

South Chichester County Local Committee

20 February 2018

Chichester Road Space Audit Discussion Paper

West Sussex County Council has recently reviewed how it develops parking schemes across the county and a pilot study has been undertaken in Chichester. This more progressive approach towards parking management, known as a Road Space Audit (RSA) has tried to determine if there are other ways for the County Council and its partners to consider existing and future parking demands.

In the summer of 2015, the County Council appointed transport consultants WSP/Parsons Brinkerhoff to take forward the pilot Chichester RSA. Based on the findings of early work, which included a series of workshops bringing together a range of technical interests, a number of concepts, in support of integrating sustainable transport infrastructure and future development in Chichester, have been identified and can be broadly be grouped under the following core themes:

- **Tackling Parking Issues (On-Street)**
- **Parking Supply and Traffic Management**
- **Reallocating Road Space: Improved Places and Sustainable Transport Corridors**
- **Reallocating Road Space: "To, Not Through"**

With the agreement of the South Chichester County Local Committee, a public consultation on the Chichester Road Space Audit took place from the 15 August until the 31 October 2017.

Copies of the full RSA, an executive summary, A Vision for Chichester and the Southern Gateway Draft Masterplan were included on the County Council's Have Your Say Consultation Pages alongside an electronic response form. Details were also provided to the Residents E Panel as well as on Facebook and Twitter. All those stakeholders who attended the Chichester RSA Workshops earlier in 2017 were informed of the public consultation directly via e-mail – a list of these can be seen in Appendix B.

Hard copies of all relevant documents were also provided in Chichester Library and a press release was issued soon after the consultation was underway. Officers did also attend a series of public meetings such as the Parklands Residents Association and the Chichester Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

There were a total of 189 electronic responses recorded during the consultation period. A further 25 responses were either submitted in writing or received outside of this period. There were also numerous posts submitted via social media that have also been considered.

179 responses (94%) were from residents/individuals and 9 (4%) were from organisations/businesses including Chichester District Council, Chichester City Council, Chichester Society, Chi Cycle, Chichester Cycle Forum, Donnington Parish Council, Westgate Residents Association and Summersdale Residents Association.

A summary of the responses is highlighted in Appendix A.

Officer Recommendation.

Taking the responses received into account, officers are of the view that further development of the RSA is justified. The support of the County Local Committee is therefore being sought to progress with design work relating to the first concept outlined in the RSA **Tackling Parking Issues (On-Street)**. In essence, this design work would take the form of a proposal for a city wide parking management plan.

The reasons why officers are making this recommendation are as follows:

- It is clear that in many parts of city, un-managed on-street parking continues to cause congestion and safety/access issues as well as limiting the ability of residents and their visitors to park (as well as tradespeople and healthcare providers etc). Traditional policy responses such as localised parking scheme extensions are typically reactive and thus compound this impression of action being a response to a problem. Such responses can also lead to parking being moved from place to place. A single parking management plan, covering the whole urban area of Chichester, could not only deal with parking problems in unrestricted areas but could also limit the amount of displacement.
- With Chichester's new housing allocations and redevelopment, business and retail expansion, the growth in the visitor economy and the associated growth in car use, the parking problems highlighted above will only intensify and could also begin to have an impact in currently unaffected areas. Officers would like to be proactive and plan for this now rather than wait and possibly be forced to react when it is too late.
- A comprehensive city wide approach could also enable a more strategic review of the existing parking scheme. Consideration could be given to Sunday/Evening restrictions and to maximising the parking opportunities for residents, visitors, tourists and local workers.
- Having a detailed design would enable all parties (officers, councillors, stakeholders, residents and businesses) to get a clearer picture of current parking capacity, what the different parking demands are across the city, the nature and cost of any potential measures and the impact that these

might have upon off-street parking facilities and traffic management in general. In turn, a detailed design could facilitate closer working between the County/District Council and even the preparation of a joint parking strategy that ensured that the road network and car parks were used and managed in the most efficient way possible.

- Having a detailed design will allow for further engagement/consultation and enable all parties to comment and potentially help shape the future of parking in Chichester. It is appreciated that many people have found it extremely difficult to comment on the future use of the road space in Chichester when there are no actual proposals to view. It should be stressed that the recommendation of officers is to proceed with design work only. Any future proposals would of course be subject to a comprehensive consultation process, with any decisions being considered by the South Chichester County Local Committee.

Contact: Miles Davy, Lead Professional – Parking Strategy Team, 0330 222 6688

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Question 4: Have you read the Chichester Road Space Audit in full?

