

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**  
**ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE**

**4.00pm 1 JULY 2014**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor West (Chair), Councillor Deane (Deputy Chair), Cox (Opposition Spokesperson), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), Mitchell (Group Spokesperson), Robins (Group Spokesperson), Buckley, Daniel, Davey and G Theobald

**Other Members present:** Councillor Summers

**PART ONE**

**1 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**1(a) Declarations of substitutes**

1.1 There were none.

**1(b) Declarations of interest**

1.2 There were none.

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

1.3 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(I) of the Act).

**2 MINUTES**

2.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 April 2014 be approved and signed as the correct record.

**3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE CITY SUSTAINABILITY PARTNERSHIP (FOR INFORMATION)**

- 3.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting of the City Sustainability Partnership held on 6 March 2014 be noted.

#### 4 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

- 4.1 The Chair provided the following Communication:

*“Today’s meeting is our first that will be webcast live and will be capable of repeated viewing.*

*May I first of all welcome Councillor Ruth Buckley and Councillor Lizzie Deane who have joined the committee for this year. Cllr Deane served previously on the Environment & Sustainability Committee and is taking the role of Deputy Chair of this committee.*

*As members will be aware our partnership bid for the Brighton & Lewes Downs to be designated a UNESCO Biosphere has been successful. I know that all three parties, while in administration have contributed to this initiative and I know that the commitment has been acknowledged by the Chair of the Biosphere Partnership. Having received recognition that our local environment is not only special but world class, we now need to move forward together to make the very most of this opportunity for nature, for our economy and for local people.*

*This morning I was delighted to open the new public toilets in the refurbished arches near the West Pier.*

*In line with the recommendation of the Scrutiny Panel and in line with the recent consultation on charging we have taken the opportunity to install charging facilities the modest charge of 30p will help support on-going costs in context of the budget constraints we face from government cuts. It’s a splendid facility.*

*Summer is always a busy time and I would like to quickly add a note of celebration of the successful opening of the Waste House at Brighton University.*

*We have also had another very successful Festival of Nature at Stanmer Park. I very much enjoyed the day with my family, and our officers really are to be commended for all the work they do and for achieving such a high turnout.*

*The Eco Technology Show was also another roaring success this weekend – this event is now a very well established and is playing a vital support of our green economy.*

*I was delighted with the recent figures showing that road safety in the city is improving. In the last three years, casualties have fallen 18%, and road deaths have dropped by 63% since 2010.*

*This a testament to the work of colleagues on this committee in approving proposals for slower speeds and better road layouts, both of which have helped save lives on our streets, and lay a strong foundation for reaching the ambition of the Road Safety Strategy we will be considering later.*

*And finally, I would like to remind members that officers are putting together a tour for members of our Nature Improvement work. This offers to be a great day out and I hope members will be able to come along and show their support for the hard work staff and volunteers are doing to improve diversity”.*

#### 5 CALL OVER

- 5.1 The following items on the agenda were reserved for discussion:

- Item 9: Review of the Animal Welfare Charter
- Item 12: Safer Roads Strategy 2014-2020- A road safety strategy for Brighton & Hove
- Item 15: Valley Gardens
- Item 16: North Street Environmental Improvement
- Item 17: Brighton & Hove Permit Scheme
- Item 18: Preston Park Triangle proposed Area J extension- consideration of objections to draft traffic regulation orders
- Item 19: Bakers Bottom & Craven Vale resident parking scheme consultation
- Item 20: Lewes Road Triangle resident parking scheme consultation
- Item 21: Double yellow lines traffic order

5.2 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 10: East Brighton Park and Wilson Avenue parking controls- formal traffic order consultation
- Item 11: Award of lease Rottingdean Pitch & Putt
- Item 13: Road Safety Audit Policy
- Item 14: Brighton Marina to River Adur coastal study
- Item 22: Surrenden Road traffic management/road safety scheme

## 6 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

### (a) Petitions

#### (i) School Pavement Safety- Councillor Summers

6.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 115 people requesting improvements to safety on Rusper Road, Selham Drive and Hawkhurst Road.

6.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*"I am sure I can speak for all members of the committee in saying how sorry we are to hear of the concerns of local residents about safety of the walk to school journey for parents and children attending Coldean School.*

*Safe journeys to school are a core element of the Council's road safety approach, which include effective school travel planning, safe infrastructure measures and speed management. We are also taking steps to deal with inconsiderate parking at key locations on routes to schools, such as junctions and at crossing points.*

*Our school travel planning officers and staff from Coldean School have made significant improvements to the travel patterns associated with the school over the past few years, as part of the work we have been doing in the Lewes Road corridor.*

*I will ask the Road Safety Manager to extend his work to include a review of the traffic and safety conditions at the junction with Selham Road and evaluate the merits of making Rusper Road a one-way street between Selham Drive and Hawkhurst Road. I will ask him to respond directly to the petitioners once this work is complete.*

*I am grateful to the petitioners for bringing their concerns to the attention of Committee”.*

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

(ii) Communal Glass recycling- Bronagh Wedderburn

6.4 The item was withdrawn by the petitioner.

(b) **Written Questions**

(i) **New England Road railway bridge- Neil Schofield**

6.5 Neil Schofield asked the following question:

*“Despite recent works the railway bridge over New England Road continues to be infested by feral pigeons, leading to mess on the pavements and a deeply unpleasant environment for pedestrians passing underneath the viaduct. Moreover the lighting has deteriorated, creating an environment that is unwelcoming and gives rise to public safety concerns. Will the Council task a named Officer to co-ordinate management of this space across the various interested Council departments to ensure that this area is kept clean and safe, and whose duties will include ensuring that Network Rail pigeon-proof the bridge properly?”*

