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# Introduction

Prefix This is still a draft document working document prepared in June 24, therefore certain aspects of the report will need to be updated in line with ongoing policy amendments and production of evidence.

## Background

* + 1. This document has been prepared by Chichester District Council (CDC) to support their emerging Local Plan process for 2021 to 2039.
    2. The document sets out the methodology for monitoring and managing and defined commitments to support the Local Plan programme for 2021 to 2039.
    3. This provisional Monitor and Manage (M&M) methodology has been prepared through close working with the West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and National Highways (NH).

## Monitor and Manage Status

* + 1. CDC had prepared a Transport Assessment (TA), dated May 24 to support their Regulation 19 submission which include a draft M&M document. In May 24, a revised TA was produced which superseded the previous document and this revised M&M document which has been prepared based on evidence included within the revised TA and on-going discussion with the key stakeholders WSCC and HE.
    2. The M&M process will be supported by a Transport Infrastructure Management Group (TIMG), who will facilitate delivery of the Local Plan with a particular focus on mitigating the impacts on transport infrastructure and services. The TIMG will be led by CDC, with WSCC and NH being key stakeholders. The TIMG is discussed further in Sections 3 and 4.

## Local Plan Proposals

* + 1. The number of units being considered between 2011 and 2039 period is a combination from the adopted Local Plan, those consented and those proposed in the plan period as per the table below.

Table 1.1: Number of Units (Southern Plan Area)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Plan Periods** | **Total Dwellings** |
| 2011- 2026 Committed | 6,029 |
| 2026-2039 Local Plan | 3,601  (TBC Reg 19) |
| Proposed Local Plan Build Out | 9,630 |

* + 1. The 9,630 dwellings will be implemented over an 18-year period which equates to an average build out of 575 dwellings per year (535 in the southern plan area).
    2. In addition to the number of residential dwellings the Local Plan includes an allowance for increased provision of employment.
    3. However, the Monitor and Manage approach managed through TIMG has sufficient flexibility to allow amendments to the emerging local plan over its period and beyond, so as to allow optimum use of the available funding and its focused use.

## CDC LP Vision and Objectives

* + 1. The Vision describes the sort of place that the Chichester plan area aspires to be by 2039. An overarching principle of the Local Plan is to support sustainable development and the local community in the context of a climate emergency. The council will enable the delivery of infrastructure, jobs, accessible local services and housing for future generations while protecting, conserving and enhancing the historic and natural environment.
    2. The Local Plan aims to address the issues facing the plan area to deliver the spatial vision for the plan area by 2039, ensuring that Chichester develops in the most sustainable way possible. The Plan also contributes to the delivery of the Vision, Objectives and Spatial Priorities for the wider Coastal West Sussex and Greater Brighton Area in the Local Strategic Statement (LSS2) and the emerging LSS3. In order to achieve this, a number of objectives have been identified.
* Objective 1: Climate Change
* Objective 2: Natural Environment
* Objective 3: Housing
* Objective 4: Employment and Economy
* Objective 5: Health and Well-being
* Objective 6: Design and Heritage
* Objective 7: Strategic Infrastructure

## CDC Policies

* + 1. The objectives are supported by a range of policies which cover the topic leads defined below
* Spatial Strategy
* Climate Change and the Natural Environment
* Housing Policies:
* Placemaking, Health and Wellbeing Policies:
* Employment and the Economy Policies:
* Transport and Accessibility Policies:
* Infrastructure Policy:
* Strategic and Area Based Policies
  + 1. Although the key polices linked to the M&M process lie within the “Transport and Accessibility Policies”, the issues and mitigation measures will also support multiple policies across all the topic leads as they will promote and benefit from the Local Plan development build out promoted by the supported mitigation within the Infrastructure Development Plan.

## Neighbouring’ Authorities

* + 1. Inevitably the neighbouring planning and highway authorities will have similar polices that will overlap with those defined by CDC, which may also influence development build out and mitigation opportunities cross boundary. These bodies are included within the M&M process.

## Key Issues

* + 1. The key transport related issues across the whole of the District area which need to be considered in development of a transport strategy to support the Local Plan as per below:
* Schemes to target and reduce high car dependency;
* Congestion on the A27 and A259 during peak periods (not limited to AM and PM peak hours);
* Congestion on A285 Westhampnett Road and A286 Chichester Ring Road which can interact with the operation of the A27;
* Limited routes to the Manhood Peninsula;
* Further tourist congestion during peak summer periods;
* Rat-running on residential and rural routes to avoid congestion on the A27;
* Level crossing delays at Southgate, Basin Road, Whyke Road, Stein Rd and others;
* Traffic related air quality management areas within the District in Chichester and Midhurst;
* Bus journeys times are slow at peak times due to congestion;
* Rail services to Brighton and the Solent cities can be slow and some trains lack modern facilities;
* Limited opportunities to use active travel modes from Manhood Peninsula and Midhurst;
* Community severance caused by A27 and the West Coastway; and
* Gaps in the cycle network.

# CDC Local Plan

## Strategic Objectives

* + 1. In order to ensure delivery of transport mitigation required to support the Local Plan, the Council will work closely with National Highways, West Sussex County Council Highways and relevant landowners. Where appropriate, to facilitate the delivery of necessary highway and sustainable transport mitigation, the council in partnership with National Highways and WSCC, will consider the use of compulsory powers.
    2. Increasing the capacity of the road network is key to supporting growth in the Local Plan. However, there is also a need to reduce demand for road transport to achieve net zero in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 as highlighted in the council’s Climate Emergency Action Plan and Strategic Objective 1. In aiming to achieve the ambitions of the action plan, all development is expected to demonstrate how it will support four key objectives to create an integrated transport network which will alleviate pressure on the road network, improve highway safety, encourage sustainable travel behaviours and help reduce transport related impact on air quality by:
    - Avoiding or reducing the need to travel by car;
    - Enabling access to sustainable means of travel, including public transport, walking and cycling;
    - Managing travel demand; and
    - Mitigating the impacts of travel by car.
    1. These four objectives are central to the aims of Policies T1 and T2, which set out the strategic transport requirements for the Local Plan and more detailed development management criteria which will be applied when considering the transport impacts of proposals for new development.

## Key Policy

* + 1. This document sets out a provisional range of supporting measures to support the Local Plan process to achieve a build out rate of 575 dwellings per year (535 Southern Plan Area) and manage the impact of the additional development across the local and strategic network.
    2. The Monitor and Manage approach is defined in CDC’s submission Local Plan document under as set out below.

|  |
| --- |
| Policy T1: Transport Infrastructure Policy Extract |
| Integrated transport measures will be developed to mitigate the impact of planned development on the highways network, improve highway safety and air quality, promote more sustainable travel patterns and encourage increased use of sustainable modes of travel, such as public transport, cycling and walking.  The council will work with National Highways, West Sussex County Council, other transport and service providers (including through the Transport and Infrastructure Management Group)and developers to provide a better integrated transport network and to improve accessibility to key services and facilities. All development is expected to demonstrate how it will support four key objectives to create an integrated transport network which will alleviate pressure on the road network, improve highway safety, encourage sustainable travel behaviours and help improve air quality, by:   * Avoiding or minimisingthe need to travel by car; * Enabling access to sustainable means of travel, including public transport, walking and cycling; * Managing travel demand; and * Mitigating the impacts of travel by car. |

* + 1. In addition to Policy T1, the key policies in the submission Local Plan which the M&M will need to consider are:
* Policy T2: Transport and Development (contribute to a safe, sustainable and accessible transport networks through requirements defined in T2);
* Policy T3: Active Travel (Promote and deliver safe, accessible sustainable transport schemes through requirements defined in T3); and
* Site allocation policies where relevant
  + 1. In addition to the transport policies, the Policy I1 Infrastructure Provision, will support the delivery of the infrastructure on and off-site required by developers to support their development.
    2. In addition to the CDC Local Plan policies, the TIMG will need to consider, West Sussex County Council (WSCC), National Highways (NH), Hampshire County Council (HCC), Havant and Arun Borough/District Council (HBC/ADC) and South Downs National Park (SDNP) polices if they overlap with CDC’s or influence the M&M process development.
    3. The M&M process will manage a combination of possible sustainable, safety and capacity improvements across the strategic and local transport networks. The measures will include enhanced walking, cycling, and public transport commitments which seek to provide alternatives to the private car first and foremost and address safety and/or capacity issues. Highway capacity schemes may also need to be considered where sustainable transport will not mitigate all severe impacts. The phasing of any such interventions will be considered within a defined time period. The actual schemes to be implemented and timing of works will be subject to a monitoring process that will define the actual demand on the network and a management process that will identify and prioritise the nature and location of supporting measures.
    4. The measures in this methodology are not fixed, but flexible and will be amended as the Local Plan period progresses and policy, funding, technical changes may promote amendments or new measures to be considered. Updates to the methodology will be progressed via the TIMG process.

