

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

4.00pm 10 JULY 2012

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Davey (Chair)

Also in attendance: Councillor Follett (Deputy Chair), Cox (Opposition Spokesperson), Janio, Mitchell, Phillips, Robins, Summers, G Theobald and West

Other Members present: Councillors Hawtree, Jarrett, Jones, Wakefield

PART ONE

1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

1(a) Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

- 1.1 Councillor Robins disclosed that his employer was referred to on page 115 of the agenda however, he was unsure as to the new regulations on interests.
- 1.2 The Acting Assistant Head of Law clarified that the rules on declarations of interests had recently changed and that the new Code of Conduct for Brighton & Hove would come into force on 19th July. In the period between 1st and 19th July, Members were required to declare Disclosable Pecuniary Interests not already included in the register of interests (as defined in the Disclosable Pecuniary Interests Regulations) only. This reference was not a DPI under the new rules.

1(b) 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 100I(1) of the Act).
- 1.4 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting.

2. CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

2.1 The Committee considered a report of the Monitoring Officer that provided information on the committee's Terms of Reference and related matters including the appointment of its urgency sub-committee.

2.2 RESOLVED-

1. That the committee's terms of reference, as set out in Appendix A to the report, be noted.
2. That the establishment of an Urgency Sub-Committee consisting of the Chair of the Committee and two other Members (nominated in accordance with the scheme for the allocation of seats for committees), to exercise its powers in relation to matters of urgency, on which it is necessary to make a decision before the next ordinary meeting of the Committee be approved.

3. MINUTES- FOR INFORMATION

3.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous Environment, Transport and Sustainability Cabinet Member Meetings held on 27 March and 4 May be noted.

4. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 In his communications, the Chair welcomed Members to the first Transport Committee. He explained that Transport issues represented some of the biggest challenges in the city and balanced the needs of residents, visitors and businesses alike. Some of these issues would be difficult and challenging but they also represented an opportunity for change. He added that he looked forward to working with the other Members of the Committee in finding the best outcomes for the City's needs.

5. CALL OVER

5.1 **RESOLVED-** That all items on the agenda be reserved for discussion.

6. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

6.1 Clare Tikly presented a petition signed by 421 people requesting the introduction of 20mph speed limits on the roads around St Ann's Well Gardens, Hove.

6.2 Councillor Davey provided the following response:

"Thank you for presenting this petition. Proposals for rolling out 20mph speed limits across the city over the next four years were agreed at the Cabinet Member Meeting on 4 May.

I am pleased to confirm that these proposals are currently being consulted on. The consultation continues until 10 August and we welcome comments and hope residents will take part in this process.

The first phase of this scheme includes the area around St Anne's Well Gardens and I can reassure you that all the streets that you mention are included.

Once the consultation is completed, it is expected that we can start implementing the first phase this financial year".

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

7. ISSUES RAISED BY MEMBERS

7b Written Questions from Councillors

7b(i) Councillor Cox- Poets' Corner

7b(i).1 Councillor Cox presented a letter regarding concerns from local residents about Poets' Corner being used as a cut through road.

7b(i).2 Councillor Davey presented the following response:

'Thank you for your question. The layout of this junction was changed in 2008 to bring the pedestrian crossing facilities up to standard in order to make it easier and safer to cross in all directions, particularly those going to and from the shops in Blatchington Road.

This has greatly improved the facilities and safety for pedestrians in the vicinity. Adding the traffic island in Blatchington Road has meant reducing traffic to one lane turning into Sackville Road. This has made journey times a little slower, although all traffic signals across the junctions are linked and coordinated so that north bound traffic leaving Blatchington Road goes through a green light when it reaches Sackville Road.

Of course we can't prevent some drivers choosing a different route to make their journey. But what we have done is introduce traffic calming measures and a 20mph speed limit in Poets Corner to discourage this and ensure drivers keep their speed down'.

7b(i).3 **RESOLVED-** That the Written Question be noted.

7b(ii) New England Road Railway Bridge- Councillor Mitchell

7b(ii).1 Councillor Mitchell presented a letter asking for clarification on action being taken in conjunction with Network Rail to improve the deteriorated condition of New England Bridge.

7b(ii).2 Councillor Davey presented the following response:

‘Thank you for your question Councillor. I can fully understand residents’ concerns about the unpleasant nature of the problem that has arisen because of the pigeon netting.

Council officers did take up this matter promptly with Network Rail earlier in the year, but despite two letters being sent, no response was received. A formal application has now been made to resolve this matter, and Network Rail has confirmed that it will inspect the site before the end of this month. It does have a duty to prevent problems like this and as soon as they have formally agreed to repair the pigeon netting, we will press them to do this at the earliest possible opportunity.

In the meantime, street cleansing by Cityclean has been taking place regularly and as part of this a ‘deep clean’ was in fact planned to take place during the last few days’.

7b(ii).3 Councillor Mitchell thanked Councillor Davey for his response and asked, if possible, that the overgrown shrubbery near to the bridge could be cut back.

