

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

4.00pm 24 NOVEMBER 2020

VIRTUAL MEETING (MICROSOFT TEAMS)

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Heley (Chair) Lloyd (Deputy Chair), Wilkinson (Opposition Spokesperson), Wares (Group Spokesperson), Appich, Brown, Davis, Fowler, Nield and Williams

PART ONE

33 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

33(a) Declarations of substitutes

33.1 Councillor Nield was present as substitute for Councillor Hills.

33(b) Declarations of interest

33.2 Councillor Wilkinson declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 39 Open Spaces Strategy Update as a current allotment holder.

33(c) Exclusion of press and public

33.3 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).

33.4 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of those items on the agenda listed as containing confidential information.

34 MINUTES

34.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 September 2020 be approved and signed as the correct record.

35 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

35.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

“Firstly, I hope everyone is safe and well during this second national lockdown we find ourselves in.

I would like to take this opportunity to say how shocked I was to hear about the strange events that occurred on Friday concerning the appearance of one of the City’s Historic Seafront Lanterns on a public auction website following its removal from Madeira Drive for safety checks. I understand that the Council’s Street Lighting Contractor, Colas were given explicit instructions to remove 20 of these lantern sets and place them into safe storage pending inspection and potential repair by English Heritage. Following the lantern being observed on social media and reported to the Council, I am very pleased that Council officers acted swiftly and took immediate action by tracking down and removing our property from a specific individual and commencing urgent investigations with the contractor. I understand the Contractor is treating this very seriously and we await the outcome and whether or not we feel any criminal action has occurred and we will involve the police if appropriate.

We have moved swiftly to seek assurance from Colas that the other lanterns are being stored safely for inspection by Historic England. They have given us this assurance, but we have asked them to evidence this urgently. Furthermore, I know that the Leader of the Council has also now written to COLAS, to raise the seriousness of the matter, and to ask for explicit assurance of the steps that will be taken by the contractor to ensure this will never happen again. To follow on from this, I have also asked for a full investigation and a report with findings and any necessary recommendations to come back to Committee.”

“It has now been confirmed that our application for additional funding from the Department for Transport’s Emergency Active Travel Fund (Tranche 2) has been successful.

I’m delighted that the council has been awarded £2.376m, its full allocation and the most to any unitary authority in the country. This is in addition to the £663,000 we were awarded in June. My thanks go to the officers who worked so hard to make this a resounding success, and for the campaigners and residents who continually kept the pressure on us to go further in support of active travel.

At the last meeting of this committee, In September we agreed that, subject to a successful funding bid, a special meeting of the committee would be held to agree the measures being taken forward and that meaningful consultation would take place so that residents and stakeholders and community groups could offer input into the process, and this will be arranged as soon as possible. We now have a draft consultation plan that we will be bringing forward to this special committee meeting.

The government has also made clear that all local councils should consult, and as mentioned before, we will do so – paying particular attention to the concerns raised by our city’s disability groups and others. Once again, I can stress that the steps we will be taking to consult will be brought to all of you as part of a special meeting. However, I am sure we can all agree that this large financial award from the government sends a strong message about the proposals for active travel in our city

Prior to today members were circulated the letter attached to our funding award from the Secretary of State for transport, Grant Shapps MP, and I wanted to read the two highlights from the letter for those watching today.

“Very few changes to anything will command unanimous support, and we do not ask it for these schemes. But there is clear evidence that for all the controversy they can sometimes cause, ambitious cycling and walking schemes have significant, if quieter, majority support. In recent surveys by my Department, 65 per cent of people across England supported reallocating road space to walking and cycling in their local area and nearly eight out of ten people support measures to reduce road traffic in their neighbourhood.”

“Evaluation of early School Streets projects has shown traffic outside schools has reduced on average by 68%, children cycling to school has increased by 51%, and harmful vehicle pollution outside schools is down by almost three-quarters.”

“We’ve been awarded this money to support safe, inclusive and sustainable travel for the city and we want everyone, of all ages and abilities, to access safe travel in Brighton & Hove. For those who do need to drive, clearer roads will be of benefit. By creating more transport choices for residents and visitors, we can also improve our health and wellbeing, reduce carbon emissions, improve air quality and support local businesses by making it possible for people to travel around the city in different ways. Tranche 1 had comments and important feedback from blue badge holders, and there is a report today that covers the changes made in response to some of these. I will set up a further meeting with groups such as BADGE to ensure that positive changes are ongoing and to pick up on feedback on today’s report.

“Last month, the city’s first climate assembly came to a close. I was lucky enough to observe some of the sessions and I was really impressed by the conversations that were had and the early suggested recommendations. I’m really looking forward to reading the report and receiving it at this committee in January.

“At the beginning of this year, as an opposition member on this committee I put forward a motion to look into how we can reduce the number of cars in the city centre by 2023, following many other local authorities announcing plans to cut emissions, increase pedestrian zones and clean air zones in similar time scales. We also put forward plans for an expanded ultra-low emission zone, similar to London’s. The initial report was due to come back to committee this month, but due to the delayed end date of the climate assembly it will now be coming in January.

The new service we’re supporting, called RevaluElectricals, has been a huge success since it was launched just a few weeks ago.

The scheme, the first of its kind in the country, is run by Tech-Take Back and allows residents to book online through a special app and have their old tech or electricals collected from their doorstep.

Goods that are working or can be refurbished or upgraded will be donated to charity. Anything that can’t be saved will be dismantled and recycled responsibly.

So far, 300 residents have registered on the app; 90 collections have been carried out and almost 1000 kgs of equipment has been collected.

“The tender for the first electric refuse truck goes live this week and will last about three weeks. The evaluation process will be carried out by four people who will then choose the successful bidder.

“We recently installed eight redeployable CCTV cameras and ANPR (Automatic Number Plate Recognition) systems across the city in some of our worst fly-tipping hotspots, with assistance from Sussex Police.

We’ve issued 55 Fixed Penalty Notice (FPNs) since the cameras were installed in mid-October, and our enforcement officers have already noticed a significant reduction in fly-tipping since installation.

Our latest additions, at Hollingbury Golf Course, are powered purely from solar and wind power and are situated to ensure we have the full benefit of the renewable energy available to us.

“These three developments are great news and will hopefully continue as we drive towards our goal of becoming a carbon neutral city by 2030”.