6.6 The Chair provided the following response:

*“The Council's street lighting team are currently working on plans to improve the lighting at the New England Railway Bridge. The works to be carried out in this financial year include removal of the wall mounted lighting, installation of columns and the provision of Pigeon proofing to protect the lanterns. Furthermore, the council clean this area weekly with a mechanical sweeper and jet washing unit, it is also manually swept and litter picked once a week. The Council's lighting and street cleansing services are part of the environment directorate, which is directed by Geoff Raw. Responsibility for any further liaison that is required with Network Rail over issues relating to the bridge ultimately lie with Geoff”.*

6.7 Neil Schofield asked the following supplementary question:

*“Thank you for a named contact. Would Geoff Raw be willing to meet local campaigners?”*

6.8 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Geoff Raw is the first point of contact however he may ask other officers with direct knowledge of the area to attend a meeting. I would suggest that there would also need to be an assessment of the effect of recent initiatives first”*

(c) **Deputations**

(i) **20mph speed limit consultation- Chris Murgatroyd**

6.9 The Committee considered a Deputation requesting the council to consult with the residential roads around Hove Park and Hove Recreation Ground as part of the next phase of the 20mph scheme on the city.

6.10 The Chair provided the following response:

*“The residents of the roads referred to were consulted, in August and September 2013, as part of Phase 2 of the 20mph programme. The exclusion of much of the Dyke Road West area from Phase 2 was as a result of a majority of residents in the area as a whole (60%) opposing the introduction of 20mph limits with only the area surrounding the local schools incorporated in the final Phase 2 design.*

*Reasons were offered in the officers reports for the removal from Phase 2 of streets within this area which included a consideration that if local residents were not in support of the lower limit on their own roads then they, the people perhaps most often driving on them, would be less likely to comply voluntarily with them making it less likely that other drivers would do so too.*

*However, the specific roads you mention, as you say, did show a small majority in support and the recent planning approval for a school site in the area adds strength to arguments in favour of inclusion of these roads in phase 3 as this new school will see more school children using these roads as routes to and from school.*

*More broadly, in your deputation you also draw attention to the journeys taken through the area by children attending a number of nearby schools, and also the journeys that are made to Hove Park and Hove Recreation Ground.*

*I would therefore ask the Committee if they are willing to instruct officers to include further consideration of this area, in light of this deputation and the future location of the Spanish Bilingual Primary School, in the future report on the 20mph programme due before this Committee in November 2014 so that members can reconsider all the issues related to these streets”.*

6.11 Councillor Cox stated his disappointment that the Committee had not been provided advance notice of the Chair’s recommendation to allow for assessment of the request.

6.12 The Chair clarified that his recommendation was not for immediate implementation of a 20mph limit in the area but a request that officers consider the request as part of the upcoming Phase 3 programme.

6.13 Councillor Mitchell stated that each Member had given careful consideration to the Phase 1 and Phase 2 programme and whilst she appreciated the Deputation request, the Committee required evidence and further consideration.

6.14 Councillor Theobald stated that ward councillors would also need to be consulted on the proposals.

6.15 Councillor Cox stated that he found it extraordinary that such a request was being made of Members without any advance notification from the Chair.

- 6.16 Councillor Davey stated that he found it reasonable to reconsider the specified area for a 20mph limit in light of the approval for a new school in the area which was an additional factor in road safety considerations.
- 6.17 The Chair clarified that he was not requesting the Committee immediately proceed with consultation of implementation of 20mph in the area but that they ask officers to revisit this specific area as part of the planned Phase 3 stage of 20mph in the city.
- 6.18 Councillor Janio stated that the Committee should have been provided advance notification of the request and without that; he could not support the proposal.
- 6.19 Councillor Davey stated that it was normal for the Committee to request a report on any matter and, if agreed, a report would be returned to Committee to examine the case for and against introduction of 20mph in the specified area.
- 6.20 The Head of Transport stated that officers had a degree of knowledge of local factors due to the extensive 20mph consultation already conducted. He added that should Committee agree, the specific area could be included in the wider Phase 3 20mph report due to be submitted to Committee in November.
- 6.21 Councillor Mitchell requested discussions be held with the new school on their travel to school plans.
- 6.22 Councillor Cox stated that he was in agreement for the request to be considered as part of the overall report on Phase 3 of the 20mph scheme.
- 6.23 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation request be investigated and reported back to Committee as part of the overall report on Phase 3 of the 20mph scheme.

**(ii) Beacon Hub proposals- Councillor Bob Webzell**

**(iii) Beacon Hub proposals- Jay Butler**

- 6.24 The Deputations were withdrawn as the Committee had agreed the amended recommendations in the related agenda item that supported the requests made in the Deputations.

**(iv) Area J extension**

- 6.25 The Committee considered a Deputation that expressed support to extend the proposed Area J Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) to include the Lewes Road/Triangle Area due to severe access problems in Park Crescent and access to local shops.
- 6.26 The Chair provided the following response:
- “Thank you for your comments. These matters are being discussed in a report later in the meeting when members of the Committee will decide on the way forward”.*
- 6.27 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

## 7 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

### (a) Petitions

#### (i) Stanmer Village- Jamie Hooper

7.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 48 people requesting that no bid be submitted to the Heritage Lottery Fund Parks for People until issues on parking space and community space be resolved. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 8 May 2014.

