

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

**4.00pm 23 JUNE 2020**

**VIRTUAL MEETING (SKYPE)**

**MINUTES**

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

**PART ONE**

**1 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**1(a) Declarations of substitutes**

1.1 There were none.

**1(b) Declarations of interest**

1.2 Councillor Brown declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 11 as her home address was on one of the roads listed however, the consultation undertaken there did not affect her directly.

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

1.3 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).

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

**2 ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY URGENCY SUB-COMMITTEE**

2.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the decisions taken by the Urgency Sub-Committee held on 24 March 2020.

**3 MINUTES**

- 3.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 21 January 2020 be approved and signed as the correct record.

#### 4 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

- 4.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

“I would like to begin by reflecting on some key events that have occurred over the last few weeks.

As a City Council we have responded at pace and built upon previous actions to avert the Pandemic Crisis and since delivered some amazing projects to enable residents and key workers to travel into their workplaces and premises whilst supporting the Govt guidelines on social distancing to prevent the spread of the virus. This has included continuing to support and fund bus services, closed Madeira Drive to provide exercise and public space, constructed 3.4 miles of cycle lane on the Old Shoreham Road and rolled out a programme of signs and markings to encourage people to share the seafront spaces responsibly.

We have also recently implemented additional measures to support the re-opening of High Street businesses by widening pavements in busy shopping areas and bus stops as well as suspending parking bays that will enable people to queue safely to access goods and transport services. These include widened footways in The Lanes (Old Town), London Road, Hove and Kemp Town (St James Street)

Our Officers have also turned around very quickly bids to Central Government at extremely short notice that will further support the City during the next Recovery Phase.

I am very proud of our achievements and will be asking this Committee to help with these efforts by thanking everyone involved, including Councillors, and to help review these measures as we go forward”.

#### 5 CALL OVER

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

- Item 9: BTN Bikeshare Reprourement and In-house options
- Item 10: Parking Fees & Charges 2020/21 Traffic Regulation Order
- Item 11: Parking Scheme Update report
- Item 12: Interim Covid-19 Response Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan

- 5.2 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 8: Brighton Marina to River Adur Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Scheme

#### 6 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

**(A) PETITIONS****(i) Remove the planter on Rottingdean High Street**

6.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 694 people that requested the removal of the planter placed on Rottingdean High Street for safety reasons and due to increased congestion.

6.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“As you are probably aware the planter is a key feature of the Rottingdean High Street scheme that was specifically designed to improve the air quality in the narrowest part of the High Street by limiting the number of vehicles in that part of the road. It is not a traffic calming measure.

The planter ensures that most queuing traffic queues further to the north where building frontages are further from the kerb and buildings are lower. This means that particulates and gases from vehicles are not trapped to the extent that they are at the southern end of the street when a queue forms there. Monitoring needs to continue as traffic returns to normal pre-COVID 19 levels to determine the impact on Air Quality in the Southern High Street and over seasonal temperature and traffic flow changes in order to reach a conclusion about the success of the trial scheme.

Officers are aware of only a single collision in the immediate area. A police investigation established that the presence of the planter was not a contributory factor. There have been no collisions at the junction of Park Road and extra signage has been installed on the approach to this junction to warn drivers to proceed with caution”.

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

**(ii) More space for walking and cycling during Covid-19**

6.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 912 people requesting the Council to implement urgent temporary measures to create more space for walking and cycling in the city to aid physical distancing.

6.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“Councillors and officers have been working very hard and at a quick pace to develop and deliver a programme of active and sustainable measures to help people move around and enjoy our fantastic city during the initial Covid-19 lockdown period. We started at the earliest, possible opportunity, before many other authorities, and we are now working to various recent government guidelines as well as standard statutory legislation. The introduction of the Madeira Drive closure and the temporary Old Shoreham Road cycle lane have been good to see and earlier this month we submitted more proposals to the Government’s Department for Transport for the Emergency Active Travel Fund initiative. We are awaiting a response from our initial submission and will announce this as soon as we can. I very much hope that it will be a positive one and we will secure almost £600,000 pounds.

You have made some specific requests and suggestions in your petition and some of these are included in our bid to the Government or the work already undertaken. These include pavement widening on St James’s Street and London Road, cycle lanes on Old

Shoreham Road and the A259 seafront road, closing Madeira Drive Terrace to motor traffic, as well as reviewing traffic signals to ensure pedestrian waiting times are minimised. In addition, we work closely with Sussex Police to identify problem areas and proactive campaigns for speed reduction”.

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

**(iii) i360 Sundial**

6.7 The Committee considered a petition signed by 146 people requesting the Council to take the necessary measures to create the world’s largest sundial by using pavement markings and the shadow of the BAi360.

6.8 The Chair provided the following response:

“The council receives an annual 1% ticket revenue contribution under the terms of the Section 106 Agreement with the i360. Those receipts are for environmental improvements in the locality of the i360 including Regency Square. From those receipts the council is obliged firstly to provide ecological interpretation and display boards in the immediate seafront locality of the i360.

The council has also confirmed with the Regency Square Area Society (RSAS) that subject to their formulating a project brief with options for proposed improvements to the Regency Square and around they could benefit from a future proportion of the receipts and that all art proposals for that area should form part of any submission. I recommend that you submit your proposals to the Regency Square Area Society for their future projects brief for that area”.

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

**(iv) Fredrick Gardens gates**

6.10 The Committee considered a petition signed by 18 people requesting that gates be installed at each end of Fredrick Gardens to deter anti-social behaviour and ensure space for physical distancing.

6.11 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition. I know this Twitten is a highly popular east – west walking route used by residents and visitors alike to access the city centre for leisure and business purposes.

Although there are footways narrower than 1.7m in the City, these and many others make the current rules on social distancing challenging, so I do share the concerns of Frederick Gardens and other residents in the City.

For this reason, an action plan for the whole city has been developed to consider how the council responds to coming out of lockdown. Within the plan there are specific proposals to introduce signing to warn people of areas where you cannot maintain social distancing and encourage people to make the correct choice. Unfortunately, gating has operational and cost related problems as well as legal implications as the only way of gating the passageway is to use specific legislation that can only be used when clear, documented evidence of anti-social behaviour is present. For this reason, I will be

seeking a solution within the Transport Action Plan that will seek to support resident's safety in Frederick Gardens”.

6.12 Councillor West stated that he understood the problems experienced by residents in Fredrick Gardens and moved a motion to receive an officer report on the matter.

6.13 Councillor Heley formally seconded the motion.

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

6.15 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive an officer report responding to the matters raised within the petition.

**(B) WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

**(i) Valley Gardens EIA and traffic modelling**

6.16 Daniel Nathan put the following question:

“So, it turns out the hard deadline to complete Valley Gardens Phase 3 - cited by elected councillors over the past eighteen months, never in fact existed. As there is no longer the urgency to complete VG3 by March 2021, will the Chair and this committee finally commit to the environmental impact and comprehensive traffic modelling studies that we hope will shape the final plan and verify its role in improving air quality, reducing congestion and reducing carbon emissions - and thus ensures that the final scheme provides residents, businesses and visitors to the city with a scheme that benefits us all?”

6.17 The Chair provided the following reply:

“As you know, Phase 3 of Valley Gardens project is the final part of this major scheme and, while we welcome the Local Enterprise Partnership's decision to alter its funding arrangements, we still intend to ensure that it can be completed as soon as possible.

As you may have already noted from my previous responses to questions about this issue, the design has been properly screened for environmental assessment and there is a technical note available on the council's website about it. This shows that potential impacts are not expected to be significant and cause harm, and they will be monitored throughout the project and beyond. It would be highly unusual for alterations to an existing city centre traffic system to justify a full Environmental Impact Assessment, we are not building a new road on green belt. If that monitoring identifies anything that changes then we will take appropriate action to address it.

We have also carried out the traffic modelling that will enable us to progress the detailed design stage for Valley Gardens Phase 3”.

6.18 Daniel Nathan asked the following supplementary question:

“Your predecessor Councillor Mitchell made a commitment to install an air quality monitor at the junction of the A23 at St James' Street. There is no reason why you shouldn't measure other things as well, particulate and road noise at the same time and

an early deployment of this monitor could inform the proposed task and finish sessions and assist with a final design for the Valley Gardens. Will this committee agree to monitor this station as a matter of urgency?"

6.19 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

"An additional air quality monitor has been installed at the junction of St James' Street and the A23 at Steine Gardens. I would need to check with colleagues as to what pollutants that monitor is monitoring, and we can confirm that in writing".

**(ii) Loading Bay survey**

6.20 Adrian Hart put the following question:

"We are grateful for the intervention of Councillor Childs, who having noticed that the Valley Gardens scheme's lack of loading provision at Richmond Place will affect his partner's business is making enquiries to ensure provision is made. The lack of loading across the whole scheme impacts not just businesses, but also residents and others who rely on deliveries of goods and medicines & those who need to be picked up and dropped off due to impaired mobility. Does the Chair agree and commit to undertaking a survey of everybody surrounding the project area and relocating or increasing loading bays/areas as necessary?"

6.21 The Chair provided the following reply:

"The scheme will deliver over 119 metres of additional loading bays throughout the area, this is in addition to exclusive Pay & Display bays, disabled parking bays and motorcycle parking bays. When providing loading and parking bays highway engineers must ensure they can be easily accessible and accommodated within the highway and must pass a further stringent Road Safety Audit. As a result, there are sections of the eastern highway corridor, particularly Grand Parade, where width restrictions simply do not enable this to work safely install additional loading bays, however Valley Gardens does provide an increased loading capacity overall.

As with all major Transport schemes we will be carrying out post scheme implementation surveys to assess the effectiveness and overall parking capacity and report the results back to a future ETS Committee".

6.22 Adrian Hart asked the following supplementary question:

"The world has changed in ways we couldn't have imagined 3 months ago, there will be next year economic and environmental challenges to the city the likes of which haven't been seen in generations. Empty slogans is not the answer. Can't you see that successive councils are not getting the balance right. Can you tell us how you intent to do things differently from now on?"

6.23 The following reply was provided on behalf on the Chair:

"As officers we are constantly making sure that we engage well with communities and there is further engagement taking place in relation to Valley Gardens so that will

continue to be the case. We take your feedback on board Adrian and will pass it back to the project team as we move forwards”.

**(iii) AQMA Valley Gardens**

6.24 Daniel Nathan put the following question on behalf of Martin Christie:

“Brighton & Hove City Council planning policy requires all major developments to provide a transport assessment to consider the impact on AQMAs. Why is it that the council’s own transport schemes don’t assess the impact on AQMAs Why isn’t there a cumulative transport assessment on the impact on AQMAs for Valley Gardens, North Street, the Old Steine, Duke’s Mound, the A259 and Madeira Drive. Does the Council’s transport team operate under different rules to everybody else?”

6.25 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The planning policy that you have referred to would relate to building developments rather than transport schemes, which follow different rules usually set out by the Government’s Department for Transport.

However, I can assure you that we have followed appropriate guidance and policy regarding the development of our transport schemes in the city, and especially the city centre.

For the city’s largest scheme, Valley Gardens, appropriate environmental assessments have done for all three phases. The most recent assessment, for Phase 3, is set out in a Review of Environmental Impacts, which can be found on our website. As has been said many times now, as the designs for this project are developed further during the detailed design stage, we will ensure that if anything changes with respect to air quality, then we will address those impacts.

The council regularly assesses and reports on its air quality levels and already has an Ultra-Low Emission Zone in North Street and continues to work very closely with public transport operators to support the introduction of cleaner and quieter vehicles across the city that will not only support improving air quality, but also support the aim of becoming carbon neutral by 2030”.

