

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

4.00pm 20 JANUARY 2015

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), Daniel, Davey, Hawtree and G Theobald

PART ONE

66 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

66(a) Declarations of substitutes

66.1 There were none.

66(b) Declarations of interest

66.2 There were none.

66(c) Exclusion of press and public

66.3 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).

66.4 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded

67 MINUTES

67.1 The Chair commented that 59.6 should read "... Residents and officers *may* lead..." and 59.7 "Carlton Park" should be "Carden Park".

67.2 Councillor Theobald stated that the word “maintained” should be replaced with “improved” at item 59.7.

67.3 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 25 November 2014 be approved and signed as the correct record subject to the above amendments.

68 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

68.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

“Officers wrote to Members last week informing you of changes to the LTP capital allocation for Highway Maintenance Work. These changes followed consultation by DfT last year, with an announcement on the new funding arrangements made on 23rd December 2014.

The new formula introduced for calculating highway maintenance has worked to the detriment of the Council resulting in an allocation of £2.623m for 2015/16, a reduction of £540,000 on last year’s Maintenance Capital Block allocation of £3.163m. This is made worse by DfT announcing similar funding levels over its six year financial programme to 2020/21 and comes (ironically) at a time when the Government is announcing a national increase in highway maintenance funding. The Council objected to the proposals during the consultation and have disputed the allocation with DfT who have been unwilling to make changes.

Also within the new funding arrangements DfT have top-sliced a budget of £275m over the next 3 years to be used for major maintenance schemes. Councils are able to bid for this Challenge Fund and can put forward schemes in the categories of £5m - £20m and over £20m. The Council has to include a local contribution of at least 10% of the scheme costs. In the bidding process, the more we contribute the more likely the scheme will be approved. Bids must be submitted by 9th February 2015, clearly a very short time-frame. Having assessed various options Officers are preparing what we believe to be our best opportunity with a bid for the reconstruction of the Shelter Hall Seafront Structure (Rip-Tide), including possible realignment of adjacent seafront structures, that potentially could support a junction improvement at West Street for the emerging Waterfront Development. This amounts to a £7-9m bid.

Unfortunately the late announcement of this process and deadlines for making submissions haven’t allowed for this to be tracked through formal committee processes. I trust that you will support and understand the need to move pro-actively on this, especially given the disappointment of the highway maintenance allocation”.

“The City Council’s Parking Services working in partnership with East Sussex County Council and Sussex Police has been successful in a bid for £183,000 of counter fraud funding from central government to be paid over 18 months. This will fund Blue Badge inspectors as well as publicity to raise awareness of the impact misuse has on genuine blue badge holders. In the first 6 weeks of the operation 25 badges are under investigation, 13 have been seized as the blue badge holder was not present at the time of inspection and one person has been prosecuted and fined over £700.

Following constructive discussions with bus operators in the city the Low Emission Zone has been formally agreed by the Traffic Commissioner and is being launched today. Significant investment is being made by bus companies to meet the new standards including..

Brighton and Hove Buses is retrofitting 50 buses with central government funding and with a further 24 brand new buses to be delivered in the spring

Cuckmere Buses has spent £90,000 on a Euro 5 sprinter

Metrobus is buying 4 brand new buses in the spring

Stagecoach has spent over £2m on 12 new buses for the 700 route

Information about the Low Emission Zone has been added to the council's website today".

"As members will probably be aware, our plans for the restoration of Stanmer Park have taken a great step forward this month with the award of stage 1 funding of £290k by the HLF and BLF. This means that, in partnership with the national park, we will now be able to develop detailed plans to support the full bid for £4m to restore the historic landscape and buildings. The HLF and BLF have confirmed the £4m has been earmarked for the project.

We now await the outcome of our second joint bid for a £6m Heritage Grant to restore and improve the Home Farm Complex. The outcome of that will be announced in early February.

In total we are seeking to invest around £12m in Stanmer to unlock its full potential to benefit local residents and our local economy as a major gateway to the national park and our UN Biosphere Reserve"

68.2 Councillor Mitchell noted that she shared the Chair's disappointment regarding the reduction in the LTP capital allocation. Councillor Mitchell asked if it was correct that successful applications to the Challenge Fund would have to be match funded with a 10% contribution from the local authority.