7.2 The Chair provided the following response in writing:

*Thank you very much for your petition expressing your concerns about parking in Stanmer Park and the need for community facilities. I know that these are issues the residents in Stanmer Park feel strongly about.*

*I hope you agree that we had a very useful meeting with you and a number of representatives from the village a few weeks ago to talk these and other issues through. Officers explained that as part of the Stage 1 submissions we will not have yet worked out the detailed proposals to address parking in the park.*

*We intend to work on the detailed proposals once we have completed our stage 1 applications in the New Year.*

*I am very pleased that we have established a working group with representatives from the village and we will work closely with this group on the development of the whole project, including parking proposals. The working group will also form a clear mechanism for residents to feed their proposals in to the continued development of the masterplan.*

*On the issue of your request for a community space, again this level of detail has not been worked out yet and is not required for the Stage 1 bid. However community engagement is a key criterion in the HLF application process and we do expect the final plans to include community facilities.*

*So in summary, subject to the decision by the Policy & Resources Committee on the 10<sup>th</sup> July we will be submitting our high level Stage 1 applications to HLF later this year. Hopefully these will be successful and contribute to the resources needed to develop our detailed Stage 2 plans which will include parking issues and community facilities.*

*I am very pleased that we have identified a mechanism for working with Stanmer Residents through the working group and look forward to your close involvement as this project progresses”.*

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

### (c) Deputations

#### (i) Recycling in the Clarendon area- Jackie Quinn

7.4 The Committee considered a Deputation concerning refuse and recycling collection in the Clarendon area of Hove. The Deputation had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 8 May 2014.

7.5 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your deputation regarding communal refuse and recycling in the Clarendon Area and I’m sorry you have had cause to complain.*

*The refuse and recycling service has been through a significant period of change since last summer and this has unfortunately caused disruption.*

*The changes were implemented following negotiations with the unions on allowances and subsequent restructuring of the collection rounds. These changes affected the whole city and were the biggest we have ever had to implement and as a result have taken some time to bed down.*

*I am pleased to say that the changes have now largely bedded down and the situation has improved significantly.*

*The changes have improved the service for residents in that we now provide collections on bank holidays for those properties with kerbside collections.*

*At the same time we have also been introducing communal recycling to many areas of the city centre following a successful trial which showed the new service increased recycling rates and was preferred by service users. Communal recycling bins are emptied at least three times per week and one of the advantages is that residents do not need to remember on what days they are collected.*

*The communal recycling roll out will be completed in the next two weeks.*

*Where communal bins are just being rolled out we are sometimes seeing a purge as people get rid of recycling they have stored for collection. We sometimes also have to tweak bin locations once we know which bins are used more than others.*

*We do not advertise collection dates on communal bins as people can use them at their convenience and do not need to remember when collection days are.*

*We are working on a campaign to encourage people to recycle more and an incentive scheme whereby the communities in the city will benefit if recycling rates increase. This will work by allocating some of the savings realised through increased recycling to a community fund.*

*I have today received your email which suggests residents are experiencing ongoing problems and I will ask officers to meet with you to discuss how they might improve the service in your street.*

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

## 8 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

### (b) Written Questions

#### (i) Abandoned bicycles- Councillor Cox

8.1 Councillor Cox asked the following question:

*‘I congratulate the progress the Administration has made in the last 3 years in the provision of more public cycle parking.*

*There does though remain a shortage of cycle parking spaces in the City. This is exacerbated by the large number of obviously abandoned bikes (and often just bits of bike) taking up valuable bike parking spaces. Currently the Council takes at least 28 days (and often much longer) to remove these bikes. Will the Council consider allowing more*

*discretion in the operation of the procedure for abandoned bikes, and in particular authorise the immediate removal of bikes which it is reasonable to assume by their condition have been abandoned?*

8.2 The Chair provided the following reply:

*“As someone who has recently returned to cycling, I very much appreciate the frustration you express about availability of cycle parking and impact of abandoned bikes can have upon that availability. Thanks to the success of our transport policies, we have a burgeoning demand for cycle parking and I am keen to explore new ways to help increase cycle parking, and we are also working on improving capacity to deal with abandoned bikes.*

*We have recently increased our collection runs for abandoned bikes to once a fortnight. These are carried out by the enforcement officers using a small pickup. In addition, the officers are now actively looking for potentially abandoned bikes and this has led to over 120 bikes being ticketed in the last few days.*

*Between April 2013 and March 2014 we investigated over 1000 bikes and removed nearly 400. Currently the bikes are handed to the Sussex YMCA.*

*Abandoned bikes cannot simply be removed from the public highway and disposed of immediately. The Council has to either give notice to the owners of their intentions (as we do now) or remove and then securely store the bikes for a period allowing any owners to claim them back. The council does not have any facility to store abandoned bikes.*

*We have contacted and met with representatives from bike recycling projects who are keen to work with us to help resolve some of these issues. Our next step is to work up an agreeable service level agreement and carry out some initial collection trials.*

*We hope that with their assistance we can increase our collection times further allowing more time for the Highway Enforcement Officers to deal with abandoned bikes as well as concentrate on other essential duties.*

*I will ask Officers to report back in a year’s time to say how this is going”.*

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

#### **(i) Yellow lines- Councillor G Theobald**

8.3 Councillor Theobald presented a letter requesting an officer report to the next meeting of the Committee regarding the 2012/13 decision to only insert new yellow lines within CPZ’s.