## Costs and Funding Requirements

* + 1. The 2016 Planning Obligations & Affordable Housing SPD includes a system for securing contributions per dwelling towards the future improvement schemes for the A27 corridor. Historically this was managed by National Highways, however they have confirmed in September 2023 that they will relinquish this role and the responsibility for collecting this contribution will fall to CDC for all un-determined planning applications.
    2. The submission Local Plan is at an advanced stage and will include a new mechanism for securing contributions to mitigate the A27 which will be linked to the M&M approach. In the interim, the Council is not able to wait for the Local Plan 2021 -2039 to be adopted before reviewing the approach to collecting development contributions for A27 mitigation. Therefore, as the Local Plan 2021 -2039 has not yet been adopted, the interim SPD (if adopted) seeks to provide updated guidance on the application of the policies within the adopted Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 and will be updated in line with the submission Local Plan following examination and in parallel to this approach.
    3. The current plan is reliant on the 2016 Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD per dwelling towards future scheme improvements for the A27 Corridor.
    4. The new SPD (subject to adoption) is based on the premise of the previous methodology with a cost per unit, however the methodology for determining this cost has been amended as defined in the revised SPD.
    5. The SPD has to address two points, 1, that the ability of new development to fund transport infrastructure is limited and 2, funding from development will be accrued over time.
    6. The new SPD would provisionally seek to recoup funds within the Local Plan period. The new Local Plan process may allow this allowance to be increased, but only for the additional 3601 dwellings proposed in the emerging Local Plan. In addition to this, Arun District Council have also been securing funds for possible mitigation schemes on the A27 linked to Bognor and Whyke Junctions which will need to be considered going forward through the TIMG.
    7. The funding and delivery of mitigation will be multifaceted and may come from other various sources and over various timetables, which will influence delivery of any mitigation.
    8. In addition to the “A27 Contribution” there are other funds that may be forth coming which could be used to promote wider mitigation, such as CIL, direct developer contributions to schemes, funding sources via WSCC and contributions from neighbouring councils whose developments may have an impact on the A27 and the wider Chichester area. These are defined in part within the updated Infrastructure Development Plan which will support the emerging Local Plan and may also be subject to discussion and agreement through the TIMG.
    9. A further source of funding may be via Government funds, NH direct activity and local authority led funding bids.
    10. It is recognised that there are existing congestion and safety issues on the A27 and not all the forecast growth can be attributed to the Local Plan. The level of existing congestion means Monitor and Manage - Provisional Methodology Chichester Local Plan that the forecasted impacts of Local Plan development and scale of infrastructure required to make the network not severely worse off are greater than they would be if the without-plan scenario was not already so congested.
    11. In addition, it is noted that the quantum of development in the CDC Local Plan is considered to be of a level that it is not solely responsible for the level of infrastructure required on the A27 corridor to address forecasted congestion and delays, given the congestion already present on the highway network prior to the addition of the planned development. National Highways have confirmed that background growth should be addressed through the “Roads Investment Strategy” (RIS).
    12. Policy’s T1 and T2 seeks the opportunities to secure funding to implement this package of improvements district wide and with a direct link to the A27. This will be maximised by working proactively with local Councils including West Sussex County Council, Arun District Council and government agencies including National Highways and Homes England, other public sector organisations and private investors. This approach will seek to work with all these parties in line with the key objectives of the T1 policy as per below, which will overlap with similar objectives for each of those that make up TIMG.
    - Avoiding or reducing the need to travel by car;
    - Enabling access to sustainable means of travel, including public transport, walking and cycling;
    - Managing travel demand; and
    - Mitigating the impacts of travel by car.
    1. Therefore, in Section 6 of this document, which reviews the provisional evidence which includes projects and schemes has been reviewed under 3 primary headings as per below, which seek to meet the objectives.

Sustainable and Active Travel

Safety and Capacity

Policy Driven

* + 1. To ensure the financial contribution applied to development is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind the council has developed an ‘Apportionment and Averaging Factor’, to be applied to the target contribution level. The Apportionment and Averaging Factor is applied at ward level and adjusts the level of required contribution on the basis of the car ownership by ward (relative to number of bedrooms) and how many of those trips are likely to impact the A27 Chichester Bypass (using an analysis of the current transport model), whilst still maximising the level of contribution required.
    2. The Apportionment and Averaging Factors directly relate to the anticipated impact that development within each Sector (ward) will have on the A27, taking into account dwelling size. The resulting contribution levels seek to balance the need to secure sufficient funding to ensure that the impact of development in the plan can be mitigated as far as possible, with the need to ensure that development as a whole remains financially viable.

**Policy as per March 24 (TBC)**

|  |
| --- |
| **A27 Mitigation contributions (applied to the south of the plan area only)** |
| Strategic development locations carried forward from 2015 Local Plan (without planning permission as at April 2024)   * West of Chichester SDL – Phase 2 = £1,803 per dwelling * Tangmere SDL = £5,914 per dwelling   All other housing development where there is a net increase in dwelling numbers~~,~~ will be required to make a financial contribution on the basis of the formula below, to be applied at the time of granting any permission:  Terminology:   * Charging Sector (Ward) – See Map 8.1 above. * Apportionment and Averaging Factor – See Table 8.1 above. * Target Contribution Level - £8,000  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Identify Charging Sector (ward) and housing mix |  | Multiply the Apportionment and Averaging Factor by the Target Contribution Level |  | Resultant contribution per dwelling (net increase) | |

* + 1. In addition to this, National Highways have secured funds for possible mitigation schemes on the A27 linked to Bognor and Whyke Junctions from developments within Arun District Council which will need to be considered going forward through the TIMG.
    2. The funding and delivery of mitigation will be multifaceted and may come from other various sources and over various timetables, which will influence delivery of any mitigation.
    3. In addition to the “A27 Contribution” there are other funds that may be forthcoming which could be used to promote wider mitigation, such as CIL, funding sources via WSCC, grants and contributions from neighbouring councils whose developments may have an impact on the A27 and the wider Chichester area. These are defined in part within the updated Infrastructure Development Plan which will support the submission Local Plan and may also be subject to consideration through the TIMG. TIMG will need to adhere to the established constitutional requirements with the relevant bodies as to the use of secured contributions.
    4. The Community Infrastructure Levy may also be used to contribute towards the cost of wider improvements to the local transport network. New development may also be required to deliver or contribute towards specific transport improvements directly related to the development.

## Provisional Budgets

* + 1. In Appendix D is a provisional programme, which includes a high-level estimate of current and future possible funding and the timeline it will be accrued over the plan period. A further key task of the TIMG will be to coordinate all funding streams and manage the secured contributions across all funding schemes.

# Monitor and Manage Management – TIMG

## Traffic and Infrastructure Management Group

* + 1. To seek opportunities and facilitate securing relevant funding and to help deliver the monitor and manage process, it is proposed to set up the Traffic and Infrastructure Management Group (TIMG). The creation of the TIMG will be supported by a Terms of Reference (see **Appendix A**) which defines the overall roles and responsibilities of the partners involved.
    2. The TIMG will have the following overall purpose.
       1. To govern the M&M Strategy e.g., approve and oversee the types of data, funding of data collection, timelines of data collection and verification of data and
       2. To make/approve M&M decisions e.g. if the data identifies issues the TIMG make the decisions on how to manage/control those issues.
    3. The TIMG will be involved in infrastructure planning and delivery with the delivery bodies. The TIMG will be made up of multiple organisations who will have differing roles in the group.
    4. This document sets out a 5 tiers approach as defined below.

Table 3.1: TIMG – Group

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tier** |  | **Attendees** | **Possible Meeting Timeline** |
| 1 | Core Group | * CDC * WSCC * National Highways * Arun District Council | Monthly/Bimonthly |
| 2 | Neighbouring Bodies | * Havant District Council * Hampshire County Council * South Downs National Park | Quarterly |
| 3 | Key Stakeholders | Bus Operators  Rail Operators | Quarterly |
| 4 | Appointed Consultants | Some of the parties may seek to appoint a consultant to support their role on the TIMG | As required |
| 5 | Others | Focus Groups, Developers, Landowners | As required |

* + 1. The core TIMG will be set up with representatives from CDC, WSCC, ADC and National Highways, this will be led by technical and policy officers from each organisation with CDC acting as Chair. It is recognised that these officers may not have authority to make decisions on behalf of their relevant bodies, therefore it is anticipated that recommendations from TIMG will need to be reported back and taken forward through the decision-making structures of their respective organisations and then reported back to TIMG.
    2. Although the premise of the group is to promote sustainable and safe transport across the plan area, it is clear that the mix of officers should not solely be related to transport and highways but should include planning and environmental officers to obtain an all-round understanding of the pressures across the plan area and the local, regional and national policies.
    3. The M&M strategy can be summarised within two objectives as set out below.

1) to prevent unacceptable safety impacts and

2) to minimize the severity of other impacts.

* + 1. The TIMG are a recommending body, however it should not be limited if insufficient funding is not available where the traffic related impacts of a development are forecast to give rise to unacceptable road safety impacts to provide recommendations.
    2. The TIMG will need to work in parallel within the planning system in circumstances where unacceptable impacts cannot be addressed, supported by planning policy, until adequate measures are in place which satisfactorily address the unacceptable impacts.

# TIMG - Provisional Objectives

## Objectives

* + 1. Within Policy T1 of the CDC submission Local Plan, the following objectives are defined in relation to the TIMG, to which all parties, including applicants, are expected to support.

1. Ensuring that new development is well located and designed to avoid or minimise the need for travel, encourages the use of sustainable modes of travel as an alternative to the private car and provides or contributes towards new or improved transport infrastructure;
2. Working with relevant providers to improve accessibility to key services and facilities and to ensure that new facilities are easily accessible by sustainable modes of travel;
3. Targeting investment to provide local sustainable travel options as an alternative to the car, focusing on the delivery of improved integrated bus and/or train services, and improved pedestrian and cycling networks, including the public rights of way network, based on the routes and projects identified in the Local Transport Plan, Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan;
4. Planning to achieve the timely delivery of transport infrastructure on the A27 and elsewhere on the network, needed to support new housing, employment and other development identified in this plan;
5. Phasing the delivery of new development to align with the provision of new transport infrastructure and the outcomes of monitoring travel demand. It may also be necessary to proactively phase development to take into account the monitoring and effectiveness of travel plans to encourage sustainable travel behaviour;
6. Using demand management measures, such as travel plans, to manage travel demand and minimise the need for new or improved transport infrastructure as part of the monitor and manage process; and
7. Delivering a coordinated package of infrastructure and other measures including sustainable transport improvements and junction improvements on the A27 Bypass, within the city and elsewhere, as identified through the monitor and manage process. These will increase modal choice, reducing the need to travel by car, result in freeing/creating capacity on both strategic and local roads, improve safety and air quality, and improve access to Chichester city from surrounding areas.
   * 1. These objectives are wide ranging and cannot be fully defined in terms of feasibility, programme or financial viability at this time, however they are provided as a means of setting out a structure for the TIMG to consider and use as a template when considering studies, measures or schemes, as they emerge and evolve.
     2. Therefore, TIMG initially may seek to prepare a ranked or priority list that would be helpful to shape the approach of the transport modelling and evidence gathering process to support the future studies and schemes, with a focus on an identification of a coordinated package of A27 improvements and consideration of possible phased implementation.
     3. The TIMG will make recommendations concerning transport related mitigation / contributions which will be utilised to consider the implementation of strategic and local schemes, in order to oversee delivery of necessary and appropriate measures to mitigate the effects of the Local Plan.
     4. During the startup period for the TIMG, the initial workshops in April/May 24 will include a mix from each of the tiers as seen appropriate. This group will meet monthly/bimonthly for the initial 12 months, while the group is being organised and the initial Year One tasks as defined later in this document are agreed and implemented.
     5. The provisional programme is based on a 5-year cycle, to run in parallel to the requirements for local plan reviews, which will allow both short- and long-term consideration of studies, schemes and measures.

