

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

4.00pm 26 NOVEMBER 2019

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Pissaridou (Chair) Wilkinson (Deputy Chair), West (Opposition Spokesperson), Wares (Group Spokesperson), Brown, Davis, Fowler, Heley, Lloyd and Moonan

Other Members present: Councillor Fishleigh

PART ONE

41 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

41(a) Declarations of substitutes

41.1 Councillor Moonan was present as substitute for Councillor Brennan.

41(b) Declarations of interest

41.2 There were none.

41(c) Exclusion of press and public

41.3 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).

41.4 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting.

42 MINUTES

42.1 Councillor West stated that minute item 37.3 did not include the full detail of what he believed to be important information he had relayed at the time.

42.2 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting be approved and signed as the correct record subject to the amendment below as shown in bold italics:

- 37.3 Introducing the motion, Councillor West explained its intention was to ensure that the species of trees planted were disease resistant, that they could adapt to the changing conditions relating to climate change and made as big as possible contribution to reducing carbon. The second part of the motion related to a feasibility study of a carbon reduction scheme. ***Councillor West noted that tree planting on the Brighton Downland may not be appropriate due to the landscape sensitivity of this characteristically open downland. However, it was feasible new trees could be planted beyond the borough in the Weald.***

43 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

- 43.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

“In relation to the Stanmer Park restoration project, we awarded the contract for the main restoration works to Buxton Building Contractors, with the value of £5m. Buxtons started on site in June and the works are scheduled for completion in September 2020. In spite of the rain and muddy conditions, the walled garden has been cleared and work is progressing well on repairing the garden wall, refurbishing the listed buildings and construction of the new café in the walled garden.

Plumpton College will move their classrooms teaching into what were previously council offices within the walled garden in January, after which their existing temporary classrooms and structures will be cleared from the Patchway area.

Work has recently begun on the wider landscape works, including the start of construction of the welcome kiosk at Lower Lodges.

A cross-party Stanmer Park Member Working Group has been established, with its first meeting to take place on 5th December.

A dedicated Estate Manager has been appointed, to be funded by the project for two and a half years. The Estate Manger will work with stakeholders to agree a vision for the Stanmer Estate, then plan for managing the estate while making it financially viable”.

44 CALL OVER

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

- Item 48: Pesticide Reduction Plan
- Item 49: Fleet Procurement Options
- Item 50: Clean Air Day and Car Free Day

- 44.2 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 51: Hangleton Safer Routes to School TRO

45 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(A) PETITIONS

- (i) Traffic Calming Bristol Gardens

45.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 70 people requesting the installation of traffic calming measures on Bristol Gardens to prevent motorists using the road as a rat run.

45.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“We are currently reviewing the junction of Bristol Gardens with Whitehawk Road as part of our high-risk sites programme. Whilst the current investigation is focused on the junction, one of the options being considered is the closure of Bristol Gardens to motorised vehicles at the eastern end. We are still at the data collection stage but once a way forward has been identified we will consult local residents and ward councillors on the details. The information supplied as part of this petition is very useful to these investigations and will be considered seriously as part of this process. Our intention is to carry out a consultation in spring of next year”.

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

(B) WRITTEN QUESTIONS

(i) Park & Ride

45.4 On behalf of Derek Wright, Councillor Fishleigh put the following question:

“In the last local elections both the Labour and Conservatives said they would introduce a Park and Ride. Bearing in mind that a term in office is four years can the Chair tell me if any progress has been made in finding a site, funding the project and do we have a time line?”

45.5 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The city council has declared a climate emergency and declared an ambitious commitment to make the city carbon-neutral by 2030 and recognises that transport is a major source of carbon emissions.

2030 is only 11 years away so we do have to move quickly, especially with major or significant strategic projects that have long lead-in times but would bring significant benefits to the city in many ways when implemented alongside other measures.

Our focus since the elections of May 2019 has been upon establishing the 2030 carbon neutral programme and cross-party member Board. A report on that will be presented to P&R Committee on 5 December 2019.

We will be developing a new Transport Strategy as part of a new Local Transport Plan to help us decide what the city needs, and by when, to make it safe, accessible, sustainable and future-proofed.

This will be progressed through consultation and engagement with the city and its partners, starting early next year, and by working with large employers and the business and tourism sectors and will include consideration of a number of transport projects that will contribute to becoming carbon neutral including Park & Ride. I do hope that you and many others will be participating in that process and will give us your views”.

45.6 Councillor Fishleigh asked the following supplementary question:

“Are you able to set aside money in next year’s budget for a Park & Ride?”

45.7 On behalf of the Chair, the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture provided the following reply:

“I think it’s premature to set aside budget. The process would be to first, review the local transport strategy as the Chair has outlined. Once that strategy is agreed then the Local Transport Plan budget would be agreed by this committee which is how the capital funding would be allocated to each of those projects. So, at this stage, we don’t know which of those projects would be funded and it would be a decision for this committee to make”.

(ii) Valley Gardens Task & Finish Group

45.8 Serena Burt put the following question:

“Can the Chair confirm that the Valley Gardens Forum will be a permanent member of the Task and Finish Group which is in the process of being set up - and as a key stakeholder will have oversight over phase 3 from this point onwards until completion?”

45.9 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question Serena.

I expect that your question has been prompted by my response to the Deputation that you presented to the council last month, when I referred to this cross-party group and how it will include stakeholders in its meetings and discussions. We very much recognise that the Valley Gardens Forum is one of those stakeholders.

The meetings of the cross-party Member Task and Finish Group for Valley Gardens will involve stakeholders, and the councillors who will have the oversight over the Valley Gardens project will be finalising how the group will operate over the next few weeks by working with officers. This will include setting themes for discussion and will therefore determine the relevant stakeholders who be invited to attend each meeting. We will not be taking an approach of inviting all stakeholders to all meetings of the Task & Finish Group, but we will invite stakeholders to those meetings that it is relevant for them to attend. I expect that the first meeting will be able to take place early in the New Year, and we will ensure that invitations and agendas are sent out in good time to give prior notice to invitees.

The principles of how the group will work are set out in the Terms of Reference that were considered and agreed at the October meeting of this committee.

