

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

**TRANSPORT COMMITTEE**

**4.00pm 30 APRIL 2013**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Davey (Chair) Councillor Follett (Deputy Chair), Cox (Opposition Spokesperson), Janio, Kennedy, Mitchell, Phillips, Robins, West and K Norman

**Other Members present:** Councillor Hawtree

**PART ONE**

**68. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**68(a) Declarations of substitutes**

68.1 Councillor Ken Norman was present as substitute for Councillor Geoffrey Theobald.

**68(b) Declarations of interest**

68.2 There were none.

**68(c) Exclusion of press and public**

68.3 In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ("the Act"), the Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during an item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present during that item, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A(3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100(l) of the Act).

68.4 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded.

**69. MINUTES**

69.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 5 March 2013 be approved and signed as the correct record.

**70. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

70.1 The Chair provided the following communication:

“As many people may be aware this is the final Transport Committee meeting. The reason for this is that the opposition parties have decided that they would prefer to include the transport agenda within a larger Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee. I am sure we will all do our best to make that new committee to work as effectively as possible.

I would like to thank all Members for their commitment to this committee over the last year. Personally I have found it very challenging but immensely rewarding and I would like to express my gratitude to all members for the positive spirit that you have brought to the committee and to the debates that we have had. Even where we have disagreed I do believe that we have been able to put our differences aside and make decisions in the best interest of the city as a whole. I hope today will continue in that vein.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Mark Prior and the transport team for their hard work over the last year in delivering an unprecedented number of major transport projects, and to John Peel for the patient and professional way that he has kept us all on track and of course to Liz Culbert our lawyer and to Geoff Raw”

**71. CALL OVER**

71.1 The following items on the agenda were reserved for discussion:

- Item 75: Seven Dials Elm Tree- consideration of design alternatives
- Item 76: Better Bus Areas
- Item 77: Brighton Station Gateway
- Item 78: Traffic Order Consultation- resident parking schemes
- Item 79: Lively Cities- Regeneration in the London Road area
- Item 80: West Hove & South Portslade residents parking consultation
- Item 83: Amex Community Stadium residents parking proposals- consideration of objections and representations to Traffic Regulation Orders
- Item 84: Fiveways Safer Routes to School scheme objections

71.2 The Democratic Services Officer confirmed that the Items listed above had been reserved for discussion; and that the following reports on the agenda with the recommendations therein had been approved and adopted:

- Item 81: Blakers Park road safety scheme- TRO for parking restrictions
- Item 82: Dyke Road (Seven Dials)- Formal Traffic Regulation Order consultation
- Item 85: Preston Park parking review- response to TRO

**72. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT****(a) Petitions****(i) Stanford Avenue residents against parking permit scheme- Jane Baker**

72.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 24 people requesting the removal of Stanford Avenue from the proposed Area J residents parking scheme.

72.2 The petitioner did not attend the meeting therefore the response was provided in writing and is set out below:

“Thank you for your petition. Whilst this will be discussed under item 78 later in the agenda I will give a brief response now.

The Report is recommending proceeding with the whole area including Stanford Avenue in line with the initial consultation where a greater number and higher proportion, 58%, voted in favour of the scheme.

If individual roads are taken out of the proposed area there is a greater risk that parking displacement could occur and more specifically in this case there are two parking scheme areas that would mean Stanford Avenue experiences displacement from two adjacent areas.

Previously, specific roads or locations across the city have requested removal from a scheme proposal and now experience severe parking pressures and area now asking to be included in existing or new parking schemes, these include Bolsover Road, Wish Park and Hanover to name a few”.

72.3 **RESOLVED-** That the petition be noted.

**(ii) Objection to a taxi rank on Fredrick Place, Brighton- Phillip Lobatto**

72.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 1006 people objecting to the installation of a taxi rank on Fredrick Place as part of the Brighton Station Gateway scheme.

72.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition and this issue will be discussed later during this meeting. I am aware that there has been ongoing opposition to the proposals from sections of the North Laine community as well as from North Laine traders. In response to these concerns a number of alternative transport arrangements have been investigated. Unfortunately none of these proposals are able to eliminate negative impact on the area in terms of reduced vehicular access and possible traffic increases on some streets. Therefore the report is recommending not to pursue the Frederick place option”.

72.6 **RESOLVED-** That the petition be noted.

**(iii) Petition to make Westbourne Street a ‘Play Street’- Ray Cunningham**

72.7 The Committee considered a petition signed by 148 people requesting the southern half of Westbourne Street be turned into a ‘Play Street’.