8.4 The Chair provided the following response:

*“As outlined as part of the 2012/13 budget implications, and as at Budget Council in February, it is not possible to carry out any more changes to parking restrictions outside of resident parking schemes under the Parking Infrastructure budget, with the exception of disabled bay requests.*

*As you can appreciate in order for any changes to be made, the proposals need to be put to the public, in the form of a draft Traffic Order, followed by the correct signing and lining on site (or removal of them) if the proposals are approved. This requires substantial time and cost; also we receive many such requests across the city. Previously we have batched up these requests for advertising twice a year.*

*However, we are now prioritising resources on essential signing and lining maintenance and we also need to consider the ongoing cost of maintenance for signing & lining and need to keep new proposals to a minimum. This is because there is no budget within Parking Infrastructure for additional maintenance and we already have a substantial amount of lining and signing throughout Brighton & Hove that we must support with the existing budget.*

*This is an issue that would need to be picked up in the budget process this year where members will be making proposals for 15/16, the Local Transport Plan (LTP) isn't relevant to this either as most minor signing and lining TRO based amendments for the type of waiting restrictions referred to are revenue funded rather than capital funded. The separate parking scheme work is Capital funded but this is through borrowing rather than the LTP.*

*Councillors have discussed the yellow line policy when other requests have come forward through public and member engagement, e.g. the Woodingdean chevron parking proposal, so I don't think it is fair to say Members are not aware of this policy. We have also had the budget process for this year, where Councillors could have amended the policy and put forward proposals. LTP4 is the bigger opportunity to review this in the wider context, and the committee will be engaged with that process, so I'm not sure a special report on this single matter is warranted".*

- 8.5 Councillor Theobald noted that there was a report on the Committee agenda proposing yellow linage in Hanover yet this area was currently outside a CPZ.
- 8.6 The Chair clarified that yellow lines could be introduced where it related to displacement from CPZ's and the financing to do so was taken from that specific capital budget.
- 8.7 **RESOLVED-** That the letter be noted.

## **9 REVIEW OF THE ANIMAL WELFARE CHARTER**

- 9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Director of Public Health that requested the Committee to approve consultation on whether to retain or remove the exemption in the council's Animal Welfare Charter allowing performances of equestrian acts following a request from the Economic, Development & Culture Committee to review this exemption.
- 9.2 Councillor Mitchell stated that she had significant problems with the report. Councillor Mitchell noted that the Green Party had historically campaigned against Zippo's Circus and the report appeared an extension to that campaign. Furthermore, Councillor Mitchell noted that the recommendation was for the Committee to agree to consultation regarding the current exemption but that case law determined that councillors could not base their decision on moral grounds. Councillor Mitchell stated that should the Committee agree to consultation, it would be extremely difficult for councillors to differentiate in the results between those who objected to equestrian acts on moral grounds and those that did not.
- 9.3 The Deputy Head of Law stated that case law was clear that councillors had to make an objective assessment of the subject and evidence when reaching a decision adding that if a decision to proceed with consultation was agreed, any subsequent report would

outline the benefit and implications to the area concerned and the consultation questions would be phrased to illicit answers that were not based upon moral judgements. The Deputy Head of Law stated that if the consultation responses were only based upon moral objections and Members debated similarly, any approval and decision to extend the exemption on that basis would be unlawful.

- 9.4 Councillor Buckley asked if any other local authorities or countries had reached a decision on this matter on the basis of collective morality.
- 9.5 The Deputy Head of Law responded that she was not aware of any other countries making a decision on that basis and was only familiar with case law.
- 9.6 Councillor Buckley stated that she was aware of several local authorities and countries using collective morality as a basis to make a decision on such an issue and asked if they could be referred to as a template of a consultation exercise.
- 9.7 The Deputy Head of Law stated that the authority could look at other authorities and the issues they had looked at such as economic benefit.
- 9.8 Councillor Deane stated that she was aware from the report that performing animals were often left in situ however; the report did not make any reference to the effect upon animals in performing such as stress.
- 9.9 The Head of Regulatory Services stated that officers and the council appointed vet had visited the circus several times and no concerns had been raised by either on this issue.
- 9.10 Councillor Daniel noted that this issue was addressed on page 60 of the report.
- 9.11 Councillor Robins stated that he would prefer that Zippo's Circus not use performing animals on a moral basis however, he believed it would be hypocritical of the authority to impose such a ban when it owned an 18% stake in Brighton Racecourse where 7 racehorses had died in the past 7 years.
- 9.12 The Chair clarified that this was a general policy matter and not specific to Zippo's Circus.
- 9.13 Councillor Mitchell stated that she found the report to be implicitly aimed at the practices of Zippo's Circus and noted that the request to review the exemption had been made by Councillor Buckley and was not agreed by the Economic, Development & Culture Committee as a whole. Councillor Mitchell supplemented that the circus was a source of entertainment and no concerns had been raised about the welfare of the performing animals by the council appointed vet. Councillor Mitchell added that there was no clear moral line on this issue and that the report was not justified and she would not be supporting the recommendations.
- 9.14 Councillor Buckley stated that she did not agree with performing animals of any type and it was clear to her that a Green Party administration would seek to remove the exemption as it was a manifesto commitment.

