

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

4.00pm 13 OCTOBER 2015

THE RONUK HALL, PORTSLADE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Mitchell (Chair) Barradell (Deputy Chair), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), West (Group Spokesperson), Atkinson, Greenbaum, Miller, Nemeth, Robins and G Theobald

Other Members present: Councillors Brown, Gibson, A Norman, K Norman Peltzer-Dunn, Taylor and Yates

PART ONE

16 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

16(a) Declarations of substitutes

16.1. There were none.

16(b) Declarations of interest

16.2. There were none.

16(c) Exclusion of press and public

16.3. 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).

16.4. **RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded

17 MINUTES

17.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 7 July 2015 be approved and signed as the correct record.

18 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

18.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

“As you may be aware a report on the Parking Permit review was due to be presented at this meeting.

However, this will now be considered in a report presented to the next Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee on 24th November.

This will allow staff time to fully evaluate the results of the parking permit survey which will be available soon.

Any new Parking schemes that do get agreed will still start after any permit changes following on from the review are implemented

“Item 30 (Parking Bay Sensors Trial) has been removed from the agenda as further due diligence is required to be undertaken on the company. I have only just been informed of this prior to the meeting and it is my opinion, having discussed the matter with officers, that it is the correct thing to do”.

19 CALL OVER

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

- Item 23: Surrenden & Fiveways Resident Parking Scheme Consultation Report
- Item 24: Valley Gardens Update
- Item 25: Parking Annual Report
- Item 26: Resident Parking Scheme Priority Timetable
- Item 28: Traffic Network Management Strategy
- Item 29: Removal of Non-Motorised Vehicles
- Item 31: Business Case and Proposals For Increased Waste Enforcement Activity
- Item 32: Proposals For Chargeable Garden Waste Collections
- Item 33: Sustainability Action Plan
- Item 34: Air Quality Action Plan

19.2 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 27: Highways Winter Service Plan 2015-16
- Item 35: Report of the Scrutiny Panel on Short-Term Holiday Lets (Party Houses)

20 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**(a) Petitions**

(i) Surrenden & Fiveways Parking Proposals- John Colman

20.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 644 people requesting the council to abandon proposals to introduce new parking regulations in the Surrenden and Fiveways area.

20.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for presenting your petition. As you will note, this issue will be considered in the report on the consultation results for this area being considered by this Committee later in the meeting”.

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

(ii) Traffic Calming on Preston Park Avenue- Damian Brewer

20.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 16 people requesting the council investigate and implement traffic calming measures on Preston Park Avenue due to motorist’s excessive speeding.

20.5 The Chair provided the following response:

Thank you for your petition.

As you may know, the implementation of the city-wide 20mph speed limit includes a period of monitoring to measure speeds and the extent of non-compliance. Following this, consideration of further, physical measures to support the speed limit will be carried out and a programme of measures will be brought before this Committee at a later date for approval following consultation with residents. Residents' concerns for Preston Park Avenue will be recorded and considered alongside the monitoring and evaluation of solutions.

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

(iii) Zebra Crossing on Bear Road- Emma Davies

20.7 The Committee considered a petition signed by 264 people requesting the council install a pedestrian crossing on Bear Road above the Bevendean Road turning.

20.8 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition.

The council has an assessment procedure for the implementation of crossing facilities to ensure safe locations, assess demand and so on. The council has limited funds and so has to prioritise.

After receiving your petition I have asked the Road Safety Team to survey that particular section of Bear Road in the next round of surveys and if it is judged that a crossing is warranted then it will be included within a recommended crossing programme”.

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

(iv) Food waste collection and composting, council-led- Hannah Rose-Tristram

20.10 The Committee considered a petition signed by 447 people requesting the council to provide a food waste collection and composting service.

20.11 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition.

We do recognise the importance of managing waste sustainably which is why we are bringing forward initiatives to make it easier for people to recycle and boost recycling levels.

