

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

4.00pm 21 SEPTEMBER 2021

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Heley (Chair) Lloyd (Deputy Chair), Wilkinson (Opposition Spokesperson), Nemeth (Group Spokesperson), Bagaeen, Davis, Fowler, Hamilton, Hills and Platts

PART ONE

26 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

26(a) Declarations of substitutes

26.1 There were none.

26(b) Declarations of interest

26.2 Councillor Nemeth declared a pecuniary interest in Item 33(3)d as his spouse was an allotment holder. Councillor Nemeth stated that he would leave the Chamber during consideration of the item.

26.3 Councillor Wilkinson declared a pecuniary interest in Item 33(3)d as an allotment holder. Councillor Wilkinson stated that he would leave the Chamber during consideration of the item.

26.4 Councillor Fowler declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 31a (ii) as a business owner in Fiveways.

26(c) Exclusion of press and public

26.5 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).

26.6 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting.

27 ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY URGENCY SUB-COMMITTEE

27.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the decision taken by the Urgency Sub-Committee held on 10 August 2021.

28 MINUTES

28.1 Councillor Platts stated that item 24.10 of the minutes of the meeting held on 21 July were factually incorrect and the committee agreed to amend the item to read as follows:

24.10 In response to questions from Councillor Platts, it was explained that if the funding allocated for Old Shoreham Road could be allocated to the other 3 schemes proposed, there would potentially be is no loss to the Council and the DfT would not request funding back if the schemes could be delivered by April 2022.

28.2 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meetings held on 22 June and 21 July be approved as the correct record subject to the above correction.

29 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

29.1 The Chair provided the following Communications:

“I was delighted to be at the unveiling and launch of our new, all-electric refuse lorry – and also very proud to be the first local authority in the South East to have one. The carbon savings we will make is a hugely positive step towards becoming a carbon neutral city by 2030. By that date we will also have save £400,000 on fuel costs. The council now has 25 all-electric vehicles in its fleet.

“We have also been working closely with local campaign groups Surfers Against Sewage and Leave No Trace on a zero-waste beach initiative to educate the public about the dangers to us all, and especially our marine life, on leaving waste on the beach.

“Tomorrow is ‘Car Free Day’, a chance for all of us to reflect on the way we move around the city. Active, inclusive and sustainable travel is the future, not just for Brighton & Hove, but for the planet.

“We are in the middle of a Climate Emergency and only by changing how we think and act around travel and transport can we begin to tackle this global challenge. We’re pleased that this year some of our partners like the BikeShare will be offering free bikeshare journeys, that Brighton & Hove buses have offered free journeys to some of our beautiful nearby green spaces and that exhibitions displaying children’s views of their dream street are on display at the library to help promote these conversations. Later we’ll hear an update on the excellent work we are doing to support people who are making the switch to hybrid and electric vehicles, as well as our future plans to deliver more School Streets, which will help keep our children safe to and from school. Both of these are great examples of how we can change to meet the challenges of the future. Only by giving people the right infrastructure will enable them to make active and sustainable travel choices.

“In the next couple of weeks, we’ll be launching a consultation on two documents which will help shape the future of travel and transport in the city. Our Local Transport Plan 5 and Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan will set out how we connect our communities for years to come. I would urge as many people as possible to take the time to look over these documents and have their say.”

30 CALL OVER

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

- Item 34: School Streets
- Item 35: National Bus Strategy: Bus Service Improvement Plan
- Item 36: Highway Works Framework Contract
- Item 37: Electric Vehicle Charge Point Installation update
- Item 38: Parking Scheme Update report
- Item 41: City Environment Modernisation update

30.2 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 39: Local Approval of B&HCC Input to Environment Agency Flood Risk Management Plan Cycle 2 (2021-2027)
- Item 40: Official Feed and Food Controls Service Delivery/Recovery Plan

31 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(A) PETITIONS

(1) Residential tarmac verge

31.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 22 people that requested the Council to tarmac the grass verges along Birchgrove Crescent to provide parking for residents.

31.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition. The highway is provided so that people can pass and repass in a safe manner and not as an area for parking, the verges are provided for various important reasons including to reduce run-off of rain and domestic water, and is a key method used for flood prevention on the road. There’s also aesthetics, drainage for footways and to help as a division between the carriageway and the footway, it is our policy not to harden off verges for these reasons.

Even if the City Council were to consider the proposal in this road, the cost of these works if we were to proceed would be prohibitive and include re-kerbing the road on both sides, excavating the banks and providing retaining structures on both sides, structurally improving the verges so that they could be parked upon safely, there is also no budget provision for this type of scheme. I am sorry I cannot support this request”.

31.3 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the petition.

(2) Keep the Free Customer Parking in Preston Drove and Ditchling Road, Fiveways

31.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 1418 people requesting the Council to overturn the decision to Change the 1 hour free parking on Preston Drove and Ditchling Road, back in to Pay and Display parking.

31.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“The changes in free parking to paid parking were agreed following initial discussions at a number of Policy & Resources (P&R) Committee in late 2020 / early 2021. This was then approved by the members of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 19th Jan 21 and ultimately at Full Budget Council on 25th Feb 21. This was all part of the Council’s budget saving proposals for the financial year 21/22 and from a parking perspective involved over 200 different charging proposals which involves changes needed to all machines throughout the City and the IT system for PaybyPhone.

We do appreciate that any increase in parking charges can be challenging for all concerned and none of us enjoy having to increase parking charges across the city. As a Council we have had to make significant savings for the current 21/22 financial year and these changes were introduced to ensure there is better enforcement of these bays to allow more short term parking to support local businesses”.

31.6 Councillor Platts moved a motion to call for an officer report on the matter.

31.7 Councillor Nemeth formally seconded the motion.

31.8 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive a report to a future meeting responding to the petition request.

(3) Traffic calming on Marmion Road

31.9 The Committee considered a petition signed by 167 people requesting the Council introduce traffic calming measures on Marmion Road to improve safety.

31.10 The Chair provided the following response:

Thank you for your petition.

The collision history on Marmion Road for the previous three years has been studied and this shows that there have been no recorded injury causing collisions in either School Road or Marmion Road in this period. However, we of course note that that doesn’t mean that roads feel safe and that speeding doesn’t happen, nor that residents aren’t legitimately concerned. On 14th September, officers also conducted a site visit to monitor traffic during normal conditions. It was found that at the School Road end several vehicles that were attempting to enter Marmion Road from School Road had to give way to traffic exiting Marmion Road because of the narrowness of the road caused by parked cars. It was further observed that traffic then driving through Marmion Road had to give way to traffic approaching from the opposite direction at any point where there was a gap in the parking to allow vehicles to proceed past them. This parking was in effect traffic calming and observations suggested that because of this vehicle speeds remained low from when vehicles first entered the road.