68.3 The Chair confirmed with Councillor Mitchell that this was unfortunately correct.

69 CALL OVER

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

- Item 73: Local Transport Plan
- Item 74: Fees & Charges 2015/16
- Item 75: 20mph Programme
- Item 76: Hove Station Footbridge Accessibility
- Item 77: Safer Routes to School West Hove
- Item 79: Traveller Strategy 2012: 2 Year Update
- Item 80: Local Flood Risk Management Strategy

69.2 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 78: Pedal Cycle Parking TRO Objections Scotland Street

70 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(a) Petitions

Speeding up the consultation for residents parking north of Preston Drove- Jan Furness

70.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 366 people requesting the council to bring forward the proposed controlled parking consultation of the area to the first quarter of 2015 rather than the summer of 2015 as currently proposed.

70.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition.

As you may be aware the Parking Infrastructure Team have recently completed two parking schemes in the city with other extensions to existing parking schemes due to begin operation in early March 2015 so it is a very busy time.

Before any resident parking scheme consultation with residents takes place we need to compile parking surveys indicating vehicle duration and the road capacity. This helps officers with the detailed design for example how long shared pay & display parking should last for and the percentage of residents parking required. This has been authorised by members of the ETS Committee in a previous meeting.

The plan is currently to do these parking surveys as soon as possible but the authorisation on taking forward a resident consultation has yet to be agreed. A parking scheme consultation lasting for six weeks is impractical after early March until mid-May due to the election period and the potential issues during the purdah period which has been outlined in guidance to officers so there would not be the opportunity or time to achieve this.

Therefore I'd like to propose that the Committee ask officers to prepare a report for our next Committee on 17th March outlining the proposed way forward seeking agreement to proceed with the Consultation as soon as possible which is likely to be in the summer”.

70.3 The Chair moved a motion for a report to be presented the next meeting of the Committee outlining options to proceed with consultation on a CPZ in the area specified.

70.4 Councillor Davey formally seconded the motion.

70.5 Councillor Mitchell noted that the Committee would be considering further requests at future meetings and queried whether the request could be funded under the current budget constraints.

70.6 Councillor Davey clarified that the Committee had already agreed to conduct parking surveys in the area when it approved the recommendations of the Citywide Parking Review report and that Preston Drove would be the next location to be consulted. Councillor Davey stated that the report requested would present the results of the surveys, set out whether a consultation should take place and to agree the boundaries of the area to be consulted.

70.7 The Chair put the motion to the vote that passed.

70.8 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive an officer report to its next Committee in relation to the above.

(b) Deputations

(i) Brighton & Hove Liberal Democrats- Sunday Parking Charges- Jeremy Gale

70.9 The Committee considered a Deputation that request a 50% reduction to charges at council managed car parks on Sundays; a 50% reduction to on street parking charges on Sundays and a 7.14% reduction to the cost of residents parking permits (the equivalent of a half day reduction).

70.10 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your Deputation.

Car park charges are set to encourage sustainable transport choices, manage demand for spaces and promote short term parking ahead of longer term, commuter parking.

The pilot 40% tariff reduction of charges in Worthing’s under-utilised car parks, quoted in the petition is said to have coincided with an increase in occupancy of 11%. What is not clear is whether the increase in car park usage coincided with a shift away from sustainable transport modes. In any case, it seems incredible that this change could be attributed to a fivefold increase in the duration of visitor stays.

Some of the proposed tariff changes before Committee today are aimed at encouraging better use of underutilised space outside the city centre, such as the 50% reduction proposed in the cost of season tickets at Regency car park which too has spare capacity. However, this is not at all the case for our other car parks in central Brighton where almost every Sundays car parks are full between 11am and 3pm. Reducing car park charges on one of the busiest parking days of the week would add to these lengthy queues for a space

On street parking is similarly busy on Sundays in central areas and encouraging additional traffic through reduced charges would make it harder for residents to find a parking space, add to congestion, be bad for air quality and in turn the health of residents. All parking and permit charges are set with traffic management objectives in mind and our obligations to meet legal air quality standards. A growing number of permit holders, currently over 10% pay just half the standard cost of a permit as they qualify for a low emission vehicle discount.

The total cost of the proposals contained in the deputation is estimated to be £1.25m annually and, given that job creation in the city over the past decade is the fourth highest in the UK, I would suggest that the well balanced parking policies of this council are a great support to our lively local economy”

70.11 Councillor Cox asked if he could receive the statistical information outlying the cost of providing the measures stated in the response which was agreed.

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

(ii) Road safety improvements for Holmes Ave & Nevill Avenue- Phillipa Sen

70.13 The Committee considered a Deputation requesting the council to install a zebra crossing with flashing beacons opposite Blatchington Mill School and to widen the ‘pedestrian refuge’, or put another zebra crossing with flashing beacons in this area on safety grounds.

70.14 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for raising the concerns of residents about the safety of children crossing Nevill Avenue near to the junction with Holmes Avenue and at the private access road to Blatchington Mill School.

