

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

4.00pm 27 JUNE 2017

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

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Mitchell (Chair) Horan (Deputy Chair), Wares (Opposition Spokesperson), Littman (Group Spokesperson), Atkinson, Brown, Nemeth, Peltzer Dunn, Robins and West

Other Members present: Councillors Daniel, Gibson, Sykes

PART ONE

1 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

1(a) Declarations of substitutes

1.1 There were none.

1(b) Declarations of interest

1.2 There were none.

1(c) Exclusion of press and public

1.3 In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ("the Act"), the Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during an item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present during that item, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A(3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100(l) of the Act).

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

2 MINUTES

2.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 March 2017 be approved and signed as the correct record.

3 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

3.1. The Chair provided the following communications:

“Members of the previous Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee will remember a report presented on the setting up of the new, Sub-National Transport Bodies.

The Sub-National Body that includes this city is to be known as Transport for the South East and the Board first met in Shadow form yesterday with Councillor Warren Morgan attending.

I will bring an update report to this committee and arrange briefings for Members on this new body.

Members of the committee may not yet be aware that two of our long serving transport staff are leaving us this Summer.

Abby Hone is leaving to take up a post with the combined boroughs of Wandsworth and Richmond. Abby has been with this council for 12 years and was instrumental in launching and progressing the Cycling Demonstration Town project plus several other Sustainable Transport projects that have significantly boosted sustainable travel options in the city.

And of course Abby has most recently been leading on the Bikeshare scheme taking it through from securing the funding to going live later this year.

Abby’s experience and enthusiasm will be hard to replace but we wish you all the best Abby in your new role.

The other officer leaving us is Jeff Elliott. Jeff has worked for the council for 22 years and came to us from one of the contractors that constructed the Brighton & Hove bypass.

He took on the role of Traffic Manager in 2012 and has given this authority an exemplar Highway Permit Scheme that has been taken up by several other Local Authorities.

Most recently, as Head of Traffic Management, Jeff has been working on an enhanced traffic management system including citywide co-ordination road and street works, including the improved operation of traffic signals.

He will be missed and we wish him all the very best in his new job across the border in West Sussex”.

4 CALL OVER

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

- Item 8: Open Spaces Strategy- Update on Action Plan
- Item 9: Biosphere Programme
- Item 10: Response to the Government Consultation on Air Quality
- Item 11: Hove Cemetery North
- Item 12: Valley Gardens Proposed Green Space Design
- Item 13: Francis Street- Proposed Revisions to Street Layout
- Item 14: Hanover & Elm Grove/Craven Vale Traffic Regulation Order Consultation
- Item 15: Balfour Road Area/Preston Village Area Traffic Order Consultation
- Item 17: Various Parking Restrictions including Verge Parking Ban
- Item 18: Intelligent Transport System- Bus Lane Camera Procurement

4.2 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 16: West Hove Parking Scheme Detailed Design Consultation

5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(a) PETITIONS

(i) Parking restrictions near Aldrington Station

5.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 90 people that requested introduction of a residents parking zone in Aldrington Avenue, Amherst Crescent, Lullington Avenue and Milcote Avenue, Hove.

5.2 The petitioner was unable to attend the meeting in person. The following reply was read by the Chair and the meeting and provided in writing:

“Thank you for your petition and I do appreciate the parking issues in your area. As agreed previously at this Committee the Hove Park area including near Aldrington Station has been included as part of the current parking scheme timetable. Officers have met recently with the Hove Park ward councillors to discuss this further. Officers have prepared an initial consultation letter to go out to residents to see if they would like a parking scheme detailed design to be worked up and whether they would prefer a light touch or full parking scheme. This consultation has now begun and the results of this consultation will be presented to a future committee meeting so the way forward can be determined”

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

(ii) South Portslade Parking Consultation

5.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 118 people requesting a resident parking consultation be undertaken in the South Portslade area.

5.5 The petitioner was unable to attend the meeting in person. The following reply was read by the Chair and the meeting and provided in writing:

“Thank you for your petition and I do understand the concerns of residents in your area. Officers are currently working on parking scheme consultations in the Hanover & Elm Grove area, Craven Vale area, Preston Village & Balfour Road areas and the West Hove area with the Hove Park area to follow soon. As residents of a number of roads have come forward as an area we will look to include this area within the future parking scheme priority timetable. The current parking scheme priority timetable runs up to 2018 (for completion of schemes) and officers will be presenting a report to this Committee later in the year on an updated timetable based on requests such as this”.

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

(iii) TRO-15-2017 Hartington Road- Double Yellow Lines on Legal Crossovers

5.7 The Committee considered a petition signed by 170 people requesting the council to allow residents in Hartington Road with legal crossovers to park across their drives without incurring penalty.

5.8 The Chair provided the following response:

“It is a legal requirement to have parking restrictions covering every part of the highway within a resident parking scheme during the controlled hours of enforcement. Therefore, it is proposed that double yellow lines will be placed across all legal dropped kerbs to ensure access to and from the off street parking provision so that is kept clear at all times.

Any resident that now applies for a crossover would need to meet the requirements of the Council’s policy which is stricter within a resident parking scheme as it is squarely based on the consideration of the loss of parking”.

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

(iv) Save the Mazda Electric Fountain

5.10 The Committee considered a petition signed by 1072 people requesting the Council to retain the Mazda Fountain in Victoria Gardens.

5.11 The petitioner was unable to attend the meeting in person. The following reply was read by the Chair and the meeting and provided in writing:

“Thank you for your petition. The Valley Gardens Preliminary Green Space Design report coming later in the agenda does include retention of the Mazda fountain as well as details of its forecast maintenance and running costs over the next 5 years. These proposals will be considered by this Committee when discussing that report”.

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

(v) TRO-14a-2017 Elm Grove Sunday parking restrictions

5.13 The Committee considered a petition signed by 292 people requesting that the proposed controlled parking scheme for Elm Grove be amended to Monday to Saturday only to allow freer movement for parishioners and visitors attending a local church on Sundays.

5.14 The Chair provided the following response:

“The parking schemes have been through an extensive consultation period with three stages of consultation and we do need to ensure the restrictions are compatible with nearby parking schemes in the central Brighton area to minimise vehicle displacement. The options available within the current design allow parishioners and visitors to the church the opportunity to park within two areas of ‘shared’ pay and display or pay by phone locations situated close by.

Alternatively, there is the option to use the parking provision of a neighbouring scheme a few roads away where restrictions would not apply over the weekend.

Officers are of the opinion that the introduction of exclusive pay and display would be underutilised for much of the time in an area where parking for residents is at a premium.

It is proposed that any schemes introduced are reviewed after 12-18 months which will allow the Council to consider any difficulties for parking should they arise and we will pay particular attention to the church area”.

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

(c) DEPUTATIONS

(i) George Street Opening Hours

5.16 The Committee considered a Deputation requesting the council produce a report to the committee considering options for George Street, Hove be opened to vehicles from 3.00pm, all year round due to significant changes to the local trading environment since 2015.