7b(ii).4 **RESOLVED-** That the Written Question be noted.

7c Letters

7c(i) Doctors Parking Bay- Councillor Jones

7c(i).1 Councillor Jones presented a Letter requesting the installation of a single doctor parking bay outside The haven GP Practice.

7c(i).2 Councillor Davey provided the following response:

‘Thank you for your letter.

As you can appreciate in order for any changes to be made, the proposals need to be put to the public, in the form of a draft Traffic Order, followed by the correct signing and lining on site (or removal of them) if the proposals are approved. This requires substantial time and cost as we receive many such requests from all over the city.

Previously we have batched up these requests for advertising twice a year.

Unfortunately you are no doubt aware that there are national and local budget savings required given the current economic situation. As part of the 2012/13 budget implications, it was agreed at Full Budget Council that it was no longer possible in the future to carry out any more changes to parking restrictions outside of resident parking schemes under the Parking Infrastructure budget, with the exception of disabled bay requests.

We also need to consider the ongoing cost of maintenance for signing & lining and need to keep new proposals to a minimum. This is because there is no budget within Parking Infrastructure for additional maintenance and we already have a substantial amount of lining and signing throughout Brighton & Hove that we must support with the existing budget.

I’m afraid that although we realise the benefit of the doctor’s bay, we are unable to provide such additional measures across the city. However, if the Surgery could make a contribution to the work, the request may be viable and would be at a reduced amount than doing so commercially.’

7c(i).3 Councillor Jones thanked Councillor Davey for the proposal which he would relay back to his resident.

7c(i).4 **RESOLVED-** That the Letter be noted.

7c(ii) Parking in Sudeley Terrace- Councillor Mitchell

7c(ii).1 Councillor Mitchell presented a Letter requesting more resident-only parking bays in the Sudeley Terrace area.

7c(ii).2 Councillor Davey provided the following response:

‘Last year officers did investigate Sudeley Terrace following the request to convert parking to resident only bays where they are currently shared Pay and Display. This was in response to a petition received at a previous meeting.

We do sympathise with the parking situation for residents in Sudeley Terrace, and understand their fears about potential parking pressures. However, in this particular case we do not feel it is appropriate to make changes to the bays in this road.

The two main reasons are because there are concerns about displacement as visitors are likely to park in the next roads along on shared bays creating the same problem and because the Council also has to consider the needs of all users in the area and ensure an adequate amount of visitor parking for the hospital within easy walking distance.

Residents can park in shared bays so there are still opportunities on-street, although we are happy to re-visit the situation at a later stage once the hospital development is complete’.

7c(ii).3 **RESOLVED-** That the Letter be noted.

8. INTRODUCTION TO TRANSPORT COMMITTEE- PRESENTATION

8.1 The Committee considered a verbal presentation from the Strategic Director, Place that included suggested key issues & Work Programme Priorities.

8.2 Councillor Cox asked what costs the Council incurred in submitting bids for European Union (EU) funding.

8.3 The Strategic Director, Place replied that he would have to research this more fully but that he believed that the resource from every bid surpassed expenditure.

8.4 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the verbal presentation.

9. RICHMOND HEIGHTS AND CANNING STREET RESIDENT PARKING SCHEMES - FORMAL TRO CONSULTATION RESULTS

- 9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that addressed comments and objections to the draft traffic regulation orders in relation to the proposed inclusion of Canning Street into the Area H resident parking scheme and the inclusion of Richmond Heights into the Area C resident parking scheme.
- 9.2 Councillor Theobald asked for the views of the relevant ward councillors for the areas as these were not contained within the agenda.
- 9.3 The Parking Infrastructure Manager confirmed that he had met with the relevant ward councillors and they had expressed their support for the proposals.
- 9.4 Councillor Theobald asked if ward councillors for Hanover & Elm Grove had also been contacted.
- 9.5 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that he had and they had also supported the proposals. Councillor Follett supplemented that he was one of the Councillors for Hanover & Elm Grove ward and he and the others, supported the proposals.
- 9.6 Councillor Mitchell expressed her support for the proposals and asked that officers monitor any displacement arising from the changes.
- 9.7 Councillor Janio enquired as to what was meant by 'subsequent requests' in recommendation 2.2.
- 9.8 The Parking Infrastructure Manager clarified that this would include, for example, requests for motorcycle bays and other types of support for residents.
- 9.9 **RESOLVED-**

1. That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following orders;

- (a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.* 20** (Areas C and H extensions) TRO-13a-2012
(b) Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.* 20** TRO-13b-2012
(c) Brighton & Hove (Various Roads) (One-Way Traffic) Order No.2 20** TRO-13c-2012

