

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

4.00pm 4 MARCH 2014

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor West (Chair), Councillor Sykes (Deputy Chair), Cox (Opposition Spokesperson), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), Mitchell (Group Spokesperson), Robins (Group Spokesperson), Davey, Hamilton, Hawtree and G Theobald

Also in attendance: Councillor Peltzer-Dunn, Councillor Shanks

PART ONE

78. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

78a) Declarations of substitutes

78.1 Councillor Hamilton declared that he was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Daniel.

78(b) Declarations of interest

78.2 Councillor Robins declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 86 as a current allotment holder.

78.3 Councillor Cox declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 86 as a current allotment holder.

78(c) Exclusion of press and public

78.4 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).

78.5 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded.

79. MINUTES

- 79.1 As a matter arising, Councillor Cox asked when the Committee would receive a report on coach parking in Roedean as agreed at the previous meeting.
- 79.2 The Chair clarified that this would be considered at their next meeting on 29 April 2014.
- 79.3 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 January 2014 be approved and signed as the correct record.

80. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE CITY SUSTAINABILITY PARTNERSHIP (FOR INFORMATION)

- 80.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting of the City Sustainability Partnership held on 22 January 2014 be noted.

81. CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

- 81.1 The Chair provided the following communication:

“Firstly, I would like to seek the Committee’s agreement that item 89 on Phase 2 of the 20mph scheme be brought forward in the agenda to be our first substantive item of business. This is because I am mindful of the high level of attendance in the public gallery awaiting discussion of this item and that there are also a number of young children present”

I am glad to say we have a number of items of business before us today which have attracted a strong interest from public and councillors. In addition to consultation responses which are reported in the agenda, we have a number of questions, letters, deputations and petitions before us and I have also agreed to requests from ward members to speak. Members of the committee and officers have also received a great deal of additional correspondence in the past few days. May I say at the out set that all these contributions are greatly appreciated and I would like to extend a general thank you to everyone who has expressed their views.

Environment and transport officers have been at the forefront of the city’s response to the storms and flooding we have experienced this winter. Sadly, we have seen a number of trees down which our arboroculturalist team have been tackling. The coast has also taken a pounding, and while defences remain sound our gritter lorries have been helping get the shingle off the promenade.

In Patcham officers have been engaged in a multi-agency emergency response to ground water flooding. Officers have been busy with everything from distributing sandbags and gully cleansing through to aiding Southern Water installing a temporary additional sewer pipe along the A23. I know that residents have expressed great appreciation for all that has been done. And, I would like to express my appreciation to the public for their assistance and forbearance and to all our officers and partners for their very hard work and professionalism.

I would just like to mention a our success in receiving a £50,000 government grant to the Bikeability scheme to provide cycle training for 1,300 9-14 year old school children. Well done to those involved with this achievement.

I would also like to extend my congratulations, as the Council has been shortlisted for a National Transport Award for Improvements to cycling. We are also runners up for the

2nd year as Civitas City of the Year. And, we have been shortlisted in 3 categories of the British Parking Awards; for customer service, partnership and refurbishment of Regency Square Carprk. Very well done again.

I would also like to mention that the Council has been successful in winning first round funding from the Government's Heat Network Delivery Unit. This is aimed at developing projects designed to supply low carbon and more efficient heat to buildings.

Cllrs Cox, Robins officers and myself had a fruitful first meeting last week when we met as a working group to consider the impact and possible ways forward on pavement and verge parking. Officers will be feeding back and taking forward suggestions from that meeting.

And finally, I would like to briefly update members on the actions being taking following requests for additional road safety measures in Church Road, Portslade. As members will recall this is a matter that has been raised at a number of previous committee meetings by residents and Cllr Robins, and I have promised to update members on this. I would like to congratulate parents of St.Peter's school for their energetic campaigning. And I am particularly appreciative of the letters I have received from many school children calling for a zebra crossing.

Officers have been engaging with the matter: evaluations have been undertaken to look at the feasibility and location for a possible crossing, and numerical surveys have been programmed in as part of the annual city-wide assessment of pedestrian crossings.

A series of meetings have been held this year between officers, members and parents. I visited with the Road Safety Manager to accompany a grandparent on her school walk, and I know other members have attended events too.

I have circulated an officer update to ward councillors and parent campaigners which I hope brings everyone up to speed. I will also make this available to members of the committee".

82. CALL OVER

82.1 The following items on the agenda were reserved for discussion:

- Item 86: Adoption of Allotment Strategy
- Item 89: Brighton & Hove 20mph limit phase 2- Objections to Speed Limit Orders
- Item 90: Dyke Road Ped & Cycle Facilities- Objections to TRO
- Item 91: Area E parking scheme- Preston Park North Traffic Order Consultation
- Item 92: Wish Ward resident parking scheme consultation
- Item 93: Proposed amendments to verge & footway parking restrictions
- Item 94: Preston Park Triangle informal consultation
- Item 95: Norton Road Car Park- Sunday Tariff

82.2 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 87: Official Feed and Food Controls Service Plan 2014-15
- Item 86: Health and Safety Service Plan 2014-15
- Item 96: Band of Interest affecting properties in Cheapside

83. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(a) Petitions**(i) 20mph limit in the Hollingbury and Braybon area- Hugh Woodhouse**

83.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 186 people that requested the council to reconsider its decision to exclude some roads in the Hollingbury and Braybon areas from Phase 2 of the 20mph programme.

83.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you Mr Woodhouse for presenting this petition.
May I congratulate you on the number of signatories you have raised - It is very helpful for committee members to hear further of the views of people living in the area.
Proposals for the second phase of the 20mph programme will be debated and considered at this meeting. I would ask the Committee to take note of this petition and to consider it when we discuss the main report”.*

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

(b) Written Questions**(i) Dyke Road park proposals**

83.4 Mavis Aldridge asked the following question:

“As an elderly person with two replacement hip operations behind me, I realise that a fall could leave me in a wheelchair. I am therefore very concerned that it is proposed to allow cyclists to share the pavement adjacent to Dyke Road Park. The park attracts the elderly and the young, two groups that are very vulnerable to accidents. Bikes no longer have bells and it is impossible to hear them about to overtake you. There is space here for a separate pavement and cycle lane so why was this option rejected in favour of the least safe option?”