# M&M Approach

## Introduction

* + 1. The M&M approach will be evidence-led and support delivery of the CDC Local Plan, however given the multitude of agencies which will be involved both within the plan area and in its neighbouring authorities, it will need to consider the wider regional impact of development and the required mitigation to support these processes.
    2. The requirements for the M&M strategy are two-fold as follows:
* Development of a monitoring process which can be used going forward to inform discussions around the mitigation requirements resulting from impacts of developments as they come forward. This will require an understanding of the transport situation and conditions (sustainable travel and highway) in the CDC pan area and specific impacts from individual development sites.
* Update of the tools to be used to assist with providing an understanding of the functioning of the transport network and the impacts of potential mitigation measures and then make recommendations to the relevant bodies for further assessment or implementation as appropriate.
  + 1. The M&M approach will take evidence about the impacts of development from a range of sources. To date this process has been supported by a regional strategic highway model which has provided district/regional wide high-level outputs. Following the adoption of the new Local Plan, the model requires replacing with a new version to support the delivery of the Local Plan. the new model will enable area-wide and more localised impacts of development and mitigation measures to be assessed both within the CDC plan area and in neighbouring authorities. To assess schemes in detail other information and transport planning tools will be required to deliver the approach and assess specific modal changes and localised impacts. The new strategic model will be needed alongside other information (e.g. survey data) and transport planning tools (e.g. junction or microsimulation models) to develop mitigation measures and inform investment decisions, which are provisionally set out later in this report.
    2. The modelling process to date utilised industry standard practice, consider neighbouring Local Plan allocations, background growth, current CDC commitments and the forecast demand for Local the Plan period up to the Reg 19 submission.
    3. However, it is recognised that the assessment in terms of forecast level of future trips is uncertain. The purpose of the new model and other localised assessment will be to consider and manage uncertainty about future trends and allow sensitivity assessments as policy’s/trend forecasts such as Circular 01/2022 and Tempro 8 are evolved coupled with a re-focus on sustainable transport and management of the network.
    4. The current modelling approach was standard practice, however changes in policy, local, regional, national and global to promote reduction in carbon emissions and push towards active net zero in line with the 2030/2050 national and global deadlines. These changes supported CDC’s declaration of a climate emergency in 2019 and the need to consult on the current second climate emergency action plan.
    5. Therefore, the TIMG will assist the CDC Local Plan to utilise a monitor and manage methodology to promote the appropriate mitigation (with emphasis on sustainable transport and decarbonisation) within the funding limits and not follow a predict and provide methodology given the fluctuations between the historical and new forecast data. Notwithstanding this, the mitigation strategy will need to recognise that road safety needs to be maintained and focus on the delivery of safety enhancements and to ensure severe cumulative impacts do not result from the Local Plan development.

## Monitoring Process

* + 1. A monitoring process will be agreed and set up at an early stage. The objective of the monitoring will be to provide a regular picture on the performance of the transport network (Highway, PT and Active Travel) as development comes forward. This will also be informed by data from developers, in terms of travel plan monitoring. The monitoring process will allow the TIMG to assess the direct impact of development over background growth and impacts from development and schemes outside of the council boundary.
    2. TIMG will be required to agree the specification for the monitoring data and how it is utilised to define and assess forecast demands on the network and how to manage future conditions.
    3. This output will show how successful measures implemented are in terms of mitigated impacts from development and will inform ongoing discussions around future mitigation requirements, which will be supported by the modelling detailed below.
    4. TIMG will publish a transport monitoring report every six months setting out any progress on transport infrastructure delivery and providing an update and the success of activities and initiatives. The report will include the monitoring findings of multi modal data collected as part of the monitoring regime.
    5. A bi or annual transport monitor and manage plan shall be prepared that covers both development site specific monitoring, as well as monitoring on the local highway and strategic road network in the south of the district. Wider data will also be obtained for active travel and public transport modes. At each TIMG meeting a progress update on ongoing studies etc will be given.
    6. Data collection methodology for the annual transport monitor and manage plan shall be agreed with the Local Highway Authority and National Highways. The principles set out below shall be engaged:
* Multi modal counts to understand the effects of sustainable transport measures from specific development sites (supported by site specific travel plan monitoring).
* Data collection and collation on key links and junctions within the network. This will utilise existing data sources such as WSCC permanent count sites and National Highways traffic counts on the A27 as far as possible, supplemented by new data collection, for example to fill gaps in a cordon.
  + 1. To make best use of ongoing monitoring of all travel, it would be appropriate to form as set of fixed monitoring locations which represent cordons or screen lines around the city and in key locations across the District. These survey sites would not only show how transport usage has changed at specific points, but also show if overall usage has changed across the entire screen line. This will, for example, enable the analysis to show whether overall traffic flows are reduced, or rate of growth reduced as a result of implementation of sustainable travel measures, or whether traffic is increasing on the county highway network, as a result of congestion remaining at the A27 junctions.
    2. As part of the monitoring exercise, there will be a requirement to assess the housing delivery situation relation to issues such as build out rats and the location of new development. progress of the Local Plan build out rate, their location, and their location as this may also influence.

## Informing the Monitoring Process

* + 1. As defined the traffic model will be central to assessing transport strategy options and phasing to address residual traffic congestion effects, however it is only part of the process and further consideration by TIMG will be required in terms of the data collection which will not only be used to support the new model, but can be used in multiple tools and assessment methodology’s needs to be given to the following:
* Collating and verifying the baseline data e.g., traffic volume, traffic queue length, crash data as a baseline to measure the ongoing monitoring data against
* Specifying and collecting relevant Monitoring Data e.g., frequency of data collection and reporting
* Identifying when decisions will be made to manage/control traffic e.g., increasing capacity, managing peak hour queues.
* Re-basing the transport evidence base including sustainable mode shares.
* Assessing the monitoring Data to forecast future transport conditions and needs.
* Identifying critical impacts.

## Staged Approach

* + 1. In Section 7 is a defined provisional programme for the TIMG, which sets out a possible work stream for data gathering and preparing a new set of tools as defined in this section. However, while those tools and assessments are being developed or carried out which is likely to require a year, the TIMG will require a working platform to seek to begin assessment of schemes prior to these being available.
    2. Therefore, there is a proposal for a short-term update of the current model using some additional 2023/24 traffic counts to provide additional verification of possible impact on local and regional roads, this is further set out in Section 7 and Appendix B.

## Strategic Model Update

* + 1. There is a requirement for the M&M process to have an evidence base and as stated above it is noted that the current model is dated. Therefore, a key task for the TIMG is to agree and produce an updated base year validated model utilising more up to date data. Below is a provisional methodology, process and deliverables for the provision of the new strategic model, which will need to be agreed and actioned by the TIMG.

1. Undertake Model scoping exercise – what existing models are available that could inform (CATM and/or Southeast Regional Model likely to be the starting point for the new model – for latter will need to understand status and age of model through discussions with National Highways). Geographical Scope. Model functionality e.g. Highway + Demand Model likely to be required as a minimum (PT assignment model – unlikely for Local Plan purposes). ***Deliverable: Model Scoping Note***
2. Undertake data collation and collection exercise – utilising as much existing data as possible (including recent traffic counts). Identify new MCC and ATC counts required for calibration and validation of the model. Mobile Network data (MND) for initial OD matrices. Journey Time data – should be able to obtain INRIX data through WSCC. ***Deliverable: Model Data Report***
3. Model Network Update – Audit existing model(s) and update network using latest guidance and best practice for coding and adding any additional detail where necessary.
4. Base year matrix development – checks and manipulation of MND to create initial OD matrices.
5. Base year model calibration and validation – undertake processes to validate model to latest Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG). ***Deliverable: Local Model Validation Report***
6. Produce Reference Case Forecasts for agreed year(s) – obtain planning data related to committed and future developments for CDC plan area and neighbouring authorities (Arun and Havant as a minimum). Obtain future highway schemes from WSCC. Update uncertainty log. Update forecast matrix development process with new information and NTEM 8.1 data (or latest data at time of development) where applicable. Checks of model output. ***Deliverable: Reference Case Model Development Report.***
7. Update Local Plan scenarios based on latest information from CDC.
   * 1. As stated, this modelling review/generation will not be in isolation and will require liaison with the neighbouring authorities, who are part of the wider TIMG, to verify their methodology for updating their model-based evidence,
     2. The methodology sets out the foundation required to generate the basic model; however, this process will also allow for collection of data from additional sources to enhance the model as per the list below which is not definitive, but begins to highlight other data sources which may be utilised, which can be obtained from transport authorities and other bodies

* monitoring information from developments
* operational data (e.g. traffic, delay)
* safety data (collision), casualties etc) from transport authorities and providers to also be used to inform the work of TIMG.

## Additional Modelling

* + 1. Through the process of producing the submission Local Plan, the discussions between CDC, WSCC and NH, have agreed that there will need to be a suite of tools utilised to assess the impact of Local Plan forecasts. The strategic model provides a high-level regional assessment. The foundation for the Local Plan assessment will be around sustainable travel and therefore a wider suite of transport planning tools is required which can be utilised to also assess the localised impact of the schemes/measures etc across all modes.
    2. These will need to be discussed in detail within the TIMG as these may be the responsibility of WSCC, NH or other authorities rather than CDC, but will be required to input into the M&M process.

1. A micro simulation model of the A27 Corridor
2. Local Junction models
3. Sustainable Transport Models or tools
   * 1. The early generation of the micro simulation and local junction models will allow for the development of a coordinated package of localised and scalable junction improvements to be assessed.