As part of the ongoing development of the detailed design of the Phase 3 layout approved by this committee in February this year, I can also give you a further assurance that the Forum will be invited to one of a number of stakeholder workshops that will be arranged in due course”.

(iii) Environmental Impact Assessment

45.10 Adrian Hart put the following question:

“I’m puzzled as to how or why the Chair could state at Full Council that a thorough Environmental Impact Assessment in line with EU Directive 2014/52/EU is not

necessary and would not be carried out. Even if you are convinced that there is no legal obligation - which incidentally our advice contradicts - is there not a moral obligation to calm public concerns by commissioning such a study?"

45.11 The Chair provided the following reply:

"Thank you for your question Adrian, and for referring to my response to the Notice of Motion that was presented by Councillor Miller and discussed by the council last month. The response I gave at that meeting is part of the papers for this committee so I won't repeat it word for word, but I will confirm again that the project was properly screened for environmental assessment and there is a technical note available on the council's website about it which should provide those people who are concerned about potential impacts and reassurance that that they are not expected to be significant and cause harm.

We do take this matter very seriously and, as I said last month, we will continue to review this throughout the detailed design process and it will be monitored during and after construction. If that identifies that is forecast to change from what we already know, then we will take appropriate action immediately as we would with any other project.

I am not able to comment on any advice that you may have sought about legal obligations, but if you would like to send it to our Executive Director, and our Head of Legal Services, then we can look at it and provide you with a further response".

45.12 Adrian Hart asked the following supplementary question:

"If, by substantially increasing congestion on the eastern side, the Administration knowingly allow an increase in NO2 and PM2.5 within the declared AMQA in full violation of the NPPF City Plan policy SU9, are you aware you may be exposing both the council and councillors who refuse an EIA to a corporate and personal liability claim in the event of a successful legal challenge?"

45.13 The Chair provided the following reply:

"I can only repeat what I just said. If that design process identifies anything that is forecast to change from what we already know, then we will take appropriate action immediately as we would with any other project".

(iv) Environmental Impact Assessment

45.14 Paul Crawford put the following question:

"It is now formally accepted that VG3 represents low value for money; but the LEP justified funding VG3 because withholding funding would negate the benefits predicted for phases one and two. In my opinion, those benefits are just made-up numbers concerning things that would probably happen anyway: such as growth in knowledge sector employment and commercial floor space. But acknowledging this and with an inevitably negative EIA outcome the whole scheme's potentially disastrous effects on the City and its economy would become obvious and inescapable. Is this really why this Council is afraid of an Environmental Impact Assessment?"

45.15 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question Paul.

The Local Enterprise Partnership has conducted a thorough assessment of the council’s Business Case for Phase 3 of the Valley Gardens project, which has included publication of all its supporting documentation, including an independent review. It concluded that project should be approved for funding, which we are very pleased to have achieved.

Similarly, all of the council’s technical background information relating to this project, including the Review of Environmental Impacts technical note, has been published on our website.

As I have just said in response to the previous question from Adrian Hart, we will continue to keep these matters all under review through the development of the design and before and after construction”.

45.16 Paul Crawford asked the following supplementary question:

“By refusing to conduct an environmental impact assessment, the council is wilfully excluding the economic cost of the increased pollution that will be caused by this congestion. Why?”

45.17 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I can only repeat what I’ve just said, that all of the council’s technical background information relating to this project, including the Review of Environmental Impacts technical note, has been published on our website”.

(C) DEPUTATIONS

(i) Veolia Waste Transfer Site

45.18 The Committee considered a deputation that asked a series of questions about the Veolia Waste Transfer site fire.

45.19 The Chair provided the following response:

“(1) Emergency Access Contingencies: Are contingencies for emergency access to the site now under review? Does the Council take a view about whether Veolia should have staff on site overnight?

Veolia currently have CCTV Remote Monitoring of the Waste Transfer Station overnight. The council is reviewing procedures with Veolia regarding waste and street collections dropped at the Waste Transfer Station in the evenings, in order to reduce the risk of combustion.

The Fire Service is able to gain access to the site using the keys in the Premises Information Box. However, on 25 August, they simply cut the lock on the gate to gain access.

Veolia are also working with the Fire Service with a view to improving fire detection technology at the Waste Transfer Station.

(2) Sprinkler System: Is there to be a review of adequacy and effectiveness of the sprinkler system?

The Hollingdean Integrated Waste Facility consists of three separate buildings, the Materials Recovery Facility, the Waste Transfer Station and the Visitor Centre. The fire was in the Waste Transfer Station. The Materials Recovery Facility has a fully automatic sprinkler system. The Waste Transfer Station and Visitor Centre have smoke and fire detection only.

Veolia are working with us, East Sussex County Council, East Sussex Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency to identify the best approach to preventing and controlling fires in the Waste Transfer Station. Sprinkler systems are being considered as part of this review along with other methods of fire prevention, early detection and fire suppression.

that is assessed as having an increased fire risk, it will be placed in the Bay. In addition, material storage within the Waste Transfer Station has been reviewed and additional fire-break walls installed.

(3) Smoke Inhalation Residents would like more information about the materials burnt during the fire and ask for a robust assessment of the risks to public health posed by smoke inhalation from the fires at this WTS.

The materials in the Waste Transfer Station were non-hazardous standard waste from streets and seafront waste bins.

Public Health England consulted the Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards for advice. They recommended that with no ongoing exposure, no further public health action (including data collection) was recommended.

The Centre for Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards reviewed the modelling of the plume obtained from Met Office. This indicated it is likely that the plume passed over Preston Park. They reviewed historical Air Quality Monitoring data from the monitoring station at Preston Park. The station doesn't monitor particulates but does record nitrogen oxide, which is a marker for potential pollution from the fire. Nothing of concern was identified as there were no recorded exceedances of hourly nitrogen oxide targets after the fire.

It is likely that there will have been respiratory health effects of short-term exposure to smoke, but these would usually resolve within a few days. The advice was that this should be clinically managed and did not require public health action.

(4) Communication at the time of the fire: Will there be a review of emergency communication contingency plans?

