

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**  
**ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE**

**4.00pm 21 JULY 2021**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Heley (Chair) Lloyd (Deputy Chair), Wilkinson (Opposition Spokesperson), Nemeth (Group Spokesperson), Appich, Bagaeen, Davis, Hamilton, Hills and Platts

**PART ONE**

**20 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**20a) Declarations of substitutes**

20.1 Councillor Appich was present as substitute for Councillor Fowler.

**20(b) Declarations of interest**

20.2 There were none.

**20(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(I) of the Act).

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

**21 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

21.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

“The pandemic has given us an opportunity to reflect on many things, including how we travel.

When lockdowns restricted our movements, more people chose to leave the car at home and enjoy their local surroundings by foot or by bike. I think it’s given us all a greater appreciation for what’s around us.

We need to do more to protect our environment and our health. The climate emergency remains our biggest threat, and this is not an abstract concept- we are already seeing the effects of it. From the awful floods in Western Europe that have left hundreds dead, to the current heatwave we are experiencing in the UK and record-breaking temperatures in Canada, which has also led to major destruction and hundreds of deaths, its real and it's happening now. We need to support people to choose sustainable methods of transport which will free up space for those who still need to travel by car: this is the absolute bare minimum we should be doing as a council, and for those who wish to remove active travel infrastructure are simply in denial. Furthermore, our physical and mental health remains more important than ever. Traveling actively has proven benefits to both and it should be our duty to provide people with a city that supports walking, cycling and a flourishing public transport network. We have a deputation in this meeting from NHS doctors that emphasises this, and I urge all councillors to bear this in mind today. Those who joined our Climate Assembly last year gave us an excellent steer on where we should be focussing our attention when it comes to transport. Currently, less than 3% of roads in Brighton and Hove City council have protected cycle lanes, which is absurd. Our job is not done until our roads look like Amsterdam's where they have a comprehensive, safe and enjoyable transport network. We must work towards a city that supports active, sustainable, and inclusive travel for everyone".

## **22 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

### **(B) PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

#### **(1) A259 and A270 emergency response times**

22.1 Darren Callow put the following question.

"Has the council reviewed the emergency services response times, to see if they have been adversely affected by the introduction of cycle lanes along the A259 coast road and Old Shoreham Road A270?"

22.2 The Chair provided the following reply:

"I can confirm that no objection to the cycle lanes has been received from the emergency services as they are able to use the cycle lanes in an emergency".

22.3 Darren Callow asked the following supplementary question:

"Has the budget set aside provision in the future budget for compensation claims for deaths caused by emergency services being delayed as a result of the cycle lanes and if they have, can they disclose that amount and if not, have you considered the possible prosecution for corporate manslaughter".

22.4 The Chair provided the following reply:

"No, we haven't as there are no delays caused by the cycle lanes".

#### **(2) Survey responses**

22.5 Peter Harland put the following question:

“Quoting from this meetings agenda (Page 10)

“Respondents over 45 (but under 75), those identifying as disabled, and car drivers, are over-represented when compared to 2011 census data, whereas younger people are under-represented. Schools were in lockdown and largely closed to pupils during the consultation period so opportunities to engage directly with schools/ pupils were unfortunately limited.

The above needs to be taken into account when reviewing the findings of the survey.”

Can you please explain to me what this means and in particular “The above needs to be taken into account” when reviewing the findings of the survey?”

22.6 The Chair provided the following reply:

“This comment is highlighting that the survey response is not fully representative of the city’s population profile and offers an explanation as to why this is the case.

The views of those underrepresented groups will not be reflected in the analysed, factual results. In drawing conclusions, this will have been noted by officers who will have also assessed the responses from all other forms of engagement. For example, section 7.8 on page 26 of the report about Old Shoreham Road outlines that stakeholder workshops with younger people showed that they generally welcomed the improvements particularly on this key route to schools and colleges”.

22.7 Peter Harland asked the following supplementary question:

“Are you not making too many assumptions”

22.8 The Chair provided the following reply:

“We’re not making too many assumptions, we had a stakeholder workshop which, as I’ve said, generally they were positive about active travel infrastructure and we need to take into account that it was under-represented by younger people so we need to consider that when looking at the full results”.

### **(3) Road Layout Changes**

22.9 Jonathan Holley put the following question:

“Why is the Green Administration continuing to impose road changes on Hove residents which are the opposite of ‘green’ and detrimental to public Health and Safety?