36 CALL OVER

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

- Item 39: Open Spaces Strategy Update
- Item 40: Fleet Strategy
- Item 41: Household Waste Recycling Sites
- Item 42: Keeping the City Clean
- Item 43: Impact of Tree Diseases
- Item 44: Emergency Active Travel Measures- Blue Badge holder parking and access for disabled people
- Item 45: Parking Annual Report
- Item 49: BTN Bikeshare Reorganisation

36.2 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 47: Parking Scheme Update Report
- Item 48: Frederick Gardens Request for Gates

37 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(A) PETITIONS

(i) Seven Dials Cycle Storage

37.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 151 people requesting cycle storage facilities for the Seven Dials area.

37.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you very much for this important petition. We absolutely need to do this and the council is aware of the need for secure residential cycle parking within the city and as part of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), currently in development, we are reviewing strategic approaches to cycle parking. I can completely

sympathise with the petitioners, as where I live would certainly make cycling easier if I had safe and secure on street storage. When 6 or more bikes can fit into the space of one parking spot, it highlights how inefficient a use of space parking can be and how bike hangars can be truly transformation in a city like ours, where many residents are desperate to cycle but the council are not providing the adequate infrastructure. I'm very disappointed that no Chair of this committee has actioned this sooner, as I believe we urgently need cycle storage to allow more people to start using cycling as a way of getting around. Therefore, in order to begin to address this key issue sooner than the longer term planning will allow through the LCWIP, we will be bringing forward proposals as part of the budget for the 2021/22 financial year for a pilot project to install some initial cycle hangar facilities in the city and learn lessons prior to wider rollout in future.

We are considering several successful case studies, including Lambeth as you mention, when planning our approach to these facilities. I will also make sure officers know that Seven Dials is a desired location for a trial, when decide which parts of the city will take part in the early trial"

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

(B) PUBLIC QUESTIONS

(i) A259

37.4 Nigel Smith put the following question:

"As it has been previously established and informed by this committee that there has been no communication between B&HCC and ESCC relating to the A259, why when the Bus Review says the Eastbound bottleneck is the Longridge junction on the city boundary, have no discussions taken place with ESCC who manage this junction, re alleviating the bottleneck that causes daily queues back to Roedean?"

37.5 The Chair provided the following reply:

"On your first point, I would like to clarify that officers do liaise with their counterparts at neighbouring authorities on cross-boundary issues. At the Full Council meeting on 22 October, I was asked specifically about the discussion's officers had had with East Sussex County Council with regards to Valley Gardens and Black Rock.

I would like to again provide reassurance that we will participate fully in any future study looking at the A259 in the east of the city and work with East Sussex County Council to ensuring this is a success.

On your second point, the Bus Network Review does highlight congestion associated with the Longridge Avenue signals in its initial assessment of congestion hotspots. I would also add that congestion is related to the volume of traffic using this stretch of the A259 as well as the junctions.

The Bus Network Review subsequently included recommendations to review the Rottingdean High Street junction and signal timings at Longridge Avenue, the junction of which is within the city boundary.

The Bus Network Review represents a long-term plan to assist in prioritising improvements to the bus network. We will continue to progress its recommendations;

however, each measure is subject to funding and, in many cases, further design and feasibility work”.

37.6 Nigel Smith put the following supplementary question:

“The highly distinguished Professor David Begg said in the Executive Summary of his 68-page paper on "The Impact of Congestion on Bus Passengers" for which Brighton & Hove Buses received strong credits:

‘Traffic congestion is a cancer which if left unchecked will destroy the bus sector. I hesitate to make such a dire and sensational prediction, but the evidence I have uncovered in this research leads me to no other conclusion’.

My question is quite simply, given that Professor Begg’s predictions are now undeniably occurring, when are B&HCC going to act on congestion? I would urge all members of this committee to consider the seriousness of the situation and its impact on our sustainable transport and carbon emissions”.

37.7 The Chair stated that a written response would be provided subsequent to the meeting.

(ii) A259 Bus Lane

37.8 Rob Shepherd put the following question:

“When asked for the traffic data and analysis that informed the recommendation for a temporary A259 bus lane at Greenways, you replied ‘The proposal was also identified in the council’s 2018 Bus Network Review, & that review was informed by supporting traffic data and analysis and can be found on our website’.

Pages 25 and 30 of the review explicitly cautioned that this was not based on traffic data and analysis. Do you agree that this reply misled you and other councillors, may have concealed bad decision making and fails to respect Public Questions that seek to expose such failings?”

37.9 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question but I respectfully disagree. The recommendations in the Bus Network Review are evidenced-based following analysis of the network including congestion hot spots for buses. This is available for all to view on the website. It is true that the Bus Network Review does make a general recommendation about the need for further feasibility work as schemes come forward; however, the need for and scope of this is dependent on the individual scheme recommendation.

In respect of the A259 bus lane extension, we have listened to concerns about introducing this quickly as an experimental scheme. As was reported at the last meeting of this Committee, it will now be considered as part of a future Local Transport Plan programme”.

37.10 The Chair stated that a written response would be provided after the meeting.

(iii) Smoke Control Area

37.11 Adrian Hill put the following question:

“Wood and coal burning in homes produces high numbers of harmful particulates that can cause many serious health issues including respiratory problems for which I suffer. Brighton is the largest city in England without a full city-wide smoke control area to protect its residents from the most polluting of home fires. I was told at the ETS in January that widening the areas would be looked at ‘very soon’; considering health is especially important now, and with the solid fuel burning season starting, will a full SCA be brought in this winter?”

37.12 The Chair provided the following reply:

recently about Smoke Control Areas and I recognise the level of your concerns about fine particles and their potential effects on your own health and that of other people’s. I know that this is a highly technical and scientific issue which requires appropriate and reliable evidence to inform our considerations about Smoke Control Areas in the city. I am therefore pleased to say that information about fine particles has been included in the council’s Air Quality Annual Status Report since 2015, in accordance with Public Health Outcomes Framework – which is the Government’s vision for public health. Our expert officers who specialise in air quality, public health and environmental protection will work together to consider the role of Smoke Control Areas as part of the preparation of the council’s new Air Quality Action Plan. They will also liaise with relevant organisations and bodies to look at the overall benefits and consider the potential financial and staffing implications.

Unfortunately, the work on the plan will take longer than the duration of this winter. We expect to be able to consult on the draft plan towards the middle of next year, and then consider and approve it before the end of the year. However, I will be asking officers to review and refresh our communications about asking people to think twice about wood and coal burning while we are still in this second lockdown period and also approaching the winter period. I will see if anything can be done to speed up this process.