9.15 Councillor Cox stated that whilst he recognised that such a policy was a manifesto commitment of the administration party, he found it contradictory that the authority would seek to ban Zippo's Circus from using performing animals when it held a stake in Brighton Racecourse. Councillor Cox stated that the circus provided entertainment to the public and any consultation would be a waste of public resources.

9.16 The Chair then put the recommendation to a vote which failed.

## **10 EAST BRIGHTON PARK AND WILSON AVENUE PARKING CONTROLS - FORMAL TRAFFIC ORDER CONSULTATION**

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

- **TRO-15a-2014** Brighton & Hove (East Brighton Park) Various Restrictions Order 201X
- **TRO-15b-2014** Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.X 201X (Wilson Avenue)

## **11 AWARD OF LEASE ROTTINGDEAN PITCH & PUTT**

11.1 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee agree to grant a lease to the Beacon Hub Project on a 15 year term at a peppercorn rent.
- 2) That the Committee authorises the Head of Law, following consultation with the Executive Director Finance and Resources, to finalise the detailed Heads of Terms and other necessary documentation

## **12 SAFER ROADS STRATEGY 2014-2020 - A ROAD SAFETY STRATEGY FOR BRIGHTON & HOVE**

12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that sought approval for the publication and dissemination of a new Road Safety Strategy for Brighton & Hove City Council for the period 2014-2020. The report was supplemented by a presentation.

12.2 The Chair asked if the responsible officer for elaboration on the targeted work on those travelling or commuting to work.

12.3 The Road Safety Manager confirmed that there were several road user groups targeted by the Strategy that had been identified using the data available. The Road Safety Manager clarified that the Brighton & Hove area had a higher than national and regional

average for collisions involving people in the course of work and there would be targeted engagement and collaboration to reduce that total.

- 12.4 Councillor Janio stated that he was concerned about some of the presentation of information specifically the reference to a 'citywide 20mph limit' which was not the case and misleading.
- 12.5 The Chair stated that opposition Members were entitled to a briefing on any report where clarification was more information was needed. The Chair added that the 20mph was a citywide project in progress but, as Members would be aware, did not apply to every single street in the city.
- 12.6 Councillor Davey thanked officers for a comprehensive report on a very important issue. Councillor Davey stated that the specific work on powered two wheelers and the work conducted with the motorcycle community was due specific praise.
- 12.7 Councillor Deane stated her support for the report which was welcome in view of the benefit to the increasing vulnerable population in the city. Councillor Deane also noted the cost benefit to numerous public services in reducing road accidents and casualties.
- 12.8 Councillor Robins noted his support for the report and expressed his hope that road safety processes could become quicker with specific regard to the long running campaign for a crossing in South Portslade.
- 12.9 Councillor Cox stated that there were 5,000 deaths per year on roads in the United Kingdom of which he had first-hand experience as a former member of the police force. Councillor Cox noted that the road casualty figures for last year were the lowest ever and something that should be celebrated. However, whilst car safety had improved dramatically, that had not been the case for other users and that needed to be looked at. Councillor Cox urged caution in celebrating the statistics prematurely adding that he believed there needed to be targeted work on the biggest causes of accidents to decrease the figures further.
- 12.10 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the adoption of the 'Safer Roads' Road Safety Strategy.

### 13 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT POLICY

- 13.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the adoption of the Road Safety Audit Policy.

### 14 BRIGHTON MARINA TO RIVER ADUR COASTAL STUDY

- 14.1 **RESOLVED-** That committee authorises the Executive Director to submit the coastal study report to the Environment Agency's large project review group (LPRG) for their formal approval.

**15 VALLEY GARDENS**

- 15.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that sought approval to implement a course of action that would enable improvements to the northern section of Valley Gardens to be delivered between June 2015 and February 2017.
- 15.2 Councillor Janio welcomed the report as very good news for the city. Councillor Janio asked the report author if he could identify any potential negatives in the scheme.
- 15.3 The Senior Project Manager stated that there were risks to the project as identified in the business case within the report. He added that although this was a large scale project, the individual elements were relatively straightforward. The Senior Project Manager added that whilst there was a loss of trees of 16 associated with the scheme, work was ongoing with an independent arboriculturist to improve that.
- 15.4 Councillor Cox noted that an earlier version of the project had proposed a public space outside the King & Queen pub which was now removed. Councillor Cox asked why it had been decided not to proceed with this element.
- 15.5 The Senior Project Manager stated that the March 2013 report had presented a series of options and a larger green space had been decided as the preferred option as it provided flexibility in the scheme and there were concerns about cost and loss of open space associated with rerouting the carriageway to create a public square.
- 15.6 Councillor Theobald noted that he had received an email from the chairman of the London Road Action Team that raised concerns about the level of consultation on the project and misgivings toward traffic movement should the project proceed. Furthermore, the London Road Action Team had requested that the project be rejected until an economic impact assessment for the project had been completed.
- 15.7 The Senior Project Manager replied that he was aware of the content of the email and had been surprised by some of the comments made. The Senior Project Manager noted that he understood the Team had 10 members and one had provided a statement of support for inclusion in the Business Case. The Senior Project Manager added that his team had been to several meetings of the London Road LAT to discuss the scheme with the London Road community. The Senior Project Manager added that the concerns made may be down to a lack of unfamiliarity with the scheme and that a large proportion of the Business Case was effectively an economic impact assessment.
- 15.8 Councillor Davey asked if there had been any other stakeholder engagement.
- 15.9 The Senior Project Manager stated that there had been consultation in September 2013 incorporating events around St Peter's Church. All aspects of the project had been developed in close consultation with representative stakeholder steering and working groups and updates on the scheme had been provided to those who had previously expressed a desire to be kept informed of scheme development. The Senior Project Manager stated that a challenge had been generating interest in the project up to this stage and work was continuing to foster that.