Specifically:-

- Air quality has deteriorated markedly due to the OSR being halved causing traffic jams which never existed before.
- Recycling has been discouraged as Residents were turned away from Hove Tip or forced to queue for up to 40 mins causing new traffic jams & pollution.
- road safety for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers is worse especially in the Holmes Ave area resulting in accidents and near misses”.

22.10 The Chair provided the following reply:

“As part of our monitoring strategy additional air quality monitoring stations have been setup along the Old Shoreham Road, however it is too early to report back on these at this point.

The relocation of vehicles to the lane further away from people on the pavement and adjacent property frontages does help to increase dispersion and reduce the effects of vehicle emissions on people’s health. The council is investing in active travel modes in line with central government direction and guidance, in order to make walking and cycling an option for shorter journeys (or as part of a longer journey). Putting in place high quality infrastructure to travel around the city by these modes aims to reduce the number of vehicle journeys, improve air quality and road safety. The solution to improving air quality is not to double the spaces for cars.

We have not seen any significant fluctuation in accidents being reported in the area where the temporary cycle lanes have been installed.

We are aware that traffic does get busy with vehicles wishing to access to the recycling centre and having marshals in place has helped with this. I have asked Officers to looking into this in more detail to see what other measures might help”.

22.11 Jonathan Holley asked the following supplementary question:

“The results of the questionnaire show the majority of residents do not want the cycle lane sited on the Old Shoreham Road from Hove Park to Portslade so I’d like to know why you are ignoring this”.

22.12 The Chair provided the following reply:

“We’re not ignoring it, it wasn’t a referendum it was a consultation so what we’re proposing to do is improve the route and keep it in place to provide a safe facility for people”

#### **(4) Stakeholder Workshops**

22.13 Andrew Peters put the following question:

“Throughout the Agenda it states ‘Stakeholder Workshops’ were held on the various areas such as the A23, A259 Western Road, Old Shoreham Road In all cases it states: “As part of the consultation, officers organised stakeholder workshops which local groups and organisations were invited to”

The Brighton & Hove taxi trade consists of around 1000 licensed vehicles and 1300 licensed drivers and so it is a significant transportation stakeholder. We are not aware of any invitations to such stakeholder workshops. Can the chair please explain why this so?”

22.14 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Information was sent out via email from BHCC’s Hackney Carriage Office to all taxi drivers in the city registered with them. This included information about the consultation generally as well as an invitation to participate in a stakeholder workshop on the 25th of February.

Information was also presented / feedback sought at a meeting of the city’s Transport Partnership, on 2nd March 2021, where the taxi trade is represented. The consultation

was publicised broadly in the city and was open to all to express views, not just those directly contacted by the council.

We received nearly 5,000 survey responses in total which compared to other consultations of this nature in the city is very high”.

22.15 Andrew Peters asked the following supplementary question:

“In the early stages of the Valley Gardens project, there were at least three specific workshops where we the trade as stakeholders sat around a table with the plans with officers. Would you agree that was a proper workshop and perhaps what you were offering was not a workshop specifically for the trade?”

22.16 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I appreciate why you might feel like that so if you like we can set up a meeting to discuss it in a more specific way”.

## **(5) Active Travel Grant**

22.17 Andi Holley put the following question:

“Why hasn’t the Green Administration spent half the nearly £3m Active Travel grant on promoting Walking as this is what the money was intended for and all Residents walk or use pavements be they young or old or disabled on mobility scooters, instead of spending the vast majority on cycling which benefits only 5% of Residents?”

22.18 The Chair provided the following reply:

“All of the Active Travel Fund proposed schemes have benefits for pedestrians. This is important to us, as everyone is a pedestrian at some point in their journey. Despite the main focus of some schemes appearing to be largely cycling-based, there are also many improvements proposed for pedestrians as well. This is something we will look to highlight more in the future as part of our Communications Plan.

The schemes proposed include numerous benefits for pedestrians including:

- Western Road – walking is a key focus in this project and proposes to bring numerous benefits to pedestrians by improving footways and crossings (formal and informal)
- A23 – numerous benefits for pedestrians including improvements to busy junctions, creation of new pedestrian crossing points at junctions and desire lines, improvements to bus stops and creation of pedestrian-only footways along the route as opposed to many of these being shared with cyclists currently.
- Old Shoreham Road – improvements for pedestrians at crossings including at Newtown Road and Hove Park
- A259 – pavement widening along Victoria Terrace shop frontage area, as well as improvements to the King’s Esplanade route to benefit pedestrians, drivers and cyclists.