Officers have carried out a lot of detailed work to assess the feasibility of a food waste collection for the city, including the challenges of food waste collections from city centre blocks of flats. It would cost an additional £1.2m per year to provide this service at a time when budgets are being significantly reduced and we have placed an emphasis on maintaining good quality, basic public services and improving our existing recycling service.

We do recognise that we throw away far too much food and we actively work with the city’s Food Partnership in schools and communities to encourage people to waste less food.

The city now has over 1,000 households participating in community composting and we want to see that number increase. Subsidies are offered for compost bins and wormeries.

On a final note I am pleased to say that less than 5% of all our waste goes to landfill”.

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

(v) Beaconsfield Road parking- Liz Goodwin

20.13 The Committee considered a petition signed by 61 people requesting the council introduce some form of resident parking scheme in Beaconsfield Road to alleviate problems being encountered by residents.

20.14 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition and for outlining the parking problems in your neighbourhood.

Before giving consideration to consulting on a resident parking scheme an assessment of the parking issues in the area would be made.

Parking scheme design has to comply with legal requirements and a one road solution may well not be successful as the number of parking spaces able to be offered could end up being much less than the overall demand.

A consultation for any potential scheme would need to have wide support from the area that could be affected so your petition will be logged and could be included in a further report on parking scheme consultations to this committee”.

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

(vi) Light Touch Parking Restrictions, Rothbury Road, Jesmond Road and Mornington Crescent- Tess Booth

20.16 The Committee considered a petition signed by 100 people requesting the council implement a light touch parking scheme in Rothbury Road, Jesmond Road and Mornington Crescent.

20.17 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition

As you may be aware from the agenda the West Hove area is being discussed for inclusion in the parking scheme programme. This report is being presented later in the meeting when Members of the Committee will discuss the way forward”.

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

(vii) Parking in the Hove Park area- Councillor Brown

20.19 The Committee considered a petition signed by 207 people that requested the council consult residents on a parking scheme to alleviate problems caused in the area.

20.20 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition. As you may be aware from the agenda the Hove Park area is being discussed for inclusion in the parking scheme programme. This report is being presented later in the meeting when Members of the Committee will discuss the way forward”.

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

(b) Written Questions

(i) Pedestrian Crossing Whitehawk Road

20.22 Dee Edmonds presented the following question:

“Last October a petition organised by me and signed by nearly 1000 people was submitted about, about the urgent need for a pedestrian crossing at the Steiner School bottom of Whitehawk Road School.

Although Councillor Gill Mitchell supported the petition and said 'I hope that the request for a crossing will be taken seriously', the request seems to have been ignored.

Continued support in the area for a crossing is shown by another petition collecting 200 signatures.

I would like to know if children need to be seriously hurt or killed before a crossing is enacted at the end of Whitehawk Road”

20.23 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your question.

As you may be aware, as part of the planning application for the development of the Royal Sussex County Hospital the council successfully negotiated section 106 monies for a number of highway improvements, which includes improvements for pedestrians in the area.

Part of the planning agreement was to release the money to the council once phase one of the hospital development had begun. Unfortunately, there have been some delays to the start of the hospital development which is outside of our control.

However, we are now hopeful that work on the hospital will begin shortly and we can begin the work to improve pedestrian crossings. Once we have some firm dates on the commencement of the works at the hospital I will ask Officers to contact you to discuss the pedestrian improvements to the area which the local community can all benefit from”

(c) Deputations

(i) Controlled Parking Zone in Lauriston and Cumberland Road, Preston Village- Joanne Field

20.24 The Committee considered a Deputation requesting the council to introduce a controlled parking zone in in the Preston Village area.

20.25 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your detailed deputation. As you may be aware from the agenda the Preston Village area is being discussed for inclusion in the parking scheme programme. This report is being presented later in the meeting when Members of the Committee will discuss the way forward”.

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

(ii) Surrenden & Fiveways area resident parking scheme- Andrew Coleman

20.27 The Committee considered a Deputation in support of the introduction of a controlled parking zone in the Fiveways area.