72.8 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition. Whilst you have focussed your petition on Play Streets I appreciate you are looking for more than this.

To this end I will suggest Officers contact you to arrange a meeting to consider what, if any options might be available including some form of signed access restriction for specific vehicular traffic with signage”.

72.9 Councillor Cox requested he also be contacted as ward councillor for the area.

72.10 **RESOLVED-** That the petition be noted.

**(b) Written Questions**

**(i) Juliet Mitchell**

72.11 Juliet Mitchell asked the following question:

"Would the Council give consideration to increasing the "Permit Holders Only" parking spaces in The Drive by replacing a portion of the centre road "Pay and Display" spaces as is the case in Grand Avenue?

The Drive has lost approximately 12 Permit spaces due to Black Bins and increased double yellow lines at entrance/exits opening and now plans for more recycle bins will mean further loss of spaces.

Residents in The Drive are continually having problems finding a parking space during the day as a result of a glut of non permit holders parking for shopping and visiting solicitors/medical businesses."

72.12 The Chair provided the following response:

"Thank you for your question and I'm sorry to hear of your parking issues. If you can provide some specific locations and information details then I will ask Officers to investigate this request further and if appropriate it will be included in the next available Amendment Traffic Order advertised in October 2013".

72.13 Juliet Mitchell asked the following supplementary question:

"Given that there is a waiting list of two years for parking permits in our zone, could I also ask Brighton & Hove City Council to review the length of double yellow lines as there are anomalies in their position and length".

72.14 The Chair provided the following response:

"I am aware that the position of double yellow lines in Grand Avenue has a specific purpose to increase visibility. However, I will ask officers to look into this issue also".

**(ii) Caroline Drijver**

72.15 Caroline Drijver presented a Deputation and Written Question. The Deputation detailed an objection to the proposed re-location of a bus stop on Ditchling Road as part of the Safer Routes to Schools scheme. The Question was as follows:

"I would like to know the committee's view on the lack of the council's rigour regarding the location of a bus stop outside Little Earthworms Nursery which is in keeping with

their stated objective of encouraging staff and parents to use sustainable travel; and how the committee considers it fair that one property, 391, will have two communal facilities outside its frontage – a bus stop and a telegraph pole with neighbours' wires hanging over the property”.

72.16 The Chair provided the following response to the Question and Deputation:

“I am sorry you have concerns over proposals to relocate the Ditchling Road bus stop south of the junction with Friar Road to a position north of Friar Road outside your house as part of the Council's Safer Routes to School Project. Road Safety Officers have investigated this issue thoroughly and looked at various options to assess the impact on adjacent properties, frequency of services, passenger numbers and general road safety in the area. They consider the proposed location outside No. 391 Ditchling Road to be the best compromise which will allow a pedestrian refuge to be built south of Friar Road on the current site of the bus stop to improve the road safety for pupils attending Varndean Secondary School, Balfour Primary School and Dorothy Stringer Secondary School. The scheme does not consider the location of telegraph poles, which are not the council's responsibility, and cannot set the priorities of a privately run business. The site consulted on outside the nursery at 387 Ditchling Road received many objections from parents, neighbours and the proprietors on road safety and child protection grounds. These objections had the potential to significantly delay an urgently needed road safety improvement”.

72.17 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

(iii) **Greg Cooke**

72.18 Greg Cooke presented the following Question:

“Why we have not been consulted in detail about the implementation of the proposed extension of the Controlled Parking Zone north of London Road railway station? For example, if it is considered that commuters are the problem then why not amend the hours of the Traffic Order to run from 9:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday as in other areas of the City?”

72.19 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your question. As you are aware this is being discussed under Item 78.

The consultation process for the resident parking scheme proposals has been extensive and is clearly outlined in the background papers within the upcoming report (Item 78). Overall during the previous consultation in November 2012 the majority of people in the whole area (58%) who responded were in favour of proceeding with these proposals. The response rate was 40% which is quite high for a parking scheme consultation of this nature. The Council have also received 296 representations to the more recent traffic order consultation.

There are currently no Monday to Friday resident parking schemes in Brighton & Hove. The source of vehicle displacement is many fold. In addition to commuters and visitors it includes residents in other parking scheme areas parking there either with their only vehicle or with their second vehicle rather than pay for one or for a second permit.

Experience elsewhere in the city such as the Queens Park area (Zone C) where a scheme was originally introduced on Monday – Saturday only residents subsequently requested that the scheme be extended to include Sundays due to continuing problems”.