We will be considering two reports today, firstly on introducing a 20mph limit for Holmes Avenue area and secondly the addition of a pedestrian refuge to Holmes Avenue south of Wayfield Avenue

As Members will know, the demand for formal crossing facilities across the city exceeds the funding available to provide them and the Council therefore has a policy of assessing requests annually through a programme of surveys with the results being reported to this Committee. Whilst the lists are annually reviewed this would not necessarily mean that surveys would be delayed by a year, it could be less if the Road Safety Team considered it to be a priority.

As Chair of this Committee I will request that officers arrange for the two sites identified to be included in that programme for the forthcoming financial year.

In the meantime, there are existing facilities to assist crossing movements by pedestrians at both locations. The four pedestrian refuges and hatched road markings already present in Nevill Avenue go some way to providing for safer crossing movements and the Road Safety Manager advises that there is good visibility for pedestrians to enable them to determine a safe opportunity to cross.

There have been no reported injury accidents in this section of Nevill Road during the past 9 years and as stated I have been advised by the Road Safety Manager that whilst there is no obvious safety concern his team will be considering these locations within the Road Safety Programme”

- 70.15 Councillor Janio asked for clarification that the site could not have a zebra crossing as there was already a pedestrian refuge there.
- 70.16 The Head of Transport clarified that road safety officers would assess the location regarding safety and as part of that, the refuge could also be reviewed.
- 70.17 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

71 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

(a) Petitions

(i) Bus shelter at the corner of Stanford Avenue and Southdown Avenue- Ms Garner

71.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 99 people referred from Full Council held on 11 December 2014 that requested a bus shelter at the corner of Southdown Avenue and Stanford Avenue.

71.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“I am pleased to confirm that the request for a shelter at the ‘Cleveland Road’ bus stop, near Southdown Avenue on the east side of Stanford Avenue, has been added to the

council's list of shelter requests. Whenever additional shelters become available officers prioritise this list, taking account of the location. Officers look at a number of factors, including how busy the bus stop is in terms of people boarding buses there; whether the location is exposed and how far it is to an alternative bus stop with a shelter.

The council is in the process of retendering the contract for bus shelter provision and we hope that new shelters will become available during the next twelve months, with the start of the new contract. At that stage officers will certainly consider the 'Cleveland Road' bus stop on the east side of Stanford Avenue as a potential site for a shelter, along with other stops in the city where shelters have been requested.

Unfortunately we do not currently have funds for the provision of new real time bus information signs as these are generally funded by new developments around the City.

We do have a list of requests for signs and Stanford Avenue/Southdown Avenue can be added to this list, if funds become available, this location will be considered"

71.3 Councillor Cox asked for an update on the tendering process of the council's bus shelter contract.

71.4 The Head of Transport clarified the council was currently in the procurement process and it was hoped the new contract would commence in June or July 2015.

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

(ii) Yellow lines on Goodwood Way- Mr Marchant

71.6 The Committee considered a petition signed by 46 people referred from Full Council held on 11 December 2014 regarding yellow lines on Goodwood Way.

71.7 The Chair provided the following response:

"The first three questions raised in the petition were answered in full as part of the reply to formal (stage 2) complaint investigation in response to a complaint you made in 2013. The reference number for the complaint was BHC – 012252 dated 26th November. Officers can supply you with a copy of the response if you wish.

The decision to approve the advertised traffic order for the Amex community Stadium residents parking scheme (including the proposed no waiting at any time restrictions in Goodwood Way) was taken by Transport Committee on 30th April 2013, agenda item 83. A link to the officer report and decision is available on the council website".

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

72 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(a) Letters

(i) Lewes Road Triangle CPZ- Brighton Sea Cadets- Councillor G Theobald

72.1 Councillor Theobald presented a letter requesting officers bring a report to the Committee's next meeting presenting possible solutions to the problems experienced by Brighton Sea Cadets and the wider issue of community organisation parking in relation to CPZ's.

72.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your Letter Councillor Theobald, I do appreciate and agree with your point about looking to see how best to accommodate the needs of community groups within the parking permit policy

Over the next few months the Council are conducting a Parking Permit Policy Review covering day-to-day general parking and specific permit issues including rules, ratios, types of permits and limits on numbers issued

Obviously we need to balance the different demands for parking where supply is limited. If we issued community organisation permits or similar types, then there could be concerns from local residents about more vehicles using resident parking schemes. We’ll consider all the issues when we look at the policy review and we’ll also give all Ward Councillors the opportunity to make comments.

The permit policy review will be included in a report to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee later in the year to agree the way forward”.

