets.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure will be recommended to adopt the policy on commuted sums as the Council's approach to securing contributions for the future maintenance of assets adopted under S278 and S38 Highway Agreements.

Decision By	Mr Elkins - Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure
West Sussex Plan priority	A Prosperous Place
Date added to Forward Plan	7 August 2018
Decision Month	November 2018
Consultation/ Representations	Internally with officers in the highways and transport, finance, and legal services teams Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Andrew Howick Tel: 033 022 25704
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

Strategic Transport Investment Programme (2018/2019)

In July 2013, the Council established a Strategic Transport Investment Programme (STIP) to identify and develop strategic (i.e. larger than local) transport schemes that

are needed to support sustainable economic growth in the county. A long list of potential schemes was identified at that time, largely building on technical work to prepare local plans and these schemes were prioritised.

The STIP has been reviewed periodically since 2013 and consideration is again being given to adding new priorities for investment and also removing schemes that are no longer considered to be priorities. Consultation has taken place with elected members and other stakeholders who were invited to put forward suggestions to inform the review. As the majority of funding for strategic transport projects will be subject to scheme appraisal in line with Department for Transport guidance, any new potential priorities will be appraised using a similar standardised approach.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure will be provided with an update on progress with current priorities and recommended to approve a revised Strategic Transport Investment Programme list of priorities, including the need for feasibility work on schemes in 2019/20.

Decision By	Mr Elkins - Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure
West Sussex Plan priority	A Prosperous Place
Date added to Forward Plan	7 August 2018
Decision Month	November 2018
Consultation/ Representations	Local Members, Local Planning Authorities and other key stakeholders were invited to put forward suggestions Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Paul Eagle Tel: 033 022 25298
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

Procurement of new Highways Contract

The Highways Maintenance Term Contract is used to deliver a range of statutory highways maintenance services and the existing contract expires on 31 March 2019. The length and scope of the contract and the detailed terms will be developed using a commissioning based approach.

The Cabinet Member will be asked to:

- (1) approve the commencement of a procurement process for a new Highways Maintenance Term Contract, to commence on expiry of the current contract; and

(2) delegate authority to the Director of Highways and Transport to enter into the contract, and to extend if appropriate, in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders on Procurement and Contracts.	
Decision By	Mr Elkins - Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure
West Sussex Plan priority	A Prosperous Place
Date added to Forward Plan	29 August 2018
Decision Month	November 2018
Consultation/ Representations	<p>Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee All-member briefing Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment Director of Finance, Performance and Procurement Director of Law and Assurance</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Chris Barrett Tel: 033 022 26707
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Director of Highways and Transport

Award of design contract for the A2300 Corridor Improvements	
<p>The Department for Transport has provided £1.7m of Local Growth Fund to assist with the design and development of the A2300 corridor improvements following the submission of an outline transport business case for the scheme by the County Council in June 2018.</p> <p>In May 2018, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure delegated authority to the Director of Highways and Transport to tender, procure and award the services of Design and Build and Contract Administration from the approved list of contractors on the Highways and Transport Frameworks. [Ref: HI03 (18/19)] A competitive tender exercise has been undertaken and the Director of Highways and Transport will award the design contract to the selected contractor.</p>	
Decision By	Mr Elkins - Director of Hghways and Transport
West Sussex Plan priority	A Prosperous Place
Date added to Forward Plan	26 October 2018

Decision Month	November 2018
Consultation/ Representations	Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment Director of Highways and Transport Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Hiong Ching Hii Tel: 033 022 22636
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment

Crawley Growth Programme: Eastern Gateway Public Realm and Highway Works	
<p>The approved Crawley Growth Programme identifies that there is scope to secure significant growth in Crawley. The Programme has a total value in excess of £60m and is supported by funding allocations from a number of partners including the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), West Sussex County Council (WSCC), Crawley Borough Council (CBC) an.</p> <p>A WSCC decision in December 2017 (OKD03 (17/18)) identified Eastern Gateway as a key project within the Crawley Growth Programme with a funding allocation of £8.35m. The project will provide sustainable transport infrastructure, highway and public realm improvements that improve connectivity and transform the quality of the living and business environment enabling the development of high quality jobs and homes.</p> <p>The Executive Director of Economy, Infrastructure and Environment will be recommended to approve the procurement and delivery of the preferred scheme option.</p>	
Decision By	Lee Harris - Executive Director Economy, Infrastructure and Environment
West Sussex Plan priority	A Prosperous Place
Date added to Forward Plan	12 November 2018
Decision Month	December 2018
Consultation/ Representations	Public Engagement – Eastern and Station Gateway June - completed July 2018. All local Crawley Borough Council and West Sussex County Council members Stakeholder Engagement process for key groups, partners and organisations.

	Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Executive Director of Economy, Infrastructure and Environment, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	
Author	Marie Ovenden Tel: 033 022 23854
Contact	Katherine De La Mora Tel: 033 022 22535

Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

Extension to Interim Highways Contract	
<p>The Highway Maintenance Contract is used to deliver a range of statutory highway maintenance services and the existing, interim, contract will expire before a new contract can be put in place. The contract needs to be extended to allow the procurement of a new contract to be effectively processed and completed.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member will be asked to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) approve the extension of the current interim contract with Balfour Beatty Living Places; and (2) delegate authority to the Director of Highways and Transport to finalise the terms and award the interim contract, and to extend further if appropriate, in accordance with the Council's Standing Orders on Procurement and Contracts. 	
Decision By	Mr Elkins - Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure
West Sussex Plan priority	A Prosperous Place
Date added to Forward Plan	13 November 2018
Decision Month	December 2018
Consultation/ Representations	<p>Executive Director of Economy, Infrastructure and Environment Director of Finance, Performance and Procurement Director of Law and Assurance</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Chris Barrett Tel: 033 022 26707

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

Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

A29 Realignment Scheme	
<p>The proposed A29 Realignment Scheme would deliver a ~4km bypass to the east of Eastergate, Westergate and Woodgate villages. The new road alignment would provide the highway infrastructure needed to mitigate the impacts of planned strategic development of 30ha of employment land and 3,720 new homes in the area. Along with alleviating problems of traffic congestion along the existing A29, notably at the Woodgate level crossing which causes delays on a key access route to Bognor Regis.</p> <p>To date, West Sussex County Council has commissioned the consultants WSP to carry out a Route Option Review of the A29 Realignment Scheme, develop the preliminary design and Full Business Case (FBC). The previously submitted Strategic Outline Business Case to the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) allocated in principle £13m of Local Growth fund to the scheme, subject to submission and approval of a FBC.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member will be recommended to approve that the FBC is submitted to Coast to Capital LEP, commence public consultation in spring 2019 and commence the procurement process to select a contractor for the next stage of the project.</p>	
Decision By	Mr Elkins - Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure
West Sussex Plan priority	A Prosperous Place
Date added to Forward Plan	16 October 2018
Decision Month	December 2018
Consultation/ Representations	<p>Consultation with internal departments and external stakeholders. Full public consultation in spring 2019</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Elaine Martin Tel: 033 022 24105
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

Gatwick Airport Draft Master Plan 2018: Approval of Consultation Response
--

Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) has revised the non-statutory Gatwick Airport Master Plan, setting out its vision about how the airport can meet growing demand for air travel and deliver global connections into the early 2030s. The draft of the new Master Plan was published for comment on 18 October 2018 for 12 weeks until 10 January 2019.

The new Master Plan, which will replace the current 2012 Master Plan, explains how Gatwick would develop and grow, balancing economic growth and environmental impact. It sets out the plan for the next five years together with three growth scenarios looking 5-15 years ahead to 2032. The scenarios, which could be taken forward separately or in combination, are: increase capacity using the existing main runway; bring the existing standby (or emergency) runway into routine use alongside the main runway; and continue to safeguard land for an additional runway to the south (while not actively pursuing one at this stage).