**(iv) Jennifer Cooke**

72.20 Jennifer Cooke was unable to attend the meeting. With discretion from the Chair, Greg Cooke presented the following Question on Ms Cooke’s behalf:

“Why is it necessary to include the whole area, from Fiveways down to Springfield Road, when only three streets voted in favour of it? Why not implement the scheme street by street as we were originally told?”

72.21 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your question. As you are aware this is being discussed under Item 78.

In terms of the London Road Station North area there are a number of reasons why it is being recommended to proceed with the whole area rather than the Southern part of the area.

There is concern about vehicle displacement if the Northern roads are not included. If a parking scheme is not taken forward in these roads it maybe a long while before the roads can be consulted again. If other planned areas are taken forward this would lead to the roads left out being sandwiched between two parking scheme areas.

There are many examples elsewhere in the city where residents have originally requested to be excluded from a scheme but as they have experienced increased parking pressures have subsequently requested to be included. Many of those residents are still waiting many years later. We wouldn’t wish the same to happen here.

Respondents to the initial consultation in the whole area voted in favour of a scheme (58%).

The comments/objections to aspects of the TROs have been taken into account but it is considered that, due to the reasons I have outlined, there is greater justification for introducing the scheme as a whole than for removing part of the area at this late stage.

The objections that have been received to the Traffic Regulation Orders are less by road than the objections received during the initial consultation when the principle of the scheme was agreed at Committee”.

**(c) Deputations**

(i) **The effect of loading restrictions on the north side of Western Road and the lack of response to e-mails by the Transport Chair- Adam Campbell (Chair of the Western and Church Road Traders Association)**

72.22 The Committee considered a Deputation that detailed the alleged effects of the loading restrictions on the north side of Western Road since their introduction and sought a change to their restrictions. The Deputation also considered communications between Adam Campbell and the Chair of the Transport Committee.

72.23 The Chair provided the following response:

“Firstly, there have been no recent changes to loading restrictions in the London Road area.

Several days ago, I walked from Montpellier Road to Palmeira Square. Between these two points I counted two vacant premises on the north side (the side with the loading restrictions) and seven on the south side (without the loading restrictions). This does not support the argument that the loading restrictions have had the impact on the businesses that you claim. In fact such a low vacancy rate on the north side could be seen as encouraging in the current economic climate where retail businesses across the country are struggling.

The Western Road loading ban was brought in following consideration of the problems and potential solutions to the heavy congestion in Western Road, along one of our primary bus routes. The ban only covers the very busy hours in the morning and afternoon, rather than being a ban at all times. It is therefore felt that businesses still have an opportunity to load and unload at other times of the day.

The restrictions have improved traffic movement and reduced congestion through this important transport corridor.

The loading restrictions were advertised via a Traffic Order proposal which gave opportunity for any individual to comment or submit objections.

You presented your objection to the Cabinet Member Meeting for Environment, Transport and Sustainability in March 2012. The Chair then made a decision having weighed up relevant information and opinion including the direct representation. As such, the loading ban was properly introduced via the correct process and will remain in place”.

72.24 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

(ii) **CPZ Extension- Martin Cross (Chair of Governors- Downs Junior School)**

72.25 The Committee considered a Deputation that detailed the likely negative effect of the proposed extension to the Area J residents parking scheme on Downs Junior School.

72.26 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for outlining your concerns. As you are aware this is being discussed under Item 78.

Officers and Ward Councillors have met with school representatives to discuss and accommodate the needs of schools in the area where possible.

With regards to the allowance of school permits, these are restricted to one for every six members of staff. This has worked well for all schools in controlled zones across

the city and to encourage sustainable transport choices. It is also critical that we adopt a fair and consistent citywide approach to school permits and for this reason we must apply the same ratio at Downs School. We have previously also issued up to 2 business permits to a small number of schools in addition to their allocation of school permits.

Following the meeting and since the formal traffic order consultation was advertised, we are also intending to provide more 11 hour shared pay & display bays to further support staff needing to park in the area.

Any issues regarding citywide fees & charges, permit allocations and enforcement are not within the remit of this parking scheme proposal and are being dealt with separately.

In respect of the remaining minor amendments proposed, including free parking there are a number of issues to consider.

First, that it would be extremely expensive to enforce. If we ask enforcement officers to allow 15 minutes observation time rather than the usual 5 minutes it would triple the amount of time required to attend to each vehicle and this would mean that we would either need more staff or we would have to reduce enforcement in another area.