On the evening the fire occurred, the incident was managed by East Sussex Fire and Rescue Service as the fire experts and the lead for public protection and public communications in this situation.

The council sought advice from Public Health England and they agreed the Fire Service approach with regards to public health safety, which was to advise residents via social media to keep windows closed as a precaution.

The council and other agencies have learned from this event and will take a more proactive approach in terms of communications and follow up with residents in the unlikely event of a future fire.

There will be a lessons learned review when all of the investigations are completed and communications will be included as part of this.

(5) Communication about the Investigation: What external (non-Veolia) scrutiny of the investigation has been put in place given the potential risks to public health and safety? How will findings be shared? What's the expected timeframe? What's the latest information about the public meeting scheduled with Veolia?

The investigations to date by the various parties have focused on the cause of the fire and the immediate actions required to enable the Waste Transfer Station to resume operations.

The council, Veolia, and East Sussex County Council have agreed to establish a joint project group to review what measures can be taken to enhance fire prevention and control above and beyond current measures. The scope will cover not just Hollingdean Waste Transfer Station, but also other major waste facilities in Brighton & Hove and East Sussex. This will draw in expertise from East Sussex Fire and Rescue Service, the Environment Agency and external consultancy as appropriate.

We anticipate being able to feedback early in the New Year.

(6) Passing of complaints between the Environment Agency and BHCC: Round Hill residents would like a review of the system of passing complaints between the Environment Agency and the BHCC Environment Team. Why don't local officers have accurate and up-to-date data on the nature and volume of complaints about the rotting smells and noise from the Veolia site?

As the lead for the contract management, East Sussex County Council receives copies of complaints from Veolia on a monthly basis as part of the contract monitoring arrangements. This will include complaints about odour. East Sussex addresses all complaints raised with Veolia.

(7) Suitability and safety of the site location: In the wake of the range of issues brought to attention by this latest fire at the WTS, we would like the Council to review the suitability and safety of locating a facility for handling local household waste and other waste imported from elsewhere within this densely-populated residential setting. The area has been an active waste site for over 100 years. It is managed in line with Environment Agency standards and Veolia's Permit from the Environment Agency and would not be able to continue to operate if considered to be unsafe and unsuitable“.

45.20 Councillor West expressed his disappointment that a letter to the committee from Councillor Osborne had not been accepted as late. Councillor West stated that a number of residents had reported health effects relating to the fire and one had been taken to hospital. Councillor West stated that communication with residents on the night of the fire was not effective and many had to rely upon social media for information and updates that was not suitable in the circumstance. Councillor West added that it had been left to the residents of Nettleton & Dudeney blocks to organise a public meeting and there had been no attempt by the council or Veolia to do so. Councillor West noted that there had been two fires in two years at the site and this raised serious questions about whether the site should be located in Hollingdean, in a residential area.

45.21 On behalf of the Green Group, Councillor West moved a motion to call for an officer report on the matters raised in the deputation.

45.22 Councillor Lloyd formally seconded the motion.

- 45.23 Councillor Wares stated he believed it would be worth doublechecking that the Waste Transfer site was in the correct location and therefore, would agree to the motion proposed by Councillor West. Councillor Wares stated that review should be undertaken by an independent agent to Veolia and the council and assess the correct procedures and plans were in place and the response effective. Councillor Wares asked when the committee might expect to receive a report.
- 45.24 The Chair replied that there were other partners involved so it would therefore, take some time to gather the relevant information and submit a report to committee.
- 45.25 Councillor West stated that whilst he understood there were other partners involved, the matter was an urgent one.
- 45.26 The Chair replied that she was very aware of the urgency and whilst there was insufficient time to prepare a report to the next meeting, a report would be received by one the meetings following that.
- 45.27 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive an officer report on the matters raised within the deputation to a future meeting.

(ii) School Traffic Situation in Westdene

- 45.28 The Committee considered a deputation requesting a permanent, timed 'School Street' closures around Westdene Primary School at drop off and collection times due to anti-social and obstructive parking and driving.
- 45.29 The Chair provided the following response:

"The school travel team have briefed me on the School Streets project undertaken in Hackney Council including a trial of permanent road closures outside school gates. This follows a successful one-day closure by one of our own Schools at St Luke's primary in March 2019. School Travel officers have been trained in how to deliver School Streets and are fully conversant with the work of Hackney Borough council and other UK authorities on such schemes.

At this stage we cannot comment on the merits of individual school sites as clear selection criteria to prioritise demand and target resources accordingly would be necessary. Careful community engagement would also be emphasised and the existing levels of support from Head Teachers, School governors, Pupils, Parents, Ward Councillors and local residents when selecting sites would also need to be considered.

Some the good work underway includes:

- Ongoing School Travel Team support for development and updating of travel plans for early years settings and all types of schools funded by the Access Grant funding.
- Ongoing education interventions and road safety resources funded by the Access Grant funding, Sussex Safer Roads Partnership and LTP funding.
- An LTP funded Safer Routes to Schools Capital programme using recent walking and cycling casualty data at school journey times to identify current safety issues city wide, targeting resources to safety priorities and funding appropriate engineering measures, working with school communities, ward councillors and residents.

- A Pedestrian Crossing Request Scheme which uses specific criteria to prioritise requests for the public by considering a range of location and social factors.
- A previous programme of 20mph zones city wide which led to 20mph limits around most schools and physical calming in locations where post scheme speed monitoring showed further action was necessary”.