However, I note that you of course want to see more done. Unfortunately, we have a great many request for traffic calming schemes and within our budget and what we have to do, we are looking at ways to manage this, and this can also mean prioritising areas where collisions have sadly been recorded. This is frustrating for all of us. I am pleased to update that there are a number of schemes planned to take place in the vicinity that should help to further reduce traffic volumes and speeds in this area. This includes the upcoming school streets scheme for School Road. If taken forward, this scheme is likely to consider a combination of signage and traffic calming to improve safety on the school approach. We are also progressing plans to implement road safety improvements along Portland Road as part of our S106 programme. These works are planned to take place this year and will include the implementation of a raised entry treatment at the junction of School Road and Portland Road. In combination, we believe these schemes will positively impact on the speed and volume of traffic in this area and will therefore address some of the concerns raised within this petition.

Considering the upcoming schemes in this area and the casualty record at this location it is not considered appropriate to take any further action at the current time. However, we would welcome feedback from the residents in Marmion Road once these schemes have been implemented to see whether there has been noticeable changes in the volume and speed of vehicles as a result of these changes. Once they are in place, please share your views via transport.projects@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Thank you so much for raising this important issue and we will continue to work to address concerns around traffic”.

31.11 Councillor Platts moved a motion to call for an officer report on the matter.

31.12 Councillor Wilkinson formally seconded the motion.

31.13 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive a report to a future meeting responding to the petition request.

(4) Speed bumps on Upper North Street

31.14 The Committee considered a petition signed by 5 people that requested the Council introduce speed bumps on Upper North Street to reduce traffic speed.

31.15 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you and of course I completely acknowledge your worries about road traffic collisions. We receive a large number of requests for traffic calming across the City. Unfortunately, taking into account budget and other considerations, priority for such schemes is given to locations that already have a high casualty risk level. In the past three years there have been two slight and one serious injury causing collision in Upper North Street and one slight and one serious in Montpelier Terrace. Whilst no casualty is ever acceptable, there are many other roads within the City with higher risk factors that would need to take priority at the current time.

We do however take your concerns very seriously and have recently installed a mobile vehicle activated sign in this location to influence driver behaviour and to capture traffic volume and speed data. The vehicle activated sign was installed in Montpelier Terrace in January 2021 and recorded an average speed of 21.03mph with a maximum speed recorded of 45mph at 20.50 on the 18th January. Although this maximum speed is

totally unacceptable it is not something that the Police, as enforcement authority for speed limits, could be prepared for and take action against. However, in addition to the vehicle activated sign, the Police have also deployed a speed indicator device at several points along the road to remind users of their speed in an attempt to keep travelling at the posted 20mph speed limit.

Based on the data available at the current time it would not be possible to prioritise this location above and beyond the current agreed programme of works. However, we will continue to liaise with the Police regarding their findings and should the situation change then officers would be happy to review this at a later date, and we are grateful to you and other residents for flagging issues of concern”.

31.16 Councillor Platts moved a motion to call for an officer report on the matter.

31.17 Councillor Wilkinson formally seconded the motion.

31.18 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive a report to a future meeting responding to the petition request.

(5) Buller Road Cycle Storage

31.19 The Committee considered a petition signed by 20 people that requested a covered cycle storage container on Buller Road.

31.20 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition and it’s great to hear of the demand for cycle storage from residents in your area.

While we are still in the early stages of setting up a cycle hangar scheme in Brighton and Hove, we will take note of the petition and will take the road into consideration when selecting locations.

We will be launching a survey in the coming weeks asking for residents to express interest in having a cycle hangar near them and we encourage the residents of Buller Road to also participate in this survey”.

31.21 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the petition.

(6) Increase pedestrian safety on Shirley Drive

31.22 The Committee considered a petition signed by 524 people requesting a 20mph speed limit and pedestrian crossing be introduced to improve pedestrian safety on Shirley Drive.

31.23 The Chair provided the following response:

“Officers have been in touch with the petitioners directly to confirm that Shirley Drive near the junction with The Droveaway has been included in the most recent round of assessments under the Pedestrian Crossing Priority Programme. This information is currently being processed and the outcome will be published as part of the pedestrian crossing priority list report that will be presented to the Environment, Transport and Sustainability committee later this year.

We receive a large number of requests for speed limit reductions across the City. The Police would need to support any proposed reduction in speed limit and they are unlikely to do this without physical measures being put in place to reduce and manage speeds along the entire corridor. This would require a detailed design, full consultation and an appropriate budget and resource to be identified in order to take it forward. As things stand, though we fully share residents' concerns around traffic speeds and the desire for more liveable neighbourhoods, priority for such schemes is given to locations that already have a high casualty risk level that specifically relate to speed related collisions. Based on the current casualty history for Shirley Drive it would not be possible to prioritise a speed limit reduction scheme of this type above and beyond the current agreed programme of works.

I appreciate that this is not the response that you were hoping to receive however we can only work with the budgets and workstreams that are in place and agreed. The only exception to this is where there is a recorded history of injury. In these instances, we can justify prioritising a scheme above and beyond the current agreed programme of works. I'd like to thank you for raising this and your concerns".

31.24 Councillor Bagaen moved a motion to call for an officer report on the matter.

31.25 Councillor Platts formally seconded the motion.

31.26 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive a report to a future meeting responding to the petition request.

(B) PUBLIC QUESTIONS

(1) Bristol Estate Refuse Collection

31.27 The questioner was not present to put the question.

(2) Arundel Drive West

31.28 Greg Moore put the following question:

"Heavy and constant traffic flows on the A259 mean that exiting Arundel Drive West in Saltdean is a dangerous and stressful experience for pedestrians crossing to the bus stop and for all types of vehicles including buses and bicycles. As part of its initiative to increase active travel, would the council please conduct some research into the viability of new traffic lights here?"

31.29 The Chair provided the following reply:

"Thank you for raising this. The Council receives a large number of requests for pedestrian crossings facilities across the City on a yearly basis. To manage this demand, we operate a pedestrian crossing priority request list. We will ask officers to add this location for consideration in the next round of assessments".

(3) Refuse Collection

31.30 Leela D’Arcy put the following question:

“I live in a block of flats called Teynham House in Saltdean. In total there are 3 refuse bins, 2 recycling bins and 2 glass bins which we share with Curzon House. The bin collections teams regularly miss us out and we simply can’t understand why, as there must be a schedule.

Please would you assign a member of staff who ensures that our bins are emptied every week?”

31.31 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question and apologies for the disruption you have been experiencing.

Upon changes to the bins whereby each block of flats received their own, lockable bins, there was some confusion as to collection crews and days.

I can confirm that Teynham House is on a collection schedule for the refuse, recycling and glass bins to be emptied on a weekly basis”.

31.32 Leela D’Arcy asked the following supplementary question:

“I would like to ask the council to pay a private contractor to empty our block?”

31.33 The Chair provided the following reply:

“We’ll take that away and I’ll personally ensure Teynham House is focussed upon in the coming weeks”

(4) Bristol Gardens Traffic Calming

31.34 David Trangmar put the following question:

“In November 2019 I presented a petition requesting the installation of traffic calming measures, /options for Bristol Gardens to prevent motorists using the road as a rat run. Since then I have asked a number of times for a progress report but have received no update on what's happening if anything. Please would you give me an update including likely timescales?”

