

South Chichester County Local Committee

1 November 2011 – At a meeting of the Committee held at 7.00pm at West Sussex County Council, County Hall, Chichester.

Present: Mr T.M.E. Dunn, Ms. Goldsmith, Mr M.N. Hall (Chairman), Mr Jones, Mr Montyn, Mr A.R.H. Smith and Mrs Whitehead (Vice Chairman).

Chairman's Welcome

58. The Chairman welcomed the public and representatives from the District, Town and Parish Councils to the meeting.

Declarations of Interest

59. Mr Pieter Montyn declared a personal interest in agenda item 7 on 20's Plenty for Chichester, as Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport. Mr Montyn declared that he would observe, but would not take part in the debate or vote on the recommendations.

Minutes

60. Resolved –
- (i) That the minutes of the special Adults' Services Grants meeting held on 5 July 2011 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.
 - (ii) That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2011 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

Urgent Matters

61. There were no urgent matters.

Part II Matters

62. There were no requests for any items to be brought into Part II.

Chairman's Update and Progress Statement

63. The Committee considered the Progress Statement (agenda item 6, copy appended to the signed minutes). The Chairman asked the Principal Community Highway Officer to provide Mr Jones with information on whether S106 contributions were available to fund a roundabout improvement in Church Road in Selsey and if so, consult Selsey Town Council on how the funding could be used.

20's Plenty for Chichester

64. The Committee considered a report (agenda item 7) from the Director of Communities and Infrastructure (copy appended to the signed minutes) regarding 20's Plenty for Chichester and the allocation of S106 monies. The Community Development and Big Society Manager introduced the report and explained that it had been brought to the Committee to consider following a '20's Plenty for Chichester' campaign which had demonstrated significant public support.

65. The Chairman invited Mrs Sharp, the '20's Plenty for Chichester' campaign organiser, and Dr Lacey to address the Committee. The following points were made:

- A 20pmh default speed limit for Chichester was a chance to make Chichester safer for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers and reduce accidents. It would also lead to an increase in walking and cycling, helping the population to be healthier,
- The campaign was an example of Big Society in action, which empowered local communities to bring about real social change,
- The campaign had been running for 18 months and had received overwhelming support. A petition of 3,091 signatures had been handed to the Chairman,
- Should the County Council implement a 20mph default speed limit, the campaign's preferred option was option 3 (as set out in paragraph 3.4 of the report),
- 20's plenty was working well in other towns and cities.

66. The Chairman invited the audience to raise any concerns or objections to a 20 mph default speed limit. The following issues were highlighted:

- There would be a high cost in implementing the speed limit with little payback. The money could be better spent on cycling routes for the whole of Chichester district,
- Little confidence that the speed limit would be enforced,
- The campaign was not universally popular and those who did not support the campaign should be encouraged to respond to the public consultation to ensure that all views were considered.

67. The Chairman invited comments from the Committee Members, who stated that:

- Mrs Sharp and the campaigners should be praised for their hard work. The large number of people who supported the campaign and were in attendance at the meeting demonstrated that this was an important issue for Chichester,
- Financial pressures must be considered,
- A formal consultation would allow the views of the community to be considered in more detail,
- Some areas of Chichester were not suitable for a default 20mph speed limit,
- The experience of Portsmouth, which did have a 20mph speed limit, should be considered. Speeds had been reduced to a degree, but there had not been a significant reduction in accidents. In Portsmouth there had also been some engineering measures to reduce speeds in addition to the road signs,
- The speed of vehicles should be based on the condition of the road at the time,
- Lower speed limits were successful in other areas of the world without engineering solutions.

68. In response to questions from the Committee, the Community Development and Big Society Manager confirmed that:

- Committee Members could be consulted on the consultation process to discuss cost, timescales and how it would be advertised,
- Causalities had reduced in Portsmouth following the introduction of the 20mph default speed limit,
- The community would need to embrace the speed limit so that it was self-enforcing,

- Sufficient S106 funding was available to implement a 20mph default speed limit in Chichester should it be approved,
- A formal consultation was required as part of the traffic regulation order (TRO) process. The consultation would ask the public whether they agree with a 20mph zone, and if so, which option is preferred. The consultation could be available for anyone to respond to on the County Council's website and could be sent to households. The public could also contact their local County Council Member,
- The results of the consultation would be brought back to the Committee to consider.

