

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SAFETY OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

10.00AM 14 OCTOBER 2011

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Morgan (Chair); Sykes (Deputy Chair), Cobb, Hawtree, Janio, Jones, Lepper and Rufus

Also present: Councillors Ian Davey, Anne Pissaridou and Garry Peltzer Dunn

PART ONE

22. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

22a Declarations of Substitutes

Councillor Lepper was substituting for Councillor Gilbey and Councillor Rufus for Councillor Littman.

22b Declarations of Interests

There were none.

22c Declaration of Party Whip

There were none.

22d Exclusion of Press and Public

In accordance with section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, it was considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in section 100I (1) of the said Act.

RESOLVED: That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

23. PARKING REVIEW CALL-IN REQUEST

23.1 Councillor Warren Morgan, Chair of ESCOSC welcomed everyone to the call-in meeting including Councillor Ian Davey, Cabinet Member for Transport and Public Realm and 14 Members of the public present. Councillor Hawtree was welcomed as a new Member of the Committee.

23.2 Councillor Morgan noted the many challenges of parking, that affected all wards in the City. However this meeting was not convened to consider individual details of parking arrangements. Instead, the Committee would consider requests from Councillor Pissaridou and Councillor Peltzer Dunn for call-in of the decision on the Citywide Parking Review. Then, hearing from Councillor Ian Davey the Cabinet Member for Transport and the Public Realm and from officers, determine whether or not to refer back the 4 October Environment Transport and Sustainability Cabinet Member Meeting Decision, for reconsideration. The Senior Scrutiny Officer described the call-in process

23.3 Introducing her request Councillor Pissaridou said she felt the decision was flawed as the timetable was misleading and unclear. Councillor Pissaridou argued there was insufficient consultation undertaken in relation to the decision. There had been major concerns for more than four years and residents were angry that consultations had been postponed. Changes to the programme of reviews had not been properly explained or consulted upon, she said.

23.4 Councillor Peltzer Dunn said the draft minutes of the CMM meeting neither recorded his comment on a petition relating to Kestrel Close, nor referred to inconsistencies in the report that he had raised at the CMM meeting. Residents living between Saxon Road and Wish Road felt they had been misled and may have voted differently, had they known the consultation only extended up to Wish Road, he stated.

23.5 Councillor Peltzer Dunn spoke about his call-in request and the response at Appendix 5. He questioned the wording of the CMM report recommendations about timescales. For example Appendix B was not a list of extensions to parking schemes but merely a timetable of parking reviews and the meaning of 'Based on one project manager' was not clear. He queried the practical implications of resolution (b) in the Record of the Cabinet Member Decision that 'Officers are instructed to review the timetable in Appendix B' and said that the resolution (e) did not state when the parking review would commence.

23.6 The January 2008 Environment Committee had acknowledged the sustained representation made since 2007 in particular areas (Wish Park), and had agreed a timetable that showed work on West Hove/Portslade would start in 2010 (paras 6.10 and 6.14 at Appendix 5 attachment).

23.7 Regarding reaching a consensus view on a suitable area; CMM report was misleading in that paragraph 3.4 implied that action had already been taken in West Hove/Portslade; however he had not been consulted nor had there had consultation with former Councillor Kemble or former or current South Portslade Councillors, he told the meeting. Other Ward Councillors later commented they had not been consulted.

23.8 It was not clear that resources were in place to work to an accelerated timetable and the decision appeared to be inconsistent. It would be contradictory to carry out works in some parts of the City before the Citywide Review in his opinion. Therefore Councillor Peltzer Dunn said the decision was flawed and should be reconsidered in two separate programmes.

23.9 The Wish Park Residents' Association Chair made a submission on behalf of the Association and residents living close to Wish Park and Aldrington recreation ground, detailing reasons that the decision was 'grossly unfair,' in their view, and requesting that Wish Park (not Wish ward as a whole) be treated as a priority for consultation. The submission circulated for inspection by the Committee.

