

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

4.00pm 5 MARCH 2013

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Davey (Chair) Councillor Follett (Deputy Chair), Cox (Opposition Spokesperson), Janio, Kennedy, Mitchell, Phillips, Robins, G Theobald and West

Other Members present: Councillor Hawtree

PART ONE

58. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

58(a) Declarations of substitutes

58.1 Councillor Morgan present as substitute for Councillor Mitchell

58(b) Declarations of interest

58.2 There were none.

58(c) Exclusion of press and public

58.3 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).

59. MINUTES

59.1 Councillor Kennedy asked for a correction to minute item 52.2 to replace the word "vouch" with "confirm there were many".

59.2 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 January 2013, as amended, be approved and signed as the correct record.

60. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

60.1 The Chair stated that he had no specific communications.

61. CALL OVER

61.1 **RESOLVED-** That all items on the agenda be reserved for discussion.

62. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(a) Petitions

(i) Brighton Station and Seven Dials proposals- Rob Heale

62.1 The petitioner did not attend the meeting therefore, the response was provided in writing and is set out below.

“Public consultation on both the Seven Dials and Brighton Station schemes was undertaken in 2012, and the specific scheme elements mentioned in the petition were made publicly available as part of the plans.

The response to the Seven Dials proposals was overwhelmingly positive and the scheme was approved by the Council’s Transport Committee on 15th January 2013.

Work was due to commence on-site on 4th March and will be ongoing for approximately 9 months.

In both cases, the scheme design has been undertaken by qualified professionals with all relevant design guidance and best practice adhered to. Both schemes will also be subject to a 3 stage independent Safety Audit process, as is the case with all significant transport schemes promoted by the Council”.

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

63. ITEMS REFERRED FROM FULL COUNCIL

(a) Petitions

**(i) Opportunity to improve residents’ car and cycle parking, Eaton Road, Hove-
Councillor Sykes**

63.1 The petitioner did not attend the meeting therefore a response was provided in writing and is set out below. At the request of a member of the Committee, the response was also read out at the meeting.

“The council continue to support the installation of cycle parking facilities across the city as a lack of adequate, well placed cycle parking facilities is a known barrier for those wishing to cycle.

In order to provide facilities and respond to requests for our residents the council maintains a database of these requests which are investigated on a rolling basis. Where cycle parking is appropriate and funding is available we endeavour to install facilities on the footway.

In locations such as the city centre where there is limited pavement space to install cycle parking, carriageway cycle parking is considered. These on-carriageway facilities are known as Pedal Cycle Parking Places (PCPPs). Before they can be installed a full site investigation is carried out to ensure facilities are in the correct location, they do not obstruct the highway and to determine the effects on existing vehicle parking facilities. We have now received the request for cycle parking on Eaton Road opposite the Sussex Cricket Ground and will investigate this request within the financial year 2013/2014. It is not possible to have a shared taxi rank and resident permit bay facility so a decision about these bays would need to be made based on the need for resident or cycle parking, consultation with the Taxi Forum and any other objections which might be received”.

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

(ii) **Pelham Street Crossing- Rohan Lowe**

63.3 The Chair of the Committee provided the following response:

“Officers have been liaising with City College for over a year and have confirmed that driver behaviour is the main issue in this case.

I did personally meet with representatives from the college in 2011 when a petition was previously submitted and we did discuss the matter of the crossing. Road safety officers made suggestions about moving some of the parking to alternate sides of the road which they felt may help reduce traffic speeds. The college were going to get back to us on this but never did.

Pelham Street has been included on the list of pedestrian crossing requests to be assessed, subject to funding, in the financial year 2013/2014. Any improvements suggested will be in line with wider area development plans such as the City College planning application which has recently been discussed at the pre-application stage with Brighton & Hove Authority Planners. We carry out assessments on an annual basis so that we can respond in a relatively proactive way to crossing requests.

As you may be aware, 20mph speed limits are due to be implemented in this area soon and hopefully this will contribute towards pedestrian safety.

The results of the pedestrian crossing assessments and the priority locations identified to be installed are listed on the council’s website. This website also lists those pedestrian crossing improvements that have been installed as a direct result of this process”.