72.3 Councillor Daniel stated that she agreed with the observations made in Councillor Theobald’s letter and that the Committee should receive a report on the matter.

72.4 Councillor Theobald stated that the Cadets were experiencing problems because the council had installed a CPZ and the council should try to be helpful.

72.5 The Chair stated that he agreed the issue needed to be reviewed but that required taking account of the wider policy context as other community and voluntary organisations might also make such a request.

72.6 Councillor Davey noted that there was a relatively short period between this meeting at the next in March and asked if it was practical or realistic for officers to consult with the 2,000 voluntary organisations in the city to prepare a report in that timescale.

72.7 The Head of Transport stated that the proposal was for officers to look at a number of permit types for community and voluntary organisations and the wider policy context. That work would take officers two to three months to complete and should Committee agree to a report for consideration at its March meeting, the report detail would be limited in scope.

72.8 Councillor Theobald stated that he did not believe there were comparable organisations and that the Committee should receive a report on this specific organisation and situation.

72.9 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive an officer report to its next Committee in relation to the above.

(ii) Safety measures on Medina Terrace/King’s Esplanade- Councillor Hawtree

72.10 Councillor Hawtree presented a letter requesting that the proposals for 20mph on Medina Terrace and King’s Esplanade be urgently implemented.

72.11 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your letter. As you know the proposals for the third phase of the 20mph programme will be debated and considered at this meeting. I ask the Committee to take note of you support for the recommendations and to consider that when we discuss the main report”

72.12 **RESOLVED-** That the letter be noted.

73 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN

73.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that outlined the public engagement and discussion that had taken place to assist in developing the draft Local Transport Plan, and included the proposed framework and content of the final document. Local highway authorities had a statutory requirement to produce a Local Transport Plan [LTP]. The report outlined how the council planned to manage and deliver transport in the future and, in doing so, where it intended to invest available funding, including the grant funding it receives from the government in the Local Transport Capital Settlement. A further report seeking endorsement would be submitted to the Policy & Resources Committee and approval sought at Full Council in March 2015.

73.2 Councillor Mitchell thanked the report author and his team for their hard work. Councillor Mitchell noted that the report was clear that the government contribution to local transport was significantly reduced this year and that new projects were unlikely to be started. Councillor Mitchell noted that councils were expected to contribute toward Local Growth Fund schemes and asked how this significant reduction would impact upon a co-ordinated schemes, in particular the £4m required for the Valley Gardens project, against demands for local maintenance and safety improvements. Furthermore, Councillor Mitchell asked what works would be required to complete work at Brighton Station and 20mph programme noted in the appendices and her disappointment that no reference was made to the improvements needed at the North Street Clock Tower junction.

73.3 The Head of Transport Strategy & Projects stated that he understood the LTP contribution toward the Valley Gardens project would be £1m not £4m and that Phases 1 and 2 were planned to be programmed across three financial years and the authority would have determination on how to profile that contribution. The Head of Transport Strategy & Projects clarified that whilst the report did not have significant detail at this stage, improvements to the Clock Tower junction would form part of the scheme referenced in the report as ‘Gateway to the Sea’ covering Queens Road and West Street combined.

73.4 The Head of Transport clarified that the final works to the Station Gateway project were toward the southern end and forecourt area outside Brighton Station that were currently covered in the current allocation and any contribution for Phase 3 of the 20mph programme would be relatively minimal from the LTP 4 allocation.

73.5 Councillor Janio asked if there had been an increase in LTP funding in recent years that was now returning to normal levels.