The second issue is that where cars are parked on double yellow lines, allowing an additional 10 minutes would increase the risk of congestion and road safety.

The third issue is that signs and lines must be designed to make it as clear as possible to motorists what the rules are across the city. If we add a layer of complexity then this could be both confusing and potentially unfair to other parts of the city where the rules are not relaxed in the same way.

Finally, we regularly receive a high volume of requests for *tighter* enforcement and we are also asked to promote alternative modes of transport for parents and children.

For these reasons it would not be possible to allow 15 minutes penalty free time.

We would strongly advise against free permits at Downs Infant and Junior Schools because it would create a complex and inconsistent citywide system and open up challenges from all schools where school permits are charged for. In addition, free permits would not support efforts to encourage sustainable transport choices”.

72.27 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

(iii) **Disabled bays on New Road- Paul Sutherland (The Courtyard Restaurant)**

72.28 The Committee considered a Deputation that requested changes to the size of disabled bays to allow The Courtyard restaurant to provide outside seating.

72.29 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your question.

As explained by officers previously (and specifically on 7<sup>th</sup> April 2011), the suggestion you make regarding rearrangement of bays outside the Courtyard creates an isolated northernmost bay with seating on both sides (belonging to the Courtyard and Pinnochios). The council’s road safety officers considered this arrangement to present a safety risk due to vehicles reversing in and out of a space close to seating, and so objected to this approach.

In relation to the other points you raise:

As explained to you in the same communication of 7<sup>th</sup> April, given that the proposal to rearrange bays was considered to create a safety concern, and given that there were

no suitable places a bay could be relocated to, the only remaining option that would enable seating outside the Courtyard was to lose disabled parking capacity. You offered to pay for the Traffic Order to test whether this was possible. Two options were suggested to you – to seek an arrangement that merged 3 bays into a single 15 metre strip (effectively resulting in loss of one disabled bay), or maintaining 2 individually marked disabled bays (resulting in the loss of two disabled bays). On 8<sup>th</sup> April 2011 you responded that “I would say that the loss of one disabled bay is preferred over the loss of two”, and it was confirmed that the TRO would be progressed on that basis. The council informed the freeholder prior to your taking the lease that it would not be possible for a licensed area to be provided outside 20 New Road if it were to become a restaurant. This was a consideration of the Cabinet decision of July 2011, which upheld objections to the removal of a disabled parking space in New Road. As outlined in the Cabinet report of July 2011, there is no suitable location to which a disabled bay could be relocated, so whether or not the Fed object to relocation of a disabled parking bay is academic. The previous iteration of this dialogue, which resulted in the formal council decision made by members in July 2011 not to remove a disabled parking bay in New Road, utilised significant amounts of officer time. It is not considered best use of officer time to dedicate more resource to this issue when a decision has been made by Cabinet, and no new information has subsequently come to light that should materially alter the basis of that decision. I am sorry there is nothing more we can do to support your deputation at this time”.

72.30 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

**(iv) Proposed bus stop on Ditchling Road- Caroline Drijver**

72.31 See item 72.15

**73. ITEMS REFERRED FROM FULL COUNCIL**

**(a) Petitions**

**(i) Elm Tree at Seven Dials- Millie Ferguson**

73.1 Dr Stephanie Pain presented a petition signed by 4318 people concerning the preservation of an Elm Tree at Seven Dials. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council on 28 March 2013.

73.2 The Chair thanked Dr Pain for attending the meeting and stated that there would shortly be further opportunities to discuss the matter under the agenda item.

73.3 **RESOLVED-** That the petition be noted.

**(c) Deputations**

73.4 Stefanie Krachen-Lashbrook presented a Deputation on behalf of residents of Paston Place regarding road safety, air and noise pollution, public health and nuisance relating to the taxi rank on the road.

- 73.5 Councillor Mitchell presented a Letter in support of Ms Krachen-Lashbrook that detailed acute problems arising from over-ranking, congestion and safety and the urgent need for a solution for all parties.
- 73.6 The Chair provided the following response:
- “I do sympathise with the concerns of residents regarding the impact of this taxi rank and particularly with the problem of the over ranking. Officers have been looking at the situation and have some ideas that they would like to go through with residents and with ward councillors. I propose that I ask Transport and Licensing Officers to sit down with you Stefanie, Councillor Mitchell and a representative of the Taxi trade to explore the various options and seek a better solution for everyone”.
- 73.7 Councillor Mitchell requested further information on the work undertaken so far and short and long-term solutions from the Head of Transport.
- 73.8 The Head of Transport stated that Transport and Licensing Officers were looking at many options. Amongst others, this included moving the feeding rank to a less residential location although because of the profile of local buildings, concerns regarding air quality would remain. Other options included developing or expanding other ranks. The Head of Transport stated that this was a complex issue and in addition to a solution for residents and the taxi trade, agreement would also be required for the hospital.
- 73.9 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation and Letter be noted.