I really do hope that decisions on the Government’s Environment Bill can also be hurried up as it is anticipated there will be updates to the Clean Air Act and useful guidance outlining legal powers and possible funding for local authorities. This will help us tackle harmful pollutants, such as particulate emissions, and protect our residents by making our city’s air cleaner, especially those who are more vulnerable to them. We are also hoping to progress many other schemes that will improve air quality in the city, such as an expanded ultra-low emission zone, however your particular concern on smoke from woodburners is noted and shared and we will do all that we can to make progress here”.

(iv) Traffic Congestion

37.13 Mark Earthey put the following question:

“Given the DfT uses 100% congestion as the level at which traffic delays rise unacceptably and intervention is needed to handle extra traffic, it is puzzling that B&H City Plan sets 125% as our limit, a level where severe disruption is the norm. Can you explain why it is acceptable to subject our citizens to more traffic delays, air pollution and carbon emissions than is acceptable nationally, and why the 125% limit was chosen and adopted by our council?”

37.14 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question Mark. I share your concerns about congestion in the city and want to make sure that we do everything we can by working with the members of this and other committees to reduce traffic levels in the city, both now and in the future. We can do this by effective development planning; and providing sustainable and active travel alternatives for people, especially for short journeys.

The current situation that we find ourselves in as a result of the pandemic especially provides the perfect opportunity to work with local communities to achieve this, and I am also really looking forward to the outcomes of the city’s Climate Assembly on reducing transport carbon emissions. Less vehicles on our roads will mean less congestion and less pollution and make it safer and healthier for people to move around the city for years to come.

However, in researching the background to your question, it has not been possible to identify the source of the 125% percent figure that you have referred to, nor any decision that agreed to it. If you are able to provide me with that information, I can make sure that you receive a written response as soon as possible”.

(v) Seafront Signage

37.15 Chris Murgatroyd put the following question:

“Does BHCC have a policy formally or informally of prioritising aesthetics and the attractiveness of the seafront which prevents it from putting up No Cycling signs in the Pedestrian Zone on the Lower Promenade, even though the absence of signage may be putting pedestrians, staff and cyclists themselves at increased risk of infection from a lack of distancing in the Covid period?”

37.16 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Consideration is given to signage on the basis of its effectiveness for the desired purpose. For example, additional “No Cycling” signage has been included on the lower promenade access ramps to discourage cyclists. Cycling is not permitted on Brighton lower promenade apart from between 6am – 11am but only for delivering/collecting from a premise or if they have a permit during that time.

Furthermore, additional signage has been introduced along the Seafront to encourage social distancing. However, social distancing is the responsibility of individuals whatever form of mobility they are utilising”.

37.17 Chris Murgatroyd asked the following supplementary question:

“In correspondence following the ETS Committee on 23 June, Council officials confirmed that they would be amending the signs to give clearer direction to cyclists on the vehicle entry gates at the Peace Statue and the Artists Quarter ramp, but nothing has yet been done - when will clear signage be put on these main entry points to help BHCC discharge its duty of care to all users by reducing pressures on distancing, and for a safer system of work for the seafront team undertaking enforcement?”

37.18 The Chair stated that a written reply would be provided subsequent to the meeting.

(C) DEPUTATIONS

(i) Cycle Storage

37.19 The Committee considered a deputation requesting that Hanover & Elm Grove be chosen as a pilot area for covered cycle storage.

37.20 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your deputation and attending to speak to the committee today. We heard a very similar petition earlier on cycle storage, so its great to hear that so many residents are requesting bike hangars. I really appreciate the data you have included which further highlights this need. In your deputation you have stated that up until now the council has not supported installing cycle hangars, so let me be clear, I absolutely support this and when I became chair I actioned council officers to start work on a pilot.

We absolutely need to do this and the council is aware of the need for secure residential cycle parking within the city and as part of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), currently in development, we are reviewing strategic approaches to cycle parking. I can completely sympathise with the petitioners, as where I live would certainly make cycling easier if I had safe and secure on street storage. When 6 or more bikes can fit into the space of one parking spot, it highlights how inefficient a use of space parking can be and how bike hangars can be truly transformation in a city like ours, where many residents are desperate to cycle but the council are not providing the adequate infrastructure.

I’m very disappointed that no Chair of this committee has actioned this sooner, as I believe we urgently need cycle storage to allow more people to start using cycling as a way of getting around. Therefore, in order to begin to address this key issue sooner than the longer term planning will allow through the LCWIP, we will be bringing forward proposals as part of the budget for the 2021/22 financial year for a pilot project to install some initial cycle hangar facilities in the city and learn lessons prior to wider rollout in future.

We are considering several successful case studies, including Lambeth as you mention, when planning our approach to these facilities. I will also make sure officers know that Hanover and Elm Grove is a desired location for a trial, when decide which parts of the city will take part in the early trial. You are right to mention that this would support the low traffic neighbourhood trial”.

37.21 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the deputation.

(ii) Request for improvement of conditions and facilities for active travellers on the B2123 Falmer Road

37.22 The Committee considered a deputation requesting infrastructure facilities for active travellers on the B2123 Falmer Road.

37.23 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you, Libby, we are very pleased with the notification from the Department for Transport on our recent successful to the Emergency Active Travel Fund Tranche 2. Unfortunately, this funding is available only for the specific schemes as outlined in our

bid, available on our website, and does not include any schemes in the areas identified in your Deputation.

However, the points raised in this deputation have been noted as part of our ongoing work on our Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), currently in development. Both the B2123 and the A259 feature in our draft cycling network for the emerging LCWIP, which will go to full public consultation next year and I would urge you and other residents in the area to input into that consultation. I will also ask officers to meet you for a site visit to discuss these specific issues in detail.

As for the installation of speed tables, this engineering feature requires specific design and road safety assessments to determine whether or not it is appropriate for specific locations and circumstances, for this reason I will also ask officers to investigate and contact you shortly”.

37.24 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the deputation.

38 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(A) PETITIONS

(i) Keep Princes St Pedestrianised

38.1 The Committee considered a petition from Councillor Childs and signed by 451 people requesting that Princes Street remain as a pedestrianised street.

38.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for presenting your petition today.