In addition to the above, many of the Tranche 1 schemes involved pedestrian-specific improvements including pavement widening”.

22.19 Andi Holley asked the following supplementary question:

“What percentage is being spent on promoting walking facilities and aiding elderly and disabled people by improving the poor state of pavements which frankly are dangerous”.

22.20 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I don’t have that percentage to hand but we can get that information to you”.

## **(6) Air Quality Holmes Avenue junction**

22.21 The questioner did not attend the meeting to ask the question.

## **(C) DEPUTATIONS**

### **(1) Cycle Network**

22.22 The Committee considered a Deputation that presents four key areas that support the urgent necessity for a high quality, key cycle network link on the only direct route in the north-west of the city.

22.23 The Chair provided the follow response:

“Thank you for your deputation. I agree with you – it is vital that we provide safe cycle facilities on routes including the Old Shoreham Road - a key direct route serving the north-west of the city.

It is not simply a case of moving safe cycling facilities to another route, we need facilities on multiple routes in the city if we are to achieve a comprehensive and safe cycling network in line with national cycling design standards (a requirement of government funding), and our strategic work on our LCWIP provides an evidence-based assessment of strategic routes that are needed in the city, this includes the Old Shoreham Road. A particularly interesting finding from the consultation was that many cyclists are now using the Old Shoreham Road when previously they were using other routes to cycle, it is important to recognise the demand for safe cycling on this key route, particularly for children and we’re hearing some of these stories today. I hope that other members of the committee can consider the strategic importance of the cycling network in this part of the city when making decisions today”.

22.24 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the deputation.

### **(2) Children and use of Old Shoreham Road cycle lanes**

22.25 The Committee considered a deputation that set out the benefits to children and young people of the temporary cycle lane on Old Shoreham Road.

22.26 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for this deputation, I am delighted to hear how you have personally benefitted from the improvements we’ve made to date, and we know many others have too.

I’ve mentioned earlier about the importance of a strategic cycling network and how we can open up demand for cycling for all when we provide safe facilities. We have heard from many people in the consultation who have benefitted from the improvements, with many stories about being able to cycle with children on this route when previously this was too unsafe.

Sadly, we didn’t hear enough from young people in the consultation. The young people we did hear from were keen to have additional cycling facilities in place to enable them to safely travel to educational facilities and other destinations, and this has been a consideration in the interpretation of the consultation results and the way forward. I urge all members of this committee to think about the younger generations when voting today.

Once again, I am pleased you have been able to benefit from our improvements and hope that the decision we take today will mean you and other young people & families can continue to do so”.

22.27 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Deputation.

**(3) A259 Cycle route**

22.28 The Committee considered a deputation that supported the retention of the A259 cycle route on the basis of safety and the health benefits of active travel.

22.29 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your deputation, it is great that you have highlighted the benefits active travel can bring to physical and mental health.

I’m pleased you have been able to benefit from the improved cycle facilities on both the Seafront and Madeira Drive – we are very proud of these facilities and the impact that additional space for both walking and cycling is already having on people’s lives.

For the Seafront cycle route we recognise that more is needed to achieve the full benefits here – for example taking cyclists in both directions off the carriageway – however we are pleased with the usage figures to date and propose to keep the temporary scheme in place, with the proposed extension, and continue to monitor usage. One of the key issues for this scheme is not just about cycling but making improvements for pedestrians – we are doing this by providing a dedicated facility for westbound cyclists, away from both motor vehicles and pedestrians, reducing conflict between cyclists and pedestrians; and additionally providing widened pavements, loading and disabled bays on this route as well as improvements to the King’s Esplanade area.

Building on the achievements of this temporary scheme, we would seek funding for more ambitious permanent improvements with wider benefits (the type of which you mention) as this route features in our strategic network”.

22.30 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the deputation.

**(4) Cycle lane network**

22.31 The Committee considered a deputation that set out the health and wellbeing benefits of active travel and cycling and urged the retention on the Old Shoreham Road cycle lane.

22.32 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you very much for your deputation and I’m particularly pleased to see the statistics highlighted in relation to the cost of physical inactivity and how investment in active travel can proactively help address this issue.

During the pandemic we have all shown appreciation for our incredible NHS staff, and I hope that all members present listen to you today.

Providing space and networks for active travel will enable everyday exercise by residents, visitors and employees alike, however, to achieve this we need a safe and comprehensive network.