- 15.10 Councillor Mitchell noted that it had been sixteen months since the Committee last received an update on the Valley Gardens project. Councillor Mitchell stated that she had read the report and business case and had noted the lack of detail on the impact of the scheme on the wider area. Councillor Mitchell stated that there was a lack of information on the impact in the reduction of 30% of the road space and associated displacement and the business case still appeared a concept scheme with a lot of focus on the environmental improvements but little on how the various changes would work in practice. Councillor Mitchell stated that the lack of such detail undermined the project which had to be taken in the context of other significant transport changes and problems in the city and as part of a wider package to reduce congestion in contrast to the statement in report that said this was beyond its remit. Councillor Mitchell stated that perhaps due to the significant changes in council funding, the project through its history had detrimentally moved away from a major urban realm scheme and had become an economically driven benefit scheme in order to increase the chances of being successful in the bidding process for funding. Councillor Mitchell supplemented that the report identified potential benefits to the knowledge economy in the area and that 290 training opportunities would be created however; there was no substance or detail to back up those claims. Councillor Mitchell expressed her concern for accountability of the project noting that recommendation 2.3 and 2.4 requested approval for a cross-party management group and cross-sector management group and that the terms of reference stated that only the Green Party's communication unit would be allowed to comment publicly on the project. Councillor Mitchell stated that she was deeply concerned that these measures were being recommended to silence the Committee and take away decision making power from the opposition groups. Councillor Mitchell stated that over the course of the past sixteen months, opposition councillors should have been invited in some capacity to comment or input to the project as it progressed. Councillor Mitchell stated that the Labour Group had in 2006 come forward with this major city centre environmental regeneration and they still supported that idea in principle. However, Councillor Mitchell believed reinforcement of the Seafront Arches to be a much higher priority and the council's effort should be firstly directed there. The Seafront Arches current state represented a much greater risk to the city's economy and had been identified as the second highest corporate risk. Councillor Mitchell stated that the focus of the LEP bid should have been the Seafront Arches and reiterated her disappointment in proposals for Valley Gardens.
- 15.11 The Chair referred to page 122 of the agenda which was clear that road capacity would be maintained by making the route more effective to travel. The Chair added that there was an extensive explanation of the economic case in the report too.
- 15.12 Councillor Davey expressed his disappointment that Members were prepared to withdraw support for a long-running scheme at the last minute. Councillor Davey stated that a lot of effort had been put into attracting £8 million worth of funding to regenerate a key area of the city. Councillor Davey added that it had been explained on numerous occasions that several bids had been put into the LEP including Valley Gardens, the Seafront Arches and an integrated transport system. Councillor Davey supplemented that the reason that bid had been successful was not down to lack of effort but that the LEP recognised the great opportunities in the Valley Gardens project. Councillor Davey stated that there had been cross party approval for the scheme on every occasion to this point adding that this was a once in a generation opportunity to create a fantastic city centre park.

- 15.13 Councillor Theobald stated that the project had been before Committee several times and each time was supported by every party. Councillor Theobald stated that the request was not a choice between the Seafront Arches or Valley Gardens but a choice whether to accept £8 million worth of investment to improve an incoherent traffic system in the centre of the city. Councillor Theobald stated that Valley Gardens was currently a confusing traffic system, caused widespread congestion and had a very poor public realm layout. Councillor Theobald asked if the funding would be lost if the Committee did not agree to the report and separately, if the proposal had undergone traffic modelling.
- 15.14 The Chair stated that the funding was non-transferable and would be lost if the Committee rejected the proposal.
- 15.15 The Senior Project Manager stated that the project had undergone traffic modelling that had demonstrated that journey times would be roughly the same as now for private vehicles. Furthermore, he explained that the business plan had to be compliant with DfT regulations and the economic business case scrutinised independently. The Senior Project Manager stated that he was confident the scheme would make a huge difference.
- 15.16 The Head of Transport referred to item 3.7 that was clear that the council was required to submit a business case approved by its Members by July 2014 to be eligible for the funding.
- 15.17 Councillor Cox explained that his Group believed that the Valley Gardens project would make a huge difference to the city and he found it hugely disappointing that other parties would turn down £8 million of funding for short-term electoral opportunity.
- 15.18 Councillor Robins stated that he often used Valley Gardens and had never experienced any traffic problems nor been told of such by others but had been told on numerous occasions of traffic problems along the seafront. Councillor Robins stated that the council should have focussed its efforts on the Seafront Arches alone and that he was concerned about why a cross party working group was needed as it did not appear a very open process.
- 15.19 Councillor Janio expressed his disappointment that the scheme was going to be refused by other political parties for short-term electoral gain. Councillor Janio stated that he was always told of the difficulties negotiating Valley Gardens by vehicle or on foot and he very much supported the opportunity to improve this area of the city.
- 15.20 The Senior Project Manager clarified that he fully expected the proposed cross party to decide its own arrangements at its first meeting and would conduct its work in co-ordination with stakeholders and the public.
- 15.21 Councillor Theobald asked if the cross party working group would report to this Committee.
- 15.22 The Senior Project Manager stated that if the cross party working group felt that an element of the project should be reported to Committee, that would happen. He added

that it was his expectation that the business of the cross party working group would be predominately on procedural issues.