## Emerging Criteria for Project/Study/Scheme Assessment

* + 1. The modelling options defined above, will highlight the impact of development-related trips and define possible mitigation requirements across the strategic highway and local road network. The following is a provisional list of defining criteria for assessing impact from proposed developments and mitigation schemes:
* Development-related trips (multi-modal)
* Safety
* Junction capacity
* Queuing and potential impacts on safety
* Delay time (including public transport)
* Journey times (including public transport)
* Impacts on Active Travel Users
  + 1. This list is flexible and will be subject to the mitigation scheme and nature of uses as to the impact and benefit. However, it sets a provisional list for TIMG to define which criteria is impacted or exceeded. This would allow the TIMG to prioritise schemes in relation to the objectives set out in the relevant Local Plan policies. This process will be evolved by TIMG.
    2. The TIMG will be required to define a full set of criteria for assessing mitigation proposals. This may include using established criteria used by the WSCC, NH and other bodies such as DFT. It may be linked to securing funding, business cases and other opportunities. The criteria will need to consider a ranking and weighting exercise to inform a priority of the criteria, inform the specification of the Monitoring Data to be collected.
    3. As set out in Section 1.4 and 1.5, the criteria assessment process is not limited to those items defined above, which are inevitably transport dominated based on the models utilised to assess the schemes. The schemes will need to be assessed against other criteria summarised below.
* Environmental
* Financial
* Social
* Climate and Carbon Based
* Economic

# TIMG - Provisional Evidence

## Background

* + 1. The TIMG will be formally defined in 2024 and will utilise the transport evidence from the Transport Assessment which supports the submission Local Plan and replaces the January 2023 evidence base as a starting point to understand the network operations at a high level and define the future content and structure of the M&M process.
    2. The revised TA will also consider additional studies carried out to support the CDC Local Plan process since the Reg 19 consultation. CDC, WSCC and National Highways have been meeting regularly to discuss the current evidence and possible additional evidence that may be required as set out below.
  + In September 2023, Stantec completed the Fishbourne Roundabout/Terminus Road, Concept Design Report (Working Document) which was requested by WSCC to assess the buildability of the Fishbourne/Terminus Road possible improvement scheme including additional bus priority options.
  + In October 23, Stantec issued the A27 Sustainable Transport Scheme Assessment which defined and assess at high level for sustainable & Active Travel schemes for the CDC area proposal by WSCC.
  + CDC, WSCC and National Highways agreed a set of new traffic surveys to validate the current modelling work and provide a set of post covid data for the A27 corridor. These were carried out in November 2023 and have been assessed to provide additional evidence for the Local Plan process and for the TIMG to review and consider against future mitigation schemes and their possible benefits. The surveys included, full turning counts, journey time and queue surveys.
  + The emerging SPD which includes the higher cost per unit is part of the ongoing discussions between the parties. A key revision is that CDC will now be responsible for collecting the A27 related contributions and current secured funds.
    1. The November 23 surveys were focused on the A27 corridor and provided recent data for comparison purposes, therefore as defined in the 5.4 Staged Approach there is a requirement for additional more localised surveys in the City and possible queue verification to allow a wider assessment of any amendments to the A27 corridor. These surveys are being considered for June 24 to support the working platform prior to the new model being complete.
    2. As shown by the sustainable transport report, the M&M approach is moving the focus to meet the plans vision and strategic objectives, which through the evidence base will change significantly the historical approach towards the A27 and how future transport impacts are judged against the focus on sustainability and environmental policy’s which will influence the future criteria for assessment.

## Local Plan Supporting Measures

* + 1. To support the TIMG, this document has sought to collate the possible mitigation schemes that at the time of publication could be considered as individual or a combined schemes to support the submission CDC Local Plan. For the purpose of this document, the schemes have been set out in 3 categories as defined below.

Sustainable and Active Travel – directly linked to Walking/Cycling and Public Transport – generally on the local highway network.

Safety and Capacity – general junction improvements which are considered to provide safety improvements and possible capacity benefits for wider road users, these schemes can include sustainable and active travel measures. These schemes are on both the local and strategic highway network.

Policy Driven – possible policy led schemes that could influence location of development or be linked to wider policy led opportunities to manage car usage (parking control, park and ride etc.).

* + 1. The measures and mitigation options discussed in this section are provided based on the evidence of the work todate, which have highlighted possible locations for mitigation and improvement. The measures discussed and defined are provided as possible opportunities to meet the mitigation requirements or provide additional benefit for all users. The schemes and designs are not finalised, the need and level of mitigation will be defined within the new modelling work.

## Sustainable and Active Travel Schemes

* + 1. WSCC provided a list of 16 Sustainable Transport Schemes to CDC, following which in October 2023, Stantec completed the Sustainable Transport Schemes Assessment Report which reviewed these schemes and sought to define those that may be viable moving forward and as such the list was reduced to nine after researching the information that was available. This does not preclude the other schemes from being considered by Officers or any other scheme which may come forward in future.

Table 6.1: WSCC Sustainability Schemes (2024)

| **S/N** | **NAME** | **DESCRIPTION** | **Provisional Budget**  **Costs (WSCC)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Active Travel** |  |  |
| 1 | Graylingwell Cycle Route | Graylingwell cycle route 2 along north side of Westhampnett Road (opp St James' Road to connect with existing footpath rear of Story Road) | £900,000 |
| 2 | Oaklands Way Toucan Crossing | Toucan crossing on Oaklands Way | £700,000 |
| 3 | Westgate Cycle Route (K) | Westgate and Fishbourne Road East - Proposed Active Travel Improvements | £1,600,000 |
| 4 | St. Paul's Cycle Route (L) | St. Paul's Cycle Route | £1,600,000 |
| 5 | Parklands Cycle Route (T) | Parklands Cycle Route | £1,100,000 |
| 6 | Chichester-Selsey Cycle Route | Chichester-Selsey Cycle Route | £12,200,000 |
| 7 | Oaklands Way Cycle Route | Oaklands Way roundabout and provision of cycle way on northern side Of Oaklands Way from Northgate gyratory in the west to College Lane in the east. | £2,600,000 |
| 8 | Hunston Road Cycle Route | Hunston Road Cycle Scheme; shared use pedestrian/cycle path to link footbridge at Whyke Road roundabout with south of A27. | £1,800,000 |
|  | Chichester to Emsworth Cycle |  | £5,000,000 |
|  | **Multi-modal** |  |  |
| 1 | A285 Chichester – Tangmere Sustainable Transport Corridor | Chichester – Tangmere Cycle route | £6,600,000 |
| 2 | City Centre to Portfield (via Oving Rd) Sustainable Transport Corridor | Sustainable Transport Corridor - City Centre to Portfield and improvements to sustainable transport facilities on Oving Road corridor. | £3,500,000 |
| 3 | Northgate Gyratory Improvement | Northgate / A286 Junction Improvement | £7,300,000 |
| 4 | A259 Chichester to Bognor Regis Sustainable Transport Corridor | Provision of bus lane along A259 approaching Bognor Road Roundabout | £17,700,000 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **Public Transport** |  |  |
| 1 | New Chichester to Littlehampton bus service | Direct and frequent bus services between Tangmere and Chichester City. | £500,000 |
| 2 | West of Chichester development bus service enhancement | Additional bus services connecting Land West of Chichester site to key destinations including Chichester city centre and rail station on a high frequency. Could also extend to Havant. | £1,226,400 (Developer Led) |
| 3 | Land East of Chichester development bus service enhancement (Kingsmead Ave & Madgwick Lane) | Land East of Chichester - Improvement & extension of existing public transport (bus) services to Kingsmead Avenue & Madgwick Lane to help residents travel sustainably to the nearest town centres, employment centres and transport hubs. | £0  TBD – Developer Led |
| 4 | Southbourne development bus service enhancement | Provision of improved bus services for the villages serving the development areas of Southbourne - an aspiration to support the Southbourne development. | £0  TBD – Developer Led |
|  | Provisional Sustainable Scheme Total Budget |  | £59,326,400 |
|  | All Projects – Sustainable Scheme Budget |  | **£64,326,400** |
| Note - Figures in this table may vary from others in this report as they have been taken from differing sources across a period of time, as these schemes have progressed and been developed. These figures are only provided to high light the quantum and scale of cost required for each scheme. | | | |

* + 1. A total of nine Active Travel (AT) schemes have been identified that are considered to promote the 4 key objectives defined in Policy T1 which will benefit access to the City centre, promote sustainable transport use and lessen travel demand in relation to the A27 junctions and local road network.
    2. The nine schemes are summarised below and shown in **Figure 6.1**. The schemes are made up of 8 Active Travel predominantly walking/cycling schemes and 1 Public Transport (which included ped/cycle improvements).

1. AT1: Graylingwell Cycle Route
2. AT2: Westgate Cycle Improvements
3. AT3: Chichester to Emsworth Cycle Route
4. AT4: Oaklands Way
5. AT5: Hunston Cycle Route
6. AT6: Chichester – Tangmere Sustainable Transport Corridor
7. AT7: City Centre to Portfield (via Oving Road) Sustainable Transport Corridor
8. AT8: Northgate Gyratory Improvements
9. PT1: Bognor Road

Figure 6.1: Location of Sustainable Transport Schemes
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* + 1. The seven schemes discounted were due to the lack of information available limiting the ability for them to be assessed and modelled. As part of the M&M these have the potential to be formally assessed and therefore can be reviewed as part of the ongoing monitor and manage process, as and when additional information becomes available.
    2. In the Sustainable Transport Schemes Assessment, the 9 primary schemes were assessed in terms of predicted project costings and current/required funding. **Table 6.2** below set out those details as defined in the Oct 23 report.

Table 6.2 Summary of Cost and Funding of Sustainable Transport Schemes

| Ref No. | Cost | Funding | % Funding Required |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AT1 | £1,022,000 | Linden Homes S106 (14/01018/OUT) | 0% |
| AT2 | £790,000 | S106/CIL & Government grants | 100% |
| AT3 | £5,000,000 | Government grants | 100% |
| AT4 | £2,600,000 | S106/CIL & Government grants (£105,000 planned for 2023/24) | 96.0% |
| AT5 | £919,800 | WSCC Funded | 0% |
| AT6 | £6,600,000 | S106/CIL & Government grants | 100% |
| AT7 | £3,500,000 | S106/CIL & Government grants | 100% |
| AT8 | £6,367,000 + £1,013,000 (Oaklands Way Crossing) | S106/CIL & Government grants | 100% |
| PT1 | £11,750,000 | £109,437.50 secured through O/19/00619/FUL | 99.1% |
| Notes  Figures in this table may vary from others in this report as they have been taken from differing sources across a period of time, as these schemes have progressed and been developed. These figures are only provided to high light the quantum and scale of cost required for each scheme.  Funding Streams are fluid as such the exact nature of funding sources will be confirmed at time of review as required | | | |

* + 1. Two separate modelling exercises were conducted, for active travel and public transport; this was done due to the nature of the areas that each mode could cover to capture a potential modal shift from car trips. The methodology defined the results the impact of the schemes could have on the minor arms of the A27 roundabouts. The assessment was then able to rank the schemes based on their percentage decrease in inbound car trips on their respective roundabouts as shown below.