69. Resolved – The Committee approved the following recommendations (Mr Montyn abstained from the vote. Minute 59 refers):

1. A report is prepared for the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport recommending that a consultation on 20's Plenty for Chichester and options for its implementation be added to the Integrated Works Programme to be progressed as soon as possible.
2. Should the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport approve that the consultation be added to the Integrated Works Programme, £30,000 of S106 funding be allocated to fund the consultation.
3. Subject to recommendations 1 and 2 above, the three options to form the basis of consultation as set out in paragraphs 3.2 to 3.4.
4. Subject to recommendations 1, 2 and 3 above, should the consultation demonstrate significant local support, the Committee support, in principle, the allocation of further S106 funds to supplement contributions from key partners to progress the preferred option, subject to the proposal being identified as a priority in the South Chichester CLC Infrastructure Plan.

Infrastructure Planning

70. The Committee received a verbal update on the infrastructure planning process (agenda item 8) from the Principal Community Highway Officer. It was reported that the Committee Members were in the process of identifying priorities in their local area. At the next Committee meeting, the Members would discuss the range of priorities to be reviewed and considered for progression.

Petition

71. The Chairman reported that the County Council had been petitioned for a safe crossing or traffic calming measures on the Lagness Road/Vinnetrow Road roundabout at Runcton. The Chairman invited the lead petitioner, Mrs Taylor, to address the Committee. Mrs Taylor highlighted the following key issues:

- Traffic speeds were only reduced to 30mph at 20 yards before the roundabout, there were two lanes on Lagness Road approaching the roundabout, the kerbstones were too high in some places, pedestrian refuges were too small, there were poor sight lines and no pavements at some points,
- Traffic had increased in volume and speed making it very difficult for residents to cross the roads around the roundabout and reach amenities and the school,
- The petition called for a suitable safe crossing on Lagness Road (east) and Vinnetrow Road (by the Walnut Tree Pub), a longer 30mph limit before the roundabout and improved signage,

- The petitioners were aware of financial pressures the County Council faced and the need for a detailed review and consideration. However, this investment was required to protect the local children and community.

72. The local Member, Mr Smith, spoke in support of the petition and measures requested. Mr Smith had visited the site and met with local residents, and was concerned with poor visibility leading up to the roundabout and overgrown vegetation. He requested that improvements to white lines and signs be carried out as soon as possible.

73. The Principal Community Highway Officer reported that:

- Initial investigations had been carried out and it was evident that some improvements were required. Road markings could be altered to take approaches to the roundabout down to a single lane and this would allow for traffic islands to be widened. Signage could also be improved and kerbs could be lowered where appropriate,
- The suggestions for pedestrian crossings were welcomed and would be investigated,
- The Committee would be updated on progress at a future meeting.

74. The Chairman asked the Principal Community Highway Officer to investigate whether any S106 funding was available to fund the engineering measures and add it to the traffic regulation order list for South Chichester. The Chairman also requested that a written response be sent to Mrs Taylor to confirm the actions the County Council would take. On behalf of the Committee the Chairman thanked Mrs Taylor for attending the meeting, presenting the petition and suggesting solutions.

Talk with Us Open Forum

75. The Chairman invited questions from members of the public. Questions were asked to which responses were given, including those set out below:

- Representatives from Selsey Town Council highlighted concerns with fading road markings, pavement parking, road signage around Selsey and a pathway required by Pink Cottage Day Nursery. The Chairman asked the Principal Community Highway Officer to send a written response to the Town Council,
- A resident drew attention to a number of issues by the Graylingwell development. The Principal Community Highway Officer reported that discussions were continuing with the developers and a legal process was underway,
- A resident requested improvements to College Lane and the Chairman confirmed this was included in the draft Infrastructure Plan for South Chichester,
- A representative from Oving Parish Council highlighted local concerns regarding the lack of new infrastructure to mitigate future housing developments in the area, heavy traffic leading up to the Bognor Regis roundabout and sewage capacity. The Chairman asked the Principal Community Highway Officer to send a written response to the Parish Council,
- The reliance on S106 funding for infrastructure schemes was questioned and the Chairman reported that S106 contributions were dedicated to support infrastructure improvements,
- A representative from Chichester District Council asked whether information could be made available to Town and Parish Councils on the availability of

