

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

**4.00pm 17 JANUARY 2017**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL, NORTON ROAD, HOVE, BN3 3BQ**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Mitchell (Chair) Horan (Deputy Chair), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), Greenbaum (Group Spokesperson), Atkinson, Deane, Miller, Nemeth, Robins and Wares

**PART ONE**

**56 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**56(a) Declarations of substitutes**

56.1 Councillor Nemeth was present as substitute for Councillor Geoffrey Theobald.

**56(b) Declarations of interest**

56.2 Councillor Janio read the following statement:

“I have applied for and been granted a dispensation under the Council’s Code of Conduct for Members para 3.5 to take part and vote on item 63 of the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2017. This relates to the item on fees and charges in respect of which I have a declarable interest because my wife has a Traders Permit”.

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

56.3 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).

56.4 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded.

**57 MINUTES**

57.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 November 2016 be approved and signed as the correct record.

**58 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

58.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

*"I have just one communication to make which is in light of the great HLF grant of £3.8 million for Stanmer Park. I really want to thank everybody, all Members from every party that have worked together on the bid as well as a lot of the good work that came from officers. As the project progresses, update reports will come to this Committee but I think we now stand to see some huge improvements at Stanmer and it's a wonderful opportunity".*

**59 CALL OVER**

59.1 All items on the agenda were reserved for discussion.

**60 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT****(a) Petitions****(i) Need for residents parking in the Harrington Road area**

60.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 73 people requesting consultation with residents in the Harrington Road area on the introduction of controlled parking zone.

60.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*"Thank you for your petition.*

*Officers are currently working on parking scheme consultations in the Hanover & Elm Grove area, Craven Vale area and West Hove area with the Hove Park area to follow soon.*

*As residents of a number of roads across the Harrington Road area have signed the petition, we will look to include this area within the parking scheme priority timetable. This would be alongside the relevant adjoining section of Surrenden Road although concerns about displacement further up that road would need to be addressed.*

*The current parking scheme priority timetable runs up to 2018 (for completion of schemes) and officers will be presenting a report to this Committee later in the year on an updated timetable based on requests such as this."*

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

**(ii) 1 hour parking in Longridge Avenue Saltdean**

60.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 390 people requesting removal of the taxi designation on the 3 spaces between the Spanish Lady Pub and the A259 and restricting parking on the 11 spaces already designated by white markings from Lynwood Ave to the A259 to 1hr parking between 9am and 6pm Monday to, and including Saturday.

60.5 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your petition.*

*The taxi rank in Longridge Avenue is advisory only which means those spaces are shared with general traffic and there has been no sign relating to a rank in place for nearly a year.*

*This arrangement seems to be working well as we have received no complaints about difficulties parking in this location or access for taxis.*

*In regard to restricting parking, due to budget considerations, we are having to be very careful with the cost of any non-essential changes outside of controlled parking zones with the exception of disabled bay requests.*

*Parking changes across the City, that require the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order, are prioritised and funded in accordance with the work plan agreed by this Committee.*

*But what we will do is keep your request on file and in case circumstances in the area change with regard to road use and funding, we will have that ready for consideration.”*

60.6 Councillor Miller moved a motion to call for an officer report on the matter.

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

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

**(iii) Yellow lines Court Ord Road**

60.9 The Committee considered a petition signed by 10 people requesting extension of double yellow lines on Court Ord Road to come in and out of Falmer Road to resolved parking issues.

60.10 The petitioner was not present however, the Chair read the following response out at the meeting:

*“It is felt that the current length meets the Road safety requirements but officers are willing to monitor this and consider this further. The main concern from officers about extending this restriction further would be the loss of parking although a traffic order would allow for comments from residents on this proposal.*

*In terms of how any further change to the Traffic Order that has now been implemented could be funded officers are exploring the possibility of using any existing or future developer contributions that are secured from nearby developments for this proposal, such as the planning application recently approved in Falmer Road.”*

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

**(iv) Tennis facilities**

60.12 The Committee considered a petition signed by 1930 people requesting the council engage all user groups of tennis facilities in the city before deciding future funding arrangements.