83.5 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you Ms Aldridge for your question.
The range of improvements proposed for Dyke Road, between Old Shoreham Road and The Upper Drive/ Highcroft Villas, have been designed to create a welcoming and supportive environment which encourages people to walk, cycle and use public transport.
People who are comfortable cycling on roads, among traffic are doing so already, but there are many who will not cycle, especially with young children unless they ‘feel’ safe cycling alongside motorised vehicles. In general lower speed of traffic and lower volume are the first principles to address, if possible, when creating good streets for cycling and walking.
To develop a quality cycle network in the city requires the Council to assess the environment of the particular street to find the most appropriate fit of cycle facility. When considering an approach to cycle facilities in Dyke Road officers looked at a suggestion by a local councillor to consider cycle facilities in Dyke Road Park. In*

discussion with users of the park it was quite clear that the lower path on the east side of the park was more suitable to pedestrians only and that the raised path, adjacent to the parking was a good solution for cyclists to share with pedestrians.

Many city authorities in the UK implement only shared use areas for pedestrians and cycles. In Brighton & Hove we have taken the opportunity to segregate where possible and integrate on short sections only, e.g. Old Shoreham Road.

We plan to widen some of the upper footway area, so it may be shared with share cycle users heading northbound only. While we anticipate that the lower path will become more pedestrian dominated, we do not wish to exclude pedestrians from the upper path. We are seeking to balance the needs of all users carefully and all designs are subject to independent Road Safety Audit which tease out any potential safety related considerations for all users of all abilities”.

(ii) Dyke Road proposals

83.6 Jason Brooks asked the following question:

“I am one of many parents concerned by the proposed removal of safety guard railings in front of Windlesham School on Dyke Road. The path from the school runs downhill and the removal of barriers means children could potentially roll on a bicycle or scooter, unimpeded into traffic, or be jostled into the road on foot. The proposal that this busy, relatively narrow area of pavement will also be shared with cyclists arriving at right angles seems to further necessitate the need for a safety barrier. Please can you explain fully what seems a dangerous step”

83.7 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you Mr Brooks for your question.

I very much appreciate the concerns now being expressed regarding the proposed changes to the controlled crossings and pedestrian guard railing in Dyke Road.

It is of course of the utmost importance to all members of the committee that we are satisfied that any measures implemented are considered to be safe.

Given the level of interest generated through the advertising of the Traffic Regulation Orders in relation to the formal crossings and guard railing, you will note that officers have commissioned a specialist consultants assessment to look at these particular aspects of the scheme – this report is included in the officers report later in this agenda. I hope you will be pleased to note that officers are recommending approval of the majority of the scheme today, while recommending deferral of decision on altering the crossings and guard railing. This will allow members to be able to see the other changes in situ before coming to a decision on the crossings and guard railing.

With regard to young people exiting the school gates some alternative options are being considered and are highlighted in section 8.2.2 of the independent assessment”.

83.8 Jason Brookes asked the following supplementary question:

“When will a decision on the deferred items be made”

83.9 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Depending on whether the report is agreed today, a decision on the deferred elements of the scheme will likely be made in the autumn”.

(iii) Dyke Road Park cycle and pedestrian improvements

83.10 Judith Waite asked the following question:

“Given that: “Choice of crossing facilities should be appropriate for prevailing environment (5.1.3) minimum of 1,000 Windlesham crossings per day on busy road with no speed cameras/School highway signs •Signalised Crossing benefits the high number of children (5.5.6) removes need for pedestrians to assert precedence/warns vehicles to stop (5.5.3) Zebra visibility concerns(7.1.1/5.5.6) •Zebra causes 'peak time' vehicle delays (5.2.19 /5.2.17) vehicles less likely to adhere to highway rules •No definitive safety argument in favour of Zebra (5.5.11) Why risk changing current crossings which pedestrians trust when fit for purpose/have good safety record (5.5.9/5.5.10)?”

Note: brackets indicate references to 'Dyke Road Cycle and Pedestrian Improvements' Pedestrian Crossing and Guardrailing Assessment (reference number 102470)'

83.11 The Chair provided the following response:

“I have a lengthy response addressing all of the points raised in your question that I will formally provide in writing to you after the meeting. As already mentioned in my previous replies, members of the committee are asked to come back to the question of crossings and guard railing at a later stage, once we have been able to experience other aspects of the implemented scheme on the ground”.

83.12 Judith Waite asked the following supplementary question:

“Will the council be liaising directly with the members of management at Windlesham School on the deferred matters”

83.13 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Subject to approval of the report, the council will continue to liaise with the school and there will be plenty of opportunity to do so. I too, am happy to engage personally”

(iv) Preston Park Triangle consultation

83.14 Leona Vincent asked the following question:

*“Can you reconsider and include Preston Drove, or the Eastern half of it, in the proposed extension to CPZJ?
Preston Drove is a long road with different requirements at either end. There may be a higher parking: household ratio overall, but mainly due to parking alongside Preston Park in the west. At the Eastern end there are houses and shops both sides of the road and parking is already under severe pressure. Here Preston Drove suffers displacement parking from the existing CPZ, there is no doubt it will get a lot worse if it is removed from the proposed extension.”*

83.15 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you Ms Vincent for your question. My fellow committee members and I, along with Ward councillors and officers have received a number of similar representations from other residents in Preston Drove. I can confirm that there has been no decision as yet to exclude or include Preston Drove in the proposed Zone J extension only a recommendation from officers based on consultation results, which showed that a majority (56%) of residents in Preston Drove were against inclusion in the scheme. However, given the strong representation from residents since the publication of the report I have asked the Project Manager to look at this element again and to discuss with the Ward councillors for both Preston Park and Withdean wards to seek their views. I am aware that there is a proposed amendment regarding Preston Drove for the Committee to consider when we discuss the report later in this meeting.”

83.16 Leona Vincent asked the following supplementary question:

“Why has it taken such protests for the council to realise that a road one mile in length cannot conform to a one-size fits all scheme”

83.17 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I do appreciate residents concerns and the questions asked in the consultation could have perhaps been worded differently”

(c) Deputations

(i) Dyke Road cycling and pedestrian improvements- Jannet King

83.18 The Committee considered a Deputation that requested the council to maintain light-controlled crossings and retain the safety barriers at the top of Crocodile Walk as part of the Dyke Road improvement proposals.