GAL considers that the proposals are in line with the Government’s policy for making best use of existing runways and that it will deliver highly-productive, incremental new capacity with minimal environmental impact, to complement expansion schemes at other airports across the South East (including a third runway at Heathrow).

The draft Master Plan also contains environmental information as well as information on economic and employment strategies and community engagement strategies. A number of questions have been posed by GAL as part of the consultation.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure will be asked to approve the County Council’s formal response to the consultation.

Decision By	Mr Elkins - Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure
West Sussex Plan priority	A Prosperous Place
Date added to Forward Plan	1 November 2018
Decision Month	January 2019
Consultation/ Representations	Internal with officers and members. Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee on 6 December 2018 Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Mike Elkington Tel: 033 022 26463
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

Guidance on Parking in New Developments

The Council provides guidance on parking in new residential and commercial developments to inform the determination of planning applications by Local Planning Authorities (LPA). It addresses the amount of car and cycle parking that is expected to be provided and includes advice to developers and the LPAs on the highway impacts of parking provision in new developments.

The current guidance was last reviewed in 2010 (residential), and 2003 (commercial). There is a need to review the current guidance to ensure it is fit for purpose, up to date and consistent with current national planning policy and guidance. A review of the current guidance has been undertaken in consultation with the LPAs to provide an updated evidence base and recommendations on which the new guidance will be based.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure will receive a report on the review of current guidance and be asked to approve the Council's updated Guidance on Parking in New Developments.

Decision By	Mr Elkins - Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure
West Sussex Plan priority	A Prosperous Place
Date added to Forward Plan	7 August 2018
Decision Month	February 2019
Consultation/ Representations	Local Planning Authorities in West Sussex Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Paul Eagle Tel: 033 022 25298
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

A Strong, Safe and Sustainable Place

Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities

Contract arrangements for Voluntary Sector Infrastructure (VCSI)

The Cabinet Member is asked to agree to the commencement of a procurement process to secure a contract relating to the provision of Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Support (VCSI) services in West Sussex from Spring 2019.

The County Council will procure a new VCSI service from the 'VCSI Alliance', which is made up of the locally commissioned VCSI organisations, and will also continue to work in partnership with District & Borough partner-funders to support VCSI in West Sussex.

The proposal is for contracts to run for two years with the possibility of a further two years extension. The total value of these contracts is approximately £200,000 per annum.

The Cabinet Member is asked to agree to the commencement of a procurement process starting in January 2019 to secure a contract relating to the provision of Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Support (VCSI) services from Spring 2019 for a period of 2+1+1 years and to delegate the awarding of the contract and the decision about a future extension of the contract to the Executive Director, Communities & Public Protection.

Decision By	Ms Kennard - Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities
West Sussex Plan priority	A Strong Safe Sustainable Place
Date added to Forward Plan	23 November 2018
Decision Month	December 2018
Consultation/ Representations	District and Borough Councils Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Safer Stronger Communities via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Seth Gottesman Tel: 033 022 28706
Contact	Erica Keegan Tel: 033 022 26050

Cabinet Member for Environment

Soft Sand Review - Issues and Options Consultation (Regulation 18 stage)

The County Council, in partnership with the South Downs National Park Authority, is required to undertake a single issue Soft Sand Review of the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan (JMLP). The timetable to undertake the Review is set out in the County Council's approved Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (the statutory management plan). Informal public consultation (Regulation 18) is timetabled to take place during January–March 2019.

The Review will consider the demand and supply of soft sand required during the plan period (to 2033), and how this demand will be met, including the potential need for site allocations. An Issues and Options consultation document will seek the views on the options for meeting the demand for soft sand. The results of the consultation, and further technical work, will inform the preparation of the Proposed Submission Draft document, which will identify the proposed changes to the relevant sections of the JMLP.

The Cabinet Member for Environment will be asked to approve the Issues and Options consultation document in December, for publication in January 2019.

Decision By	Mrs Urquhart - Cabinet Member for Environment
West Sussex Plan priority	A Strong, Safe and Sustainable Place
Date added to Forward Plan	9 October 2018
Decision Month	December 2018
Consultation/ Representations	<p>Internal with planning officers in the County Council and the South National Park Authority prior to the Key Decision being taken.</p> <p>There will be full public consultation on the Issues & Options Document in January 2019, in line with the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme.</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Environment, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Rupy Sandhu Tel: 033 022 26454
Contact	Judith Shore, Democratic Services Officer Tel: 0330 22 26052

Cabinet Member for Environment

Halewick Lane Energy Storage Project

The project forms part of the agreed objectives of the Your Energy Sussex (YES) partnership by increasing and enabling the expansion of renewable energy generation in the county as well as developing the low carbon economy and reducing CO₂ emissions. It also supports the outcomes identified in the approved [Energy Strategy](#). The project will also facilitate a much needed re-development of the site, with the existing buildings being demolished and the site fully secured. The site has in recent years suffered problems with safety, break-ins and vandalism.

Since 1 April 2014 the YES team has been working to develop a significant pipeline of energy related projects including:

- The imminent completion of Westhampnett solar farm with 4 mega-watts of energy storage on site,
- Development of Tangmere Solar farm, which is now complete,
- Installation of commercial scale PV (photovoltaic) systems on schools and third party roofs including at Goodwood Aerodrome,
- PV systems for 225 houses owned by Crawley Borough Council, and
- For Adur & Worthing councils, installation of gas central heating systems in houses served by a newly installed gas main.

Generation of income for all the energy schemes will be achieved through the Council's energy purchaser (N-Power) selling power on its behalf, maximising the

<p>income opportunities available as an energy generator. The dual expansion of solar generation and stand-alone battery storage is a key part of the YES energy project pipeline, with solar farms and battery storage continuing to represent a relatively low risk investment for capital.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member will be asked to approve the development of the previous Sompting Waste Destructor site (Halewick Lane, Sompting) into a battery storage facility.</p>	
Decision By	Mrs Urquhart - Cabinet Member for Environment
West Sussex Plan priority	A Strong, Safe and Sustainable Place
Date added to Forward Plan	14 August 2018
Decision Month	March 2019
Consultation/ Representations	<p>Member for Sompting and North Lancing, Sompting Parish Council, District councillors, resident engagement session planned for North Lancing and surrounding area, South Downs National Park Authority</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member Environment, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
Background Documents (via website)	Full planning documentation (when submitted - October 2018)
Author	Tom Coates Tel: 033 022 26458
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

A Council that works for the Community

Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities

Community Hubs
<p>The County Council continues to explore opportunities for maximising the strengths of the County's communities and to make the most effective use of the spaces in our communities where services are provided.</p> <p>In Worthing over the last few months the views of residents and service users have been sought on ideas for remodelling the main library building and the services available within it. This is to include the transfer of services currently provided at the children and family centre. These proposals have received very positive support and are now ready to be described in more detail on order to secure the full engagement of members, residents and service users in the delivery of this project.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member will take a decision on the timing and form of the implementation of a plan to remodel Worthing library and for it to incorporate the services currently provided in the Worthing children and family centre and to become a more flexible and</p>

adaptable community hub.

This project will also be used to help inform and support longer term plans to consider options for similar remodelling of County Council facilities and service buildings, focusing on libraries, children and family centres and other community based buildings to consider whether they can provide similar benefits as 'community hubs', whilst maximising the most effective use of the County Council estate.

The strategy that will develop would recognise the critical role paid by libraries and children and family centres in local areas in providing information, places to connect people, support for residents in need and in building community resilience and capacity.

The aim would also be to increase community engagement through redesigning these services with the communities who use them and incorporating space for community led activities and for partners to deliver their services locally.

By bringing local services together and using council buildings more flexibly and effectively we should also realise financial benefits whilst improving our offer to local communities and protect these important services for the future of West Sussex.