- 45.30 Councillor Davis stated that he had visited the school in the past week along with Councillors Nield and West and a traffic officer and all had agreed that the traffic situation was very dangerous around Westdene School. Councillor Davis added that Headteachers had expressed support for the introduction of a School Streets project and the scheme could be self-sufficient.
- 45.31 Councillor Lloyd added that he had also visited the school and had found the situation to be very dangerous. Councillor Lloyd added that the school catchment area was very large, and it was not feasible for all parents and children to walk or cycle to the school.
- 45.32 Councillor West stated his support for a School Streets project adding that whilst there were many measures in place, these were not adhered to by the majority of people.
- 45.33 The Assistant Director, City Transport explained that the School Streets project was new to council officers who were considering the project in great detail to assess which measures the council may be able to introduce. The Assistant Director noted that Hackney Council were within the Transport for London area so had greater powers for such measure's comparative to Brighton & Hove. The Assistant Director stated that officers would speak to the Department for Transport to investigate which measures could be introduced in the city and take forward any measures as soon as possible.
- 45.34 Councillor Wares noted that in Patcham and Hollingdean, a no loading ban had been introduced outside schools to some good effect. Councillor Wares suggested that a review of the committee work plan was necessary to calibrate it to its priorities.
- 45.35 Councillor Moonan noted that the committee had requested two further officer reports above existing workloads in this meeting alone and reminded Members of the importance of allowing officers to undertake work rather than preparing and writing reports to the committee.
- 45.36 On behalf of the Green Group, Councillor West moved a motion to call for an officer report on the matters raised in the deputation.
- 45.37 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture noted that there was a Notice of Motion listed on the agenda relating to a very similar matter and moving a motion under that item may allow any report to be broader in scope rather than focus on the actions requested in the deputation.
- 45.38 Councillor West asked if any motion to amend the Notice of Motion could consider Westdene in the context of a potential pilot.
- 45.39 The Chair confirmed that report could consider Westdene for a pilot scheme.
- 45.40 Councillor West withdrew the motion.

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

46 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

(A) PETITIONS

(i) Pedestrianise St James' Street

46.1 The Committee considered a petition referred from the Full Council meeting of 24 October 2019 and signed by 416 people requesting the council pedestrianise St James' Street.

46.2 The Chair provided the following response:

"I have been made aware of the previous suggestions and representations about St James's Street that have been made by members of the local community in the past, and the results of the consideration of them by officers and councillors. I believe that the most recent of those were in 2013 and 2014.

It is worth remembering that St James Street is a very important bus route serving and supporting tens of thousands of residents across key parts of the City including the Hospital and also relied upon by the wider community for easy public transport access to the supermarket and local businesses, so pedestrianisation would not come without its challenges.

However, I do think that it would be helpful for the committee to consider this issue in a future report to this committee to give us a greater understanding of the challenges both in terms of transport logistics and finance and what potential option might work best for everybody".

46.3 Councillor West referred to a letter received by Members from the Managing Director of Brighton & Hove Buses expressing the company's concern in relation to any potential pedestrianisation of St James' Street. Councillor West stated that in the context of the Valley Gardens project, it would be timely to re-consider the matter of pedestrianisation.

46.4 The Chair stated that any report would detail a full evaluation of options.

46.5 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive an officer report on the matters raised within the deputation to a future meeting.

(C) DEPUTATIONS

(i) Valley Gardens

46.6 The Committee considered a deputation referred from the Full Council meeting of 24 October 2019 that proposed an alternative design for the Valley Gardens Phase 3 project and requested the council consider amendments to the current preferred option.

46.7 The Chair provided the following response:

“I provided a full response to this item when it was presented to full council which is included in the minute extract, so I will not be repeating it again today.

However, I will refer and elaborate on the final points that I made in that response, as the deputation is seeking fuller consideration of the proposed design that has been put forward.

The proposal differs significantly from the approved design, which will be the starting point for the detailed design stage, and unfortunately it lacks any technical detail that we can consider or compare. For example, the deputation says that the proposal generates a better cost-benefit ratio than the approved design but there is no evidence of this. However, it is similar to an option that was tested as part of our assessment of different layouts and which resulted in a negative result, and the reasons for that are fully explained in the technical reports which are available on our website.

If sustainable and low emission transport is going to be at the heart of how we future-proof our city by achieving carbon neutrality by 2030 and improving air quality, especially in the highly valued central and historic area, then there are some key issues within your proposed design that will prevent this. These include:-

- there is only a short section of southbound bus lane to the north. The removal of the sections further south in the approved design means that the benefits that thousands of bus and taxi passengers will gain from this priority route in this busy location every day will be lost;
- the loss of Pool Valley as the location for the city’s coach station, while accepting that it not a welcoming environment at present, would place greater pressure on the Old Steine area and also remove a taxi rank;
- the realigned cycle route appears to pass through two of our highly valued Elm trees by the Royal Pavilion and then through a diagonal crossing at North Street, creating conflicts that seem very dangerous to me;
- the excellent public space that has been created outside the Royal Pavilion to bring the area more to life has suffered the same fate - it has been removed; and
- the much-discussed Palace Pier junction takes pedestrians to indirect crossing points and removes the additional areas of paving that will be created to accommodate the millions of people that visit the city, many of whom will pass through this area

The Valley Gardens Forum proposed design of that junction also remains as a roundabout and therefore retains the principles of the current junction which is highly unsafe and perpetuates the dominance of traffic and vehicles over people in this busy location. There are two extra traffic signal junctions near the Royal Pavilion and a new signal crossing on the A259 which will add to delays to drivers and therefore increase the disbenefits that many people have referred to. The demolition and rebuilding of the listed Art Deco bus shelters will also add a further complication and cost to the scheme. But as I said at Full Council, we will consider whether any of the ideas put forward can help further support the improvements within the agreed design, and improve safety, accessibility and sustainability and maintain value for money. For example, these could include looking at the one-way road between North Street and St James’s Street and the inclusion of more Bike Share hubs within the area.

My final point is that, having finally secured the funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership, we really must press on now and develop the design that this committee has agreed and deliver the final part of this fantastic scheme for the city”.

- 46.8 Councillor Wares stated that whilst he welcomed the milestone that the Valley Gardens Forum would be considered as a stakeholder on the Task & Finish Group, if the council wanted a scheme to have buy-in from residents, businesses and stakeholders, then it must consider alternative ideas and the proposal put to the council in the deputation should not be flatly rejected. Councillor Wares added that the alternative proposal had not been given any consideration and in his view that was disappointing, particularly as the proposal had been devised and submitted by those directly affected by the project.
- 46.9 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Wares moved a motion to receive an officer report on the deputation to a future meeting and requested a recorded vote.
- 46.10 Councillor Brown formally seconded the motion and the request for a recorded vote.
- 46.11 The Chair then put the motion to the vote with the following outcome

Councillor Brown: For
Councillor Davis: Against
Councillor Fowler: Against
Councillor Heley: Against
Councillor Lloyd: Against
Councillor Moonan: Against
Councillor Pissaridou: Against
Councillor Wares: For
Councillor West: Against
Councillor Wilkinson: Against

- 46.12 Therefore, the motion failed.
- 46.13 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the deputation.