60.13 The Chair provided the following response:

*“As I think is generally understood, as the council’s General Fund budget reduces and as the demands on our caring services, such as Children’s’ and Adults Social Care and Homelessness significantly increase, this is leading to less money for the services that we would like to continue to provide but do not receive any specific ring-fenced funding for – such as parks and open spaces maintenance and sports subsidies.*

*The existing budget, the second smallest in the council, is already less than adequate and a sustainable way ahead to protect and hopefully improve these facilities for the future has to be found.*

*So, across a whole range of council services we are looking at doing things differently and in terms of our decreasing ability to maintain sports subsidies the best place to start was to talk directly to the clubs, players and their governing bodies giving the full financial picture for each sport including the shortfalls. These discussions have been taking place for over a year.*

*In relation to tennis, these discussions last month have produced an outline proposal from the Brighton and Hove Tennis League that would enable greater control over the running of the courts by those who use the facilities, including looking at how the retention of revenue raised from tennis can potentially be kept by the League or the clubs themselves.*

*There are areas that need to be clarified within this proposal and officers; the League and the Lawn Tennis Association are meeting to ensure that there is enough detail in the proposal for tennis players in the city to know what it means for them before again meeting with the tennis clubs to get their feed-back on it. This will then be presented to councillors on this committee to decide whether it can be accepted.*

*This has to be a careful and collaborative process and is not something that can be achieved overnight.*

*Officers are also exploring whether there is any opportunity to use planning gain money available for the area around Hove Park to draw in additional external funding. We have recently used this approach very successfully at Hove Recreation Ground Rugby Pitches and the Velodrome at Preston Park.*

*It is not practical for officers to discuss these proposals with every single individual user of the Councils sports facilities. For tennis facilities we are aiming to discuss them with representatives of all of the clubs using facilities, any coaches booking the facilities and the sport’s governing body. I am aware that concerns have been raised about a club at Hove Park that was not being involved and I can assure you they are now being kept informed and invited to meetings of the Cities clubs.*

*Officers and the LTA will be meeting with the Brighton and Hove Tennis League in the first week of February to review a more detailed proposal prior to sharing it with clubs.*

*And so this is an ongoing collaborative process and I appreciate that it is difficult for us to reach out to every single player and have individual conversations but I can assure you that we will do all we can to make sure that a proposal, when it is arrived at, I will do my utmost to make sure all tennis players are aware of it.”*

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

**61 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**

**(a) Petitions**

**(i) Zebra or pelican crossing, Lovers Walk across A23/Preston Road**

61.1 The Committee considered a petition referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 15 December 2016 and signed by 204 people requesting a pedestrian crossing at the point where Lovers Walk meets the road and across into Preston Park.

61.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“In October 2016 the 2016/2017 Pedestrian Priority list was approved with 57 locations the top 11 are being considered for improvements or additional funding this financial year.*

*Within this priority list a location on Preston Road near Rookery Road was included and is currently listed as number 26. As this Petition relates to a location within 350 meters of this current request officers recommend these requests are considered together and therefore when the priority list is revised location number 26 will read “Crossing request to be considered on Preston Road between Lovers Walk and Rookery Close”. When looking at the requested locations the existing crossing facilities including the pedestrian islands and the Pelican Crossing 100m to the north of Lovers walk will be considered.*

*If Preston Road is considered a priority location as part of the pedestrian crossing methodology the final location of the crossing will be determined after detailed inspection by Highway Engineers. As part of this process the ‘type’ of facility is considered on a case by case basis by Highway Engineers considering existing highway layout, road conditions and likely frequency of use.”*

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

## **62 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

62.1 No items were received from Members.

## **63 FEES AND CHARGES 2017/18**

63.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture and the Executive Director, Neighbourhoods, Community & Housing that set out the proposed 2017/18 fees and charges for the service areas covered by the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee in accordance with corporate regulations and policy.