6.26 On behalf of Martin Christie, Daniel Nathan asked the following supplementary question:

“You say the council regularly assesses air quality levels so you must be aware it is at illegal levels throughout much of the city centre and a proper and thorough EIA is a priority whatever the rules dictate. The ULEZ does cover North Street that is notoriously one of the most polluted streets in the UK almost entirely caused by 200 plus bus journeys an hour almost entirely caused by the narrowing of the road in 2014. You say you work closely with the Go-Ahead group, a private transport company with a poor record of providing value for money to train and bus passengers and ignore the views of residents and the city’s leisure, hospitality and independent business sectors. If the rumoured consultation for VG3 is under way that is good. If all is involved is deciding where the street furniture going, arranged the deckchairs honesty Titanic comes to mind”.

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

**(iv) Madeira Drive Road Closure**

6.28 Ian Ross put the following question:

“The road closure on Madeira Drive has provided lots of additional safe space for walking and exercise and is always busy. We have used one local cafe (Jumble Rumble Golf Cafe) daily for the last 6 weeks and there is always a queue of customers. There is plenty of road parking on Marine Parade, which is always empty. Will the Chair consider extending the road closure for the rest of the year, since it provides crucial exercising space for local residents to use (whilst following social distancing) without the risk of road traffic accidents?”

6.29 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The closure of Madeira Drive was always taken as an urgent temporary measure to provide more walking and cycling for local residents. While this has been a big success it was always going to be reviewed as clearly, when businesses begin to open as that will have an effect on the closure. This is why the issue around reopening Madeira Drive is included in a later report at this committee meeting for a decision on the way forward”.

**(v) Walking and Cycling in Kemptown**

6.30 Martin Farley put the following question:

"The Lockdown since March 2020 has had a very negative impact on shops, bars, restaurants and other traders in Kemptown. The Government's Emergency Active Travel Fund requires the council to introduce swift and meaningful measures to make it safer for cyclists and pedestrians, to be implemented within 8 weeks. What proposals are being urgently developed to give local businesses a boost by allowing people to walk and cycle in Kemptown in a fully or partly pedestrianised environment so that people are attracted to the area, especially in the local shopping centres of St James Street and St George's Road?"

6.31 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I am delighted to say that urgent measures to widen the footway along St James Street have now been completed. They provide more space for people to move around on a busy shopping street and offer some opportunities for businesses. Reviewing the area, it is clear that many people use the very busy bus services that operate through St James Street and this has to be considered in any further decisions about this location. A further report about other temporary meaningful measures will be discussed later in today's agenda and a further update will be presented to this committee in September”.

6.32 Martin Farley asked the following supplementary question:

“If the funding being provided by the emergency active travel fund requires action within eight weeks how does that waiting for the report make use of that funding?”

6.33 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“Firstly, we don’t actually have access to that funding yet Mr Farley. We have bid to government and we are waiting and hopefully will hear something by the end of the month. But we are going to be drawing up plans and a programme to look at parts of Kemptown to see what we can do to support business opening whether that is widening footways or cycling provision it is very much open and flexible at the moment”.

**(vi) 20mph Limits**

6.34 Jonny Anstead put the following question:

“Low vehicle speeds are critical to safety, but also to enabling walking and cycling and independent movement for children. Under Covid that’s more important than ever. In my neighbourhood the 20mph limit isn’t observed or enforced. Freshfield Rd is dangerously fast and with no decent crossing my 11-year old finds it impossible to cross alone.

Sussex Police admit under FOI that they don’t enforce the limit, having issued just 3 penalties since 2013 on 20mph roads. Their policy is for street design to encourage self-enforcement.

What measures is the council taking to create a low speed culture in Brighton & Hove?”

6.35 The Chair provided the following reply:

“In 2013 B&HCC (Brighton & Hove City Council) began a phased introduction of 20 mph speed limits across the City. As part of that work B&HCC worked closely with Sussex Police to ensure those roads that were selected met the relevant criteria and were self-enforcing with the introduction of additional 20 mph signs and road markings.

Therefore, I can confirm that all 20mph streets are fully legally compliant under Traffic legislation to enable the Police to enforce these mandatory speed restrictions.

I can also inform you that all road collisions are investigated in partnership with Sussex Police and in incidences where speed is a common causal factor in collisions the Council will explore options to introduce further physical measures to reduce speed.

You may also be aware that during this period of lock down, although traffic numbers have greatly reduced nationally and locally, a consequence has been an increase in the average speeds of vehicles - which is of concern. In order to help tackle this issue I have asked Officers to introduce 10 new mobile vehicle activated speed warning signs that will be periodically moved to locations where we are aware of speeding issues. In addition, I share your concern that the 20 mph markings have over time become worn and less effective, I have therefore also asked Officers to begin repainting all the 20 mph markings across the city. As well as physical measures, B&HCC is a member of the Sussex Safer Road Partnership (SSRP) whose members include East and West Sussex County Councils, Sussex Police and Fire and Rescue services. The aim of the SSRP is to combine skills and resources to deliver education and marketing campaigns to improve road safety such as the Share the Road, Share the Responsibility campaign which focuses on encouraging all road users to use the road responsibly and within the law.

I will also be writing to Sussex Police regarding what further steps can be taken in terms of enforcement and further opportunities for joint working on education and promotion in relation to reducing vehicle speeds.

In relation to your concern on speeding vehicles on Freshfield Road I will ask Officers to look into this and respond to you directly”.

6.36 Jonny Anstead asked the following supplementary question:

“I mentioned an example of Freshfield Road where the 20mph limit is not complied with and many children need to cross to get to Saint Luke’s and other local schools and other older residents across into the bus stop. The council committed to deal with this back in late 2013 following a campaign by local residents, but nearly nothing has been done to make things safer. Can I ask for a new safer crossing and making sure the 20mph limit is adhered to whether as part of the emergency measures for Covid or otherwise?”

6.37 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“Request for crossings do come to the ETS committee and we do look at the criteria and the priority and the issues that impact the need for a crossing such as accidents and vehicle speed. It is something we can look at and reassess. Freshfield Road is within the 20 miles an hour speed limit zone. I certainly will be taking this up with Sussex safer partnership and local traffic police. As the Chair pointed out all of the streets and all of the zones in the 20 miles an hour zone are legally compliant and should be enforceable by the police. I take the point about issue about the police and their own policy, but the designed traffic legislation it is legally enforceable we will be having that discussion to ensure that we are working jointly to ensure that speed limits are enforced”.

## **(C) DEPUTATIONS**

### **(i) Low Traffic Neighbourhood**

6.38 The Committee received a Deputation requesting a pilot of a Low Traffic Neighbourhood in the Hanover area.

6.39 The Chair provided the following response:

“The introduction of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in the city are an interesting development and I can see that they can provide real benefits in the city. The council has been developing an Interim Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) that has been developed in response to the impact on the city from the pandemic and we will be discussing this in a specific Report later on this evening. This plan identifies the strategic walking and cycling routes and has begun to develop routes in the city and refers to Low Traffic Neighbourhoods as a possible complementary measure to support these. This plan will lead onto a full LCWIP that will be subject to consultation in the. and we will need to look very closely at how we can review residential areas in the city to see whether low traffic neighbourhoods could work and where we can achieve maximum benefit by reducing through traffic, and therefore help link areas and also create pleasant walking and cycling routes away from major roads at limited cost”.

6.40 Councillor West thanked residents for making their deputation and noted that his Group had formally submitted a proposal on the matter later in the agenda that he hoped would gain support and be taken forward.

- 6.41 Councillor Wares stated that he did not believe the committee needed to wait for the outcome of the amendment. Councillor Wares stated that the residents had made their views clear and the committee should be supportive of that. Councillor Wares added that there would be a benefit to understanding the impact of these types of measures in beyond the Covid transport measures undertaken.
- 6.42 Councillor Wares moved a motion to request an officer report on the matters detailed in the deputation.
- 6.43 Councillor West formally seconded the motion.
- 6.44 The Chair put the motion to the vote that was agreed.
- 6.45 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive an officer report responding to the matters raised within the Deputation.

**(ii) Francis Street Safety issues**

- 6.46 The Chair stated that due to the similarity in topics, the question submitted by Councillor Shanks and the deputation would be taken together and a joint response issued.
- 6.47 Councillor Shanks read the following question:

"In June 2017 the issue of Francis Street was discussed at ETS. The issues followed the development of the Open Market by Hyde Housing including blocks of flats on Francis Street. The Barrows and Corola Court flats. The following improvements were agreed.

A -a raised entry treatment at the entry to Francis Street from Ditchling Road to improve the pedestrian route and reduce excessive driver speeds

B -changes to the amount and provision of tactile paving at the junctions of London Road and Ditchling Road with Francis Street;

C -an Access Only restriction so that no driver can pass from one end of the street to the other without having a legitimate purpose to be in the street;

D -using planters, maintained by residents, to help 'green' the street and help protect pedestrian areas outside homes;

E -a change in parking controls to a restricted zone where there is no loading and no waiting except in signed bays;

F -additional bollards on the southern side of Francis Street near Ditchling Road and at its junction with London Road to protect pedestrian movements;

G -the slight relocation and replacement of damaged street lighting column;

H -removal of redundant road markings at the junction of Francis Street/London Road; and

I -a left turn ban (except for cyclists) sign from London Road into Francis Street."

None of this has been done. When I became a councillor, I contacted both Hyde and council officers and after some discussion as to where the drawings were, I felt something would happen. However, nothing has, hence my current question.

Will the council listen to residents and implement the agreed proposals above, and review the possibility of blocking the end of the street including modal filters so it cannot be

used as a rat run and will improve the street for residents who have no outside space in their flats. This would be in line with the LCWIP proposals to improve walking and cycling in the city and in line with the Covid 19 transport response”.

6.48 The Committee considered a deputation requesting that the previously agreed safety measures for Francis Street be implemented as a matter of urgency.

6.49 The Chair provided the following joint response:

“Thank you for presenting your deputation today and also for your question Councillor Shanks. I can fully understand your concerns about the safety of people using the street and your disappointment that these measures have not been completed since being agreed by committee. I therefore must apologise that they have taken so long to be delivered. A lot of work has been done jointly with Hyde’s engineers on finalising the designs and drawings, but I do accept that this has taken far longer than expected on this occasion.

More recently, the officer who was leading this work has left the council and this has regrettably added more delay, which we need to address. Officers are now reviewing how we can reallocate our resources to deliver these measures, given the much more recent need to also prioritise our Covid-19 recovery programme, which we had not planned for.

Officers have advised me that they will be reviewing what is needed within the next few weeks, as they need to plan it around staff availability and other works. Once this has been confirmed, I will ensure that we communicate to everybody what will be happening and when it will happen in order that we can finally create a more liveable and people-friendly environment in this busy part of the city.

I have noted the suggestion about blocking the street to traffic, but this is unlikely to be possible as residents and the Open Market traders will still need to reach their properties as it is the main access for them, and CityClean will also need to empty bins too. This is why the agreed measures also include an Access Only restriction to reduce the use of the street by through traffic”.

6.50 Councillor West stated that this was not the first occasion where the committee had agreed a course of action and it had not been implemented by officers. Councillor West stated that considerable problems had been caused by the redevelopment of the market with no mitigating measures for residents and a more thorough solution was required than additional signage as the matter had become a considerable safety concern.

6.51 Councillor Wares stated that it was very unfair on residents for the committee to agree a course of action in response to their considerable concerns and that action not be undertaken. Councillor Wares stated that the matter must now be treated as a priority action by officers.

6.52 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Deputation.

### **(iii) Seafront Signage**

6.53 The Committee considered a deputation that requested the installation of No Cycling signage on the on the Lower Promenade between the Peace Statue and the ramp by the Artists' Quarter to ensure social distancing was adhered to.

6.54 The Chair provided the following response:

“The council has installed a series of additional signage along the seafront, including the lower promenade since the start of lockdown and more residents and visitors have chosen to walk and cycle. This has included mobile variable message signs, high impact floor signage, stencilling and banners to promote safe physical distancing as well as to encourage cyclists and pedestrians to share the responsibility and approach to road safety in shared public spaces. Additional signage is still being installed at various locations and a full review is planned as part of the implementation of the proposed A259 cycle route improvements, subject to approval at this committee. The scope of the review will also include the lower promenade across Brighton and Hove seafront and so thank you for sharing your views which will be considered thoroughly as part of this process”.

