

## Cabinet Member Responses

<b>Response from Cabinet Member for Environment – Mrs Deborah Urquhart</b>		
<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Environment &amp; Communities Scrutiny Committee recommendations (18 November 2020)</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>West Sussex Tree Plan</b>	1. Welcomed the Plan and acknowledged that it was needed.	
	2. Requested that hedgerows are included.	A reference is made in paragraph 2.10 to the importance of hedgerows in providing links between areas of woodland, urban parks, and gardens, thereby creating additional habitat space and allowing wildlife to move freely in and out of urban areas.  However, by definition, hedgerows are lines of closely spaced shrubs and, in some but not all cases, trees. Therefore, it is not appropriate to address hedgerow protection through the Plan.
	3. Requested that UK tree stock is used to reduce the risk of bringing in pathogens and to support the UK economy.	A reference to using native tree stock has been added to paragraph 4.21. This important matter, which links to Objectives 2, 3 and 4, will also be addressed by the Operational Tree Policy.
	4. Noted the programme for dealing with Ash Dieback and welcomed that funding is in next years' budget	Noted.
	5. Requested that members have a briefing note on Ash Dieback, when the information becomes available	Noted - Director of Highways, Transport and Planning to action.
	6. Asked whether we had adequate resources to implement the plan and encouraged the Cabinet	The issue of funding is addressed in Section 7 of the Plan, which includes seeking external sources of funding and generating additional income to deliver the Plan.

## Cabinet Member Responses

	Member to pursue available funding.	
	7. Supports setting up of the Forum and requested that some members of the Committee are members of the Forum. Would also like the Forum members to report back to this Committee.	Noted and agreed.
	8. Need to work with the local planning authorities including the National Park as planning decisions could be in conflict with the Tree Plan.	The impact of new development on trees will be a key matter for discussion with the other planning authorities through the Forum.
	9. Stated that it is important to get the survey and mapping done to allow for serious dialogue on protection and future developments.	Noted.
	10. Through the work of the Forum, requested that drainage issues, impact of tree roots on structures, and the role of TPO's are considered on council trees.	Drainage and the other technical matters will be addressed through the Operational Tree Policy. Governance relating to TPOs will be a matter for discussion with the other planning authorities through the Forum.
	11. Requested that the Donate a Tree scheme is better publicised, and that the Cabinet Member satisfies herself that charges were appropriate.	Noted as an action for Local Highway Operations.

## Cabinet Member Responses

	12.Supported the idea of a leaflet/information sheet for members of the public who wish to plant trees	One of the key actions under Objective 5 is to support local communities and individuals by using our website to direct them to guidance and best practice, including in relation to the planting of new trees.
<b>Response from Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure – Mr Roger Elkins</b>		
<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Environment &amp; Communities Scrutiny Committee recommendations (18 November 2020)</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Call-in Emergency Active Travel Fund Cycle Lane Scheme in Chichester (HI10 20/21)</b>	Rejects the call-in of the Emergency Active Travel Fund Cycle Scheme in Chichester but requested that the Cabinet Member considers the closeness of the vote before confirming his decision.	The Cabinet Member has carefully considered all of the available information, including the call-in reasons and the comments made at the committee meeting. The decision came into effect on 18 November 2020.
<b>Call -in Emergency Active Travel Fund Cycle Lane Scheme A270 Upper Shoreham Road (HI11 20/21)</b>	Supports the call-in of the Emergency Active Travel Fund Cycle Scheme A270 Upper Shoreham Road and asks the Cabinet Member to reconsider his decision.	<p>The Cabinet Member has carefully considered all of the available information, including the call-in reasons and the comments made at the committee meeting. The Cabinet Member is also aware that the majority of comments received by the County Council (via the on-line survey and correspondence) were opposed to the scheme due to loss of parking, safety and lack of consultation though he recognises that the positive comments have been the highest for any of the county's emergency schemes.</p> <p>The scheme constituted significant changes to the highway but there was no time to undertake meaningful engagement with local stakeholders. The Department for Transport set out the funding criteria and the allocated funding on 27 May, and bids had to be submitted by 5 June - eight working days later. This</p>

## Cabinet Member Responses

		<p>resulted in an absence of public engagement/feedback and compromises in terms of the design, assessment and impact criteria.</p> <p>As an emergency response to a unique set of circumstances the scheme has been a success but the conditions on the network have now changed and public transport options restored. The Cabinet Member has, therefore, confirmed his decision to remove the Shoreham emergency active travel cycle scheme. The date of removal will be confirmed in due course.</p> <p>The County Council is looking to progress a permanent cycle way scheme in Shoreham given the support and enthusiasm shown for a scheme through the 'pop-up' cycle way process. Any scheme in the town would be redesigned to make sure it is suitable as a permanent scheme. If taken forward as a priority for the County Council this would be subject to the Department for Transport agreeing additional investment as well as full and thorough consultation with the public and engagement with all relevant stakeholders. If agreed by the Department of Transport, this scheme would be added to the Tranche 2 cycle way work which will see permanent cycling improvements across the county.</p>
<b>Response from Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure – Mr Roger Elkins</b>		
<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Environment &amp; Communities Scrutiny Committee recommendations (18 November 2020)</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Cycling &amp; Walking Strategy</b>	1. Was supportive of the approach being taken and that lessons have been learned particularly regarding	<i>The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure welcomes the committee's comments in particular those in respect of better communication and consultation. The Committee will be interested to know that a revised strategic communication plan</i>

## Cabinet Member Responses

	<p>better communication and consultation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Would hope that the Strategy will include linking up some of the piecemeal cycling infrastructure that is already in place.</li> <li>3. Would like the Strategy to include public education to persuade cyclists to use the cycle paths already provided.</li> <li>4. Would like to see local councillors involved in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP).</li> <li>5. Would like the opportunity to review the criteria for prioritising potential schemes and the resources required and whether the resourcing would cause other projects to drop off the list.</li> </ol>	<p><i>that will be applied to all larger cycling schemes has been published on the WSCC website and can be found at:</i></p> <p><a href="https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/media/15053/active_travel_fund_consultation_plan.pdf">https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/media/15053/active_travel_fund_consultation_plan.pdf</a></p> <p><i>The development of the revised walking and cycling strategy will achieve a number of outcomes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Bring together and prioritising those larger schemes identified as part of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) currently being developed by WSCC, the District and Borough Councils and the National Park Authority. The Government has said that any future bids for schemes under the active travel fund will need to have been subject to the LCWIP process and an appropriate business case.</i></li> <li>• <i>Use the suggested scheme ideas within the existing strategy as the basis for schemes that gap fill / link parts of the existing cycling network.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inform our response to development management.</i></li> <li>• <i>Determine a revised method of prioritisation between schemes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Determine the degree to which public engagement, education and training forms part of our approach to scheme development. For the larger schemes where government funding is sought this is a pre-requisite.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The Walking and Cycling Task and Finish Group will assist in the development of the revised strategy which will be subject to full consultation with members, key stakeholders and the general public as part of our approach to communication and engagement. It is intended that the revised strategy will be brought before the Committee as part of this consultation.</i></p>
--	--	--