The proposals for Prince’s Street are featured in the preliminary design as an addition to the original scope for Valley Gardens Phase 3, following stakeholder engagement during 2018. I understand that the changes were intended to address issues with deliveries to businesses in the area, improve emergency vehicle access, and prevent illegal and potentially unsafe traffic movements from occurring.

Although it is a road with kerbs and footways, I can see why it is a popular pedestrian route and therefore gives the impression that it is pedestrianised. I can therefore fully understand the concerns in the petition about the street potentially being used more by traffic than it is now. The north end of Prince’s Street is also used by a local business with outdoor seating, the type of which has been very useful during recent months to support the required social distancing measures during the pandemic.

I can therefore confirm for you and the petitioners that this particular matter will be reviewed by the project team, who will be considering possible alternative arrangements to address the matters that had prompted the proposed change to the northern end of Prince’s Street. If alternative arrangements are considered safe and achievable, then it is likely that the street can remain as it is in terms of the existing closure at the Edward Street end.

The results of this technical work will be part of the recommended outcomes of the further detailed design for the whole project and, together with the results of the recent consultation, will be reported back to this committee early next year”.

38.3 Councillor Wares stated that it was a shame that the committee couldn’t be stronger and instruct officers that the road should be kept closed to traffic.

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

(ii) A new crossing and traffic calming for Freshfield Road

38.5 The Committee considered a petition from Councillor Childs and signed by 344 people requesting a new crossing and traffic calming measures for Freshfield Road on safety grounds.

38.6 The Chair provided the following response:

“We carried out a detailed crossing assessment of the Freshfield Road and Cuthbert Road junction in 2017 where it came out as very low on the Council’s priority list, however, at this time the criteria required at least one injury causing collision, we have now amended the criteria by removing this provision so will be reassessing the junction and will report the outcome to a future ETS Committee.

In terms of your request for Traffic Calming I will ask Officers to look again into the issue of vehicle speeds as part of the work that will be carried out for the Pedestrian Crossing request in the area.

However, it is worth noting that we use data supplied by Sussex Police and work jointly with them as part of the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership to target our limited resources where they are needed and therefore have to prioritise roads or junctions that have a proven history of traffic collisions. Therefore, we cannot take into account reports of near misses as these are subjective and therefore open to interpretation. We will be taking note of your concerns and can report any further update alongside our findings in relation to the crossing request.

I am asking officers to bring a report to a future committee outlining our current policy when it comes for criteria for traffic calming, as we think it’s wrong that an accident is used as evidence rather than taking a preventative approach. We will include Freshfield road in this report”.

38.7 Councillor Davis, Councillor Wares and Councillor Wilkinson expressed their support for the petition and the review of the criteria.

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

(B) WRITTEN QUESTIONS

(i) Stanmer Village Parking

38.9 Councillor Wares put the following question:

“September Committee required parking controls to support Stanmer Village residents and businesses be brought back to this November Committee. This hasn’t happened. However, I am advised by the Assistant Director of City Environment that consultation is due to take place. I am further assured that the parking charge TRO for the whole of Stanmer Park will not be introduced until a decision on the village scheme is made; a report on the matter is anticipated for January 2021 with the start date for both (if agreed) to be February 2021. In the absence of a report, please would the Chair agree

that the advice provided by the Assistant Director is accepted and forms the basis upon which Committee agrees this matter will be progressed?"

38.10 The Chair provided the following reply:

"Thank you for raising this and the Assistant Director of City Environment has asked me to apologise to members of the committee that she was not able to present the report on Stanmer Village Parking to this committee. I am happy to accept the approach as you have already described with a report to now be presented in January Committee".

(ii) Old Shoreham Road

38.11 Councillor Wares put the following question:

"On the 30th August 2020 the Administration posted on their Councillor Facebook page that cycling on Old Shoreham Road had gone up by 61% since the introduction of the cycle lane installed as part of Covid measures. The Deputy Chair of ETS had previously made the same claim to this Committee in June. Please could the Chair confirm, in light of their own report at last ETS Committee, that the post was fake news?"

38.12 The Chair provided the following reply:

"Thank you for your question. It is not fake news. I can confirm that the 61% increase in cycling trips relates to data collected in 2017 compared with data collected in 2020 at the location of Lullington Road. In 2017 data showed 339 cyclists per day, compared with data collected in 2020 which showed 545 cyclists per day giving a 61% increase".

(iii) Transport Partnership

38.13 Councillor Wares put the following question:

"For over a year and again in recent times we have been trying to understand who makes decisions as to who can sit on the Transport Partnership, what the qualifying criteria is and when sitting members were last reassessed to ensure they met the criteria. The Transport Partnership is increasingly being referred to especially in support of transport projects. However, it is unclear what the democratic process is to ensure that the Transport Partnership is accountable, properly represents all interests and remains objective in its work. Absent of clear advice and scrutiny, the Transport Partnership risks being viewed as a closed shop".

38.14 The Chair provided the following reply:

"Councillor Wares, as you know, the Transport Partnership is a strategic partnership which forms part of the Brighton & Hove Connected family of partnerships. Membership of the Transport Partnership is agreed by members of the Partnership and is subject to periodic review by the Partnership, the last such review being in 2019. The Transport Partnership is chaired by the Chair of ETS committee and includes representation from all political groups on the city council. The appointment of new

members or the removal of existing members is subject to agreement by the Transport Partnership rather than any single member organisation.

As a result of chairing my first transport partnership this month, and becoming aware of the unacceptable lack of diversity on the partnership, as Chair I have asked officers to urgently review membership in order to increase representation of women, people of colour and young people in particular. It is not acceptable in 2020 to have a transport partnership dominated by white men, nor is it acceptable that young people (apart from myself) and BAME people are completely unrepresented despite often having very different experiences of transport in the city. As I have just outlined, any new additions recommended will have to be accepted via a vote of the Transport Partnership which includes yourself. If you have any suggestions of people or organisations that will help us achieve improved diversity, then please let me know.

I have been made aware that there are certain groups that you would support joining the transport partnership, but the one I have been made aware of which is the Valley Gardens forum I believe, does not meet the Brighton and Hove Connected criteria of being “able to take a genuine, strategic city wide view, in order to effectively represent their sector”. This is from the BH Connected member Handbook from 2016. This specifically relates to BH Connected, but equally applies to thematic partnerships, as they are part of BH Connected”.