- 15.23 Councillor Janio stated that it be clear in the recommendations that major decisions on the project be taken by Committee.
- 15.24 The Deputy Head of Law stated that the Committee could add “with the exception of major design changes” to the end of recommendation 2.3 of the report.
- 15.25 The Senior Project Manager stated that in the short-term it was required to submit an approved business case to access funding for the project however, an additional report could be submitted to the next Committee with proposals for a management structure for the project.

The meeting was adjourned at 18.45 and reconvened at 18.55

- 15.26 The Chair moved a motion to delete the current recommendation 2.2 and 2.3 and add a new recommendation 2.2 as shown in bold italics below:

***2.2 A report in relation to future project management will be brought to the next Committee and regular reports will be brought to Committee;***

- 15.27 The motion was carried.
- 15.28 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee:
- 1) Agrees that the Business Case required to secure funding from the Local Growth Fund (LGF) should be submitted to the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to enable delivery of physical improvements to the northern section of Valley Gardens (the Scheme), as summarised at Appendices 1 to 4 of the report;
  - 2) A report in relation to future project management will be brought to the next Committee and regular reports will be brought to Committee;
  - 3) Notes that a cross-sector Management Group will be established to investigate and trial innovative ways to manage and maintain the public spaces of Valley Gardens to minimise additional future maintenance pressures on the parks service.

## **16 NORTH STREET ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT**

- 16.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that reported that Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS) had approached the council to seek permission to make public realm enhancements between Ship Street and East Street with RBS meeting all associated costs. The report provided the plans for the improvements and sought permission to proceed to implementation. The Senior Project Manager noted the correspondence sent to Members shortly ahead of the Committee by taxi forum and GMB union recommending deferral due to the lack of correspondence with that group. The Senior Project Manager clarified that officers had not been able to attend any taxi forum meetings as none were scheduled to be held

between late May and early August. The Senior Project Manager added that a local consultation had been undertaken and representatives from the taxi trade had been invited to input into that. Furthermore, the RBS team would be attending the next taxi forum meeting in August and comments from that meeting would still be able to feed into the design process. The Senior Project Manager also noted that officers had invited the taxi forum to nominate one or two representatives who would act as a contact for any future events associated with the project that fell between taxi forum meeting dates. On that basis, but subject to Members consideration, the Senior Project Manager stated that he would not be recommending the Committee to defer its decision on the matter.

- 16.2 The Chair noted that appendix 3 stated that City Cabs had attended one of the workshops held.
- 16.3 Councillor Janio asked if traffic disruption in the area associated with the improvement works would be minimised wherever possible and short-term.
- 16.4 The Senior Project Manager stated that RBS were keen to deliver the project as quickly as possible adding that discussions would be held with the council's traffic operations team to minimise any disruption. The Senior Project Officer added that the bulk of the project would not take place on the carriageway.
- 16.5 Councillor Mitchell stated that Members might find it helpful to receive advice on how this project would fit in with the redevelopment of Brighton Square.
- 16.6 Councillor Davey stated that a workshop for Members to show interaction could be set up with any comments or discussed with the developers and designers.
- 16.7 Councillor Theobald noted that the busiest foot movements in the area occurred from New Road and he asked if moving the crossings away from that area might disrupt pedestrian desire lines.
- 16.8 The Senior Project Manager stated that the final location of crossings still had some scope for manoeuvre but would need to fit in with another project in the Ship Street area.
- 16.9 Councillor Robins stated his support for the report.
- 16.10 Councillor Davey stated his support for the report and that he had found discussing the details with the designers illuminating. Councillor Davey added that the shop fronts in the area were some of the most blighted in the city and the project could make a huge benefit to the businesses in those areas.
- 16.11 Councillor Janio welcomed the report specifically that private investment was being made to improve the public realm.
- 16.12 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That Committee approve the initial proposals.
  - 2) Committee agree that the council oversees proposals to implement environmental improvements in North Street at the earliest opportunity.

**17 BRIGHTON & HOVE PERMIT SCHEME****17.1 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the submission of B&HPS application to the DfT.
- 2) That the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee authorises officers to continue with operational activities in preparation for implementing the B&HPS including IT upgrades, accommodation review, staff training and recruitment.

**18 PRESTON PARK TRIANGLE PROPOSED AREA J EXTENSION - CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS TO DRAFT TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS**

18.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that addressed the comments and objections to the draft traffic orders proposing an extension to the Area J residents parking scheme (London Road Station area).

18.2 Councillor Cox stated that it was clear objections to the scheme came from the further north of the area because residents were aware there was likely to be further displacement and another extension as with many other areas. Councillor Cox stated that whilst there were many extension to CPZ'S across the city, the Hanover area which had a clear need on safety grounds for a CPZ was not being considered. Councillor Cox stated that he was unwilling to support any extension to an existing CPZ until the problems in Hanover had been resolved.