31.35 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question. The early proposals for Bristol Gardens were put on-hold, along with a number of other schemes from the Local Transport Plan programme, at the start of the pandemic so that staff resources could focus on the delivery of the Transport Covid Action Plan. The delivery of this plan is still on-going as the team deliver the second tranche of the Emergency Active Travel Fund programme which is due for completion in 2022. The design process for Bristol Gardens however will commence once resources are available then any proposals that are taken forward will be subject to consultation with the local community.

Thankfully there have been no casualties on Bristol Gardens within the last three years and a speed survey was carried out in 2019 in response to the petition. The survey

recorded an average speed of 15mph eastbound and 18mph westbound. However, this doesn't of course mean that residents don't witness speeding or feel that more needs to be done. Whilst we understand the concerns of residents in this location, however as previously stated in other questions unfortunately we are unable to justify prioritising this scheme above and beyond the current agreed programme of works based on the information that is available, as we must prioritise areas with high casualty rates. However, I fully appreciate your comments and would encourage responses to the consultation on the design process for Bristol Gardens".

(5) Cycle path at Ovingdean Roundabout

31.36 Kevin Tilson put the following question:

"I recently had a serious accident whilst riding along the cycle path at Ovingdean roundabout.

Having revisited the area, I believe my accident was a result of the poor condition of the cycle lane both in terms of design and in terms of maintenance such as foliage growing over the cycle lane and a lack of signage. Please would the council meet me at the site to discuss how the bike lane here can be improved? As I would hate to think of someone else suffering in the way I currently am".

31.37 The Chair provided the following reply:

"Thank you for your question, I am very sorry you suffered an injury on the cycle path and hope you are making a good recovery, I can confirm that Officers would be happy to visit the site with you.

Please pass on your details after the meeting and officers will be in touch to arrange that".

(6) Communal Bins

31.38 Dinah Clarke put the following question:

"If residents taking part in the waste management consultation in Brighton, reject communal bins, or the street does not have suitable places for communal bins, what other ways are you considering that will ensure that our pavements are kept free of wheelie bins and recycling bins/boxes? Has the council considered issuing these residents with hard-wearing sacks for rubbish and recycling, like the one's residents in Lewes use and that are easily stored indoors between collections?"

31.39 The Chair provided the following reply:

"Thank you for your question.

There are many factors the council has to consider when determining how best to collect waste from different streets across the city.

This includes, for example, the placement of bins or boxes or bags ready for collection, the types and size of the vehicles required to complete the collection, service efficiency and health & safety.

One of the important factors, particularly in relation to the hard-wearing sacks, is manual handling.

Therefore, when determining the possibilities for waste collection – which can include bins, boxes and sacks, options appraisals are completed to ensure all factors are considered”.

31.40 Dinah Clarke asked the following supplementary question:

“Has the council considered issuing these residents with the hard wearing sacks as Lewes does for refuse and recycling?”

31.41 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Yes, the hard sacks have been recommended to us by both residents and councillors so that is something we are looking into as part of the options appraisal referred to in the answer”.

(7) Bins at Ovingdean Café

31.42 Deborah Smith put the following question:

“This summer I have worked at the lovely cafe on the undercliff at Ovingdean. Time and time again the 2 small bins there have overflowed - and people have asked why there aren't any recycling bins there either. Councillor Fishleigh told me she has requested more general waste and recycling bins there on numerous occasions. Please can you let me know why the bins were removed and what's the problem with replacing them?”

31.43 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question.
I am told that Cityclean is not aware of any bins being removed.
With regards to recycling bins, Cityclean is looking into how the recycling triple bins can be rolled out along the seafront in Ovingdean.
It's not as simple as just placing the bins, as the narrow promenade makes the emptying of these bins difficult.

Therefore, the service is looking at how the bins can be regularly emptied in a safe way before any bins can be installed”.

31.44 Deborah Smith asked the following supplementary question:

“The lorries do come down to collect rubbish, but they don't always stop at Ovingdean and I'm not sure why?”

31.45 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I can take that back to the team and ask about the trucks driving past the bins and not emptying the bins”

32 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

(A) PETITIONS**(1) Whitehawk Speed Bumps**

32.1 The Committee considered a petition referred from Full Council and signed by 60 people requesting the council install traffic calming measures on Whitehawk Road.

32.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“We receive a large number of requests for traffic calming across the City. As things stand, priority for such schemes is given to locations that already have a high casualty risk level. Based on the current casualty history for this section of Whitehawk Road it would not be possible to prioritise a speed limit reduction scheme of this type above and beyond the current agreed programme of works.

The Council does however operate a mobile vehicle activated sign programme which places flashing warning signs around the City to help to improve driver behaviour and to raise awareness of speed limits at locations where residents have raised concerns. We will ask for Whitehawk Road to be included for consideration as part of this programme. In the meantime, the Council is part of the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership and works with other bodies and Authorities to help improve road safety in the Sussex region. The Police are important partners and work with the Council and the community to help address concerns about speeding via its SpeedWatch initiative.

You can find out more about Community Speed Watch via this link to the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership: <https://www.sussexsaferroads.gov.uk/info/safer-speed/safer-speed/community-involvement/community-speed-watch>

I appreciate that this may not be the immediate solution you were hoping for but please rest assured that we take safety on our roads very seriously and all concerns are given fair consideration within the resources available”.

32.3 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the petition.

(2) Portland Road Crossing

32.4 The Committee considered a petition referred from Full Council and signed by 323 people requesting a pedestrian crossing on Portland Road close to Westbourne Street.

32.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition and highlighting the importance of reviewing this crossing. As this year’s 2021/22 Pedestrian Crossing Programme is currently being implemented, we will include this request as a priority for assessment in next year’s 2022/23 Programme that will be investigating the safety criteria including the information supplied as part of this petition that will be considered seriously as part of this process”.

32.6 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the petition.

(3) 20mph Speed Limit on Portland Road

32.7 The Committee considered a petition referred from Full Council and signed by 687 people requesting the introduction of a 20mph speed limit on Portland Road.

32.8 The Chair provided the following response:

“We receive a large number of requests for speed limit reductions across the City. The Police would need to support any proposed reduction in speed limit, and they are unlikely to do this without physical measures being put in place to reduce and manage speeds along the entire corridor. This would require a detailed design, full consultation and an appropriate budget and resource to be identified in order to take it forward. As things stand, priority for such schemes is given to locations that already have a high casualty risk level that specifically relate to speed related collisions. Based on the current casualty history for Portland Road it would not be possible to prioritise a speed limit reduction scheme of this type above and beyond the current agreed programme of works. However, officers are in the process of reviewing the current Road Safety Strategy and a report on this, which will include an updated approach to the management of speeding concerns, will be brought to a future committee.

We are also in the process of developing a series of road safety improvements for the Portland Road corridor as part of our S106 programme. This will include the following key elements:

The key aims of the scheme are as follows:

- Improved visibility at six junctions via build-outs and/or raised tables
- Improved pedestrian safety through reduced crossing distances and better visibility
- Speed reductions through the introduction of central hatch markings to visually narrow the carriageway and through tighter junctions to slow turning vehicles
- Improved cycle safety through the introduction of parking buffer zones and cycle symbols to encourage cyclists to take a primary position adjacent hazards such as junctions and parked vehicles
- Improved cycle infrastructure with the addition of cycle parking along the corridor.