38.15 Councillor Wares asked the following supplementary question:

“I would like officers to be a bit more specific about precisely what the criteria is as I want everybody who is already on it to pass that criteria and prove where they do pass it before we continue”

38.16 The Chair provided the following reply:

““Thanks for your support and I’m happy to send you the criteria that I’ve seen as Chair of the Transport Partnership and we can discuss the issue further”

(iv) Task & Finish Groups

38.17 Councillor Wares put the following question:

“Over a month ago we raised with Executive Officers concern that the task and finish groups overseeing the LCWIP, Valley Gardens Phase 3 and Stanmer Park had all long expired in being legitimate and permissible groups under the Constitution. None were renewed after six months and all are now over a year old which is Constitutionally prohibited. We were advised that the issue would be resolved with reference back to Committee. Please could the Chair confirm that the three task and finish groups are now disbanded and invalid and advise when Committee will review and decide on alternative arrangements for the future, if any”.

38.18 The Chair provided the following reply:

““To begin with, I want to acknowledge that when these groups were set up based on the suggestion of my colleague Councillor West, it was recognising that they would provide an opportunity to involve stakeholders where possible - something that is so

important in our work - as well as ensuring that Members have clear oversight of the projects

I want to thank officers for setting the groups up and administering them, and also those stakeholders who have been able to attend and contribute to them. I am sure that you and the other Members involved have welcomed them and recognised the value of them. As my colleagues definitely have. The original Terms of Reference that were agreed by this committee did acknowledge the nature and likely duration of the projects that they were being used to support and guide. However, I do recognise that the requirements of the Constitution for this type of Member Working Group have not been fully met on this occasion, and the six month period has been exceeded. I will therefore ensure that a report which outlines what the groups have achieved and also considers their future, will be brought to this committee in January next year. If they are to be made permanent, then this will also require a report to Policy & Resources Committee. For continuity in the interim, I think it would be really helpful if the groups could continue to 'meet' virtually and informally. Alternatively, the Members involved should still receive relevant information or updates from officers that would have been discussed at any planned or future meeting of the group, including a review of its Terms of Reference. An early discussion between the Chair and the nominated Members of each group regarding the merits of continuing will help officers drafting the January committee report".

(v) Urgency Powers

38.19 Councillor Wares put the following question:

"When the section of cycle lane on the A259 was removed between the Aquarium junction and West Street we were briefed by the Assistant Director that the decision was taken by officers using delegated urgency powers. That being correct, officers are required to report the use of urgency powers to Committee. That didn't happen in September and is not on this agenda. When will the use of urgency powers be properly reported to Committee or was the advice originally given incorrect and the decision was made under some other power; if so please, could the Chair clarify?"

38.20 The Chair provided the following reply:

"Thank you for your question Councillor Wares, the decision to remove a section of the A259 cycle lanes was taken by the Assistant Director under the Scheme of Delegation to Officers in Paragraph 7(2) relating to urgent decisions following consultation with myself.

The reasons for removal related to the need to explore potential mitigation measures to deal with congestion at the eastern end of the new cycle lane and its impact on city centre traffic and bus operations. This decision will be formally reported to the next available Committee meeting. Apologies for that and thank you for raising it."

(vi) CCTV

38.21 Councillor Wares put the following question:

"With the evolving success of using CCTV to combat fly-tipping, would it be possible for the Cityclean to consider focussing on council estates. Many estates have communal

bin areas that are targeted by others that dump their waste in or around the bin areas. It may be that in collaboration with the Housing department, CCTV equipment could be procured so that it remains dedicated to supporting just council estates”.

38.22 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I agree that the new CCTV cameras to prevent fly tipping are proving to be a success. In fact, early signs suggest that in some sites where there is a camera the quantity of fly tips appears to be reducing. I agree that it would be a very good idea to extend this into fly tipping hotspots on our council housing estates. Officers have started discussions with colleagues in housing about how this service could be jointly provided. Housing will continue to explore this, and I will ask be raising this with the Co-Chairs of Housing.”

38.23 Councillor Wares asked the following supplementary question:

“Could you ask officers to brief lead Members as to how this progresses?”

38.24 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Yes, we can do that”.

(D) NOTICES OF MOTION

(i) Temporary Cycle Lane on Old Shoreham Road

38.25 Councillor Wares moved the following Notice of Motion on behalf of the Conservative Group:

This Committee agrees:-

1. To request officers to urgently remove the cycle lanes installed on Old Shoreham Road between Sackville Road and Hangleton Lane junctions.

38.26 Introducing the Motion, Councillor Wares stated that the cycle lane was unpopular with local residents as demonstrated by the survey results, was underused and causing traffic congestion was a ‘trojan horse’ tactic to introduce schemes based on ideology not feasibility. Councillor Wares stated that whilst he supported the principle of encouraging active travel, this cycle lane was not fit for purpose and should be removed.

38.27 Councillor Brown formally seconded the Motion and similarly observed that the cycle lane was underused and causing traffic congestion and therefore not appropriate.

38.28 The Chair made the following statement as clarification on the Notice of Motion:

“The Notice of Motion says that “The cycle lane has only been subject to a survey and is not proposed to be subject to any further consultation.” As Councillors Wares and Brown know, at ETS in September we approved a 6 week long consultation would take place and the committee also agreed to hold a special ETS meeting in order to approve the consultation plans, so that part of the NoM is incorrect.

I also want to point out the fact that the Committee looked at this issue in September and decided that the temporary arrangements should continue all the time that the threat from Covid is escalating. The risk from infection is indeed escalating and so it would be exactly the wrong time to remove these measures.

The only options at Committee are to note the NOM or call for an officer report. The Committee cannot make a decision to revoke the arrangements on the day because it does not have the legal, financial, equalities or any other implications (eg safety) in front of it which would enable a decision to be taken with all the relevant considerations being taken into account”.

38.29 Councillor Wilkinson welcomed the recent announcement of Emergency Active Travel Fund Tranche 2 funding for the city. Councillor Wilkinson stated that there were extreme time pressures when the first round of funding had been announced. Now there was more time for the development of schemes for Tranche 2, it was important for residents, stakeholders and businesses to have their voices heard via a consultation on the range of measures introduced and those forthcoming and it was time to get on with that consultation. Councillor Wilkinson stated that as that consultation would be going ahead, he would not be supporting the Notice of Motion.

38.30 Councillor Davis welcomed the announcement of Tranche 2 funding and noted that the council had made a cross-party commitment to be a carbon neutral by 2030 and bold measures were required to meet that target.