83.19 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you Ms King for your deputation, acknowledgement of officer engagement and appreciation of the importance of providing improved facilities for people to cycle. The Dyke Road scheme has been designed to achieve the best balance possible for all street users. The proposal to change signalised crossings to zebra crossings is part of a holistic approach to the corridor, creating an environment where a sense of pedestrian priority is created across the entire area instead of being heavily dominated by vehicular traffic as it is currently. Zebra crossings enable crossing on demand by pedestrians rather than waiting for traffic lights to change. The independent report commissioned by officers demonstrates an overall reduction in delay for all users and the Committee report highlights the Council’s ‘Share the Road, Share the Responsibility’ approach which encourages all users to think, acknowledge one another and act accordingly. With reference to the proposed removal of the ‘Safety Barriers’ at Crocodile Walk and Windlesham School these are indeed termed guard-railing and current guidance and

policy on transport and road safety is moving away from using pedestrian guard-railing as a road safety measure. In its recent circular on the matter Local transport Note 2/09 the Department for Transport states "There is no conclusive evidence that the inclusion of pedestrian guard railing at any type of pedestrian crossing or junction has any statistically significant effect on the safety record".

Further guidance, issued by the Institute of Highways and Transportation in the Manual for Streets 2, includes the following statement - "Guardrail is a very intrusive element. It disadvantages pedestrian movement by making people walk further, away from their desire lines and creates an unpleasant feeling of restraint. It also narrows the usable footway which can lead to congestion. It is unsightly and detracts from local character and visual amenity and there is evidence that it can increase traffic speeds and present an increased risk to cyclists who can be crushed against it by vehicles"

The local environment will see considerable changes in the near future with the increased capacity at BHASVIC and potential for a theatre space at Dyke Road Park. It is important that we take this opportunity to help create the right environment for sustainable travel now. I trust Friends of Dyke Road Park will welcome recommendation 2.3, which allows for incremental observation before a final decision on this element of the proposals".

83.20 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

(ii) Safety concerns- Dyke Road pedestrian and cycle facility proposals- Alison Heal

83.21 The Committee considered a Deputation that requested the Committee to reject the proposed changes to traffic crossings on Dyke Road, the removal of guard rails outside Windlesham School and creation of a shared pedestrian and cycle pathway as part of the Dyke Road improvement scheme.

83.22 The Chair provided the following response:

"Thank you Ms Heal for presenting your deputation.

Given the similarity of the concerns raised regarding crossing provision, may I also refer you to replies I have given earlier, in which I covered the rationale behind the proposals. I know that officer have met with you previously and officers and I met with you last week, when the matter of consultation was discussed and has also been addressed in correspondence with officers too. The safety considerations have been covered, and with the exception of the Road Safety Audit, are further considered in the independent assessment.

The assessment report, specifically commissioned to respond to concerns raised in the TRO consultation also highlights some options to be considered further, particularly in relation to railings. I trust you will welcome recommendation 2.3 in the report, which allows for an incremental observation before a final decision on the crossing and guard railing elements of the proposals".

83.23 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

(iii) Creation of new resident parking Zone E- Peter Meekings

83.24 The Committee considered a Deputation that expressed support for the council's proposals for a controlled parking scheme in the Preston Park Station north area that

the Deputies believed would improve parking, safety, residents and businesses in the local area.

83.25 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you Mr Meekings for presenting this deputation. It is very helpful for members of the committee to hear these views.
Members of the Committee will be discussing this matter in more detail under Agenda item 91 of the agenda, and we will take all your views into account”*

83.26 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

(iii) Request that Preston Drove, Stanford Avenue and Surrenden Road are included in the 20mph speed limit programme in Brighton & Hove- Becky Reynolds

83.27 The Committee considered a Deputation that requested the inclusion of Preston Drove, Stanford Avenue and Surrenden Road in Phase 2 of the 20mph programme to improve road safety in what was a residential area.

83.28 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for presenting this Deputation and for your contribution to raising the public debate on the proposals for the second phase of the 20mph programme, which committee will be considered later in this meeting”.

83.29 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

(v) 20mph speed limit for Surrenden Road- Esther Gill

83.30 The Committee considered a Deputation that requested the inclusion of Surrenden Road in Phase 2 of the 20mph programme to improve safety for children accessing local schools and for the benefit of residents in the area.

83.31 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for presenting this Deputation.
I’m sure all members will appreciate your concern for the safety of children and young people travelling to and from the schools and colleges and having to negotiate Surrenden Road.
The proposals for the second phase of the 20mph programme will be considered later in this meeting.
In recognition of the strength of views expressed by local residents, a recommendation has been included in the report to be considered today for the speed limit on these three roads to be reduced to 20mph.
This has been supported by a number of stakeholders including Brighton and Hove Bus Company who have confirmed that they would have no objections to a 20mph limit on these roads”.*

83.32 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

(vi) Deputation from ConsultUs (Community Parking Committee)- James Thompson

83.33 The Committee considered a Deputation that requested the Committee to reject proposals for creation of a controlled parking zone in Preston Park Station north area. The Deputies outlined their key concerns, specifically that the majority of residents did not support the scheme, that council officers had ignored vital evidence and not made a case for the introduction of a scheme and that there was not a significant parking problem in the area to justify a scheme.

83.34 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you Mr Thompson for presenting this Deputation. It is very helpful for members of the committee to hear these views.

Members of the Committee will be discussing this matter in more detail under Agenda item 91 of the agenda, and we will take all your views into account”.

83.35 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

84. ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**(a) Petitions****(i) 20mph limit on Preston Drive, Stanford Avenue and Surrenden Road- Becky Reynolds**

84.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 742 people that requested the council to re-consider its decision not to reduce the speed limit on Preston Drive, Stanford Avenue and Surrenden Road to 20mph. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 31 January 2014.

84.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition, and may I congratulate you on the very strong level of support you have received to this.

As I mentioned in my earlier response, the proposals for the second phase of the 20mph programme will be debated and considered at this meeting and include, in recognition of the strength of views expressed by local residents, a recommendation has been included for the speed limit on Surrenden Road, Preston Drive and Stanford Avenue to be reduced to 20mph. This has been supported by a number of stakeholders including Brighton and Hove Bus Company who have confirmed that they would have no objections to a 20mph limit on these roads”

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

(ii) Dyke Road pedestrian and cycle plans- Councillor Jayne Bennett

84.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 184 people that urged the council to the review the proposals for Dyke Road pedestrian and cycle facilities. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 31 January 2014.

