

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**  
**ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING**

**4.00PM 24 SEPTEMBER 2009**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor G Theobald (Cabinet Member)

**Also in attendance:** Councillors Mitchell (Leader of the Labour Group) and Rufus (Opposition Spokesperson, Green)

**Other Members present:** Councillors Carden and Davis

**PART ONE**

**30. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**30a Declarations of Interests**

30a.1 There were none.

**30b Exclusion of Press and Public**

30b.1 In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ('the Act'), the Cabinet Member for Environment 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 nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press or public were present during that item, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A(3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100I(1) of the Act).

30b.2 **RESOLVED** – That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

**31. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

31.1 **RESOLVED** – The minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2009 were approved and signed by the Cabinet Member as a correct record.

**32. CABINET MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS**

32.1 The Cabinet Member reported that to assist with the evaluation of speed limits on minor roads and in light of the large number of individual requests received by the Council he would be referring the issue of 20 mph speed limits to the Environment & Community

Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee. The Committee would also consider the evaluation report on the Portsmouth 20mph Pilot Scheme.

### **33. ITEMS RESERVED FOR DISCUSSION**

33.1 **RESOLVED** – That with the exception of the items reserved (and marked with an asterisk), the recommendations and resolutions contained therein be approved and adopted without debate.

### **34. PETITIONS**

#### **34(i) Petition – pedestrian safety issues in the Clarendon area**

34.1 Councillor Davis had submitted a petition signed by 268 people concerning pedestrian safety in the Clarendon area of Hove.

34.2 Mr Anthony Hewines, local resident, presented the petition.

34.3 The Cabinet Member explained that Officers regularly monitored collision data in response to residents' and councillors' concerns and reviewed the appropriateness of existing speed limits and road layouts where necessary. The Clarendon area had a good safety record with no pedestrian injuries or instances of excessive speed therefore the Council was not currently considering a reduction of the speed limit to 20mph or implementing associated traffic calming measures in the area. The Cabinet Member reiterated that the Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee would, however, be considering the issue of 20 mph speed limits.

34.4 The Cabinet Member added that the request for increased crossing facilities would be investigated along with all such other requests; priority would be given to areas with severe safety issues.

34.5 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

#### **34(ii) Petition – Double yellow lines in Thornhill Rise**

34.6 Councillor Carden presented a petition signed by 31 people requesting a reduction in the length of double yellow lines in Thornhill Rise, Portslade.

34.7 The Cabinet Member reported that the request would be included in the next amendment traffic order to be advertised in November and if approved it would allow more opportunity for residents to park in the area.

34.8 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

### **35. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

35.1 The Cabinet Member reported that one public question had been received.

35.2 Mr Hooper asked the following question:

“Why was this Safety Audit conducted *after* going out to Tender for its construction, *not received* by B&HCC *before* a successful Tenderer was informally selected, conducted by the *same* company (Amey) as designed the roads on behalf of B&HCC; and *did not consider* the question of the design of the road leading from the A270 to both Stanmer Park and Sussex University having no traffic calming measures (other than a restricted width), or the conflict of both the road into Stanmer Park, and the new access road into that University having, at different times, larger traffic flows than the other?”

35.3 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:

“I can assure you that it is acceptable and common practice for a consultant designing a scheme to carry out the required safety audits, as long as they are by different teams. In this case the Second Stage Safety Audit was undertaken by Amey’s Euston Office and the design was completed by the Lewes office.

The junction design will significantly improve public safety whilst passing, entering or leaving the park and meets the strict standards of the council. This audit considered the safety implications of the detailed design and the recommended and agreed changes to the scheme are considered as minor variations to the contract.

The junction into the park and university has been designed to a standard that will accommodate the varying flows of traffic throughout the year, which were taken into consideration at the design stage.”

35.4 Mr Hooper asked the following supplementary question:

“Will the Council now instruct officers to consider the problems associated with the roads experiencing larger traffic flows and report back to the Cabinet Member Meeting?”

35.5 The Assistant Director for Sustainable Transport gave the following response:

“The roads were fully future-proofed and the safety audit would have picked up the probability of larger and more varied traffic flows.”

## **36. DEPUTATIONS**

36.1 There were none.

## **37. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS**

37.1 There were none.

## **38. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

38.1 There were none.

## **39. NOTICES OF MOTION**

39.1 There were none.

**40. RESIDENT PARKING SCHEMES CONSULTATION**

40.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the outcome of the public consultation undertaken regarding a proposed extension to the Area H Residents Parking Scheme (for copy see minute book).

40.2 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:

(1) That approval be given for:

(a) The Area H Extension Residents Parking Scheme to be progressed to final design and the Traffic Regulation Order advertised, subject to the amendments outlined in this report.

