

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

4.00pm 11 OCTOBER 2016

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL, NORTON ROAD, HOVE, BN3 3BQ

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Mitchell (Chair) Horan (Deputy Chair), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), Greenbaum (Group Spokesperson), Atkinson, Deane, Miller, Robins, G Theobald and Wares

Other Members present: Councillors Brown and Mears

PART ONE

20 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

20(a) Declarations of substitutes

20.1 There were none.

20(b) Declarations of interest

20.2 There were none.

1(c) Exclusion of press and public

20.3 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(l) of the Act).

20.4 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded

21 MINUTES

21.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 28 June 2016 be approved and signed as the correct record.

22 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

22.1 The Chair provided the following communication:

“Since the last Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee meeting, the food safety service has been invited by the Food Standards Agency to take part in a national pilot to charge businesses for re-score revisits requested under the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme. As the project is due to take place between 15th August and 7th November this year it was necessary to decide on this before this meeting. In consultation with the Interim Director for Neighbourhoods, Communities and Housing, I felt it appropriate to proceed as part of the pilot.

Such requested rescors are not a statutory function of this authority so are chargeable under the Localism Act 2011. Visits undertaken by officers to protect public health and ensure compliance with relevant legislation are unaffected and are outside the scope of the pilot. In line with guidance from the Food Standards Agency on a cost recovery basis rescore visits will be charged at £90-00 per visit”.

23 CALL OVER

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

- Item 27: Rottingdean High Street- Traffic and Air Quality
- Item 30: Pedestrian Crossing Priority List
- Item 31: East Street Pedestrianisation Order
- Item 33: Gloucester Rd/East St/Avenue TRO Objection
- Item 35: Stanmer Park Traffic Regulation Order Consultation Permission
- Item 36: Wheeled Bin Recycling
- Item 37: Enforcement Contract Update

23.2 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 28: Brighton & Hove Bike Share- Contracts
- Item 29: Highways Winter Service Plan 2016-17
- Item 32: Cromwell Road Pedestrian Crossing TRO Objection
- Item 34: Various Traffic Regulation Orders

24 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(a) Petitions

(i) Speed Bumps on Ovingdean Road- Anna Taylor

24.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 220 people requesting the installation of speed bumps to enforce the 20mph limit on Ovingdean Road.

24.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“I attended a Residents Association meeting on 22nd September along with your ward councillors and listened with interest to concerns and suggestions to deal with issues in Ovingdean Road

Brighton & Hove City Council receive many requests for traffic calming or other measures to mitigate against the effects of traffic in the streets or neighbourhoods where they live and so we have had to adopt a policy where we address those areas where we know people are suffering injuries as a priority.

The collision record for Ovingdean has been checked and I am pleased to say that there have been no injury causing collisions in the past three years. We are also aware from previous checks that the average speed through the village is around 24mph so with no injuries and low speeds I am afraid that we are not in a position to directly prioritise this request just now.

However, should there be any possible developments around the village that may give us potential income in the form of development agreements then we will revisit this decision. And in addition, as promised at the meeting, we will look at low-cost measures such as improved signage to highlight the fact that sections of Ovingdean Road are a shared space may be possible”

24.3 **RESOVLED-** That the petition be noted.

(ii) Public review of Elm Grove/Lewes Road junction- Dani Ahrens

24.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 781 people requesting an urgent review of the junction of Elm Grove and Lewes Road involving public engagement on a wide range of options for making the junction safer for people on bikes and on foot.

24.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“An upgrade of the Elm Grove/Lewes Road junction is currently on the Local Transport Plan Programme that was agreed last Autumn and is due for completion in 2016/17.

The project is in its early stages but it is anticipated that the project will include an upgrade of the traffic signals to improve the efficiency of the junction as well as the introduction of cycle advance signals. As part of the process we will also conduct a safety review to ensure that safety is maximised for all users.

Due to timescale and budget constraints it will not be possible to conduct a full, wide-ranging public engagement on multiple options however we will liaise with all of the important stakeholders and immediate frontagers such as the ones you have suggested as appropriate. And if anyone would like to put forward suggestions then they are very welcome to do so by emailing Travel.Planning@brighton-hove.gov.uk.

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

(iii) Parking Zone U- Charles Baines

24.7 The Committee considered a petition signed by 51 people requesting the council to change parking in Zone U to a 9am-8pm pay and display zone.

24.8 The Chair provided the following response:

“Residents in Area U were consulted on changing the hours of restriction a few years ago and a large majority wanted to keep things as they are.

However, the parking situation has changed since then with an extension of the scheme so in response to this petition the Council will consult residents in Area U on whether they would like to be considered for a 9am-8pm parking scheme.

It is proposed that this leaflet drop will happen in December alongside the parking scheme consultation in the Hanover, Elm Grove and Craven Vale areas with the results presented back to this Committee next spring”.

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

(iv) Event Parking in East & North Moulsecomb- Spencer Carvill

24.10 The Committee considered a petition signed by 230 people requesting changes to parking Zone D to prevent unauthorised parking on event days in East and North Moulsecomb.

24.11 The Chair provided the following response:

“I am aware that officers have met up with residents and representatives of the football club recently and are looking into a few short term measures that can be introduced.

This will include a Traffic Order funded by the Football Club to propose parking restrictions such as yellow lines to reduce vehicle obstruction in the Match-day parking areas.

Officers will also review the operation of the schemes including how the permits are issued and how they are enforced.

Fundamental changes to the scheme operation including boundaries would require much more detailed discussion and funding from the football club as it is distinctly different from the way other parking schemes are managed and introduced. There is currently no plan or resources to include or undertake a further consultation within the existing parking scheme programme but I hope that officers will be able to progress the other measures that I’ve just outlined as quickly as possible”

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

(v) Zone G parking- Laura Gunns

24.13 The Committee considered a petition signed by 98 people requesting Ditchling Gardens to be reinstated as Zone J due to a negative impact on local residents being able to park in Ditchling Road and the surrounding streets subsequent to the areas recent transfer to Zone G.