6.55 Councillor Lloyd stated his agreement with the comments made in the deputation adding that even before the pandemic, the area was inappropriate as a shared cycle and pedestrian space.

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

## **7 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

### **(B) WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

#### **(i) 20mph Limits**

7.1 Councillor Davis put the following question:

“The 20mph speed limit has been an emotive subject but nobody can deny that slower moving vehicles lead to less serious injuries and a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists.

This month TFL have introduced a blanket 20mph speed limit to their central streets alongside and an enforcement team to further enhance city centres and so my question is, would this administration consider following suit and rolling out a city wide 20mph speed limit?”

7.2 The Chair provided the following reply:

“As you are aware there is already a comprehensive city-wide network of 20 mph speed limits of streets across the City and concentrated more so in the centre. And as you point out 20mph speed limits enhance the public safety for all pedestrians, those with mobility and sensory impairments, cyclists and other users of the streets.

Our current focus is on delivering the agreed COVID 19 action plan. The action plan will be under constant review and your suggestion to introduce a blanket 20mph speed limit has been noted for consideration as part of this process”.

7.3 Councillor Davis asked the following supplementary question:

“I feel more than ever we need to encourage our residents to choose active travel over vehicles and we need to protect them as well. And hopefully as we have seen some recovery from this pandemic, we need to harness this moment and use as an opportunity to further cement our commitment to protect the health and the well-being of our city. This committee gave is overwhelming support to a report into a car free city centre and a carbon neutral environment and that will only be positive to this endeavour. If you are unfortunate to fall from the first floor of a building you would hit the ground at roughly 19mph. If you bear in mind most vehicles tend to travel close to or slight over the speed limit to achieve 30mph you would have to fall from the fourth floor. The next time you are in a building high enough I would like you to examine the differences to give you a real idea of what I am saying. Pedestrians hit at 20 mph have a 90 per cent chance of living and at 30mph a 90 per cent chance of dying. Boroughs across London, and I know TfL is different, but they have speed detection. The limit is legally enforceable”.

7.4 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“I think with a very small exception, the majority of streets not only in the city centre but quite few residential areas are 20 miles per hour. In response to one of the earlier questions I did also point out all the streets where 20 miles per hour operates or other speed limits are all legally enforceable. We do rely upon the police to enforce speed limits in the city.

The chair has already acknowledged that I would be writing to the local police the local Brighton police force as well as the Sussex safer road partnerships to see if we can do a bit more to jointly enforce speed limits. It isn't about just layouts it is about the legislative powers around speed limits and the traffic regulation orders that also cover that.

So, the speedily limits are enforceable. There is a small exception that does not actually apply so some of the busy bus routes might be 30 miles per hour but the majority are already 20 miles per hour and in the you make the point that this will be again looked at as part of the car free city centre and the ultra-low Emission Zone reports that we will look at what other measures can be brought forward”.

## **(ii) Cityclean Modernisation Programme**

7.5 Councillor Wares put the following question:

“As it has not been included on today's agenda, come September it will be 8 months since this Committee has been updated on Cityclean's modernisation programme. The Administration recently entered into a secret deal with the unions and next month will the end of the two years we were told it would take to fix Cityclean. Clearly, the Administration are nowhere near fixing the problems and it seems are now reluctant to report to this Committee. Please would the Chair confirm that a comprehensive update report will be bought to 29th September 2020 ETS Committee for Members to scrutinise and question in a format as described in the Chair's letter dated 1st June 2020 to me”.

7.6 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I can confirm that a report on the City Environment Modernisation Programme will be presented to Committee on 29 September in the format described in the letter. This will include:

- Being clear on which projects form part of the Modernisation Programme as opposed to those activities that are business-as-usual
- Reviewing the project timescales for each relevant project in order to provide a percentage completion rate
- Providing a RAG status to the projects
- Highlighting key risks and dependencies

As has been reported to previous Committees, at the start of the Modernisation Programme, the scale of the challenge was unknown – we didn't know what we didn't know. As the work has progressed, further issues and improvements have been added to the Programme, and it is therefore fair to say we are not near the completion of what was initially described as a two-year programme. The improvements to reporting I described earlier will provide Members with a better indication of where modernisation is going.

It should be noted that over the last couple of months, progress has been significantly affected by the service's response to the Covid-19 pandemic. Project Officers were deployed to support the frontline delivery of services. As a result, much project work had to be deprioritised. Now colleagues have returned to work, Project Officers, in the main, have returned to their substantive duties”.

7.7 Councillor Wares asked the following supplementary question:

“Thank you very much Chair, I am very grateful for that commitment and I am sure that colleagues look forward to that report.

In your answer you said you didn't know what you didn't know. Do you not agree with me that the administration should know what is going on in all its departments?”

7.8 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“Certainly, as officers we will always endeavour ensure both the administration and other parties are kept briefed and as the chair has said we will be bringing an update to the future committee on the modernisation programme.

I would also add if any Members want briefings on particular items, they are always able to request those, and we would be happy to support them with that”.

### **(iii) Graffiti Strategy**

7.9 Councillor Wares put the following question:

“The graffiti strategy much lauded by the Administration was on the postponed 17th March 2020 agenda for Committee to consider. Since then it appears to have fallen off the radar, yet our city remains graffiti hell for our residents and visitors. Please could the Chair advise if the Administration's graffiti strategy has now been shelved”.

7.10 The Chair provided the following reply:

The Graffiti Reduction Strategy itself was agreed by Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee in November 2018. Since then, an action plan has been

developed and activities within it, delivered. This continues and the Strategy has not been shelved.

At March 2020 ETS Committee, officers were due to present the outcomes of a consultation regarding a new enforcement process requiring property owners to remove graffiti within an agreed timeframe. This will be presented to ETS Committee in 29 September 2020.

Although delivery has been affected by the services' Covid-19 response, progress in recent months includes:

- Refreshing the action plan, including adding in new activities and providing progress updates
- Increasing the resources to deal with graffiti including a new jet washer, a new van and another graffiti removal operative
- Increasing the number of Environmental Enforcement Officers to patrol the city; four Fixed Penalty Notices have been issued; two are proceeding to prosecution for non-payment
- Identifying further options for anti-graffiti coating
- Trialling a graffiti removal spray for volunteers to use

We are also working on a media campaign and planning a community clean-up day.

This will be targeted to a specific area of the city, involving council staff, businesses and residents. If this model is successful, we will extend this model to other areas”.

#### **(iv) Old Shoreham Road temporary cycle lanes**

7.11 Councillor Wares put the following question:

“The temporary cycle lanes in Old Shoreham Road have been in place since around the 11th May and have been much publicised. As of today, the cycle lanes would have been in use for six weeks. Please could the Chair provide daily usage data for each of the east and west bound lanes between Sackville Road and Hangleton Lane”.

7.12 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The temporary cycle lane on Old Shoreham Road has been introduced as part of the range of measures to provide Active Travel choices during the Covid19 pandemic. I can assure you that Officers will be introducing cycle counters on the new temporary section of the cycle lane in the coming weeks. I can also inform you that there are existing cycle counters that currently monitor the eastern end of the Old Shoreham Cycle route which will also help provide an overall picture of cycle levels and improved connectivity between the new temporary lane to the west and the old existing lane to the east. Officers will also be undertaking work to monitor all new temporary measures as part of the requirements to the funding the Council has received from central Government for introducing temporary active travel measures in light of the Covid crisis”.

7.13 Councillor Wares asked the following supplementary question:

“Off of the back of what you have said, am I right in saying since this was introduced and it was very welcome and needed and all the rest of it, the reality is as a council we have absolutely no idea how much it is being used? How traffic has changed or is there an idea how many cyclists are taken to using the space? Is that the bottom line to the answer you just gave me?”

7.14 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“As the Chair responded to the question Councillor Wares, we do have existing counters on the east end of the cycle lane at the Bhasvic to The Drive So at the moment we are currently looking at figures and we will be looking to supplement that with new counters on the west end. Currently officers have been dealing with the other Covid 19 measures and putting together bids for the emergency fund so we are quite busy, and we are reviewing the current data and will be able to report that back to next committee to you”.

**(v) Refuse collections**

7.15 Councillor Wares put the following question:

“We have two refuse rounds in Patcham and Hollingbury that constantly give rise to complaints. They include parts of Cuckmere Way and surrounding streets, Ladies Mile Road, Windmill View and all of the Mackie Park estate. These routes have been a problem for many years and have not improved during the last two years of Cityclean’s modernisation. Please could the Chair confirm precisely what the problems are, what is being done to fix them and when those solutions will be delivered. Please could the Chair confirm to residents when a missed collection will be a rare exception as opposed to a weekly norm”.

7.16 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The issues in Patcham and Hollingbury are caused by multiple factors, including vehicle issues, staff shortages and service disruption in other parts of the city.

In recent weeks, the service has been impacted by

- A large number of temporary staff (due to Covid 19); each time there is a change the crew has to learn new rounds which can cause delays
- The need to social distance as fewer people can be in the truck, which can cause delays
- Large volumes of domestic waste arising from lockdown meaning the crews must tip more frequently causing further delays

In the short term, as our staff start to return to work, we will be keeping on some of the temporary staff to help with catch up where needed

For the longer term the Modernisation Programme has been established to address these issues. In particular:

- investing in several new trucks to reduce the instance of vehicle breakdowns and all the associated issues. The number of vehicles off the road is already decreasing and this is having a positive impact on collections.
- reviewing current round structures and reconfiguring them to ensure operational health and safety, ensure the fair distribution of work, improve service delivery, increase recycling rates and become flexible to adapt to potential forthcoming legislative changes.
- improving the real-time information flow, including reports of missed work, through investing in technology across all parts of the service”.

7.17 Councillor Wares asked the following supplementary question:

“The reason why these areas are badly effected is because of the two rounds that they are actually on. Those rounds need restructuring urgently. We are not going to get back to somewhere we can have a regular and safe collection service, one that we know when we put the bins out, they will be taken away until those rounds are restructured. We all know that is the case we would really like to see something move forward on that and I hope you will be able to advise that somebody will make it a priority to look at these rounds, particularly in those two areas”.

7.18 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“Yes, absolutely we are actually looking at Hollingbury and Patcham and a couple of other pockets in the city right at the moment there are areas where at the end of the week because of the delays things fall off the end and it is the same roads that unfortunately get missed over and over again. I can only apologise to the residents. The key to it is the extra temporary crew and we are building new rounds now. Although I do appreciate it is not just to do with Covid 19. It is long standing problems and what we really need to do is a fundamental restructure across the totality and a very big piece of work the first step of which to get to that is new technology. We are moving ahead with that and we will be able to keep updating you and we realise we need to put the people in place for those residents who keep having their collections missed”.

**(vi) Carbon Neutral 2020**

7.19 Councillor Wares put the following question:

“The Administration at ETS frequently refers to initiatives that are helping towards the council being carbon neutral by 2030. However, we have no idea what the starting position is, what level of reduction an initiative provides (and how sustainable it is) and thus there is no means by which to track progress. Would the Chair agree to bringing a six-monthly report to ETS that details how carbon neutrality is being delivered through initiatives and allows Members and the public to see progress. Otherwise we just have meaningless noise and rhetoric that has no way of being substantiated”.

7.20 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I am happy to confirm that a new carbon neutral KPI has been developed for 2020/21 onwards, which P&R committee on 8th October will be asked to agree. This will monitor not only carbon dioxide emissions but also other greenhouse gases and will set the city a challenging science-based target of cutting emissions by 12.7% every year (from a 2017 baseline) to meet our 2030 carbon neutral target.