Yes 109 (57.67%)
No 7 (3.70%)
Partly read 73 (38.62%)
Not Answered 0 (0%)

Question 6: Do you agree/disagree that there are sufficient on/off-street parking problems, as well as wider issues in Chichester that merit the County Council undertaking a Road Space Audit?

Strongly agree 57 (30.16%)
Tend to agree 62 (32.80%)
Neither agree nor disagree 14 (7.41%)
Tend to disagree 27 (14.29%)
Strongly disagree 23 (12.17%)
Don't know 6 (3.17%)
Not Answered 0 (0%)

Question 7: Could the principles of "tackling parking issues (on-street)" work in Chichester?

Strongly agree 9 (4.76%)
Tend to agree 39 (20.63%)
Neither agree nor disagree 18 (9.52%)
Tend to disagree 40 (21.16%)
Strongly disagree 73 (38.62%)
Don't know 10 (5.29%)
Not Answered 0 (0%)

Question 8: Would you support or oppose applying the principles of "tackling parking issues (on-street)" in Chichester?

Strongly support 15 (7.94%)
Tend to support 45 (23.81%)
Neither support nor oppose 13 (6.88%)
Tend to oppose 37 (19.58%)
Strongly oppose 75 (39.68%)
Don't know 4 (2.12%)
Not Answered 0 (0%)

Question 9: Do you have any major concerns about applying the principles of "tackling parking issues (on-street)" in Chichester?

Yes 150 (79.37%)
No 25 (13.23%)
Don't know 14 (7.41%)
Not Answered 0 (0%)

Summary of concerns:

- There was a general feeling that the Road Space Audit document was too long and contained too much technical information, making it difficult to cross reference when providing a consultation response.
- A large number of respondents questioned the validity of the parking survey data, stating that residential roads mentioned as having some capacity actually do not. Therefore, it could not be certain that demand for parking could be met on-street. More surveys would be needed.
- Many residents objected to the idea of allowing commuters to park in residential roads, even if there was capacity, arguing that it would affect their ability to have visitors/tradesmen/deliveries etc and also affect the character/environment of the area. Access, safety and air quality might be affected by increasing levels of circulating traffic looking for space.
- Many residents also pointed out that not everyone works 9-5 and that they would need access to spaces during the daytime. This would not be possible if commuters were parking there.
- Some residents argued that additional restrictions would be costly, bureaucratic and confusing. It was also pointed out that for low paid local staff, daily parking charges would be too much. For the elderly, it may also be too far to walk from outlying residential roads.
- There was a feeling that WSCC should first seek to reduce demand for car parking (and promote modal shift) rather than increase parking supply e.g. ensuring businesses get their staff to use buses. Therefore, buses needed to be more frequent and cheaper.
- Many others saw a need to provide more and cheaper car parks, including comprehensive Park and Ride facilities.
- A number of respondents felt that the audit did not take the demographics of the city into account – a rising elderly population, working parents or those doing the school run, poor or expensive public transport and multi car ownership were all a fact of life and therefore meant that the concept of city wide restrictions was not realistic and would not work.
- Some felt that not enough attention had been paid to the impact of electric vehicles and/or driverless pods, as these could reduce congestion and pollution.
- Some saw the audit as anti-car/motorist whilst many others saw it as too car orientated and paying less attention to alternative modes.
- Some argued that the planning system (parking standards) added to the on-street congestion issue and so this needed to be rectified.

Question 10: Could the principles of “parking supply and traffic management” work in Chichester?

Strongly agree 8 (4.23%)
Tend to agree 42 (22.22%)
Neither agree nor disagree 32 (16.93%)
Tend to disagree 35 (18.52%)
Strongly disagree 66 (34.92%)
Don't know 6 (3.17%)
Not Answered 0 (0%)

Question 11: Would you support or oppose applying the principles of “parking supply and traffic management” in Chichester?

Strongly support 11 (5.82%)
Tend to support 43 (22.75%)
Neither support nor oppose 16 (8.47%)
Tend to oppose 45 (23.81%)
Strongly oppose 69 (36.51%)
Don't know 5 (2.65%)
Not Answered 0 (0%)

Question 12: Do you have any major concerns about applying the principles of “parking supply and traffic management” in Chichester?