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

64. **MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

64.1 No items were received.

65. VALLEY GARDENS

65.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that set out the principles for the Valley Gardens Concept Scheme. The report was supplemented by a presentation at the Committee.

65.2 Councillor West asked if the design brief presented to the Committee was the same as the one it had received previously in July 2012. In addition, he asked the Senior Project Manager to acknowledge the issue of traffic neutrality and the presence of elm trees.

65.3 The Senior Project Manager clarified the brief was substantially the same as the one presented to Committee in July for all but a few words. He supplemented that the elm trees were a constraint on where roads could be routed and the retention of the gyratory system was considered but this was not deemed practical.

65.4 Councillor West asked if a traffic reduction was considered in order to eradicate the need to build across the park.

65.5 The Senior Project Manager replied that this had not been specifically tested, but that Traffic Modellers had advised that reducing highway infrastructure to a single lane in each direction would likely have significant impact on traffic flow within Valley Gardens and dispersal of traffic onto alternative roads in the city. The Senior Project Manager stated that if required, the number of traffic lanes in the proposal could be reduced ahead of any construction. However, to achieve this, wider strategies would need to be implemented to reduce levels of traffic in Valley Gardens. These strategies, which would likely need to overcome issues such as clustering of car parks in the city centre, were beyond the scope of the Valley Gardens project being presented.

65.6 Councillor Robins stated he had found difficulty in visualising how he would drive from Edward Street to New England Road under the new proposals.

65.7 The Senior Project Manager explained that the journey would be made in much the same way as today. The Senior Project Manager confirmed that private vehicles would be able to enter sections of bus lane for local access, but that measures would be implemented to prevent private vehicles driving along the whole length of the bus lanes.

65.8 Councillor Morgan noted that items 3.9 and 4.3 of the report highlighted that this was a long-term scheme and therefore needed cross-party support to deliver it effectively. Councillor Morgan stated the Labour & Co-Operative party's support for the current scheme proposals and for the long-term enhancement.

65.9 The Chair agreed noting the recent announcement that applications to the Cycle Ambition City grant would need to demonstrate cross-party support as a condition.

65.10 Councillor Janio praised officers for the work they had conducted thus far. He agreed that consensus on a masterplan was needed from all parties. Councillor Janio noted that recommendation 2.5 referred to the establishment of a management team. He asked for

clarification that this be formed by existing staff and budgets and not be a consultancy organisation.

65.11 The Head of Transport confirmed that this team would be formed by existing staff and there may be Member involvement.

65.12 Councillor Kennedy thanked Transport officers for work undertaken on the project. She agreed that cross-party support for a vision would be best for the project which, with its public realm and environmental improvements, had very exciting potential. The proposals would bring significant enhancement to an area that often gave the impression of neglect.

65.13 Councillor West stated that whilst he believed there were many good aspects to the proposed scheme which would deliver improvements, he had numerous concerns. Councillor West stated that he was uneasy about the impact of two lanes of traffic in the natural open spaces of Valley Gardens including a possible third stretch of road on Marlborough Place. Councillor West noted that he had checked the brief provided to Committee in July 2012 which he believed differed to the one presented to Committee at this meeting. Specifically, there was less traffic and more tranquillity and that the potential of the scheme had not been met with the current proposals. Councillor West added that whilst he appreciated that aspects of the scheme had been consulted on, he believed that the specific details of the scheme, particularly the new elements, should be consulted on again as the public must have ownership of the Valley gardens scheme. Councillor West stated that he believed the scheme could be improved adding that because of the constraints of a traffic neutral scheme and the narrowing of green spaces, the current design would create little more than a central reservation.

65.14 Councillor Janio asked the Senior Project Manager if the proposals would lead to a significant loss of green space as described by Councillor West.

65.15 The Senior Project Manager replied that it was important to differentiate between quality and volume of green space. In terms of quality, the current plans would enhance the ambience, connectivity, safety, ecology and character of the area. In terms of quantity, and excluding new swales and trees on landscaped areas, a scheme that included the realignment of the road to the west of Victoria Gardens south would lead to a reduction of around 7% in green space. Leaving the road in its current alignment would result in a 1% increase in green space. The Senior Project Manger added that the stated figures did not include the flexibility within the scheme to amend the design details at future points.