S106 funding. The Community Development and Big Society Manager confirmed that this information was held and could be shared with local Members and Town and Parish Councils. In addition, the infrastructure planning process would help the County Council to confirm local priorities and spend S106 funding,

- A resident asked the County Council to lobby Network Rail for improvements to the bridge at Fishbourne and crossing on Stockbridge Road. Mr Montyn reported that he would raise this with Network Rail in his capacity as Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport,
- A resident asked the Committee to consider whether there was too much emphasis on traffic regulation orders and highway improvements for Chichester city and not the surrounding areas. In response it was reported that the Infrastructure Plan would allow the Committee to consider all local issues and to decide on their top priorities.

Community Initiative Funding

76. The Committee considered a report (agenda item 11) by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services (copy appended to the signed minutes) concerning applications received under the Community and Parish Initiative Funding schemes.

77. Resolved –

- (i). The following applications and amounts to the Community Initiative Fund be approved:

1677/SC, Bracklesham Bay Community Association, £1,200, widening access to the Community Centre for local young people,

1678/SC, Chichester Canoe Club, £1,500, for the purchase of additional canoes to meet BCU requirements and widen access,

1680/SC, West Stoke Village Hall, £1,225, part-funding for car-park enlargement,

1682/SC, Fishbourne PreSchool Ltd, £1,500, towards renovations and improvements of pre-school facilities (£3,100 had been requested),

1685/SC, City Angels, £1,335, towards a late-night mobile coffee bar for Chichester City Centre, to assist in the management of the night-time economy,

1690/SC, Friends of Chartres, £900, towards fees and materials for two workshops for twinning competition winning school pupils.

- (ii) The following applications the Community Initiative Fund be declined:

1676/SC, West Wittering Croquet Club, £2,000, towards croquet lawn leveling and enhancements as the wider community would not benefit,

1679/SC, The Village Magazine, £2,358, to widen print-run for a two-month period, including increased distribution costs, as the application did not meet the criteria for funding,

1681/SC, Selsey Time Bank, £1,200, various itemised costs towards a cookery course as the application did not meet the criteria for funding,

1698/SC, East Wittering Village Hall & East Wittering PCC, £5,000, towards the installation of a disabled toilet at the Hall as the application did not meet the criteria for funding and other more suitable funding streams were available.

- (iii) The following application and amount to the Parish Initiative Fund be approved:

1688/SC/PIF North Mundham Parish Council, £711, to assist with the installation of concrete bike base stands.

- (iv) The Parish Initiative Fund be merged into the Community Initiative Fund.

Appointment of Local Authority Governors

78. The Committee considered a report (agenda items 12) by the Director of Learning (copy appended to the signed minutes).

79. Resolved – That Local Authority Governors be appointed as follows:

- (i) That the following appointments be approved:

Mrs H Denman to Chichester Nursery for a 4-year term
Miss C Rickard to Lavant Primary for a 4-year term
Mrs R Ottaway to Rumboldswyke CE Infant for a 4-year term
Mrs S Crowther to Lancastrian Infants for a 4-year term
Mr N Steward to Southbourne Infants for a 4-year term
Mr J Madinaveitia Southbourne Infants for a 4-year term

- (ii) That the following re-appointments be approved:

Miss VJ Henson to Birdham School for a 4-year term
Mr S Elliott to Chichester High for Girls a 4-year term

Date of Next Meeting

80. The Committee noted that its next scheduled meeting would take place on Tuesday 21 February 2012 at a venue to be confirmed.

The meeting ended at 8.50pm

CHAIRMAN