5.17 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your deputation and I do understand the concerns you have raised. Changing the hours of restriction in George Street (to 4pm all year round) was reported to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 24th November 2015 and it was agreed not to proceed for the following reasons.

- *The licence to place advertising boards and tables and chairs on the public highway is for pedestrianised hours only*
- *Some stakeholders wanted to keep the restrictions as they currently are*
- *The Council received submissions from the public during the period of consultation and 85% were against any changes*
- *A number of road safety issues were identified.*

However, it is appreciated that the situation has now changed following the change in policy by Tesco’s who now require a minimum spend of £5 to allow parking for greater than 30 minutes in their car park.

Therefore, I would propose that a report is brought to a future meeting of this Committee to consider the road safety and licensing concerns if vehicles are allowed to enter George Street from 3.00pm, all year round and to consider if a Traffic Order should be advertised which would then give a further period of consultation”.

5.18 Councillor West stated that the Committee had considered issues relating to the opening times for George Street a number of times over recent years and whilst he did have sympathy for those issues the local traders had raised, he did not believe there was public support for a change and the proposal did not meet the council’s own sustainable transport objectives.

5.19 The Chair thanked Councillor West for his observations replying that she did believe that a report on the issue would be helpful.

5.20 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive an officer report on the matter.

(ii) Hanover & Elm Grove and Craven Vale Resident Parking Scheme Traffic Regulation Order

5.21 The Committee considered a Deputation requesting the council amend the proposals for controlled parking in Hanover & Elm Grove moving the 'Top Triangle' area from a light touch scheme to a full scheme due to the potential for parking displacement.

5.22 The Chair provided the following response:

"These issues have been discussed in previous reports and will also be discussed as part of a further report later in the meeting.

In a previous consultations it is correct that residents in the Top Triangle preferred no scheme overall out of all of the options available.

However, in a further question when asked which type of scheme they would prefer if a scheme were to be introduced then the majority wanted a scheme with the least amount of enforcement which is a light touch scheme in preference to a full scheme.

Our overall approach has been to approach it as a whole area and not to take out one particular area and one given time because that has an immediate knock-on effect to adjacent roads.

Therefore, it would be entirely wrong of us to re-consult just five streets without re-consulting the wider area within the light-touch scheme.

So what we have done is give a clear commitment that the whole scheme will be reviewed after 12 months. And that will be built into the controlled parking scheme that comes before this committee in the autumn and therefore, any issues like that can be picked up.

The reason we did two consultations for Hanover & Elm Grove on the detailed design and the type of scheme, that is unusual for the process of most parking schemes was that so residents, when they voted the second time around, could see how the preferences had occurred throughout the rest of the area. We also kept ward councillors closely involved every single step of the way as this final design was brought forward and the final design was agreed by this committee in March.

You have my assurance that there will be a review in 12 months' time and any difficulties in any area of the scheme as a whole that have occurred, once it's in, can therefore be picked up".

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

6 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

(a) PETITIONS

(i) A259 South Coast Road

6.1. The Committee considered a petition referred from the Full Council meeting of 6 April 2017 and signed by 5188 people requesting the council, alongside East Sussex County Council and Lewes District Council, to carry out a joint traffic evaluation study on the A259 South Coast Road between Newhaven and Brighton Marina as well as carrying out an economic impact study of the detrimental effects caused by traffic congestion on the A259 on the local economy for this area as well as air quality studies. Once the results of these studies have been reviewed, that the councils clearly identify what new

physical road infrastructure improvements will be required to meet any identified capacity shortfall, along with a schedule of works for when those improvements will need to be implemented before any further development takes place.

6.2. The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition to this committee on behalf of SAFE and the people who have signed it. As you know, we received the petition and debated it at our Full Council meeting in April, and the summary of that debate can be found in today’s agenda. In that debate, I did refer to the transport and planning studies that have already been done, and the ongoing, local monitoring and reporting of air quality within the area that you are concerned about.

To summarise for the members of the public attending today’s meeting:-

- those studies have not concluded that significant, new transport infrastructure is required to address future, planned growth; and*
- the monitoring is showing improvements in air quality in Rottingdean High Street and we have also approved funding for a local scheme to manage traffic flows there, through dialogue with the Parish Council and local councillors.*

I also outlined the significant success of the existing priority lanes on the A259 in terms of increased bus passenger numbers and service frequencies that are in use, and would add that they also benefit other public transport users such as taxi and coach passengers.

In my view, therefore, there appears to be sufficient ongoing research and results involving all these councils to indicate what each council needs to know to be able to plan in a strategic and cross-border manner, co-operating at both a Strategic Planning level and with respect to Transport Planning and this information is regularly added to. This information is used when considering any changes or improvements to the sub-regional transport infrastructure such as the A259. This council's Strategic Transport Assessment was produced to support our City Plan Part 1 and the technical modelling used was validated using nationally recognised and recommended techniques. The data collected and put through the modelling process for the STA also included traffic growth factors to 2030 and allowed for local growth, again using nationally recognised estimating methods. An examination in public was held on the City Plan and its supporting documentation. The Planning Inspector concluded that it was sound. When preparing their own Local Plans, our neighbouring council's would have undertaken a similar process, so this information has been gathered.

I am aware that your petition has been received by our neighbouring councils to the east and that the progress of the petition is that,

- The District Council will discuss it either at a full council meeting or an appropriate committee and*
- The County Council may be preparing a response for its next Lead Member Meeting in the Autumn.*

Therefore, at this stage, we are not yet aware of the views or discussions that our neighbouring councils may have. However, I am sure that your petition will have raised a greater awareness of these issues and I know that, for example, the main local bus company is looking at the possibility of increased services connecting with the A259 that will help to relieve the pressure in that area”.

- 6.3. Councillor West stated that the Committee should respect the views of residents and Members should be made fully aware of the current position and what more could be done. Councillor West added that there was sufficient concern from residents that when the information became available from the partner authorities, the committee should receive an officer report.
- 6.4. Councillor Wares agreed with the observation made by Councillor West noting that a more considered view would be available once the partner authorities had provided input. When the council received that information that would be the time to prompt informed dialogue and take decisions.
- 6.5. The Chair stated that it was the intention that the committee would receive a report once all information was known.
- 6.6. **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the petition.

(ii) Surrey Street Traffic Alleviation

- 6.7. The Committee considered a petition referred from the Full Council meeting of 6 April 2017 and signed by 83 people requesting the council address congestion by taxi traffic on Surrey Street and surrounding roads with use of Double Red Lines and increased CCTV coverage to assist enforcement.
- 6.8. The petitioner was unable to attend the meeting in person. The following reply was read by the Chair and the meeting and provided in writing:

"I am very much aware of the issues regarding the impact on residents of Surrey Street as a result of taxis queuing to access the rank in Brighton Station and shortly after forming administration of the Council, moved very quickly to set up meeting with Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR), with the bus companies, with the taxi representatives as well as Highways officers to look to see how we could address this unfortunate consequence of the Brighton Station Gateway Scheme.

