

22 September 2016

Highways England

By email to:

[info@highwaysengland.co.uk](mailto:info@highwaysengland.co.uk)

### **A27 Chichester bypass scheme**

On behalf of Bricycles (Brighton and Hove Cycling Campaign) and as a Cycling UK campaigner for Brighton and Hove, I am writing in response to the above consultation.

The online questionnaire<sup>1</sup> on the proposed A27 Chichester bypass scheme is one of the most biased consultation questionnaires I have come across in 20 years of local transport.

It is impossible to give my views as a cyclist and a user of public transport. My responses are clearly not expected or welcome.

Air quality, human health, severance of walking and cycling routes, increased road danger to vulnerable road users from induced traffic are not even mentioned in Question 3 (*Which issues around the A27 Chichester bypass scheme are you most concerned about?*) and there is nowhere to add my concerns.

Options for managing congestion other than a road scheme are not offered in Questions 7 and 8.

It's take it or leave it. And yet there is clearly a case for other options as clearly spelt out in the Traffic Forecasting report, paragraph 1.1.3 that **“Although a strategic route, the majority of traffic using the bypass is local traffic entering and leaving Chichester itself.”**

Highways England has totally overlooked the benefits of walking, cycling and public transport for local journeys and is solely interested in choosing a destructive road scheme at enormous cost to the health of people and the environment.

The travel choices of neighbouring authorities are important to us because we come into daily contact with traffic and we are strongly in favour of modal shift to bring about traffic reduction and better conditions for cycling.

Here in Brighton and Hove we have one of the lowest car ownerships and highest bus patronage outside London.

We cycle in West Sussex and greatly enjoy the Chichester Harbour area which is threatened by this proposed road scheme.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/H6SMXTN>

Authorities along the South Coast need to invest fully in cycling, walking and public transport. Funds should be switched from road schemes for this purpose. This would be better for the environment and better for human health.

A recent study by Dr Tim Chatterton, Senior Research Fellow et al has shown that air pollution causes more deaths than motor vehicle crashes.<sup>2</sup> The study refers to a problematic policy 'tone' that "continues to provide for the private car as central to national transport policy."

Cycling facilities and road layout should comply with the best practice in infrastructure design such as the London Cycling Design Standards<sup>3</sup>. If cycling were properly funded as called for in Cycling UK's Space for Cycling campaign, research by the University of Leeds shows that there would be £¼ trillion in economic benefits by 2050<sup>4</sup>.

We hope you will take our points into consideration.

Yours sincerely,



Becky Reynolds

Campaigns Officer & News Editor, Bricycles, the Brighton and Hove Cycling Campaign  
[www.bricycles.org.uk](http://www.bricycles.org.uk) [www.facebook.com/Bricycles](https://www.facebook.com/Bricycles) and [twitter.com/Bricycles](https://twitter.com/Bricycles)  
Cycling UK campaigner, Brighton and Hove [www.cyclinguk.org/](http://www.cyclinguk.org/)

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.airqualitynews.com/2016/08/30/transport-planning-neglects-air-pollution-study-claims/>

<sup>3</sup> <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/lcds-chapter1-designrequirements.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.cyclinguk.org/sites/default/files/1501\\_fcrawford-rlovelace\\_economic-cycle-reformatted.pdf](http://www.cyclinguk.org/sites/default/files/1501_fcrawford-rlovelace_economic-cycle-reformatted.pdf)