20.28 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your detailed deputation. As you may be aware from the agenda the results of the consultation from the Surrenden & Fiveways area is being presented later in the meeting and Members of the Committee will discuss the way forward”.

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

(iii) Parking Situation in West Hove- Peter Reeves

20.30 The Committee considered a Deputation requesting that residents be consulted on the option of joining the light touch parking zone adjoining the area to alleviate parking problems in the area.

20.31 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your detailed deputation. As you may be aware from the agenda the West Hove area is being discussed for inclusion in the parking scheme programme.

This report is being presented later in the meeting when Members of the Committee will discuss the way forward”.

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

21 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

(a) Petitions

(i) Brentwood Road pedestrian crossing- Holly Robertson

21.1 The Committee considered a petition referred from the Full Council meeting on 16 July 2015 and signed by 189 that requested the installation of a pedestrian crossing on Brentwood Road, opposite Hollingdean Children’s Centre.

21.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition.

All requests for new or improved road crossings across the city are analysed rigorously by our Road Safety team. They look at a number of factors including collision data, the width of the road, proximity of junctions and speeds of vehicles. The way these assessments are carried out has been approved by full council.

Our programme of road crossing works for 2015-16 was agreed earlier this year and is currently being implemented.

Recommendations for 2016-17 based on the highest priority sites across the city are expected to be considered by the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee at a future meeting and your request will be taken into consideration”.

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

(ii) Proper Parking Consultation- Rachel Finn

21.4 The Committee considered a petition referred from the Full Council meeting on 16 July 2015 and signed by 253 people requesting the council to consult with residents on the type of parking controls applied when introducing new schemes.

21.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“When consulting on potential parking schemes, the city council consults over a wide area and will only do so following clear support for such a consultation to take place.

Residents are offered the chance to express a preference on the times of enforcement and to propose different types of parking controls.

The consultation is a two-stage process so residents that will be living in roads where it is proposed to implement a scheme have a further opportunity to comment once the detailed designs have been done and Traffic Regulation Orders published”.

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

(iii) Lollipop Crossing for West Blatchington Primary School- Councillors Barnett, Janio and Lewry

21.7 The Committee considered a petition referred from the Full Council meeting on 16 July 2015 and signed by 150 people requesting the council provide a lollipop person to help children cross Hangleton Way.

21.8 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for submitting this petition on behalf of your residents.

I am pleased to confirm that this request has been included in the programme of crossing assessments and that surveys have been undertaken to determine levels of activity. Once the data has been analysed, a decision on whether a School Crossing Patrol can be provided will be made. I have asked the Road Safety Manager to write and inform you of the outcome once it is known”

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

22 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(b) Petitions

(i) Lewes Road Traffic Scheme- Councillor Yates

22.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 771 people requesting the council release all Lewes Road scheme monitoring report produced since November 2013 and for the committee to bring a report to a future meeting fully reviewing the scheme.

22.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“The city council's cross-party transport committee unanimously agreed plans on 2nd October 2012 to make transport improvements to the Lewes Road corridor. This followed an extensive public consultation exercise where the majority of those who responded indicated they were in favour of the proposals.

The scheme included measures to improve public transport services and safety for pedestrians and cyclists as well as the upgrade of traffic signals at key junctions to improve the efficiency of the route for car drivers.

Pre-traffic surveys were undertaken in October/November 2012 in order to establish the existing baseline condition. These surveys included manual traffic counts on the mode of transport, journey times for both buses and cars, automatic traffic counts on surrounding key routes as well as obtaining bus patronage data from the local bus company.

To ensure that post-monitoring is comparable, surveys must be repeated at the same time of year so that seasonal variations do not influence the outcome. As such, the monitoring was repeated in October/November 2013 following the completion of the scheme and the results were published on our website.

In October/November 2014, the construction work to improve the safety of the Vogue Gyratory was taking place and therefore the annual monitoring had to be delayed until January/February 2015 when the works were completed. This delay meant that the surveys were subject to seasonal variation but this was deemed preferable to the alternative of gathering data during major construction works.