- 73.6 The Head of Transport Strategy & Projects clarified that whilst he didn't have the specific details to hand, LTP funding had increased recently to a peak for the 2014/15 financial year.
- 73.7 Councillor Robins noted that the report noted investment in electric vehicle charging points and asked how popular the current points were.
- 73.8 The Head of Transport clarified that electric charging points had grown dramatically from very few up to 50-60 currently following a successful Civitas project and a report would be forthcoming to committee to discuss whether the current provision could be expanded.
- 73.9 Councillor Davey that the projects endorsed by the Committee over the past four years was a credit to its Members past and current. Councillor Davey stated the report was very important as it would form the basis of funding proposals and applications in the future. Councillor Davey added that it was clear that the authority would increasingly be competing with others for funding in the future and the report made the case to challenge for that funding. Councillor Davey added that Valley Gardens was a huge public realm scheme and he was delighted that after many years pursuing funding, the council was now very close to securing nearly £14 million and he felt it was negligent to refuse that funding and may compromise the authority's credibility.
- 73.10 Councillor Janio welcomed the report but expressed his belief that there could have been a clearer view on methods to keep transport moving, without delays and coherently. Councillor Janio added that he shared Councillor Davey's observation that to refuse funding for Valley Gardens would be wrong. Councillor Janio stated that the possible £14 million funding would bring significant growth benefits to the city and dramatically improve the area. Councillor Janio urged the Labour & Co-operative Group to support the project, to no longer abstain from attending the Valley Gardens Project Board and have an input into the future of the city.
- 73.11 Councillor Mitchell clarified that the Labour & Co-operative Group had previously not supported proposals for Valley Gardens as they felt the scheme in that form was misguided and that the Seafront Arches were a higher priority. Councillor Mitchell added that it was entirely responsible, given the funding constraints on the authority, to question how the scheme could be progressed in a cohesive way.
- 73.12 Councillor Deane stated that the public health benefits noted in the report could not be understated and she welcomed the progress made to that end.
- 73.13 Councillor Cox stated that his principal regret having been a member of the Committee the past three years was that Members had not persevered in moving the taxi rank in the Brighton Station Gateway Scheme that would have resulted in considerable benefit in his view. Councillor Cox stated that whilst he agreed the Labour & Co-operative Party's scrutiny of the Valley Gardens project, he could not understand their boycott of the schemes Project Board and publically urged the Group to attend the meetings.
- 73.14 Councillor Mitchell stated that she did not understand why Councillor Robins name was listed in the minutes of the Project Board as he was not a member. Councillor Mitchell added that she was disappointed officers were producing minutes along those lines and

formally requested that Councillor Robins name was removed in future as his name should not appear.

73.15 RESOLVED-

1. That the Committee endorses the framework and principles established for the new Local Transport Plan, as attached in Appendix 2.
2. That the Committee agrees that a draft, revised document is submitted to Policy & Resources Committee in March 2015 prior to the final document being considered and approved by Full Council in March 2015.

74 FEES AND CHARGES 2015/16

74.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that set out the proposed 2015/16 fees and charges for the service area covered by the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee in accordance with corporate legislations and policy.

74.2 The Chair read the following statement:

“Members will note that advice has been circulated by the council’s Head of Law with reference to the following report stating that given the potential complications with the budget process, it is proposed that:

- 1. All elements of the proposed fees and charges that are not contentious/have cross party support will be agreed at the meeting.*
- 2. The parts of the proposals which Members would like to vote against or amend will be referred to full Council to be decided as part of the budget. At the moment, the only item that we are aware of is the one relating to parking fees and charges.*

This will enable the Council to make decisions taking account of the full financial implications in the context of the overall budget and, at the same time, avoid everything going to full Council, which would make the Council agenda unmanageable”.

74.3 Councillor Mitchell stated that she agreed with the suggestion provided and asked if a formal amendment to the recommendations was required.

74.4 Councillor Theobald stated that he understood the reasoning behind the proposal and that he would support any motion to amend the recommendations accordingly.

74.5 The Deputy Head of Law suggested the following technical amendment to the recommendations as shown in bold italics below:

- 2.1 That Committee approves the proposed fees and charges for 2015/16 as set out within the report and its appendices ***with the exception of Appendix 4 (Parking Fees and Charges)***

2.2 That the Committee agrees that Appendix 4 (Parking Fees and Charges) be referred to Budget Full Council for consideration

- 74.6 Councillor Hawtree asked why this specific element of the report was to be deferred to Full Council as he could not recall any previous examples.
- 74.7 The Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing clarified that as the pressure on the authorities funding became more onerous the council's fees and charges would become more important. The proposals would provide the political groups a fuller scope of the various parts of the council's budgets and perhaps allow for further briefings on the matter.
- 74.8 Councillor Cox referred to paragraph 3.14 and enquired whether Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) of on street parking was introduced in 2011 as stated.
- 74.9 The Head of Transport clarified that this was a typing error and DPE of on street parking had been introduced in 2001.
- 74.10 Councillor Janio stated that he had heard various reports that PCSO's could now issue Penalty Enforcement Notices and asked if this was the case.
- 74.11 The Head of Transport stated that as far as he was aware, PCSO's could only issue obstruction notices but he would provide further clarification to Members subsequent to the meeting.
- 74.12 Councillor Cox stated that a High Court ruling had been taken against Barnet Council for misinterpreting the law and implementing excessive parking charges and he believed that the proposals for parking charges presented to the Committee would present a similar risk to this authority if agreed. Councillor Cox noted his particular concern that the proposals recommend charges higher than those that had led to the judgement against Barnet Council. Councillor Cox stated that he was sure an argument would be made that parking charges were being implemented in a legal manner but cautioned that there would be serious implications if the charges would be used towards the General Fund for example, as this would be against the law stipulating that parking revenue could only be used for specific purposes. Councillor Cox urged a further review of the proposals before its submission to Full Council as it would not be in the authority's interest to operate outside the law. Councillor Cox supplemented that it was very unclear whether charges were being increased to raise revenue or to reduce congestion and pollution as the case was regularly made for both. Councillor Cox stated that continued rises were not in the interests of residents or businesses in the city.
- 74.13 Councillor Mitchell stated that her group were also concerned by the proposals in particular the increases and decreases for annual and six monthly permits. Councillor Mitchell relayed that the figures clearly demonstrated that in some areas the charges for these permits were far too high and in some instances, no permits had been sold at all. Councillor Mitchell stated her concern that charges were being increased to offset the proposed reductions on annual and six monthly permits. Councillor Mitchell stated that parking permits needed to be fair and this in turn would ensure that parking in the city could be effectively controlled. Councillor Mitchell added that every other charge