Decision By	Ms Kennard - Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger Communities
West Sussex Plan priority	A Council that Works for the Community
Date added to Forward Plan	1 November 2018
Decision Month	December 2018
Consultation/ Representations	Representations concerning the proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Safer, Stronger, Communities by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	
Author	Rachel North Tel: 033 022 22681
Contact	Erica Keegan Tel: 033 022 26050

Cabinet

Approval of the County Council's Revenue Budget 2019/20 and Capital Programme 2019/20 to 2023/24	
<p>The Budget report details the County Council's revenue budget, the level of council tax proposed for 2019/20, the nature of its expenditure, income and savings for a balanced budget. It will also outline the County Council's Capital Programme to cover the five year period 2019/20 to 2023/24, which will update the programme previously agreed by County Council.</p> <p>Cabinet will be asked to endorse the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme for approval at County Council on 15 February 2019.</p>	
Decision By	Mr Elkins, Mr Marshall, Mrs Urquhart, Mr Lanzer, Ms Goldsmith,

	Mr Burrett, Mrs Jupp, Ms Kennard, Mr Hunt - Cabinet
West Sussex Plan priority	A Council that Works for the Community
Date added to Forward Plan	12 November 2018
Decision Month	January 2019
Consultation/ Representations	Performance and Finance Select Committee 17 January 2019 All Member Session – 9 January 2019 Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	Previous County Council Budget Books
Author	Steve Harrison Tel: 033 022 23391
Contact	Katherine De La Mora Tel: 033 022 22535

Strategic Budget Options 2019/20

As part of the County Council's budget process 2019/20 and in light of current financial challenges, Cabinet Members will be asked to determine various portfolio budget proposals as set out below.

Cabinet Member for Environment

Funding for Recycling Credits	
<p>The County Council must increase recycling and reduce the amount of residual waste. In order to increase the recycling rate the Council needs, together with district and borough partners, to work differently to make sure as much as possible is removed from the waste stream. By changing the way recycling services are funded, the aim is to drive change in the amount and variety of material collected for recycling. The County Council is working closely with district and borough partners to ensure this change has the desired effect and works towards a cleaner, greener, West Sussex.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member will be asked to approve changes to the funding arrangement with district and borough councils whilst maintaining the requirements of the Recycling Credit Provisions under the Environmental Protection (Waste Recycling) Payments (England) Regulations 2006.</p>	
Decision By	Mrs Urquhart - Cabinet Member for Environment
West Sussex Plan priority	A Strong, Safe and Sustainable Place
Date added to Forward Plan	29 August 2018

Decision Month	November 2018
Consultation/ Representations	District and Borough Councils in West Sussex Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Environment, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Kelly Goldsmith Tel: 033 022 27714
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

Passenger Transport (Bus) Strategy and Supported Services Review	
<p>The Cabinet Member established an Executive Task and Finish Group (TFG) in November 2017 to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the county-wide passenger transport strategy relating to buses • the criteria by which the County Council intervenes in the bus market • the application of the revised policy to the County Council's current level of investment into the bus market; and • a review of how funding is spent across the county to allow residents to have equitable access <p>The TFG is due to meet in November 2018 and make recommendations to the Cabinet Member for consideration in December 2018.</p>	
Decision By	Mr Elkins - Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure
West Sussex Plan priority	A Prosperous Place
Date added to Forward Plan	29 August 2018
Decision Month	December 2018
Consultation/ Representations	Bus operators and key stakeholders Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee Public consultation on the strategy and forthcoming impact consultation Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.
Background Documents	Documents arising from the Task and Finish Group process

(via website)	
Author	Bill Leath Tel: 033 022 25438
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure

On-street parking to support traffic management	
<p>Providing parking in a well-managed way helps to support local businesses, residents and communities. Road Space Audits are being used to identify where there is a need to implement better settlement wide parking solutions that support the County Council's aspirations in terms of economic development, improved safety and sustainable transport.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member will be asked to agree a parking management programme to implement on-street parking controls in various locations across the county and to review the operation of the parking service county-wide, including charges. Specific proposals for each settlement will be put to the Cabinet Member as they arise from the programme of Road Space Audits which is already underway. Road Space Audits will be progressively rolled out to the majority of urban areas across the county.</p>	
Decision By	Mr Elkins - Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure
West Sussex Plan priority	A Prosperous Place
Date added to Forward Plan	29 August 2018
Decision Month	December 2018
Consultation/ Representations	<p>County Local Committees District and Borough Councils in West Sussex Environment, Communities and Fire Select Committee Local members, statutory public notices and website advertising proposed changes</p> <p>Representations concerning this proposed decision can be made to the Cabinet Member for Environment, via the officer contact, by the beginning of the month in which the decision is due to be taken.</p>
Background Documents (via website)	None
Author	Miles Davey Tel: 033 022 26688
Contact	Judith Shore Tel: 033 022 26052

Environment, Communities & Fire Select Committee

6 December 2018

Bus Strategy 2018-2026 and Financial Changes to the Non-Commercial Bus Network

Report by Executive Director of Economy, Infrastructure and Environment and Director of Highways and Transport

Summary

This report presents the final draft of the West Sussex Bus Strategy 2018 to 2026 together with recommended changes to financial support to the non-commercial bus network.

West Sussex County Council currently invests £2.570m into the bus network that supports bus routes that are not otherwise commercially viable. In addition approximately £11m per year is required to fund the English National Concessionary Bus Pass. Sustained financial pressure on Council funding means that funding needs to be reduced to ensure a balanced budget is achieved. Part of the reductions are expected to come from financial support for the non-commercial bus network.

A cross party Executive Task and Finish Group has looked at both revisions to WSCC Bus Strategy and also at how best to approach any reductions in financial support. In recognising that all services play a valuable role, their approach was to determine which categories of services were of greatest benefit to residents of West Sussex. The Bus Strategy, detail of the Task and Finish Group's methodology and findings are included at the Appendix to this report.

The focus for scrutiny

The Committee is asked to consider;

1. The sufficiency of the final draft of the Bus Strategy,
2. The methodology adopted by the Task and Finish Group to understand the impact of changes to financial support for the non-commercial bus network.
3. The findings of the Task and Finish group

1. Background and Context

- 1.1 Approximately 85% of local bus services in West Sussex are operated on a fully commercial basis by bus companies through a de-regulated market since 1986.
- 1.2 The remaining 15% are where the Council has chosen to step in and contract socially necessary supported bus services where they are not commercially viable. The Council also provides grants for some local community transport schemes for residents unable to use conventional bus services or where they

don't operate. In addition, the Council has duties to fund school transport for eligible children as well as make provision for the English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (Free off peak bus travel for older and disabled people).

- 1.3 The Council has developed relationships with the bus operators supporting the continued sustainability of commercial bus services that provide 27 million passenger journeys each year. The supported services and funding of school travel on local bus services where possible also helps sustain the commercial network.
- 1.4 The Council acts as a catalyst working with developers and bus companies to enable sustainable bus services serving new developments as an alternative to increased car use.
- 1.5 The challenges faced across West Sussex are increased congestion affecting commercial services mainly along the coast and in the towns in the north of the county (Crawley, Horsham and East Grinstead) and a lack of commercial viability for conventional bus services in rural areas.
- 1.6 The Bus Strategy is needed to ensure the future approach to supporting bus and community transport aligns with the West Sussex Plan 2017-2022 that sets out the direction and vision of the County Council and to respond to the Bus Services Act 2017.
- 1.7 Sustained financial pressure on Council funding means that part of overall Council wide savings need to come from financial support for the non-commercial bus network.
- 1.8 A Key Decision will be taken by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure on the Bus Strategy and any changes to financial support for bus services and community transport in January 2019.