Further monitoring is programmed to take place in October/November 2015 after which a full report will be published summarising all the data collected to date. This will include accident analysis and will also identify any impacts on the surrounding area that may be identified as part of the latest data gathering exercise. For example, the November 2013 monitoring report identified an issue with increased queueing at the Coombe Road/Lewes Road junction. As a result, a left turn filter lane was introduced at the traffic lights and the traffic signals were adjusted. The latest queue length surveys for this junction have shown that this remedial action has been very successful and queue lengths have now fallen below the level recorded before the scheme was implemented. Should other issues be identified via the monitoring then the next report will identify suitable solutions to address them.

The report will be published on our website once it is complete which is expected to be in December 2015”.

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

(c) Written Questions

(i) Pay-By-Phone Parking- Councillor Janio

22.4 Councillor Janio presented the following question:

“Will the Chair of the Committee please tell me a) how much revenue has been raised through ‘service charges’ since pay-by-phone parking was introduced by the Council in September 2013; b) what proportion of transactions are now carried out by phone, compared to pay & display and PayPoint pro rata; and c) what impact, if any, the introduction of pay-by-phone parking has had on overall income in the areas where it applies?”

22.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“The service charge for pay by phone transactions was cut from 15p to 10p in May 2015. Since it was introduced 2 years it has raised £98,986. Today 1% of transactions are made at a PayPoint outlet, 25% of transactions are by phone and 74% are at a pay and display machine. Overall income and length of stay have increased in the areas where pay by phone shows the highest take up with 6 % of pay by phone transactions being ‘top up’ extensions of the original parking session”.

(d) Letters

(i) Southdown Avenue- Councillor Hamilton

22.6 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillor Hamilton requesting a resolution to parking issues on Southdown Avenue.

22.7 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your Letter to this Committee.

My understanding is that following a resident meeting Ward Councillors met with an officer on site to discuss this further. It was agreed that the different options that could be considered on Victoria Road are the following;

- *Change the times of the single yellow line on the north side e.g. 9am – 5pm to allow parking after 5pm until 9am in the morning.*
- *Introduce 1 hour / 4 hour limited waiting parking on certain sections of Victoria Road – could be 9am-5pm or other times.*
- *Look into changing the parking layout on Victoria Road near the park.*

These options were sent to Ward Councillors to discuss with residents to see if they felt it would solve some of the issues. As you are aware the main issue is Southdown Avenue residents needing to park after 5pm in the area when spaces are difficult to find. Any feedback can be sent to Officers to progress this.

In terms of a resident parking scheme this would require significant support from residents to take forward and there is concern that this would not solve the current issues as parking would be limited to one side of one road. However, if residents wish to pursue this then it would be advisable for them to make a further representation”.

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

(ii) West Hove Parking- Councillor Nemeth

22.9 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillor Nemeth presenting the results of a recent parking survey undertaken by the Wish Ward councillors and requesting the area be consulted on a controlled parking scheme that included the option for a light touch model.

22.10 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your detailed letter.

As you may be aware from the agenda the West Hove area is being discussed for inclusion in the parking scheme programme.

This report is being presented later in the meeting when Members of the Committee will discuss the way forward”.

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

23 SURRENDEN & FIVEWAYS RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME CONSULTATION REPORT.

23.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that set out the outcome of the public consultation undertaken for a proposed parking scheme in the Surrenden & Fiveways area and requested permission to proceed with a scheme in the Fiveways area as detailed in the report.

