

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting for questions submitted by a member of the public.

The question will be answered without discussion. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion. The person to whom a question, or supplementary question, has been put may decline to answer it.

The following written questions have been received from members of the public.

(i) Aquarium Roundabout- Beatrice Segura Harvey

“BHCC reports the number of accidents in this area but numbers in relation to volume of traffic are actually low. It is widely believed that the only most serious injury encountered by a pedestrian in proximity to the Aquarium Roundabout in the last five years was caused by a collision between a cyclist and a pedestrian. Is it possible for Brighton & Hove City Council to verify or clarify this?”

(ii) Aquarium Roundabout- David Rochford

“It is universally accepted that roundabouts are safer than traditional signal-controlled stops. Roundabouts reduced injury crashes by 75 percent at and around intersections where traffic lights were previously used. As well as being safer calmer and improving traffic flow, they are also cheaper to install and maintain than T junctions. Wider circulatory roundabouts are judged to be more future-proof and appropriate in a coming age of autonomous electric vehicles. On what basis did consultants ‘prefer’ a signalised junction over an improved remodelled roundabout?”

(iii) Valley Gardens consultation- Martin Christie

“Valley Gardens Forum’s dialogue with Coast 2 Capital informed us that there is no requirement for the agreed funding to be drawn down this financial year. Also that, as Valley Gardens 3 is a vitally important, once in a generation project, a suitable and appropriate timespan should be taken to ensure that it is done planned properly. Is the botched and rushed consultation and planning due to the electoral timetable of Councillor elections in May?”

(iv) Air pollution- Gary Farmer

“Harmful road traffic pollutants are at their most dangerous within the first 100m of the traffic with a drop off to near background levels within 200m downwind and 300m upwind. Current levels around the Old Steine already breach WHO targets and European law. This proposal doubles traffic on one side of the road within 10m of residences & businesses with increased stop-start traffic, buses in conflict with private vehicles, lorries & coaches – noise

levels doubled, acknowledged increased levels of air pollution. How can BHCC, Green Party councillors consider this acceptable for Brighton and the people who live here?”

(v) Valley Gardens Phase 3- Tam Duy Dao

“The reviewed plan has now added additional parking for 6 bays in front of listed buildings opposite the historic Victoria Fountain in which I live. In addition to 6 lanes of traffic outside my house how does the scheme which is designed to "ease traffic" imagine that 6 parking bays, a bus stop and 6 lanes of traffic waiting outside my house will in anyway make our lives, my home, my health, the facilities and events that use this avenue and the environment any better?”

(vi) Valley Gardens Phase 3 Business Case- Nic Roe

“Outside of the desk based research conducted by appointed consultant Mott Macdonald, what , if any, qualitative research, detailed third party advice or consultation was carried out in preparation of the approved Business Case for the project?”

(vii) Valley Gardens Phase 3 Design- Andy Roberts

“Apart from Council Officers, the Project Board and external consultants Mott Macdonald, were any other councillors, other BHCC departments, organisations, businesses or lobby special interest groups involved in selecting and drawing up the ‘preferred’ Option 1 from a working list of 44 plans and the eventual shortlist of 4 plans?”

(viii) Valley Gardens Phase 3 Design- Mirek Golabek

“Under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 relating to the land at 6-7 Old Steine a sustainable transport contribution sum paid to the council was £20,000 for a footway island. Initial option 1 plans did not meet this criteria and were reviewed. The revised plans do not meet this requirement, there is no footway island and concerns regarding the space and how it is vital for the viability of businesses in the area have been paved over. Why has the council ignored this matter and will we receive the island as agreed 5 years ago?”

(ix) Valley Gardens Event Space – Julian Caddy

“The Business Case for the Valley Gardens redevelopment cites several references to enhancing quality and capacity of event spaces. However, the quality for mid to large-scale events will be severely compromised through the lack of adequate allowance for power, water, waste and access, and capacity will be greatly reduced across VG Phases 1-3. New, often smaller, events sites are created without adequate consultation, while existing ones (Victoria Gardens, St Peter’s Church North and Old Steine) are either left unimproved or rendered unsuitable for future use. What assurance can the Committee give that fit-for-purpose space will indeed increase within current plans?”