65.16 Councillor West formally moved the following amendments to the recommendations as shown below:

The existing recommendations 2.1 and 2.2 to be replaced with:

2.1 That Committee notes the Valley Gardens Concept Scheme proposals.

2.2 That Committee instructs officers to undertake a full public consultation on the Valley Gardens Concept Scheme proposals and to bring the results of the consultation back to a future Committee.

Recommendation 2.5 to be amended to read:

2.5 That Committee agrees that a management team should be established to oversee consistent development of the Concept Scheme, and to ensure synergy between the proposals and surrounding schemes and policies.

65.17 The motion did not receive a formal seconder and therefore, was not put to the vote.

65.18 Councillor Cox stated that he support the proposals. The overall vision was to a high standard and realistic should funding be achieved. Councillor Cox stressed the importance of as much cross-party support as possible as it was a long-term project and likely to be delivered over more than one administration. Councillor Cox added that the current design problems at Valley Gardens demonstrated that lessons needed to be learned in consistent delivery of such schemes over a number of administrations. Councillor Cox supplemented that he hoped funding would be forthcoming and investigated as much as possible.

65.19 Councillor Theobald expressed his support for the Concept Scheme and his thanks to the Senior Project Manager and his team for their work on the project thus far and how the design had appreciated or included a broad spectrum of opinion. Councillor Theobald believed that the Valley Gardens area was currently underused, in a very poor condition and lacking in smooth transition for pedestrians and cyclists.

65.20 Councillor Robins stated that the Concept Scheme was very good and essential in an area at the heart of the city.

65.21 The Chair thanked Members for their positive comments and the discussion. He added that whilst he appreciated the concerns raised, public engagement was ongoing which would help refine the scheme to resident's priorities and preferences.

65.22 RESOLVED-

1. That Committee agrees that the principles established by the Valley Gardens Concept Scheme as outlined in this report should guide future improvements in and around Valley Gardens.
2. That Committee agrees that further work should be undertaken, incorporating full public consultation, to develop the public realm aspects of the Concept Scheme, specifically the public parkland spaces and hard landscaped civic spaces.
3. That Committee agrees that continued financial allocations to the Valley Gardens project should be made within the council's Local Transport Plan capital programme to enable the continued development of the project, and that £100,000 should be allocated for this purpose in 2013/14.
4. That Committee agrees that early consideration should be given to the preparation of bids for external funding that would assist in developing and implementing elements of the Valley Gardens proposals.

5. That Committee agrees that a management team should be established to oversee consistent delivery of the Concept Scheme, and to ensure synergy between the proposals and surrounding schemes and policies.

66. AWARD OF ON-STREET PARKING MANAGEMENT CONTRACT

- 66.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that requested approval for the award of the on-street Parking Management Contract to the preferred bidder for a three year duration with the option to extend for a two years plus a further option to extend for an additional two years.
- 66.2 Councillor Janio asked if the three tenderers had applied to the same criteria, in particular with regard to the movement of staff.
- 66.3 The Head of Transport Operations confirmed that this had been the case.
- 66.4 Councillor Morgan noted his concern that the Committee were considering financial, contractual information and that it perhaps should have done so in private session. Councillor Morgan noted that there was only one tenderer which he believed demonstrated that outsourcing of contracts was not as effective as often claimed. Councillor Morgan stated that he could not support the recommendations on this basis.
- 66.5 The Acting Assistant Head of Law clarified that there was no information contained within the report to merit consideration being held in confidential session. She added that there was a conscious effort on behalf of the authority to restrict reports where absolutely necessary.
- 66.6 **RESOLVED-** That Transport Committee authorises the Strategic Director Place to approve the award of the on-street Parking Management Contract to the preferred bidder for a three year duration with option to extend for two years plus a further option to extend for a further two years, in line with the recommendations of the Tender Evaluation Report produced by the evaluation team.

67. ITEMS REFERRED FOR COUNCIL

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

The meeting concluded at 5.15pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of