We know that many people don’t cycle in the city as they don’t feel safe – with many travelling by car for short journeys as they feel there is no alternative. We know that facilities need improving for pedestrians as many pavements and crossings just aren’t up to scratch. This all needs to change and highlights the importance and gravity of what we are recommending today – fully funded by government money just for this purpose. We’ve still got lots of work to do on the wider strategic routes in the city but by approving the recommendations today the committee would be taking the city in the right direction for improving the health of many of our residents by investing in walking and cycling improvements for all, and thus supporting our National Health Service. Many thanks for you and your colleagues for bringing this deputation today”.

22.33 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the deputation.

## **23 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

### **(A) PETITIONS**

#### **(1) Petition to stop Brighton & Hove Council closing Stapley Drive**

23.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 660 people and referred from the Full Council meeting held on 15 July that requested the Council not to implement a no right turn restriction into Stapley Road.

23.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“I can inform you that following consultation with residents as part of the Old Shoreham Road phase 2 scheme that there are no proposals to introduce a closure at Stapley Road”.

23.3 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the petition.

## **24 ACTIVE TRAVEL FUND**

24.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that outlined the consultation exercise undertaken on four of the Active Travel



Fund schemes (Western Road, A23, A259 Fourth Avenue to Glendor Road, and Old Shoreham Road) and recommended proposals for the next steps of these schemes.

24.2 On behalf of the Labour Group, Councillor Wilkinson moved a motion to amend the recommendations as shown in bold italics and where struckthrough below:

~~2.4 That the Committee agrees to progress the development of improvements to the Phase 1 Old Shoreham Road cycle lane as a temporary scheme (from The Drive to Hangleton Road) and to undertake continued monitoring of the scheme. The improvements are as set out in Appendix 8, including temporary changes to increase vehicle capacity at the Olive Road / Stapley Road junction.~~

**2.4 That the Committee requests that an Urgency Sub-Committee be convened before 11 August 2021 to consider the removal of the Phase 1 cycle lanes on Old Shoreham Road**

**2.5 That the Committee requests officers explore alternative local routes for a temporary scheme, including but not limited to, Portland Road and New Church Road, in consultation with local residents and bring a report back to the committee with potential options.**

~~2.6 That the Committee agrees to proceed with the proposed pedestrian crossing improvements to Old Shoreham Road at Newtown Road and Hove Park as set out in Appendix 8.~~

2.9 That the Committee agrees to proceed with **that prior to considering** the proposals for Phase 2 of the Seafront (A259) temporary westbound cycle lane and proposals to introduce an experimental traffic scheme on King's Esplanade (and adjoining roads), as set out in Appendix 11, **officers are to consult and engage fully with the businesses and residents directly impacted, and bring a report to the next full meeting of the ETS Committee.**

2.10 That the Committee agrees to officers progressing with the Active Travel Fund 2021/22 bid to the Department for Transport (DfT), to secure future funding for schemes including consideration of Marine Parade, Old Town, A23 and **alternatives to the current temporary scheme on Old Shoreham Road (including options that are not limited to Portland Road and New Church Road)**, as well as consideration of a 'Mini-Hollands' proposal for the City.

24.3 Councillor Appich formally seconded the motion.

24.4 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Nemeth moved a motion to amend the recommendations as shown in strikethrough below:

~~2.1 That the Committee agrees to the preliminary designs for the Western Road scheme (presented in Appendix 5), to the advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) (including for the proposed changes to loading bays and amendments to the bus lane in the vicinity of the Dyke Road junction), and the commencement of construction on elements of the scheme which do not require a TRO.~~