18.3 The Chair noted that discussions between the council and Hanover LAT were ongoing.

**18.4 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following orders:
  - (a) The Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.\* 20\*\* (Area J extensions) TRO-10a-201
  - (b) The Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment Order No.\* 201\* (TRO-10b-2014)
- 2) That the committee notes that any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order and (if approved) added to the proposed scheme during implementation.

**19 BAKERS BOTTOM & CRAVEN VALE RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME CONSULTATION**

- 19.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that set out the results of the recent consultation undertaken for the proposed extension to the Area U residents parking scheme and requested approval to proceed to the final design stage and publication of the necessary traffic order.
- 19.2 In reference to recommendation 2.1 (c), Councillor Mitchell stated that verge parking was not the issue in this area rather overrunning of the verge and she was not sure a prohibition would resolve the problem.
- 19.3 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that there was no type of restriction to cover overrunning of verges but he would discuss the issue with the council's transport and traffic partners.
- 19.4 Councillor Mitchell asked if bollards could be put in place to prevent overrunning.
- 19.5 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that bollards were expensive at £60 each and would have to be placed on a long stretch and therefore such measures would likely be beyond the available budget.
- 19.6 Councillor Mitchell clarified that a contribution to installing bollards may be forthcoming from the local tenants association.
- 19.7 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that he would discuss the issue with residents and the association during the TRO process.

**19.8 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee approves:
- (a) That an extension of the Area U resident parking scheme be considered within the Bakers Bottom area and that this proposal be progressed to the final design with the Traffic Order advertised to allow further comment.
  - (b) That no extension of a resident parking scheme takes place in the Craven Vale area.
  - (c) That a prohibition of verge parking on the east side of Queensway is advertised alongside any double yellow lines in the Craven Vale area which would be considered in appropriate locations.

**20 LEWES ROAD TRIANGLE RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME CONSULTATION**

- 20.1. The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that set out the results of the recent consultation undertaken for the proposed extension to the Area J residents parking scheme within the Lewes Road Triangle area and requested approval to proceed to the final design stage and publication of the necessary traffic order.

- 20.2. Councillor Daniel noted there were many empty shops in the area and relayed her concern that the scheme proposed further loading restrictions and that the proposals could adversely affect businesses already struggling. Councillor Daniel enquired further as to business feedback to the consultation.
- 20.3. The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that the loading restrictions only applied specifically to cycle safety and junctions for vehicles and the proposals did not recommend significant changes to the existing arrangements. The Parking Infrastructure Manager clarified that local businesses had attended consultation meetings and had predominantly commented on visitor parking. Further meetings further meetings would be scheduled to discuss these issues. The Parking Infrastructure Manager added that it was intended for the proposals to create more parking spaces but these spaces would be pay and display.
- 20.4. Councillor Davey noted that there was no reference in the report about the number of spaces that would be made pay and display and the cost of the parking. Councillor Daniel asked if parking would be offered at a reduced tariff, similar to that on London Road.
- 20.5. The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that detailed correspondence would be reviewed in drawing up the final design and the parking tariff would be low tariff.
- 20.6. **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee approves:
- (d) That an extension of the Area J resident parking scheme be considered within the Lewes Road Triangle area and that this proposal be progressed to the final design with the Traffic Order advertised to allow further comment.
- (e) That a further restriction on loading on the east side of Lewes Road just north of the Elm Grove junction is advertised as a separate traffic order between 10am-4pm.
- (f) That an order should be placed for any required pay and display equipment to ensure implementation of the new proposed parking scheme (if agreed at a further committee meeting) is undertaken as programmed.

## **21 DOUBLE YELLOW LINES TRAFFIC ORDER**

- 21.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that noted that the Parking Infrastructure Team had received a number of requests from residents and ward councillors for alterations to parking restrictions due to displacement from resident parking schemes. The report set out the comments, support and objections received to an amendment traffic regulation order and requested approval to proceed with the proposals.
- 21.2 Councillor Theobald noted that double yellow lines were being put in place in Hollingbury & Stanmer and enquired as to the financing of those.

- 21.3 The Parking Infrastructure Manager clarified that the yellow lines were introduced in Hollingbury & Stanmer due to displacement on the roads around Ditchling Road associated with the London Road Station area scheme.
- 21.4 Councillor Daniel welcomed the proposals although she was concerned about the level of consultation with ward councillors. Councillor Daniel stated that the proposals would make a real difference to access for refuse collections and emergency services in an area where the streets were very narrow.
- 21.5 Councillor Cox stated that he was uncomfortable that the scheme appeared a tax on those residents in nearby streets where a CPZ had been introduced seemingly to fund installation of double yellow lines in an area that had refused to be part of a scheme. Councillor Cox stated that the proposals in this case did appear sensible.
- 21.6 Councillor Robins asked how the double yellow lines would be enforced as it was outside a CPZ.
- 21.7 The Parking Infrastructure Manger clarified that enforcement officers could enforce restrictions outside CPZ's and the council could not enforce in area where there were not lines.

#### **21.8 RESOLVED-**

- 1) The Committee approves the following Order (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections):

Brighton & Hove Outer areas (Waiting, Loading, and Parking) and Cycle Lanes consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No. \*201\* (TRO-16-2014) Traffic Regulation Order.

#### **22 SURRENDEN ROAD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT/ROAD SAFETY SCHEME**

- 22.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee, having taken into account all duly made objections received, approves the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised.
- (i) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No. \* 201\* (TRO-)

#### **23 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

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

The meeting concluded at 7.40pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of