38.31 Councillor Lloyd stated his dismay at the idea that the temporary cycle lane increased traffic as it was clear to him that excessive vehicle traffic caused traffic congestion. Councillor Lloyd noted the increase in users of the Old Shoreham Road, particularly children travelling to the local schools although excessive traffic continued to make the road unsafe and hinder usage. Councillor Lloyd noted that Waltham Forest had recently introduced Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and at the beginning of their introduction, 70% of residents had been opposed to the schemes. Over the following months, that figure had reduced to 2% in opposition and residents were fully in support of their benefits.

38.32 Councillor Appich stated that the council should be promoting a better cycle network and active travel measures, with a full consultation as well as improving signage and cohesion with the existing network. Councillor Appich stated that she would not be supporting the Notice of Motion as the consultation should be received by the committee first.

38.33 Councillor Wares observed that the cycle lane was introduced overnight, without consultation or agreement by committee so in his view, its removal would not necessitate a further report detailing the financial cost and legal implications of doing so.

38.34 The Chair put the Notice of Motion to the vote that failed.

39 OPEN SPACES STRATEGY UPDATE

39.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided an update on the Open Spaces Strategy (2017/27) and also sought approval for three projects arising from the strategy. The Committee noted that

there was an error in the report that listed Saltdean Car Park as on council owned land and this area would be removed from the project.

39.2 Councillor Wares moved a motion on behalf of the Conservative Group to amend recommendation 2.1 as shown in bold italics and where struck through below:

2.1 That the committee ***requests officers to bring to a future committee a report on progress to delivering resilience and potential new funding for parks and open spaces as set out in the Open Spaces Strategy 2017 including but not limited to the Parks Foundation, sponsorship, donations and advertising etc. The report to also include discussion as to progress on all the priorities detailed in the 2017 strategy that will also enable a decision to be made on the draft update included in this report referenced Appendix 2, Draft No. 3.***
~~approves the initiation of Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) statutory consultations to introduce car parking charges for car parks in several city parks listed in Appendix 4.~~

39.3 Introducing the motion, Councillor Wares stated that it was inappropriate to introduce parking charges in parks during the pandemic when residents would be using open spaces more. Councillor Wares stated that the Open Spaces Strategies had a number of other options proposed that should be reviewed and reconsidered.

39.4 Councillor Brown formally seconded the motion.

39.5 Councillor Fowler stated that whilst she was supportive of the wildflower trial however, she could not support car parking charges in parks as usage of open spaces should be encouraged rather than impeded.

39.6 Councillor Appich stated that it was strange that ward councillors had not been consulted on the proposals. Councillor Appich concurred that parking charges near parks should not be introduced and supported the Conservative Group motion.

39.7 Councillor Wilkinson stated that parks were essential during the Covid pandemic and charging for parking would disproportionately affect those that needed open spaces the most.

39.8 Councillor Wares commented that he was pleased to see in the report a renewed commitment to deliver on the actions in the Allotment Strategy as progress was very much needed and overdue.

39.9 Councillor Lloyd agreed that the actions in the Allotment Strategy needed to be delivered and welcomed the emphasis on that in the report.

39.10 The Chair then put the motion to the vote that passed.

39.11 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to the vote that were agreed.

39.12 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the committee requests officers to bring to a future committee a report on progress to delivering resilience and potential new funding for parks and open spaces as set out in the Open Spaces Strategy 2017 including but not limited to the Parks Foundation, sponsorship, donations and advertising etc. The report to also include discussion as to progress on all the priorities detailed in the 2017 strategy that will also enable a decision to be made on the draft update included in this report referenced Appendix 2, Draft No. 3.
- 2) That the committee approves the initiation of a consultation in relation to a refresh of the Allotments Strategy 2014- 2024 Delivery Plan, to ensure transparency and a refocus on delivery of the objectives of the strategy.
- 3) That the committee approves a trial of wildflower areas on grass verges in the Stanmer Park and Hollingdean ward in response to a letter by Councillor Martin Osbourne for the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.

40 FLEET STRATEGY

- 40.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval for the corporate Fleet Strategy 2020-2030
- 40.2 Councillor Appich welcomed the report and asked if progress could be quicker and if there were any financial implications to the introduction of 'new' carbon by buying fleet rather than retrofitting.
- 40.3 The Head of Fleet Management stated that the programme could be accelerated but that would be subject to decisions on budgets and financing. Older vehicles could be retrofitted but would still not be fit for purpose and newer vehicles did not cost much more than retrofitting and would be more suitable.
- 40.4 Councillor Wares enquired as to the intention to dispose of the current fleet, the cut off point by which charging infrastructure would be required and details on the battery replacement programme.
- 40.5 In response, the Head of Fleet Management clarified that vehicles that could be refurbished and reused would be but there would be a certain amount of disposal of the existing fleet, that there were already five charging points at the Depot and options on infrastructure were still being reviewed including the potential use of hydrogen power. Further, it was clarified that battery life was around ten years however, individual cells could be replaced that would extend that lifespan.
- 40.6 Councillor Lloyd stated that electric vehicles were a stepping stone to hydrogen powered vehicles once its production became 'greener' and an annual review was sensible based the ever changing developments in technology.
- 40.7 **RESOLVED-**
 - 1) That the committee recommends to Policy & Resources Committee that the Fleet Strategy 2020-2030 (appx 1) and Action Plan (appx 2) are adopted.

- 2) That the committee recommends to Policy & Resources Committee that the model of centralised purchasing through the Fleet Service using unsupported borrowing is continued as opposed to leasing.
- 3) That the committee recommends to Policy & Resources Committee that approval for £1 million of additional capital investment funded from unsupported borrowing is agreed for 2021/22 to enable the decarbonisation of the council's refuse vehicle fleet on the basis that borrowing costs are repaid from savings in the Fleet revenue budget.

41 HOUSEHOLD WASTE RECYCLING SITES

- 41.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval to undertake a public consultation on proposals to introduce changes at the two Household Waste Recycling Sites on whether to introduce charges for some types of waste and to introduce ID checks. The purpose of the measures was to ensure Brighton & Hove taxpayers were not paying for the disposal of non-Brighton & Hove waste.
- 41.2 Councillor Brown stated that she was not keen on charges for non-commercial waste as it may lead to increased fly tipping and the consultation would be useful to gauge residents' feelings on the matter.
- 41.3 In response to questions raised by Councillor Wilkinson and Councillor Williams, the Head of Business Support & Projects confirmed that data on an increase in fly tipping could be gathered from additional authorities and discussions were in progress with Veolia on the system for ID checks.
- 41.4 **RESOLVED-** That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approve for a public consultation to take place on 1) introducing charges for some waste at the HWRS and 2) to implement ID checks at the HWRS.