These works are in the final stages of development and works are planned to commence from November this year. If the petitioners would like to view details of the proposed improvements then please pass on your details and one of our officers would be happy to provide further information.

Portland Road is visited several times per day by enforcement officers and they will be increasing patrols of the area. Dangerous parking can be reported directly to enforcement officers on the number provided on the parking web pages. The administration is supportive of more 20mph roads in the city, so I am proposing not only to receive the road safety strategy report, but also one more specifically to assess feasibility for 20mph on Portland Road and similar roads”.

32.9 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive a report to a future meeting responding to the petition request.

(4) Free school travel for children in Whitehawk, Bristol Estate and Manor Farm

32.10 The Committee considered a petition referred from Full Council and signed by 545 people requesting the council provide free return transport to secondary school for all

children and young people living in the East Brighton communities of Whitehawk, Manor Farm and Bristol Estate.

32.11 The Chair provided the following response:

“Firstly, I would like to thank everyone who has organised and signed the petition. I and the Chair of the Children, Young People & Skills Committee, are very keen to ensure that young people are not disadvantaged in their education because of where they live in the city or the transport options available to them. Therefore, we have already asked officers to look into what improvements can be made.

The city does benefit from a number of commercially operated school bus services and the council funds several services on top of this.

It is unfortunately very challenging to provide additional school bus services without significant further funding being identified. However, free school transport to a young person’s nearest suitable school is provided in line with statutory requirements set by the government. This means young people who live more than three miles from their catchment area secondary school are already eligible for free transport. In addition, the council will fund free public transport for children from low-income households who live more than two miles from school, subject to them meeting certain criteria.

I would encourage anyone from a low-income household, who is not already claiming help, to check if they are eligible for free school transport via the Home to School Travel Pages on the council’s website. <https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/apply-help-home-school-transport>

In terms of improving bus services, I am pleased to say we have introduced an extra late afternoon service from Longhill to Whitehawk which began at the start of this term. The council is funding this as a trial for this term and if demand is high, we will consider extending it. I hope this will allow more of Longhill’s students to benefit from the after-school activities the school offers.

In the longer-term, the draft Bus Service Improvement Plan on the agenda for this meeting includes a commitment to a future review of bus services supported by the council, including school bus services. This will happen once we are clearer on what long-term changes there may be to demand across the bus network generally because of the pandemic.

As part of this, I also want to make sure that the limited resources available are directed where they are most needed and that school buses are provided in a fair and equitable way across the city.

On a personal note, I completely believe that all public transport should be free. But unfortunately, the costs of making it free for a certain area of the city are extremely prohibitive for councils. But I sincerely hope that with our new enhanced partnership with the bus companies in the city we can work to bring costs down as much as possible.

Thank you again for bringing this petition”.

32.12 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the petition.

(5) Bexhill Road play area crossing

32.13 The Committee considered a petition referred from Full Council and signed by 317 people requesting a pedestrian crossing near Bexhill Road play area to improve safety of those accessing the play area.

32.14 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition and the updated information about Bexhill Road traffic provided. As you have identified in your petition the Council has an agreed process for assessing the suitability of pedestrian crossing locations, this includes a range of important social factors which effect pedestrian movement such as public perception of danger, the impact of crossings on community cohesion, access to key services and green space and improvements for mobility impaired people.

Assessments have been carried out annually since 2011/12 and funding allocated to make necessary improvements at priority locations. I have been made aware of the previous request back in 2014 where traffic flows alongside the other criteria didn't get this location into the priority for a crossing at Bexhill Road. However, as the petition rightly calls out changing conditions, your request has been added to the pedestrian crossing list for re-assessment in next year's 2022/23 financial year to determine whether a full investigation is now required”.

32.15 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive a report to a future meeting responding to the petition request.

33 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(B) MEMBER QUESTIONS

(1) Motorcycle Parking

33.1 Councillor Yates put the following question:

“Can the council commit to review their policies for the parking of motorbikes with respect to:

- On street paid spaces
- Access to residents parking permits
- Provision of on street secure parking facilities such as tethers

Residents see parking facilities for both cycles and motor cars and those residents and visitor who use motorcycles deserve similar consideration rather than the haphazard approach where a motorbike visitor to the CPZ cannot use the visitors permit to park in a bay that we would be happy for a car to use”

33.2 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The council has over 700 motorcycle bays throughout the city in which motorcycles can park free. We are currently working with Sussex Police and using their data concerning bike crime across the city in order to create a heat map of high crime areas, where we will be prioritising for the instillation of secure locking points.

We also encourage residents to apply for motorcycle parking during the consultation of resident parking schemes. Once resident parking schemes are implemented residents can also contact us to request a bay outside their property.

From experience there are always difficulties with motorcycles sharing parking bays with vehicles rather than using a dedicated bay, but we will be happy to review our policies of where motorcycles can park within controlled parking zones”.

(2) Bike Racks on The Undercliff at Saltdean

33.3 Councillor Fishleigh put the following question:

“The Undercliff is a very popular cycle route promoted by the council. Please could we have bike racks installed at the Saltdean end which is where many people stop for the cafe and sandy beach.

There are bike racks by the lido, but they are not signposted from the Undercliff and are a bit far from the seafront”.

33.4 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your request for cycle parking at this location. I’m pleased to say that we have annual rolling programme for new cycle parking locations funded through our Local Transport Plan. I will ask Officers to put your request on the list and explore suitable locations in the area”.

(3) LCWIP

33.5 Councillor Fishleigh put the following question:

“Residents from Ovingdean and Rottingdean have already been to numerous committees to ask for pavements and bike lanes beside Greenways and Roedean Road which are both busy main roads. These will help them out of their cars. Will pavements and bike lanes at these locations be included in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, when will the plan be finished and who is working on it?”

33.6 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question Councillor Fishleigh. I’m told that the technical input used to identify strategic priorities for the next ten years for the LCWIP has followed government recommendations and this has been combined with a wide-range of stakeholder input from across the city. On this basis, Rodean Road does feature in the proposed walking route for improvement. The wider Ovingdean neighbourhood has been assessed and is included but as a lower priority compared to some others across the city. The LCWIP consultation will be promoted and publicised across the city and enable people to review the various proposals in the document which are high level and to provide us with their comments and suggestions.

Once the consultation is complete, the plan will be brought back to this committee in March next year for it to consider the consultation results and approve the final document. It will then continue to be reviewed at regular intervals”.

(4) Bins in Ovingdean

33.7 Councillor Fishleigh put the following question:

“An Ovingdean resident came to committee and asked for new bins throughout the village. He even suggested locations. Sadly, no bins have appeared so please would you give me an update?”

33.8 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question.

Spring and summer are very busy times for Cityclean. Additional staff are recruited each spring and summer to complete seasonal tasks, such as weed removal, and help keep the city clean and tidy as a result of the additional footfall, particularly along the seafront. Unfortunately, in line with the national challenges facing employers, Cityclean has had difficulties with its seasonal staff recruitment this year.

Also, as reported previously, Cityclean has also faced disruption in recent months as a result of the volumes of staff ‘pinged’ and having to self-isolate, which is compounded by difficulties in recruiting additional agency staff.