2. Proposal – The Bus Strategy

- 2.1 The Bus Strategy supports the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011- 26 that outlines the County Council's broader transport direction and aspirations. It also sits alongside the West Sussex Walking and Cycling Strategy and will be used to consider funding priorities for bus and community transport services and infrastructure solutions in the context of future developments across the county. The draft Bus Strategy is included as Appendix A.
- 2.2 The Bus Strategy sets out a vision with the proposal that West Sussex will be a place where:
 - (1) Bus services are punctual, reliable and accessible
 - (2) Bus users can plan, book and pay for travel using the latest technology
 - (3) Bus services give people a viable alternative to being a car owner
 - (4) Bus services allow older people to continue to live independently
 - (5) Bus operators and their services give a consistently good level of quality for users across the County

- (6) Bus travel is affordable for users
- (7) Air Quality is better as a consequence of investment in cleaner buses as opposed to cars

2.3 In order to achieve this vision the County Council has the following ambitions being:

- (1) Give buses priority over other travel modes when congestion occurs
- (2) Implement cross ticketing and easy payment systems
- (3) Use the latest clean engine technology
- (4) Prioritise investment in good accessible bus infrastructure for bus users
- (5) Work with property developers to design developments to incorporate buses as a priority with suitable infrastructure
- (6) Work with all tiers of Local Government in seeking funding for prioritised local services
- (7) Explore whether it makes sense to use our own vehicles to provide services working with Community Transport where appropriate
- (8) Work with bus operators to provide affordable fares for young people

2.4 It is proposed to achieve the ambition through powers within the Bus Services Act 2017 to enter into area-based Enhanced Partnerships with bus and community transport operators, district/borough councils and other key local stakeholders. In addition, work with Total Transport partners (these being Surrey and East Sussex County Councils, Brighton and Hove City Council and the NHS) will continue to develop joined up solutions.

Financial Support for the Non-Commercial Bus Network

2.5 A cross party working group (the Executive Task and Finish Group (TFG)) looked into how best to approach reductions in financial support. This work included meeting with and considering the views of bus operators, considering alternative funding options and taking account of the many comments from the public from a Bus User Survey. The Survey was used as an Impact Assessment giving the TFG an understanding of the use of existing surveys and the impact on users if they were to be changed.

2.6 In recognising that all services play a valuable role, the approach was to determine which categories of services were of greatest benefit to residents of West Sussex. These services comprise:

- Those routes which carry people that we have a legal duty to transport e.g. eligible school children
- Those routes which serve isolated rural communities
- Those routes where there are no alternatives
- Those routes which help to maintain access to key services such as hospitals, shopping and work at appropriate times of day.

2.7 On that basis, the TFG considered all bus services for reduced financial support. Appendix B shows the findings of the TFG including comment on what might happen as a result of reduced financial support.

3. Resources

3.1 The Bus Strategy implies new ways of working in the form of Enhanced Partnerships with bus operators and key stakeholders. This will involve existing officers from Highways and Transport, as well as the Communities directorates.

3.2 Revenue consequences of proposal

Public Transport Support Gross Expenditure Budget	Current Year 2018/19 £m	Year 2 2019/20 £m	Year 3 2020/21 £m	Year 4 2021/22 £m
Revenue budget	2.570	2.570	2.070	2.070
Change from Proposal	0	-0.500	0	0
Remaining budget	2.570	2.070	2.070	2.070

3.3 The implication of the findings in Appendix C is that financial support for would fall by £0.242m from April 2019.

3.4 The TFG took into account any possible impacts to the arrangements where income may be generated towards the overall cost of support for each supported service. Examples of this includes use of income from other Councils and large employers.

3.5 There are no capital consequences arising from this proposal.

Factors taken into account

4. Issues for consideration by the Select Committee

4.1 The Committee is asked to review the sufficiency of the final draft of the Bus Strategy and whether it aligns with the direction and vision in the West Sussex Plan 2017-2022. Previous comments by the Committee have been taken on board within the strategy.

4.2 The Committee is asked to consider if the opportunities in the Bus Services Act 2017 have been assessed appropriately. Information on the Act can be found at [Bus Services Act 2017: new powers and opportunities - GOV.UK](#)

4.3 The Committee is asked to consider the methodology adopted by the TFG to understand the impact of financial changes to the non-commercial bus network.

4.4 The Committee is asked to consider the findings of the TFG in respect of financial changes to the supported bus network.

5. Consultation

- 5.1 An 8 week public consultation was undertaken ending 6 June 2018 on the Bus Strategy. The consultation was widely advertised through press releases, posters and leaflets on local buses, through schools and parish councils and various other media.
- 5.2 Members have been consulted through receiving the questionnaire, as well as the Select Committee in June 2018. External consultees included district/borough councils, town and parish councils, schools, bus and community transport companies, other partners and bus / non-bus users.
- 5.3 The Bus User Survey/impact assessment took place from 8 October to 18 November 2018. The results can be found at Appendix B. The impact assessment comprised:
- Notifications publicised via a press release, placed prominently on our website, libraries, Help Points, council offices, and on buses.
 - Letters to all WSCC members including County Local Committee (CLC) chairs
 - Information paper available to CLCs
 - Email letters to all district & borough councils and parish/neighbourhood councils
 - Direct contact made with affected schools and other appropriate organisations.
 - Web and paper (where requested) feedback together with email and postal address.
 - Registration on the 'Have Your Say' website
 - Contact Centre support - signposting information to callers and sending paper questionnaires upon request.

6. Risk Management Implications

- 6.1 It is recognised that any change to financial support could affect many people who rely on affected bus services. The complicated nature of bus services means that any funding reductions may bring risks which may be summarised as follows:
- Increased car use leading to congestion, increased highways maintenance costs and significant harm to the sustainable transport agenda.
 - Increased social isolation, particularly rural communities and for older people. This can lead to increased demand on other services such as Community Transport.
 - Increase demand on other WSCC resources such as Adults Services.
 - Increased costs to the WSCC Home to School Transport (this was taken into account by the TFG in their review).
 - Reduced support to the local economy and employment.
 - Greater and disproportionate impact on lower income groups.
 - Potential impact on the viability of smaller bus operators
 - Increased risk of not enough capacity on remaining services i.e. the buses will be full and passengers may be unable to board.
 - The effect on the changing shape of day care in the County.

- 6.2 The Bus Strategy does not impose additional risk on the Council and indeed will help to reduce the adverse impacts listed above. It is expected that the pro-active approach to reviewing existing and designing new bus and community transport through community engagement and Enhanced Partnerships will reduce the risk to the Council.
- 6.3 The alignment of the Bus Strategy with other plans and strategies, such as the Walking and Cycling Strategy, should help to reduce risk and in particular reputational risk to the Council. Continuing to re-focus priorities for future funding will reduce the risk of short term reductions in services through the work of the partnerships.
- 6.4 The Bus Strategy will help the Council to ensure that future developments are designed and built to accommodate bus services and infrastructure alongside other sustainable travel solutions to enhance health and well-being of residents and to enhance the local economy.

7. Other Options Considered

- 7.1 In respect to the Bus Strategy the move to a franchising model as found in London was considered but is unsustainable due to need and cost to deliver. Rural solutions linked into commercial services can be achieved without the move to this model through Enhanced Partnerships giving greater local accountability.
- 7.2 Other options for funding and delivery have and continue to be explored. Such actions take time to come to fruition and the Council will take up such options whenever they become available. However the financial pressure on the Council means that action is required in advance of completing such work.

8. Equality Duty

- 8.1 **Equality Act.** An Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed and is at Appendix D. Bus and community transport networks are designed based on both need and commercial viability. The Council has the power to intervene where the commercial network fails. Consideration of the available solutions takes into account the needs of all users.

