

**WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

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

The following written questions have been received from Members:

**(1) Councillor Wares- Stanmer Village parking**

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

**(2) Councillor Wares- Old Shoreham Road**

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

**(3) Councillor Wares- Transport Partnership**

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

**(4) Councillor Wares- Task & Finish Groups**

Over a month ago we raised with Executive Officers concern that the task and finish groups overseeing the LCWIP, Valley Gardens Phase 3 and Stanmer Park had all long expired in being legitimate and permissible groups under the Constitution. None were renewed after six months and all are now over a year old which is Constitutionally prohibited. We were advised that the issue would be resolved with reference back to Committee. Please could the Chair confirm that

the three task and finish groups are now disbanded and invalid and advise when Committee will review and decide on alternative arrangements for the future, if any.

**(5) Councillor Wares- Urgency Powers**

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

**(6) Councillor Wares- CCTV**

With the evolving success of using CCTV to combat fly-tipping, would it be possible for the Cityclean to consider focussing on council estates. Many estates have communal bin areas that are targeted by others that dump their waste in or around the bin areas. It may be that in collaboration with the Housing department, CCTV equipment could be procured so that it remains dedicated to supporting just council estates.