#### **74. MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

##### **(c) Letters**

- 74.1 See minute item 73.4.

#### **75. SEVEN DIALS ELM TREE – CONSIDERATION OF DESIGN ALTERNATIVES**

- 75.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that outlined the options for incorporating the Vernon Terrace Elm Tree into the Seven Dials improvement scheme and recommended a preferred option.
- 75.2 Councillor Mitchell thanked officers for finding a solution however; she believed the current option should have been presented to the Committee originally. Councillor Mitchell also stated that care should be taken to preserve the tree roots during the improvement work.
- 75.3 Councillor Kennedy welcomed the opportunity to re-visit the originally decision and sought assurance that an arboriculturist would be present during improvement work.

- 75.4 Councillor Norman re-iterated the statements made by Councillors Mitchell and Robins adding that the work must be carried out correctly and carefully.
- 75.5 Councillor Robins asked whether the tests to ascertain potential internal decay of the tree had been conducted and whether there would be a continuing re-inspection of the safety and condition of the tree.
- 75.6 Councillor Cox noted that paragraph 5.2 of the report provided information on the £300,000 grant from the Department for Transport Cycle Safety Programme for the improvement works. He request confirmation that the £20,000 required to preserve the tree would not be diverted from the grant.
- 75.7 Councillor Janio welcomed the opportunity to reconsider the scheme and stated that he hoped this would encourage a more common-sense approach to policy-making from the administration.
- 75.8 The Chair replied to Councillor Janio that the significant majority of schemes approved by the Transport Committee had received cross-party support.
- 75.9 Councillor West stated that he believed the Committee were correct to respond to the concerns raised about the removal of the tree by the local community however, his concerns that the retention of the tree would compromise increased accessibility remained.
- 75.10 In response to the issues raised, the Principal Transport Planner stated that the decay test on the tree had been completed and had found that the tree was healthy. He added that there was likely to be continuing uplift from the roots of the tree and there would be continual assessment and remedial work where necessary. The Principal Transport Planner clarified that the £20,000 required for work required to the retain the tree was a minor element of the overall budget and would be taken from a designated contingency fund. Furthermore, the Principal Transport Planner confirmed that there would be full supervision from an arboriculturist throughout the improvement work.

75.11 **RESOLVED-**

1. That the Transport Committee notes the options for incorporating the Elm tree into the Seven Dials scheme and the benefits and disbenefits associated with each option.
2. That the Transport Committee grants permission for officers to proceed with the preferred option for incorporating the Elm Tree, as outlined on the plan at Appendix 5.

**76. BETTER BUS AREAS**

- 76.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that sought approval to undertake consultation with members of the public and other stakeholders on proposals for infrastructure improvements on Edward Street as part of the Better Bus Areas Programme.

- 76.2 Councillor Mitchell stated that she fully supported the consultation but was disappointed that the worst part of the road from Brighton College to Sussex Square was not covered. Councillor Mitchell asked if the £770,000 capital funding was sourced from the authority or the Local Transport Plan.
- 76.3 Councillor Robins asked if any problems with loading on the south side of Edward Street might arise.
- 76.4 Councillor Cox stated his support for infrastructure developments in the area and queried whether a duplication of bids may arise with funding applications for cycle lanes in both Marine Parade and Edward Street.
- 76.5 In response to the points raised, the Principal Transport Planner clarified that the £770,000 would be comprised of £520,000 from the DFT (available immediately) and £250,000 from the Local Transport Plan fund for 2012/13. There was a requirement arising from the successful DFE grant funding that it be met by an element of match funding. The Principal Transport Planner supplemented that the need for improvement work in the area between Brighton College and Sussex Square had been identified however, progress would be delayed awaiting the development of the proposed 3T's project. The Principal Transport Planner added that loading on the south side of Edward Street may be an issue and would be discussed with stakeholders as part of the consultation process. Furthermore, the Principal Transport Planner stated that the development of cycle lanes on both Edward Street and Madeira Drive were deemed necessary to meet demand, as distinct locations and to promote safer cycling.
- 76.6 The Chair stated that he felt cycle lanes in both Madeira Drive and Edward Street were necessary as a very high number of journeys, to different locations were conducted on both roads.
- 76.7 Councillor West stated his support for the proposals as the latest part in improving road safety and sustainable travel that included Valley Gardens and Lewes Road. Councillor West added that his personal experience as a pedestrian on Edward Street was very bad and he felt the traffic was an impediment to the communities on either side of the road. Councillor West supplemented that improvements on the road would also assist transport links to the hospital, Amex Community Stadium and Brighton College all of which were key destinations in the area.
- 76.8 **RESOLVED-** That the Transport Committee approves for consultation with members of the public and other stakeholders, the scheme proposals for Edward Street contained within and attached to this report.