Yes 135 (71.43)%
No 35 (18.52)%
Don't know 19 (10.05)%
Not Answered 0 (0%)

Summary of concerns:

- There was a feeling that WSCC should first seek to reduce demand for car parking (and promote modal shift) rather than the more forceful increasing/relocating parking supply. Therefore, buses/trains need to be more frequent and cheaper e.g. Manhood – at the moment car is the only option after 6pm.
- It was considered that there was not enough space to relocate long stay parking from car parks. Also this could increase pollution in other areas.
- Many felt as though such a measure would result in fewer people visiting the city centre (unable to carry goods etc) and so would therefore kill trade. Out of town retails parks would benefit as a result. This goes against the aim of The Vision – to attract visitors to the city.
- Building on this, it was felt as though this measure would make it even more difficult for the elderly, disabled and less mobile. In some cases, walking further to a car park could be unsafe.
- More cars would come into Chichester looking for, or unaware that there would be fewer spaces – an equation that does not add up!
- Need more car parking, including Park and Ride sites. Also, having an effective A27 would facilitate this. More car parks could also be pay on exit and therefore encourage longer stays.
- Charging more in the city centre car parks (especially on Saturdays) rather than changing use could reduce the congestion. Tiered charges could be considered for greener vehicles.
- On-street parking bays would be more difficult to park in compared to designated end on off-street bays (reverse parking etc)
- On the one hand, WSCC should be dictating to people whether they should drive into the city, but on the other, there is too much focus on car use in the RSA

Question 13: Could the principles of “reallocating roadspace” work in Chichester?

Strongly agree 21 (11.11%)
Tend to agree 37 (19.58%)
Neither agree nor disagree 18 (9.52%)
Tend to disagree 39 (20.63%)
Strongly disagree 66 (34.92%)
Don't know 8 (4.23%)
Not Answered 0 (0%)

Question 14: Would you support or oppose applying the principles of “reallocating roadspace” in Chichester?

Strongly support 24 (12.70%)
Tend to support 33 (17.46%)
Neither support nor oppose 19 (10.05%)
Tend to oppose 41 (21.69%)
Strongly oppose 67 (35.45%)
Don't know 5 (2.65%)
Not Answered 0 (0%)

Question 15: Do you have any major concerns about applying the principles of “reallocating roadspace” in Chichester?

Yes 123 (65.08%)
No 39 (20.63%)
Don't know 27 (14.29%)
Not Answered 0 (0%)

Summary of concerns:

- There was concern that this measure would not decrease traffic but just move it into less suitable roads, many of which are already congested. Therefore, an integrated traffic route plan would be required in order to redirect traffic and prevent gridlock.
- One of these roads was the A27, which was already congested
- Moving traffic to other roads would increase noise/pollution as well as cause confusion. Need Park and Ride to deal with displaced traffic.
- Many said that more road space was needed in order to keep traffic moving, not less. This was especially the case with traffic set to grow due to new developments – less roads would equal longer queues.
- Concern over how city centre residents would park if roads were reallocated.
- No account of Electric Vehicles/Pods which could take people direct to destinations without pollution etc.
- Concern that Blue Badge holders as well as elderly/less able will lose access to key facilities/destinations in city centre
- Imperative that any new cycle routes were segregated rather than shared. Also that they accommodate commuting cyclists as well as leisure ones (perhaps a Dutch approach)

- Deliveries etc would have to take place at unsociable hours, making the city less attractive (in conflict with Vision)
- Any roadspace reallocation should benefit alternative transport modes rather than promote building developments.
- This would not work if tackled in isolation. For example, money should also be spent on improving the appearance of buildings/shops – so that people spent money as well as visited.
- Reallocation in roads such as Avenue De Chartres would ruin the view of the Cathedral.

Question 16: Could the principles of “to not through” work in Chichester?

Strongly agree 15 (7.94%)
 Tend to agree 52 (27.51%)
 Neither agree nor disagree 25 (13.23%)
 Tend to disagree 25 (13.23%)
 Strongly disagree 55 (29.10%)
 Don't know 17 (8.99%)
 Not Answered 0 (0%)

Question 17: Would you support or oppose applying the principles of “to not through” in Chichester?

Strongly support 21 (11.11%)
 Tend to support 45 (23.81%)
 Neither support nor oppose 30 (15.87%)
 Tend to oppose 25 (13.23%)
 Strongly oppose 51 (26.98%)
 Don't know 17 (8.99%)
 Not Answered 0 (0%)

Question 18: Do you have any major concerns about applying the principles of “to not through” in Chichester?

Yes 110 (58.20%)
 No 46 (24.34%)
 Don't know 33 (17.46%)
 Not Answered 0 (0%)

Summary of concerns:

- There were numerous concerns raised by local residents who would still need regular access across the city at different times of the day (e.g. shopping, work, school run). Being unable to do this could impact upon lifestyle but also add to congestion/pollution in other residential roads, many of which would not be suitable or were already busy.
- There was significant doubt as to whether the A27 could cope with any additional traffic (i.e. re-routed from the city) as it was bad enough already and so the improvements for this road or a northern bypass needed to be clarified before To Not Through should ever be considered. Both would need to be done in tandem.