84.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you Councillor Bennett for representing this petition.

The report before Committee at agenda item 90, the additional independent assessment included with the report, and recommendation 2.3 specifically address concerns raised regarding crossing arrangements. I trust that councillors and people who have signed the petition will welcome the recommendation.

While many members of the public respond keenly to consultations, we never hear back from everyone. What is key is that the council make any consultation as widely available as possible, commensurate to the scale and budget of the scheme proposals.

For what could be termed a ‘cold’ survey (postal information addressed only to ‘the occupier’ of 1520 addresses) a 5 – 10% response rate would be an average. The informal consultation stage for these proposals had an 11% response.

Further details of the informal consultation are included in the report to 26th November 2013 committee, when members considered the consultation responses and agreed to progress with the scheme to advertising of the associated Traffic Regulation Orders”.

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

(ii) **Postpone enforcement on Elm Grove until substantially more safe and legal parking is created- Tanya Richardson**

84.7 The Committee considered a petition signed by 1443 people that request the council to postpone enforcement of vehicles parked on yellow lines until substantially more safe and legal parking was created. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 31 January 2014.

84.8 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you Ms Richardson for your petition, and may I congratulate you on the considerable level of response you have received to the question.

In response, I have to say that it is the opinion of officers that enforcement of yellow lines in Elm Grove should not be suspended pending creation of additional parking spaces.

Enforcement of yellow lines in Elm Grove was reinstated to improve the environment of the area and for road safety reasons, and it is important to monitor the effects of enforcement on the number of road traffic collisions over a 12 month period.

A public consultation took place with local residents last year in which a substantial majority rejected the creation of additional parking spaces, the stated alternative was the enforcement of existing restrictions and at Committee in October members noted the results of the consultation and approved a multi agency enforcement initiative to tackle illegal parking and other nuisances on the street such as abandoned bicycles and unlicensed materials on the highway.

About 500 PCNs have been issued to vehicles on yellow lines in Elm Grove since November so the impact on safety of suspending the activity would be considerable would set a precedent for other parts of the city.

It is possible to include the provision of more safe and legal parking spaces in Elm Grove as part of a consultation for a residents parking scheme for this area however the

previous Hanover & Elm Grove Parking Scheme Consultation resulted in a rejection by nearly 70% of households - so it is not clear what the majority of residents are seeking. A fresh consultation would only be triggered by a substantial petition of residents in favour and the support of local ward councillors. The consultation would need approval from this committee and the process could take at least 18 months with no certainty that residents would support a scheme. Therefore if enforcement was suspended now, illegal and unsafe parking may persist in the long term without resolution. There has been some positive feedback following enforcement, here are some examples.

“Parking behind yellow lines in Elm Grove caused difficulties for bus passengers in accessing bus stops..... I would therefore support the Council's actions in enforcing the yellow lines in this case”. – Bus company spokesperson

“feels so much safer just driving on Elm Grove now. Before enforcement began....had a few near misses as most of the junctions were completely blind. – scooter rider”

“I see no reason why enforcement should be postponed any longer. The petition effectively asks for restrictions to be lifted indefinitely. If this is done in Elm Grove, what’s to stop residents anywhere else in the city doing the same?” – A local business owner

Finally, I would like to note welcome news that at a meeting of the Hanover & Elm Grove Local Action Team in December 2013 a working group discussed parking issues in the area. The meeting was attended by ward councillors, residents and Sussex Police and reviewed a draft questionnaire which might form part of a community parking survey. Council officers from the parking and highways team were invited to attend and to comment including matters of design and highway law – this I must stress was conducted in an informal a capacity”.

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

85. MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(c) Letters

(i) Speed limits on Stanford Avenue, Preston Drove and Surrenden Road- Cllrs Jones, Kennedy, Littman

85.1 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillors Jones, Kennedy and Littman requesting the Committee reconsider its decision to remove Stanford Avenue, Preston Drove and Surrenden Road from Phase 2 of the 20mph programme. Councillors were unable to attend the meeting to present the Letter

85.2 The Chair stated that he would provide a formal response to the Letter subsequent to the meeting. That response is provided below:

“Thank you for your letter.

I am sure members of the committee are grateful to you for your sharing your insight into this matter as ward members.

Proposals for the second phase of the 20mph programme will be debated and considered at this meeting and include, in recognition of the strength of views expressed by local residents, a recommendation has been included for the speed limit on Surrenden Road, Preston Drove and Stanford Avenue to be reduced to 20mph. This has been supported by a number of stakeholders including Brighton and Hove Bus Company who have confirmed that they would have no objections to a 20mph limit on these roads”

85.3 **RESOLVED-** That the Letter be noted.

(ii) Review of 20mph speed limit zone- Councillor Shanks

85.4 The Committee consider a Letter from Councillor Shanks that requested the Committee reconsider its decision to remove Stanford Avenue, Preston Drove and Surrenden Road from Phase 2 of the 20mph programme. Introducing the Letter, Councillor Shanks explained that as ward councillor for a section of the area and Chair of the Children & Young Peoples Committee, she believed slower speeds would be of benefit to the safety of residents and children attending the local schools.

85.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for presenting your letter.

I am sure members of the committee will be grateful to you for your sharing your insight into this matter as a ward member.

Proposals for the second phase of the 20mph programme will be debated and considered at this meeting and include, in recognition of the strength of views expressed by local residents, a recommendation has been included for the speed limit on Surrenden Road, Preston Drove and Stanford Avenue to be reduced to 20mph. This has been supported by a number of stakeholders including Brighton and Hove Bus Company who have confirmed that they would have no objections to a 20mph limit on these roads”

85.6 **RESOLVED-** That the Letter be noted.

86. BRIGHTON AND HOVE 20MPH LIMIT PHASE 2 - OBJECTIONS TO SPEED LIMIT ORDERS

86.1. The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that addressed the comments and objections relating to the draft Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the proposed introduction of a 20mph speed limit on the phase 2 area of Brighton & Hove.

86.2. Councillor Hawtree noted that consultation on phase 3 of the programme was scheduled to begin on 14 March and asked if Medina Terrace would be included in this phase as he had submitted a petition on the matter recently.