contained within the report was proposed to increase at the rate of inflation and it was only fair that parking charges did likewise.

74.14 Councillor Davey stated that there was no question regarding the legality of the parking charges proposed. Councillor Davey stated that over the past three years most charges had been frozen or reduced and across all areas there was a modest increase of 2%-4% with some going down, some going up and some remaining the same. Councillor Davey provided the example of Regency Car Park that had 10 price tariffs. Of those 10, 7 would be reduced, 2 would increase and 1 would stay the same. Councillor Davey noted that the proposals would mean that parking in Regency Car Park would be less expensive than under the previous administration. Councillor Davey added that there were 220 parking tariffs in the report and he urged the opposition parties to review their position as the proposals presented were fair and coherent. Councillor Davey supplemented that prices were targeted to encourage use and overall, grounded in managing congestion and air quality problems on which Brighton and Hove were improving but was still a huge concern.

74.15 Councillor Robins asked if the allotment waiting list charge of £15 was refunded when applicants were successful.

74.16 The Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing stated that he was unable to answer that question at this time but would relay the answer to Members subsequent to the meeting.

74.17 The Chair then put the amended recommendations to the vote which passed.

74.18 **RESOLVED-**

1. That Committee approves the proposed fees and charges for 2015/16 as set out within the report and its appendices with the exception of Appendix 4 (Parking Fees and Charges)
2. That the Committee agrees that Appendix 4 (Parking Fees and Charges) be referred to Budget Full Council for consideration.

75 20MPH PROGRAMME

75.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that updated the Committee on the progress and monitoring of Phases 1 and 2 of the 20mph programme, outlined the results of the recent public consultation on proposals for Phase 3 of the programme and presented proposals for Phase 3, informed by the consultation and requested approval to advertised the necessary Speed Limit Orders (SLO's).

75.2 Councillor Cox stated that whilst he supported 20mph in principle, he was concerned that claims had been made to the positive outcome of the programme that were premature as longer term data was required to make such assertions. Councillor Cox stated that he would be supporting the recommendations of the report with the exception

of recommendation 2.8 as the scheme required public and ward councillor support and this was not forthcoming in the case of Woodingdean.

- 75.3 Councillor Mitchell stated that she too would be supporting the recommendations of the report with the exception of recommendation 2.8. Whilst she was grateful to officers for explaining the situation in Woodingdean, Councillor Mitchell was concerned that the results showed a clear divide between two areas in support and against. Councillor Mitchell also stated her concern that the proposals would not decrease rat running east of Falmer Road and the area needed to be looked at again.
- 75.4 Councillor Robins asked if there was an ongoing maintenance programme for the 20mph scheme as many signs and lines were showing signs of wear and tear in Portslade.
- 75.5 The Principal Transport Planner confirmed that 20mph signs became part of the normal maintenance programme as with all signs adding that she would urge reporting of signs that needed replacement so the work could be carried out.
- 75.6 Councillor Hawtree stated that he supported the proposals and was pleased to see an initial decrease in accidents and congestion and an improvement in air quality.
- 75.7 Councillor Janio stated that he too would be supporting the recommendations with the exception of 2.8 as he felt it was very important for Members to listen to local people when arriving at decisions and there was no clear public support for 20mph in Woodingdean ward. Councillor Janio noted that he had campaigned for lower limits in his own ward of Hangelton which had a high number of school children.
- 75.8 Councillor Theobald asked what the maintenance cost of 20mph signs amounted to.
- 75.9 The Principal Transport Planner answered that it was very difficult to provide a definite figure as it was subject to a number of variables including accidents and vandalism. The Principal Transport Planner clarified that there was a £20,000 budget for replacement however; very little of that budget had been spent. Furthermore, replacement signs cost less than £20 each and lining was undertaken within existing work.
- 75.10 Councillor Mitchell asked for clarification on this point as she understood that council policy meant that lining could only be undertaken inside a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).
- 75.11 The Head of Transport clarified that any new requests for lining could only be undertaken inside CPZ's however, refreshment of existing lines could be carried out anywhere in the city with the cost of doing so relatively small.
- 75.12 Councillor Davey stated that he agreed with Councillor Cox's observation that caution was required adding that officers had been clear that robust information could only be available after three years. However, Councillor Davey stated that that had to be balanced against the Committee's need for data to inform its next steps and as an update on progress. Councillor Davey noted that the data clearly showed a reduction on road casualties over the past three years adding that credit was also due to the coalition government for encouraging authorities to introduce 20mph limits. Councillor Davey