24.14 The Chair provided the following response:

“As reported in a response to a question from Councillor Hill to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee in June 2016, the Council has undertaken an extensive and detailed two stage consultation process for this parking scheme which received full support.

We also need to consider the previous issues within Ditchling Gardens when a number of residents outlined difficulties for their visitors finding a parking space.

Therefore, as part of the overall process we intend to undertake a period of monitoring and these comments that have come today will be included in the monitoring period. If

there are continued difficulties for residents in Ditchling Road and the surrounding areas with their Area J permit and a number of spaces remain in Ditchling Gardens then proposals could be considered to a future Committee meeting as part of the six monthly traffic orders advertised”.

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

(b) Written Questions

(i) Powered Two Wheelers in bus lanes- Mark Greening

24.16 Mark Greening put the following question:

“In 2014 there was unanimous agreement at Committee regarding use of Powered Two Wheelers in three bus lanes. Access in two lanes continues but three years on, Lewes Road still sees PTWs excluded. Motorcyclists have been patient but now want to hold the Council to account.

*Without access to bus lanes the available width of space for riders, adversely affects our safety. In addition to better protecting bikers as a vulnerable road user group other benefits include: road space in a crowded city and environmental benefits
Could an explanation for the delay be given and a clear timescale provided?”*

24.17 The Chair provided the following response:

“The Lewes Road has gone through some fundamental design changes and the Council is still currently in a monitoring period following the extended work which incorporated changes to the Vogue Gyrotory.

In order to understand the impacts of the changes and monitor behaviors, it has been decided not to introduce any major changes which may impact on the data and observations that have already been taken. The three year monitoring period finishes in December 2016.

In the meantime, work on additional coloured surfacing designs at five key junctions to support the trial and the safety of other vehicles using the bus lanes has begun. This work is a minor modification for the purposes of the Lewes Road scheme but will benefit existing bus lane users. It will also support a trial to allow Motorcycles to use the bus lanes if the decision is made to proceed with this in due course.

These works have been delayed due to staff capacity within the Transport department, but were scheduled to take place at the start of October.

A precise timetable for these works cannot be given because they are weather dependent, requiring dry weather in order to ensure a longer life for the surfacing. All works are scheduled to take place at night in order to minimise disruption”.

24.18 Mark Greening put the following supplementary question:

“Some councils have motorcycle liaison officers- is that something that could be considered by the council in the future?”

24.19 The Chair provided the following response:

“At a time of dwindling council resources, it is not possible to provide a dedicated post. If you want to know more details about the works to the junctions then Matthew Thompson is the key contact”

(ii) Traffic in Woodingdean- John Paul Amos

24.20 John Paul Amos put the following question:

“Can the administration please bring a report to a future meeting of this committee outlining positive and practical measures that can be implemented to better manage the increasing traffic flows coming through Woodingdean as a result of the 3Ts hospital redevelopment and the Lewes road scheme? The congestion that this extra traffic is causing is making life intolerable for residents of the village.”

24.21 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your question, Mr Amos. It echoes the concerns that were also outlined by Mr Roke when he presented a Deputation on behalf of Woodingdean residents to a meeting of the Full Council in July, and is now on the agenda for this meeting. The Deputation was raised after the public meeting that was arranged and held at the end of June, which I hope you were able to attend. I provided a full response to the Deputation in July and we can provide you with a copy of that response, as I believe that it answers your question.

One of the points I made within my response, and would repeat today, is that I would encourage yourself and any other residents that are interested and concerned about the situation to attend and participate in regular liaison meetings that are held with Hospital representatives and their contractors about day-to-day issues in relation to the redevelopment of the Hospital.

This could include any concerns you or others have about Hospital-related traffic in Woodingdean. You would be most welcome to attend the next meeting which will be in the evening on Wednesday 23 November in the Audrey Emerton Building beginning at 7pm.

I can inform you that since the public meeting in Woodingdean took place with Officers and representatives from the Hospital development, Road Safety Officers have examined the road safety data which indicates that the junction is operating safely. Officers have agreed to monitor the junction on a regular basis and take necessary action should safety problems become evident as the construction traffic begin to use the route.

In addition as agreed at the public meeting, Officers are currently analysing recent speed survey data for the village and will be feeding back the results to myself and local ward members within the next month”.

24.22 John Paul Amos asked the following supplementary question:

“Please can Councillor Mitchell outline who made the decision, and when it was made, to change the route site traffic would use for the 3T’s development previously agreed within the original planning application and what consideration was given to the additional impact it would have on Woodingdean roads?”

24.23 The Chair provided the following response:

“There was no previously agreed route that was decided at the same time as the planning permission. It was always the case that the developers, in conjunction with the Hospital Trust would come forward with a proposal for their consolidation and construction centre. At the time that the planning application was decided, that site was not known. In April this year, the council was informed that site would be at the Kempton Gas Works at the bottom of Wilson Avenue, very near to the Hospital site. And therefore it was not possible before that time to consider the route once we had that necessary information.”

(c) Deputations

(i) St Margaret’s Place, Loading Only zone removal- John Clinton

24.24 The Committee considered a Deputation requesting the removal of a loading bay located on St Margaret’s Place.

24.25 The Chair provided the following response:

“At the start of the meeting, we undertook what is known as a callover at which we decide which items to discuss. Any items we choose not to discuss, which includes the Traffic Regulation Order position for St Margaret’s Place, are automatically agreed and so the decision has already been taken as part of that process. This, therefore, has what has been agreed:

There have been 2 objections, 2 items of support and a petition of support with 4 signatures to the proposed removal of the loading bay. This was requested by a resident outlining that the loading bay was being misused by a nearby business and vehicles were parking in the bay overnight. This is a difficult issue and we have also recently received a letter from the caretaker of Sussex Heights on behalf of residents requesting that the loading bay remain. It is proposed, therefore, that we put a hold on this proposal and consult residents in the area through a leaflet drop including Sussex Heights to get their views on this proposal”.

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

(ii) Old Town Transport Scheme (permanent East Street weekend closure to traffic- Olivia Reid

24.27 The Committee considered a Deputation in favour of the proposal to permanently close East Street to traffic between the hours of 11am and 7pm Saturday and Sunday.