- 86.3. The Principal Transport Planner confirmed that Medina Terrace would be included in the consultation for phase 3.
- 86.4. Councillor Cox asked if Friends of the Earth had withdrawn their objection to the reduction of the speed limit on Surrenden Road.
- 86.5. The Principal Transport Planner replied that no specific withdrawal of this objection had been communicated.
- 86.6. Councillor Robins asked why monitoring of casualty figures was conducted between 8 April and 7 December as referenced at 4.50 of the report.
- 86.7. The Principal Transport Planner clarified that this was the only period feasible subsequent to the agreement of phase 1 of the scheme and allowed for consistency in a like for like comparison of data.
- 86.8. Councillor Theobald asked if the proposed SLO for Surrenden Road would apply to its entirety and if so, if two SLO's could instead be advertised. Councillor Theobald explained that separating the Orders would allow residents to contribute to their specific area and there were no bus routes linking Ditchling Road to Braybon Avenue.
- 86.9. The Principal Transport Planner confirmed that the proposed SLO applied to all of Surrenden Road, two separate Orders could be advertised with Committee agreement.
- 86.10. Councillor Davey stated that he was pleased to see a positive response to the advertised SLO's and he hoped that the Committee could support the proposals that had the backing of stakeholders such as Brighton & Hove Bus Company, Sussex Police and residents. Councillor Davey added that 20mph limits would make the cities streets safer and would go some way to addressing Brighton & Hove's road safety record which was a matter of some concern.
- 86.11. Councillor Mitchell stated her support for the proposals adding that she was re-assured that the SLO's for Surrenden Road could be separated. Councillor Mitchell expressed her thanks to the parents of Surrenden Road who had invited her to the area to view some of their concerns about road safety and to council officers who had explained some of the physical measures planned for the area. Councillor Mitchell stated that she strongly believed the introduction of 20mph required physical measures as a means of enforcement and hoped these would be forthcoming.
- 86.12. Councillor Hawtree stated his support for the proposals that he believed were in the best interests of residents of the city.
- 86.13. On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Theobald formally moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.3 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.3 The Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising **two** formal Speed Limit Order's (SLO's) to reduce to 20mph the speed limit on Surrenden Road. **One to cover the section of road running north to south and the second to cover the section of road running east to west** for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 4.41-4.44

- 86.14. Councillor Janio formally seconded the motion.
- 86.15. The Chair put the motion to the vote which was passed.
- 86.16. Councillor Hamilton stated that there appeared to be two small sections of road in South Portslade that were not identified in the SLO. Councillor Hamilton added that whilst he did not believe speeding would be an issue on these roads, he was concerned that their exclusion may potential cause problems regarding mandate.
- 86.17. The Principal Transport Planner clarified that she would check the legal status of the roads concerned and if it was found they been excluded in error, it was likely a report would have to be brought back to Committee for their inclusion.
- 86.18. Councillor Janio stated that he was pleased 20mph limits were being introduced although he believed arterial routes should remain at 30mph. Councillor Janio added that he did not believe enough data had been gathered from phase 1 of the scheme to justify commencement of phase 2 of the scheme and he was concerned the programme had been rushed.
- 86.19. The Principal Transport Planner stated that officers were continuing to monitor phase 1 and phase 2 of the scheme and she envisaged a report on the introduction of 20mph in phase 2 would be brought to Committee in the future.
- 86.20. Councillor Cox expressed his support for the proposals as a long advocate of 20mph limits on residential roads. Councillor Cox congratulated those who had campaigned for the inclusion of Preston Drive, Surrenden Road and Stanford Avenue as he had supported its original exclusion with some reluctance.

86.21. **RESOLVED-**

2.1 That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee approves as advertised the following orders

- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 1) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-3a-2014)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 2) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-3b-2014)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 3) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-3c-2014)
- With the following amendment:
That Copse Hill be removed from the Order for the reason set out in paragraphs 4.78 - 4.79
- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 4) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-3d-2014)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 5) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-3e-2014)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 6) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-3f-2014)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 7) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-3g-2014)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 8) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-3h-2014)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 9) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-3i-2014)
 - Brighton & Hove (Coldean Lane) (30mph Speed Limit) Order 201* (TRO-3j-2014)

- 2.2 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising a formal Speed limit Order (SLO) to reduce to 20mph the speed limit on Dartmouth Crescent for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 4.41 – 4.44
- 2.3 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising two formal Speed limit Order's (SLO's) to reduce to 20mph the speed limit on Surrenden Road. One to cover the section of road running north to south and the second to cover the section of road running east to west for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 4.41-4.44
- 2.4 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising a formal Speed limit Order (SLO) to reduce to 20mph the speed limit on Preston Drove for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 4.41 – 4.44
- 2.5 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising a formal Speed limit Order (SLO) to reduce to 20mph the speed limit on Stanford Avenue for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 4.41-4.44
- 2.6 That the Committee note the forward programme for the 20mph programme as outlined in paragraph 6.5
- 2.7 That the Committee instructs officers to continue a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation programme to accompany and follow the implementation of the 20mph speed limits and to bring a report to Committee should such monitoring indicate that the introduction of the reduced speed limit has had a significant negative impact in line with objections raised

87. ADOPTION OF ALLOTMENT STRATEGY

- 87.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that set out the Allotment Strategy and Action Plan. The 10 year Strategy and Action Plan had been produced in partnership with the Allotment Federation and facilitated by the Food Partnership.
- 87.2 The Chair welcomed the report and progress on what was a very important and significant issue.
- 87.3 Councillor Sykes asked if the fee of £15 to join the waiting list would be reimbursed when an allotment was obtained.
- 87.4 The Head of Strategy & Projects clarified that this was a non-refundable fee that contributed to a ring-fenced resource that supported people on the waiting list and provided information on what to expect if their application was successful.
- 87.5 Councillor Janio stated that he was very supportive of the proposals and achievements. Councillor Janio added that he supported the voluntary sector being entrusted to look after service areas and believed that model should be expanded. Councillor Janio noted his concerns that the proposals may disadvantage those people seeking a full allotment plot.