9. Social Value

- 9.1 The Bus Strategy is a strategic document that deals with the long term ambitions and priorities for bus and community transport services in West Sussex and does not cover more detailed commissioning decisions. Therefore no social value implications have been identified in this regard.
- 9.2 Financial reductions in the non-commercial bus network may have a negative impact on social value that officers will seek to mitigate working with local communities to seek to arrange local alternatives such as community transport solutions. WSCC has a good relationship with the main community transport operators in the county and will work with them sharing assets where necessary to provide local solutions where practicable.

10. Crime and Disorder Implications

10.1 None identified

11. Human Rights Implications

11.1 None identified

Lee Harris
Executive Director of Economy,
Infrastructure & Environment

Matt Davey
Director of Highways &
Transport

Contact: Bill Leath 0330 22 25438

Appendices:

Appendix A - Draft Bus Strategy

Appendix B – Impact Analysis Results – To Follow

Appendix C – Findings of the TFG – To Follow

Appendix D – Equality Impact Assessment – To Follow

Background Papers

[Bus Services Act 2017: new powers and opportunities - GOV.UK](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
BUS STRATEGY 2018

1 Introduction

Buses play an important role in many lives across West Sussex providing travel for thousands of residents and visitors in the county. They play a vital role in reducing the social isolation for older, disabled and other vulnerable people who, without local bus or community bus services, would not be able to get out and about seeing friends and family and accessing important services. Research has proven that the costs to society if these services couldn't be accessed would be extreme and have a large impact on the local economy.

Modal shift from private cars to buses reduces traffic congestion improving journey reliability, thereby reducing carbon emissions linked to climate change. Nearly 27 million passenger journeys are carried out on the bus network across West Sussex each year with 85% of the bus mileage delivered on a fully commercial basis by local bus operators.

Bus services have changed dramatically since they were deregulated in 1986 (footnote) bringing both the benefit of commercial investment and the challenge of public sector support and it has been some time since we last reviewed our approach.

Bus patronage has risen in West Sussex with large scale commercial investment by national bus companies alongside local authority investment in infrastructure. The relationship between the bus companies and the County Council is seen as very positive.

West Sussex has an aging population with a higher than average number of residents living on the coast. Many of these residents are entitled to free off peak bus travel that has led to a 'second peak' after 9.30am that has a positive impact on the residents lives and helps to alleviate social isolation and loneliness.

1.1 The need for this Strategy

The purpose of this document is:

- To clearly state the County Council's aims and objectives for local buses and community bus transport between 2018 and 2026
- To determine the County Council's priorities for funding reflecting its overall passenger transport aspirations
- To provide guidance in support of prioritising bus infrastructure in new developments
- To provide a framework through which local interest and community groups can assist in the development of passenger transport improvements
- To support interested parties in securing additional funding where available
- To provide fit for purpose services and infrastructure supporting those services
- To determine which opportunities within the Bus Services Act 2017 are supported

This strategy explains how the County Council will prioritise funding and support for local buses and community transport. This may be direct funding for non-commercial services, investment in infrastructure, promotion of the bus and community transport network and use of internal resources where the market cannot provide a sustainable service.

In addition, it will outline the County Council's approach to the Bus Services Act 2017, the Total Transport Initiative and the wider challenges presented through ongoing pressures on local authority funding.

1.2 Strategic Context

The West Sussex Plan sets out how we at the County Council will shape our services during 2017-2022.

The West Sussex Plan explains how we will focus on:

- Giving children and young people the best start in life
- Ensuring West Sussex is a prosperous place
- Communities will be strong, safe and sustainable
- We will support you in later life to remain independent
- We will be a council that works for our communities

The West Sussex Plan contains our vision for West Sussex and what we are trying to achieve for our residents and for the county. This bus review has been undertaken to ensure we align with those principles to take us forward.

This review of our approach to buses also supports the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011 – 2026 objectives. The Transport Plan (known as the Local Transport Plan or LTP) is the County Council's approach to integrated transport policies and plans. It includes four key priorities that guide our approach to maintaining, managing and investing in transport, and meeting the main objective of improving quality of life for the people of West Sussex:

- Promoting economic growth
- Tackling climate change/air quality issues
- Providing access to services, employment and housing
- Improving safety, security and health

1.3 What will be achieved?

West Sussex will be a place where:

1. Bus services¹ are punctual, reliable and accessible
2. Bus users can plan, book and pay for travel using the latest technology
3. Bus services give people a viable alternative to being a car owner
4. Bus services allow older people to continue to live independently
5. Bus operators and their services give a consistently good level of quality for users across the county
6. Bus travel is affordable for users
7. Air Quality is better as a consequence of investment in cleaner buses as opposed to cars

This means we will:

1. Prioritise investment in good accessible bus infrastructure for bus users
2. Give buses priority over other travel modes when congestion occurs
3. Work with all tiers of Local Government in seeking funding for prioritised local services

¹ Includes conventional and community local bus services operating to a published timetable as well as demand responsive bus services operated by WSCC and community transport organisations

4. Implement cross ticketing and easy payment systems
5. Use the latest clean engine technology
6. Work with property developers to design developments to incorporate buses as a priority with suitable infrastructure
7. Work with bus operators to provide affordable fares for young people

2 Discussion

To achieve the future state as outlined in the place statements above we have to identify the current state and see what the gaps are. From that we can see what the challenges are and how the Bus Services Act gives us opportunities to close that gap.

2.1 GAP analysis

The current ways the County Council supports bus and community transport are outlined in Appendix 1. In summary funding is provided for:

- Conventional bus services that are not commercially viable but are deemed socially necessary meaning a reasonable proportion of residents may become socially isolated if they were not available.
- Community Transport schemes who can apply for grants from the Accessible Transport Forum. This includes Community Bus Services that are open to the public.
- To reimburse bus companies for revenue they forego by providing free off peak bus travel for older people and disabled people at any time.
- School transport via season tickets on commercial and supported bus services
- Developer (Section 106) funding is used to pump prime new services and to develop local bus infrastructure

The County Council also coordinates road side bus infrastructure such as bus stops and bus stands. It liaises with District/Borough Councils on the delivery of bus shelters and coordinates provision of Real Time Passenger Information screens throughout the county.

Analysis of the place based statements in 1.3 and especially what we will do helps us to identify the gaps between that 'future state' and the current state' to enable us to determine what needs to be tackled.

2.2 Challenges

The challenges are:

1. Bus service punctuality is being impacted by congestion - the County Council has proactively tackled urban congestion through major schemes (such as Fastway in Crawley²). However, most work has been to prioritise buses at junctions through signals linked to transmitters fitted to the buses. The downside is that the buses still have to sit in the traffic until they reach the traffic signals. Congestion continues to grow in most of the urban areas where commercial bus services operate more successfully.
2. To improve public transport Cross Ticketing and Easy Payment Systems – the Discovery ticket covers most of the South East facilitated by Councils.

² Fastway was a major scheme including a guided bus way constructed by WSCC to allow buses to be separated from traffic. Buses were also prioritised at junctions and roundabouts through signalling improvements leading to a step change in bus services. The local bus company Metrobus introduced new buses and put on high frequency services for the town and Gatwick Airport as the main local employment location

However, take up is small and operators prefer to push their own products. The BusPlus ticket product for bus/rail use take up is patchy. Take up in some towns such as Crawley is good. We need to challenge resident's views of their local bus services and use of them to get to the train station. What is needed is products that the public recognise and are attractively priced. In addition, technology has made great advances for passengers. However, the application of easy payments and bus pass solutions isn't universal. Contactless payments might be available via larger operators but not the smaller firms who provide valuable in filling bus services. The County Council has much to gain from working across the industry to gain good quality information about bus use as well.