stated that he hoped 20mph would become the standardised limit in residential areas in the future, with signage only necessary for speed limits above that.

75.13 RESOLVED-

1. That the Committee notes the results of the public consultation on proposals to implement 20mph speed limits in Medina Terrace, Mile Oak, Hangleton, Woodingdean, Rottingdean & Ovingdean and Saltdean.
2. That the Committee notes the positive results of the first year of implementation of Phase 1 of the 20mph programme in Central Brighton & Hove.
3. That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limits for the Hove Park area as described in paragraphs 4.28 to 4.32.
4. That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limits for the Medina Terrace area as described in paragraph 4.39.
5. That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit to the Mile Oak area as described in paragraph 4.41.
6. That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit to the Hangleton area as described in paragraphs 4.45 to 4.46
7. That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit to the Rottingdean and Ovingdean area as described in paragraphs 4.49 to 4.51
8. That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit to the Saltdean area as described in paragraphs 4.59 to 4.60.
9. That the Committee instructs officers to continue the comprehensive monitoring and evaluation programme of the programme report on this to Committee at regular intervals together with any resulting recommendations for alterations or other remedial actions that may be identified.
10. That the Committee note the ongoing forward programme of the 20mph programme as outlined in paragraph 6.5.

76 HOVE STATION FOOTBRIDGE ACCESSIBILITY

- 76.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Place that outlined the history, ownership and condition of Hove Station Footbridge following a request from the Committee at its meeting on 7 October requesting officers bring a report to the next available meeting.

76.2 The Head of Transport Strategy & Projects added a further verbal update to the Committee on activity since the report was published. Further constructive discussions had taken place between council officers and Network Rail that had resulted in a joint visual inspection of the Bridge and agreement from Network Rail that they would carry out a detailed principle structural inspection of the Bridge during the next financial year. That inspection and its results would be fundamental to any further discussion of the future of the Bridge as it would inform of its condition and any value of future investment in it.

76.3 **RESOLVED-**

1. That Committee authorises the Executive Director to continue discussions with Network Rail and to agree such repairs that a) comply with the historic legal agreements regarding the maintenance of the footbridge, and b) which can be accommodated within existing budgets.
2. That the Executive Director submits a further report to this committee outlining possible future options for the footbridge, following further detailed inspections and discussions with Network Rail.

77 **SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOL SCHEME PORTLAND ROAD**

77.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that sought permission to proceed with the proposed Safer Routes to School Scheme measures for Goldstone Primary, West Hove Infant and West Hove Junior Schools.

77.2 Councillor Pissaridou addressed the Committee on the proposals. Councillor Pissaridou stated that the new development on the junction of School Road and Portland Road, including a doctor's surgery and pharmacy would have significant implications in the area. Councillor Pissaridou stated the consultation conducted by the council was flawed as it did not take into account the future change to the site. Councillor Pissaridou added that the Wish Road Surgery Patients Group had conducted a survey of its users that had shown majority support for light crossing controlled crossing as opposed to a zebra crossing at the junction. Councillor Pissaridou requested that the Committee defer any decision on that specific recommendation in order to carry out a further investigation into the implications of the surgery.

77.3 The Road Safety Officer stated that the submission of the Patients Group had been considered in the report and officers had visited the location. The Road Safety Manager added that there was an existing zebra crossing at the location and the proposal was to extend that zebra crossing. Subsequent to the consultation being carried out, the Patients Group had come forward outlining their concerns and proposal. The Road Safety Manager stated that it was his view that there were no safety grounds that demonstrated that a light controlled crossing was in principle safer than a zebra crossing. The zebra location currently at the location meant that children could impose control over traffic movement. A light controlled crossing meant that users would have to wait to cross and it was his view that not all children and adults did so, increasing the

safety risk. The Road Safety Manager stated that a widened zebra crossing would cater from the additional demand the new development would create.