42 KEEPING THE CITY CLEAN

- 42.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that formally responded to a Notice of Motion received by the committee at its meeting on 29 September. Further, the report provided Members with an update on other work to keep the city clean, including the development of a Waste, Resources & Street Cleansing Strategy and sought endorsement for the approach described in the report.
- 42.2 Councillor Fowler asked for clarification on the use of glyphosate as she understood it had been agreed to no longer be used.
- 42.3 The Head of Business Support & Projects stated that the wording reflected that in the Council's Corporate Plan and the committee would be receiving an update on weed management in early 2021.
- 42.4 Councillor Wares expressed his concern that the Modernisation Plan was seeking a five-year extension to the original two-year plan. Councillor Wares also expressed his concern regarding the amber rating for health and safety given its importance and

several action deadlines that should in his view, be shorter or definitive and not open-ended.

- 42.5 The Head of Business Support & Projects clarified that the Strategy was not linked to the Modernisation Programme and would be more outward looking and not focussed on internal operational issues as the Modernisation Programme was. The X stated that the other issues raised would be detailed in the next Modernisation report.
- 42.6 Councillor Brown stated that she agreed with the approach for bins for the city's parks however, a useful additional measure would be increased enforcement in those areas specifically focussing on littering and dog fouling. Furthermore, Councillor Brown stated that the liners and caddies for food waste should be provided free of charge if the scheme was to be a success.
- 42.7 The Head of Business Support & Projects stated that the comments on littering and dog fouling would be passed on to the Enforcement Team and free liners and caddies was certainly a consideration in the options appraisal for the food waste service.
- 42.8 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee note the response to the Notice of Motion as detailed in Appendix 1 and the Seafront Action Plan in Appendix 2.
 - 2) That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee endorse the development of a Waste, Resources & Street Cleansing Strategy as described in sections 3.4 to 3.11 and the Communications and Engagement Plan as detailed in Appendix 3.

43 IMPACT OF TREE DISEASES

- 43.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided an update on Elm Disease and Ash die-back and sought approval for a number of mitigating actions.
- 43.2 In response to questions from Councillor Wilkinson, Councillor Brown and Councillor Lloyd, the Head of Operations- Cityparks explained that that Cityparks currently dealt with a number of cases of Elm Disease on private land free of charge and it was expected that would continue. However, there was little that could be done about Ash die-back so there would only be an intervention if there was a direct threat to the highway. It was difficult to give a specific number of trees planted to replace the 5,000 lost since 2005 and the pandemic had significantly halted planting programmes however, there was significant financial and operational support from residents and businesses that was of help. Further, the Head of Operations- Cityparks explained that Elm Disease was spread by beetles that were most active in summer and it was estimated that 70% of Ash trees would die.
- 43.3 **RESOLVED-**

That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:

- 1) Note the initial projected cost of £3.4 million to deal with ash dieback (of which £0.352 million relates to ash trees on housing land) over the next 5 – 10 years.
- 2) Recommend to Policy & Resources Committee the allocation of an initial tranche of £0.400 million funding during the 21/22 budget setting to start tackling Ash die-back.
- 3) Notes the cost pressure of £0.300 million in 20/21 for dealing with elm disease which is being managed within budget by making in- year savings.
- 4) Recommends that Policy & Resources allocate £0.200 million in the budget setting for 21/22 to deal with elm disease next year.
- 5) Approves the approaches being taken to tackle these two diseases.

44 EMERGENCY ACTIVE TRAVEL MEASURES - BLUE BADGE HOLDER PARKING AND ACCESS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE

44.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that responded to a deputation presented to the September meeting of the committee that detailed the impact of the Council's Covid-19 Urgent Response Transport Action Plan on Blue Badge parking and disabled access in the city.

44.2 Councillor Williams moved a motion on behalf of the Labour Group to amend the recommendations as shown in bold italics and where struck through below:

~~That the Committee~~

2.1 ~~That Note~~ the action being taken to address the issues raised in the deputation on Blue Badge holder parking and access for disabled people ***be noted***;

2.2 That in relation to 2.1 above, to request that the action being taken takes fully into account experiences of Blue Badge holders and those who have difficulties getting around in order to avoid negative outcomes by undertaking a city-wide appraisal with the aim of improving access for disabled and less abled people; and

2.3 That it be noted ~~Note~~ that this action is not considered to breach the Council's obligations under the Public Sector Equality Duty.

44.3 Introducing the motion, Councillor Williams explained that it was intended to ensure a full and wide-ranging citywide appraisal of all the council's facilities.

44.4 Councillor Wilkinson formally seconded the motion.

44.5 Councillor Wares stated that it was inappropriate for the council to investigate itself on whether it had breached the Equalities Act. Councillor Wares noted that BADGE and Possibility People had written to the committee members at length with their disagreement with the contents of the report. Councillor Wares stated that it was highly concerning that the report stated that disability groups had been consulted with when this was clearly not the case and of further concern was that many of the specific locations raised in the deputation had not been addressed. Councillor Wares stated that

there was a lack of transparency in not publishing the A259 audit undertaken and he was very disappointed in some of the language used that in places was discriminatory. Councillor Wares stated that his Group would not be supporting the report nor the Labour Group motion.

- 44.6 The Assistant Director- City Transport explained that a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit was currently being undertaken on the A259 and required input for the design team that was currently in progress. The initial findings of that audit was there were no safety related issues and that audit would be published as soon as it was completed.
- 44.7 The Chair then put the motion to the vote that passed.
- 44.8 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to the vote that were agreed.
- 44.9 Whilst no formal recorded vote was undertaken, Councillor Wares and Councillor Brown asked that it be recorded in the minutes that they voted against both the motion and the recommendations as amended.

44.10 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the action being taken to address the issues raised in the deputation on Blue Badge holder parking and access for disabled people be noted;
- 2) That in relation to 2.1 above, to request that the action being taken takes fully into account experiences of Blue Badge holders and those who have difficulties getting around in order to avoid negative outcomes by undertaking a city-wide appraisal with the aim of improving access for disabled and less abled people; and
- 3) That it be noted that this action is not considered to breach the Council's obligations under the Public Sector Equality Duty.