## 77. BRIGHTON STATION GATEWAY

- 77.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that requested permission to undertake the preferred option for the Brighton Station Gateway project. The report was supplemented by a presentation.

- 77.2 The Chair praised the outcome of the report, which he believed to be the best outcome from difficult circumstances. Specifically, the Chair highlighted the areas conservation area status.
- 77.3 Councillor Mitchell stated that on the basis of the informative and thorough presentation provided, the Labour & Co-Operative would reverse their original intention to abstain and now fully supported the project. Councillor Mitchell added that she hoped the Network Rail would realise Brighton & Hove City Council's commitment to the advancement of Brighton Station as a network link and that they would reciprocate. Councillor Mitchell supplemented that whilst this project was a good start, a lot more needed to be done in the area including developments to the Mangalore Way area. Councillor Mitchell noted that the work appeared expensive with cost £1.5m and asked for further information to this end.
- 77.4 Councillor Robins stated that he supported the comments made by the Chair. The project had a difficult brief and the best outcome had been reached.
- 77.5 Councillor West thanked the Project Manager for his work. As ward councillor for the area he was aware how thorough the consultation had been via workshops, public meetings and meetings with community and traders associations. Councillor West added that there were a number of complications arising from the location of a taxi rank on Fredrick Place and, whilst the possibility of doing so needed to be examined, it was clear that logistically and from the negative reaction from the North Laine Community Association and North Laine Traders Association that this was not viable. Councillor West summarised that even though the issue of the relocation of the taxi rank had not been resolved, this would be offset by other benefits including a gyratory system and a large increase in pavement space.
- 77.6 Councillor Follett stated he felt the final project proposals were a magnificent achievement in the circumstances and praised officers for their achievement.
- 77.7 Councillor Cox moved the following motion to change the recommendations as shown in bold and italics below:
- 2.1 Instructs the Executive Director Environment, Development and Housing to progress to detailed design a preferred scheme that ***relocates the Station taxi rank to Frederick Place using one of the options recommended by JMP Consultants in the North Laine Transport Study*** ~~retains taxis in their current location (as set out in Appendix 5)~~ and to advertise any necessary traffic regulation orders (TROs).
  - 2.2 Instructs the Executive Director Environment, Development and Housing to implement the detailed design subject to the outcome of the statutory TRO consultation process
  - ~~2.3 Instructs the Executive Director Environment, Development and Housing to work with other relevant partners to develop a Taxi Management Plan that will ensure the station taxi rank is properly managed in future.~~

2.4 Agrees that a decision on the future of the Station Canopy be deferred, subject to receipt of a future Network Rail planning application.