This will replace our current KPI which measures carbon dioxide emissions and is aligned to previous targets to 2050.

I agree that regular monitoring reports to Committee should be an important feature of the Carbon Neutral Plan to ensure that members and the public can see progress. And I am pleased that we are making some progress, we have the Interim Covid-19 Response Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan on the agenda today. I am also happy to feedback that last week Housing Committee approved a programme of up to 1,000

domestic solar PV array installations by 2023, with plans to increase this to 2,500 by 2026.

However, this is just a start, and we need to continue to challenge ourselves to do more. We will need to focus on scale, transformation and acceleration – ‘business as usual’ will not be enough. We also need to use the window of opportunity when we move into the Covid recovery phase to try and accelerate action to address the climate and nature crises.

The Carbon Neutral 2030 programme is overseen by a cross-party Member Working Group, which receives updates on projects in delivery and new initiatives in the pipeline. This group, along with other member working groups, has not been meeting since March due to the prioritisation of covid-19 response work pandemic, but I am pleased to report that we will start meeting again later this week”.

7.21 Councillor Wares asked the following supplementary question:

“Thank you very much Chair for that answer. My question was directed towards ETS agreed initiatives and it was whether or not you would agree to bring in a report on a six monthly basis to this committee so we can see what initiatives we are talking about and agreeing and how we think they should be implemented and working. That was the basis of the question”.

7.22 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“As the Chair said, the regular monitoring report to this committee should be a feature of how we deliver the carbon neutral programme particularly where decisions are required. So, where they are the function of ETS we absolutely will be bringing reports. The working group starting up again next week and that is something we can take back to the cross-party working group too”.

#### **(vii) Licensing Fees & Charges**

7.23 Councillor Wares put the following question:

“By reference to the reported decision of West Sussex County Council to waive licensing fees this year for cafes and restaurants and the like, perhaps such as pubs, to have tables and chairs on the pavement, would the Chair advise if she would support Brighton and Hove doing the same. Premises still have to apply for licences and officers need to agree but it would help many of our businesses as they recover from the pandemic”.

7.24 The Chair provided the following reply:

“As I’m sure you can appreciate the Council has acted swiftly to respond to the Government’s call to implement Emergency Active Travel Measures including Cycling and Walking Infrastructure that will also serve a dual purpose of supporting business opening through the gains in social distancing on pavements by temporarily reallocating road space to footways.

We will also be exploring further potential measures through the Safer High Streets programme to consider other measures to support businesses and the wider local economy. Whilst there is a significant income generation for management of outside

seating and A-boards that supports wider Council services, we will be considering the potential and impacts associated with waiving licensing fees this year”.

7.25 Councillor Wares asked the following supplementary question:

“Can you advise me when the decision to waive those fees will be announced?”

7.26 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“In terms of supporting businesses with the need to be able to spread out on pavements we have been discussing that with the sector, particularly in anticipation of the hospitality sector opening up at the beginning of July. We have provided the sector with opportunities to approach us with their proposals.

So, we will consider the fees issue as part of those proposals as they come forward. I think for each business they will have different requirements”.

**(viii) Potholes on Carden Hill**

7.27 Councillor Wares put the following question:

“Potholes on Carden Hill have been reported for months by councillors and residents. There are literally dozens of holes, some big and deep. The council is aware because most now have a white square sprayed around them. However, this is a main bus route and is becoming even more dangerous with vehicles swerving to miss the craters. At least the white paint helps highlight where they are, but please could the Chair ask highways officers to increase the priority for repairs before there is a nasty accident”.

7.28 The Chair provided the following reply:

“There has been a scheme in place since early April to repair the Potholes on Carden Hill, hence the paint marks, however it has proved to be a difficult location to work on due to it being on a busy bus route and the amount of parked cars that during lockdown we have been unable to move.

This requires that we will need to temporarily remove a considerable length of parking in this the road. We are hoping that within a few weeks’ lockdown restrictions will be further lifted enabling our contractors to safely access and complete our works, however we are continuing to monitor the situation and the state of the defects”.

7.29 Councillor Wares asked the following supplementary question:

“Please can you get on and get it fixed rather than it would appearing to be sort of a kick it down the road can answer which with respect I felt I got then”.

7.30 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“To give assurances to Councillor Wares I will be speaking to the contract manager tomorrow to make sure that work is expedited, and I hope to have rough type timescales when that work will be carried out. You should hear from me by the end of the week.”

**(ix) Temple Street**

7.31 Councillor Heley put the following question:

“In January, this committee voted in support of the closure of Temple Street. Whilst we understand the impacts that Covid-19 has had on officer workload, campaigners and councillors are frustrated by the lack of progress on this road. The pandemic has exacerbated the need for closure, with very narrow pavements making it difficult for social distancing and increased use of the road as a rat run. Is it possible to use an emergency TRO in order to quickly close Temple Street?”

7.32 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Emergency traffic orders can only be used in specific scenarios where there is an immediate risk to public safety such as a gas leak or a burst water main. They are not designed to be used to hurry in restrictions to avoid following due process and doing so could leave us open to legal challenge. We are aware that the residents in Temple Street are frustrated by the delay that has been caused to this scheme by the current COVID 19 situation. There will be an opportunity to review priorities within the Local Transport Plan (LTP) once the COVID 19 action plan has been delivered but until this time, many schemes on the current interim LTP programme have been put on temporary hold to release resources to address the emergency situation.

As an interim measure to address residents concerns about the speed of traffic in Temple Street, we have installed a mobile vehicle activated sign. It is hoped that this will help to modify driver behaviour but will also allow us the opportunity to collect data on the speed and volume of vehicles that will help once this scheme comes back online”.

7.33 Councillor Heley asked the following supplementary question:

“Campaigners have been told that the road will be included in the council’s streets for people as part of the Covid 19 recovery. Could you provide us with detail on this because we are struggling to get it and just a point that it would be good if the campaigners could have a bit more communication from officers. I think it’s very fronts trading note knowing the real hold up and it is difficult to understand why things take so long to happen for council and residents”.

7.34 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“I haven't heard about the streets for people campaign so I can't really answer that question unfortunately, Councillor Heley but I can give you assurance that we will be a bit more communicative and we will provide more updates about what is happening and when. We have been incredibly busy with the Covid-19 response. We have been as you know turning around bids and trying to deliver things as quickly as possible. We are really sorry about the delays to Temple Street and we really understand that residents are frustrated but we will be a better at communication and try and give you update as soon as we can”.

**(x) Committee meetings**

7.35 Councillor Heley put the following question:

“We have not had a full meeting of this committee since January, which means we have had 6 months with no opportunity to scrutinize the administration or to contribute in taking this city forward with progressive new policies in the policy areas of Environment, Transport and Sustainability. Why was the March meeting ‘postponed’ but never rearranged, and the May meeting ‘cancelled’?”

7.36 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The 17th March ETS committee was postponed due to the escalating Covid-19 public health crisis which meant it was not possible to hold the committee at that time but was then rearranged very quickly for the following week and did go ahead on 24th March as an Urgency Sub-Committee. Significant reports on the Local Transport Plan, Traffic Regulation Orders, the Bulky Waste Contract, and Brighton Bikeshare were considered at this committee.

The 5th May ETS committee was cancelled as officers were focussing efforts on responding to the Covid-19 outbreak, and there were no reports for decision due to be considered at this committee and therefore, a lack of business to convene a meeting”.

7.37 Councillor Heley asked the following supplementary question:

“I totally appreciate officers are very busy but for example why did Housing Committee meet but ET&S couldn't. I know housing officers are also very busy and further the next committee meeting is not scheduled until September. So will the Chair arrange for an extra ET&S meeting to take place before them then as we have so much to get through”.

7.38 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“As the chair said Councillor Heley, the reason committee was cancelled because there wasn't any business at that time. There is a period when we have to make a decision as to whether committee needs to be cancelled or not in terms of any additional items these the same principle applies. If there is business that is required where we need to make a decision and that business can't wait until a future committee, then the Chair can call either a special committee or an urgency sub-committee and that's a provision facility is available. So that's always the case and it continues to be the case. It will depend upon whether there is business and decisions that are required”.

**(xi) ULEZ**

7.39 Councillor Heley put the following question:

“The covid-19 pandemic has made the need to tackle air pollution more urgent. In October last year, myself and my Green Colleagues submitted a letter to this committee on the topic of implementing an Ultra-Low Emission Zone in the city, to which the Chair confirmed the council will explore. Please could we have an update on the progress of this?”

7.40 The Chair provided the following reply:

“As you know, the committee has since made a decision to also explore the feasibility of a car-free city centre by 2023, including how an Ultra-Low Emission Zone for private vehicles in the city centre can be part of the transition to this.

Officers are therefore progressing both these workstreams in a joined up and strategic way and are commissioning consultants to help with this as it will inform a major policy decision. A combined report on possible options for expanding the current Ultra-Low Emission Zone and the feasibility of introducing a car-free city centre is therefore planned to be presented to the November meeting of this committee”.

**(xii) Shelter Hall**

7.41 Councillor Heley put the following question:

“Like many of my colleagues, my inbox is full of concerns about the narrow path next to Shelter Hall on the A259, a popular passage for people cycling, walking and running along the seafront. Why is the council prioritising the building works of Shelter Hall over the provision of safe, socially distanced space for residents?”

7.42 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I can inform you that the project team have investigated options for opening up the shared space around the Shelter Hall to ease the pinch point and provide social distancing opportunities for walking and cycling. Unfortunately, as the shared space is also adjacent to the road works there is very little room to provide further space at this location as it’s important to ensure that members of the public are kept a safe distance from the works going on behind the hoarding and the roadworks progressing on the busy A259 junction with West Street.

Therefore, hoarding around Shelter Hall must remain in place until the contractor has completed the surfacing works on the upper promenade around the new structure. The project team is working hard to ensure that the upper promenade will be opened at the end of July/early August for both pedestrians and pedal cycles. The new road junction that provides better linkage for walking and cycling provision will also be completed by early August. Additional signage has been installed on both ends of the shared space asking people to slow down and maintain their distances. We are continually monitoring the situation and will keep you updated as things progress”.

**(xiii) Electric Vehicle Charging Points**

7.43 Councillor Heley put the following question:

“It has been great to see the rollout of Electric Vehicle charging points across the city in recent months, but I am frequently contacted by residents frustrated by the lack of dedicated parking bays next to the charging points. Will more dedicated bays be marked in the upcoming weeks and months?”

7.44 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The installation of 200 lamp post electric vehicle charge points together with dedicated electric vehicle recharging bays has been delayed by Covid 19, with just over 100 installed to date.

Work has now resumed, and 18 lamp post charger bays will be signed and lined as for dedicated electric vehicle charging only by the end of August.

Additionally, 44 fast charging bays will be advertised as dedicated electric vehicle recharging bays.

Any objections to these proposals for dedicated bays will be considered at September’s ETS Committee. We will continue to monitor charge point usage closely and any complaints from members of the public about them being blocked, advertising a change to dedicated recharging bays where required”.

#### **(xiv) Disabled Cycling Provision**

7.45 Councillor Heley put the following question:

“Organisations like Pedal People are doing great work in the city to make cycling more accessible. What specific examples can the council give of how they are actively including disabled cyclists (too often wrongly assumed to not be cycling themselves) in both the temporary and permanent plans to expand cycling provision in the city?”

7.46 The Chair provided the following reply:

“In terms of the temporary plans to expand the cycle network, we are allowing as much width in our designs as the existing streets will allow. For example, in Old Shoreham Road, much of the new cycle lanes are 3m wide and we have extended this for the remainder of the route as far as possible. There will also be further opportunities to review pinch points and junction layouts for all schemes if a decision is made to make them permanent at a later stage. Pedal People are also engaged in the Consultation process for the Interim and Full Local Walking & Cycling Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) that both include and Equalities Impact Assessment to ensure the needs of all users, including disabled cyclists, are incorporated into our plans.