Therefore, resources have been prioritised to focus on the seasonal activities required to keep the city clean, rather than the installation of new bins.

By way of an initial update of the six locations proposed in March, Cityclean has been able to give initial consideration to the proposed locations.

For the location near the bus stop on Greenways: this is an option Cityclean will explore further as the Bin Infrastructure Action Plan is delivered.

For the location near Blind Veterans on Greenways: this site is not possible due to the bin needing to be placed on grass.

For the location along the parking strip on Greenways: again, this site is not possible due to the bin needing to be placed on grass.

For the location on Ovingdean Road, at the entrance to the farm: this is an option Cityclean will explore further as the Bin Infrastructure Action Plan is delivered.

For the location at the junction of Ovingdean Road and Longhill road, next to the farm gate: this site is not possible due to the bin needing to be placed on grass.

For the location at the bottom of Old Parish Lane that links Ovingdean to Woodingdean: this is an option Cityclean will explore further as the Bin Infrastructure Action Plan is delivered.

Therefore, and as stated in March, the sites that are possible will be considered as part of the wholesale review of the bin infrastructure across the city. The potential locations will be included as part of this”.

(5) Refuse collections

33.9 Councillor Fishleigh put the following question:

“My friends in East Saltdean never have any problems with their bin collections. Not before COVID. Not during and not now. They even have food waste collections. What lessons can BHCC learn from LDC?”

33.10 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question.

As per the feedback provided to you from the Head of Operations, one of the particular issues that has affected Saltdean in recent months, has been vehicle breakdowns.

The widely reported issues of staff being ‘pinged’, the national shortage of HGV drivers and manual workers and staff taking well deserved annual leave, have compounded the issue.

This has meant that many areas of the city have faced disruption. The council understand this is frustrating which is why we asked for residents to bear with us whilst the service managed this incredibly difficult situation.

New vehicles have been procured and recruitment is taking place to alleviate the pressures. For Saltdean, a new twin-pack has been deployed, which was the type of vehicle suffering from breakdowns.

It is our understanding that there have been different arrangements in place for managing refuse and recycling collections during the pandemic between different local authorities. This may account for the differences experienced by residents in different local authority areas”.

(6) Seafront Cycle Lane Safety

33.11 Councillor Nemeth put the following question:

“What assessment has been made of safety to vulnerable, disabled and other pedestrians, and to cyclists themselves, of misleading markings that are still in place on the seafront cycle lane and of the continued misuse of that cycle lane whereby many cyclists continue to cycle along it in the wrong direction?”

33.12 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Safety assessments are undertaken by design engineers on all new Highway Schemes when in the design phase to understand and mitigate the impact to all users of the highway, including this scheme that offers cyclists additional separated space to use which improves their safety and better protects them from motor vehicles.

As you know the seafront cycle lane on the pavement also shares space with an incredibly busy pedestrian footpath particularly in summer months. Providing cyclists with their own separated space on the road has eased some of the potential for conflict between cyclists and pedestrians on the original cycle route.

A Road Safety Audit was undertaken for the disabled parking which did not raise any significant issues however we are always open to reviewing this if necessary and if concerns are specifically raised. As for disabled cyclists, the new routes now meet national standards and allow better access for disabled cyclist on specially adapted bicycles.

Some of the old signage on the original cycle lane was not removed as part of the initial installation of the phase 1 experimental cycle lane, this is due to the short time frame officers had to implement as a result of the government’s emergency active travel requirement, and there was not time for a full audit.

I’m pleased to inform you that an audit has now been conducted and incorrect markings and signs shall be amended, along with additional markings to further highlight the new one-way lanes.

There are very large road signs advising cyclists to move to the new cycle lane on the road at strategic locations and in addition there are also two large, illuminated signs to further advise cyclists and motorists of movement between lanes at Shelter Hall and by the Peace Statue”.

33.13 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“Do we know when the misleading markings will be removed by?”

33.14 On behalf of the Chair, the Assistant Director City Transport stated that a specific date was not currently known but could be clarified subsequent to the meeting.

(7) Wish Park Path

33.15 Councillor Nemeth put the following question:

“When will a path on the west side of Wish Park be reinstated, as per the wishes of ward Councillors and various other interested parties, to overcome the current unacceptable situation which sees vulnerable and disabled park-users having to leave the park itself just to get around it when the ground is wet?”

33.16 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for the question.

Unfortunately, the council does not currently have the budget to either install or maintain a new path.

It is the view of officers, following the site visit with yourself and Councillor Peltzer Dunn, that existing budgets are better spent on maintaining current infrastructure, and it’s not clear that a whole new path would resolve many of the issues raised”.

33.17 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“Do you see why members of the community who are disabled and those that look after anybody with disabilities would find this answer unacceptable?”

33.18 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Yes, it does sound a difficult issue and I’ll ask them to look at it again, but we do have very limited budgets. I’m sorry about that and I’ll see if there’s anything we can do to improve the situation”.

(8) Aldrington Tunnel

33.19 Councillor Nemeth put the following question:

“Why did the Chair back the removal of pedestrian safety measures at Aldrington Tunnel without assessing the risk in any way whatsoever to vulnerable and disabled pedestrians and without discussing the matter with any groups, such as Possability People and BADGE, that represent those who are now most in danger?”

33.20 The Chair provided the following reply:

“This request came from a local charity who take elderly and disabled people for cycle rides, and this route was previously completely inaccessible for accessible bikes. As you are aware there is no Traffic Regulation Order in place that excludes cyclists from using the tunnel and engineers have introduced signing to encourage cyclists and pedestrians to share the space responsibly. I understand that Officers undertook further site visits recently and have identified additional locations for further signing and lining to

be installed. I will also ask Officers to continue to monitor the situation and undertake further observations and if necessary, undertake risk assessments if that is deemed necessary and engage with interested groups”.

33.21 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“Was it just Pedal People that got in touch to lobby on the point or disabled charities that have a more general purpose rather than just cycling?”

33.22 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Pedal People came directly to me which is what escalated the issue but I believe lots of residents got in touch about the issue too”.

(9) Parking Permits

33.23 Councillor Nemeth put the following question:

“What assistance has the Council been giving to the thousands of vulnerable residents who have found it impossible to renew their parking permits in recent months and since I raised the subject at the June meeting of this committee?”

33.24 The Chair provided the following reply:

“We have tripled the number of staff working on the accessibility line to assist vulnerable residents or those who are digitally excluded. We also have built into the new online system the capability of Parking staff creating permits on behalf of residents who are unable to do this themselves.

We encourage digitally excluded or vulnerable residents to post their applications to us so we can process their applications. There is a drop box offer outside Hove Town Hall for residents to manually post their applications to us. We have also built in the facility for residents to upload their applications via the council’s new contact management system. I know the team are working round the clock to resolve these issues”.

33.25 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“How are we assessing the help we are giving to what might be thousands of people?”

33.26 On behalf of the Chair, the Assistant Director City Transport stated that the Head of Parking Services and himself were dealing with these issues daily and the problems were multiple, and the Council had brought in additional resources to target the issue carefully and effectively.