3. To put buses at the forefront in use of Clean Technology – buses have a reputation of being high polluters when in fact they can be lower than cars based on a per passenger calculation, especially with the latest Euro 6 engines. However, there remain a large number of older vehicles used to cover secondary services and school transport that do produce high pollutants. We need to work with the bus and coach operators to replace or retrofit their vehicles to reduce this. There is more to be done together to get the message to our residents that choosing a clean bus contributes to improved air quality leading to better life outcomes. In addition, new technology such as Electric and hybrid vehicles will be explored.
4. To improve journey experience by prioritising investment in modern suitable bus infrastructure – where partners have done this there has been step changes in bus use (such as in Crawley). We are always competing with other road users many of whom prefer to use the car for their travel needs. Buses have a large part to play so there is the need to convince hearts and minds of both users and funders to prioritise spending as an investment in the network.
5. To ensure the design of new developments incorporates buses as a priority – more can be done across the County Council, and with our District/Borough Council partners, to ensure new developments are designed with the bus at its centre along with walking and cycling. Too many developments have been built with access and facilities for bus use as a secondary consideration. We want developers to promote greater bus use by new residents.
6. Funding pressures means that we will have to prioritise funding for bus services that contribute to the West Sussex Plan – requiring changes in the criteria used to determine bus support and grant funding for Community Transport. Rural access is a growing issue with transport solutions being expensive and sometimes difficult to achieve.
7. Public sector funding varies across West Sussex – by working with other public sector partners such as District/Borough/Parish and Town Councils as well as the NHS we want to provide equitable funding for services across West Sussex.
8. Young people can struggle to access their local services such as learning and work opportunities. The cost of public transport can be a barrier. Therefore we will concentrate on working with partners to seek reduced fares and other solutions.

2.3 Opportunities

The Bus Services Act 2017

The basis of the Act is to give Local Authorities a new toolkit to enable improvements to be made to bus services in their areas. It provides a number of options (tools) that can be adopted including:

- Strengthened arrangements for partnership working between bus operators and LA's in England, introducing new Advanced Quality and Enhanced Partnership schemes;
- Bus franchising powers to replace previous Quality Contract Schemes;
- Modernised ticketing legislation and
- Powers necessary for a step change in the information available to passengers through audio and visual on-board information and through the provisions of open data on timetable, fares and bus services arrival times (in England).

Further detail of the opportunities within the Act can be found at Appendix 2.

Of interest to us are the potential benefits from Enhanced Partnerships and Advanced Ticketing Schemes. Enhanced Partnerships present greater opportunities than Advanced Ticketing Schemes.

The Act can be used to achieve three main categories of outcomes:

- Better Journeys
- Better Places
- Better Value

An Enhanced Partnership (EP) is an agreement between a local transport authority (such as the County Council) and the majority of local bus operators to work together to improve local bus services. It includes a clear vision of the improvements that the EP is aiming for (known as an EP plan) and the accompanying actions to achieve them.³

An EP Scheme can include vehicle specifications, branding, payment methods, ticketing structure, real-time information requirements, frequency of services and timetables amongst others. It also provides more benefits than ticketing schemes as shown in the table below:

Can a requirement be put on bus operators to:	Ticketing schemes	Enhanced Partnership
Sell and accept a multi-operator or multi-modal tickets (including in a specific format, such as on a smart card Akin to the London Oyster Card)	✓	✓
Market particular tickets in a certain way (including promoting multi-operator tickets not just their own tickets)?	x	✓
Set all their tickets and fares on a standard set of 'zones' that applies to all operators?	x	✓
Follow common ticket rules for their own tickets (such as a standard length of 'period' tickets or age to qualify for a youth	✓	✓

³ The Bus Services Act 2017 – New powers and opportunities OGL Crown copyright 2017

concession if offered)?		
Sell or accept any ticket on a particular technology (such as a smart card)?	✓	✓
Charge a set price for a multi-operator ticket?	x	✓
Charge a set price for their own, single-operator tickets?	x	x

The Act does give local authorities greater powers to determine where bus services run, when, fares and branding via Franchising. Bus services in London are run via a franchising model with all services effectively supporting by the London Mayor on behalf of the city through Transport for London. However, this model requires large scale investment that the County Council cannot afford at this time and there is no appetite from bus companies as they lose the ability to run services where they want commercially. It would effectively mean the large commercial bus network would be dismantled. In addition the County Council would have to seek the permission of the Secretary of State. Therefore, the option of franchising is not being pursued as it is believed the likelihood of meeting the challenges will be achieved through new Enhanced Partnerships with the local bus operators, District/Borough Councils and other key stakeholders such as the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and the NHS.

Community Transport

West Sussex has many local Community Transport groups and schemes operating in local communities. However, many choose to operate locally as they have been developed by local residents to meet a local need. Some groups have grown to cover wider areas and tend to provide more services such as minibus operations be they demand responsive or timetabled bus services.

There are seven community bus schemes operating weekly services from villages to shopping in larger towns for residents who don't have a local accessible conventional bus or train service. These services provide a valuable link to those communities but rely on the goodwill of volunteers to sustain the service. Many older people rely on these services travelling using their free bus pass.

Other larger community transport groups operate demand services in both minibuses and cars to vital public services. Some use volunteers and other have paid staff with the latter often competing for County Council school and day service transport contracts to support their wider service.

Community Transport often leads a fragile existence in West Sussex competing for local authority grant funding and contracts. However, they provide valuable services that greatly contribute to the West Sussex Plan. In addition, minibus licensing is open to refreshed guidance from Government that could have a negative impact on their cost base.

We will work to have a more coordinated approach to Community Transport across all the public sector partners (including County, District/Borough Councils and the NHS). We will work with Bus Operators and Community Transport Operators where joined up solutions can be found to help fill in some of the gaps.

Total Transport

The Government awarded top tier Councils funding to help them deliver change to improve passenger transport to meet the challenges they face. It was recognised that transport can be fragmented, particularly impacting rural areas with a variety of public sector funded transport services that cater for a range of transport needs. These included:

- Non-emergency patient transport
- Adult social care transport
- School bus services
- Community transport services and
- Subsidised local bus services

The County Council was a partner to a consortium of local Councils including Surrey County Council and East Sussex County Council that bid for funding. They were successful in being awarded £497,000 for a number of initiatives across the tri-county area. They have worked with Brighton and Hove City Council and other partners to understand the value of community transport, sought closer working with the NHS and established joint contractual approaches to supported conventional and school transport. However, further work is needed to realise the potential of close partnership. These areas feed into the challenges and opportunities outlined below.

The partners have all expressed a keenness to carry on the work together having joint procurement solutions already in place. The opportunity is to take this work forward on bus and community transport services to the benefit of all parties. This should be formalised and concentrate on cross county solutions. The pooling of funds should be fully explored.

2.4 Challenges and Opportunities

The following table outlines the main challenges and opportunities in respect of buses and bus travel in West Sussex.