Table 6.3: Conclusion of Sustainable Transport Schemes Impact on Respective Roundabouts

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ref | Roundabout | AM Peak | | | PM Peak | | |
| LP % of Trips (Demand) | LP minus Shift % of Trips (Demand) | Change | LP % of Trips (Demand) | LP minus Shift % of Trips (Demand) | Change |
| PT1 | Bognor | 7.8% | 5.6% | -2.2% | 7.0% | 4.8% | -2.2% |
| AT 1+6 | Portfield | 7.1% | 6.7% | -0.4% | 7.6% | 6.7% | -0.9% |
| AT 2+3 | Fishbourne | 5.9% | 5.3% | -0.6% | 5.9% | 5.7% | -0.2% |
| AT5 | Whyke | 6.5% | 6.4% | -0.1% | 6.3% | 6.1% | -0.2% |

* + 1. The report focused on the impact of the schemes on the inbound car trips on the junctions with the A27 that have proposed STS on or by them. However, the study provides a provisional ranking of the schemes for the TIMG, but as part of the M&M process, other aspects such as safety for both car drivers, bus passengers, and those who use travel by active travel modes will provide additional benefits.
    2. As shown by the table, there are a range of projects that are provisionally recommended for the TIMG to review and consider in the initial review period and subject to funding, against the transport, environmental, social, financial and climate/carbon criteria to be agreed.

## Safety and Capacity

* + 1. The submission Local Plan policies are focused on managing the current road network and capacity issues rather than building new or larger junctions through the focus being more on promoting sustainable transport.
    2. However, this needs to be balanced with the opportunity that possible capacity schemes may offer:
* to sustainable transport, in terms of reducing delay and queues which may offer wider benefits to sustainable modes which see a betterment from these changes such as cyclists and buses.
* the capacity changes at a key local or strategic junctions may result in a reassignment of traffic from unsuitable local roads, which are impacted by delays and queueing on other parts of the network which result in rat running.
  + 1. Within CDC area, there are two road types, the local roads managed by WSCC, and the strategic network managed by National Highways. The plans below show the local and regional strategic junction being considered.
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Local Schemes

* + 1. Within the Local Plan Preferred Approach, a number of capacities led schemes were considered. However, in the January 2023 pre- submission version of the Local Plan these schemes were modified to offer a wider benefit with increased provision of sustainable measures providing wider safety benefits, while still promoting additional capacity. The schemes set out in this section are provisional scheme layouts shown in **Appendix C**.
* A286 New Park Road / A286 St Pancras Road (Junction 7)
* A259 Via Ravenna / A259 Cathedral Way Roundabout (Junction 8)
* A259 Cathedral Way / Fishbourne Road East (Junction 10)
  + 1. An additional mitigation scheme has been identified in Chichester City as a result of the removal of the Southern Gateway Mitigation Scheme from the Reference Case. The scheme, which is located at the A286/B2178 Churchside gyratory (junction 20) involves signalising the A286 Oaklands Way approach arm junction from a priority junction.
    2. Only one junction in the wider Chichester area has been identified as requiring mitigation:
* Fishbourne Road West / Appledram Lane South (Junction 11)
  + 1. However, this mitigation is only required without the Stockbridge Link Road (SLR) in place. The SLR has the potential to offer an alternate route to Appledram Lane. The modelling suggests that if the link was not provided, then the Appledram Lane and Fishbourne Road junction would require significant improvement, however, Appledram Lane itself is a narrow road of sub-standard width and alignment, with a significant number of residential properties on either side of the road. It also forms the eastern boundary of the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It was considered unsuitable for further improvement; however, it could be assessed again in future as part of the M&M approach.
    2. Within the Reg 19 evidence, a provisional budget (2020) was included for the local schemes of around £2.5m. This was for budget purposes and will need to be updated per scheme if progressed and evolved as part of the TIMG or other processes.

Strategic Schemes

* + 1. In the January 2023 TA document, the provisional M&M document, which is now superseded by this document, considered the requirements for the strategic highway notably the A27 corridor. There are 6 primary junctions on the A27 Corridor which provide access to and around Chichester as set out below.
* Fishbourne Road Roundabout
* Bognor Road Roundabout and
* Portfield Roundabout
* Oving Junction
* Whyke Roundabout
* Stockbridge Roundabout
  + 1. Both Portfield and Oving junctions have been the subject of localised mitigation schemes in the past 24 months linked to the schemes defined in the previous Local Plan.
    2. As the Oving Junction has been designed to support bus priority there is little scope to further modify this junction. The Portfield Roundabout has only had circulatory and minor kerb line changes and therefore there is future opportunity for additional mitigation, if required.
    3. The following junctions have provisional mitigation schemes, which have been discussed with CDC, WSCC and National Highways. (Provisional Scheme Options – **Appendix C**).
* Fishbourne Road Roundabout convert to a 4-arm hamburger signalised junction,
* Stockbridge Roundabout convert to signalised crossroads.
* Whyke Roundabout convert to a signalised crossroads
* Bognor Road Roundabout convert to a 4-arm hamburger signalised junction.
  + 1. All 4 of the junctions have a number of possible mitigation schemes which have been considered over the years. The IDP for the adopted Local Plan included a set of possible schemes. The proposed changes at the Stockbridge and Whyke junctions would ban the right turn movements from the A27 to Chichester and the peninsula, which in turn would trigger the requirement for an additional mitigation scheme defined as the Stockbridge Link Road Scheme.
    2. As stated previously the supporting evidence for the Reg 19, included a set of mitigation schemes on the A27, notably this included restrictions at Stockbridge and Whyke junction which removed access to and from the A27 at these junctions and generated need for the Stockbridge Link Road scheme, which was not required under the current local plan which had no restrictions at these junctions.
    3. These schemes need to be seen in the context of work carried out to date for the current and submission local plan processes. The current local plan had a set of defined schemes, which the submission local plan process utilised and enhanced. These have been generated from the assessment work todate as defined in the supporting Transport Assessment which supports the submission local plan process. In the context of the TIMG these are provided as examples of schemes that would address the outputs as per the methodology and sensitivity assessments carried out. As defined in the M&M approach, the ongoing interim and Year 1 evidence-based upgrades are proposed to allow the ongoing assessment of these junctions.
    4. This review may also seek to consider localised individual and corridor wide improvement options. However, National Highways have raised concerns about isolated junction improvements.
    5. The combined cost of all the schemes is estimated at between £90 to £135 million as a combined package. At this stage these are high-level costs, but include an allowance for risk, contingency and optimism bias.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Works** | **Lower Estimate** | **Upper**  **Estimate** |
| Fishbourne Junction including Terminus and Cathedral Way | £9.52m | £12.90m |
| Bognor Road Roundabout including Bognor Road / Vinnetrow Road Diversion | £19.39m | £30.42m |
| Stockbridge Link | £41.53m | £55.08m |
| Stockbridge Roundabout | £8.65m | £14.61m |
| Whyke Roundabout | £7.05m | £13.10m |
| Portfield Roundabout | £1.85m | £5.49m |
| Oving Junction | £1.40m | £5.49m |
| Total (All Schemes) | £89.39m | £134.03m |
| Total (Excluding Stockbridge Link) | £47.86m | £78.95m |

* + 1. The provisional mitigation schemes have been determined based on the current transport assessment that supports the Local Plan process. However, these are not fixed and during the M&M process, if alternate schemes which are of a lesser scale and in line with the characteristics below would be considered.

1) consistent with the Vision and strategic objectives of the plan,

2) necessary to prevent unacceptable safety impacts or otherwise severe impacts and

3) deliverable prior to them becoming necessary within the Local Plan period.

* + 1. As developments come forward, they will be supported by transport statements and assessments that provide more detailed information about site-specific impacts and the need for mitigation that will also be considered. Transport Assessments for developments will need to demonstrate in line with the NPPF (115) that the developments do not represent unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
    2. As defined these schemes are based on outputs from the current and submission local plans, however TIMG are proposing consideration of the option for smaller scale schemes along the A27 corridor.

## Policy Driven

* + 1. The Local Plan and the M&M approach to delivery potential mitigation, which is integrated into their wider policy objectives, Net Zero, carbon reduction, Air Quality, prioritising of sustainable transport solutions, which are likely to centre around walking and cycling initiatives, public transport and parking management. These policy’s led initiatives may reduce the requirement for additional physical improvements on the highway through reduction of vehicle use. The table below sets out a provisional list which will be expanded through the Local Plan and M&M process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Possible Policy Considerations | Comments |
| Parking | CDC have an established Car Park Strategy which is currently being updated. This is considering measures to reduce availability of car parking spaces in the city centre and towns to promote use of other sustainable forms of travel and reduce car-based trips. This could be through amending the charging scheme for both long- and short-term parking, removal of car park spaces or management of current car parks. |
| Public Transport | Local/national funding schemes and developer contributions could also be utilised to fund potential public transport enhancements within the city centre including an expansion of the bus service and priority within Chichester City Centre, this could include new buses, technology etc. These will seek to reduce reliance on the car in the longer term towards sustainable public transport. |
| Walking and Cycling | Provide potential extension and enhancements of the current walking and cycling network within Chichester City. It could also fund potential regeneration of key movement areas within the city centre through the promotion of initiatives such as ‘Healthy Streets.’ Such initiatives could lead to an increase in sustainable modes of travel due to reduced reliance on driving. Healthy Streets,’ alongside reducing vehicle trips within the city centre, could also help to reduce air and noise pollution, improve mental health, help combat social isolation and bring economic benefits to local shops through increased footfall. |
| Park and Ride | P&R could be part of an emerging wider policy. Historically, P&R has been considered at high level for employment, tourist and as part of a wider parking management option. Generally, the low demand and financial cost v return are likely to make this unviable at the time, However the option has been maintained as a future option by CDC |
| Environmental Policies | Across CDC and WSCC, both councils have a range of environmental linked policy’s which would be included with the M&M process. |

## Wider IDP Consideration

* + 1. The previous sections seek to define a wide range of provisional possible measures that the TIMG could consider as early opportunities for consideration and further assessment, either independent or within the evidence base suite of modelling options or other means as required.
    2. The IDP’s from Chichester, Havant and Arun, may have other schemes which have a cross boundary relevance as may WSCC and HCC’s Local Transport Plans as all these evolve with time. Therefore, TIMG are not fixed by current documents and need to be flexible to consider not only local, but regional and national policies as they evolve.