47 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(B) WRITTEN QUESTIONS

(i) Bikeshare

- 47.1 Councillor Wares put the following question:

“At 8th October 2019 ETS Committee I asked a series of questions relating to the Bikeshare scheme to which the answer was “we’ll do a report”. Given that the information to answer most of my questions was in the officer brief dated 25th July 2019, it is a surprise that there was no report on this agenda. Would the Chair please confirm that the officer briefing dated 25th July 2019 can now be made publicly available?”

- 47.2 The Chair provided the following reply:

“At this stage disclosure of confidential information relating to the Council’s negotiations with Hourbike, their negotiations with sponsors and their financial position, would pose a risk to the business of Hourbike and in turn this would have a potentially negative impact on the Council and its service users.

Hourbike have not consented to the public disclosure of commercially sensitive information about their finances or sponsors in view of the potential impact on their business. It is for this reason that the confidential briefing to Members cannot be disclosed at this time.

Discussions between the council, the operator and other stakeholders are taking place now, meaning that the sensitivity of the information remains high. Officers will offer lead members a further confidential briefing early in the new year. If Members consider a report to Committee necessary at that stage, officers will seek to identify the earliest appropriate ETS Committee in 2020”.

47.3 Councillor Wares asked the following supplementary question:

“Could you at least confirm the real reason why we had the tariff increase recently, to the Bikeshare scheme and can you confirm when the report will be provided given you had alluded to one but haven’t said when that will happen?”

47.4 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I don’t have the answers, so we will send you a written response”

(ii) Patcham Roundabout

47.5 Councillor Wares put the following question:

“At the 25th June 2019 ETS Committee the Chair recognised the importance of the gateway entrance to the city at Patcham roundabout. The Chair talked about Cityparks being on the threshold of a breakthrough and that Ward Councillors would be briefed by officers. Importantly, the Chair gave their personal assurance that something would be delivered this calendar year. For the last five months we have heard nothing. Please could the Chair now share with us the details of this great breakthrough and what will be done this calendar year that will give us the confidence that the Chair’s personal assurances are worth the paper they are written on?”

47.6 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you, I agree that the Patcham Roundabout is an important visual gateway for the City. I do know that City Transport and City Parks Officers are working together to deliver this significant improvement and have already secured a partner who is prepared to fund the significant costs associated with the improvement works, maintenance and traffic management costs to operate on Highways England’s high-speed trunk road. Officers and their on-board partner have prepared a design that has been with Highways England for their final approval for some time and I’m aware that Council Officers have been chasing for a response, so they can begin the works. I know this has been a very long time in coming but dealing with Highways England is a very slow and lengthy process, but I am confident that we will deliver this scheme that will be a credit to the residents of Patcham and the wider City for many years to come”.

47.7 Councillor Wares asked the following supplementary question:

“What would have been helpful, if officers have advanced this particular decision was to keep ward councillors briefed and then of course, we can keep residents briefed and we can protect the council somewhat from what may appear inaction because there might be a very good reason for it. Perhaps then, the officers could share with us what the design is, what the council is trying to do, we can then speak with our residents as well and then maybe we can constructively work with you to get this across the line”.

47.8 The Chair provided the following reply:

“We will provide a full briefing to ward councillors so they can inform their local residents”.

(iii) Climate Emergency Communications

47.9 Councillor Heley put the following question:

“We need to improve the way that the council communicates the climate emergency to the residents of our city. In January 2019, the Green Group submitted an amendment that asked the council to publicise the council’s recognition of the climate and biodiversity emergencies, to request a report outlining low-cost measures the Communications team could organise to publicise the ‘Climate Emergency’ declaration, and the placement of an online banner on the home page of the BHCC website ‘Unanimous ambition of this Council: zero carbon by 2030.’ I’m pleased to see that recently there is now some information on the council’s website, but why did this take so long? Shouldn’t we be communicating to our residents in such a way that reflects that this is an emergency?”

47.10 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The communications team is supporting the recently established council working group, which met for the second time last week, on developing the work programme for carbon neutral 2030 and climate crisis actions. Proposals to establish a Climate Assembly and a Carbon Neutral 2030 programme will be put to the Policy & Resources Committee on 5 December.

In preparation for this major work we have published regular climate crisis stories updating the city on the council’s recent developments – on 28 March, 12 April and 4 November. The latest story references that the council are in a climate emergency and a further news story is about to be published, ensuring the issue is kept alive on our news channels.

In June and September, we communicated our support for the climate change protests. The Communications Team have produced a draft communications plan which will be discussed by the cross-party working group this week. A project team of officers with expertise across communications channels has been established to take forward other actions such as joining up actions from across the council to tell the story of what the council is doing, updating our digital channels to ensure the subject has a high profile on our website and producing clear information for residents and our staff”.

(iv) Cityclean Communications

47.11 Councillor Heley put the following question:

“Cityclean is looking at how it can improve its communication to residents, particularly with regards service disruption and missed collections.

Through the Modernisation Programme, the team is working with colleagues in IT & Digital to identify how best this can be achieved.

Unfortunately, at present, the systems used in Cityclean do not have the capability to provide direct communication to residents either via email or text message. Other channels are being considered including how we can better use the website and social media.

Moving forward, it is hoped that improved systems and the My Account function being developed by IT & Digital will allow for improved communication”.

(v) Standing Agenda Item

47.12 Councillor Heley put the following question:

“The agendas of this committee must reflect the severity and urgency of the Climate Emergency, and so far, the agenda items of this crucial committee have not done that. Will the Chair reconsider her decision to not have a standing item on the ETS agenda that provides an update on our progress of becoming a carbon neutral city by 2030? This could be as simple as Nick Hibberd providing a verbal update at the beginning of each committee, in order to avoid overloading officers. Can the chair commit to this?”