- 77.8 Councillor Janio formally seconded the motion.
- 77.9 Councillor Cox commended the work of officers adding that his proposed amendments were not a criticism of the work. However, he had concerns that the Committee were presented with a £1.5m scheme that had not found a solution to the significant problem of taxi flow outside Brighton Station. Councillor Cox noted the consultant's report, and their work which had cost £27,000, identified Fredrick Place a viable location for the taxi rank. Councillor Cox commented that in not relocating the taxi rank, the administration were not adhering to their own policies that placed great emphasis on decongestion of the public realm. Councillor Cox believed the scheme should adhere to its original promise and to do so would involve relocating the taxi rank to Fredrick Place. Councillor Cox felt that if the Committee could not agree to the relocation, the scheme should be abandoned and the allocated budget of £1.5m be diverted to the Old Town pedestrianisation scheme in order for the proposals there to fill their potential.
- 77.10 Councillor Janio supported the comments made by Councillor Cox and added that he could not establish why the scheme should go ahead. Councillor Janio supplemented that he believed there were better ways to spend the money.
- 77.11 The Chair commented that he was surprised by Councillor Cox and Councillor Janio's comments as the original vision for the Gateway scheme had been inherited from the previous Conservative Party administration. The Chair stated that the Brighton Station Gateway project was not simply about the relocation of the taxi rank although that topic had dominated the process. The Chair added that improvements in the area were badly needed and had been neglected too long. He believed the proposals put to Committee would deliver those improvements.
- 77.12 Councillor Mitchell agreed with the Chair adding that the area was becoming increasingly dangerous and could not be left as it was. Councillor Mitchell asked if the £1.5m budget for the scheme represented value for money and sought assurances that Network Rail would also provide significant investment.
- 77.13 The Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing clarified that it was for Members to determine whether they believed the proposals represented value for money. However, he believed there would be a significant, visible difference from the investment benefiting tourists, visitors and residents of the city. The Executive Director also commented that investment in changes to the physical landscape were often expensive due to the purchase of materials to do so. The Executive Director also highlighted the significance of the linkage to other investments in the area, specifically in the New England Quarter.
- 77.14 The Project Officer stated that the project covered a very large area and included significant structural changes, particularly to road junctions. In addition, the Project Officer referenced the improvements made to New Road as an example of how value for money could be achieved through good public realm design"
- 77.15 The Chair put the motion moved by Councillor Cox to the vote with the following result:

For: 3

Against: 7

77.16 Therefore, the motion was not carried.

77.17 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee:-

1. Instructs the Executive Director Environment, Development and Housing to progress to detailed design a preferred scheme that retains taxis in their current location (as set out in Appendix 5) and to advertise any necessary traffic regulation orders (TROs).
2. Instructs the Executive Director Environment, Development and Housing to implement the detailed design subject to the outcome of the statutory TRO consultation process
3. Instructs the Executive Director Environment, Development and Housing to work with other relevant partners to develop a Taxi Management Plan that will ensure the station taxi rank is properly managed in future.
4. Agrees that a decision on the future of the Station Canopy be deferred, subject to receipt of a future Network Rail planning application.

## **78. TRAFFIC ORDER CONSULTATION - RESIDENT PARKING SCHEMES**

- 78.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that addressed the comments and objections to the draft traffic regulations orders for proposed extensions to the Area J resident parking scheme (London Road Station area).
- 78.2 Councillor West stated that he believed that introduction of a controlled parking scheme in the London Road Station South area had been the benefit and prevented displacement. Councillor West noted that the overall result of the consultation had been equal and that he was in favour of accepting the recommendations to improve road safety.
- 78.3 Councillor Kennedy stated that whilst she was sympathetic to the concerns raised by Downs Junior School and the impact the measures would have on teachers, on balance she believed an extension to the controlled parking zone would be of significant benefit to resident safety which was very important.
- 78.4 Councillor Cox commented that the extension of the controlled parking zone was self-defeating and believed the problem of displacement was being shifted from one area to another as new and extensions to existing zones were introduced. Councillor Cox stated that he was in favour of a light touch scheme on the outskirts of the city and couldn't support the recommendations as in the report.
- 78.5 Councillor Norman noted that the result of the consultation was a 50/50 split and queried why this should indicate approval and not disapproval of such a scheme.

Councillor Norman re-iterated Councillor Cox's support for a light touch scheme in the area.

- 78.6 The Chair referred to paragraph 3.7 of the report which stated that overall 58% of respondents to the consultation supported the proposed extension with 42% against.
- 78.7 Councillor Mitchell noted that there were 288 responses to the TRO advertised for London Road North with 122 support and 166 against. In the Round Hill area 12 responses to the TRO were received with 1 in favour and 11 against. In addition, the London Road North figures had been imbalanced due to the very high number of respondents in Florence Road and Springfield Road that combined accounted for 71 of the overall total of 111 in support. Councillor Mitchell stated observed that only 3 of the 12 streets were in overall support for the scheme and on the basis, she could not support the recommendations.
- 78.8 Councillor West stated that the TRO process was quite distinct from the consultation process and the Committee could not assess the TRO responses alone.
- 78.9 Councillor Robins noted that 274 of the 385 responses in favour at the consultation stage had also come from 3 of 12 roads and had skewed the figures. Councillor Robins stated that he believed that the measures should apply to only the roads affected.
- 78.10 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to vote which resulted in a tie. He then used his casting vote in favour and the recommendations were carried.