(10) Bikeability in Schools

33.27 Councillor Nemeth put the following question:

“What discussions has the Chair had with schools to address concerns over a reduction in Bikeability training over the forthcoming year?”

33.28 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Bikeability continues to be an extremely popular nationally recognised cycle training course service offered to children of school age. This year the Council have secured funding for 1255 Bikeability Level 1-3 training courses in 2021/2022 this compares with 1046 funded places in 2019/2020 and 992 places in 2020/21. Invitations have been sent to all schools to offer Bikeability places up to the end of summer 2022 and we have confirmed places with schools for the Autumn and Spring terms.

This year we also have 254 places on the extra balance and learn to ride courses and additional 141 places for the new Family Module. In addition to Bikeability the team have secured 300 funded adult cycle training courses and are continuing to offer places at park training courses which are extremely popular”.

33.29 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“There seem to be a concern amongst instructors over the rigidity of the contracts and they fear that students in certain schools won’t be able to get places because the number of hours are fixed. So, if there’s high demand in one school and a lower demand in the other, it’s thought that there will be a gap. Is that valid and if so, is it being addressed?”

33.30 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I have been in touch with some of the staff and it’s an operational issue and I know that staff are working hard to resolve it”.

(11) Madeira Drive

33.31 Councillor Nemeth put the following question:

“Knowing full well how hard the Council’s Events Team has worked to ensure the continuation of events on Madeira Drive, why has the Chair overseen inadequate consultation of interested parties when painting a large proportion of the road green amid warnings from event organisers and myself at the last meeting of this very committee?”

33.32 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The Madeira Drive scheme was delivered and developed following ETS Committee approval in September 2020. The scheme was discussed with Events Team colleagues and with event organisers and delivered in consultation with key stakeholders to nationally recognised standards including the most current Government guidance on walking and cycling infrastructure LTN120.

During design and following construction, meetings were held with Events Team colleagues and event organisers to ensure the scheme could support events. Initial consultation on plans were circulated to stakeholders in December, including events teams and seafront office teams, to circulate to their relevant stakeholders. As a result, colleagues in events provided contact details for the speed trials event organisers. The team spoke directly to the Chair of Brighton and Hove motor club regarding the plans on the 9th February 2021, 11th February and again on the 17th and 19th of February

following the relaxation of lockdown. On the 1st March officers met with the Chair of B&HMC on site to further discuss in detail the plans and how they could be adapted to ensure Speed Trials could continue to take place.

The green surfacing applied by approved contractors was tested for skid resistance and lawful use on the public highway and this was further demonstrated to event organisers including UK motorsport and Speed Trial Event organisers. Since its application all planned events have taken place including the speed trials that went ahead on the 4-5th September with the exception of the motorbikes due to a late licence application, it is understood motorbikes will take part next year. The Brighton Marathon weekend took place 11-12 Sept and further events are planned to take place as usual including The Electric Vehicle Rally and the London to Brighton Bike Ride”.

33.33 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“At the last meeting I did flag up serious concerns over the transport team’s position on Madeira Drive and I’m really just asking what steps were taken immediately after the meeting we had when this gap in knowledge over licensing was highlighted?”

33.34 On behalf of the Chair, the Assistant Director City Transport stated that all the issues were address including how they had undertaken the various levels of consultation with local businesses and event organisers”.

(12) Barley Grass

33.35 Councillor Nemeth put the following question:

“What, if anything, is the Chair doing to tackle the proliferation of highly-invasive barley grass in our parks, on our pavements and around trees to ensure the safety of dogs and to increase biodiversity?”

33.36 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Barley grass has always grown within our parks and on road verges.

When councillors of this committee decided, in November 2019, to restrict the use of glyphosate to remove weeds, it was made clear that there would be more weeds on hard surfaces

In line with the Open Spaces Strategy, grassed areas are being managed as natural green spaces, with reduced mowing. This means it is now more evident that barley grass exists across the city – but, it has always been there and has always seeded. City Parks are trialling yellow rattle at Easthill Park. This is a semi- parasitic plant which feeds off the nutrients in the roots of nearby grasses. By feeding off the grasses, it encourages wildflowers to grow. If the trial is a success, the team can look to rollout in other areas.

In areas that favour barley grass, it will continue to grow even if increased mowing and weeding was completed”.

33.37 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“Are you aware of the pain caused to dogs by its seeds and the financial costs to owners when these seeds make their way into the dogs bloodstream?”

33.38 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I’m not an expert at all but I was aware and I’m happy to arrange a conversation between you and Cityparks if you want to discuss anything in more detail as they are the experts”.

(C) MEMBERS LETTERS

(1) TRO-8a-2021 Surrenden Road

33.39 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillor McNair in support of the proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), but also in support of a resident proposal regarding the crossovers found on the north side (and two on the side south) of Surrenden Road in Patcham Ward.

33.40 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your comments in relation to the Traffic Regulation Order 8a-2021 Surrenden Road Area.

Legally the same restriction across a crossover needs to be consistent across a whole zone otherwise it would cause confusion and enforcement difficulties. We have had requests for access protection markings in the past on the basis that parking will be limited but light touch parking schemes (which this will be) tend to be underutilised so we would expect there to be sufficient parking on-street. If difficulties remain then we can consider this in the review one year after the scheme begins operation which allows residents to comment on how the scheme is running.

However, the Council could not condone any exemptions to double yellow lines as this would be very difficult to manage/enforce which could lead to issues and complaints. In terms of parking on tarmac crossovers between grass verges behind double yellow lines then we must have consistent legal traffic regulation orders. The lining restrictions need to be marked on every part of the carriageway including parking bays across the driveways to avoid confusion in enforcement, that also leads to PCN challenges that we could lose if there is ambiguity and non-conformity with other parking schemes”.

33.41 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Letter.

(D) NOTICES OF MOTION

(1) Tree Planting

33.42 Councillor Nemeth moved the following Notice of Motion:

This Committee calls for an urgent Officer Report to address confusion amongst residents and community groups over tree-planting costs which clearly sets out:

- i. The costs of different types of tree;
- ii. The costs in different planting situations such as park, old tree pit, etc; and
- iii. How applications should be made.

33.43 Councillor Bagaeen formally seconded the Notice of Motion.

33.44 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for this Notice of Motion. I support this and will request officers to bring a report on tree planting to a future committee meeting.

In the meantime, I am pleased to announce that we have been successful in the Forestry Commission's Green Recovery Challenge fund bid for funding towards the planting of 90 new trees in soft surfacing areas of high deprivation and low tree cover. The wards to receive trees are North Portslade, Moulsecomb & Bevendean and Woodingdean. We will be receiving just over £60,000, which includes three years of watering.

The Arboriculture Team are working closely with Highways colleagues to deliver the £200,000 stump replacement programme by April 2022. 63 sites across the city have been identified for stump removal, new tree pits, new trees and tree planting.

Also, phase 2 of Carden Woods will begin this winter, with the planting of approximately 2500 saplings (whips)”.

33.45 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approve the Notice of Motion.

(2) Citywide Roll-out of Real-Time Air Quality Monitoring System

33.46 The Committee considered a Notice of Motion approved and referred to it by the meeting of Full Council held on 15 July 2021.