47.13 The Chair provided the following reply:

“As agreed with the cross-party working group, the approach to responding to the climate crisis and the council’s declaration of a climate emergency is to establish a 2030 Carbon Neutral Programme, Citizens Assembly and Independent Advisory (‘experts’) Board. A report will be presented to P&R committee in December to formally establish this Programme. It’s important to note that the Programme scope is beyond just moving the city towards carbon neutrality – it will include action around the wider aspects of the climate emergency such as adaptation, resilience and supporting biodiversity. The primary committee for the 2030 Carbon Neutral Programme is P&R committee because of the corporate and city-wide significance – as the programme will impact across all function of the council and all of the various policy committees. The ETS committee will undoubtedly receive many reports that contribute to our 2030 Carbon neutral goal. There are 2 reports on the November ETS agenda that will actively support the 2030 Programme, the Pesticide Free report (which contributes to biodiversity), and the Fleet Procurement report (which will aim to reduce carbon emissions as we modernise our fleet).

Whilst I am not against having periodic updates to committee on progress with the development and delivery of the whole 2030 Carbon Neutral programme, I am not sure that it will be good use of officer time to insist that we have this as standing item at every committee. To do so could detract from the time that officers have to focus on actually progressing the important projects that we will need to deliver as part of the Programme in order to reach the 2030 goal. There is a danger that officers end up spending more time producing reports for committee rather than doing that work that will really make a difference to addressing the climate emergency.

There will be a Communications Plan running alongside the programme that will ensure that progress is communicated to the public, using the website, social media and other

engagement mechanisms. This will ensure that we can keep the City informed of the progress that we are making since declaring an emergency. In addition to this I am happy, as Chair of ETS Committee, to provide updates on our progress at each committee during my chair's communications".

(vi) Crossing on New England and Old Shoreham Road

47.14 Councillor Heley put the following question:

"Ward councillors for Preston Park Ward are deeply concerned by the lack of progress on changing the dangerous road layout where New England Road meets Old Shoreham Road under the railway bridge. There are two major issues presented in this poorly designed road. The first is road safety- it is simply not safe to cross. When you walk downhill on Old Shoreham road, the pavement simply disappears, and you have to cross the road dodging fast moving traffic to simply be able to walk on a pavement. This is incredibly unsafe for anyone, especially those with pushchairs and in wheelchairs, as no crossing exists and there is no dropped curb. This leads us to the second major issue of accessibility. As a City Council we have a duty to ensure that our pavements are fully accessible and safe. This road is incredibly dangerous for those that use wheelchairs and other mobility aids. As it stands, the road is completely inaccessible, and it is failing these residents. For Prestonville resident who wishes to access London Road, there is no other reasonable walking route. Some might go out of their way via Dyke Road Drive, but less mobile residents, or those with buggies etc., are restricted to going under the bridge or simply not going at all. Will the Chair ensure that this is looked at as a matter of urgency and the road and pavement is made safe and accessible as soon as possible?"

47.15 The Chair provided the following reply:

"I agree the road layout here is very challenging for pedestrians and people with mobility challenges as it is very constrained by the junction of 2 very busy roads under the bridge where there is very limited space to carry out any significant improvement without committing to very significant costs or fundamentally re-planning the transport network here and across the wider locality.

However, the Council has a budget each year to install pedestrian dropped kerbs around the City to improve accessibility for all road users. As part of this programme a series of dropped kerbs have been installed this year on the side roads off Old Shoreham Road on the approach to the bridge. Further improvements have been planned to provide a set of dropped kerbs across Old Shoreham Road at the junction with York Grove and improvements to the existing dropped kerbs at the vehicle access point on the way to the signalised crossing point on New England Road. Collectively, whilst not able to fundamentally change the key design challenges at this junction, these works will provide some improved accessibility at this difficult junction for the benefit of many users".

47.16 Councillor Heley asked the following supplementary question:

"When will the works be taking place in that area specifically?"

47.17 On behalf of the Chair, the Assistant Director- City Transport provided the following reply:

“There is a planned programme to ensure that we will do that in this financial year, so very soon”.

(D) NOTICES OF MOTION

(i) Safe School Walking Zones

47.18 The Committee considered a Notice of Motion, referred from the Full Council meeting of 24 October that requested the committee commission a report exploring various issues relating to Safe School Walking Zones.

47.19 The Chair provided the following response:

“There is a good deal of work currently being undertaken and which are consistent with the broad principles behind a Safe School Walking Zone programme. These include:

- Proposals and options for a School Streets programme of one day and a trial of permanent road closures outside school gates following a successful one day closure at St Luke’s primary in March 2019, including a clear selection criteria to prioritise demand and target resources accordingly and to include careful community engagement.
- Ongoing School Travel Team support for development and updating of travel plans for early years settings and all types of schools funded by the Access Grant funding.
- Ongoing education interventions and road safety resources funded by the Access Grant funding, Sussex Safer Roads Partnership and LTP funding.
- Pedestrian, scooter and cycle training at all infant and junior level schools by Council Transport staff funded by dedicated Dept. for Transport Grants and LTP funding.
- An LTP funded Safer Routes to Schools Capital programme using recent walking and cycling casualty data at school journey times to identify current safety issues city wide, targeting resources to safety priorities and funding appropriate engineering measures, working with school communities, ward councillors and residents.
- A Pedestrian Crossing Request Scheme which uses specific criteria to prioritise requests for the public by considering a range of location and social factors.
- A previous programme of 20mph zones city wide which led to 20mph limits around most schools and physical calming in locations where post scheme speed monitoring showed further action was necessary.

I hope you will appreciate from all this activity currently being undertaken by Officers that we are already delivering significant improvements in School Safety initiatives that match and exceed the criteria for a Safe School Walking Zone Programme. To go beyond this would require further additional resources, distract officer time from that activity and would require significant realignment of budgets”.

47.20 Councillor Davis stated the proposals detailed in the Notice of Motion were different to the School Street project as they covered broader issues. Councillor Davis explained

that he did not believe current school safety measures were working effectively and more needed to be done.