23.10 Councillor Ian Davey Cabinet Member for Transport and the Public Realm acknowledged the long history of issues around parking including the Wish area. The timetable agreed in 2008 covered four areas that were intentionally relatively large to minimise overspill to neighbouring areas. All work on further schemes was halted due to cuts in national funding. Three of the four schemes had been designed, consulted on and were partially implemented. No work was done on West Hove and Portslade. (It was later noted that West Hove/Portslade Station, priority 4 area at the time, was rescinded at July 2010 CMM.)

23.11 Councillor Davey told the Committee that, rather than awaiting the outcome of the Citywide Parking Review, taking around 18 months, his preferred option was to take action now in high priority areas identified from an analysis of road safety concerns, previous council consultation and levels of community and Ward Member support, as summarised at report Appendix A.

23.12 Councillor Davey was familiar with the parking problems in West Hove and Portslade however residents in only a small area had been consulted. Residents around Wish Park wanted a scheme and Ward Members were in support of a scheme covering a wider area, which required more resources. Officers were therefore asked to accelerate the timetable if possible as part of the budget considerations and a working group for the Wish ward had been suggested.

23.13 The Citywide parking review had full support of all political groups however the previous budget had not allocated funding for work during 2011-2012. It was hoped to identify resources in next year's budget. A similar review elsewhere had cost £200,000 and taken 2 years to complete; experience in other local authorities would be drawn upon but this level of funding was unlikely to be available here, he commented.

23.14 This was therefore a reasonable decision that would at least resolve some pressing problems though could not possibly solve all at once.

23.15 Councillor Davey answered questions on: the reason for combining two separate elements into one decision; why CMM did not reconsider, when it was clear that Ward Councillors had not felt properly consulted; the time taken for implementing schemes; and implications of self-financing schemes, especially regarding light touch.

23.16 He detailed why Wish area and West Hove and Portslade were different from the schemes that would proceed urgently, and told Members that he wanted to minimise any time wasted on schemes that are designed but then rejected at consultation stage, as happened in the two latest consultations. Work on the new schemes was not incompatible with the citywide review; one would inform the other, he stated.

23.17 Replying to questions the Project Manager Owen McElroy said some terminology might have been misunderstood. For example 'proposed extensions and adjustments' are reviews. Consultation responses are generally accepted up until Cabinet Member meetings. Road

safety concerns could have been ranked; Appendix A was a summary table and recommendations were based on a range of technical grounds. Resources were available for the timetable in Appendix B and work was done as quickly as possible but extra resources depended on the budget process. The Citywide Review involving all stakeholders would start as soon as authorised.

23.18 The Senior Scrutiny Officer set out the decision-making rules in Article 13 of the Constitution.

23.19 Councillor Davey then left the room. Members considered the call-in requests and discussed the details of the timetabling of the reviews and the principles of consultation; the extent of linkage between the elements of the decision; the potential benefits of a reconsideration, whether referral would be proportionate, the plight of Wish area residents; and possible implications of calling in the decision.

23.20 The Deputy Chair Councillor Ollie Sykes said ideally operations would follow strategic and tactical reviews but on balance there was justification for going ahead with urgent reviews before the Citywide review. A call-in would not necessarily benefit Wish area residents in his opinion

23.21 The Lead Commissioner City Regulation and Infrastructure explained that funding from revenue streams, of the Citywide Parking Review was independent of the capital budget to be used for urgent reviews/adjustments.

23.22 Councillor Cobb suggested that the Citywide Parking Review be accelerated, and individual reviews then follow.

23.23 Summarising, the Chair reiterated the difficulties of balancing competing views and financial pressures when dealing with parking issues. Councillor Morgan proposed that due to concerns including lack of consultation, the combination of both the strategy review and alterations to the timetable for parking scheme implementation, and unclear timetables and resources, the decision be referred back for reconsideration. He proposed that the Citywide Parking Review be considered separately from the programme of other parking reviews. Whether or not to include a Wish review, and consultation with Ward Members residents should also be considered by CMM.

23.24 The proposal was agreed following a vote.

23.25 RESOLVED (i) that the decision be called in.

(ii) that the CMM meeting consider separately the decisions on the Citywide Parking Review and the programme of other reviews/consultations

(iii) that the CMM meeting consider consultation with relevant Ward Members and residents, and whether or not to undertake an urgent Wish review

The meeting concluded at Time Not Specified

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of