63.2 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture explained that a proposed officer amendment to the report had been circulated to Members. The amendment was in relation to paragraph 3.11 that concerned highway fees and specifically Temporary Event Advertising signs and sought to clarify where the council was proposing to charge for public event signage. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture explained that the charge was only proposed for signage for advertising purposes and would not be applied to any reasonable directional signage used to direct people to the location of a public event in the city. Furthermore, charities would be entitled to a 50% reduction in the fee. The officer amendment to paragraph 3.11 is set out in bold italics with relevant deletions below:

### **City Transport**

3.11 Highways (Appendix 3)

The majority of fees and charges will increase in line with the corporate rate of inflation with the following exceptions.

- Fees relating to Section 50 Opening Charges and Works on the Highway (installation of ramps) have been reviewed and amended to reflect the cost of associated inspections and officer time. The proposed fees have therefore been set to ensure cost recovery.
- It is proposed to introduce a new fee for Temporary Event Advertising Signs. Brighton and Hove is a very popular city for a range of events, for which many organisations wish to advertise on the public highway ~~or need to provide temporary directional signage to the event location~~. There are specific requirements that must be met with regard to advertising and signing on the highway, which involves an officer assessing the application and sites for signage and authorising each location. The introduction of a new fee will allow the council to recover the costs for providing essential highway approval for these temporary advertisements and signage. It is estimated that an initial fee of £10 per sign for the first 50 reducing to £5 for any further signs will cover the cost of administrating this process. ~~As the process is the same irrespective of type or size of the event, this fee will apply to all type of events, including charity events.~~ **However, a 50% discount will be offered to charities.**

The Brighton and Hove Traffic Management Permit scheme was introduced on 30th March 2015 as a way to manage activities in the public highway and to minimise disruption from street and road works. To meet the additional cost of introducing and operating a permit scheme, the Traffic Management Act 2004 gives permit authorities the power to charge a fee in respect of certain activities. Fees have been set at levels that are expected to reasonably cover the cost of the scheme and are reviewed on an annual basis. It is proposed that fees will be maintained at existing rates in the 2017-18 financial year. A schedule of fees is available on the council website.

- 63.3 Councillor Deane thanked officers for a detailed report and asked for clarity on the 50% increase in wasp nest removal.
- 63.4 The Environmental Health Manager explained that this was a new service introduced in 2016/17 and was not meeting cost recovery at its current fee.
- 63.5 Councillor Atkinson thanked officers for a comprehensive report. Councillor Atkinson welcomed sports booking fees remaining at the same level whilst discussions took place on the future of parks. Councillor Atkinson noted that most fees would only rise at the rate of corporate inflation which was a fair approach. Revised charges for parking appeared to be a sensible mixture of discouraging non-resident parking and promoting underused car parks and parking charges were one method of reducing congestion and air pollution. Councillor Atkinson stated that in relation to sustainable transport goals in the city, he hoped local bus operators would think carefully before raising their prices.