## Cost Summary

* + 1. The schemes set out above include a wider range of projects for consideration, but it is not an exhaustive list and is designed as a starting point for the TIMG to review, amend, add new, replace or delete as required.
    2. However, the table below sets out a summary of the combined costs of those schemes with provisional costs including the wider area review and those which may form the basis of the initial review by the TIMG. A copy of the assumed costings is set out in **Appendix F**.
    3. The table is provided for information purposes only, to highlight the scale of funding required to support the schemes defined. The totals include the lower and upper limits, and the summary totals show with and without the Stockbridge Road link.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Summary Table** |  | **All Schemes with Defined Costs** | | **Schemes TIMG may consider Reviewing within M&M Process** | |
|  |  | **Lower** | **Upper** | **Lower** | **Upper** |
| Part |  | Total Costs | Total Costs | M&M Summary | M&M Summary |
| 1 | Sustainable | £64,326,400 | £64,326,400 | £47,000,000 | £47,000,000 |
| 2A | Local | £2,500,000 | £2,500,000 | £2,500,000 | £2,500,000 |
|  | Strategic | £89,390,000 | £137,090,000 | £89,390,000 | £137,090,000 |
| 3 | Policy | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| Notes  1. Figures in this table may vary from others in this report as they have been taken from differing sources across a period of time, as these schemes have progressed and been developed. These figures are only provided to high light the quantum and scale of cost required for each scheme. | | | | | |

* + 1. These costs need to be seen in the context of the premise that these represent a combined list of possible projects that M&M could draw upon to be assessed by the TIMG. This level of investment is not required to mitigate the submission local plan development as not all the schemes are required, and this will be part of the role of the TIMG to assess schemes on an individual basis or as part of a localised package of works across all the scheme types and policies.

# Provisional Programme and Action Plan

## Background

* + 1. The TIMG process commenced in March 2024. The provisional meetings have begun to agree a programme as part of their governance to support the Monitor and Manage approach which will be aligned with the relevant policies within the submission Local Plan. This will form the basis for the M&M process.
    2. A provisional programme with defined tasks based on the requirement to generate an up to date means of assessing the impact and required mitigation of the submission Local Plan is set out below and in **Appendix D**.
    3. The M&M document sets out a number of tools that may be required to generate the evidence base across all modes to aid TIMG in their determination of the impact and benefit of schemes in line with the policies. These tools will be subject to funding and programme, noting that the creation of anew transport model is likely to require 12mths, therefore TIMG will be required to begin this process to provide them with a working model in the defined timeline of Year 1.
    4. In March/April 2024, provisional TIMG meetings began the governance process, to agree the attendees and governance, these are pre-formal TIMG meetings, which will commence once the groups governance is finalised. However, the meetings have also been utilsed to commence early discussions on interim means to generate a short-term working platform prior to the new model being generated.

## Local Plan Review

* + 1. In line with national policy the Local Plan will be reviewed every 5 years, the M&M process has been set out to work in parallel with this requirement.

## Programme Considerations

* + 1. The proposal is for the main M&M process to operate on a 5-year cycle in line with the local plan review process. However, there will need to be regular review process through that period, especially in relation to safety, as TIMG would seek to be proactive to any changes during this period that may require them to re-assess their approach and not only at the end of the 5-year period. Given that the scheme for the first five years of the plan is still being considered every effort will be made to condense the process of arriving at a sustainable transport strategy for Chichester and that these are regularly assessed and amended/replaced over the programme period.

## Action Plan

* + 1. In **Appendix B**, is a provisional action plan which seeks to summaries the study’s, measures, schemes etc. that TIMG are being asked to consider, review, promote in order to support the local plan process moving forward. This table simply allows a high-level tracking of the items that TIMG are being asked to consider and outcomes. The table will also include the initial set up requirements for TIMG.

## Interim Actions – Update of Current Model

* + 1. As stated, the initial TIMG meetings have sought to consider updates to the current model to provide a working platform, prior to the new model being commissioned and completed. In the background the Year 1 programme which sets out the items that will require significant costs or extended periods to complete to provide updated tools for TIMG to utilise will progress. However, in the short term and to allow for assessment work to progress the following have been suggested as interim short-term packages for TIMG to consider. Due to scale and cost it is anticipated that these can be agreed while the TIMG is still being formalised and key objectives, outcomes and criteria are still being agreed.

1. Create a **Working Platform** using additional traffic data to create localised refinement for the area of the city centre and the A27 corridor.
2. Create base models using the Nov 23 traffic data and current geometrics of the key junctions on the A27 to be agreed with NH and WSCC
3. Create base models for local junctions to be agreed with WSCC.
   * 1. The above items and the data collected will all support the long-term programme of works and can be utilised in the evidence assessment being considered going forward including the creation of a new model.
     2. The TIMG have agreed to item 1 in terms of carrying out the additional traffic surveys which are due to be complete in early June 24. Due to the timing of these works and the status of TIMG in May 24, CDC will be funding the additional surveys so that they can be captured prior to the school holidays and then a decision on the modelling updates can be taken over the summer.

## Year 1 Provisional Actions/Programme

* + 1. There are some key actions that need to be addressed in year 1 as summarised below, these are not extensive and will include tasks within tasks but set out a means to progress.

1. Set Up TIMG and meeting calendar.
2. Establish and Agree TIMG Governance and Terms of Reference
3. Define and Agree TIMG Objectives
4. Define and Agree optimum means to provide evidence led solutions – (Assumed new model
5. Define a means of assessing mitigation measures (until model is available)
6. Define criteria for assessment of mitigation measures.
7. Establish the current and future funding availability (Cross Boundary)
8. Scope out and commission a new Model
9. Establish a provisional package of mitigation schemes for testing and review by TIMG.
10. Support an update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan
    * 1. As set out a key action in year one is to generate a new means to assess the impact of the Local Plan etc and how best those are mitigated, which requires a new strategic model. The table below sets a provisional indicative programme for creating a new model. Until TIMG can be certain of the funding stream then the modelling process can commence, given the current timelines the target for the model completion would be late 2025.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Undertake Model scoping exercise |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Undertake data collation and collection exercise |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model Network Update |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base year matrix development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base year model calibration and validation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Produce Reference Case Forecasts for agreed year(s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* + 1. During year one, there will be schemes that are brought forward by CDC, WSCC or developers, the TIMG will need to consider these schemes in an appropriate and agreed manner until the modelling work is complete.
    2. Subject to requirement there are more modal specific tools that will allow localised sustainable transport schemes to be assessed, which may be able to bdelivered in advance of the strategic model, to provide a wider means for TIMG to assess and review schemes.

## Year 1 to 2 Overlap

* + 1. On the premise that the new model is agreed and being used to assess the Local Plan and other local/regional policy impacts then the following could be considered.

1. Subject to requirement – create the A27 Corridor Micro Simulation Model
2. Review existing mitigation schemes.
3. Prepare new mitigation schemes in accordance with the evidence.
   * 1. Provisional yearly methodology for year 1 to 5 are included in Appendix E These are provided in draft format for discussion and agreement by TIMG and will as agreed be transferred to the Action Plan.

## Year 3 to 4

* + 1. In the 5th year of the plan, report on the changes between the baseline/forecast and the actual surveyed data and assess if any of the triggers have been met. If so what action or schemes should be considered in the next 5-year period of the plan. The review will need to include any amendments to development forecasts as defined in the Local Plan.

## Year 5 (2028/29)

* + 1. In year 5, the M&M process will provide the baseline evidence for the Local Plan review and therefore subject to a model and IDP review.

## Moving Forward

* + 1. The Council will seek to use the 1–5-year template as a means of progressing the M&M to process for future Local Plans and other relevant Development Plan Documents through the TIMG, who will continue to be responsible for delivery of infrastructure and mitigation and securing the required funding and contributions.

1. Terms of Reference (June 24)

**CDC Local Plan**

**Monitoring & Manage**

**Traffic & Infrastructure Management Group (TIMG)**

**DRAFT Terms of Reference (June 2024)**

**Introduction**

1. The submission Local Plan (2021 to 2039) for Chichester includes the need for CDC to monitor and manage the progress of Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) in order to assess the effectiveness of the LP. The IDP supports the whole local plan area and therefore, as well as defined schemes, the TIMG may seek to review and consider other measures or schemes that may overlap with the Local Plan objectives.

2. The Monitor and Manage Strategy is required to be submitted and approved by CDC, the Local Planning Authority (for the Chichester Local Plan area) in consultation with National Highways, (the strategic highway authority) and West Sussex County Council (the local highway authority). This condition has been discharged based on the agreed Monitor and Manage strategy dated (TBC). The implementation of the Monitor and Manage strategy also incorporates monitoring relating to the off-site transport mitigation required, as well as ongoing liaison with the planning and highway authorities.

3. It is suggested that the control of the Monitor and Manage process is managed by a Traffic & Infrastructure Management Group (TIMG). This note sets out the Terms of Reference for the proposed TIMG.

**The role of the TIMG**

4. The primary role of the TIMG is to discuss the long-term monitoring and review of the local planning transport mitigation strategy.

5. The TIMG will monitor progress towards the relevant transport-related objectives, targets and costs as defined within the approved and agreed Monitor and Manage Strategy, which will include consideration of those schemes defined in the IDP. Conversely any additional projects/proposals identified through the TIMG will be considered for inclusion within the IDP.

6. The TIMG is the key element in the management of the overall Monitor and Manage approach to mitigating the transport impact arising from the Local Plan. This approach ensures that flexibility and resilience is built into and accounts for changing circumstances from wider local policy changes, as well as reflecting any changes to IDP as it is progressed. The TIMG is therefore the key forum for discussing and recommending studies and measures and considering appropriate changes to both the nature and the timing of any proposals.

7. A key objective of this approach is to manage the level of funding and investment committed, to ensure appropriate and proportionate use of the available resources to get maximum and optimum outcomes across the period of the development build-out. In addition, the TIMG will also be responsible for discussing and recommending opportunities for additional sources of funding for travel plan initiatives (and other transport interventions) relating to the IDP and the wider area.

1. The TIMG will also support wider discussion of relevant transport issues as they arise during the implementation of IDP relevant to their governance. These feed into the point above and will inform the nature of decisions made.
2. The TIMG will consider transport issues within a broader context than just highways i.e. it will integrate and consider matters in light of wider environmental and social considerations.