2. That any subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

10. BRIGHTON STATION GATEWAY PROGRESS REPORT

- 10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that outlined the results from recent feedback on design options for the Brighton Station Gateway project and sought a decision on the next steps in the process.
- 10.2 Councillor Robins noted that the consultation results had found that 64% of people walk to Brighton Station. He did not believe this figure to be accurate which in turn could impact upon the preferred design scheme.
- 10.3 The Project Manager clarified that he would provide the statistical information to Councillor Robins. These results were supported by the videos taken by the Transport team that demonstrated a greater percentage of people arriving at Brighton Station on foot. Furthermore, the design would not be based on these percentages alone but focussed on trends in the results.
- 10.4 Councillor Mitchell explained that she had several concerns about the project. She did not believe the consultation had been properly conducted as hard-copies had only been distributed to households within a walking distance which may have distorted the arrival results. Councillor Mitchell added that she did not believe any of designs would provide a difference. The city was growing and there needed to be bolder, longer term solution with serious consideration given to traffic interchange. Councillor Mitchell also had great concern that the Committee would have no influence over the design option on the preferred option for the final round of consultation in September. Councillor Mitchell stated her intention to abstain on a vote on the report.
- 10.5 Councillor Davey noted that the Transport team had experience many delays in there discussions with Network Rail and Southern Trains.
- 10.6 Councillor Follett stated that he understood Councillor Mitchell's concerns however; he believed the report was honest and clear and had taken a sensible approach by representing a combination of views.
- 10.7 Councillor West stated that he agreed with Councillor Mitchell's request for a bold approach. He was ward councillor for the area and felt there was a need for considerable change but it was necessary to trust officers to devise a reliable and innovative proposal. Councillor West gave London Victoria Station as an example of a bold approach to traffic interchange measures.
- 10.8 Councillor Janio expressed his fears for motorists who he believed had been negatively impacted by a succession of policies. He also felt that the proposals hinged upon the outcome of plans for cycle storage at the station. He asked if recommendation 2.2 could be amended so that the Committee could consider options further before going to the final stage of public consultation.

10.9 Councillor Theobald stated that he believed the traffic problems could be alleviated somewhat by addressing links from the Seven Dials area. He also the positioning of the bus stop was an extremely difficult issue.

10.10 Councillor Davey enquired as to the impact on the consultation process if a preferred option was brought back to Committee in October before going to a further round of public consultation.

10.11 The Project Manager clarified that this would add a month to two month delay to the process.

10.12 Councillor Davey moved an amendment to the recommendation 2.2 to read (shown in bold):

2.2 That Committee agrees that a preferred option should be developed drawing on feedback received **to date and that this is brought back to Committee for approval** prior to a further round of public consultation ~~to agree the final layout of the Brighton Station Gateway scheme.~~

10.13 Councillor Follett formally seconded the amendment.

10.14 **RESOLVED-**

1. That Committee notes the results of the recent public consultation on options for Brighton Station Gateway.
2. That Committee agrees that a preferred option should be developed drawing on feedback received to date and that this is brought back to Committee for approval prior to a further round of public consultation.

11. VALLEY GARDENS CONSULTATION & PROGRESS REPORT

11.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that provided a progress update on the delivery plan for the enhancement of Valley Gardens.

11.2 The Strategic Director, Place and the Acting Assistant Head of Law proposed that the Committee consider additional wording to recommendation 2.2 to read (shown in bold):

2.2 That Committee authorises officers to develop a draft design option(s) ahead of public consultation as set out in the main body of the report **and subsequently to bring a preferred and costed option(s) back to Committee for decision.**

11.3 The Chair and Committee agreed to the proposed amendment to recommendation 2.2.

11.4 Councillor Davey thanked officers for the report. He recommended that Members read the Public Realm analysis conducted particularly the information on the number of crossings in the area. Councillor Davey relayed that the Transport Model would be used on the project.

- 11.5 Councillor West noted that Valley Gardens was a central part of the city landscape that had effectively become a series of traffic islands. He welcomed improvements to the area and hoped it would become a better area to live in and visit.
- 11.6 Councillor Mitchell supported the proposals and hoped they would enhance the area.
- 11.7 Councillor Janio noted his support for the project and his agreement with the use of the Transport Model. He hoped the changes would improve traffic flow.
- 11.8 Councillor Summers expressed her belief that residents and businesses would welcome the proposals and she was pleased that changes to the Pool Valley area were also being examined.
- 11.9 Councillor Cox noted that he was in favour of the re-development of the area which no longer worked effectively for motorists, cyclists or pedestrians. Councillor Cox referred to the National Gallery in London where similar proposals had been extremely effective.
- 11.10 Councillor Robins believed the area had suffered from the popularity of the seafront and the proposals would reverse that effect, making Valley Gardens an enjoyable place.
- 11.11 **RESOLVED-**
 - 1. That Committee notes the results of initial scoping consultation and agrees the resulting design brief for the project.
 - 2. That Committee authorises officers to develop a draft design option(s) ahead of public consultation as set out in the main body of the report and subsequently to bring a preferred and costed option(s) back to Committee for decision.

The meeting concluded at 6.03pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