- 63.6 Councillor Janio asked for further clarification on the proposed increase to Temporary Event Advertising Signs specifically the proposed policy for those signs that provided directions and those advertising events.
- 63.7 The Chair stated that the officer amendment circulated clarified the policy and removed all references to directional signs and made the position of charities clear.
- 63.8 Councillor Miller noted that High Street car park had a proposed charge of £2,080 for an annual season ticket and asked for clarification as to why this was significantly higher than the main car parks such as Regency Street and Trafalgar Street. Furthermore, Councillor Miller noted that there was no three hour tariff and asked if residents and visitors would have to pay for four hours even if they stayed little over two hours.
- 63.9 The Assistant Director- City Transport answered that High Street car park was very busy and in the central area and the differential between that and other car parks reflected market rates. In relation to the query raised on two hour tariffs, the Assistant Director- City Transport confirmed that a stay longer than two hours and up to four hours would be charged at the four hour tariff price.
- 63.10 Councillor Greenbaum welcomed the report stating that the parking tariff management struck a fair balance. Councillor Greenbaum asked why all off-street parking did not increase at 2% and why second permits in households had not been introduced.
- 63.11 The Parking Strategy and Contracts Manager stated that the increases were considered in the context of traffic management and any increases were related to demand. The Parking Strategy and Contracts Manager clarified that second permits had not been considered due to several complications particularly in relation to students and which member of the household paid the higher charge.
- 63.12 Councillor Janio requested assurance that there would be no misinterpretation over what constituted advertising signs and directional signs.
- 63.13 The Chair provided her assurance to Councillor Janio on the matter.
- 63.14 Councillor Wares stated that he was supportive of the fees and charges proposed for allotments, sports clubs, flyer licensing, trading standards, commercial, trade and green waste and environmental health. Councillor Wares stated that he was concerned about the highways element of the report and it appeared to him that the case put forward for rises relating to congestion and pollution were a smokescreen for opportunistic rises. Councillor Wares referred to the fact there were no increases in off-street parking charges aside from one location which was opposite the i360. Councillor Wares noted that the Council needed the i360 to be a success and such proposals may deter visitors to the attraction. Councillor Wares added that increases to the price of permits for sole traders, small businesses, doctors, teachers and carers could not, in his view, possibly be to manage demand or congestion. Councillor Wares also believed there should be no increases to apply for a disabled bay.
- 63.15 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Wares moved the following motion to add recommendation 2.1 d), e) and f) as shown in bold italics below:

- d) ***Recommends to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee that on-street parking charges be frozen at current rates.***
- e) ***Recommends to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee that parking permits of all types be frozen at current rates.***
- f) ***Recommends to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee that disabled bay application fees and individual bays be frozen at current rates.***

63.16 Councillor Miller formally seconded the motion.

63.17 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Miller moved a motion to add a recommendation 2.1 g) as shown in bold italics below:

- g) Recommends to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee that at Rottingdean Marine Cliffs, Rottingdean West Street car parks and Rottingdean High Street seafront pay and display; a free one hour tariff be introduced***

63.18 Introducing the amendment, Councillor Miller stated that the three Rottingdean Coastal ward councillors had met with local traders that morning and they had asked for the proposal to be made. Councillor Miller explained that whilst Rottingdean High Street did have high levels of air pollution; many residents were elderly and had to travel by car. Local business had suffered in recent years and several had shut or were about to close due to parking charges and the fact that all villages in the surrounding area had free parking. There would also be a negative impact to the council through business rates lost.

63.19 Councillor Wares formally seconded the motion.

63.20 Councillor Greenbaum stated that whilst she was sympathetic to Councillor Miller's amendment, it was necessary to think more progressively particularly in relation to air quality and a free one hour tariff was not the solution to such issues.

63.21 The Legal Officer advised that in the event any of the proposed motions were agreed, additional wording would be required at the end of 2.1 a) to reflect the Committees recommendation to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee.

63.22 The Chair put the officer amendment to the vote which was carried.

63.23 The Chair put 2.1 d) of the Conservative Group motion to the vote which failed.

63.24 The Chair put 2.1 e) of the Conservative Group motion to the vote which failed.

63.25 The Chair put 2.1 f) of the Conservative Group motion to the vote which was carried.

63.26 The Chair put 2.1 g) of the Conservative Group motion to the vote which failed.

63.27 The Chair then put the recommendations, as amended, to the vote which was carried.



63.28 **RESOLVED-** That Committee:

- a) Approves the proposed fees and charges for 2017/18 as set out within the report and its appendices save for as set out in d) below.
- b) Delegates authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Environment & Culture to increase any charges for fees as notified and set by central Government during the year.
- c) Approves the introduction of a 50% discount on the cost of parking suspensions for charities and local community events with an estimated attendance of less than 15,000 and not already covered by an exemption such as Pride and Armed Forces Day.
- d) Recommends to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee that disabled bay application fees and individual bays be frozen at current rates.