West Sussex will be a place where:	Challenge (see 2.2)	Opportunity
<p>Bus services are punctual, reliable and accessible</p> <p>Bus operators and their services give a consistently good level of quality for users across the county</p> <p>Air Quality is better as a consequence of investment in cleaner buses as opposed to cars</p>	<p>1.How to tackle congestion to improve bus service punctuality</p>	<p>1. Ensure all plans and solutions to improve traffic congestion prioritise buses along with other sustainable travel modes</p> <p>2. Complete Road Space Audits in towns to maximise access for bus services</p> <p>3. Work with bus operators to share bus GPS data to see where congestion occurs</p> <p>4. Identify opportunities for bus lanes</p>
<p>Bus users can plan, book and pay for travel using the</p>	<p>2.Improve cross ticketing across operators and modes</p>	<p>5. Improve the Discovery Card offer working across all operators including concentrated marketing</p>

Agenda Item 13
Appendix A

<p>latest technology</p> <p>Bus services give people a viable alternative to being a car owner</p> <p>Bus services allow older people to continue to live independently</p> <p>Bus travel is affordable for users</p>	<p>and Easy Payment Systems</p>	<p>to promote it to residents</p> <p>6. Agree affordable/competitive prices for multi operator tickets depending on location</p> <p>7. Consider zoned ticket prices in areas served by multi operators</p> <p>8. Bus/Rail smart ticketing specifically for older people</p> <p>9. Specify technology for easy payments including smart cards across operators</p> <p>10. Seek greater use of buses by local employers</p>
<p>Air Quality is better as a consequence of investment in cleaner buses as opposed to cars</p>	<p>3. Use of Clean Technology</p>	<p>11. Promotion of bus use reducing emissions compared to cars</p> <p>12. Prioritise newer cleaner buses in air quality areas, seek funding for retrofitting clean exhaust filters or new vehicles</p> <p>13. Work with bus operators on investing in new vehicle technology</p>
<p>Bus services are punctual, reliable and accessible</p>	<p>4. Prioritise investment in modern suitable bus infrastructure</p>	<p>14. Work with partners to improve infrastructure offer for residents including smart shelters</p> <p>15. Improve bus information sources for modern travellers using the latest technology</p> <p>16. GPS on all services linked to real time at roadside and key locations such as rail stations, shopping centres, major employment zones</p>
<p>Bus services are punctual, reliable and accessible</p> <p>Bus users can plan, book and pay for travel using the latest technology</p> <p>Bus services give people a viable alternative to being a car owner</p>	<p>5. Design new developments to incorporate buses as a priority</p>	<p>17. Seek developers funding free/low cost bus travel for new residents on new housing developments for a period to engender a bus culture</p> <p>18. Developers to design housing and industrial estates with easy access for buses and modern smart stops and shelters</p>
<p>Bus services give people a viable alternative to being a car owner</p>	<p>6. Prioritise support funding for bus and community transport services that contribute to the West Sussex Plan</p>	<p>19. Update bus funding criteria to reflect the outcomes in the West Sussex Plan</p> <p>20. Review use of grant funding for CT</p> <p>21. Develop a proposal for partner</p>

<p>Bus services allow older people to continue to live independently</p> <p>Bus travel is affordable for users</p>	<p>7. There are challenges to the use of Section 19/22 minibuses licences for the operation of Community Transport and Internal Fleet Operations</p>	<p>Councils to assist in funding most needed local services</p> <p>22. Ensure plans for services are rural proofed</p> <p>23. Develop internal minibuses and transport services to assist in filling some gaps in the delivery of passenger transport in partnership with CT groups particularly in rural areas</p> <p>24. Provide support to CT groups should licensing changes be made</p>
<p>Bus services give people a viable alternative to being a car owner</p> <p>Bus services allow older people to continue to live independently</p> <p>Bus operators and their services give a consistently good level of quality for users across the county</p>	<p>8. Public sector funding varies</p> <p>9. Opportunities to successfully gain agreements for developer funding for enhanced local passenger transport</p>	<p>25. Develop an agreement with District/Borough Councils to provide joint funding with WSCC</p> <p>26. Develop existing agreements with Town and Parish Councils to provide funding towards local bus and community transport</p> <p>27. Formalise agreements across the Total Transport Councils to continue to pool funds and joint working on solutions across the region</p> <p>28. Proactively seek developer funding towards local transport solutions that favour the use of sustainable modes over the car</p>
<p>Bus services give people a viable alternative to being a car owner</p> <p>Bus travel is affordable for users</p>	<p>9. Bus Travel can be unaffordable for some young people</p>	<p>27. Work with bus operators to provide affordable young people's child fares for 16-19s in full time education</p>

2.5 Funding

Funding for bus services has been steadily reduced in recent years. Government grants ceased leading to a reduction in support for conventional bus services though the grants for Community Transport were ring fenced. When the Government transferred the responsibility for administration of ENCTS in West Sussex from District/Borough Councils to the County Council there was a £3m shortfall that we had to fund from elsewhere putting further pressure on reducing budgets.

The trend of lower revenue funding availability is set to continue for some time so the County Council has to take steps to account for it. We have to be realistic about what can be done with less funding but to pursue opportunities to enhance the

current commercial network and work hard with partners where there are gaps. This may mean very difficult decisions and a lot of work with local communities to find affordable alternatives to conventional bus support. New services are unlikely unless they are supported through greater use by fare payers from new developments. It is essential that bus companies work hand in hand with local Councils and developers to tackle travel behaviours to ensure residents choose the bus in place of the car.

It is notable that commercial bus patronage across West Sussex has been steadily increasing and seen as a success story. The bus operators have told us this is partially down to how we have worked together supporting some services where needed, but also in the delivery of much needed infrastructure and information about their services. Funding from infrastructure improvements has come from various sources including WSCC Highways, S106 developer funding and Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) funding for growth.

Delivery of such capital improvements can be made through the Strategic Transport Improvement Programme (STIP) where the scheme cost exceeds £1m or smaller (less than £1m) programmes such as the Local Transport Improvement Programme (LTIP). Both programmes have potential schemes evaluated against set criteria as funding has to be prioritised. Work on LTIP has been progressed at pace leading to a number of improvements with officers working with the bus companies.

Other opportunities can be explored with the Total Transport Fund partners, notably the use of community transport and the internal fleet.

3 DELIVERING THE STRATEGY

The Bus Services Act outlines the powers and opportunities that Local Authorities can use to improve bus services to support economy and connect communities to the workplace, vital public services.

Whilst funding remains challenging there are opportunities explored in 2.5.

Given on-going funding constraints the Strategy does not contain specific targets. The proposed delivery plan is set out below. We will work with all relevant partners to deliver the strategy which will benefit the residents and economic vitality of West Sussex.

Action 1: We will strengthen relationships between the county council and its key stakeholders including bus and community transport operators, public sector partners and the LEP. We will put in place governance arrangements to oversee the delivery of the bus strategy, monitor and report on progress.

Action 2: We will enter into an Enhanced Partnership arrangement under powers within the Bus Services Act 2017 with the Bus Operators and other partners seek to actively achieve better bus services used as a travel more of choice over the car where appropriate. This will include how the partners work together to combat congestion through road reallocation and other bus prioritisation solutions.

Action 3: We will ensure our approach to reviewing use of road space and developing highways and transport schemes fully considers how buses will be prioritised over cars.

Action 4: We will ensure the Local Transport Plan 2011 to 2026 is reviewed to align with this Bus Strategy.

Action 5: We will formalise our partnering arrangements with Surrey County Council, East Sussex County Council and Brighton and Hove City Council developed through the Total Transport initiative and work together to pool resources where appropriate.

Action 6: We will ensure that new developments are designed to accommodate buses and that developer funding is ring-fenced to fund low cost bus travel.

Action 7: We will take forward the delivery of bus infrastructure through the Local Transport Improvements Programme (LTIP). See Appendix x for list of proposed schemes.

Action 8: We will review supported bus services and community transport funding to prioritise where they mostly contribute to the West Sussex Plan.

Action 9: We will develop a joint plan with bus operator to prioritise the use of clean vehicles in Air Quality Management Areas.

Action 10: We will through the Enhanced Partnership to improve multi-operator and multi-modal travel by reviewing the tickets and products allowing this. This will include seeking to have fares structures aligned across operators on an easily understood basis and the increased use of easy payments solutions enhancing the experience for users.

Action 11: We will, through Enhanced Partnership and other partnerships, support investment in clean bus technology solutions and new vehicles in areas where congestion occurs and Air Quality Management Areas. In addition, we will support the use of new technologies including hybrid and electric vehicles.

Action 12: We will, through the Enhanced Partnership, work with bus companies to provide lower cost fares for young people and other incentives for their use and to build commercial patronage.