24.28 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for taking the time to come along and present your Deputation. Proposals for the future of the weekend pedestrianisation of East Street will be considered at this meeting at Agenda Item 31”

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

(iii) **Deputation to support the offer of funding for a children's playground in Stanmer Park- Jamie Hooper**

24.30 The Committee considered a Deputation requesting a report be brought to the next committee meeting formally asking permission to proceed on the proposed site for a play area in Stanmer Park to enable to completion of the Deed of Dedication for the area with Fields in Trust.

24.31 The Chair provided the following response:

"Thank you Mr Hooper for your deputation that you have submitted along with other interested individuals with regard to the proposed play area for Stanmer Park. Your personal generosity in relation to this project is much appreciated.

However, as indicated previously the provision of the new play area needs to be considered within the wider context of the Stanmer Estate, Parks for People grant application and the forthcoming Open Spaces Strategy. We are also working on that in conjunction with Heritage England, the National Park, the Heritage Lottery Fund and with other residents so there are a wide range of stakeholders that need to be carried with us and also consulted.

The future provision of parks and open spaces set within the context of severe budget reductions for the council will be considered at a later date by this Committee. While we await the outcome of the Stage 2 bid to the former, and work is progressing on the latter it would not be appropriate for Members to consider a request at this stage regarding a new play area. In particular, we would need to know if the grant application is successful and the outcome of the assessment of play equipment across the city.

In order that Members can make an informed decision it is really important that any new playground equipment that is decided to be implemented can be maintained because the council would have to take on the revenue resource for maintaining the equipment and that decision would have to be taken in conjunction with a decision regarding the equipment at the other 54 playgrounds across Brighton & Hove so that we make the best use of our maintenance resources.

I appreciate your desire to move forward on a play area, however, due to the scale of the responses to the Open Spaces Strategy, well over 2,000 now it is unlikely the strategy will be considered by Members until the New Year, therefore, consideration of the request on the play area is therefore likely to undertake a similar timescale.

I know you have previously linked with the Parks Projects Team who will keep you updated".

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

25 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

(a) Petitions

(i) Marine Gate Safety- David Woodcock

25.1 The Committee considered a petition referred from the Full Council meeting of 21 July 2016 and signed by 142 people requesting the Council to address road safety and antisocial behaviour at Marine Gate and in the Marina car park area. An additional 558 signatures to the petition were presented at the meeting.

25.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Marine Drive was a location assessed for a crossing in 2012.

At the time it was considered that the existing pedestrian refuge was adequate.

At the 27th November 2012 E&TS Committee, it was agreed to remove the crossing from the list but that the area would continue to be monitored.

That monitoring has resulted in justification to consider this location for pedestrian improvements.

As a result, this location has been included in the Pedestrian Priority List on today’s agenda with a recommendation to further investigate improvement solutions including a formal pedestrian crossing.

Unfortunately we are not in a position to carry out traffic calming measures on the A259, this busy main arterial road linking several major towns along the south coast, however, the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership currently operate a mobile camera enforcement site in the lay-by above the Marina that covers the section of road up to, and including, Marine Gate flats. This will undoubtedly have an effect on vehicle speeds especially where people are currently crossing the road to and from the Marina.

In relation to your concerns about noise from the Marina, any noise complaints can be reported to the Council’s Environmental Protection Team and they will take up any issues the organisations running the Marina but in addition, the Marina already has a security company that operates 24/7 and can be contacted on 01273 693696”

25.3 Councillor Miller asked if the Committee could take the recourse of receiving a report on the matter, addressing the issues raised in the petition.

25.4 The Chair stated that she was reluctant to receive a report on the matter as the matter was addressed in agenda item 30 and it would be appropriate to discuss the issue amongst the other locations that had undergone a rigorous road safety assessment.

25.5 Councillor Janio suggested that officers meet with ward councillors to provide a briefing on what was a complex issue and if that did not provide resolution; they could bring an item to the next meeting.

25.6 David Woodcock noted that the speed camera in place was not sufficient and what was required was a camera monitoring eastbound traffic as that was where problems arose.

25.7 The Chair stated that she would ask officers to discuss this matter with the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership as they were the responsible organisation for speed cameras.

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

(ii) Rottingdean Traffic & Air Pollution- Lynne Moss

25.9 The Committee considered a petition referred from the Full Council meeting of 21 July 2016 and signed by 1309 people requesting the Council to address and provide solutions at the earliest available opportunity to poor air quality in Rottingdean High Street.

25.10 The Chair provided the following response:

“This issue will be considered by the Committee when it discusses the officer report at agenda item 27”.

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

(iii) Reintroduce scratch card voucher parking- Councillor Brown

25.12 The Committee considered a petition referred from the Full Council meeting of 21 July 2016 and signed by 1714 people that requested the reintroduction of scratch card voucher parking alongside the new pay-by-phone system to give residents and visitors to the city a choice on how they pay to park.

25.13 The Chair provided the following response:

“A voucher system used to be available as an alternative to paying for parking by cash in a small area of the city but was withdrawn following committee agreement almost 10 years ago.

They were withdrawn following feedback from the Traffic Penalty Tribunal about the signage and use of the vouchers which some drivers found confusing. Drivers had to scratch off their arrival time and date and display the correct amount of vouchers for their stay, whereas other payment systems work this out automatically.

Since the withdrawal of the vouchers the number of PCNs issued has fallen by around 30,000 per year partly as a result of fewer mistakes being made by drivers using the voucher system. The voucher system was also very expensive to administer with costs including the invoicing of up to 200 outlets, a member of staff and van required to restock them, voucher printing costs and signage costs which would be considerable if the scheme were to be re-introduced citywide

Very few councils still now sell parking vouchers as a result.

Drivers wishing to pay for parking in cash at an outlet rather than at a machine or by phone can do so at one of 150 PayPoint outlets in the city. And the substantial cost which would be involved in reinstating a scheme which could even outweigh income received from their sale. And of course recently, the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee did agree to the introduction of pay by card parking system and we hope and we feel that will be a very easy and convenient method for motorists to use”.