**Membership of the TIMG**

1. The table below sets out the agreed TIMG membership group. The 4 main tiers are seen as fixed, based on the ability to define their roles and responsibilities through TIMG, however the list is not closed and there is scope for other bodies to be invited to present to TIMG as required.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tier** |  | **Attendees** | **Possible Meeting Timeline** |
| 1 | Core Group | * CDC * WSCC * National Highways * Arun District Council | Monthly/Bimonthly |
| 2 | Neighbouring Bodies | * Havant District Council * Hampshire County Council\* * South Downs National Park | Quarterly |
| 3 | Key Stakeholders | Bus Operators  Rail Operators | Quarterly |
| 4 | Appointed Consultants | Some of the parties may seek to appoint a consultant to support their role on the TIMG | As required |
| 5 | Others | Focus Groups, Developers, Landowners | As required |

*\*Consideration is currently being given to whether HCC are within tier 1 or 2*

1. Attendance from each of the core stakeholder organisations subject to requirement listed above is considered essential, so if any invitee cannot attend it is requested that an alternative is nominated to attend in their place.
2. The TIMG as shown will also need to include additional stakeholders / interested parties, who may not have a full-time role, but can be invited on a regular basis or as required according to the items agreed for discussion at each meeting.
3. The TIMG does recognise that the officers attending may be technical and policy officers who can represent their relevant organisation and engage within the TIMG framework to agree the reconditions from the TIMG group but may not have the ability to make formal decisions on behalf of their relevant organisation. Therefore, it is noted that recommendations from the TIMG will need to be taken back to their relevant organisations to be taken through their internal decision making process and then reported back to TIMG.

**Frequency and form of Meetings**

1. Meetings for the core group will take place at approximately 1-2-monthly intervals from April 2024, but the TIMG may agree at any time to review the frequency of meetings if considered necessary / appropriate. These meetings will be utilised to engage with Tier 2 to 4 on a Quarterly basis.
2. Meetings of the TIMG may take place either physically at an agreed location, or digitally – as agreed and as appropriate.

**Agenda and reporting**

1. CDC are the appointed chair and will issue by email a draft agenda incorporating matters for discussion, two weeks before each meeting, such that amendments / additions may be made prior to the meeting. The agenda will be formally confirmed by CDC (as planning authority) a minimum of one working day before the meeting.
2. As required, the meeting papers will include a draft Progress Report on progress with development and infrastructure implementation, with reference to the IDP and transport mitigation triggers.
3. CDC will issue by email notes of the meeting, together with actions arising, for agreement by all core members of the TIMG.
4. Any specific actions required between meetings will be addressed and confirmed to the TIMG via email.

**Key issues / agenda items for discussion**

1. The key issues likely to form agenda items for most meetings include the following:

* Local Plan(s) progress update
* Agreement on programme to support Local Plan process.
* Agree methodology for generating new evidence for LP process.
* Identify M&M schemes/policies to support Local Plan
* Consideration, analysis and agreement of future mitigation schemes
* Updates to the travel plan and traffic monitoring, surveys and review
* Construction traffic issues
* Financial/viability matters
* Progress on other related developments;
* Progress on other relevant transport interventions / initiatives
* Discussion on actions/items arising.
* Progress report

**Meeting Chair and decision making**

1. The meeting will be chaired by CDC as planning authority for which the A27 Chichester Bypass is within.
2. The role of the group is advisory, and any proposals recommended by the group will require agreement by those bodies responsible for implementation and release of funding, through each authorities respective governance procedures. Recommendations will be made by agreement.

**Record of Meeting**

1. A record of each meeting will be kept by way of written minute, which will be agreed following each meeting by circulation. If a matter in the minutes is disputed and cannot be resolved by way of electronic circulation and discussion, the minutes will be returned for agreement to the following meeting of the TIMG to be resolved, prior to publication.
2. Once the minutes have been agreed by relevant members of the TIMG, they will be made publicly available.
3. Action Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TIMG ACTION PLAN – PROVISIONAL May 24 (Bold Live Actions)** | | | | | | | |
| Ref | Task/Project/Scheme | Purpose | Timeline | Budget | Action | TIMG Approval | Status |
| Interim | | | | | | |  |
| **I1** | **Generate Working Platform** | **Interim scheme assessment year 1** | **May to Sept 24** | **£35k** | **Stantec** | **Surveys Only – June 24** | **May 24 CDC agree to fund Surveys** |
| I2 | Generate Localised Models for A27 Jcts | Assess more localised scheme improvements (smaller scale) | May to Sept 24 | TBC | TBC |  |  |
| I3 | Generate Localised Models for Local Roads | Assess more localised scheme improvements (smaller scale) | May to Sept 24 | TBC | TBC |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 1 | | | | | | |  |
| **TIMG 1** | **Set Up TIMG and meeting calendar.** |  |  |  | **TIMG** |  | **May 24 On going** |
| **TIMG 2** | **Establish and Agree TIMG Governance and Terms of Reference** |  |  |  | **TIMG** |  | **May 24 On going** |
| TIMG 3 | Define and Agree TIMG Objectives |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIMG 4 | Define and Agree optimum means to provide evidence led solutions – (Assumed new model |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIMG 5 | Define criteria for assessment of mitigation measures. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIMG 6 | Establish the current and future funding availability (Cross Boundary) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SModel 11 | Undertake Model scoping exercise |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Provisional Mitigation Schemes  
    (For Information)

**Safety and Capacity – Provisional Mitigation Schemes**

**LOCAL – WSCC**

**Junction 7 A286 New Park Road / A286 St Pancras Road**

![Diagram, engineering drawing

Description automatically generated]()

**Junction 8 Via Ravenna / A259 Cathedral Way Roundabout**

**Diagram, engineering drawing

Description automatically generated**

**Junction 10 A259 Cathedral Way / Fishbourne Road / Terminus Road**

**Diagram, engineering drawing

Description automatically generated**

A286 Northgate/Oaklands Way

Diagram

Description automatically generated

**Strategic Junction – National Highways and WSCC**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Current Local Plan | Emerging Local Plan (Options only) |
|  |  |
| Emerging Local Plan – with Bus Priority (Options only) | |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Bognor Road and Vinnetrow Road combined Concept Schemes  Diagram  Description automatically generated | |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1. Programme

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **M&M 2021-2039** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4**  **M&M Yr 1** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **13** | **14** | **15** | **16** | **17** | **18** | **Total** |
| **LPR Year** | **2021/22** | **2022/23** | **2023/24** | **2024/25** | **2025/26** | **2026/27** | **2027/28** | **2028/29** | **2029/30** | **2030/31** | **2031/32** | **2032/33** | **2033/34** | **2034/35** | **2035/36** | **2036/37** | **2037/38** | **2038/39** |  |
| **Year** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** | **2026** | **2027** | **2028** | **2029** | **2030** | **2031** | **2032** | **2033** | **2034** | **2035** | **2036** | **2037** | **2038** | **2039** |  |
| **Period** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **2** | **3** | **3** | **3** | **3** | **3** |  |
| Commitments and Adopted Local Plan Outstanding Allocations | 659 | 626 | 652 | 489 | 516 | 592 | 493 | 314 | 289 | 289 | 289 | 289 | 257 | 95 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 6,029 |
| Emerging Local Plan Allocations (Additional need) |  |  | 20 | 85 | 154 | 300 | 346 | 330 | 360 | 370 | 305 | 250 | 230 | 240 | 215 | 150 | 135 | **111** | **3,601** |
| Total Proposed Local Plan | 659 | 626 | 672 | 574 | 670 | 892 | 839 | 644 | 649 | 659 | 594 | 539 | 487 | 335 | 260 | 195 | 180 | **156** | **9,630** |
| Average Per Year | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 535 | 9630 |
| CDC Funding  £ million |  | £4.4 | £4.5 | £5.6 | £7.1 | £8.6 | £10.1 | £12.5 | £15.4 | £18.3 | £21.1 | £23.7 | £26.2 | £28.8 | £31.3 | £33 | £34.4 | £36 | £36 |
| Other Funding Streams | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Estimated Budgets | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Local Plan** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local Plan Reviews |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Manage and Monitor** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| M&M Set Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| M&M Review |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIMG Set Up |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIMG Meetings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Modelling** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Strategic Model and Updates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Micro Sim Model and Updates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local Junction Models and Updates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainable Transport Models and Updates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Mitigation Measures** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainable and Active Travel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Safety and Capacity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy Driven |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Provisional Methodology (Draft)