- 87.6 The Head of Strategy & Projects clarified that the proposals identified specific full plot areas and these would be allocated from the waiting list when they became available. Furthermore, it was hoped that the introduction of micro plots would reduce overall demand.
- 87.7 Councillor Robins expressed his praise for the Food Partnership, Allotment Federation and council officers for the excellent work that had resulted in the proposals presented to Committee. Councillor Robins added that allotments were of huge benefit to people and the city as a whole and the recommendations represented fantastic work by all involved.
- 87.8 Councillor Sykes commended the depth of responses to the two surveys and to the organisations involved. Councillor Sykes stated that the proposals were of huge importance to the city.
- 87.9 The Chair extended his personal thanks to Mr Alan Phillips, the Allotment Federation and Food Partnership for their considerable work.
- 87.10 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee formally adopts the draft Allotment Strategy
- 88. OFFICIAL FEED AND FOOD CONTROLS SERVICE PLAN 2014/15**
- 88.1 **RESOLVED-** That the committee agrees the Official Feed and Food Controls Service Plan 2014/2015 set out in the appendix to this report.
- 89. HEALTH AND SAFETY SERVICE PLAN 2014-15**
- 89.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approves the proposed Health & Safety Service Plan 2014/2015 at Appendix 1.
- 90. DYKE ROAD PED & CYCLE FACILITIES: OBJECTIONS TO TRO**
- 90.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that set out the comments and objections to the draft TRO associated with the introduction of pedestrian and cycle facilities at Dyke Road between the junctions of the Upper Drive and Old Shoreham Road.
- 90.2 Councillor Sykes asked if a public safety risk assessment had been conducted.
- 90.3 The Principal Transport Planning Officer confirmed that an additional independent assessment had been conducted in response to the concerns raised in the TRO process. The results were listed at appendix two of the report.
- 90.4 Councillor Davey asked for clarification on safety audit process in scheme development.

- 90.5 The Principal Transport Planner clarified that all schemes were subject to an independent road safety audit and road safety was assessed at the initial design stage, the detail design stage, upon implementation with a further road safety audit conducted one year after implementation. The Principal Transport Planner added that a number of organisations conducted road safety audits and transport planners were trained in that area to a qualified standard. The Principal Transport Planner added that the independent road safety audit in this specific case had identified that there was no definitive safety argument for either a zebra or pelican crossing.
- 90.6 The Road Safety Manager added that the council's own internal research had found that there were no grounds to conclude that a zebra crossing was more or less safe than a zebra crossing.
- 90.7 Councillor Theobald asked if consideration had been given to separating the proposed cycle lane from the pavement.
- 90.8 The Principal Transport Planner stated that this option had been considered after being raised with the council by the Dyke Road SOS group.
- 90.9 The Chair stated that the plans had already been agreed by the Committee at their last meeting and this report was to consider the objections to the draft TRO associated with those plans.
- 90.10 Councillor Janio stated that different crossings were more suited to different locations.
- 90.11 The Principal Transport Planner acknowledged that pelican crossings worked in the Dyke Road area however, the proposals were a holistic examination of the Dyke Road corridor seeking to promote pedestrian priority and to reduce vehicle dominance and for that function, and zebra crossings were preferential over pelican crossings.
- 90.12 Councillor Mitchell stated that it was clear from the representations made by parents and residents from Dyke Road that they wished for the pelican crossings to be retained and the Committee should not go against that wish. Councillor Mitchell added that the scheme as proposed had not sufficiently dealt with competing priorities in the area, the design was not to a high enough standard and on that basis, the Labour & Co-operative Group could not support the proposals.
- 90.13 Councillor Theobald stated that he was not content with the proposals, specifically the replacement of pelican crossings with zebra crossings, the removal of guard railing and the shared cycle and pedestrian path that he felt should be separated. Councillor Theobald added that he believed these three core issues should be re-examined and a report be brought back to Committee.
- 90.14 Councillor Cox stated that he believed it was essential that a cycle route be included in the proposals as many children were using the route to travel to school by that method.
- 90.15 Councillor Janio stated that whilst he support the expansion of cycle lanes and the potential linkage with other routes in this specific proposal, he felt that all parties had reached entrenched positions and the issue need to be re-considered and brought back to Committee.

- 90.16 Councillor Davey stated that it was council officers as technical experts to design projects and it was unusual for Members to involve themselves in instructing on the specific detail of those designs.
- 90.17 Councillor Hamilton stated that he felt there were many issues that required resolution and the report should be deferred.
- 90.18 Councillor Robins stated that the proposals did not appear sufficiently thorough enough and the report should be deferred to resolve the issues aforementioned.
- 90.19 Councillor Theobald stated that he felt any subsequent report should retain the current crossings and guardrails and alternative options for the cycle lane be considered.
- 90.20 Councillor Mitchell stated her agreement with the comments made by Councillor Theobald.
- 90.21 The Chair moved a motion to defer the report which was passed.
- 90.22 **RESOVLED-** That the report be deferred.

91. AREA E PARKING SCHEME - PRESTON PARK STATION NORTH TRAFFIC ORDER CONSULTATION

- 91.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing. The Parking Infrastructure Manager provided an extensive introduction to the report, a summary of which follows:
- In 2007, during a parking scheme consultation in the Preston Park station area, the specific area now under discussion voted to be excluded from any scheme.
 - Since 2007 and the subsequent inclusion of Tivoli Crescent in the scheme, requests had been made by local residents to re-consider the area for possible inclusion in the scheme. This was agreed by the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting held in November 2011
 - In September 2013, a leaflet and questionnaire was circulated providing details of the proposals for a scheme. The response rate was 57% and resulted in a 50/50 vote for and against.
 - Although the council's parking policy states that schemes are progressed where there is a majority in favour, following discussions with lead and ward councillors, analysis took place of the data and particularly the comments received to the questionnaire. Analysis revealed key themes and strong messages regarding concerns about restrictions on visitor parking and that commuter parking was an issue.
 - On the basis of the analysis of those comments and support from ward members, officers refined the scheme proposals recommending a flexible approach of 5-day a week restrictions.
 - It was not unusual to make changes to parking scheme proposals following the first stage of consultation as the responses to it enable officers and members to analyse suggestions and comments from local people, and to revise proposals accordingly.