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

(c) Deputations

(i) Deputations concerning Woodingdean Traffic Management- Stephen Roke

25.15 The Committee considered a Deputation referred from the Full Council meeting of 21 July 2016 requesting the Council to review traffic management arrangements for the next ten years in Woodingdean due to current levels of traffic volume and dangerous driving in the area.

25.16 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your deputation.

In regard to your query on traffic volumes I will ask officers to contact you directly to clarify with you exactly what changes are evident and that you have the latest traffic volume data.

I can inform you that since the public meeting in Woodingdean took place with Officers and representatives from the Hospital development, Road Safety Officers have examined the road safety data which indicates that the junction is operating safely. Officers have agreed to continue monitor the junction on a regular basis and take necessary action should safety problems become evident. In addition, as agreed at the public meeting, Officers are currently analysing recent speed survey data for the village and will be feeding back the results to myself and local ward members within the next month.

The issue of construction traffic movements over the next 10 years are being picked up specifically by the developers of the 3T's hospital at regular residents liaison meetings. I would encourage yourself and other residents to attend and participate in these meetings that are held with Hospital representatives and their contractors about day-to-day issues, and those associated with the 3Ts development. This could include any concerns you or others have about Hospital-related traffic in Woodingdean. You would be most welcome to attend the next meeting which will be in the evening on Wednesday 23 November”.

- 25.17 Councillor Janio stated that Members needed to take heed of the number of representations being made from the east area of the city as it would indicate there were extensive issues in the area and that action needed to be taken to address those issues.
- 25.18 The Chair stated that she could assure Councillor Janio that the issues raised were being taken seriously but were also intrinsically linked so any proposals coming forward from one particular area of the Deans would have an impact on another area. Therefore, a joined up solution was required.
- 25.19 Councillor Miller agreed that a linked solution was required but did not believe the council were allocating adequate resources or effort into finding a solution.
- 25.20 The Chair stated that she could provide assurance that officer time was being given to find a short and long-term solution to the issues.
- 25.21 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

(d) Notice of Motion

(i) Finding a solution to the air pollution problems on Rottingdean High Street

- 25.22 The Committee considered a Notice of Motion referred from the Full Council meeting of 21 July 2016 that noted the severity of traffic-related air pollution problems in Rottingdean High Street and requested a report be brought before the next committee meeting outlining options for improving traffic flow through the village and any other measures that would reduce air pollution levels in Rottingdean.
- 25.23 The Chair provided the following response:

“The Notice of Motion has requested an officer report and this matter and as Members will be aware, that is at agenda item 27. I propose discussing the matter when we reach that item later in the meeting”.

25.24 **RESOLVED-** That the Notice of Motion be noted.

26 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(b) Written Questions

(i) Victoria Road Parking Scheme- Councillor Wares

26.1 The question was withdrawn.

(ii) Bus Shelter- Councillor Wares

26.2 Councillor Wares put the following question:

“Please could the Chair confirm that the Council ensures that companies who supply and own bus shelters in the City have them fully insured such that if they are damaged beyond economic repair, such as a hit and run driver, they will be replaced quickly by the company and that in the event the company fail to replace the shelter, the Council will utilise funds from the self-insured fund so as not to affect residents who need and rely on bus shelters”.

26.3 The Chair provided the following response:

“The company that currently supplies and owns a majority of the bus shelters in the City is Clear Channel. They have confirmed that, amongst other insurance policies, they have public liability insurance in the sum of £10m. In relation to damage to their bus shelters they have stated that they self-insure and pursue claims against third parties where details are known. Corporate Finance and Resources do not intend to use Council Insurance fund resources for the replacement of bus shelters that are the property of Clear Channel. Officers are engaged with the current supplier and pressing them to fulfil their obligations and ensure the swift replacement of any bus shelters that are damaged beyond economic repair”.

26.4 Councillor Wares put the following supplementary question:

“Could I have the support of the Chair for the shelter on Mackie Avenue to be replaced as quickly as possible?”

26.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“You have my assurance and I will speak to Officers after the meeting to bring pressure to bear on Clear Channel to replace the shelter”

(c) Letters

(i) Marine Gate- Councillor Mears

26.6 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillor Mears that requested that a report be brought before the next committee meeting outlining options for addressing road safety, traffic and noise related issues at Marine Gate.

26.7 The Chair provided the following response:

“Marine Drive was a location assessed for a crossing in 2012. At the time it was considered that the existing pedestrian refuge was adequate. In the 27th November 2012 ETS Committee meeting, it was agreed that we would remove the crossing from the list but that we would continue to monitor the area. And the monitoring that has been undertaken has now shown there is justification to consider this location for pedestrian improvements.

As a result this location has been included in the Pedestrian Priority List report with a recommendation to further investigate improvement solutions in that complex area including a formal pedestrian crossing.

Between Marine Gate flats and Roedean Road there have been 11 slight collisions and 2 serious collisions in the past three years, however, these are spread out along its length and are not particularly concentrated at any particular spot except for the collisions that will be addressed by a report into pedestrian priority that is to be considered by this committee later.

Sussex Police are responsible for enforcing speed limits in Brighton & Hove and are currently, as most local services are, experiencing severe cuts to their funding and this is having a direct effect on their ability to actively police speeds limits. For this reason they would not support a reduction in the speed limit in Marine Drive and the low collision history in the area also supports this view with no speed related collisions recorded in this section.

The Sussex Safer Roads Partnership operate speed cameras on behalf of the Police and have to meet strict Home Office criteria when considering their deployment. I am pleased to say that, aside from the pedestrian collisions near Rifle Butt Road that could be addressed by the installation of a light controlled crossing, there have only been two collisions in the section of Marine Drive where you are requesting a camera. This would not meet the criteria for a fixed camera site, however, the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership do operate a mobile camera site in a lay by above the Marina and this enforces in both directions up to, and including, the pedestrian refuge at Rifle Butt Road. Any noise complaints can be reported to the Council’s Environmental Protection Team.