In terms of other permanent schemes, the Parks Projects team is interested in working with Pedal People whom they understand are looking to develop longer-range bike-led experiences for those with dementia and their carers, as well as drop-in and try-out opportunities.

Stanmer Park has great potential to host visitors who are being supported by Pedal People and will welcome disabled and able-bodied cyclists. The city’s largest park offers an attractive and safe environment. The restoration project when completed will include:

- o Additional accessible toilet provision in a new welcome kiosk at the main park entrance, and in the historic Walled Garden, which is being developed into a public attraction including expertly designed gardens and a café, all with accessibility at the core;
- o It will also include an extension to the existing permissive bridleway as part of a wider Estate development of public trails designed for maximum access and enjoyment;
- o The project’s Activity Plan is providing staff and volunteer disability awareness training.
- o The project’s Activity Plan will also be funding a mobility scooter for visitor use”.

**(xv) Madeira Drive**

7.47 Councillor Lloyd put the following question:

“One of the few benefits of the Covid-19 crisis has been the welcome drop in unnecessary traffic across the city. We have all enjoyed the clean air, the peace, the clear night skies and roads that were safe for our children to cycle on. Sadly, the traffic has now returned, and the roads are once again polluted and unsafe. The closure of Madeira Drive was a welcome initiative and I know how many of our residents have enjoyed the traffic free space. Can we assume that Madeira Drive will remain a traffic free space from now on?”

7.48 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Madeira Drive has been temporarily closed in response to the current pandemic to provide a safe public space for residents to walk, cycle and exercise safely, it has also been identified in the Councils Urgent Transport Action Plan as a measure to prepare the city as it comes out of lockdown. The Madeira Drive temporary closure will continue to be assessed and any decision about its potential re-opening or future state will be made considering all its potential users, including residents, local businesses and visitors”.

7.49 Councillor Lloyd asked the following supplementary question:

“I am aware that Madeira Drive is creates a very high degree of parking revenue. So, what is administration’s approach to replacing that revenue bearing in mind it looks like it is going to remain close and what will happen to the numerous car and motor bike rallies that park there in summer months?”

7.50 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“It is pretty fair to say the financial implications of the closure of Madeira Drive are detailed in the report that Councillor Pissaridou referred to as coming later. It is something that is quite apparent. Parking income does fund a lot of other transport measures so that is an issue we as a Council need to address and try and find a solution for. Given the current pandemic that is having an impact on all parking fees not just Madeira Drive. In terms of the events programme with government current restrictions and emerging restrictions on lockdown and social distancing I think some of these events are unlikely to take place at the foreseeable future, so we have not given great consideration to that. Currently Madeira Drive remains closed for the foreseeable future so events will not be the main focus for consideration of the Madeira Drive”.

**(xvi) Active Travel**

7.51 Councillor West put the following question:

“Two of the many important insights that lockdown has shown us are how many people could save a trip to the office through meeting virtually, and when traffic is tamed how encouraged people are to cycle.

To realise our ambition of the city becoming carbon neutral by 2030 we have to crack the stubborn carbon footprint of transport. And, I feel we will only achieve this if we prioritise reducing the need to travel, along with developing active travel and sustainable shared travel systems, over that of private vehicle use.

Will the administration support this sustainable transport hierarchy, and commit to developing Brighton & Hove as an exemplar Active Travel City?"

7.52 The Chair provided the following reply:

"I think we are already recognised for being at the forefront of delivering sustainable and active travel solutions for our residents. Our successful BikeShare scheme and our extended Access for Sustainable Growth are good examples of this. The pandemic has focused minds even more now and we are responding quickly to the opportunities that these challenging times are creating.

The development of our first Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan and our next Local Transport Plan will enable us to further ensure that we can provide people with sufficient choices and manage traffic and parking demands. I will ensure that we will take every opportunity to deliver a step-change and make cycling and walking the first choice for people's local journeys, wherever possible".

7.53 Councillor West asked the following supplementary question:

"While that sounds very encouraging Chair, and Covid does indeed actually give us an opportunity to stretch the opportunity of active travel, the LTP is a capital investment in infrastructure plan. The LCWIP is where we need to capture the idea of reducing the need to travel and then promoting active travel and shared travel over the car. That is the bit that I actually wish to see the Administration commit to. And when will you commit to making the LCWIP the guiding philosophy of LTP5?"

7.54 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

"As you know we have started the process for taking forward LTP5 with a number of officer member working groups to steer through the process for delivering our LTP5, and one of the fundamental principles would be to look at the hierarchy of travel, travel needs and certainly looking at the needs to travel into the office and looking at alternative forms of work, whether they be at home or other places in remote locations would be part of the thinking on that".

## **(xvii) Litter**

7.55 Councillor West put the following question:

"With Boris prematurely easing lock down, Brighton & Hove has seen visitors flock to our beaches and into our parks. With Covid far from under control, and infections rising once again, residents are rightly worried about the safety of so many visitors failing to maintain social distancing. Seafront bars opening for takeaway food and drink, have been ill equipped to properly serve all their customer's needs, with public urination and littering rife. We appreciate the Council have requested visitors to stay away and endeavoured to control numbers accessing the beach, while also reopening public loos and most recently raised the fine for littering. However, with uncertainty surrounding

holidays abroad and in the UK this summer, this season may be remembered as the summer of day-trippers.

While the city won't be able to stop people visiting, it can plan to cope better than it has so far with meeting the challenge. What concerted action is the administration taking to work with the hospitality businesses to help them take responsibility in providing more staff training, bins, loos and customer signage to reinforce good behaviour? And similarly, what extra resources are being put into council services to provide more bins, cleansing, pop up loos, and communications. Together we can better protect our beaches and parks from being spoiled and the image of the city tarnished. Is the administration leading a city-wide and cross departmental strategic response?"

7.56 The Chair provided the following reply:

"We have a dedicated team of Street Cleansing operatives who focus on keeping the beach and seafront areas clean and free of litter. In the summer, we supplement this with an additional 20 staff.

Current provision to keep the beach and seafront clean includes:

- 46 large, 1100 litre litter bins which we put out temporarily each summer
- 300 triple bins, with recycling facilities; these are very closely spaced so beach goers will always have a bin in easy reach. If one of the bins is full, there is another nearby.
- regular social media messages reminding people to take litter home and to keep the beach clean.

The impact of Covid-19 on maintaining the beach, as well as other areas of the city, has been significant.

During lockdown, only 40-50% of Street Cleansing operatives have been at work. In the early stages of lockdown, this was manageable as footfall within the city was significantly lower. However, as the good weather has returned, bringing with it an upsurge in beach use, pre-pandemic anti-social and anti-environmental behaviour also returned.

Normally, we have more than 100 volunteer litter picks a year which makes a very big difference. These went on hold when lockdown started but I am pleased to say that a few Clean-ups have been done by community groups in recent weeks. We have now developed appropriate guidance for these to be extended further.

The Environmental Enforcement Service was suspended during the initial stage of lockdown, meaning the deterrent of a littering fine disappeared. The service has now been fully re-introduced and we are taking on 3 extra enforcement staff and extending the service hours into the early evening. The staff already work 7 days a week.

Moving forward, we have a cross-departmental approach in place:

The Seafront Team has placed seven pop-up toilets and a urinal in central seafront locations.

Communications will be increasing the number of media stories and social media posts relating to looking after the beach and disposing of waste responsibly.

Cityclean, Communications and the Seafront Team are installing new signage along the seafront to remind people to bin their waste or risk receiving a £150 fine for littering.

This is being installed along the seafront today and similar signs are being developed for parks, the city centre and other littering and fly-tipping hotspots. A new fly tipping hotline has been introduced this week and will be publicised later in the week.

The Licensing Team has written to traders to remind them of their responsibilities in relation to doing extra litter picking, in the vicinity of their businesses and not leaving out serviettes, straws etc.

Cityclean will be facilitating volunteering and Tidy Up Team requests.

Cityclean, Sustainability, Economic Development, the Seafront Team and Licensing will be working with Surfers Against Sewerage and businesses on the seafront to ensure waste is managed responsibly. This work started last year.

This will include getting businesses involved to reduce litter on the seafront, reducing single use plastics, exploring opportunities to use licencing terms for changes to single use plastics. Exploring the option of a pledge and/or recognition scheme for businesses that manage waste generated by them and their customers. This will be complemented with an improved communications approach, including how businesses can help with messages to the public”.

7.57 Councillor West asked the following supplementary question:

“What I am hearing are all good initiatives and I am very glad in particular to hear that the beach cleans will be starting again because I am one of the members of the tidy up team and I have been a regular off and on at the Deans beach cleans around Rottingdean and Ovingdean which are very good events.

What I am not really hearing there is a proper joined up strategic approach. Where is this all owned?”

7.58 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“Yes, we can produce written strategies although I would like to reassure Councillor West that we are taking a strategic approach in relation to the current situation. We have an events and economy working group working very closely with hospitality sector, very closely with the seafront team and the refuse teams and the whole community to ensure that we are thinking about a strategic approach to what is happening in terms of the seafront trading on the sea front and reopening of businesses as we ease the lockdown restrictions.

So, for me I think the importance is the joined-up approach right now. I'm not sure that producing more documents is necessarily going to achieve that the in the short-term. But we always take your feedback on board Councillor, thank you”.

## **(C) LETTERS**

### **(i) Tree Planting on Glebe Villas**

7.59 The Committee considered a letter from Cllrs Nemeth and Peltzer Dunn that requested the usual tree-planting fee to be honoured in lieu of any revised figure and that a survey to be undertaken as a matter of urgency so that tree planting could take place on Glebe Villas in the autumn.

7.60 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your letter, it is good to read about the public’s enthusiasm for street tree planting in Glebe Villas. I understand that you have spoken with the arboricultural manager who has agreed to come and survey the Glebe Villas in mid-July. Until the survey has been done, we will not know if the road is suitable for planting, but we will

advise when the survey is complete. As you may already be aware, we have to locate the underground services that will run under the pavement before deciding if a road is suitable, this is in addition to the more obvious things that can be seen on the surface. For this reason, tree planting surveys are time consuming.

We will be getting additional staff to speed up this process going forward as there is a great deal of interest in street tree planting at the moment.

We cannot use the standard tree donation figure for street tree planting although occasionally it is appropriate for example when planting in a grass verge, however planting into hard surfaces is far more expensive. Due to the level of concern about disruption to the pavement surfaces, which is a very real problem in the city, street trees will only be planted in properly formed tree planting pits which costs a lot more than the standard donation fee and could not be covered from existing budgets. Street tree planting costs are also very variable so need to be dealt with on a tree by tree basis. We are experiencing a very high loss of street trees this year due to elm disease so need to make the most of any offers to replace them. For this reason, I have asked the arboricultural manager to ensure that this particular street survey goes ahead as planned although I have asked the arboricultural manager to concentrate on the current efforts to contain elm disease as the consequences of losing control will be devastating to our street trees”.

7.61 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Letter.

**(ii) Patcham Roundabout**

7.62 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillor Wares that expressed disappointment in the delays to the re-design of Patcham Roundabout and lack of briefings to Patcham ward councillors on the plans. The Letter formally requested these briefings be provided and all correspondence between the Council and Highways England be shared. Councillor Wares noted that the offer of a briefing had been provided the previous day so a response from the Chair was not necessary. However, given the delays previously experienced, he hoped that a date for the briefing would be confirmed as soon as possible so he did not have to bring the matter to committee for the sixth time.

7.63 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Letter.

**(iii) Springfield Road Trees**

7.64 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillor Heley requesting the planting of replacement street trees on Springfield Road.

7.65 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your letter and great to see both the public and ward members enthusiasm for street trees. I understand that on the site visit the arboriculturist made it clear that the trees could not be replanted in the way that the existing trees are planted, jutting out into the highway with no form of vehicle protection to protect the trees and avoid damage to residents cars. Subsequently to this the arboricultural manager has advised that in his opinion the only safe way to plant the trees would be to construct build outs into the road which could impact on traffic flow or on available parking.