This Council notes that:

- The city needs publicly available real-time data about pan-city air pollution (NO₂ and PM) to enable:
 - Officers to assess how interventions, building configuration changes or traffic flow changes affect air quality
 - Residents and visitors vulnerable to air pollution to plan their days when pollution levels are high.

This Council also agrees to request that:

- The Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee explores investing in a city-wide real-time AQ monitoring system with information available in real-time via a website for residents, councillors and officers.

33.47 The Chair provided the following response:

“The effects of harmful pollutants on individuals’ and local communities’ health were succinctly and powerfully described when Councillors Ebel and Evans spoke to support this Notice of Motion when it was presented by Councillor Fishleigh in July.

To tackle the main source of emissions, we have to reduce the number of vehicles on our roads, enable people to use active and sustainable travel for their local journeys, and shift to cleaner vehicles for essential journeys. These are the key themes of the emerging new Transport Plan for the city.

We fully recognise the valuable role that accurate, quality assured data can provide in helping people make informed decisions. The city's current monitoring system includes over 50 diffusion tube monitoring sites and four automatic monitoring stations which help to regularly monitor trends in air quality against national criteria.

A greater level of information will help to raise awareness of the effects of harmful pollutants on peoples' and communities' health. It can also inform people's day to day and future travel decisions, by helping them to choose when or if they travel to avoid the worst areas or times for pollution, or switch to lower or zero emission alternatives to minimise emissions.

Officers are currently in the process of reviewing air quality monitoring contracts locally and across Sussex with other local authorities, as there are value for money and data quality advantages of taking a consolidated and joint approach. Recognising the growing interest in, and benefits of, real-time monitoring, I am pleased to say that the role of an accurate and reliable real-time monitoring system as part of our approach to tackling air quality is already being explored.

Our Air Quality Officer has raised this matter in discussions with partners, citing international examples as well as those in London and Wales. This has been positively received and active consideration is now being given to available funding streams to develop an appropriate system. The new DEFRA air quality grant bidding round is an excellent opportunity to seek the funds required to develop a real-time system, and we will have a greater chance by working with partners and being able to offer matched funding. Our previous successes with that grant, such as the retrofitting of bus exhaust systems, also puts us in a good position.

Funding allocated from the council's current Carbon Neutral Fund will help to enable initial investment in air quality monitoring equipment. However, sustained and increased levels of investment will require further amounts of capital and revenue funding to be included in future council budgets to pay for and maintain established and new systems. I therefore agree to the Notice of Motion and propose calling for an officer report".

33.48 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approve the Notice of Motion.

(3) Urgent review of Allotments

33.49 The Committee considered a Notice of Motion approved and referred to it by the meeting of Full Council held on 15 July 2021:

"This Council resolves to:

1. Note concerns that have been raised by Site Representatives and Allotment Holders with regard to (i) the administration of the Council's Allotment Service and (ii) deviation away from the aims of the Brighton & Hove Allotment Strategy 2014-2024;
2. Request the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee to call for an officer report on options for improvement which provides the following:
 - (i) Breakdown by site of the different sizes of plot (i.e. full/half/third);
 - (ii) Breakdown by site and plot type of rent that was paid during the last accounting period;
 - (iii) Breakdown by site and plot type of plots that are currently unlettable;

- (iv) Breakdown by year of the number of people who have joined the allotment waiting list and paid the £17 charge, and how the funds have subsequently been spent;
- (v) Breakdown of the resources that are allocated to the Allotment Service;
- (vi) Breakdown of annual expenditure by site;
- (vii) Description of the role of Allotments Officer;
- (viii) Detail on which recommendations in the Allotment Strategy have been implemented and which remaining outstanding;
- (ix) Estimate by site of annual cost of water leaks;
- (x) Detail on when and why regular joint liaison meetings between Allotments Service staff, BHAF and other key stakeholders stopped; and
- (xi) Total amount that has been raised by voluntary donations from plot holders.

33.50 The Chair provided the following response:

“I can confirm a report on allotments will be brought to the next committee meeting. In terms of the specific points within the Notice of Motion, I have spoken with officers to determine what is and is not available for a future report. On point six, it is not possible to provide a breakdown of annual expenditure by site as the data is not recorded. On point seven, the report will provide a description of the allotment service, rather than only the Allotment Officer. This will link to the next point regarding the Allotment Strategy. On point nine, the cost of water leaks is not available, but water use per site can be provided”.

33.51 Councillor Platts asked if the points raised in the Notice of Motion would be incorporated into the report that had previously been agreed to be received by committee in November.

33.52 The Assistant Director, City Environmental Management confirmed that if agreed, it would be.

33.53 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approve the Notice of Motion.

34 SCHOOL STREETS

34.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out the proposed delivery approach of a city-wide School Streets programme for consideration and an update on the School Streets closures trialled as part of the emergency School Streets programme and considers comments and objections received through the consultation and advertisement of the relevant Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders.

34.2 In response to queries from Councillor Bagaeen, the Senior Project Manager clarified that the criteria process previously agreed by the committee had been applied for Aldrington School. The school had been assessed twice as part of the overall process and been determined as eligible for a school streets closure, the specific detail design of that had not yet been assessed or determined.

34.3 In response to questions from Councillor Wilkinson, the Senior Project Manager explained that AQMA's had not been undertaken at sites due to the urgency to deliver the scheme but could be considered for at least some sites. Furthermore, the three parking bays removed on Queens Rise could be reviewed and consideration given to reinstatement.

34.4 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee approve the proposed delivery approach for the School Streets programme, including the identified priority list of schools for closures to be delivered in the first two years of the programme as detailed in Appendix 1.
- 2) That the Committee note the comments and objections received through the ETROs for current School Streets closures, as detailed in paragraph 5 and Appendix 3, and agree to the Traffic Regulation Order amendments as set out in paragraph 3.6.

35 NATIONAL BUS STRATEGY: BUS SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

35.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval of the draft Bus Service Improvement Programme with delegated authority to amend, finalise and submit the document in advance of the Department for Transport's deadline.

35.2 In response to questions from Councillor Platts, it was clarified that the ambition was to include Stagecoach in the common ticketing although there were some GDPR issues to overcome with the technology. Furthermore, officers and operators were seeking to expand real-time information coverage with possible new funding streams available and similarly, efforts were being made to overcome technology issues. In relation to the reduction of fares, dealing with congestion was a significant factor to costs and officers were pushing bus companies to give a better offer. In addition, the Senior Project Manager explained that there had been some misunderstanding in relation to the Budget Council amendment but that was now understood. A circular bus service had been tried before and it was clear that it was not sustainable without significant funding although the matter would be looked at again for a solution. On free fares for under 16's, the obstacle and complexity was that there would be a big impact on bus services at peak demand time and more buses and therefore more subsidy might be required.

35.3 In response to Councillor Bagaeen, the Senior Project Manager explained that supported services needed clarification was needed on what additional funding the DfT and council could provide as well as any additional support from the bus companies.