- 47.21 Councillor Lloyd echoed the comments made by Councillor Davis adding that measures on promoting cycling to school could not work as the areas around schools were dominated by vehicles, creating a dangerous environment. Councillor Lloyd stated that the Notice of Motion proposed measures to shift that balance and create an environment where pedestrians had priority and felt safer.
- 47.22 Councillor West noted that Full Council had requested the committee to commission a report and it would be logical to consider the School Safety proposals amongst those recommendations.
- 47.23 Councillor Moonan agreed that safety around schools should be considered however, it was correct to recognise the good work already being undertaken and that not every school experienced such circumstances.
- 47.24 Councillor Brown stated that the council required a fundamental change in policy relating to pedestrian crossings on school routes. Councillor Brown noted that since 2012, since had consistently requested the installation of three pedestrian crossings on school routes but these had been refused on the grounds that a serious accident had not occurred at these locations. Councillor Brown stated that the council needed to be more proactive than reactive on such matters and there was opportunity for cross-party working on resolving funding difficulties.

The meeting was adjourned at 18.03pm and reconvened at 18.26pm

- 47.25 On behalf of the Green Group, Councillor Davis moved a motion to add a recommendation to the recommendations from Full Council as shown in bold italics below:

- That the committee requests that the report includes consideration of the Schools Streets Project undertaken in Hackney and options for a pilot of that project

- 47.26 Councillor Wilkinson formally seconded the motion and explained that the issue of safety outside of schools was a citywide issue and did not apply to one specific school and he hoped the report would lead to a policy that reduced such dangerous environments.
- 47.27 The Chair then put the motion to the vote that passed.
- 47.28 The Chair then put the recommendations, as amended, to the vote that were agreed.
- 47.29 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability committee commission a report, exploring:

- How existing 10-minute walking zones around our schools can be optimised, adding the crossings and road calming measures necessary to create genuinely safe walking routes to school.
- How visual elements could be used throughout a zone to give drivers a clear message that they are near a school, walking families have priority, and drivers are guests in that zone.
- Funding options available to create these zones (such as grants, planning contributions, parking surplus, bids for funding)

And further, that such a report:

- sets out the ways in which the council will work in close consultation with schools and local communities about the creation of these zones
- That the committee requests that the report includes consideration of the Schools Streets Project undertaken in Hackney and options for a pilot of that project.

48 PESTICIDE REDUCTION PLAN

- 48.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that outlined the current position on efforts to reduce the use of pesticides in city parks and open spaces, pavements and highways and sought permission from the committee for City Environmental Management services to phase out most pesticide use by 2022.
- 48.2 Councillor West stated that there was growing evidence that glyphosate was carcinogenic and whilst that evidence was not completely conclusive, it was right to limit its use as a precautionary measure. Councillor West highlighted that his Group had been calling for such measures for a number of years and he agreed with a gradual approach of introducing alternative methods of pest control. Councillor West explained that whilst he supported the reduction in the routine use of glyphosate, there would be a need to use chemical treatments in certain situations in a limited way. Councillor West stated that the trial had indicated that manual removal was a feasible alternative however, it would be important to keep that under review to ensure there were no unforeseen impacts such as an increase in trip hazards or damage to the highway.
- 48.3 Councillor Brown stated that the issue was complex as whilst the reduction in the use of pesticides was something to be welcomed, the potential for a dramatic increase in weeds was an issue of concern. Councillor Brown stated the biggest risk was in the outlier areas on the city where there was less routine maintenance and footfall and asked if a comprehensive log of where action had been taken would be kept particularly given most of the work would be undertaken by seasonal workers.
- 48.4 The Assistant Director- City Environment explained that manual weed removal was conducted over a six-week period over the year as a test. Whilst there was no significant impact in weed growth in the areas with high footfall, it had been found that small areas on the outlier areas of the city did experience some problem with weed growth. The Assistant Director- City Environment stated that the manual removal programme has now finished, and weeds typically started to die at this time of year. However, if there were particular problem areas, ward councillors could contact the Cityclean service. The Assistant Director- City Environment added that the information gathered from the six-

week test would be used to schedule when and where works would be undertaken in 2020.

- 48.5 In reference to paragraph 5.3, Councillor Wares noted that it was intended to undertake a consultation with residents and asked whether this would be on continuing or stopping the reduction plan or whether the new operation was working effectively.
- 48.6 The Assistant Director- City Environment clarified that the consultation would be focussed on whether residents had found the scheme beneficial and effective and the specific questions could be discussed further with Members.
- 48.7 Councillor Wares stated that the hasty decision made to begin a pesticide reduction in the city had led to a haphazard implementation and he would welcome the opportunity to view the plan for 2020 when it was finalised. Councillor West stated that the report was missing an impact assessment from the Highways service which was important as overgrowing weeds would also impact upon the road surface, possibly creating increased costs in maintaining the pavements and roads.
- 48.8 The Assistant Director- City Environment thanked Councillor Wares for his feedback and provided assurance that a discussion would take place with Highways colleagues and any impact would be included in the proposed review. The Assistant Director- City Environment added that plans for next year could be shared with ward councillors as they were developed, and that plan and information from the trial period would mean the service could take a proactive rather than reactive approach from next year.
- 48.9 Councillor Fowler stated her support for the reduction in pesticides that would have positive impact on biodiversity.
- 48.10 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee agrees to end the use of glyphosate by Brighton & Hove City Council's City Environmental Management services with immediate effect, other than in exceptional cases to kill invasive plant species, such as Japanese Knotweed or to kill tree stumps.
 - 2) That the Committee agrees that City Environmental Management will not engage with contractors to use glyphosate on any land managed by these departments.
 - 3) That Committee approves to City Environmental Management working with other departments to phase out glyphosate use across the council and to work towards phasing out other pesticide use by 2022.
 - 4) That the Committee notes that the removal of weeds in parks and on hard surfaces will be undertaken manually as an alternative approach to using pesticides.
 - 5) That the Committee agrees that an update report should be brought back to committee in autumn 2020 to update members on progress and the results and to review this approach to weed removal.