Action 13: We will work with District/Borough and Town/Parish Councils to jointly contribute to the cost of supporting non-commercial bus and community transport services.

Action 14: We will work with our partners seeking alternative sustainable provision in rural areas where conventional buses are not suitable. In particular, we will explore co-ordinated use of our own fleet along with Community Transport partners.

Action 15: We will measure the success of actions above through a developed robust set of Key Performance Indicators

Appendices for background

APPENDIX 1

1. Existing Approach

1.1 Conventional Bus Services

The County Council spends £1.8m on directly supporting conventional timetabled bus services that are not commercially viable. In addition income from Developer Contributions, Gatwick Airport, other large employers and some town and parish councils increases the expenditure on supporting bus services to £3.4m. This approach has been used for many years following the deregulation of bus services in 1986. The amount has reduced since Central Government ceased substantial funding to Local Transport Authorities (LTA's) for rural transport (the Rural Bus Subsidy Grant).

Nearly 27 million passenger journeys are undertaken across all timetabled bus services in West Sussex each year. The majority of these services are on services operated commercially with no support from the County Council. Approximately 13.5 million bus miles are undertaken across the network.

The current criteria for prioritising services are based on the following:

- Cost per passenger subsidy
- Wider Economic Impacts provided by service location/type
- Patronage Trends – likelihood of increase leading to commercialisation
- Resource options – likelihood of attracting alternative funding
- Option value – whether there are alternatives for residents to access
- Interchange possibilities
- Contribution to Land Use Policy

Weightings to the criteria were added when reviewing supported services in 2011. This allowed exploration of service frequency reductions as opposed to full funding withdrawal where possible enabling some residents to still have a service in some cases.

The County Council works with local bus operators and other partners such as District/Borough Councils, and Developers in the commissioning of bus infrastructure such as bus stops, shelters and Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI). This is via capital funding and developer (S106) contributions.

1.2 Community Transport

The County Council provides grant funding to Community Transport schemes who apply via the West Sussex Forum for Accessible Transport on an annual basis. This is to support schemes providing Community Buses that are timetabled services operated by voluntary organisations where conventional bus services wouldn't operate, notably in rural areas. In addition, it supports demand responsive schemes such as Dial-a-Rides, voluntary car schemes and shopmobility services. The total annual budget for the grants is £160k.

1.3 English National Concessionary Travel Scheme (ENCTS)

ENCTS provides free off peak bus travel for people who have reached the national retirement age and people of any age with registered disabilities. The national scheme is administered locally by the County Council who has decided to subsidise free bus travel for people with disabilities at any time.

The County Council reimburses bus journeys made by pass holders on registered timetable services starting in West Sussex. If the service returns from within another County of Unitary Authority's area they reimburse the return journey. Scheduled coach services are not included; only local bus services. If the number of passengers regularly causes the buses to overload the operator has to put on additional capacity and the County Council is duty bound to fund it.

It's a common misconception that the County Council is supporting the local bus services themselves through the Scheme. The payment to bus operators is reimbursing the pass holders travel and not paying for the running of the bus itself.

The national Scheme isn't fully funded so the County Council has to fund any shortfall from within its own budget. The overall cost of the scheme is approximately £11.5m per annum. The approximate number of bus journeys undertaken by pass holders is 9.9m (2016/17). The number of journeys has been falling in recent years mainly owing to the increase in eligibility age for older people. However, this still represents about 37% of all bus journeys are undertaken by non-paying passengers.

1.4 Home to School Transport

The County Council has a statutory duty to provide free school transport for entitled pupils attending their nearest suitable school based on meeting walking distance criteria. Approximately 7,000 pupils receive transport that can be via local bus services, trains, coaches and taxis. The latter are generally used for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) who are unable to travel on conventional public transport.

The County Council spends approximately £12.5m on Home to School Transport through purchasing season tickets, contracting coaches and taxis, as well as via its internal fleet. The costs are met through the Home to School Transport budget that is held by Education & Skills.

1.5 Health and Social Care

The County Council arranges transport for residents eligible for day and/or residential services depending on criteria. Numbers of service users travel to and from day services via internal minibuses operated by the County Council. Others use local public transport using their ENCTS pass for free travel on conventional buses. In some cases this follows use of Independent Travel Training commissioned by Adults Services.

Travel to health care is made in various ways including by:

- Conventional bus services – that often include the local hospital in their routing. Older passengers may be able to travel free off peak via ENCTS, disabled pass holders can travel anytime for free and can have a companion
- Community Transport – resident can access local schemes, some of which specialise in travel to medical appointments and provide companions to help them when at the hospital or other medical facility
- Patient Transport Services (PTS) – for eligible people with a diagnosed health care need who travel funded by the NHS using cars and accessible minibuses

The County Council has worked with local bus operators and the NHS to divert services into hospitals as well as providing travel information screens in the reception area.

APPENDIX 2

1 Bus Services Act 2017 – partnering (PCs)

The Bus Services Act allows LTAs (outside London) options to play a greater role in their local bus networks. The Act outlines 4 approaches that WSCC could pursue:

Advanced Quality Partnerships

Under a bus partnership services continue to be operated by commercial bus operator. New standards are set which some or all of the bus operators in the area are required to meet. The Advanced Quality Partnership Scheme (AQPS) is made by the local authority generally for a service, route or corridor. However AQPS can be for a wider geographic area. Operators not meeting the standards in the AQPS will not be able to use any of the infrastructures the local authority has provided. Operators do have a say in the proposals but this can be a time consuming process.

Enhanced Partnerships

An Enhanced Partnership (EP) is an agreement between the local authorities and the majority of the bus operators to work together to improve local bus services. It includes a clear vision of the improvements it is aiming for from the EP Plan. A framework is set up to ensure the partners have the best opportunity to solve problems together as a collective. The range of outcomes that can be achieved through an EP is broader than can be delivered through an AQPS.

Franchising

Franchising is an established model used in London as well as many cities across Europe. Local authorities have the power to determine where and when services will run and how they will be operated. This is typically under a contract to the local authority. Franchising does cost the local authority more to operate as it has a dramatic impact on the commerciality of the services. It brings many opportunities but does expose local authorities to significant financial risks.

The decision to introduce a franchising arrangement has to be taken locally by a named individual such as a Mayor, who is accountable for it. The Secretary for State for Transport has to approve the franchising scheme.

Advanced Ticketing Schemes

These establish multi-operator and multi-modal ticketing schemes where local authorities can specify, among other things, technology that is used. The authority also has to consider how advanced ticketing arrangements can be facilitated with journeys to and from nearby authorities. Powers do not allow local authorities to set the price of tickets as they have to be agreed by the operators.

The County Council did have voluntary quality bus partnerships but these have largely fallen by the wayside owing to lack of resources. However, some pockets of good work have been undertaken through the Growth Plans on a local basis such as in Crawley. In addition, the County Council has worked closely with bus ops on improvements to local bus infrastructure (LTIP). Congestion remains an issue as it is

growing on key corridors used by bus services that require a broader approach to achieving solutions.

Discussion:

Bus patronage in West Sussex has been rising in the last ten years contrary to a national trend of falling numbers outside London. The majority of the journeys are undertaken on commercial bus services with no direct support from the County Council.

Whilst season tickets are purchased for entitled pupils and journeys are reimbursed under ENCTS the bus companies have largely invested themselves in those services. Successes have been where the County Council provides good bus infrastructure and RTPI working in collaboration with the bus operators and District/Borough Councils.

The option of Bus Franchising isn't considered appropriate at this current time as it would essentially mean the County Council would have to seek the Secretary of State's approval with a suitable business case. That business case would require substantial ongoing funding to resource a local model akin to Transport for London. Therefore franchising is being discounted to ensure there remains a robust commercial network in West Sussex.

This page is intentionally left blank