45 PARKING ANNUAL REPORT 2019-2020

- 45.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval for the publication of the Parking Annual Report 2019-20 on the performance of Parking Services for general publication under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004.
- 45.2 Councillor Wares moved a motion on behalf of the Conservative Group to amend recommendation 2.3 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.3 That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee ***reminds and requests officers to produce the report for Policy and Resources Committee*** ~~notes the view~~ on the potential use of parking income to invest in the restoration of the Madeira Terraces area ***as agreed by Policy and Resources Committee on 9th July 2020***. ~~within the Financial and Legal implications.~~
- 45.3 Councillor Brown formally seconded the motion.

- 45.4 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture stated that there was some confusion in relation to the motion as the committee Decision List from 9th July 2020 indicated that the decision taken was to consider unpausing of the purchasing of commercial properties and capital borrowing to support Madeira Terraces restoration. Subsequently, a petition was received by Full Council sought for parking revenue to be used for the restoration. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture explained that whilst officers would deliver decisions made, a link to a decision on 9th July could not be found.
- 45.5 Councillor Wares stated that the proposal should not be in the report as it was not the place to agree upon how money should be spent to restore Madeira Terrace. In relation to the report, Councillor Wares noted that the council had once more received a record amount of parking revenue, a record he did not believe the city should be proud of.
- 45.6 The Chair then put the motion to the vote that was lost.
- 45.7 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote that was agreed.
- 45.8 Whilst no formal recorded vote was undertaken, Councillor Wares and Councillor Brown asked that it be recorded in the minutes that they voted against recommendation 2.3.
- 1) That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee endorses the publication of the Parking Annual Report for 2019-20 under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004.
 - 2) That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee authorises the Head of Parking to produce and publish the report, which will be made available on the Council's website.
 - 3) That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee notes the view on the potential use of parking income to invest in the restoration of the Madeira Terraces area within the Financial and Legal implications.

46 PARKING PERMIT REVIEW

- 46.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval for changes to the operation of various parking permits throughout the city.
- 46.2 Councillor Williams moved a motion on behalf of the Labour Group as shown in bold italics and where struck through below:
- 2.1 That the Committee agrees to amend the following permits as outlined in Appendix A, ***whilst retaining the current requirement for Carers permit eligibility:***
 - Self-employed Professional Carers Permit
 - ~~Carers Permit Eligibility~~
 - School Permits

2.2 That the Committee notes ~~the changes to the current General Practitioner sign-off process which is included in Appendix B,~~ and the staff engagement analysis.

46.3 Introducing the motion, Councillor Williams stated that the changes were needed to avoid an unnecessary increase in administrative work for GP's and because the reduction of fraud and suspected fraud was a matter for the Police not GP's.

46.4 Councillor Wilkinson formally seconded the motion.

46.5 The Chair then put the motion to the vote that passed.

46.6 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to the vote that were agreed.

46.7 **RESOLVED-**

1) That the Committee agrees to amend the following permits as outlined in Appendix A, whilst retaining the current requirement for Carers permit eligibility:

- Self-employed Professional Carers Permit
- School Permits

2) That the Committee notes the staff engagement analysis.

47 **PARKING SCHEME UPDATE REPORT**

47.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments, agrees to proceed to the next stage of advertising a Traffic Regulation Order to introduce a light touch resident parking scheme in the Surrenden Area.

48 **FREDERICK GARDENS REQUEST FOR GATES**

48.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee agree to introduce signing improvements to reduce the use of the twitten as a through route.

49 **BTN BIKESHARE REORGANISATION**

49.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that considered the findings of the independent specialist review of the Brighton Bikeshare (BTN Bikeshare) scheme that had been undertaken by Steer (a specialist transport consultancy). The report considers options for the sustainable future of the BTN Bikeshare Scheme in terms of the business case and a preferred procurement model and also included options for expansion to a city-wide scheme and for a scheme that could expand in the future across the Greater Brighton city region.

49.2 In response to a proposal from Councillor Wares to publicly report the subsidy value figure, the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture explained that Officers recommended that the profit share assumptions remain confidential. This was because to bring them into public domain at this stage would show potential bidders the modelling assumptions and may mean that the council receive less competitive bids submitted through the tender process. Therefore, the public interest in maintaining the exemption to disclosure outweighed the public interest in disclosure.

- 49.3 In response to questions raised by Councillor Appich, the Access Fund Manager explained that the procurement process would take some time and therefore, the impact of the terms of the UK's exit impending exit from the EU would be known later in that process. Community Interest Companies (CiC's) had been ruled out as concessionaire's due to the exposure to risk the council then may have in relation to costs for the transfer of staff and legal and governance matters. Finally, there were a number of options for sponsorship and progress on those options was subject to the outcome of the decision on the committee.
- 49.4 Councillor Lloyd welcomed the report and the introduction of e-bikes that would help those residents in the fringe and outskirts of the city and the more challenging topography.
- 49.5 Councillor Wares stated that it was disingenuous to present the concession contract as financially viable or sustainable to it was wrong to say that a surplus would be delivered. Councillor Wares stated that the scheme would operate with an effective subsidy from the council of £116,000 per annum in the best-case scenario.
- 49.6 In response to questions from Councillor Wares, it was explained that it would not be possible to recover some of the costs of the purchase of e-ready bikes following a takeover of the company the purchase had been made from. It was clarified that the council had arranged a payment schedule for the surplus share owed to it by the current operator and the full amount would be cleared by the end of the contract.
- 49.7 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:
- 1) Agree to procure a single supplier concession contract which is established as a framework so that neighbouring authorities can enter into call-off contracts with the supplier creating a wider bike network.
 - 2) Agree to grant delegated authority to the Executive Director Economy, Environment & Culture and Executive Lead Strategy Governance & Law to take all necessary steps to implement the recommendation at 2.1.
 - 3) Approve that any surplus revenue from the bikeshare scheme received by the Council is invested back into servicing the borrowing and / or fleet replacement.

Councillors Brown and Wares requested that their vote against the recommendations be recorded in the minutes

50 BTN BIKESHARE REORGANISATION - EXEMPT CATEGORY 3

- 50.1 As per minute item 49.

51 PART TWO PROCEEDINGS

- 51.1 **RESOLVED-** That the items contained in Part Two of the agenda remain exempt from disclosure to the press and public.

52 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

52.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 8.15pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of