**78.11 RESOLVED-**

1. That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following order;
  - (a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.\* 20\*\* (Area J extensions) TRO-6-2013
2. That any necessary minor amendments and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

**79. LIVELY CITIES - REGENERATION IN THE LONDON ROAD AREA**

- 79.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that informed Members of the results of the INTERREG IVB-assisted Lively Cities 'place making' pilot project that took place in the Ann Street/Providence Place area between 1-14 October. The report requested approval for preparation of a plan for a permanent scheme beginning in early 2014. The project was one of a number planned in line with the council's London Road Central Masterplan. The report was supplemented by a presentation.

79.2 Councillor Kennedy thanked the officer for the report which was to a high standard. Councillor Kennedy noted that she was encouraged with the proposals and progress and that she had monitored the project since its inception.

79.3 Councillor West commended the work undertaken to regenerate the area that was demonstrating early success.

79.4 **RESOLVED-**

1. That the committee endorses the preparation of a permanent implementation plan that falls within the remit of the Local Transport Plan and which takes forward and develops the successful aspects of the Lively Cities Common Room pilot project for the Ann Street/Providence Place area.
2. That the permanent implementation plan be considered at a future meeting of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.

**80. WEST HOVE & SOUTH PORTSLADE RESIDENTS PARKING CONSULTATION**

80.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that outlined a plan and timetable for consulting residents in West Hove and South Portslade on resident parking in accordance with the recommendations of the City Wide parking Review.

80.2 **RESOLVED-**

1. That, later this year residents, businesses and other stakeholders in Wish ward, Hove, with the exception of Boundary Road are asked by way of a simple letter, and any other measures officers deem appropriate, whether they agree in principle to the introduction of a full residents parking scheme for their area.
2. That officers in consultation with ward members consider the responses to the letter and decide which, if any parts of Wish ward should proceed to detailed design consultation and a further report is brought to Committee giving authority to proceed to detailed design consultation on any proposed scheme.

**81. BLAKERS PARK ROAD SAFETY SCHEME - TRO FOR PARKING RESTRICTIONS**

81.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee, having taken into account all duly made representations and objections, approves as advertised the Brighton & Hove (Waiting and loading/unloading restrictions and parking places) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No. \*20\*\* (TRO-7-2013)

**82. DYKE ROAD (SEVEN DIALS) - FORMAL TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER CONSULTATION**

- 82.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Transport Committee (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections):

Approves the BRIGHTON & HOVE VARIOUS CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2008 AMENDMENT ORDER No.\* 201\* (Dyke Road – Seven Dials)

With the following amendment:

- the proposed Loading Bay in Dyke Road (southern section) is to be amended and a Disabled Bay provided for the reasons set out in paragraph 4.6.

**83. AMEX COMMUNITY STADIUM RESIDENTS PARKING PROPOSALS - CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS**

- 83.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that addressed the comments and objections to the draft traffic regulation orders for match and large day resident parking schemes for the Coldean and Moulsecoomb areas of Brighton.
- 83.2 The Chair thanked officers for the production of an excellent piece of work and expressed his hope that the measures would assist Brighton & Hove Albion Football Club to meet their sustainability ambitions.
- 83.3 Councillor Norman stated that a similar permit scheme had worked very well in the Withdean area during the period Brighton & Hove Albion's were located there.
- 83.4 **RESOLVED-**
1. That having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, Transport committee approve as advertised the following orders:
    - (a) The Brighton & Hove (Coldean & Moulsecoomb) Event Days) Parking Order 20\*\* (TRO-9a-2013)
    - (b) The Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No. \* 20\*\* (TRO-9b-2013)
  2. That any subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

**84. FIVEWAYS SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOL SCHEME OBJECTIONS**

- 84.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that addressed the comments and objections to the draft traffic

regulation orders for double yellow line measures on Preston Drove and the repositioning of a bus stop to a position outside 391 Ditching Road.

84.2 The Chair stated that whilst he understood the concerns of the residents of 391 Ditchling Road, the relocation of the bus stop to that position was the most suitable option on the basis of safety.

84.3 **RESOLVED-**

1. That having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Transport committee approves Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No. \* 20\*\* (our ref TRO-23b-2012) for double yellow lines at Preston Drove.
2. That having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Transport Committee approves the relocation of the bus stop to the position outside 391 Ditchling Road.

**85. PRESTON PARK PARKING REVIEW - RESPONSE TO TRO**

85.1 **RESOLVED-** That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections the Committee approves as advertised the order:

- (a) Brighton & Hove (Preston Park) Various Restrictions Order 2012 Amendment Order No.\* 20\*\* (TRO-8-2013)

**86. ITEMS REFERRED FOR COUNCIL**

86.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 7.10pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