They can be contacted on ehl.environmentalprotection@brighton-hove.gov.uk or 01273 294266. If the noise is occurring Friday and Saturday nights 10pm to 3am residents can call the Council’s out of hours Noise Patrol Service on 01273 293541. In addition the Marina have a security company that operate 24/7 and they can be called on 01273 693636”.

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

27 ROTTINGDEAN HIGH STREET - TRAFFIC AND AIR QUALITY

27.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out options and considerations regarding possible measures or schemes that could improve traffic flow and reduce air pollution in Rottingdean,

specifically High Street. The report had been requested by Full Council following public and Member representations at its meeting on 21 July 2016.

27.2 The Chair moved a motion on behalf of the Labour & Co-operative Group to amend recommendation 2.1 and add recommendations 2.2 and 2.3 as shown in bold italics as follows:

2.1 The committee recommends that the options and considerations outlined within this report regarding possible measures or schemes that could improve traffic flow and reduce air pollution in Rottingdean village, and especially the High Street, ***are best taken forward by the RPC liaison group. [This will avoid duplication of officer resources and ensure that more time can be spent on exploring the options for implementation referred to at 2.3 below]. This group should be appropriately resourced, including with the attendance of a senior officer, to be decided by the Executive Director following consultation with the Chair of the Committee and Lead Opposition Spokespersons and should meet on a quarterly basis.***

2.2 ***The Committee agrees that a report be brought back to E,T&S Committee on an annual basis updating on progress.***

2.3 ***The Committee notes the potential sources of funding outlined in paragraph 7.2 and agrees that sufficient resources are explored from the 2017/18 LTP Capital Programme and the Transport division's revenue budget and beyond, to look to implement the Task & Finish Group's work and recommendations based on traffic modelling.***

27.3 Introducing the amendment, the Chair explained that the purpose of the motion was to strike a balance between being able to maintain sufficient resources to pursue the agreed Local Transport Plan (LTP) programme and at the same time, continue the liaison with the Rottingdean Parish Council (RPC) and the village community in pursuing option to improve traffic flow and air quality in Rottingdean High Street. The Rottingdean Parish Council liaison group would be the body this work would be taken forward with.

27.4 Councillor Horan seconded the motion.

27.5 Councillor Miller moved a motion on behalf of the Conservative Group to amend recommendation 2.1 and add recommendations 2.2 and 2.3 as shown in bold italics as follows:

2.1 The committee recommends that the options and considerations outlined within this report regarding possible measures or schemes that could improve traffic flow and reduce air pollution in Rottingdean village, and especially the High Street, ***are best taken forward by a continuation of the established task and finish group. This group should be appropriately resourced, including with the attendance of a senior officer, to be decided by the Executive Director following consultation with the Chair of the Committee and Lead Opposition Spokespersons and should meet on a quarterly basis.***

2.2 The Committee agrees that a report be brought back to E,T&S Committee on an annual basis updating on progress.

2.3 The Committee notes the potential sources of funding outlined in paragraph 7.2 and agrees that sufficient resources are explored from the 2017/18 LTP Capital Programme and the Transport division's revenue budget and beyond, to look to implement the Task & Finish Group's work and recommendations based on traffic modelling.

27.6 Introducing the amendment, Councillor Miller stated that recommendation 2.3 of the Labour & Co-operative Group amendment would need to be adjusted as the Task & Finish Group recommendations would be taken forward by the RPC liaison group and the Task & Finish Group would come to an end. In terms of the Conservative Group amendment, Councillor Miller stated that its intention was to give purpose to the original report recommendations with evidence based solutions. Councillor Miller stated that Rottingdean High Street was an Air Quality Management area and the motion requested resources be found from later in the LTP programme to address not only air quality issues but the recent reduction in businesses operating from the High Street.

27.7 Councillor Janio formally seconded the motion.

27.8 Councillor Janio stated that the Committee had heard several representations from residents based in the east of the city that made clear there were issues to resolve. Councillor Janio stated that it was fair that resources, including that of a senior officer attending meetings, were provided in finding a suitable resolution and that the Task & Finish Group were the appropriate body to take the matter forwards.

27.9 The Chair asked for clarification that the Conservative motion proposed the issue be discussed at the RPC, Task & Finish Group and RPC liaison group.

27.10 Councillor Janio confirmed that to be the case however, the amendment only requested that a senior council only have to focus on the Task & Finish Group.

27.11 Councillor Greenbaum enquired as to the composition of the Task & Finish Group.

27.12 The Assistant Director- City Transport clarified that the Task & Finish Group comprised a sub-section of the RPC and council officers and more recently had included ward councillor representation.

27.13 The Chair then put the Labour & Co-operative motion to the vote which was tied. The Chair used her casting vote and the motion was carried.

27.14 The Chair then put the Conservative Group motion to the vote which was tied and not carried.

27.15 The Chair then put the recommendations, as amended, to the vote which were agreed.

27.16 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) The Committee recommends that the options and considerations outlined within this report regarding possible measures or schemes that could improve traffic flow and reduce air pollution in Rottingdean village, and especially the High Street, are best taken forward by the RPC liaison group. [This will avoid duplication of officer resources and ensure that more time can be spent on exploring the options for implementation referred to at 2.3 below.] This group should be appropriately resourced, including with the attendance of a senior officer, to be decided by the Executive Director following consultation with the Chair of the Committee and Lead Opposition Spokespersons and should meet on a quarterly basis.
- 2) The Committee agrees that a report be brought back to ET&S Committee on an annual basis updating on progress.
- 3) The Committee notes the potential sources of funding outlined in paragraph 7.2 and agrees that sufficient resources are explored from the 2017/18 LTP Capital Programme and the Transport division's revenue budget and beyond, to look to implement the Task & Finish Group's and RPC liaison group's work and recommendations based on traffic modelling.

28 BRIGHTON & HOVE BIKE SHARE - CONTRACTS

- 28.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approves the extension of a concession agreement for a Bike Share scheme for an initial contract term of three years including the mobilisation period which is anticipated from December 2016 to June 2017.