I have asked officers to explore the feasibility and potential costs of creating build outs. This is not always straight forward as underground infrastructure, how the road has been constructed and repaired over time can impact on the ability and costs of building on the road.

If it leads to a reduction in parking spaces, we will also need to consult more widely with residents who will have fewer parking spaces available to them.

I am sorry that it has taken officers some time to get back to residents and ward members on this matter. We will progress this as soon as we can with a view to trying to have the information for residents prior to this autumn's planting season so that they have time to fund raise as necessary to meet the costs. However please be aware that the arboricultural team are having to give absolute priority to tackling Dutch Elm Disease to try to prevent the spread and lose more trees and their ability to take this forward may be impacted by this".

7.66 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Letter.

**(iv) Carden Woods and Tree Planting & Biodiversity Notice of Motion**

7.67 The Chair stated that due to the similarity in topics, the Letter submitted on Carden Woods and the Notice of Motion received on Tree Planting & Biodiversity would be taken together and a joint response issued.

7.68 The Committee considered a Letter received from Councillors McNair and Theobald requesting the committee to re-affirm its commitment to tree planting in Carden Woods.

7.69 The Committee considered a Notice of Motion submitted by the Conservative Group that asked the Committee to delegate authority to the Executive Director to produce plans and details to enable and subsequently engage in local public consultation on proposals for the planting of 8,000 trees, the extension of controlled grazing of chalk grassland and the creation of bee banks and biodiversity on the slopes above Carden Park. Furthermore, that subject to the outcome of that public consultation and agreement of Patcham Ward councillors, procure and implement the necessary works and planting to deliver the scheme.

7.70 The Committee expressed their full support for the proposals outlined in the Letter and Notice of Motion.

7.71 The Chair provided the following response:

"Thank you, Councillors for your contributions, this scheme has my whole-hearted support, I had hoped that we would be looking at a range of schemes but as this one is far more advanced than others, I have asked officers to prioritise this one. I am determined to start to see large quantities of trees planted in the City this winter. Although the current pressures of elm disease on top of all the issues of Covid 19 are stretching resources, we need to get some new trees in if we are going to avoid declining tree cover in the city and make real progress towards a carbon neutral city".

7.72 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Letter and agree to undertake the actions requested in the Notice of Motion.

**(v) School Streets**

- 7.73 The Committee considered a Letter submitted by Councillors Davis and West requesting the roll-out of a School Streets programme ahead of the Autumn term restart to assist with safety, space and social distancing requirements outside schools.
- 7.74 Several committee members expressed support for the proposal and hoped it could begin as soon as possible.
- 7.75 The Chair provided the following response:

“I agree that the idea of School Streets is a very useful policy that I fully support. School Streets programmes improve safety and air quality around school gates and deliver additional benefits for residents who live near school sites by reducing noise and congestion in their street. Concerns about road safety are a barrier to choosing active and sustainable modes and we know from the experience of other authorities that more pupils are likely to be allowed to walk or cycle where School Streets Schemes are in place.

However, I am also aware that before we get there, we need to follow the right process to make this work and also consider the capacity of officer and financial resources to deliver another huge work programme during the Covid 19 Pandemic.

So, in response to the key points in your letter there are three strands to School Streets that the council needs to consider. These are taster days, permanent road closures and emergency road closures in response to the Covid-19 pandemic.

The 21 January 2020 ETS Committee agreed a set of School Streets site selection criteria based on the Hackney Toolkit and approved the principle of revenue funding for one 0.6 full time equivalent officer post to project manage one pilot permanent closure in 2020-21. Members agreed that ‘gateway’ criteria for either a taster or permanent closure should be the support of a school’s head and board of governors.

An officer led one day taster closure as part of the Access Grant funded programme was also approved by the 21 January ETS to coincide with Car Free Day on 22 September 2020.

In May 2020 the Sussex Air Quality Partnership’s successful bid for a grant from Department for the Environment and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) has secured funding for two further one day taster closures. These will be delivered by Sustrans with the support of council officers, meaning there is now funding for three one day taster closures in total. In response to the Covid-19 crisis, the schools which were interested in one day closures have asked to postpone these until the spring or summer terms of 2021. Heads are more focused on organising premises and feel preparation for worthwhile events to mark a one-day closure will require more time than the two weeks between opening on 7 September and Car Free day on 22 September will allow.

The Covid-19 crisis and the debate about schools reopening have increased calls for further emergency road closures to assist with social distancing outside the school gate. At the moment it is not clear what the government’s guidance will be by September, but we recognise that concerns will remain for staff, students, parents and carers regardless of government advice.

Lead in times for emergency road closures can be lengthy due to the need for local consultation with affected residents and often it may not be possible to implement a scheme depending on the complexity of the road layout next to the school.

Officers are therefore investigating alternatives to full closures to create wider pavement spaces such as traffic order and parking suspensions which would provide additional pavement space for social distancing without a full road closure. This would require a full audit of all sites before the end of term, plus buy in from schools and site staff for suspensions from September and may need to use volunteer marshals to be run successfully.

Camera enforcement is currently not a legal option for local authorities outside London, so physical barriers and signage are the only options available to authorities in the rest of the UK. In May 2020 the SCRIF capital funding agreed for this scheme was suspended. A decision on its future will be made in July by the Policy and Resources committee.

However, to remind you what we are already doing, The Safer Routes to School Scheme has run in Brighton and Hove for the last 20 years, delivering engineering solutions and addressing perceptions of safety risks in school communities and amongst residents. This has included and continues to do so by introducing;

- safer crossing points
- refuges
- build outs,
- parking controls,
- signage,
- Lighting and other measures in response to casualty data on walking and cycling.

So, until we have full support from head teachers and clarity on social distancing arrangements for schools as well as available officer resources we cannot embark on a city wide programme of delivering School Streets but will be constantly looking for opportunities to take forward specific schemes, be they temporary or permanent”.

7.76 Councillor West expressed his disappointment with the response provided that he felt made excuses for not taking action that was necessary and urgent.

7.77 The Chair noted that the issue was covered in an amendment proposed for later in the agenda and could be discussed by the committee at that point.

7.78 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Letter.

**(vi) SUP Litter**

7.79 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillors Clare and Mac Cafferty that noted the increase in single-use plastic litter on the seafront and the damage it caused and requested that several actions be undertaken to combat the rise.

7.80 The Chair provided the following response:

“I too share your concerns about the exceptionally high amounts of seafront litter in recent weeks. This is an unprecedented situation linked to the pandemic and other popular visitor destinations across the country are suffering in the same way. It is very sad that some people are not more responsible with their rubbish  
In addition to the challenges that you highlight in your letter during lockdown, only 40-50% of Street Cleansing operatives were at work due to Covid 19. In the early stages of lockdown, this was manageable as footfall within the city was significantly lower.

However, as the good weather has returned, bringing with it an upsurge in beach use, pre-pandemic anti-social and anti-environmental behaviour also returned. Every year, we employ an additional 20 seasonal staff who focus on keeping the beach and seafront areas clean and free of litter. These staff have been recruited and some started work last week. We also increase bin provision in the busier months and this year have added 46 large, 1100 litre bins along the seafront, to supplement the 300 new triple-recycling bins we rolled out during the winter months. There is now greater bin capacity along the seafront than there has ever been before and facilities to allow recycling.

The Environmental Enforcement Service was suspended at the start of lockdown, but they are now fully operational, and we are recruiting 3 additional staff who will work into the early evening. 2 of these staff have already started. New signage to deter littering and to warn people of the £150 fine is being placed along the seafront today. We are intending to roll out similar signage elsewhere in the city and in our parks.

Normally, we have more than 100 volunteer litter picks a year which makes a very big difference. These were on hold at the beginning of lockdown, but I am pleased to say that some community groups have recently recommenced beach clean ups and we have put in place appropriate arrangements for these to start again more widely.

The Communications Team has published several media stories and social media posts relating to looking after the beach and disposing of waste responsibly and explaining what the implications are if this is not followed. We are developing a broader media campaign about keeping our city clean.

We really appreciate the approach from Surfers Against Sewerage who were already working with the seafront team, city clean and businesses last year to try to encourage traders to end the use of single use plastics on the seafront.

Moving forward, I am pleased to let you know that a new working group has been established with several council services represented including:

- Cityclean
- The Sustainability Team
- Economic Development
- The Seafront Team
- Licensing

They will be working with Surfers Against Sewerage on the suggestions within your letter with Surfers Against Sewerage, including:

- Working with seafront businesses to develop a pledge/charter for businesses to sign up to, committing them and their customers to manage their waste responsibly. This could be rolled out more widely once developed.
- Identifying ways for businesses to reduce the use of single use plastics such as exploring use of alternatives and/or a deposit return scheme. We are investigating the introduction of a workable Vegeware utensils collection for seafront businesses so that all seafront businesses can invest in using this as an alternative to the throw-away food and drink packaging they currently use.
- Exploring opportunities to use licencing terms for changes to single use plastics.
- This officer group will review how other local authorities have reduced the use of single use plastic.

The first meeting with Surfers Against Sewerage with officers is tomorrow when we will be suggesting that we develop a joint action and will find out if SAS have any additional ideas. The way to tackle these issues is certainly through collaboration.

In terms of the council's work on reducing the use of single use plastic more generally this has become strategically embedded through the development of a Circular Economy Framework for the City to help inform changes in council procurement policy. We require service providers to evidence the minimum use of single-use plastics and use of reusable alternatives where possible through service delivery and purchasing decisions. The Circular Economy working group is particularly focussing on working with the construction industry and food to try to encourage reuse of all materials wherever feasible.

The elimination of single-use plastics across council buildings is on-going. The use of disposable plastic cups has ended, and many services have audited their purchasing and eliminated the use of Single Use Plastic wherever possible, Reusable options to replace the previous disposable anti-bacterial wipes was rolled out across council building towards the end of 2019. As staff return to council buildings the use of reusables will be further promoted to encourage staff to keep using sustainable alternatives and to ensure single-use plastics are kept out of the workplace.

The outdoor events team have been working over the past year to support event organisers in adopting sustainable practice across city events and eliminating their use of single-use plastics. Key policy documents have been updated to reflect the on-going work of the team in supporting these measures. These include updates to the Events Charter, Sustainable Commitment Form and new Environmental Impact Assessment".

7.81 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Letter.

**(vii) Domestic Air Quality**

7.82 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillor Osborne that set out various issues that contributed to poor air quality and requested that the committee commission a report covering a number of issues that could address this.

7.83 The Chair provided the following response:

I am sure that you and the committee will be reassured to know that I have requested officers undertake a comprehensive review of air quality which will result in a report coming to this committee towards the end of this year. We will also make sure that the outcomes of that work are reported to other relevant boards and committees.

The work will review our Air Quality Management Areas and make recommendations for any changes, and a new Air Quality Action Plan with appropriate and deliverable measures will be developed for consultation and approval. I am sure that this work will have the right emphasis on particulates, and that it will consider the issues that you have raised in your letter where it can.

The Government is also taking steps to deal with this national problem in its 2019 Clean Air Strategy and is updating the Clean Air Act to modernise smoke control legislation for local authorities. It also recognises the need to meet World Health Organisation guidelines for particulates. Issues related to the wider aspects of air quality in terms of environmental protection in the UK is likely to change with the new Environment Bill that is being developed. Central government does recognise that councils have an essential role to play by leading specific and locally appropriate responses and driving innovation.

The Bill provides additional powers and flexibilities for councils to deliver action, and we look forward to being able to use these in the future.”

7.84 Councillor West and Councillor Wares expressed their support for the proposals made by Councillor Osborne in his Letter and the very concise way complex information had been presented.

7.85 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Letter.