- ~~2.2 That the Committee agrees to the preliminary design for the A23 scheme (presented in Appendix 7), to initiate further discussion with key stakeholders to inform design development, to progress the development of designs, to undertake further public consultation and return to a future ETS Committee with detailed design recommendations on the A23 scheme.~~
- 24.5 Councillor Bagaeen formally seconded the motion.
- 24.6 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Nemeth moved a motion to amend the recommendations as shown in bold italics and where struckthrough below:
- 2.3 That the Committee ~~agrees to progress a trial~~ ***calls for an officer report to be presented at the Committee's next meeting on the Administration's proposals*** for a trial Park & Ride site at Mill Road from Summer 2022, working with Brighton & Hove Bus and Coach Company.
- 24.7 Councillor Bagaeen formally seconded the motion.
- 24.8 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Nemeth moved a motion to amend the recommendations as shown in bold italics and where struckthrough below:
- 2.4 That the Committee agrees ***to request an officer report setting out the implications of the removal of the Phase 1 Old Shoreham Road cycle lane to an Urgency Sub-Committee to be convened at the earliest possible opportunity*** ~~to progress the development of improvements to the Phase 1 Old Shoreham Road cycle lane as a temporary scheme (from The Drive to Hangleton Road) and to undertake continued monitoring of the scheme. The improvements are as set out in Appendix 8, including temporary changes to increase vehicle capacity at the Olive Road / Stapley Road junction.~~
- ~~2.6 That the Committee agrees to proceed with the proposed pedestrian crossing improvements to Old Shoreham Road at Newtown Road and Hove Park as set out in Appendix 8.~~
- 2.9 That the Committee ***authorises officers to extensively consult residents, businesses and disabled groups in the wards of Central Hove, Westbourne and Wish prior to the presentation of proposals for Phase 2 of the Seafront (A259) temporary cycle lanes at a future meeting of the Committee*** ~~agrees to proceed with the proposals for Phase 2 of the Seafront (A259) temporary westbound cycle lane and proposals to introduce an experimental traffic scheme on King's Esplanade (and adjoining roads), as set out in Appendix 11.~~
- 24.9 Councillor Bagaeen formally seconded the motion.
- 24.10 In response to questions from Councillor Platts, it was explained that if the funding allocated for Old Shoreham Road could be allocated to the other 3 schemes proposed, there would potentially be no loss to the Council and the DfT would not request funding back if the schemes could be delivered by April 2022. With regards to the presentation of the data, that reflected the way it had been collected and analysed

specifically, the questions were not a binary choice and more nuanced meaning one comment could be categorised over several area. In addition, the report highlighted the difficulty in engagement with people, particularly young people during a national lockdown. School were largely closed and rather than conducting in person workshops as would normally be the case, information was sent to schools who then passed this on to parents.

- 24.11 In response to a question from Councillor Bagaeen, it was explained that the consultation ran from the 21<sup>st</sup> February to mid March and schools were mostly closed during this period. No engagement had taken place with children and schools outside of the consultation period. The meetings of the Youth Climate Assembly had indicated support for active travel measures and additional information to inform decision making.
- 24.12 In response to a question from Councillor Wilkinson, the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture stated that it was now felt a report would be required to remove the Old Shoreham Road Cycle Lane as there were wider financial, sustainability, equalities and public health implications relating to the removal that were not detailed or covered in the report being considered by the committee at the meeting.
- 24.13 In reply to questions from Councillor Appich, it was explained that the 'Mini-Holland' proposal related to cycling and walking improvements and would form part of the council's bid to government for Tranche 3 funding. Furthermore, there was an active program to maintain and enhance pavements and would be taken forward un the Local Transport Plan Capital Programme.
- 24.14 In response to a query from Councillor Bagaeen, it was clarified that details of the 'Mini-Holland' project had been included in the report so the process of apply for funding could start. Should the application be successful, officers would work with councillors on locations for appropriate schemes.
- 24.15 Councillor Platts stated that a decision needed to be made on fact and the results indicated majority support for the Old Shoreham Road cycle lane.
- 24.16 Councillor Lloyd stated that whilst a decision was not easy, it was clear that the least vulnerable road users were those most in favour of removal of the cycle lane and the committee should be minded toward supporting those most vulnerable.
- 24.17 Councillor Hamilton stated that the elderly were also a vulnerable group and often relied upon a car to travel. Councillor Hamilton stated that there had been a tremendous increase in traffic relating to the installation of the cycle lane and it was clear to him that it was in the wrong place.
- 24.18 The Chair noted that the data collected indicated there had been no increase in congestion along the Old Shoreham Road.
- 24.19 Councillor Platts agreed that an alternative cycle lane was needed, and the Labour Group were committed to supporting cycling.
- 24.20 Councillor Lloyd stated that one of the reasons Old Shoreham Road was an optimal location was because a cycle lane did not cut through private parking spaces and was

on a school corridor route. Councillor Lloyd stated that a discussion should not focus on alternative routes but additional ones and no consultation had taken place on harmful traffic measures.