29 HIGHWAYS WINTER SERVICE PLAN 2016-17

- 29.1 **RESOVLED-** That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approves the Brighton & Hove City Council Highways Winter Service Plan 2016-17 as attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

30 PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS PRIORITY LIST

- 30.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that presented the findings of the pedestrian crossing assessments of locations requested up to January 2016 and identified priority crossing points to be delivered over the next 12 months subject to availability of funds.
- 30.2 Councillor Wares noted the pedestrian priority list detailed on page 103 of the agenda and asked when an assessment of each location was carried out.
- 30.3 The Transport Planning Officer clarified that assessments were carried out in January and February 2016.
- 30.4 Councillor Wares noted that there were discrepancies between table on page 98 of the report that listed the top ten priority crossings and the top ten crossing locations listed on the longer list at page 103. Councillor Wares asked if that meant Marine Drive/Rifle Butt

Road would be taken as one of the ten locations to be assessed for a crossing thereby replacing Millers Road/Highcroft Villas in that top ten.

- 30.5 The Transport Planning Officer clarified that Marine Drive/Rifle Butt Road would be a further location taken forward in addition to the ten sites listed on page 98 having been identified by the Road Safety Team and would potentially be a joint funded scheme.
- 30.6 Councillor Wares noted that assessments were made in January and February 2016 and risks for varying locations could change over six months. Councillor Wares noted that on the table listed on page 103, Winfield Avenue near Carden Avenue scored 12 and of the ten priority sites to be taken forward, the lowest score was 12.5. Councillor Wares noted that regrettably, there had been an accident at Winfield Avenue in the past two weeks. On that basis, its assessment score of 12 would likely be higher and it should therefore be brought into the top ten crossing sites to be taken forward, replacing Millers Road/Highcroft Villas.
- 30.7 The Chair noted that the Pedestrian Crossing Priority List was an annual report so the incident referred to would be analysed and included in the next report in 2017.
- 30.8 The Transport Planning Officer confirmed that the assessments were carried out annually and ranked over a three year period and it would be very difficult to be reactive as it would make all locations difficult to compare and prioritise. The current methodology, agreed by the council allowed officers to deliver road safety improvements in a co-ordinated and fair manner to set criteria.
- 30.9 The Assistant Director, City Transport confirmed that accidents and other factors were examined over a three year period rather than in isolation. Each location was assessed with scientific and technical rigour. Furthermore, it was unlikely that a single accident would be so significant to bring the location in question into the top ten priority listings. The Assistant Director, City Transport added that a comprehensive briefing on the pedestrian crossing assessment process could be provided.
- 30.10 Councillor Wares stated his disagreement with that analysis and it was clear from the scoring on page 102 that the recent incident at Winfield Avenue would bring the location into the top ten based on the scoring system and current score.
- 30.11 The Chair stated that Winfield Avenue may well be considered for a pedestrian crossing in 2017 but she was very concerned that a fair, robust, scientific and technical process not be unpicked by committee.
- 30.12 Councillor Miller noted that some information regarding funding detailed on page 105 was blank and asked how the locations would be funded.
- 30.13 The Assistant Director, City Transport confirmed that this was because data was missing but all locations had obtained funding or funding was being pursued.
- 30.14 Councillor Greenbaum noted in the assessment scoring, certain speed limits added a plus mark in terms of safety and asked whether 20mph limits could feasibly determine a minus score as it made roads safer. Councillor Greenbaum noted her support for the comments made by the Chair that it would be inappropriate to review a technical and

scientific process on an ad-hoc basis and that it was very important to have a consistent system.

- 30.15 The Transport Planning Officer clarified that the methodology had been agreed prior to the introduction of 20mph speed limits in the city.
- 30.16 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Wares moved a motion to include Winfield Avenue in the top ten priority crossing locations for 2016/17, replacing Millers Road/Highcroft Villas.
- 30.17 The Chair stated that it would be very difficult to move to a vote on the matter as the resource implications were not before the committee and it was likely that every site on the priority list would have to be re-assessed and a revised report returned to committee.
- 30.18 The Principal Transport Planner noted that the pedestrian crossing priority list was not the only budget that road safety measures could be introduced and the committee had previously provided remit to officers to examine Winfield Avenue for the introduction of 20mph and other road safety measures. Once online data for the area for Winfield Avenue had been collected, discussions with stakeholders and ward councillors about possible solutions would commence.
- 30.19 The Road Safety Projects Officer added that the Safer Routes to Schools also had its own budget and could provide funding for any improvements on Winfield Avenue should that be deemed required. Furthermore, the Road Safety Projects Officer noted that the police report into the recent incident on Winfield Avenue had not yet been received and the final conclusion of their investigation was awaited.
- 30.20 Councillor Wares stated that he would be withdrawing his motion on the information provided and would welcome a briefing on the matter.

30.21 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the priority crossing list and grants permission for Officers to begin implementing the prioritised pedestrian crossing locations where funding has been identified. Where crossing points require higher funding levels these should be acknowledged and identified as part of future work plans
- 2) That the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee authorises officers to construct the prioritised pedestrian crossings for which funding has been identified within the financial year 2016/17, subject to Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) being advertised prior to implementation of crossing points.

31 EAST STREET PEDESTRIANISATION - EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

- 31.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out objections received in relation to the East Street Experimental Traffic Regulation Order which allows for the closing of a portion of East Street to traffic

between 11am and 7pm on Saturdays and Sundays and the removal of driving prohibitions in Little East Street to allow motor vehicles to exit the area during these times.

- 31.2 Councillor Deane welcomed the report noting her disappointment that that the closure to traffic would only be at weekends rather than seven days a week as originally proposed and that traders, residents and visitors were unable to benefit sooner.
- 31.3 **RESOLVED-** That, having taken account of all duly made objections and representations to the Experimental Traffic Order, the Committee approves action being taken to make this order permanent.

32 CROMWELL ROAD PEDESTRIAN CROSSING TRO OBJECTION

- 32.1 **RESOLVED-** That the committee supports the advertised Amendment Order No.* 201* (ref: TRO-3-2016).