#### **64 PRESTON VILLAGE & BALFOUR ROAD AREA RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME CONSULTATIONS**

- 64.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out the outcome of the recent public consultation undertaken for a proposed parking scheme in the Balfour Road area and Preston Village area and requested permission to proceed.
- 64.2 Councillor Miller stated that he felt individuals rather than households should be able to respond to the consultation as there may be a difference of views.
- 64.3 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that one purpose of such an approach was that the council could only guarantee one permit per household at the outset of any scheme consultation. Furthermore, it would be unfair for a five person household to have a more significant representation to a consultation than a single person household when both households would have the same parking capability in the area.
- 64.4 Councillor Wares asked if there would be any impact from the three local schools as this issue had previously been raised and was not mentioned in the report.
- 64.5 The Parking Infrastructure Manager clarified that should the scheme be approved, the schools would be eligible for one permit for every six members of staff and some schools in the area had off-street parking which would be taken into account. In addition each school would also be entitled to two business permits.
- 64.6 Councillor Wares asked if officers were satisfied that there would be sufficient spaces for residents, teachers and school staff.
- 64.7 The Parking Infrastructure Manager responded that it was always difficult to determine a precise capacity for a proposed controlled parking zone as it would depend on take-up once the scheme was operational. Furthermore, there would be a limit of twenty permits per school and a pay and display system was under consideration for the top end of Balfour Road where there were less residential properties.

- 64.8 Councillor Nemeth asked officers if they had any view as to why the consultation results indicated a preference for a full scheme rather than a light touch scheme.
- 64.9 The Parking Infrastructure Manager clarified that this could be due to several reasons including a view on how the nearby Fiveways scheme had worked or that a full scheme was preferable as there was increased enforcement.
- 64.10 Councillor Janio asked if there was any statutory guidance requiring that households were consulted rather than individuals.
- 64.11 The Parking Infrastructure Manager replied that this was reflected in the local Highways consultation policy.
- 64.12 The Legal Officer supplemented that if reviewed by the courts, the council's consultation approach would be deemed over and above what was necessary. The council, through its own policies, had introduced an additional stage of consulting with householders that was not required by legislation. The Legal Officer added that there was also a second stage to the consultation in the advertising of the necessary Traffic Order to which any individual could make objection or support and those representations were returned to the committee for consideration.
- 64.13 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approves:
- (a) That a new resident parking scheme (Monday to Friday 9am-8pm) be considered within the Preston Village area (Appendix B) and that this proposal be progressed to the final design with the Traffic Order advertised to allow further comment.
  - (b) That an extension to the Area F resident parking scheme (Monday to Sunday 9am-8pm) be considered within the Balfour Road area (Appendix A) and that this proposal be progressed to the final design with the Traffic Order advertised to allow further comment.
  - (c) That an order should be placed for any required pay and display equipment to ensure implementation of the new proposed parking scheme (if agreed at a further committee meeting) is undertaken as programmed.

## 65 BRIGHTON AND HOVE PERMIT SCHEME END OF YEAR REPORT

- 65.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval to publish the end of year report detailing performance of the Brighton & Hove road and street works permit scheme against nationally set Key Performance Indicators (KPI's).
- 65.2 Councillor Janio noted that the eventual introduction of the scheme had begun with a Conservative Group Notice of Motion and he was pleased that the Permit Scheme had been a success and established more order on the transport network. Councillor Janio noted several discrepancies in the document that he believed required further input before the document was formally published.

65.3 The Chair moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.2 as shown in bold italics below:

2.2 That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approves the publishing of the attached end of year report on the Councils web pages ***following consultation with the lead spokespersons.***

65.4 The motion was carried.

65.5 Councillor Atkinson welcomed the report that had reduced disruption on the transport network in Brighton & Hove.

65.6 Councillor Wares welcomed the report that had made a significant difference in his ward as to how work had been planned and communicated.