GTR is responsible for the overall management of Brighton Station and taxis within the station. Please be assured that Officers have been liaising with the managers of GTR in order that agreement can be reached to improve the flow of taxis in and around the station.

In regard to your specific request to introduce double red lines and CCTV, Officers did look at a range of these traffic management options when developing the original Station Gateway proposal but Officers believe the solution now lies in providing taxi access to the rear of the station, thereby reducing the numbers of taxis in Surrey Street and Queens Road.

However, in terms of the rear of the station GTR are the landowners and are central to proving a solution. Very recently, GTR contacted the Council requesting a meeting at which they will update Officers on the progress they are now making in providing better provision and access for taxis in and out of the station. I will ask Officers to contact you with an update once this meeting has taken place".

- 6.9. Councillor West stated that congestion on Surrey Street had become a citywide issue and was affecting a major transport hub. Councillor West noted that whilst he was

pleased to hear that GTR were now less resistant to a rank at the back of Brighton Station, an officer report would give an opportunity for a stronger response.

- 6.10. Councillor West moved a motion to call for an officer report on the matter.
- 6.11. Councillor Littman seconded the motion.
- 6.12. The Chair stated the council were giving through consideration to the issue that was a result of the flawed Gateway Station scheme introduced by the previous administration where the taxi rank should have moved to the back of the station. The Committee had received a Deputation to an earlier meeting where a very detailed response had been given and meetings with all interested partners were continuing. The Chair noted that the land in question was private land and would mean working closely and carefully with GTR. If and when an agreement with GTR was reached, a report would be considered by the Committee by necessity outlining any implications for the council. The Chair stated that it was her preference that officers be allowed to continue the work already in progress rather than be occupied writing reports for the committee.
- 6.13. Councillor Littman stated that the current situation was causing significant distress for local residents. The issue was both long and short term and it was his preference the committee receive a report to understand what measures could be taken.
- 6.14. The Chair put the motion to the vote which failed.
- 6.15. The Chair moved a motion to note the petition that was agreed.
- 6.16. **RESOLVED-** That the petition be noted.

(iii) Bus shelter, Hazeldene Meads

- 6.17. The Committee considered a petition referred from the meeting of Full Council on 6 April 2017 signed by 80 people requesting a bus shelter at the southbound Hazeldene Meads bus stop that had been on the waiting list since 2010.
- 6.18. The petitioner was unable to attend the meeting in person. The following reply was read by the Chair and the meeting and provided in writing:

“Senior Officers from City Transport, Legal and Procurement have spent much of the last 18 months in very difficult and complex negotiations regarding bus shelter contracts for the city.

I am pleased to say that a positive outcome has been reached and a new contract will be in place by January 2018.

There are approximately 300 requests for new shelters on the current list and this would equate to more than £2 million in expenditure.

Therefore, officers will review and prioritise the request list according to a formal criteria that will be brought to this committee for approval this Autumn.

One the new contract is in place, a realistic programme of new shelter installations can start, based on available resources. Until that time officers will continue to use funding secured through the planning process wherever possible.

I realise that this response is not particularly helpful to you in relation to Hazledeane Meads but felt it important to set out the overall position. It is the aim of the council to get to a point where every bus stop which has the physical space to accommodate a shelter, has one”.

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

(iv) Reclaim our amenity space

6.20. The Committee considered a petition referred from the meeting of Full Council on 6 April 2017 signed by 91 people requesting the council to reinstate the green at the junction of Court Farm Road and Nevil Road to public use and remove the food van directly outside the school that was inappropriate and contrary to local health guidelines.

6.21. The petitioner was unable to attend the meeting in person. The following reply was read by the Chair and the meeting and provided in writing:

*“The Council is not currently registered as the owner of the land. It has made an application to the Land Registry to be registered as the owner based on its maintenance of the land over a number of years.
The Council has considered all the options available to it to remove the van from the site but until it is registered as the owner, is unable to take any further steps.
The Council is in regular contact with the Land Registry and hopes that they will make the decision in the next few weeks. Once the Council is the registered owner it will promptly take legal action to remove the van”.*

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

7 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(c) LETTERS

(i) 47 bus route- Councillors Hyde, Mears and Miller

7.1 The Committee considered a Letter from the Rottingdean Coastal ward councillors requesting an extension of either the 47 bus route service or the 57 bus route service under the current negotiation of the supported bus network contract.

7.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your letter. As you may be aware this matter is currently the subject of a live tender that is in the process of being evaluated by officers.
The points you have raised have been noted by officers and will be considered, as all feedback on the bus network is, as part of that tender evaluation process. A report on the tender evaluation with recommendations for new contracts is scheduled to come to PR&G Committee on 17th July”.*

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

(ii) Street Closures

7.4 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillor Sykes that requested clarification on the consenting regime for street closures for parties and events.

7.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“The Council is generally positive in supporting local community events such as street parties but is also aware they are being used as the back end process to Temporary Event Notice for commercial events sometimes and this is causing some concern from local residents.

Therefore I will be asking officers from both Highways and Environmental Health to look at this together to come up with a proposal for dealing with this in the future and to clarify the policy.

I have a more detailed briefing that addresses the specific queries you raise in your letter and I will send that to you in writing along with this reply”.

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

(iii) Beach rubbish collection- Councillor West

7.7 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillor West that requested information on the additional cost of collecting and disposing of the increased waste on the seafront during peak tourism periods, and how much was being invested in a communication campaigns to encourage people to collect their litter.

7.8 The Chair provided the following response:

“I think I must start by thanking our City Clean street cleansing staff who do a great job in all weathers, including the recent heat-wave.

It is important that in welcoming visitors to our beaches we also remind them to dispose of their rubbish properly and this message is backed up by education and enforcement plus campaigns such as the recent 4 week anti-littering campaign run in conjunction with the ‘Keep Britain Tidy’ group.

This campaign ran through March was very well received by residents and we are now planning our next campaign, the details of which I will be in a position to announce very soon. Again, it will be innovative and creative, focussing on well used areas of the city including the beach and seafront.

Up to 23rd June, we had a total of 15 employees dedicated to the seafront.

I’m pleased to say that that number has now increased by 6 to 21 in total. Additionally with our agency we will have the additional opportunity to request further 4 should there be a need.

Furthermore, a further 50 bins were delivered to the seafront last week and we will be replacing the communal bins there with new ones.

We have made significant investment in our street cleansing service in terms of new mechanical sweepers and 100 Big Belly Bins. We will be installing new bins along the seafront as well as replacing the communal bins”.