- There were concerns that this would make Chichester less attractive to visit and could affect footfall. For example, how could events be held if roads were shut.
- There was a need to get Sat Navs to route people away from the city centre.
- Rather than design out the car, improving the alternatives should be a priority e.g. segregated cycle routes, park and ride and better buses. Better railway signalling could also reduce congestion.
- Requests were also made to limit the ability of HGVs to come into the city
- Any measure such as this should be done as a trial rather than permanently.

Question 19: Please rank the four principles in order of preference for Chichester (1 = most preferred, 4 = least preferred). If you do not have a preference, or you do not agree with any of the principles then please skip this question.

Reallocating roadspace - 1.53
 Tackling parking issues (on-street) - 1.52
 Parking supply and traffic management - 1.50
 To not through - 1.34

Tackling parking issues (on-street)
 1 32 (16.93%)
 2 25 (13.23%)
 3 21 (11.11%)
 4 42 (22.22%)
 Not Answered 69 (36.51%)

Parking supply and traffic management
 1 23 (12.17%)
 2 33 (17.46%)
 3 40 (21.16%)
 4 13 (6.88%)
 Not Answered 80 (42.33%)

Reallocating roadspace
 1 28 (14.81%)
 2 32 (16.93%)
 3 31 (16.40%)
 4 19 (10.05%)
 Not Answered 79 (41.80%)

To not through
 1 27 (14.29%)
 2 21 (11.11%)
 3 20 (10.58%)
 4 42 (22.22%)
 Not Answered 79 (41.80%)

Question 20: On a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 = easy and 5 = very challenging) and based on your local knowledge and experience of Chichester and what is contained within the Road Space Audit, how achievable do you consider this provisional approach to be?

1 - easy 2 (1.06%)
2 7 (3.70%)
3 20 (10.58%)
4 51 (26.98%)
5 - very challenging 109 (57.67%)
Not Answered 0 0%

Question 21: Please tell us about any principles or particular measures that you would like to see or feel are currently missing from the Road Space Audit?

- The RSA is too car focused – there is a need to make public transport more appealing and cheaper as well as for a joined up cycle network.
- Need more consideration of electric vehicles, driverless vehicles, electric bikes and 'Boris' bikes.
- Need to take more account of the demographic – the population will be older/less mobile so ease of access will be key. This includes a need to provide more parking for the disabled.
- Also need to know who visits Chichester and why they choose to drive etc
- Needs to account for A27/Southern Gateway proposals.
- Chichester needs Park and Ride and more/bigger car parks
- Need to convert grass verges to laybys
- Need to deal with student parking
- Need cheaper parking on and off-street
- New developments do not provide enough parking spaces
- Need to ensure that children can attend their nearest school, thereby limiting the need to travel by car etc
- Need safer parking outside schools
- Need more detail on air quality

Social Media – Summary of Responses

- Need cheaper/free bus travel to make it a viable alternative
- Roads mentioned as having capacity are already full
- Pensioners etc need daytime access to spaces
- Cutting off roads will cause congestion elsewhere
- Need Park and Ride
- Need a northern bypass
- Hospital should fund its own parking improvements
- Need more protected cycle paths

Summary of Responses (hard copies posted to WSCC)

- Additional parking in residential streets will add to congestion, access problems and safety concerns.

- Need for care providers to park at particular locations
- Does not prioritise non-car modes such as buses and cycles
- Commuter parking will prevent residents from getting a space when they return home from work (even if 'managed') – make schemes just for residents
- Would need (interactive) Variable Message Signing
- Need to restrict city centre car parks but not close them
- Need to encourage Electric Vehicles
- Also have electric public transport to get people from gateway car parks to city centre
- Need to improve the servicing facilities for the commercial properties in the city centre
- Review bus timetables, routes and stops within the city
- Change Orchard St Car Park to a gateway one – WSCC to lead by example
- Whitehouse Farm southern access road needs to be clarified before any traffic plan devised for this part of the city
- Parking arrangements should not be significantly changed in the absence of an overall traffic policy.
- Should not allow more parking in the city centre at night time etc
- Major employers should work together to deliver better, cheaper and more frequent bus services from Selsey or Bognor to enable their employees to travel easily and cheaply to work.
- It would be more sensible to reduce the city centre car parks gradually every year and add to cycle lanes, bus services, and offer people alternatives to car parking (rather than shut straight away).
- Parking prices should be raised so that the bus becomes a realistic alternative and the profits from the car parking should be used for the bus
- Change to electric buses and re-allocation of road space for more planting of trees and hedges to reduce pollution.
- Freight consolidation centre should be built on one of the industrial estates near A27 to avoid bringing huge lorries and frequent vans into the city centre.
- The creation of a Greater Chichester Cycle Network. This is achieved by researching where people cycle now, and the creation of routes/infrastructure designed to encourage increased use through behaviour change.
- Addition of measures to encourage a sustainable so-called 'last mile' delivery infrastructure. That is to say using cargo bikes to deliver where appropriate
- The Audit's recommendations should not be 'cherry picked' – it works only if it is implemented as a whole.

LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS

STATUTORY

Sussex Police

Fire Brigade

Ambulance Service

Road Haulage

Freight Transport

DEFRA

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

Southdowns National Park

POLITICAL STAKEHOLDERS

MP for Chichester

County Councillors

District Councillors

City Councillors

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL OFFICERS

Economy

Strategic Planning

Better Communities

Traffic Management

Highways

Public Transport

Behavioural Change/Travel Plans

Chichester Voluntary Sector Relationship Officer

Diversity Staff Groups

Youth Services

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICERS

Community Forums

Car Parks

District Planning

Car Clubs/Sustainable Travel

Local Strategic Partnership

Taxis

Economic Development

Waste/Recycling

CHICHESTER PARKING FORUM

Federation of Small Businesses, Surrey and West Sussex

Federation of Small Businesses, Surrey and West Sussex

Chichester Chamber of Commerce and Industry

Chichester Business Improvement District

Chichester Access Group

Independent disabled representative

CHICHESTER STAKEHOLDERS

PA to the Bishop of Chichester

Chichester Scouts

Chichester Society

Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Chichester Transition

THIRD SECTOR

4sight

WEST SUSSEX ASSOCIATION FOR DISABLED PEOPLE

Disability Awareness UK

Carers Support Service Regis, Chichester & Rural

MAJOR LAND USES

St Richards Hospital

Chichester University

Chichester College

Chichester Festival Theatre

Chichester Rugby Club

Chichester Football Club

Westgate Leisure Centre

Goodwood

Chichester Canal Trust

Nuffield Hospital

CYCLING/WALKING ORGANISATIONS

Living Streets

Chichester Cycle Forum

ChiCycle

Sustrans Smarter Choices

20's Plenty

BUS & RAIL OPERATORS & INTEREST GROUPS

Stagecoach

Compass Travel

Emsworth & District Bus

Sussex Bus Company Heritage Travel

Sussex Coaches

Southern Railway

Network Rail

Sussex Community Rail Partnership

West Sussex Rail Users

PARISH COUNCILS

Lavant Parish Council

Fishbourne Parish Council

Oving Parish Council

Donnington Parish Council

Chichester City Council

Westhampnett Parish Council

RESIDENT ASSOCIATIONS

New Town RA

Parklands RA

Summersdale R A

East Broyle RA

Whyke RA

Pallants RA

Lime Close RA

Graylingwell Park RA

Richmond Park RA

Swanfied Park Residents Neighbourhood Group

Westgate RA

Chichester Community Development Trust

Roussillon Park RA

HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS

Chichester Greyfriars HA

Hyde Martlet

Anchor Trust

The Chichester Foyer

Hanover HA

Kelsey Housing Association Ltd

Stonham HA Ltd

Home Group

SCHOOLS

Chichester Nursery School, Children and Family Centre

Chichester Language College

Chichester Tuition Centre

The Prebendal School

Chantry House Nursery School

First Steps Childcare

Central CE Junior School

Central CE Junior School

Chichester Lancastrian Infants' School

Jessie Younghusband School

Kingsham Primary School

Kingsham Primary School

Parklands Community Primary School

Portfield Community Primary School

Rumboldswyke CE Infant School

St Richard's Catholic Primary School

Bishop Luffa CE School

Bishop Luffa CE School

Chichester High School For Boys

Chichester High School For Girls

Fordwater School

Fordwater School

St Anthony's School

St Anthony's School

DOCTORS SURGERIES

Lavant

Langley House Surgery

The Parklands Surgery

Cathedral Medical Group

Westgate Surgery

Chichester Holistic Centre

CHURCHES

Chichester Cathedral

Chi Baptist Church

Christ Church

St Paul's Church

Revelation Church

St Wilfrid's Church

St Richard's Church

St Pancras' Church

St George's Church

Chichester Quakers

Swanfield Chapel

Immanuel Church

Grace Church

Chichester Family Church

Youth Extreme

Jehovah's Witnesses

Christian Science Society

Muslim Community Centre