65.7 Councillor Deane echoed the praise made by other members of the committee and that the scheme represented effective cross-party working.

65.8 **RESOVLED-**

1) That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approves the publishing of the attached end of year report including sending a copy to the Department for Transport.

2) That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approves the publishing of the attached end of year report on the Councils web pages following consultation with the lead spokespersons.

**66 THE BIG CONVERSATION - AN OPEN SPACES STRATEGY FOR BRIGHTON & HOVE**

66.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out a review of the future provision and maintenance of parks and open spaces in the city together with the results of over 3500 responses to "The Big Conversation", the public consultation on the future of parks and open spaces. The review and consultation results informed the Open Spaces Strategy recommended for approval.

66.2 Councillor Janio stated that the policy was very sensible and in accordance with his political party's manifesto. Councillor Janio thanked officers for the amount of work that had been put into the report but expressed his concern that there was a slight disconnect between the report and appendix that set out the Strategy. Councillor Janio stated that because of his concern regarding a loss of democratic oversight, he would be moving an amendment to ensure that the public had further opportunity to comment on any policies as this was likely the first occasion they had seen proposals for the future of parks and open spaces.

66.3 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Janio moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.1 as shown in bold italics below:

- 2.1 That the Committee approves the Open Spaces Strategy attached in Appendix 1 ***on the condition that the actions listed in the Strategy will return to this Committee for final approval and will have been consulted on with stakeholders.***
- 66.4 Councillor Wares formally seconded the motion.
- 66.5 Councillor Nemeth asked how any tennis club strategy would link in with the Playing Pitch Strategy.
- 66.6 The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management answered that the council were keen on establishing a formal partnership with local clubs and associations and any changes arising from a future implementation plan would be consulted upon with clubs, the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) and the Brighton & Hove League before being brought before committee for decision.
- 66.7 Councillor Wares asked for clarification that the proposed amendment would not lead to a contradiction in recommendations 2.4, 2.5 and 2.1.
- 66.8 The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management clarified that the Playing Pitch Strategy was recommend to Members for approval as following discussions with the Football Association, an approved Playing Pitch Strategy was a fundamental requirement in any applications for grant funding. The Play Area report listed at recommendation 2.4 for noting was important as there was value for Members to be aware of the current play area conditions alongside the short-term, mid-term and long-term outlook for the facilities and the implications for the council. Implementation Plans for play areas would be brought back to committee following relevant consultation for consideration.
- 66.9 The Head of Sport & Leisure added that in relation to the Playing Pitch Strategy, this had been undertaken in line with the strict requirements of Sport England and had been signed off by the governing bodies of the steering group and Sport England. The document was important for pitches across the city and it was a requirement for cities with a population of 250,000 and above to have a Playing Pitch Strategy.
- 66.10 Councillor Robins noted that the large reduction of those on the waiting list for an allotment had been due to the Allotment Strategy which had not been mentioned in the report. Furthermore, the report noted that 77% had never used or visited an allotment site but had not addressed the fact that allotment sites were not on public land. Councillor Robins asked what the difference was between an open and closed church yard.
- 66.11 The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management stated the figures provided were just a snapshot and increased and decreased year round. The difference between open and closed church yards was complex but in essence related to a church yard that ceased to have additional burial space. The Diocese could then hand these over to the local authority for maintenance but there was no obligation on the part of the Diocese to provide the funding to do so.