35.4 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee approves the draft BSIP.
- 2) That the Committee grants delegated authority to the Executive Director Economy, Environment & Culture to:
 - (i) approve any amendments to the draft BSIP that the Executive Director may consider appropriate or expedient following further consultation with the Chair of ETS, Chair of

the Quality Bus Partnership, ETS Lead Spokespersons and members of the Quality Bus Partnership; and

(ii) approve the submission of the final BSIP before the deadline set by the DfT (currently 31 October 2021).

3) That the Committee notes the receipt of a further £124,481 Capacity Funding provided by the DfT to the Council to respond to the tasks set out by the DfT in the National Bus Strategy and that the Committee agrees for such funding to be used in the development of Enhanced Partnership schemes.

36 HIGHWAY WORKS FRAMEWORK CONTRACT

36.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval to retender the Highway Works Framework contracts which are expiring and incorporate other services into the tender process to improve efficiency.

36.2 In response to a question from Councillor Nemeth, it was explained that the new contract wouldn't tie the council to any specific operation in relation to tree planting or stump removal and the council could consider an in-house option or an alternative to the current contractor.

36.3 RESOLVED-

1) That the Committee authorises the procurement of a framework agreement for new highways works and grants delegated authority to the Executive Director Economy, Environments & Culture to enter into call-off contracts in accordance with the terms of that framework agreement.

37 ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGE POINT INSTALLATION UPDATE

37.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that updated Committee on progress in expanding the electric vehicle charging infrastructure in the city, and a successful new bid for funding. The report also responded to the deputation received by Electric Brighton CarShare Ltd requesting permission to set up a local not for profit electric car club. It proposes that officers work to identify parcels of land close to the A27 trunk road suitable as a long-term investment opportunity for a rapid charging station.

37.2 In response to questions and comment from Councillor Bagaeen, the Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager explained that sector was very new and emerging and there were not many companies with experience of delivery. The risks were detailed in the report and the eight bays that would be transferred could be reconverted or given to other car club companies if any issues arose. The Lawyer stated that the company was incorporated and a legal entity so there were no legal issues in relation to that specific matter.

37.3 In response to a query from Councillor Wilkinson, the Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager stated that delivering on the significant demand for electric charging points was a challenge and officers would continue to apply for funding to deliver those.

37.4 In response to a question from Councillor Nemeth, the Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager explained that the parcel of land required was approximately ¼ of an acre and no specific site had been identified as yet.

37.5 RESOLVED-

- 1) That Committee notes progress with the installation and commissioning of lamp post chargers, fast chargers and on street rapid charging hubs and the planned submission of further bids to the Office for Zero Emission Vehicles for funding for charge points
- 2) That Committee notes the successful bid for Innovate UK funding to create model bookable disabled bay charge points and bookable public charging for fleet vehicles where the driver has no off-street parking.
- 3) That Committee agrees to allocate eight car club bays at the four locations identified in this report for use by Electric Brighton CarShare Ltd, subject to the consideration of any objections to the Traffic Regulation Order.
- 4) That Committee agrees to re-allocate the car club bay in Ewart Street from Enterprise Rent-A-Car to Electric Brighton CarShare Ltd.
- 5) That Committee requests that officers work with UK Power Networks to identify a parcel or parcels of land close to the A27 trunk road suitable for inviting commercial investment in a rapid or ultra-rapid charging station under a minimum 15-year lease and other terms agreed with Property & Design.
- 6) That Committee notes that where possible new charge points installations will be placed on the carriageway to avoid pavement clutter.

38 PARKING SCHEME UPDATE REPORT

- 38.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that updated Committee on the progress of the recent parking consultation in Hazeldene Meads and The Beeches and also asked Committee for approval on recent Traffic Regulation Orders for the Surrenden area and for agreement that residents of Ditchling Road Nos. 204-276 (evens) shall be restricted to applying for a resident permit for Zone J only.
- 38.2 In response to a question from Councillor Hamilton, the Parking Infrastructure Manager explained that the issue regarding Ditchling Road related to a new online permit system that was different and linked to council tax and DVLA records.
- 38.3 In response to a comment from Councillor Fowler that the new system was a major inconvenience for three residents, the Head of Parking Services explained that the new system was more robust and would improve the customer experience. Unfortunately, residents could not be offered a choice as the status quo was presenting major problems and doing so would set a precedence citywide that would be unworkable.

- 38.4 In response to a question from Councillor Davis, the Head of Parking Services confirmed that Internal Audit had issued a high-level recommendation in relation to the matter as the previous system was not robust and open to fraud with the new system requiring proof of address.
- 38.5 Councillor Nemeth suggested the committee defer the report for a solution to be found.
- 38.6 Councillor Lloyd stated that a deferral would be unfair on those residents in Hazeldene Meads and Surrenden Road who had waited a very long time for a parking scheme.
- 38.7 The Chair proposed voting on the recommendations separately.
- 38.8 A vote was undertaken and recommendations 2.1 and 2.2 were agreed and recommendation 2.3 failed.

38.9 RESOLVED-

- 1) That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments, agree to proceed to the next stage to advertise the Traffic Regulation Order for a scheme in the Hazeldene Meads and The Beeches area (Extension to Zone P – Hove Park)
- 2) That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments, agree that the following Traffic Regulation Orders are approved to enable the Surrenden area parking zone 10 to proceed to the implementation stage: -
BRIGHTON & HOVE VARIOUS CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2018 AMENDMENT ORDER NO.* 202* (TRO-8A-2021)

BRIGHTON & HOVE OUTER AREAS (WAITING, LOADING AND PARKING) AND CYCLE LANES CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2018 AMENDMENT ORDER NO.* 202* (TRO-8B-2021)

39 LOCAL APPROVAL OF B&HCC INPUT TO ENVIRONMENT AGENCY FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN CYCLE 2 (2021-2027)

39.1 RESOLVED-

- 1) That the Committee approve the officer input to the Flood Risk Management Plan as detailed in Appendices 1 and 2 of this report.

40 OFFICIAL FEED AND FOOD CONTROLS SERVICE DELIVERY/ RECOVERY PLAN

40.1 RESOLVED-

- 1) That the committee agrees the Official Feed and Food Controls Service Delivery/ Recovery Plan for 1 October 2021 to 31 March 2023 set out in the appendix to this report.

41 CITY ENVIRONMENT MODERNISATION UPDATE

- 41.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided an update on the City Environment Modernisation Programme, provided updates relating to several Cityclean service areas.
- 41.2 In response to questions from Councillor Platts, the Assistant Director, City Environmental Management stated that there were long-term problems with the refuse service and whilst a huge amount of work was happening, there was so much to do to get the foundation of the service right. The Head of Business Support & Projects added that Cityclean phone lines would open next week, and a discussion would be held with the customer service team about the standard of responses. In addition, a report on options for food waste would be received by a future committee and on graffiti, businesses would be asked to start tackling this on utility items and there would be further discussions about challenges met by bug businesses in removing graffiti from their property. On the subject of weeds, officers had held discussions with the Pesticide Action Network (PAN). Weed removal technology had moved on rapidly recently and City Environmental Management would be purchasing new equipment for manual removal.
- 41.3 **RESOLVED0**
- 1) That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee note the progress of the Modernisation Programme, including the updates in Appendix 1.

42 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

- 42.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 8.30pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of