# ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & Agenda Item 5(b) SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE Brighton & Hove City Council

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting for questions submitted by a member of the public.

The question will be answered without discussion. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion. The person to whom a question, or supplementary question, has been put may decline to answer it.

The following written questions have been received from members of the public:

#### (i) New Trees in Bevendean- Mitchie Alexander

"Recommendations include that this Committee agrees £500,000 on woodland management and tree planting.

As a local Bevendean resident have been emailing the council for over a year now about getting new trees planted along the Avenue. The community will fund-raise for this project. The Housing Dept have agreed in principle but state that City Parks need to give the go ahead too. Following several emails to city parks dept, I still have not received a response.

Can the Chair ensure that our community's tree planting project is given the go-ahead for the benefit of the local residents and the environment?"

# (ii) Strategic Road Network- Andrew Peters

"The DFT and Highways England's plans for a strategic road network - much of it is underwritten in our region by the same Local Enterprise Partnership that is funding the Valley Gardens scheme.

Nowhere else is there a plan to deliberately throttle the region's trunk roads as currently proposed on all routes through central Brighton.

Can the Chair confirm that the current preferred option for the Valley Gardens meets the approval of the DFT's plans and can they share this advice with us?"

#### (iii) Valley Gardens Phase 3- Paul Crawford

"If it were shown that the ETSC's decision on February 7<sup>th</sup> to delegate all further decision making on Valley Gardens Phase 3 to Officers was taken on the basis of incomplete, inadequate or erroneous information would the Chair consider recalling oversight of the project to elected members, and, if so, can you advise us how and when, and, if not, why not?"

# (iv) Valley Gardens Forum- David Rochford

"The Council wrote to the Valley Gardens Forum last month accepting our offer of formal ADR mediation. During a constructive meeting with Council Leader, ETS Chair and Officers a few days ago, ADR was cited as a useful way to resolve whether correct and sufficient consultation had been

undertaken without recourse to judicial review - on the basis that we all want to progress the Valley Gardens project. However, the Council wrote back to us 24 hours later bluntly withdrawing the offer - suggesting instead, an unmoderated meeting with Officers. What was the reason for withdrawing from the earlier commitment?"

## (v) Bins provision, Bramble Way- Michael Jenkins

"Please will you honour the thirty resident homes and families who live at the top of Bramble Way. Please do your duty to provide them with a complete new set of seven brand new 1100 Litre Mobile Bins for the second Bramble Way bin area please. Five for normal Refuse, one for mixed recycling, one for glass recycling"

# (vi) Valley Gardens Phase 3 Environmental Impact Assessment- Gary Farmer

"Current Illegal pollution levels throughout the city centre are a lethal danger to residents, workers and visitors and yet current Valley Gardens plans intentionally make this worse for the east of the city. WHO Director Maria Neira suggested last week that politicians should face prosecution for knowingly exacerbating air pollution on their watch. "No politician will be able to say I didn't know because we all knew". Advocates for the Valley Gardens scheme repeatedly talk about winners and losers - but this isn't a game. Will the council conduct a full and open environmental impact assessment for the scheme?"

# (vii) Valley Gardens Deadlines- Daniel Nathan

"At November ETSC, we heard that there was no pressure from the LEP to drawdown funding for VG3. The LEP subsequently stated that such drawdown "should not be used as a reason not to follow proper consultation processes" and imposed fresh funding conditions. Valley Gardens Forum Directors met with Councillors & Officers a few days ago and we were grateful to hear another myth debunked; there is no imminent deadline for the spending of the LEP grant or the completion of VG3. There is still time to properly consult after all. Will the Chair please confirm and repeat this today?"

#### (viii) Valley Gardens Events- Sam Rush

"For Phases 1 and 2 the programming of construction works and the provision of facilities towards events requirements have only been achieved after an extensive and concerted campaign of lobbying, complaints, written questions and a deputation from the Brighton events community. This struggle has caused considerable disruption and damage to the Brighton events programme particularly to Brighton Fringe. Can the Chair ensure that, for Phase 3, Events Organisers are genuinely involved in the planning and design process - and therefore to pause Phase 3 now to allow a sensible timescale for this proper consultation to take place"

# (ix) Local Infrastructure & Walking Improvement Plan- Mark Strong

"We note the item to progress the LCWIP (Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan) for Brighton & Hove. Improved infrastructure for active

travel will benefit the many people in our city who currently - or would like to - walk or cycle.

However, we are very concerned about lack of active participation proposed during the LCWIP's development. The proposed process follows the bare minimum in DfT guidance, (e.g. Transport Partnership workshops) which will not allow ongoing support and feedback. We therefore ask the Chair to revise the Steering Board to include stakeholders plus representatives from the 3 main parties"

### (x) Aquarium Roundabout- Julia Basnett

"The Council's own technical report commissioned from Mott Macdonald showed that retaining a roundabout would actually prevent 328 accidents as compared with the current proposed junction, does the Chair agree that a roundabout is safer, cheaper and by allowing the most flexible throughput of traffic also the most environmentally friendly solution for the aquarium junction."