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

(d) NOTICES OF MOTION**(i) Cleaner Air**

7.10 The Committee considered a Notice of Motion referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 6 April 2017 that requested the Committee consider the example of Westminster City Council and introduce visitor parking differentials to incentivise diesel vehicle drivers not to enter highly polluted areas of the city and options to enforce fixed penalty notices for vehicle idling offences.

7.11 The Chair provided the following response:

“The proposed trial of charging all diesel vehicles 50% more to park on street is due to start on 3 April 2017 in one parking zone in Westminster.

The proposal involves a check with DVLA when a vehicle is first registered with the phone parking provider to establish whether it meets the criteria for a surcharge. At Westminster the Pay and Display machines are also linked to the phone provider. This is not the case in Brighton and Hove so it would not be possible at present to assess whether the vehicle should be charged a surcharge when parked at a Pay and Display machine through an enquiry to the DVLA.

Any system would also need to be straight forward for visitors to understand. Officers will closely monitor the outcome of this trial which it is hoped will provide a valuable insight on how this policy works in practice.

In relation to the second request of this Committee, Civil Enforcement Officers have been provided with leaflets to discourage engine idling when they come across it.

Studies have shown that 90% of drivers switch off when asked.

There would be costs associated with setting up an IT system to process the very small number of fixed penalties which we estimate would be issued in the city to drivers who failed to comply with a request. These costs are unlikely to be covered by revenue generated from fixed penalties due to the high compliance rate when asked to switch off. A more informal approach of providing leaflets to educate drivers through is currently being trialed with Civil Enforcement Officers and will be monitored for its effectiveness. I will ensure to keep Members informed as we go along”.

7.12 Councillor Littman stated that the Notice of Motion requested an officer report rather than noting adding that it would be useful to receive an options appraisal.

7.13 Councillor Wares asked if the council could consider more efficient routes to prevent vehicle idling such as signs asking motorists to switch off their engines at key points where congestion was known such as the train crossing at Portslade train station.

7.14 The Chair agreed noting that the local Socialist Environmental and Resources Association (SERA) was interested in encouraging their members to become active in precisely the campaign Councillor Wares had outlined. Furthermore, the issue was mentioned in the Air Quality report later in the agenda and it was hoped external funding could be sourced for that.

7.15 Councillor West stated that either TfL or Westminster City Council was training members of the public to become clean air wardens as it was believed drivers were more receptive to being asked to stop idling by members of the public rather than wardens.

Councillor West identified such an option as exactly the type of thing an officer report could consider.

7.16 The Chair stated that it would be more useful to the committee to see the results of the Westminster trial as the outcomes were not yet known. The Chair added that London had the benefit of the Mayor's Clean Air Fund and a level of funding not available to this council. External funding would be pursued with any advancement to that end reported back to the committee.

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

The meeting adjourned at 17:30 and reconvened at 17:40

8 OPEN SPACES STRATEGY - UPDATE ON ACTION PLAN

8.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided an update on progress made against the Open Spaces Strategy agreed by the committee at its meeting in January 2017 and requested approval to proceed with specific actions.

8.2 Councillor Nemeth asked for clarification on what level of support would qualify as consensus from tennis clubs.

8.3 The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management stated that this would likely be a simple majority supporting one set of proposals or clubs setting out a number of proposals that could be supported.

8.4 Councillor Atkinson noted his disappointment that the application for Parklife Funding was unsuccessful and asked whether that could re-applied for at any stage.

8.5 The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management clarified that a reapplication could not be made at this stage but that would give opportunity to revisit the discussions held with football clubs prior to the application for funding, particularly those that had expressed interest in self-managing arrangements.

8.6 Councillor Littman noted that the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) had a chequered history of involvement with tennis clubs in the city and asked the rationale behind their involvement in the Strategy.

8.7 The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management replied that it would be unusual if a national body such as the LTA was not engaged in such a Strategy and a strong working relationship would enhance the chances of unlocking funding opportunities.

8.8 Referring to appendix 10 of the report that detailed sponsorship and advertising, Councillor Littman expressed his concern for the over-commercialisation of public green spaces and how the partnership with Friends of Groups would relate to that.

8.9 The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management stated that the council had a commitment to working with Friends of Groups. The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management added that clear guidelines were in place relating to what

the council could and could not do in terms of sponsorship and advertising and regular update reports would be brought to the committee.

- 8.10 Councillor Wares asked what experience the LTA had in guiding local authorities in how to manage tennis clubs and facilities. Referring to page 70, Councillor Wares asked what discretion would be given to volunteers for maintenance of parks and facilities, particularly in relation to pruning and cutting trees.
- 8.11 The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management confirmed that the LTA had worked with other authorities and given professional advice. Volunteering was something the council wanted to develop and promote and a set of standards and safeguards would need to be put in place.
- 8.12 Councillor Brown noted that page 57 stated that there would need to be identification of costs where events had caused a detrimental impact to park infrastructure so as not to cause a shortfall in the cost to Cityparks in making good. Councillor Brown welcomed the initiative but expressed concern as to why such a policy was not already in place. Councillor Brown asked for clarification on what was meant by a 'park improvement district' in Hove Park and for clarification on statement relating to the benefits of car parks in parks as that was cause for some concern.
- 8.13 The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management stated that there were instances where Cityparks had reinstated damage caused to parks in relation to events where costs could not be recovered and there was a need to understand what that level of cost was and have appropriate mechanisms to be able to re-charge. Park improvement districts were an initiative learnt from other authorities and a concept whereby park improvements could be directly associated with business improvement districts. That would entail discussions with the private sector about possible levies or volunteer work to drive improvement in city centre green space at in turn raise business footfall. The Assistant Director- City Environmental Management clarified that the statement on car parks was related to the car parking arrangements in place at Preston Park whereby revenue from station parking was ring-fenced for improvements to the park infrastructure. That measure would relate to existing car parking infrastructure and no new car parks would be built.
- 8.14 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Wares moved an motion to amend recommendation 2.3 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.3 That Committee approves the direction of travel on new management arrangements for the tennis courts in the city council's parks as per paragraphs 3.7-3.12 of this report ***that will also include a detailed review and recommendation on the proposal put forward by the Queens Park Tennis Club.*** A further report will be brought to a future Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee for a decision on the management arrangements.
- 8.15 Introducing the motion, Councillor Wares stated that the purpose of the amendment was an attempt to make explicit that the proposal put forward by Queens Park Tennis Club would be reviewed.
- 8.16 Councillor Peltzer-Dunn formally seconded the motion.