#### **(D) NOTICES OF MOTION**

##### **(i) Environmental Impact Assessment and Traffic Modelling**

7.86 Councillor Wares moved the following motion on behalf of the Conservative Group:

This Committee agrees to request the Executive Director Economy, Environment & Culture: -

1. To commission and undertake a full environmental impact assessment (including air quality assessment) and full comprehensive traffic modelling assessment (including traffic displacement and bus congestion impact analysis for North Street and Old Steine) over the project areas known as Valley Gardens 3 and Duke's Mound including the A259 and Madeira Drive. The assessments to consider the areas as if they were one; and
2. Report back the results of those assessments for further consideration by this Committee at the earliest opportunity.

7.87 Introducing the motion, Councillor Wares noted that the committee had previously been informed that funding deadlines for the Valley Gardens scheme could not be extended however, the recent announcement on the extension of the deadline had disproven that. Councillor Wares stated that he believed there was little understanding of the impact the changes relating to Valley Gardens Phase would have on the surrounding areas. The extension to funding for the scheme now provided opportunity to the assessments that should have been carried out at the scheme inception.

7.88 Councillor Brown formally seconded the motion and stated that it was imperative to have a greater understanding of traffic movement and air pollution relating to the changes at Valley Gardens so the council could meet its carbon neutrality ambitions.

7.89 The Chair provided the following response:

“Following your detailed and very similar question at Full Council in January, I did provide you with a written response that addressed these matters.

This Notice of Motion also seems remarkably similar to the one Councillor Miller presented at Full Council on the 24 October 2019, which was not supported.

I will therefore repeat what I have previously explained or written in response to Member's representations, and those from other people, about these issues.

The Valley Gardens Phase 3 project was properly screened for environmental assessment and there is a technical note available on the council's website about it.

This will provide reassurance that that potential impacts are not expected to be significant and cause harm. We will continue to review these matters throughout the next design stage and will monitor them during and after construction. If that review or monitoring identifies anything that changes from what we already know or expect, then we will take appropriate action immediately as we would with any other project. Sufficient traffic modelling has also been done to enable us to begin the detailed design stage for Valley Gardens Phase 3.

The planning application for the Black Rock site works, which included the Duke's Mound junctions, has now been considered and agreed by the Planning Committee. Information about transport and many other important issues such as the environmental ones were part of that process, and the committee will have taken this into account when making its decision".

- 7.90 Councillor Davis noted that the matter had been raised at committee a number of times and it was clear that the scheme had been properly screened for an environmental impact assessment and this matter would be continually reviewed. Two air quality monitors would be placed in the area that would be a further measure to monitor air quality. Councillor Davis stated that it was clear that to meet carbon neutrality targets, traffic would have to decrease, and more sustainable methods of transport promoted and supported.
- 7.91 Councillor Fowler stated that it was highly unusual for alteration to an existing city centre traffic centre to justify a full environmental impact assessment and the council were not building a new road on a green belt site. Councillor Fowler added that comprehensive measures were in place to monitor the scheme and changes could be made to the detailed design if negative impacts were discovered. Councillor Fowler explained that personally, she was looking forward to the development of a new green space to enjoy in the heart of the city.
- 7.92 Councillor Wares stated that he believed the Phase 3 scheme to represent an enormous risk to the economy of the city and he would not support that. Councillor Wares stated his view that no comprehensive analysis had been undertaken aside a few sentences in a consultant report. Councillor Wares noted that similar measure undertaken in North Street had caused a huge increase in pollution and he found it likely this scheme would do exactly the same.

7.93 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Motion.

**(ii) Active Travel Infrastructure**

- 7.94 Councillor Heley moved an amended motion on behalf of the Green Group. The changes to the originally published version are shown in bold italics below:

"This committee notes that the Covid-19 pandemic has highlighted the importance of active travel and has emphasised the need to quickly improve infrastructure to allow for safe walking and cycling.

Walking and cycling have become popular and safe ways to travel during this period of social distancing. The other benefits of improving air quality, promoting health and wellbeing, and helping our city become carbon-neutral by 2030 highlight the urgency of

building adequate infrastructure and re-allocating road space for the benefit of active travel users and for the climate.

Therefore, this committee;

- 1) Notes the importance of Brighton and Hove City council providing the infrastructure for active travel, in order to encourage walking and cycling
- 2) Requests that this committee begins the necessary processes to **review** ~~ensure~~ all temporary measures taken as part of the ~~Covid-19 emergency travel plan~~ **Urgent Response Transport Action Plan** ~~and with emergency funding from the Government, will work to ensure work begins to take these forward as bring these proposals forward~~ as permanent measures, subject to **work undertaken to identify the funding required and** an Equality Impact Assessment.

Further;

- 3) That in considering proposals, the council takes into consideration all necessary statutory consultation, particularly in order to ensure any changes to road layouts meet high accessibility standards, so that changes to the road layout are clearly identifiable to all users

7.95 Introducing the motion, Councillor Heley stated that it should not have taken a global pandemic to provide opportunity to residents to walk and cycle on roads. Councillor Heley stated that the Council needed to expand existing infrastructure to allow more people to travel rather than focus on behaviour change without providing safe ways of doing so.

Councillor Heley added that the evidence was clear that where there are cycle lanes there are more cyclists where there is more space for pedestrians there are more people on foot and the motion proposed a sensible way to make permanent the temporary measures brought in.

7.96 Councillor Davis formally seconded the motion and stated that with the reduction in traffic during the pandemic, there was a window of opportunity to make real changes in the residents navigate the city. Councillor Davis stated that if the council's ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030 was critical and investment in permanent active travel infrastructure would go a long way in reaching that ambition.

7.97 The Chair provided the following response:

"Each member of this committee, and all of our colleagues, will fully recognise the importance and benefits of active travel in addressing a number of city-wide issues, including improving air quality, promoting health and wellbeing and helping our city become carbon neutral by 2030. These challenges, and the opportunities to address them by delivering active travel infrastructure, are recognised within many of our plans and strategies – our Corporate Plan, our City Plan, our Local Transport Plan and our joint Health & Wellbeing Strategy.

That recognition has now been heightened because of the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic, and we have moved quickly with positive decisions at a number of committees in recent weeks, to ensure that transport is a key part of our recovery

programme. The report that we will be considering later on this agenda about an Interim Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan clearly sets out how we can respond further to the Covid-19 pandemic. It explains that any temporary measures put in place in the city are evidence-based and strategically planned. The measures themselves are detailed in the Urgent Response Transport Action Plan within that report with recommendations that we will be considering today. They are ambitious because we need to make a difference to people's lives and the city by locking in the benefits that the lockdown period has presented to us.

The suitability of retaining temporary measures in the longer term will need more work and evidence to assess them such as the public feedback we receive about them, the monitoring of their effectiveness, consultation with the local community, and their deliverability and cost.

Any measures taken forward will be subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment, which will consider the needs of those with protected characteristics including those with disabilities. The council has already, as part of the Interim LCWIP work, engaged with groups representing walking, cycling, equalities and accessibility, including Possibility People. Any measures taken forward will also follow guidance and best practice and be subject to necessary statutory consultation and other legal processes.

We do welcome the additional funding that the government has made available to us to introduce these measures; the indicative allocation was one of the highest in the country. I am confident that our first application to the government's Emergency Active Travel Fund will be successful, and that we will be able to demonstrate that we can do more in the second application round when we know more about it".

7.98 Councillor West welcomed the motion and stated that proper investment was required to encourage people to walk and to cycle to meet the council's carbon neutral 2030 target. Councillor West stated that residents who had benefitted from the temporary measures put in place during the pandemic needed assurance that the council would consult on the matter and make those measures permanent where supported.

7.99 Councillor Wilkinson stated his support for the motion and that interim Covid-19 response local cycling walking infrastructure plan report later in the agenda was a significant and exciting first step towards transforming active travel in the city.

7.100 Councillor Wares stated that his Group would not be supporting the motion and the reasons for that would be raised in the later discussion of the interim Covid-19 LCWIP report.

7.101 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee agree to undertake the request of the Notice of Motion.

## **8 BRIGHTON MARINA TO RIVER ADUR FLOOD AND COASTAL EROSION RISK MANAGEMENT (FCERM) SCHEME - DETAILED DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS**

8.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee recommends to the Policy and Resources Committee that it:

Delegates authority to the Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture to take all steps necessary to procure and award the detailed design contract required for the implementation of the Brighton Marina to River Adur FCERM scheme.

## 9 BTN BIKESHARE REPROCUREMENT AND IN-HOUSE OPTIONS

9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set Bikeshare scheme reprocurement options following approval to do so at the meeting of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee Urgency Sub-Committee meeting of 24 March 2020.

9.2 Councillor Wares moved a joint Conservative Group and Green Group motion as shown in bold italics and strikethrough below:

That the Committee:

2.1 ~~Grants delegated authority to the Executive Director to procure and award a new concession contract to operate a mixed fleet of pedal, pedelec (e-bikes) and e-scooters in the city from March 2022~~

2.2 ~~Notes that if~~ Following the preparation of a financial model, **that would detail the extent of any potential** prior to the commencement of the procurement, Council funding is required to subsidise the contract, a further report will be brought to this Committee **seeking permission to procure and award a new concession contract with delegated authority based on the prepared financial model.**

2.3 **Agrees that this report will provide further detail on the modelling and business case underpinning the in-house and alternative delivery vehicle (e.g. CIC) options, including any updates in the availability of suitable premises space, or spare capacity to deliver aspects of the project 'in-house,' should this be necessary in future.**

9.3 Introducing the motion, Councillor Wares explained that whilst he was agreement with the majority of the proposals made within the report, it was absolutely necessary for the committee to see and approve a full business case before proceeding and that was precisely what the motion sought to do.

9.4 Councillor West formally seconded the motion stating that he agreed that it was necessary to see the full information for all options before agreeing a preferred option. Councillor West stated that each option required detailed modelling based on evidence, so that conclusions and recommendations could be properly drawn to inform Members decision. The report before the committee did not do that and in his view, rested heavily on frankly unsubstantiated opinion. Councillor West stated that he was very disappointed with the report recommendations. Substantial investment was in e-bikes to widen their reach across the Greater Brighton region so it could meet its potential as a form of public transport.

- 9.5 Councillor Brown agreed with statements made adding that it would be an error by the committee to agree to awarding a new contract based on information from a 2014 business case.
- 9.6 Councillor Wares stated that the issue was a complex one, mainly relating to the fact the LEP had assessed the 2014 business case as not fit for purpose and the council had entered into a poor contract that effectively realised a subsidised scheme. On that basis, Councillor Wares deemed it essential that the committee receive and agree a full business case for the re-procurement of the contract.
- 9.7 Councillor Wilkinson stated his full support for the Bikeshare scheme and the benefits to public health adding that there was a fine balance between making the scheme attractive and affordable. Councillor Wilkinson agreed that it was important for the committee to receive a full business case and on that basis, he would be supporting the motion. Councillor Wilkinson stated his support for the expansion of the Bikeshare scheme, particularly in deprived socio-economic areas where choices on car ownership and access to public transport was more limited.
- 9.8 Councillor Lloyd supported the comments made by Councillor Wilkinson adding that the increase roll-out of e-bikes was a necessity given the topography of Brighton & Hove.
- 9.9 The Chair then put the motion to the vote that passed.
- 9.10 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to the vote that were agreed.
- 9.11 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee:
- 1) Agrees in principle to delegating authority to the Executive Director to procure and award a new concession contract to operate a mixed fleet of pedal, pedelec (e-bikes) and e-scooters in the city from March 2022
  - 2) Following the preparation of a financial model, that would detail the extent of any potential Council funding required to subsidise the contract, a further report will be brought to this Committee seeking permission to procure and award a new concession contract with delegated authority based on the prepared financial model.
  - 3) Agrees that this report will provide further detail on the modelling and business case underpinning the in-house and alternative delivery vehicle (e.g. CIC) options, including any updates in the availability of suitable premises space, or spare capacity to deliver aspects of the project 'in-house,' should this be necessary in future.