- Agreement to proceed to the next stage of consultation on the revised proposals was granted at the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee
- As well as advertisement of the traffic order, a letter was sent to every household in the affected area to make them aware of how to make comments during the next phase of consultation although that differed from the previous consultation in that a questionnaire was not supplied for return.
- 203 items of correspondence to the Order were received. 165 were from the proposed area and 38 were from outside that area.
- 62 items of correspondence were of support, 60 of those from within the proposed area.
- 141 items of correspondence were against, 105 of which were from inside the area.
- Officer experience was that the formal TRO process was used as a period to outline concerns rather than demonstrate support. The report author highlighted that only twice in the period from 2009-2014 had there been more support than objections to the advertising of a formal TRO.
- 102 of the representations commented that there were no parking problems in the area and that a scheme was not needed, that it was not a busy area of the city, was an indirect tax on residents, that the area was in the majority a family area with visitors who needed easy/unrestricted parking and that congestion was due to displacement problems in schemes being implemented in the surrounding area.
- The Parking Infrastructure Manager noted that the purpose of proposing unrestricted parking at weekends was due to the many observations in the previous consultation of the impact on visitor parking.
- Furthermore, 92 representations stated that the consultation process was undemocratic or inadequate. The Parking Infrastructure Manager observed that the consultation process had been extensive and had been outlined in all the reports presented to the Committee on the matter.
- The Parking Infrastructure Manager noted that there had been several submissions to Members and Officers since publication of the report. Of the 59 received, 29 were against the scheme proceeding and 30 were in support of the scheme.

91.2 Councillor Shanks made a representation to the Committee. Councillor Shanks stated that she believed the proposals represented a compromise and had been agreed by all ward members. Councillor Shanks added that she had received much correspondence on the issue both in support and against although more recently the correspondence had been from those in favour of the scheme. Councillor Shanks stated that as ward members for the area, she was very aware of the problems associated with parking in the area and that it was used extensively for commuter parking. Councillor Shanks also believed that the introduction of a controlled parking scheme would have other benefits such as increasing road safety for the high number of children who lived in the area. Councillor Shanks requested that the Committee Members accept the proposals in the report.

91.3 Councillor Janio asked if any consideration had been given to short-term parking.

91.4 The Parking Infrastructure Manager clarified that short-term parking provision would be introduced in the area near shops (specifically Matlock Road).

- 91.5 Councillor Mitchell stated that she acknowledged the huge public involvement in this issue and that she was in support of the proposals. Councillor Mitchell stated that she believed the proposed scheme represented resident's views and that its location so close to Preston Park station meant the need for a scheme had become increasingly pressing. Councillor Mitchell added that she was glad Hazeldene Meads would be monitored and that she would welcome a wider assessment of parking tariffs in the city.
- 91.6 The Head of Transport clarified that tariffs were reviewed annually in the fees & charges report presented to Committee and would be considered again for 2015-16.
- 91.7 Councillor Hawtree stated that scheme displacement was a common problem particularly in those areas close to railway stations and in the circumstances he believed a compromise had been reached with the proposals.
- 91.8 Councillor Davey stated that parking was always a difficult topic more so with an increasing amount of cars in the city as the 2001-2011 census demonstrated. Councillor Davey observed that much of the increase in car ownership was located in suburban areas like Preston Park. Councillor Davey added that as Lead Member for Transport, he had been asked many times to resolve the problem of indiscriminate parking in the area which included occupation of disabled parking bays by those not permitted to do so. Councillor Davey supplemented that he had received much correspondence on the matter from those for and against and he was convinced that concerns residents concerns had been addressed and compromise reached in the proposals.
- 91.9 **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 2008 No.* 201*
 - (b) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.* 201*
 2. That the Committee notes that any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers will be added to the proposed scheme during implementation subject to advertisement and approval as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

92. WISH WARD RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME CONSULTATION.

- 92.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that addressed the responses to an initial consultation in Wish ward. The consultation had asked residents, businesses and services whether they would like to be consulted on a detailed design for a resident parking scheme.
- 92.2 Councillor Peltzer-Dunn made a representation to the Committee. Councillor Peltzer-Dunn explained that the Wish ward councillors had conducted their own survey that had

concluded similar results to the survey conducted by the council. Councillor Peltzer-Dunn added that a light touch scheme appeared overwhelming the favoured choice in the area and the adjoining light touch scheme plus a full scheme would sandwich the specified area. Councillor Peltzer-Dunn asked for clarification on the report recommendations that stated a light touch scheme would be enforced between 11am and Noon and 7pm- 8pm Monday to Sunday.

- 92.3 The Parking Infrastructure Manager clarified that there was a mistake in the report and light touch enforcement was proposed to be between 10am and 11am not 11am to Noon as stated.
- 92.4 The Chair thanked Councillor Peltzer-Dunn for presenting his views to Committee.
- 92.5 Councillor Hawtree asked for further detail as to how the adjoining areas had become light touch scheme.
- 92.6 The Parking Infrastructure Manager explained that introduction had been down to long running efforts to reduce displacement parking in the area. He added that in practice, this had instead increased displacement particularly to the detriment to users of Wish Park.
- 92.7 Councillor Sykes stated his support for the recommendations and thanked officers for their extensive consideration of options and a potential solution for the area.
- 92.8 Councillor Davey stated that there had been long running investigations into how to maximise parking in the Bolsover Road area and he was pleased that those efforts had finally led to an option for residents to consider. Councillor Davey stated that whilst he believed the negatives of a potential light touch scheme outweighed the positives, it was down to residents to decide what they wanted for their area and he was pleased that options would be available to them in the consultation.
- 92.9 Councillor Mitchell stated her support for consultation on both a light touch and full scheme as it would provide the residents a choice.
- 92.10 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approves:
- (a) That a new proposal for a resident parking scheme be consulted upon in the Wish Park / Aldrington Recreation Ground area
 - i) Consult residents in the agreed streets for a stand alone full scheme (9am-8pm Mon to Sun) or an extension to the Zone W light touch scheme (10am-11am & 7pm-8pm Mon to Sun).
 - (b) To take forward Bolsover Road as an extension to Area R (Westbourne West) as part of the next stage of consultation and to take forward an option to create parking lay-bys on the west side to maximise parking.
 - (c) That a further consultation for a resident parking scheme in any other roads within Wish Ward is not taken forward at this stage.

93. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO VERGE & FOOTWAY PARKING RESTRICTIONS

- 93.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that set out the representations, comments, support and objections to the amendment TRO's for verge and footway parking restrictions in parts of the Surrenden area of Brighton and Mile Oak in Portslade.
- 93.2 Councillor Hamilton expressed his full support for the proposals. As ward councillor for the area, he was very aware of the lack of parking available in the area particularly for users of the sports centre. Councillor Hamilton added that he hoped the proposals would also reduce traffic problems in the area.
- 93.3 Councillor Robins requested that Hillbank Close be monitored as some residents had raised concerns with him that Cityclean refuse trucks were sometimes unable to access the area.
- 93.4 The Programme Manager assured Councillor Robins that the issue would be monitored.
- 93.5 **RESOLVED-** That having taken into account the duly made representations and objections the Committee is recommended to approve the Brighton & Hove (Various Roads) (Prohibition Of Stopping and Waiting On Verges And Footways) Order 2013 Amendment Order No.* 201* and the Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.* 201* drafts of which are attached at Appendices C & D ("the Amendment Orders").

94. PRESTON PARK TRIANGLE INFORMAL CONSULTATION

- 94.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that presented the results of a consultation for a proposed residents parking scheme in the triangle roads between Preston Drove and Stanford Avenue.
- 94.2 In his presentation of the report, the Programme Manager explained that the report recommendations proposed to exclude Preston Drove, the reasons for which were set out in paragraph 5.32. However since publication of the report, officers had received a large number of representations requesting Preston Drove is included if the rest of the scheme went ahead. Many of those representations asserted that it was not made clear in the consultation that this road could be excluded if residents voted against. The Programme Manager explained that 32 emails had been received from separate households in Preston Drove requesting its inclusion, 29 of those were from numbers 129 eastwards, all in Preston Park ward and 3 are from the southern side of Preston Drove between Preston Park Avenue and Beaconsfield Villas, again all in Preston Park ward. A further three emails were also from the Tennis club and club members asking for Preston Drove in whole or part, to be excluded from the scheme. The Programme Manager added that Ward Councillors for Preston Park ward had also requested an amendment proposed to include that part of Preston Drove that is within their ward boundary. Furthermore, one of the three ward councillor for the area in Withdean ward had requested inclusion in the scheme with the other two ward councillors against. The Programme Manger explained that there were many advantages to inclusion of this

area benefits to local businesses, road safety benefits and uncontrolled parking retained for visitors to the Tennis Club. Possible disadvantages included a possible increase in parking in uncontrolled parking locations in the area. The Programme Manager explained that due to the high number of representations to the proposals and the advantages aforementioned, it was his professional judgement that recommendation 2.1 be amended to include a section of Preston Drive. The amended recommendation is shown in bold italics below:

- 2.1 That the Committee authorises the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing to progress, with the exception of ***the section of Preston Drive between Preston Road and Harrington Villas (eastern kerb line)*** an extension to the Area J London Road station (North) residents parking scheme as set out in this report to the final design stage.
- 94.3 Councillor Davey noted there had been an empathic response from residents with 66% of the high number of respondents in favour of the scheme. Councillor Davey added that whilst the original proposals were well intended, it was clear from correspondence received from residents that it would be pragmatic to support the inclusion of the section of Preston Drive identified in the amended officer recommendation.
- 94.4 Councillor Theobald stated that in 2010 he assured residents that he would not support any further controlled parking schemes as there were already too many. Councillor Theobald added that his position remained the same and he did not support the proposals.
- 94.5 The Chair put the recommendations, as amended, to a vote.
- 94.6 **RESOLVED-**
1. That the Committee authorises the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing to progress, with the exception of the section of Preston Drive between Preston Road and Harrington Villas (eastern kerb line) an extension to the Area J London Road station (North) residents parking scheme as set out in this report to the final design stage.
 2. That the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing be authorised to publish statutory notices of the necessary traffic orders to implement the proposed scheme to allow formal representations to be made.
- 95. NORTON ROAD CAR PARK ~ SUNDAY TARIFF**
- 95.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that set out options for a reduction to half the weekly rate for Sunday parking charges at Norton Road car park as requested by Policy & Resources Committee on 5 December 2013.
- 95.2 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Cox formally moved a motion to add a further recommendation as shown in bold italics below:

2.2 ***That the Committee authorise a 6-month trial of free parking from 1800 hours to 0900 hours Monday to Friday, and all day Saturdays and Sundays, for vehicles displaying a valid Zone N Residents' Parking Permit***

- 95.3 Councillor Cox stated that whilst he was pleased a report had been produced, he did not think the proposals went far enough. Councillor Cox explained that the car park was under used partly due to the free parking at the local supermarket and on Sunday on George Street. Councillor Cox added that local residents with Zone N permits should be allowed to use Norton Road car park for free which would in turn free up on-street parking for residents and visitors and potentially become a de-facto park and ride with its excellent bus links. Councillor Cox supplemented that there were anti-social behavioural problems associated with the car park and introducing such measures could stop that downward cycle. Furthermore, Councillor Cox did not believe there would be any significant financial implication if the motion was accepted.
- 95.4 Councillor Janio formally seconded the motion adding that he too believed there would not be any significant financial implications and the proposal may promote use of the car park in the long-term.
- 95.5 The Chair asked the Head of Transport Operations if it was his view that there would be any significant financial implications to the motion.
- 95.6 The Head of Transport Operations stated that it was difficult to ascertain the financial impact of the proposal as limited data was currently available. The Head of Transport Operations added that the car park was currently open free of charge between 8pm-8am.
- 95.7 Councillor Mitchell stated her concerns regarding the capacity if both the measures proposed in the report and the Conservative Group motion were both accepted. Councillor Mitchell asked if there was a current waiting list for Zone N permits.
- 95.8 The Head of Transport Operations clarified that there was not currently a waiting list for Zone N permits.
- 95.9 Councillor Hawtree asked how the 6 month trial of free parking at weekends for hotel users would work.
- 95.10 The Head of Transport Operation confirmed that permits would be available on a pay-by-phone system and participating hotels would control the issuing of the permits. The Head of Transport Operations added that the system would be monitored by sample spot checks.
- 95.11 The Chair then put the Conservative Group motion to the vote which was not carried.
- 95.12 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee authorise a 6-month trial of free parking at weekends for hotel guests at Norton Road Car Park (Option 2).

96. **BAND OF INTEREST AFFECTING PROPERTIES IN CHEAPSIDE**

96.1 RESOLVED-

1. That the Committee agrees that the Band of Interest delineated on the plan attached as Appendix 1 be rescinded; and
2. That the Committee requests that the Executive Director notifies the owners of the affected properties of the rescission decision and ensures that council records are amended accordingly.

97. ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

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

The meeting concluded at 8.30pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of