- 8.17 On behalf of the Green Group, Councillor Littman moved a motion to amend recommendations 2.1 and 2.2 as detailed in bold italics below:
- 2.1 That the Committee approves the establishment of a Brighton & Hove Parks Foundation as set out at Section 3.2 and Appendix 6 to lead creative and innovative fundraising which would be invested in the council's parks and open spaces **subject to 2.2 below**
- 2.2 That the Committee recommends to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee that it approve the appointment of **a member of each political group of the council alongside the three independent Trustees and that the Brighton & Hove Parks Foundation be delegated the decision on the appointment of its Chair**
- 8.18 Introducing the motion, Councillor Littman stated that the amendment was not a personal reflection of the Chair but a measure to remove potential politicisation of the organisation and to increase democratic oversight by including a member of each political group on the council. Councillor Littman added that he strongly believed that the appointment of Chair should be made by the Foundation rather than the council as it would be best suited to decide upon the best candidate.
- 8.19 Councillor West formally seconded the motion.
- 8.20 Councillor Wares encouraged officers to be certain in any proposals for bowls clubs as it would be a very sensitive issue and one that had to be right. Councillor Wares added that the council had to be very clear in its communications that residents were not to be asked to cut all small grass verges and such a scheme was strictly voluntary.
- 8.21 Councillor West stated that open space hire and any income from advertisement and sponsorship should be ring-fenced for use and maintenance of parks to protect them.
- 8.22 Councillor Littman stated that a key part of obtaining support for the Strategy and any proposals that came with it would be to demonstrate to the public the opportunities for changes. Councillor Littman explained that this had been particularly beneficial in the case of Preston Park where changes were made to parking arrangements but it was made clear that any surplus would be ring-fenced to improve the park.
- 8.23 Councillor Robins stated his concern that the Foundation Board may be too small at six and a larger number could be considered to cover a wider skill set.
- 8.24 The Chair noted that the report that would be submitted to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee at a later date would clearly identify the personnel and make-up of the Board
- 8.25 The Chair then put the Conservative Group motion to the vote which passed.
- 8.26 The Chair then put the Green Group motion to the vote which passed.
- 8.27 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to the vote which were agreed.
- 8.28 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee approves the establishment of a Brighton & Hove Parks Foundation as set out at Section 3.2 and Appendix 6 to lead creative and innovative fundraising which would be invested in the council's parks and open spaces subject to 2.2 below
- 2) That the Committee recommends to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee that it approve the appointment of a member of each political group of the council alongside the three independent Trustees and that the Brighton & Hove Parks Foundation be delegated the decision on the appointment of its Chair
- 3) That the Committee approves the proposal on new management arrangements for the tennis courts in the city council's parks as per paragraphs 3.7-3.12 of this report that will also include a detailed review and recommendation on the proposal put forward by the Queens Park Tennis Club. A further report will be brought to a future Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for a decision on the management arrangements.
- 4) That the Committee notes the updates provided in the appendices in relation to:
 - Allotments
 - Cemeteries and Churchyards
 - Heritage
 - Open Space Hire
 - Outdoor Sport & Physical Activity Facilities
 - Parks Foundation
- 5) That the Committee approves the establishment of a Brighton & Hove Parks Foundation as set out at Section 3.2 and Appendix 6 to lead creative and innovative fundraising which would be invested in the council's parks and open spaces.
- 6) That the Committee recommends to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee that it approve the appointment of the Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability as the Chair of Brighton & Hove Parks Foundation.
- 7) That the Committee approves the direction of travel on new management arrangements for the tennis courts in the city council's parks as per paragraphs 3.7-3.12 of this report that will also include a detailed review and recommendation on the proposal put forward by the Queens Park Tennis Club. A further report will be brought to a future Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for a decision on the management arrangements.
- 8) That the Committee notes the updates provided in the appendices in relation to:
 - Allotments
 - Cemeteries and Churchyards
 - Heritage
 - Open Space Hire
 - Outdoor Sport & Physical Activity Facilities
 - Parks Foundation
 - Parks & Gardens
 - Parks Trust
 - Small Grassed Areas

- Sponsorship, Advertising and Donations
- Volunteering

9 BIOSPHERE PROGRAMME

- 9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided an update on the Biosphere programme and progress made including creating and launching a new brand identity as 'The Living Coast', developing priority projects through both individual partners and the programme team, strengthening governance and engaging new partners and support.
- 9.2 The Chair relayed that at the request of the Member Development Working Group, each committee would hold a number of Member Development briefing sessions that would be open to all Members and in consultation with the group spokespersons, the Biosphere programme had been chosen as the committee's first briefing topic in October.
- 9.3 Councillor West noted that 2020 was the international year of Biodiversity and he hoped that and current and future projects could be used to translate the Biosphere story to the public.
- 9.4 Councillor Atkinson stated that some projects, such as the Brighton ChaMP for Water partnership were very technical in detail and it might be useful to cover such detailed issues in the briefing session.
- 9.5 Councillor Wares stated that the matter was an extremely important subject area and commended officers and partners for the progress made.
- 9.6 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee notes the progress made on The Living Coast Biosphere as a firm foundation for its future development.

10 RESPONSE TO THE GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON AIR QUALITY

- 10.1. The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that requested retrospective approval of the officer response to the government on behalf of the council to the consultation on the government's draft 'Improving Air Quality: National Plan for tackling nitrogen dioxide in our cities'.
- 10.2. Councillor Littman welcomed the report and praised the response given the time constrictions. Councillor Littman stated that the key to improving air quality was reducing traffic congestion by increasing active travel.
- 10.3. **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee retrospectively approve the officer response set out in Appendix 1, which was submitted to the government on behalf of the council in response to the consultation on the government's draft 'Improving Air Quality : National Plan for tackling nitrogen dioxide in our cities'.

- 2) That the Committee note that, subject to the anticipated publication of a final National Air Quality Plan later this year, that a further report may be required in order to consider its implications and the progress made locally in addressing local air quality levels.

11 HOVE CEMETERY NORTH

- 11.1. The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out the findings of the assessment conducted as to the cost to re-open Hove Cemetery North toilets following a request of the committee to do so.
- 11.2. On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Wares moved the following motion to amend recommendation 2.1 and add a recommendation 2.2 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.1** *That the public toilets at Hove Cemetery North closed in 2012 remain closed in line with the budget decision made in 2012. That the Committee recommends to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee that the public toilets at Hove Cemetery North closed in 2012 be reopened.*
- 2.2** *That the Committee requests officers prepare a report for Policy, Resources & Growth Committee setting out the work and options available to enable the public toilets at Hove Cemetery North closed in 2012 to be reopened.*
- 11.3. Introducing the motion, Councillor Wares stated that the decision to close the toilets had been made in 2012 and the rationale for the decision had since changed. Councillor Wares added that he was not certain that the data and evidence provided in the report was truly accurate and noted that whilst there was a toilet at the southern cemetery, that entailed a journey across the busy Old Shoreham Road.
- 11.4. Councillor Peltzer Dunn formally seconded the motion stating his agreement with the comments made by Councillor Wares. Councillor Peltzer Dunn noted that the southern cemetery toilet was only 500m away but across a main trunk road and the users of the toilets were in very difficult circumstances.
- 11.5. Councillor Littman stated that he had looked back on the reports that led to the decision made in 2012 that had set out a clear rationale for closure and had not changed since. Councillor Littman stated that the council's hand had been forced on the issue due to severe cuts to its budget and that he would be agreeing to the report recommendations as there was no other option in the current financial climate.
- 11.6. The Chair then put the Conservative Group motion to the vote which failed.
- 11.7. The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote that were agreed.
- 11.8. **RESOLVED-** That the public toilets at Hove Cemetery North closed in 2012 remain closed in line with the budget decision made in 2012.