## 10 PARKING FEES & CHARGES 20/21 TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

- 10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out written objections to the proposal to set a new charge of £50 for the annual resident visitor permit in event / matchday parking schemes.

- 10.2 Councillor Brown stated she did not agree with the increased fees and charges. Councillor Brown cited the large increases to park in the Laine's and Regency Square and asked for the reasoning behind the increases.
- 10.3 The Head of Parking Services explained that the price increase related to a rise in demand and met the council's objectives relating to traffic management and air quality.
- 10.4 Councillor Wares stated that his Group had been consistent in refusing to accept large increases in parking charges, particularly those permit charges that would hurt those on the lowest of incomes in the city. Councillor Wares explained that his Group would be voting against the recommendations.
- 10.5 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approves the following Traffic Regulation amendment Orders (as outlined in more detail in para 3.3);
- 1) Brighton & Hove (Off-Street Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2019 Amendment No.\* 202\* (TRO-4a-2020)
  - 2) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2018 Amendment Order No.\* 202\* (TRO-4b-2020)
  - 3) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2018 Amendment No.\* 202\* (TRO-4c-2020)
  - 4) Brighton & Hove Seafront (Various Restrictions) Consolidation Order 2018 Amendment No.\* 202\* (TRO-4d-2020)
  - 5) Brighton & Hove (Coldean & Moulsecocomb) (Event Days) Parking Order 2013 Amendment Order No\* 202\* (TRO-4e-2020)

## 11 PARKING SCHEME UPDATE REPORT

- 11.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided an update on the progress of recent resident parking scheme consultations. Further, the report requested approval of Traffic Regulation Orders for the Coombe Road area in regard to resident parking scheme and an area outside the recently introduced Hove Park resident parking scheme in relation to parking restrictions.
- 11.2 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments, agrees to proceed to the next stage of the detailed design for the Surrenden Road Area Parking Consultation. This will consist of a consultation to the whole area on a light touch parking scheme Monday to Friday.
  - 2) That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments, agrees that the following Traffic Regulation Orders are approved and the Coombe Road area (Zone U) proceeds to the implementation stage:-

BRIGHTON & HOVE VARIOUS CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES  
CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2018 AMENDMENT ORDER 202\* (TRO-6A-2020)

BRIGHTON & HOVE OUTER AREAS (WAITING, LOADING AND PARKING) AND  
CYCLE LANES CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2018 AMENDMENT ORDER NO.\*  
202\* (TRO-6B-2020)

- 3) That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments, agrees that the following Traffic Regulation Order is approved on the displacement of vehicles from the Hove Park scheme proceeds to the implementation stage:-

BRIGHTON AND HOVE OUTER AREAS (WAITING, LOADING AND PARKING)  
AND CYCLE LANES CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2018 AMENDMENT ORDER  
NO.\*202\* (TRO – 1 – 2020)

- 4) That the Committee note that no changes are being proposed to Zones B (Coldean) & D (Moulsecoomb).

## 12 INTERIM COVID-19 RESPONSE LOCAL CYCLING & WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN.

- 12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that responded to the decision at the 14 May 2020 Policy & Resources Urgency Sub-Committee that an Interim Covid-19 Response Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) [Interim LCWIP] be produced for review by the committee. The report was in addition to ongoing development of a wider LCWIP document. The report also responded to the statutory guidance issued by government on 9 May 2020 in which local authorities are urged to consider how towns and cities can do what is necessary to ensure transport networks support recovery from the Covid-19 emergency and provide a lasting legacy of sustainable, safer transport; as well as the announcement from government on 28 May 2020 for the provision of the Emergency Active Travel Fund (EATF).
- 12.2 On behalf of the Green Group, Councillor West moved a motion to amend the report recommendations as shown in bold italics below:

### ***2.2 Agree that the recommendations at paragraphs 8.1 to 8.26 of Appendix 2 be amended and that further paragraphs 8.27- 8.29 be added to this list as follows:***

- 8.2. To monitor the impact of the temporary cycle lanes on Old Shoreham Road and gather evidence for a future decision on keeping or removing the cycle lanes. ***Commit to extend the temporary cycle lane to the West Sussex boundary in anticipation of West Sussex bringing forward proposals to link up. Continue to monitor what West Sussex County Council proposes for the Old Shoreham Road.*** The future decision on keeping or removing these cycle lanes will be brought to the September ETS Committee.

- 8.18. Commit to implementing ~~To continue to work on~~ a programme for School Streets in the city, **to support safe reopening of all primary and nursery schools**, subject to feasibility in highway terms. ~~adequate budget and staff resource availability from the council, and support/agreement from the schools to be involved.~~
- 8.26. To note the proposals for increased cycle parking and BikeShare hubs. **To support increased cycling, especially commuting, urgently make available temporary cycle parking by deploying and securing railings and gates (as often provided by event organisers).**
- 8.27 To develop a pilot Local Traffic Neighbourhood as requested in the Hanover Action Deputation.**
- 8.28. To implement an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order to allow full or partial closure of Trafalgar Street following engagement with local businesses.**
- 8.29. Establish an informal cross-party member liaison group to give oversight of the emergency funding bids and implementation of temporary highway and transport measures. This will also aid wider partner engagement.**
- 2.3** Agree the recommendations contained in Section 8 (8.1 – ~~8.26~~ **8.29**) of the updated Urgent Response Transport Action Plan (included as Appendix 2 to this report); as the delivery plan for measures identified in the Interim Covid-19 Response Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan; and to give delegated authority to the Executive Director Economy, Environment and Culture to take all steps necessary to deliver these recommendations.
- 2.4** Note that the schemes included in the recommendations contained in Section (8.1 – ~~8.26~~ **8.29**) of the updated Urgent Response Transport Action Plan (included as Appendix 2 to this report) are all subject to securing appropriate levels of external funding to support delivery, principally the government's Emergency Active Travel Fund.
- 2.5** Agree that officers will bring a report which reviews the progress of the Urgent Response Transport Action Plan to the September meeting of the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee.
- 2.6** Agree that the proposed approach to significantly increasing provision of cycle parking within the city will be included as part of the main Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan process, as set out in paragraph 3.8 of this report.
- 12.3 Introducing the motion, Councillor West stated that it was intended as a measure to make long-term the urgent measures undertaken to prioritise pedestrian and cyclist movement across the city. Councillor West stated that it was essential to encourage active travel on the commuter links in the city and that included the A259 and Old Shoreham Road. The motion also proposed essential work that could be taken in residential areas specifically, Low Traffic Neighbourhoods that was a matter brought to the committee by residents earlier in the meeting.

- 12.4 Councillor Lloyd formally seconded the motion and stated that residents across the city were asking for traffic calming measures in their areas and the motion was an opportunity to deliver that.
- 12.5 Councillor Wares asked why the traders and residents had not been listened to regarding the re-opening of Madeira Drive. Further, Councillor West noted that there had been an objection to the removal of the taxi rank on St James's Street by the taxi trade and local traders and asked what response had been provided to that. Councillor Wares explained that the council had received many complaints from Blue Badge holders stating that their concerns and issues were not being considered. Councillor Wares noted that the committee had received correspondence from a North Portslade and South Portslade ward councillor relating to their residents objections to the Old Shoreham Road cycle lane and asked whether that view was shared by the remaining councillors for that area of which the Chair was one.
- 12.6 The Chair stated that she was concerned about the implication of the cycle lane for North Portslade residents.
- 12.7 The Head of Traffic Management explained that the taxi rank needed to be removed quickly to meet government guidance. Conversations with the taxi trade about the potential siting of a rank would begin in the coming days. The interim plan had been discussed with traders and the plans amended as a result of that feedback and that dialogue would continue. In relation to disabled bays, there were initial problems relating to their closure however, many had been put back, most as they originally were.
- 12.8 Councillor Wares stated that he would not be supporting the recommendations or Green Group motion that he deemed to be a trojan horse approach to enforcing permanent transport measures upon the residents of the city that they did not support. Councillor Wares stated that unpopular, untested measures were being brought in and were being hijacked into permanent measures. Councillor Wares noted that there were projects and groups already in existence looking at all of the measures proposed, and these should be allowed to finish, and any permanency agreed through a proper democratic process that would involve consulting with residents first. Councillor Wares stated that the committee should listen to residents and traders and re-open Madeira Drive immediately.
- 12.9 Councillor Lloyd stated that the views of businesses and traders should be taken very seriously however, there were examples in Brighton and many other places where the reduction of traffic has transformed city centres and residential areas, boosting businesses and the same time.
- 12.10 Councillor Brown stated that whilst there aspects of the report such as school streets that were welcome, she had grave concerns about many aspects of the report, especially the impact of the temporary cycle lane on Old Shoreham Road as it was a major arterial route in the city. Councillor Brown stated that the cycle lane was too wide that led to cars using the bike lane to undercut traffic and did not appear well used by cyclists.
- 12.11 Councillor Wilkinson stated his support for the report that met the urgent need to deliver enhanced walking and cycling measures in the city and would put the council in a good

position to secure the further funding the government would be making available for such measures. Councillor Wilkinson stated that it was vitally important to make active travel measures available, especially for shorter journeys in the city but it was not a given these would become permanent. Councillor Wilkinson explained that the pandemic meant that public transport would not be able to operate at full capacity for some time therefore, it was vital to increase sustainable transport options so as to avoid a large increase in car travel and worsening air quality because of it.

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

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

12.14 **RESOLVED-** That the committee:

- 1) Agree the findings of the Interim Covid-19 Response Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (included as Appendix 1 to this report) as an independent analysis of options which provides a strategic overview for delivering further walking and cycling measures during the Covid-19 recovery period;
- 2) Agree that the recommendations at paragraphs 8.1 to 8.26 of Appendix 2 be amended and that further paragraphs 8.27- 8.29 be added to this list as follows:
  - 8.2. To monitor the impact of the temporary cycle lanes on Old Shoreham Road and gather evidence for a future decision on keeping or removing the cycle lanes. Commit to extend the temporary cycle lane to the West Sussex boundary in anticipation of West Sussex bringing forward proposals to link up. The future decision on keeping or removing these cycle lanes will be brought to the September ETS Committee.
  - 8.18. Commit to implementing a programme for School Streets in the city, to support safe reopening of all primary and nursery schools, subject to feasibility in highway terms.
  - 8.26. To note the proposals for increased cycle parking and BikeShare hubs. To support increased cycling, especially commuting, urgently make available temporary cycle parking by deploying and securing railings and gates (as often provided by event organisers).
  - 8.27 To develop a pilot Local Traffic Neighbourhood as requested in the Hanover Action Deputation.
  - 8.28. To implement an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order to allow full or partial closure of Trafalgar Street following engagement with local businesses.
  - 8.29. Establish an informal cross-party member liaison group to give oversight of the emergency funding bids and implementation of temporary highway and transport measures. This will also aid wider partner engagement.
- 3) Agree the recommendations contained in Section 8 (8.1 –8.29) of the updated Urgent Response Transport Action Plan (included as Appendix 2 to this report); as the delivery

plan for measures identified in the Interim Covid-19 Response Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan; and to give delegated authority to the Executive Director Economy, Environment and Culture to take all steps necessary to deliver these recommendations.

- 4) Note that the schemes included in the recommendations contained in Section (8.1 – 8.29) of the updated Urgent Response Transport Action Plan (included as Appendix 2 to this report) are all subject to securing appropriate levels of external funding to support delivery, principally the government's Emergency Active Travel Fund.
- 5) Agree that officers will bring a report which reviews the progress of the Urgent Response Transport Action Plan to the September meeting of the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee.
- 6) Agree that the proposed approach to significantly increasing provision of cycle parking within the city will be included as part of the main Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan process, as set out in paragraph 3.8 of this report.

### **13 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

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

The meeting concluded at 10.00pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of