49 FLEET PROCUREMENT OPTIONS

- 49.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval for the approach towards the future procurement of the council fleet. It agreed that will form the basis of a council wide Fleet Strategy and Replacement Programme which would be developed over the next six months.
- 49.2 Councillor West stated that it was important to note in relation to the carbon cost calculation detailed in the report that this accounted for just fuelling and maintenance of the vehicle and not the energy used to make it. That would be an important point of consideration and potential refinement going forward.
- 49.3 On behalf of the Green Group, Councillor West moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.1 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.1 That the Committee approves Option 4 as the approach to procurement of the council fleet as set out in appendix 1. ***This approach to include consideration of opportunities to reduce the need to travel, and to incorporate e-bikes and e-cargo bikes into the fleet.***
- 49.4 Introducing the motion, Councillor West stated that whilst he welcomed the report that would update and ageing fleet that was costly in maintenance and staff time and resource, successive Administrations had waited too long to bring about that action. Furthermore, Councillor West stated there was no information in the report on reducing the need to travel.
- 49.5 Councillor Lloyd formally seconded the motion and referred to the huge potential of hydrogen fuel cells.
- 49.6 Councillor Wares stated that the report was an attempt to fix a dire situation the City Environment Directorate had found itself in due to lack of funding and forward planning. Councillor Wares noted that the options set out in Appendix 1 were all costed except the option the committee was being asked to agree. Councillor Wares stated that the proposals were subject to the budget setting process however, there was no indication of the outcome of that process and it could potentially lead to an absence of funding that would in turn lead to a collapse of the strategy. Councillor Wares asked if consideration had been given to refurbishing or retrofitting the fleet with Euro 6 engines that may be more cost effective and have a smaller carbon footprint than replacing the fleet.
- 49.7 The Assistant Director, City Environment clarified that more analysis on cost was required and that would be ready for the budget setting process. It was likely that borrowing would be required to purchase fleet and that savings would meet that cost. The Head of Fleet Management explained that in relation to refurbishment, discussions were underway with three companies on specification and cost and that would be an option considered. Furthermore, officers were considering options to bring in an in-house repair mechanism to further reduce costs and speed up repair times.
- 49.8 Councillor Wilkinson welcomed the report adding that it was an indication of the Administration's commitment to tackling poor air quality, climate change and reducing carbon emissions.

49.9 Councillor Moonan welcomed the report that sat within the Administration's wider work and agenda towards moving to carbon neutrality.

49.10 The Chair moved the motion to the vote that passed.

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

49.12 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee approves Option 4 as the approach to procurement of the council fleet as set out in appendix 1. This approach to include consideration of opportunities to reduce the need to travel, and to incorporate e-bikes and e-cargo bikes into the fleet.
- 2) That the Committee agrees that this approach should be developed as part of a council-wide Fleet Strategy which will be brought to this Committee and to Policy & Resources Committee for final approval.
- 3) That the Committee notes the requirement for additional borrowing to purchase a sufficient number of new vehicles within City Environmental Management, to meet service requirements, which will be based on a business case and will be considered as part of budget setting.

50 CLEAN AIR DAY AND CAR FREE DAY

50.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that outlined the background to two primary and recognised events, which are Clean Air Day and Car Free Day, and outlined possible options available to the council to undertake activities and encourage people to participate in them in 2020.

50.2 On behalf of the Gren Group, Councillor Heley moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.2 as shown in bold italics below:

2.2 That the Committee agrees to receive a further report ***to the next ETS committee***, to consider options for participating in European Mobility Week and Car Free Day in September 2020, ***with such a report including:***

- ***a list of options for road closures and detail of the effects on traffic; including the feasibility of road closures in areas already identified by some residents via petitions to this council, such as St James Street and roads on the seafront***
- ***a detailed analysis of the costs associated with closing a road and/or multiple roads in Brighton and Hove, with consideration given as to how these costs may be provided for in the council's 2020/21 budget planning***

further detail on the nature of community events that could be organised on roads, detailing and exploring the amazing and unique opportunity that road closures provide, as well as further analysis on how events such as this act can act as the first steps towards tackling the public health crisis of air pollution and becoming a carbon-neutral city by 2030

- 50.3 Introducing the motion, Councillor Heley stated that the report lacked ambition and ideas and the motion provided a list of actions and recognised the urgency required in addressing the climate emergency.
- 50.4 Councillor Lloyd formally seconded the motion.
- 50.5 Councillor Wares stated his support for the motion and noted that this was the fifth request since March 2018 for the committee to receive a report on the matter. Referring to paragraph 3.10, Councillor Wares asked what projects the £1.5m in Access for Sustainable Travel Programme funded and what assessments were made to ensure those projects had and continued to have value and the benefits of the investment.
- 50.6 Referring to the time traffic restrictions in place outside St Luke's School, Councillor Brown asked if there had been any feedback received to indicate the project had been successful and if the project could be extended if so.
- 50.7 The Assistant Director, City Transport confirmed that the information was available and could be provided to Councillor Brown after the meeting. Furthermore, a briefing note could be provided to Councillor Wares on the Sustainable Travel Programme investment and projects.
- 50.8 The Chair then put the motion to the vote that passed.
- 50.9 The Chair then put the recommendations, as amended to the vote that were agreed.
- 50.10 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee requests that officers approach Rottingdean Parish Council to discuss opportunities to work jointly on a Clean Air Day initiative in June 2020.
 - 2) That the Committee agrees to receive a further report to the next ETS committee, to consider options for participating in European Mobility Week and Car Free Day in September 2020, with such a report including:
 - a list of options for road closures and detail of the effects on traffic; including the feasibility of road closures in areas already identified by some residents via petitions to this council, such as St James Street and roads on the seafront
 - a detailed analysis of the costs associated with closing a road and/or multiple roads in Brighton and Hove, with consideration given as to how these costs may be provided for in the council's 2020/21 budget planning
 - further detail on the nature of community events that could be organised on roads, detailing and exploring the amazing and unique opportunity that road closures provide, as well as further analysis on how events such as this act can act as the first steps towards tackling the public health crisis of air pollution and becoming a carbon-neutral city by 2030

51 HANGLETON SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOL - TRO

- 51.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee, having taken account of all duly made representations, approves as advertised the Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting,

Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2018 Amendment Order No.* 201* (TRO-25-2019).

52 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

52.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 7.25pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