77.4 Councillor Davey stated that the Road Safety Team were qualified professionals and it was important that Members carefully considered their recommendations, specifically that a zebra crossing was more appropriate for this location than a light controlled crossing. Councillor Davey noted that light controlled crossings had previously been replaced by zebra crossings during improvements at the Seven Dials roundabout and asked if that had led to a decrease in collisions compared to previous years.

77.5 The Road Safety Manager clarified that before the improvements, there were on average eleven injury accidents at the Seven Dials roundabout compared to one casualty in the last year although that had not been due to a collision.

77.6 Councillor Mitchell stated that the report was of a high standard and she supported the proposals with the exception of the recommendation for the crossing at the junction of School Road. Councillor Mitchell stated that it was her view that this issue needed to be looked at again in conjunction with the surgeries own travel plan for the best option.

77.7 Councillor Janio stated that it was important for Members to respect the judgement of road safety experts and he would be supporting the report recommendations.

77.8 Councillor Davey stated that he was a resident of the area and as a regular user of Portland Road, supported a zebra crossing as it provided authority to pedestrians.

77.9 Councillor Mitchell moved a motion to amend the recommendation on behalf of the Labour & Co-operative Group as shown in bold italics below:

2.1 That the Committee approves the preferred scheme outlined at 3.3 and shown in Appendices 1-5 and authorises officers to begin implementation including the advertising of any necessary Traffic Regulation Orders ***with the exception of proposals for School Road which are reconsidered in consultation with the Patients Group and Surgery.***

77.10 The motion was formally seconded by Councillor Robins.

77.11 The Chair put the motion to the vote which failed.

77.12 The Chair then put the report recommendations to the vote that passed.

77.13 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approves the preferred scheme outlined at 3.3 and shown in Appendices 1-5 and authorises officers to begin implementation including the advertising of any necessary Traffic Regulation Orders.

78 PEDAL CYCLE PARKING TRO OBJECTIONS SCOTLAND STREET

78.1 **RESOLVED-** That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following orders;

TRO-31b-2014 Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.* 201*

79 TRAVELLER STRATEGY 2012: 2 YEAR UPDATE

- 79.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that provided an annual monitoring update on the Traveller Commissioning Strategy in accordance with the recommendations of the Traveller Scrutiny Panel held in 2012.
- 79.2 Councillor Hawtree asked if any update was available on the proposed Horsdean site.
- 79.3 The Head of Tenancy Services clarified that there was a significant amount of work to undertake including installation of a utility block, community rooms and drainage work and the aim was for the site to be completed by the end of March 2016.
- 79.4 Councillor Theobald noted that the council had been provided with a grant of £1.7m by central government and enquired as to any additional costs above that.
- 79.5 The Head of Tenancy Services clarified that Policy & Resources Committee had allocated an additional £250,000 at its December 2014 meeting primarily to complete drainage work. She added that construction inflation costs had risen dramatically since approval that had been difficult to manage.
- 79.6 Councillor Theobald stated that he still had many reservations about ongoing costs and suitability, particularly with regard to flooding, about the site location.
- 79.7 Councillor Robins stated that he had sat on the Traveller Scrutiny Panel in 2012 and he had envisaged that the council would have created a better dialogue with the travelling community since then. Councillor Robins expressed his disappointment that no significant progress had been made and sites were still a matter of local dispute, and urged officers to undertake this as a matter of priority.
- 79.8 The Head of Tenancy Services stated that the council and other agencies had made progress in attempting to establish link, bonds and trust with the travelling community but there was still significant work to undertake to this end.
- 79.9 **RESOLVED-**
1. That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee notes the progress made, achievements and challenges in delivering the strategy (Appendix 1).
 2. That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee notes the progress made in implementing the Scrutiny Panel recommendations (Appendix 2).

80 LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

- 80.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that sought approval for the draft Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and associated documents for public consultation.
- 80.2 Councillor Theobald asked if there would be any funding for the Patcham area and noted his view that the proposals for the Horsdean site went against the proposals in the report.
- 80.3 The Flood Engineer clarified that funding had been awarded to undertake a preliminary study for the Patcham Flood Alleviation Scheme that would hopefully be completed in the summer of 2015 and funding had also been awarded through the Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Grant and Aid Fund for the year 2017-18 subject to detailed approval of the detailed proposal by the Environment Agency.
- 80.4 **RESOLVED-**
1. That Committee approve the draft Local Strategy and associated documents for public consultation.
 2. That Committee note the Objectives and associated Action Plan described in the Local Strategy setting out current local flood risk management priorities and proposed timetable for their implementation.

81 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

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

The meeting concluded at 7.30pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of