12 VALLEY GARDENS PROPOSED GREEN SPACE DESIGN

- 12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided the committee with an overview of the project history and requested approval of the preferred Preliminary Green Space design.
- 12.2 Councillor Wares expressed his disappointment that the Leader of the Council had made statements about his group's position on the future of the Mazda Fountain adding that the matter had been discussed positively up to that point. Councillor Wares stated that he was encouraged by the lighting improvements but it was very important that lessons had been learned from the renovation of the Level. Councillor Wares stated his support for dedicated spaces for events that was an important factor both for the cultural diversity of the city and financially. Councillor Wares enquired whether the green space around Valley Gardens would be designed in such a way that it could cope with the heavy vehicles that would need to be used for events.
- 12.3 The Senior Project Manager stated that the lighting in Valley Gardens had been given extensive focus both in terms of maximising public safety at night and reviewing and learning from the lighting installed at the Level. The Senior Project Manager added that the area had its own Event Strategy that identified designated hard surface and grass areas for events in Valley Gardens. Where larger events were hosted, a set of specification had been devised to reduce any impact on the grassed areas.
- 12.4 Councillor Brown stated that she was pleased that the Elm trees were being retained and enquired as to the maturity of the additional trees to be planted adding that these should be sturdy and protected.
- 12.5 The Senior Project Manager clarified that the majority of species of additional trees to be planted would be semi-mature and a minimum height of 3 metres. Elms trees naturally bed into the surface at a lower level and would need to be protected with stakes and hoarding until they reached maturity.
- 12.6 Councillor Littman praised the report and the quality of the design. Councillor Littman agreed with the earlier comment made by Councillor Wares relating to statements made by the Leader of the Council that he too had found disappointing. Furthermore, Councillor Littman observed that many of the policies and projects considered by the committee at the meeting had been negatively received by the current administration when they had been in opposition but were now positively promoted.
- 12.7 The Chair stated that a number of concerns had been raised regarding a number of aspects of the Valley Garden scheme inherited by the current administration that now had the responsibility of ensuring the scheme was right under the constraints inherited in terms of the business case and funding.
- 12.8 Councillor West welcomed the support of the Chair for the Valley Gardens project but noted his disappointment that enthusiasm was not shared by the Leader of the Council. Councillor West stated that the project was critically important for the city as a public realm space, transport link and as a welcome for visitors. Councillor West stated that the project had been delayed for a number of years and in his view, the current administration was stalling work further. Councillor West added that his group would be

supportive in pushing the scheme through but he did believe that the ambition of the original design had diminished. It was critical to look at additional funding to improve the public realm space, perhaps through ring-fenced funding as this was a space not currently used that would quickly become heavily used and keeping high standards would not be possible through maintenance funding alone. Specifically, Councillor West felt there needed to be an increase in hard standing and adequate reinforced areas to ensure the Gardens were kept in good condition after events. Councillor West stated that personally he did not agree with the retention of the Mazda Fountain as its operational costs were a waste and could not be justified.

- 12.9 Councillor Nemeth enquired as to what additional utilities would be provided to those hosting events such as electricity.
- 12.10 The Senior Project Manager stated that a three phase power supply would be in place in key locations that would help reduce the need for generators and in turn, heavy equipment.
- 12.11 Councillor Nemeth asked if there would be a water or broadband supply.
- 12.12 The Senior Project Manager stated that power was currently the main focus but other utilities could be looked into during the detailed design stage.
- 12.13 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated whilst he hoped the scheme could be as successful as possible, he was fearful that the increased level of footfall would mean the Gardens would be unable to cope. Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked if specific trees and plants had been considered to reduce the impact of emissions in the area.
- 12.14 The Senior Project Manager replied that the appointed landscape architects for the project had been specifically asked for trees and plants that would assist in reducing airborne pollutants. Furthermore, the location of footways and cycle paths had been intentionally designed to be away from the majority of pollutants from vehicles.
- 12.15 Councillor Wares asked how much space was currently used for events and how much had been identified in the proposed design.
- 12.16 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture replied that the majority of use of Valley Gardens was for Brighton Fringe Festival during the month of May each year. Discussions had been held with representatives of Brighton Fringe on the future of events in Valley Gardens. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture stated that included reviewing this year's festival that had been the most popular held and how improvements could be made for future years. Secondly, discussions had been held on how the Fringe could be supported during the construction phase and thirdly, looking at a sustainable future for the Fringe. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture stated that the detailed design not only considered how Valley Gardens could support the Fringe in terms of event space but also how it could provide event space all year round that would assist in generating income for maintenance. That included consideration to bringing forward three phase electricity that would benefit organisers in reducing the cost of operating generators, the city in reducing diesel emissions and increasing the amount of space available.

12.17 Councillor Horan stated that it appeared that there were not appropriate levels of funding for the scheme because it had been rushed through by the previous administration that demonstrated a level of recklessness.

12.18 Councillor Robins stated that he did not believe the scheme had been diminished; rather the current administration had made a flawed scheme they had inherited into one that was workable through rationalisation.

12.19 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the Preliminary Green Space Design for Valley Gardens (Phase 1 & 2), as presented in Appendix 1 and authorises officers to progress to the Detailed Green Space Design stage, including initiating the associated planning application process.
- 2) That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approve the instigation of the procedure to exchange highway to appropriate green space to support the proposed preliminary design as explained in Section 7.

13 FRANCIS STREET - PROPOSED REVISIONS TO STREET LAYOUT

13.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that addressed traffic-related issues in Francis Street following concerns raised by residents and Members agreement to receive a report on the matter following a deputation received by the committee in March 2017.

13.2 Councillor West expressed his thanks to officers for a very quick turnaround in producing measures to improve the situation in Francis Street. Councillor West stated that it was important that the committee understand how the new system was working and therefore should receive an update report in 12 months' time.

13.3 The Chair replied that she was delighted with the report officers had produced and how quickly work had been undertaken with residents and stakeholders. The Chair added that she was sure the measures would be kept under review and that she did not see the need for a report back to committee unless a major issue arose.

13.4 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee welcomes the work undertaken by officers and the developer to finalise the proposed package of final works within Francis Street that is associated with the Open Market redevelopment, and which will address concerns expressed by residents.
- 2) That the Committee agree the proposed package of works summarised in paragraph 3.3 and illustrated in Appendix 2 of this report; and request that officers and the developer continue to work together to finalise the package and detailed designs, prepare and advertise the necessary Traffic Regulation Order to allow further comment, and then implement the works as soon as possible.