- 24.21 Councillor Hills stated that removing the cycle lane would force more cars on to the road as cycling would no longer be a viable option. Councillor Hills expressed surprise at the position taken by the opposition groups that was very different to the colleagues in other areas of the country. Councillor Hills highlighted Waltham Forest as a pioneer on the matter and their active travel measures were now very popular with residents and were realising significant health and environmental benefits.
- 24.22 Councillor Davis stated that Portland Road had 38 junctions and 350 pay and display parking bays as well as many more resident parking bays meaning it significantly more difficult to introduce a cycle lane along the road compared to Old Shoreham Road. Councillor Davis stated that people locally and nationally were dying prematurely because of air pollution and Members should not be swayed by a noisy minority seeking to remove the cycle lane. Councillor Davis added that 97.3% of roads in Brighton & Hove did not have cycling routes and it was imperative to increase this figure.
- 24.23 Councillor Nemeth commented the issue of the cycle lane had been manufactured into a culture war. Councillor Nemeth stated that minority groups could support motor infrastructure and he believed more effort could have been put into winning people over.
- 24.24 Councillor Wilkinson stated that his Group supported the vast majority of the schemes proposed in the report however, it was clear that the temporary Old Shoreham Road cycle lane was not working and was unpopular. Councillor Wilkinson noted that his Group did not want to remove the cycle lane but find a suitable relocation. Councillor Wilkinson stated that it was imperative for the council to listen to residents and act in meaningful ways.
- 24.25 Councillor Hills stated that the only method to promote cycling was to make the option available and make it safe.
- 24.26 Councillor Lloyd commented that he believed both opposition groups had created negativity around the Old Shoreham Road cycle lane via negative press releases. Councillor Lloyd felt that active travel measures required more visible support from Members to create unity.
- 24.27 The Chair then put the first Conservative Group motion to the vote which failed with 8 votes against and 2 in favour.
- 24.28 The Chair then put the second Conservative Group motion to the vote that passed with 6 votes in favour and four against.
- 24.29 The Chair then put the third Conservative Group motion to the vote that passed with 6 votes in favour and four against.
- 24.30 The Chair then put the Labour Group motion to the vote that passed with 6 votes in favour and four against.

24.31 The committee then held an adjournment in order for a substantive amendment to be drafted comprising of the amendments carried.

24.32 The Chair then put the recommendations, as amended to the vote that were unanimously agreed.

24.33 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee agrees to the preliminary designs for the Western Road scheme (presented in Appendix 5), to the advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) (including for the proposed changes to loading bays and amendments to the bus lane in the vicinity of the Dyke Road junction), and the commencement of construction on elements of the scheme which do not require a TRO.
- 2) That the Committee agrees to the preliminary design for the A23 scheme (presented in Appendix 7), to initiate further discussion with key stakeholders to inform design development, to progress the development of designs, to undertake further public consultation and return to a future ETS Committee with detailed design recommendations on the A23 scheme.
- 3) That the Committee calls for an officer report to be presented at the Committee's next meeting on the Administration's proposals for a trial Park & Ride site at Mill Road from Summer 2022, working with Brighton & Hove Bus and Coach Company.
- 4) That the Committee requests that an Urgency Sub-Committee be convened before 11 August 2021 to consider the removal of the Phase 1 cycle lanes on Old Shoreham Road
- 5) That the Committee requests officers explore alternative local routes for a temporary scheme, including but not limited to, Portland Road and New Church Road, in consultation with local residents and bring a report back to the committee with potential options.
- 6) That the Committee agrees not to proceed with the Phase 2 Old Shoreham Road temporary cycle lane proposals at this stage.
- 7) That the Committee agrees not to proceed at this stage with the proposals for Nevill Road, Windlesham Close, Weald Avenue and Stapley Road (access restrictions).
- 8) That the Committee agrees to progress the development of improvements to the Phase 1 Seafront A259 temporary westbound cycle lane (from West Street to Fourth Avenue) as an experimental scheme, including to disabled parking, as set out in Appendix 10, and to undertake continued monitoring.
- 9) That the Committee that prior to considering the proposals for Phase 2 of the Seafront (A259) temporary westbound cycle lane and proposals to introduce an experimental traffic scheme on King's Esplanade (and adjoining roads), as set out in Appendix 11, officers are to consult and engage fully with the businesses and residents directly impacted, and bring a report to the next full meeting of the ETS Committee.

- 10) That the Committee agrees to officers progressing with the Active Travel Fund 2021/22 bid to the Department for Transport (DfT), to secure future funding for schemes including consideration of Marine Parade, Old Town, A23 and alternatives to the current temporary scheme on Old Shoreham Road (including options that are not limited to Portland Road and New Church Road), as well as consideration of a 'Mini-Hollands' proposal for the City.
- 11) That the Committee notes the summary of the Active & Inclusive Travel Forum to date as set out in Appendix 16.

**25 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

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

The meeting concluded at 8.05pm