33 GLOUCESTER RD/ EAST ST/ AVENUE TRO OBJECTION

- 33.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out objections received in relation to a Traffic Regulation Order for Gloucester Road, East Street and Avenue.
- 33.2 On behalf of Bricycles, Councillor Greenbaum expressed their disappointment with the tone of the report that insinuated they had been obstructive which was not the case and that they were happy to proceed with the proposals.
- 33.3 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the committee agrees to adopt the amendments to TRO-8a-2016 and TRO-8b-2016 as proposed.
 - 2) That the committee instructs officers to advertise a new TRO amendment to The Brighton (North Laine Traffic Management) Order 1986 allowing cycling on Gloucester Road between Kensington Place and Queens Gardens to ensure all local stakeholders have an opportunity to respond to the proposed change.

34 VARIOUS TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

- 34.1 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee agree (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections) the following:
 - a) Approve the Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.* 201* with the following amendments:
 - The proposed removal of the permit parking bay in Medina Place, is to be amended on this Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.7.

- The proposed removal of the shared parking bays in Regency Square is not to be taken forward on this Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.8.
 - The proposed removal of the loading bay in St Margaret's Place, is not to be taken forward on this Traffic Order and put on hold due to the reasons outlined in section 3.10.
- 2) That the Committee agree (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections) the following:
- a) Approve the Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No. * 201* with the following amendments:
- The proposed double yellow lines on the east side of Lyminster Avenue, is to be amended on this Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.11
- 3) That the Committee agree (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections) the following:
- Approve the Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment Order No.* 201*.

35 STANMER PARK TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER CONSULTATION PERMISSION

- 35.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that summarised the current parking problems in Stanmer Park, the findings of the previous consultation and recommended that consultation be undertaken to introduce charges and controlled parking.
- 35.2 Councillor Janio stated that whilst he was supportive of the project and wanted it to be a success, he had concerns that would not be the case. As a representative on the Stanmer Project Board, he had raised a number of issues regarding the sustainable transport model and traffic management. Councillor Janio stated that he had further concerns in relation to the possibility of circular traffic associated with the pricing of potential parking and loss of spaces across the park. Councillor Janio asked if the approval of the TRO was strictly related to a successful Heritage Lottery Funding bid and would not go ahead if that bid was unsuccessful.
- 35.3 The Assistant Director, City Environmental Management confirmed that the TRO would only be implemented if the funding bid to the HLF was successful.
- 35.4 Councillor Miller asked a number of questions in relation to the TRO and wider project. These included whether double yellow lines would be installed to prevent illegal parking up to the park, whether there would be permanent parking in front of the house, whether Chalk Hill would be resurfaced and potentially utilised more, whether the Church car park could be used at weekends when the South Downs National Park Authority would not be using the site, if there would be resident parking, whether students of Sussex University might take advantage of lower season ticket pricing in Stanmer Park in comparison to the University's own site (particularly in the Lower Lodges) and where the Patchway overflow would be located.

- 35.5 The Assistant Director, City Environmental Management clarified that enforcement options were set out in paragraph 3.3 and any proposals brought forward would be based on the established enforcement process, the owners of the house were supportive of the bid and discussions regarding events and parking would continue, a precise location of the Patchway overflow site could be provided after the meeting and options for the Church car park and Chalk Hill would be examined through the consultation process. The Assistant Director, City Transport added that to avoid potential annual season ticket misuse, a scheme could be adopted whereby a vehicle would need to be registered within a certain location in order to qualify to apply for a permit.
- 35.6 Councillor Wares moved a motion on behalf of the Conservative Group to amend recommendation 2.2 in bold italics as follows:
- 2.2 That the Committee approves the proposals to control parking in Stanmer Park as set out in this report, subject to the statutory consultation process for Traffic Regulation Orders ***and receiving HLF funding.***
- 35.7 Councillor Theobald seconded the motion.
- 35.8 The motion was carried.
- 35.9 Councillor Theobald stated that he had been asked many times whether 300 trees would be removed from the park and asked for clarification on the matter.
- 35.10 The Assistant Director, City Environmental Management there was a tree management plan being developed for the park following advice from Heritage England. There were trees that may be unsuitable for the park and any decision would be relayed to Members following detailed design work.
- 35.11 Councillor Greenbaum enquired whether the committee were agreeing to the charges set out at paragraph 3.11 of the report as she had concerns that the pricing structure would fail to be sufficient deterrent not to park in the central areas of the park.
- 35.12 The Chair clarified that the committee were being asked to consult on the measures set out in the report and as part of that consultation, adjusting the tariff could be considered.
- 35.13 Councillor Greenbaum noted her concerns regarding recent signage put up along the road to the house counting down the number of minutes it would take to arrive at the house by car that she felt contradicted the council's sustainable transport ambitions.
- 35.14 The Chair then put the recommendations, as amended, to the vote which were agreed.
- 35.15 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee notes the outcome of the past consultations.
 - 2) That the Committee approves the proposals to control parking in Stanmer Park as set out in this report, subject to the statutory consultation process for Traffic Regulation Orders and receiving HLF funding.

- 3) That the Committee approves the advertising of the associated Traffic Regulation Orders by Officers.

36 WHEELED BIN RECYCLING

- 36.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided the consultation results of the wheeled bin recycling trial and sought approval in principle to expand the trial area of 4000 wheelie bins for recycling to all households across the city where there is room for storage estimated at a further 60,000 properties. A full financial business case and audit would be submitted to the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee (PG&R) on 8 December 2016.
- 36.2 Councillor Wares noted that he had received anecdotal feedback that the bins were light and could be blown around in high winds leading to the lids to crack.
- 36.3 Councillor Janio stated that he had received 100% positive feedback from residents about the trial. More residents wanted the bins and he hoped a further roll-out could be underway as quickly as possible. In relation to improvements to recycling rates, Councillor Janio expected there to be a period of adaptation but he believed rates would substantially increase once the scheme was settled.
- 36.4 Councillor Atkinson expressed his thanks to Cityclean staff for their work and from the correspondence he had received, the trial had proven to be very popular. Furthermore, Councillor Atkinson noted that he had received multiple enquires from residents about when they would receive the bins such had been the positive impact.
- 36.5 Councillor Deane asked if the bins would be provided to households that had front gardens or suitable storage but were located in a communal refuse area.
- 36.6 The Assistant Director, City Environmental Management stated that this would not be something taken forward as it would have a detrimental impact on the functioning and efficiency of the service.
- 36.7 Councillor Miller welcomed the results of the trial and asked if there could be a communication focus on items that could and could not be recycled in order to dispel common myths and increase recycling rates. Councillor Miller asked if a maintenance and replacement budget had been identified, if residents would be permitted more than one bin where appropriate and if it would be possible to locate the bins in communal blocks.
- 36.8 The Assistant Director, City Environmental Management clarified that, subject to the approval of the financial and business case at PG&R Committee, there would be a robust communications and advertising strategy which was not in place for the trial. There was a budget in place for replacement and maintenance of bins that would be supplemented by a shifting in allocation for black box bins as these would no longer be required in the longer-term. The Assistant Director, City Environment Management added that families would be entitled to two bins if required and there would also be the option of lower capacity bins for smaller households. Communal blocks were always a challenge for the service in terms of number and locations and newer developments