- 66.12 Councillor Miller welcomed the report and asked whether the costs detailed in relation to the life expectancy of play equipment and estimated costs of replacement were index linked.
- 66.13 The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management responded that the figures were not index linked and the report was a snapshot of an assessment of play equipment carried out in September 2016.
- 66.14 Councillor Atkinson thanked officers for producing a substantial and important piece of work adding that the Strategy was forward thinking in the context of ongoing challenging financial circumstances. Councillor Atkinson stated that he was excited by the opportunity to bid for the Parklife Football Hubs National Programme to fund the introduction of 3G football pitches. Councillor Atkinson noted that Mile Oak Wanderers were an excellent example of a local community organisation in his ward area, were desperate for more playable pitches and were positive about a partnership arrangement with the council. Councillor Atkinson noted his concern that raising sponsorship for specific parks may be more challenging in less affluent areas. Councillor Atkinson supplemented that he found the establishment of a Parks Foundation to be a positive idea
- 66.15 Councillor Deane thanked officers for a comprehensive and informative report. Councillor Deane stated her agreement with Councillor Robins that the Allotment Strategy had been the key driver in reducing allotment waiting lists rather than a lessening in demand. Councillor Deane noted that 74% of respondents to the consultation had stated a preference for more natural play equipment adding that there had perhaps been a lack of foresight in introducing the playbuilder equipment without an allowance for a ring-fenced maintenance fund.
- 66.16 Councillor Greenbaum stated that officers had produced an excellent report for the future of parks and green spaces in the economic circumstances. Councillor Greenbaum stated that the scale of proposed government cuts to maintain green spaces was a tragedy. Councillor Greenbaum asked for reassurance that volunteers would be provided appropriate resources to undertake work and clarification on any known health risks associated with 3G turf.
- 66.17 The Chair stated that she was aware that international studies had been carried out on potential health risks associated with 3G turf and she would ensure that an evaluation report would be included with any report on the matter submitted to the committee.
- 66.18 The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management stated that the Park Ranger service was ideally placed to lead on volunteering and the consultation had demonstrated a willingness of people to engage and work with the council. The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management added that there had been a number of studies carried out on the safety of 3G turf pitches that addressed the concerns raised and he would circulate this subsequent to the meeting.
- 66.19 Councillor Janio stated that officers had produced a fantastic report and he found the idea of a parks foundation or trust to be very positive. Councillor Janio asked if he could be involved in the creation of the Tree Strategy that was identified in the report as he was a trustee of the Woodland Trust and could provide useful input.

66.20 The Chair stated that she would very much support Councillor Janio's input into any review of the Tree Strategy.

66.21 Councillor Wares commended officers for an excellent report. In reference to the motion put forward, Councillor Wares noted that whilst there were 3,000 responses to the consultation which meant it was one of the city's most engaging, this represented just over 1% of the total population of Brighton & Hove and it was important that the public had a second opportunity to contribute as detailed proposals were considered. Councillor Wares noted the detail in relation to anti-social behaviour, safety and crime and asked whether the Chief Constable had been consulted as part of the process as they could provide a useful viewpoint on the proposals. Councillor Wares asked if there was an omission or mistake made as nowhere within the document was there mention of the risk or management of travelling families and proposals on permitted stopping places.

66.22 The Chair explained that council policy in relation to travelling communities was enshrined in the Traveller Strategy agreed by the Committee and she was not aware of any proposal for permitted stopping places. The Chair confirmed that Sussex Police were one of the consultees.

66.23 The Chair put the Conservative Group motion to the vote which passed.

66.24 The Chair put the recommendations as amended to the vote which passed.

66.25 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee approves the Open Spaces Strategy attached in Appendix 1 on the condition that the actions listed in the Strategy will return to the Committee for final approval and will have been consulted on with stakeholders.
- 2) That the Committee approves the priority actions listed in the Executive Summary included in the Open Spaces Strategy attached in Appendix 1.
- 3) That the Committee notes the results of "The Big Conversation" consultation for which a summary report is attached in Appendix 2.
- 4) That the Committee approves the Playing Pitch Strategy as circulated to Members and made available on the council's website for which the Executive Summary is attached in Appendix 3.
- 5) That the Committee notes the Play Area Report in Appendix 4.
- 6) That the Committee notes that further reports on the detailed implementation plan and timetable will be brought to future committees for Members consideration.

**67 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

67.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 6.25pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