**NEW Model Approach**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part 1** | **Baseline** |  |  |
| Task | Actions | Outputs | Other Comments |
| 1 | Strategic Links and Junctions  Agree a new common baseline from which the future housing delivery and associated traffic growth can be managed. | Carry out new traffic surveys of the area to produce current new link and turning count data for the agreed Model Area (inc A27 Corridor)   * Traffic Flows (all modes) * Queue * Delay * Sat Flows * Journey Times | TIMG to agree survey coverage and content |
| 2 | Local Junctions  Agree a new common baseline from which the future housing delivery and associated traffic growth can be managed. | Carry out new link and traffic surveys of the study area to produce current new and turning count data for the local highway schemes.   * Traffic Flows (all modes) * Queue * Delay * Sat Flow * Journey Times | TIMG to agree survey coverage and content |
| 3 | Using New TEMPro agree background growth which the future housing delivery and associated traffic growth can be assessed | Produce new forecast years for assessment of Local Plan allocation | Basis being TEMPro 8.0 |
| 4 | Create the localised models for the current A27 junctions | Produce LinSig/Transyt models of the junction or a micro sim model of the corridor | These provide a more accurate assessment methodology for the junctions than the strategic model – Agreed with TIMG |
| 5 | Create the localised models for the current localised junctions (including pedestrian and cycle observations) | Produce Junction 10/LinSig/Transyt models of the junctions | These provide a more accurate assessment methodology for the junctions than the strategic model – agreed with TIMG |
| 6 | Determine the current junction condition and level of capacity. | Assess the local model’s capacity with the current flows to validate junctions | Agree with TIMG |
| 7 | Define the Local Plan development assumptions for forecast years | Option to utilise 535 per year or north/south distribution to be defined.  (Option for testing of differing provisions) | Agree with TIMG |
| 8 | Generate a set of new forecast years to meet the M&M timeline | There will be 3 forecast years 2029, 2033 and 2039 | Agree with TIMG |
| 9 | Assess the current junction layouts with the 3 forecast year flows before mitigation | Assess if the junctions or individual links are exceeding any defined limits and may need mitigation | This will define if the current junctions can be maintained with an agreed level of over capacity on the A27 and side roads.  Agree with TIMG |
| 10 | Assess the proposed junction layouts with the 3 forecast year flows with mitigation | If the junctions or links are witnessing issues, then consider mitigation | This will define the likely trigger years for the required mitigation, again allowing for an agreed level of over capacity on the A27 and side roads.  Agree with TIMG |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part 2** | **Monitor and Mitigation** |  |  |
| Task | Actions | Outputs | Other Comments |
| 1 | Year 5 Review  Replicate the baseline surveys in Part 1 | Carry out as required updated link and traffic surveys of the area to verify validation of model.   * Traffic Flows (all modes) * Queue * Delay * Sat Flows * Journey Times | TIMG to agree survey coverage and content |
| 2 | Compare the surveyed data with the 2033 forecast year assumptions | Define the difference in forecast v actual growth | TIMG to agree any differences and need for action |
| 3 | Re-test the current junction’s layouts with the new data (A27 and City Schemes) | Assess if the junctions or individual links are exceeding any defined limits and may need mitigation | TIMG to assess and verify any need for mitigation |
| 4 | Re-test the mitigation junctions with the new data (A27 and City Schemes) | If the junctions or links are witnessing issues, then consider mitigation | TIMG to agree required mitigation |
| 5 | Assess the proposed junction layouts with the 2 forecast year flows with mitigation | With the new baseline and any TEMPro changes forecast the remaining forecast years and assess the junction operations | To be used for forecasting only, no action unless TIMG determines need |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part 3** | **Monitor and Mitigation** |  |  |
| Task | Actions | Outputs | Other Comments |
| 1 | Year 10 Review  Replicate the baseline surveys in Part 1 and 2 | Carry out as required updated link and traffic surveys of the area to verify validation of model.   * Traffic Flows (all modes) * Queue * Delay * Sat Flows * Journey Times | TIMG to agree survey coverage and content |
| 2 | Compare the surveyed data with the 2033 forecast year assumptions | Define the difference in forecast v actual growth | TIMG to agree any differences and need for action |
| 3 | Re-test the current junction’s layouts with the new data (A27 and City Schemes) | Assess if the junctions or individual links are exceeding any defined limits and may need mitigation | TIMG to assess and verify any need for mitigation |
| 4 | Re-test the mitigation junctions with the new data (A27 and City Schemes) | If the junctions or links are witnessing issues, then consider mitigation | TIMG to agree required mitigation |
| 5 | Assess the proposed junction layouts with the final forecast year flows with mitigation | With the new baseline and any TEMPro changes forecast the remaining forecast years and assess the junction operations | To be used for forecasting only, no action unless TIMG determines need |
| 6 | On Going Approach for Local Plan | Begin to discuss new methodology for Local plan approach for end of period (work up in period 10-15) | Ongoing need for TIMG to be reviewed subject to requirement |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject to Item 6 of 10 Year Review – New Approach** | | | |
| **Part 4** | **Monitor and Mitigation** |  |  |
| Task | Actions | Outputs | Other Comments |
| 1 | Year 15 Review  Replicate the baseline surveys in Part 1, 2 and 3 | Carry out as required updated link and traffic surveys of the area to verify validation of model.   * Traffic Flows (all modes) * Queue * Delay * Sat Flows * Journey Times | TIMG to agree survey coverage and content |
| 2 | Compare the surveyed data with the 2039 forecast year assumptions | Define the difference in forecast v actual growth | TIMG to agree any differences and need for action |
| 3 | Re-test the current junction’s layouts with the new data (A27 and City Schemes) | Assess if the junctions or individual links are exceeding any defined limits and may need mitigation | TIMG to assess and verify any need for mitigation |
| 4 | Re-test the mitigation junctions with the new data (A27 and City Schemes) | If the junctions or links are witnessing issues, then consider mitigation | TIMG to agree required mitigation |
| 5 | End of Local Plan Period | New methodology to implemented | Ongoing need for TIMG to be reviewed subject to requirement |

1. Provisional Cost Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CDC Local Plan** | |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Summary of ALL Transport Related Schemes** | | | |  |  |  |
| **Working Document V3 - Feb 24** | | | |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Stantec Ref** | **WSCC Ref** | **IDP** | **Scheme** | **Lower** | **Upper/**  **Estimated** | **Comments** |
| Part 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Active Travel** |  |  |  |
| AT1 | 1 | IBP/341 | Graylingwell Cycle Route |  | £900,000 |  |
|  | 2 | IBP/342 | Oaklands Way Toucan Crossing |  | £700,000 |  |
| AT2 | 3 |  | Westgate Cycle Route (K) |  | £1,600,000 |  |
|  | 4 |  | St. Paul's Cycle Route (L) |  | £1,600,000 |  |
|  | 5 |  | Parklands Cycle Route (T) |  | £1,100,000 |  |
|  | 6 | IBP/361 | Chichester-Selsey Cycle Route |  | £12,200,000 |  |
| AT4 | 7 | IBP/840 | Oaklands Way Cycle Route |  | £2,600,000 |  |
| AT5 | 8 | IBP/544 | Hunston Road Cycle Route |  | £1,800,000 |  |
| AT3 | TBC | IBP/884 | Chichester to Emsworth Cycle |  | £5,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  | **Total** |  | **£27,500,000** |  |
|  |  |  | **Multi-modal** |  |  |  |
| AT6 | 1 | IBP/353 | A285 Chichester – Tangmere Sustainable Transport Corridor |  | £6,600,000 |  |
| AT7 | 2 | IBP/656 | City Centre to Portfield (via Oving Rd) Sustainable Transport Corridor |  | £3,500,000 |  |
| AT8 | 3 | IBP/352 | Northgate Gyratory Improvement |  | £7,300,000 |  |
| PT1 | 4 | IBP/354 | A259 Chichester to Bognor Regis Sustainable Transport Corridor |  | £17,700,000 |  |
|  |  |  | **Total** |  | **£35,100,000** |  |
|  |  |  | **Public Transport** |  |  |  |
|  | 1 |  | New Chichester to Littlehampton bus service |  | £500,000 |  |
|  | 2 | IBP/542 | West of Chichester development bus service enhancement |  | £1,226,400 |  |
|  | 3 |  | Land East of Chichester development bus service enhancement (Kingsmead Ave & Madgwick Lane) |  | £0 |  |
|  | 4 |  | Southbourne development bus service enhancement |  | £0 |  |
|  |  |  | **Total** |  | **£1,726,400** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Part 1 - Total Budget** |  | **£64,326,400** |  |
|  |  |  | **Part 1 - M&M Schemes** |  | **£47,000,000** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part 2 A** | **Safety and Capacity - Local Schemes** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  | A286 New Park Road / A286 St Pancras Road |  | £2,500,000 |  |
| 8 |  | IBP/371 | A259 Via Ravenna / A259 Cathedral Way Roundabout |  |  |
| 10 |  | IBP/1264 | A259 Cathedral Way / Fishbourne Road East |  |  |
| 20 |  |  | A286/B2178 Churchside gyratory |  |  |
| 11 |  |  | Fishbourne Road West / Appledram Lane South |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Total** |  | **£2,500,000** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Part 2B Safety and Capacity – Strategic** | | | | | |  |
| Stantec Ref | WSCC Ref |  |  | Lower | Upper |  |
| 10\_13 |  | IBP/339 | Fishbourne Junction including Terminus and Cathedral Way | £ 9,520,000 | £ 12,900,000 |  |
| 16 |  | IBP/339 | Bognor Road Roundabout including Bognor Road / Vinnetrow Road Diversion | £ 19,390,000 | £ 30,420,000 |  |
|  |  |  | Stockbridge Link | £ 41,530,000 | £ 55,080,000 | This scheme is subject to the options considered for Stockbridge and Whyke Junctions and level of restriction introduced. |
| 14 |  | IBP/339 | Stockbridge Roundabout | £ 8,650,000 | £ 14,610,000 | Scheme includes restricted access from A27 |
| 15 |  | IBP/339 | Whyke Roundabout | £ 7,050,000 | £ 13,100,000 | Scheme includes restricted access from A27 |
| 18 |  | IBP/339 | Portfield Roundabout | £ 1,850,000 | £ 5,490,000 | Works have been completed at this junction, however the TA suggested that additional mitigation may be required, therefore it has been included |
| 19 |  | IBP/339 | Oving Junction | £ 1,400,000 | £ 5,490,000 | Works have been completed at this junction, however the TA suggested that additional mitigation may be required, therefore it has been included |
|  |  |  | **Total** | **£ 89,390,000** | **£ 137,090,000** |  |
| Part 3 | Policy Driven |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Parking | £0 | £0 | IDP includes possible policy, measures, mitigations and service proposals, which can be considered in the TIMG process. However, these have not been prejudged at this time, so no allowance has been included. |
|  |  |  | Public Transport | £0 | £0 |
|  |  |  | Walking and Cycling | £0 | £0 |
|  |  |  | Park and Ride | £0 | £0 |
|  |  |  | Environmental Policy’s | £0 | £0 |
|  |  |  | **Total** | **£0** | **£0** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Summary Table** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Lower** | **Upper** | **Lower** | **Upper** |
| Part |  |  | Total Costs | Total Costs | M&M Summary | M&M Summary |
| 1 | Sustainable |  | £64,326,400 | £64,326,400 | £47,000,000 | £47,000,000 |
| 2A | Local |  | £2,500,000 | £2,500,000 | £2,500,000 | £2,500,000 |
|  | Strategic |  | £89,390,000 | £137,090,000 | £89,390,000 | £137,090,000 |
| 3 | Policy |  | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total (All Costed Schemes)** |  |  | **£156,216,400** | **£203,916,400** | **£138,890,000** | **£186,590,000** |
| Total (without Stockbridge Link Road |  |  | **£114,686,400** | **£148,836,400** | **£97,360,000** | **£131,510,000** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Note**  **Figures in this table may vary from others in this report as they have been taken from differing sources across a period of time, as these schemes have progressed and been developed. These figures are only provided to high light the quantum and scale of cost required for each scheme.** | | | | | | |