offered the opportunity to adopt new technologies, including underground storage. Furthermore, discussions were in progress on the wider communal bin replacement programme.

- 36.9 Councillor Robins welcomed the report that had been very well received by residents in his area.
- 36.10 Councillor Greenbaum welcomed the report and asked how storage room for the bins would be assessed, whether this would be self-assessment or if there was existing data.
- 36.11 The Assistant Director, City Environment Management stated that this would be undertaken with a street by street assessment.
- 36.12 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee notes the update on the wheeled bin recycling trial and recommends to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee that it approves the introduction of wheeled bin recycling in principle subject to detailed financial implications of the scheme being presented for consideration at the Policy, Resources & Growth meeting on 8 December 2016.

37 ENFORCEMENT CONTRACT UPDATE

- 37.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided an update on the procurement and implementation of the council's waste and litter enforcement service.
- 37.2 The Assistant Director, City Environment Management added a further update detailing information and data for the period subsequent to that included in the committee report. In the past eight weeks, 27 Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN's) had been issued for fly-tipping compared to 8 in the first eight weeks of operation, 65 FPN's issued in relation to commercial waste in the past eight weeks compared to 36 issued in the first eight weeks of operation. This increase was a demonstration of the council's work with the provider in relation to the concerns of residents and also the result of the natural settling in period of any new service.
- 37.3 Councillor Janio stated that whilst he was supportive of the successes of the enforcement service, it did appear from the statistics that action taken against cigarette butt littering was disproportionate than against other forms of unauthorised waste activity, particularly fly-tipping. Councillor Janio stated that he did not think that the contract was in accordance with the council's priorities for the service or that it would begin behavioural change and enforcement appeared overly weighted towards the city centre.
- 37.4 Councillor Mitchell stated that in contrast, residents in East Brighton had welcomed enforcement on cigarette butt littering that had been a severe issue outside the hospital for a number of years.
- 37.5 The Assistant Director, City Environment Management answered that the service was a very new one for the council and that a period of bedding in was a reasonable expectation. In comparison to the first eight weeks of operation, the past eight weeks had seen FPN's issued for fly-tipping exceed those issued for cigarette butt littering

although the latter was a serious issue in the city. In addition, recruitment and training had taken time and more staff had been taken on by the provider that would allow more opportunity to move around the city.

- 37.6 Councillor Wares stated that it would be helpful for ward councillors to receive information on the geographical spread of enforcement. Councillor Wares asked what action was taken on unpaid fines and enquired as to the usefulness of proposed CCTV measures if these were in fixed locations as protagonists were likely to simply move to a different, unmonitored location. Furthermore, Councillor Wares asked what the criteria was for specifying 'hot spot' areas and enquired whether the waiving of FPN's where the offender has no permanent UK address precluded enforcement of offences committed by tourists and traveller encampments.
- 37.7 The Assistant Director, City Environment Management clarified that the recommendations detailed that a Members Seminar would be held where detailed information could be provided. In relation to unpaid fines, there would be an element that would be pursued through the regular legal route by 3GS. Any enforcement undertaken by use of CCTV would be mobile and the Members Seminar would provide opportunity to hear from ward councillors of any specific locations that should be identified. In relation to the question raised on offenders not having a permanent UK address, the Assistant Director, City Environment Management clarified that this was a matter of legislative condition of issuing FPN's.
- 37.8 Councillor Deane stated that whilst the re-assurance provided for activity over the past eight weeks was helpful, expectations for the service were higher than had yet been met. Councillor Deane stated that there did not appear sufficient focus on the issue of dog fouling which was not only a problem in some areas of the city but also presented a health risk.
- 37.9 The Assistant Director, City Environment Management stated that there had been a lot of work with 3GS and the council in terms of priorities for the service and whilst the current primary focus was litter and fly-tipping as it was deemed high priority, this would eventually envelope other initiatives and dog fouling would certainly be one of those.
- 37.10 Councillor Atkinson noted that there had 2,219% increase in performance and whilst the balance of the contract was not yet right, there was a positive outcome of the new service.
- 37.11 Councillor Greenbaum stated that whilst she had been re-assured by the update on recent enforcement activity, it was important for the council to keep pushing 3GS to ensure that the service it delivered matched the council's ambitions and priorities.
- 37.12 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee
- 1) Notes the progress made with regard the enforcement of fly-tipping, waste & litter offences.
 - 2) Agrees with the approach outlined below with regard the enforcement of waste and littering offences.

- 3) Agrees with and delegates authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Environment & Culture to trial the introduction of CCTV cameras and the operational activities associated with this type of enforcement activity, to be funded through the proceeds of Fixed Penalty Notices.
- 4) Grants delegated authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Environment & Culture to develop a pro-active education and communications plan around the use of Fixed Penalty Notices and CCTV, funded through the proceeds of the Fixed Penalty Notices.
- 5) Grants delegated authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Environment & Culture to arrange a Member Seminar to enable officers and 3GS provide detailed briefings on procedures, policies and legislation around the use of FPN's.

38 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

38.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 7.25pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