(b) Cowfold Road and Manor Road residents to be contacted again by letter drop to ensure that they are aware a scheme will be progressed around them and to give them a further opportunity to decide whether to be in or outside of this scheme.

(c) An order to be placed for all required pay and display equipment to ensure implementation of the proposed parking schemes are undertaken as programmed.

**41. PARKING ANNUAL REPORT 2008/9**

41.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the first parking annual report on the performance of parking services for submission to the Department for Transport and Traffic Penalty Tribunal and for publication under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004 (for copy see minute book).

41.2 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:

(1) That the publication of the first Parking Services Annual Report 2008/9 for submission to the Department for Transport and Traffic Penalty Tribunal under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004 be endorsed.

**42. VARIOUS CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES (CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2008 / AMENDMENT ORDER NO.\* 200\*)**

42.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning alterations to parking restrictions within the Controlled Parking Zones (for copy see minute book).

42.2 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:

(1) That (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections) the traffic order be approved with the following amendment:

- (a) The proposed removal of disabled parking bays in Goldstone Road, is to be removed from the Traffic Order as the bay is still required by local resident.

#### **43. ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING POINTS\***

- 43.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the installation of on-street charging points for electric vehicles in the city (for copy see minute book).
- 43.2 The Cabinet Member reported that as the Council had received no objections or representations to the traffic order it could proceed without his approval and, therefore, no decision on recommendation 2.2 of the report was required.
- 43.3 In response to a query from Councillor Mitchell concerning vandalism the Assistant Director for Sustainable Transport explained that the charging points were robust and would be as secure as possible; he added that no problems had been reported in London, where the charging points were already being utilised.
- 43.4 Councillor Rufus welcomed the installation of the charging points, particularly as they would be located in the Air Quality Management Zone.
- 43.5 In response to questions from Councillor Rufus the Cabinet Member explained that eight additional charging points would be installed using the Civitas funding and that the expectation was to continue maintaining the points following the completion of the Civitas project.
- 43.6 The Assistant Director for Sustainable Transport added that maintenance costs would be low and the Council would be looking for partners to share the cost, particularly if further charging points were to be installed. He also explained that electric vehicles would not be able to park in the charging spaces unless they were being charged and this would be shown by indicator lights on the points.
- 43.7 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
- (1) That approval be given to proceed with the introduction of the Electric Vehicle Charging Points scheme in Brighton & Hove as set out in this report.

#### **44. APPROVAL TO PROCURE STREET LIGHTING ENERGY CONTRACT\***

- 44.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the purchase electricity for street lighting and illuminated signs jointly with East Sussex County Council (ESCC) (for copy see minute book).
- 44.2 The Cabinet Member explained that the Council's street lighting formed part of the larger East Sussex lighting infrastructure which had one single electricity supply; working with East Sussex's greater resources and buying power would currently be the best value option for the Council.

- 44.3 In response to a question from Councillor Mitchell the Head of Network Management confirmed that each street lamp was routinely checked and was, where possible, fitted with photovoltaic cells; lamps were also switched on as late as possible to conserve energy.
- 44.4 Councillor Rufus commented that in the future the Council should be seeking more than 30% renewable energy and be asking suppliers to demonstrate how they can provide 100% renewable energy.
- 44.5 The Assistant Director for Sustainable Transport explained that the Council would aim to increase the overall amount of renewable energy in the future; the proposals in the report would allow the Council to use the proceeding 18 months to investigate options for the next contract.
- 44.6 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That the Director of Environment be authorised to:
- (a) Enter into an arrangement with ESCC to utilise the Buying Solutions' framework agreement to procure the electricity for highway street lighting and illuminated signs for a period of 18 months until April 2011.
- (b) Carry out a review, including soft market testing as to the options and costs for the future procurement of electricity for highway street lighting and illuminated signs and to report back to the Cabinet Member with recommendations following the review.

#### **45. APPROVAL TO PROCURE STREET LIGHTING MAINTENANCE CONTRACT\***

- 45.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the procurement of a Highways Street Lighting Maintenance Contract for the period 2010 – 2012 (for copy see minute book).
- 45.2 Councillor Mitchell asked that where lamp columns are replaced they are replaced like for like, particularly in period areas that are outside of the Conservation Areas.
- 45.3 In response to concerns raised by Councillor Rufus the Assistant Director for Sustainable Transport explained that the report demonstrated that there were a number of options available to the Council, but that there was no intention to reduce the level of service; a report would come back for the Cabinet Member to approve the preferred contractor.
- 45.4 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That the Director of Environment be authorised to:

- (a) To enter into a procurement process with ESCC to tender for the maintenance of the highway street lighting, illuminated signs and bollards stock.
- (b) To present a future report to the Cabinet Member outlining the results of the procurement process and seeking permission to proceed with appointing the contractor.

