

## Cabinet Member Responses

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

## Cabinet Member Responses

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

## Cabinet Member Responses

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

## Cabinet Member Responses

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

## Cabinet Member Responses

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

## Cabinet Member Responses

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

## Cabinet Member Responses

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

## Cabinet Member Responses

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