14 HANOVER & ELM GROVE / CRAVEN VALE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER CONSULTATION

- 14.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out comments and objections received to draft traffic regulation orders for proposed parking schemes in the Hanover & Elm Grove area and Craven Vale area.
- 14.2 Councillor Gibson addressed the committee on the proposals. He highlighted his support for the requests of the residents of the 'Top Triangle' who had presented a deputation to the committee earlier in the meeting. Councillor Gibson noted that the residents did not originally want a parking zone or loss of parking on one side of the street. Following the decision in March to proceed with a light-touch parking scheme for the area, a resident led survey was conducted with households on the preference for a light touch or full scheme with 70% expressing support for the latter. Councillor Gibson stated that provided a clear view to the committee and that the council should not ignore the desire of residents and trust and confidence could be gained from local residents in implementing a full scheme. Councillor Gibson requested the committee to agree to the amendment tabled and delay the implementation of a light touch scheme and undertake TRO consultation with the 'Top Triangle' area for its inclusion in a full scheme with the results of that consultation reported for decision to the October meeting of the committee. Councillor Gibson added that should the committee not be in agreement with the first amendment then it should support the second Green Group amendment to re-consult residents in the 'Top Triangle' on a introduction of a full scheme as part of the scheduled consultation on the adjacent Zone U area.
- 14.3 Councillor Littman noted that an amendment had been tabled by the Conservative Group that would increase the issuing of visitor permits for businesses in the Hanover & Elm Grove area from 50 to an unlimited amount. Councillor Littman asked what the likely impact would be on capacity in the area in going above the proposal for issuing 50 permits per business.
- 14.4 The Head of Parking Services stated that the likely impact would be very difficult to judge and could be impact by several issues such as when businesses used the permits that may be during the day when regular permits were not in use. Expected demand for resident permits was anticipated to be high so an unlimited number could cause capacity issues but it would be difficult to have a full picture until the scheme was operational.
- 14.5 Councillor Littman asked if there was a specific figure that would strike a balance between the needs of residents and business that would not threaten the capacity of the scheme in the first six months of operation.
- 14.6 The Head of Parking Services stated that it was understood that approximately 20 businesses in the area would take up the option of visitor permits under the pilot scheme and for every 100 permits issued to each business, 7 spaces would be occupied per day.
- 14.7 Councillor Wares moved a motion on behalf of the Conservative Group to amend recommendation 2.2 as shown in bold italics below:

- 2.2 That any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order **and to include contra flow cycle lanes in all appropriate one way streets as part of the implementation programme and include in the subsequent amendment TRO**
- 14.8 Introducing the amendment, Councillor Wares stated that its intention was to regularise the position on cycle contraflows clearly in the recommendations.
- 14.9 Councillor Peltzer Dunn formally seconded the motion.
- 14.10 Councillor Wares moved a motion on behalf of the Conservative Group to amend recommendation 2.3 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.3 That a trial scheme should be piloted allowing businesses to buy a number of visitor permits, in order to offset potential adverse impacts of a Controlled Parking Zone as outlined in paragraphs 6.4 and 6.5 **save that businesses providing proof that they pay business rates will be entitled to buy an unlimited number of visitor permits on the basis they are advanced purchased in quantities of 50 visitor permits for use only in the Hanover and Elm Grove Light Touch Scheme Area.** This would be reviewed after 6 months alongside the overall permit parking review and presented to a future Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.
- 14.11 Introducing the amendment Councillor Wares stated that in a full scheme, pay and display machines would be provided. However, in a light touch scheme machines were not installed and therefore there was a lack of options for the customers of businesses. Councillor Wares added that businesses in the area had expressed fears that they would not be able to survive with an allocation of 50 permits. Councillor Wares stated that businesses would buy the permits in quantities of 50 and he believed this would lead to businesses self-policing. Councillor Wares stated that the pilot scheme needed to be given the best opportunity to succeed and the six month review would give opportunity to make any amendments necessary.
- 14.12 Councillor Peltzer Dunn formally seconded the motion. Councillor Peltzer Dunn noted that a slight change was necessary to the motion to identify that only businesses paying business rates would be eligible to purchase the permits.
- 14.13 Councillor Littman moved a motion on behalf of the Green Group to amend recommendation 2.1 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.1 That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following orders;
- Hanover & Elm Grove (Full Scheme)
- a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.* 201* (TRO-14a-2017)
 - b) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.* 201* (TRO-14b-2017)

- c) Brighton & Hove (Hanover West Area) (One-Way) Order 201* (TRO-20-2017)

Craven Vale Parking Scheme

- g) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.* 201* (TRO-16a-2017)
 h) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.* 201*(TRO-16b-2017)

and defers approval of the following orders;

Hanover & Elm Grove (Light Touch Scheme)

- d) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.* 201* (TRO-15a-2017)
 e) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.* 201* (TRO-15b-2017)
 f) Brighton & Hove (Hanover East) (One-Way) Order 201* (TRO-15c-2017) 167

subject to consideration of the ‘top triangle’, being included in the full scheme, with the necessary TRO consultation to be undertaken between June and September with a final decision to be made at the next meeting of Environment, Transport and Sustainability in October

14.14 Introducing the amendment, Councillor Littman stated that the ‘Top Triangle’ area did not want a parking scheme but did express a preference for a light touch scheme should a parking zone go ahead. However, residents were unaware of how the mix of schemes would come in and believed their proximity to a full scheme would make the light touch scheme in their area unworkable. Therefore, the motion was a request for the light touch schemes to be delayed in their implementation giving a chance to reconult with the residents of the five roads in the ‘Top Triangle’ to allow them to comment on whether they would prefer to join a full scheme.

14.15 Councillor West formally seconded the motion.

14.16 Councillor Littman moved a motion on behalf of the Green Group to add a recommendation 2.5 as shown in bold italics below:

2.5 That the proposed review of Zone U, (currently earmarked for January 2018) also consider whether the ‘top triangle’ should become part of the full scheme;

14.17 Introducing the amendment, Councillor Littman stated that the intention of the motion was a second option in the event the first motion failed. The amendment requested that the light touch scheme in the ‘Top Triangle’ area proceed but that residents be consulted on whether to become part of the full scheme as part of the proposed review of Zone U.

14.18 Councillor West formally seconded the motion.

- 14.19 Councillor West welcomed the Conservative Group motion on contraflow cycling adding that it was important to remember that parking schemes were not just about the provision of parking but promoting sustainable travel. Councillor West stated that it was easy to underestimate demand for cycle parking. Councillor West noted that Councillor Gibson had made some important points particularly listening to residents and he hoped the committee would support their amendment.
- 14.20 Councillor Littman welcomed the Conservative Group amendment that dealt with contraflow cycling that he would support. Councillor Littman stated that he could not support the second Conservative Group amendment as the issuing of unlimited visitor permits to businesses could cause significant difficulties to the scheme as a whole. Councillor Littman stated that it would be sensible to begin at an economical figure as there was an option to increase at the point of the six month review.
- 14.21 The Chair noted that the introduction of contraflow cycling was council policy and built into the scheme.
- 14.22 The Chair then put the first Conservative Group motion to the vote that passed.
- 14.23 The Chair then put the second Conservative Group amendment to the vote that passed.
- 14.24 The Chair then put the first Green Group amendment to the vote that failed.
- 14.25 The Chair then put the second Green Group amendment to the vote that failed.
- 14.26 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to the vote that passed.