#### **46. CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO DRAFT PPS15: PLANNING FOR THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT**

- 46.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment seeking endorsement of the proposed response to Government consultation on the draft Planning Policy Statement 15: Planning and the Historic Environment (for copy see minute book).
- 46.2 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That the draft Planning Policy Statement 15: Planning and the Historic Environment be broadly welcomed and that the response to consultation, as set out at Appendix 1, be endorsed.

#### **47. MAINTENANCE OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS**

- 47.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment providing an annual update on repair works to historic buildings in the city, including the enforcement of repairs where necessary (for copy see minute book).
- 47.2 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That the updated register of listed buildings that are considered to be 'at risk' (Appendix 1) be endorsed.

#### **48. CONSULTATION ON THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE FUTURE SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY\***

- 48.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the Council's response to the government's 'Consultation on the membership of the future South Downs National Park Authority' document (for copy see minute book).
- 48.2 Councillor Mitchell supported the proposed response and queried how other local authorities were responding.
- 48.3 The Cabinet Member reported that the local authorities that would be allocated two members under the proposal for a larger Authority had stated a preference for this, while the other local authorities preferred a smaller Authority; the Council's response included a caveat that if the larger Authority was agreed, Brighton and Hove should be allocated

an additional member. He added that even the lower proposal of 29 members was higher than any other National Park Authority making 39 an unlikely proposition.

- 48.4 Councillor Rufus stated that the Council should push for greater representation for Brighton and Hove as one of the principal gateways to the National Park. He added that, as stakeholders, residents from the area should be permitted a directly elected representative on the Authority.
- 48.5 The Cabinet Member stated that the Council had made representations, but was restricted by the options proposed. He added that any individuals or groups could respond to the consultation.
- 48.6 Councillor Mitchell stated that it was important that the maximum amount of funding was directed towards maintaining the National Park, rather than towards a larger Authority and that it was the responsibility of local authorities to ensure that residents were aware that they could feed comments through via their local Authority members.
- 48.7 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That approval be given to the draft response to DEFRA, attached at Appendix 1, regarding the proposed membership of the future South Downs National Park Authority.

#### **49. CITYPARKS DOWNLAND MANAGEMENT\***

- 49.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning proposals to increase the grazed area of council land managed by Cityparks (for copy see minute book).
- 49.2 The Cabinet Member reported a minor correction to recommendation 2.2 of the report (see resolution).
- 49.3 The Cabinet Member explained that the Council had been re-introducing sheep grazing to a number of key chalk grassland sites for a number of years. This resulted in benefits to wildlife, as well as educational and community benefits, and the Council had the opportunity to graze much larger areas with funding from Natural England. Conservation mowing would continue until grazing was introduced.
- 49.4 The Cabinet Member paid tribute to the volunteer shepherds and the wildlife groups for their participation in the initiative.
- 49.5 Councillor Mitchell welcomed the extension of grazing, but raised a number of concerns about the practicalities of the approach. She stated that the report did not address plans for the sites that would not be grazed or the decision to stop collecting grass clippings; there was also no mention of the letter from the Chairman of the Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee to the Cabinet Member or consultation with countryside and wildlife groups.



- 49.6 Councillor Rufus stated that the proposals in the report should form part of a framework for the management of all the sites; the Council should implement a Biodiversity Action Plan with individual action plans for each site rather than developing the proposals in the report separately.
- 49.7 The Cabinet Member reported that he had met with representatives of some of the relevant groups to discuss issues around grazing and that the report made it clear that proposals would not be progressed until consultation had taken place.
- 49.8 In response to questions from Councillor Mitchell, the Assistant Director for City Services made the following comments:
- Proposals for each site would be drawn up in through the consultation and this would determine the number of sheep on each site.
  - No financial savings were expected and the Council would seek funds from the Higher Level Scheme.
  - There would be no impact on jobs.
  - The cost of composting had increased, making grazing a more viable option.
- 49.9 The Assistant Director for City Services added that the report did not address all the conservation issues, as the report was specifically about grazing; some sites had management plans while others did not, and the intention was that these would form part of the Biodiversity Action Plan that was being developed as part of the Open Spaces Strategy.
- 49.10 The Director of Environment confirmed that further written information would be provided to Councillor Mitchell regarding the issues that she believed wildlife groups expected to see addressed.
- 49.11 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
- (1) That the grazing plans for each site be approved, subject to full consultation with ward councillors and residents.
  - (2) That approval be given for the implementation of the grazing plans for key chalk downland sites and where feasible, subject to the above consultation being completed successfully.

The meeting concluded at 5.00pm

Signed

Cabinet Member

Dated this

day of