14.27 **RESOLVED-**

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

Hanover & Elm Grove (Full Scheme)

- a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.* 201* (TRO-14a-2017)
- b) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.* 201* (TRO-14b-2017)
- c) Brighton & Hove (Hanover West Area) (One-Way) Order 201* (TRO-20-2017)

Hanover & Elm Grove (Light Touch Scheme)

- d) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.* 201* (TRO-15a-2017)
- e) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.* 201* (TRO-15b-2017)

- f) Brighton & Hove (Hanover East) (One-Way) Order 201* (TRO-15c-2017)

Craven Vale Parking Scheme

- g) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.* 201* (TRO-16a-2017)
- h) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.* 201* (TRO-16b-2017)
- 2) That any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order and to include contra flow cycle lanes in all appropriate one way streets as part of the implementation programme and include in the subsequent amendment TRO.
- 3) That a trial scheme should be piloted allowing businesses to buy a number of visitor permits, in order to help offset potential adverse impacts of a Controlled Parking Zone as outlined in paragraphs 6.4 and 6.5 save that businesses providing proof that they pay business rates will be entitled to buy an unlimited number of visitor permits on the basis they are advanced purchased in quantities of 50 visitor permits for use only in the Hanover and Elm Grove Light Touch Scheme Area. This would be reviewed after 6 months alongside the overall permit parking review and presented to a future Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.
- 4) That all of the proposed parking schemes are reviewed after 12-18 months to see how they are working for residents, businesses and services. This would be included in the parking scheme priority timetable which is due to be presented in a report to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 28th November 2017.

15 BALFOUR ROAD AREA / PRESTON VILLAGE AREA TRAFFIC ORDER CONSULTATION

- 15.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Housing that addressed the comments and objections to the draft traffic regulations orders for proposed parking schemes in the Balfour Road area and Preston Village and sought committee approval to proceed.
- 15.2 Councillor Littman welcomed the report stating that he was aware of the displacement difficulties caused to residents in his ward in being left out the Zone F scheme.
- 15.3 Councillor Wares referred to paragraph 5.11 that identified the permits issued to schools could cause disruption to the scheme in Balfour Road with the high number of schools located in the surrounding area. Councillor Wares noted that the Withdean ward councillors were opposed to the introduction of any scheme and had requested that be formally recorded.

15.4 RESOLVED-

- 1) That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following orders in the Balfour Road area;
 - a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.* 201* (Ref: TRO-9a-2017)
 - b) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.* 201* (Ref: TRO-9b-2017)
- 2) That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following orders in the Preston Village area;
 - c) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.* 201* (Ref: TRO-10a-2017)
 - d) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.* 201* (Ref: TRO-10b-2017)
 - e) Brighton & Hove (Preston Village) (One-Way) Order 201* (Ref:TRO-10c-2017)
- 3) That any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed schemes during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

16 WEST HOVE PARKING SCHEME DETAILED DESIGN CONSULTATION

- 16.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approves a new Light Touch resident parking scheme (Monday to Sunday 11am -12 Noon & 6pm - 7pm) within the West Hove area (Appendix A) be progressed to the final design and the Traffic Order stage advertised to allow further comment.

17 VARIOUS PARKING RESTRICTIONS INCLUDING VERGE PARKING BAN

- 17.1. The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out the comments, support and objections received to the proposed traffic regulation orders for alterations to parking restrictions with in Patcham.
- 17.2. Councillor West praised Councillor Wares for bringing forward the issue and expressed his support for the proposals. Councillor West hoped the alterations would be successful but was concerned the lack of enforcement could be an issue. Councillor West added that he hoped that Wilmington Parade could also be reviewed in the future due to excessive pavement parking.
- 17.3. **RESOLVED-** That the Committee (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections) agree the following:

Approve the Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment Order No.* 201* and Brighton & Hove

(Various Roads) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verges and Footways) Order 2013 Amendment Order No.* 201

18 INTELLIGENT TRANSPORT SYSTEM - BUS LANE CAMERAS PROCUREMENT

- 18.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval for a tender exercise to be undertaken for the procurement of a contract for the provision and installation of Traffic and Parking Enforcement cameras, associated enforcement system and ongoing maintenance of the camera system.
- 18.2 Councillor Wares noted that the existing contract would end on 31 March 2018 with the new contract beginning in October 2017 and asked how the overlap would be managed. Referring to paragraph 3.4, Councillor Wares asked why bus gates had not been included in the Valley Gardens scheme budget as paragraph 3.4 inferred. Furthermore, referring to paragraph 3.9 asked who could change priorities mid-contract.
- 18.3 The Control Centre Manager clarified that the two contracts would run side by side for the reason that the new contractor would need time to install the 21 new cameras. In relation to the query raised on bus gates, the Control Centre Manager confirmed that bus gates in Valley Gardens would be funded by that scheme and the new contract would be an addition to that. In reference to changes to priorities mid-contract the Head of Parking Services clarified that he, in liaison with the Head of Traffic Management and would be primarily concerned with the extension of the two year contract.
- 18.4 Councillor Wares moved a motion on behalf of the Conservative Group to amend recommendation 2.2(b) as shown in bold italics as follows:
- 2.2 (b) extend the contract referred to in 2.1 above period(s) up to a total maximum of 2 years should he/she consider it appropriate at the relevant time as outlined in para 3.9 ***subject to the prior agreement of the Procurement Advisory Board.***
- 18.5 Introducing the amendment, Councillor Wares stated that the intention was to ratify Member oversight of the extension of the contract.
- 18.6 Councillor Peltzer Dunn formally seconded the motion.
- 18.7 The Chair put the motion to the vote that passed.
- 18.8 The Chair put the recommendations, as amended to the vote that passed.
- 18.9 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:
- 1) Approves the procurement of a new contract for the provision and installation of Traffic and Parking Enforcement Cameras and associated enforcement support system for a term of 3 years with the option to extend for up to a further 2 years;
 - 2) Grants delegated authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Environment and Culture to:

- (a) carry out the procurement of the contract referred to in 2.1 above including the award and letting of the contract;
- (b) extend the contract referred to in 2.1 above for period(s) up to a total maximum of 2 years should he/she consider it appropriate at the relevant time as outlined in para 3.9 subject to the prior agreement of the Procurement Advisory Board.

19 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

19.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 8.30pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