- 23.2 Councillor Ken Norman addressed the Committee on the proposals. He explained that the Withdean ward councillors had conducted their own survey and found that 75% were against the proposals in their ward. Councillor Norman stated that the local Conservative Party manifesto had outlined the need for a citywide parking review on the basis of a fairer approach to parking in the city and his group would vote against any extensions to controlled parking zones as they disagreed with an incremental approach. Councillor Norman asked the committee to refuse the proposals of the report and instead begin a thorough citywide parking review.
- 23.3 The Chair noted that a Citywide Parking Review had been undertaken by the previous administration in 2013. The previous administration had also begun a parking policy and permit review and the results of that study would be presented to the committee at its next meeting. The Chair stated that she hoped that would allow more flexibility to how parking operated in the city, particularly in outer areas. However, the council were bound by the requirement by central government that all schemes were mandated to be self-financing.
- 23.4 Councillor West thanked the Chair for her observations. In relation to the specific scheme before the committee, Councillor West noted that if the recommendations were agreed as per the report and parking enforcement was introduced in Preston Village, the Surrenden area would be surrounded by controlled parking zones and were likely to suffer from displacement issues. Councillor West felt this would lead to Surrenden residents returning to the committee requesting to join a zone in the future and Members should be braver and broader in its current approach. Councillor West noted that Councillor Littman had corresponded with him regarding two roads in the Preston Park ward that should be included in the scheme: one side of Balfour Road and Beacon Close.
- 23.5 The Parking Infrastructure Manager noted that it would be very difficult to introduce a scheme on one side of the road particularly with regard to signage and lining.
- 23.6 The Chair stated that if the committee were to receive representation from residents of those roads detailed by Councillor West, they could be consulted as part of the scheduled consultation with Preston Village, subject to approval of the report.
- 23.7 Councillor West asked if Surrenden residents would be re-consulted as part of any consultation with the Preston Village area.
- 23.8 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that there was no clear consensus from the wider Surrenden area on a parking scheme in the most recent consultation and there would need to be representation from residents before officers would revisit the matter.
- 23.9 Councillor Theobald noted that with the number of local schools in the area, bringing Balfour Road into a scheme could cause a significant drop in the number of parking spaces available. Councillor Theobald stated that he disagreed with the proposals of the report in principle. He had been approached by a number of residents who believed the council were introducing some schemes purely for income.

- 23.10 Councillor Robins stated that there was no one solution to parking issues in the city and noted that with residents approaching the council with requests to join controlled parking zones, the council had duty to consider the request.
- 23.11 Councillor Barradell stated that the city was very congested and it was sometimes difficult to find a space even within a controlled parking zone. Councillor Barradell felt that the council should commit more focus toward a modal shift to public transport to ease parking pressures within the city.
- 23.12 Councillor Greenbaum stated that she agreed with Councillor Barradell and also felt that controlled parking zones would not solve congestion problems and there needed to be a modal shift to public transport.
- 23.13 The Chair then moved the recommendations to the vote which carried.

23.14 **RESOLVED-**

That the Committee approves:

- 1) That a new resident parking scheme progressed within the Fiveways area (Appendix B) and as outlined in paragraph 5.8 of this report be progressed to the final design stage and publicised for statutory consultation thereafter;
- 2) That no resident parking scheme is taken forward in the further Surrenden area within the Withdean and Patcham Wards.
- 3) That limited waiting free parking bays replace the exclusive pay & display bays in Preston Drove (see Para 5.14).

24 VALLEY GARDENS UPDATE

- 24.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that updated Members on the Valley Gardens project.
- 24.2 Councillor West noted that he continued to be supportive of the scheme but was worried by a number of aspects. Councillor West noted with concern that the financial implications suggested there was no guarantee of the same amount of funding through re-profiling; that the delay would jeopardise future funding opportunities and that there was no mention of the cost of new surveys and re-modelling.
- 24.3 The Head of Transport gave assurance that since the point of publication of the report, he had received a letter from the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) confirming the same level of funding. He added that traffic modelling was an expensive process but it was important to make sure the scheme was robust and captured recent changes to the network that would directly impact upon the Valley Gardens area. Furthermore, the re-examination of the scheme gave an opportunity for officers to gather new data for the long-term.
- 24.4 Councillor West asked for confirmation of the cost of updating the traffic model.

- 24.5 The Head of Transport confirmed that this was in the region of £70,000 to £80,000 that was expensive but was very important for a large, citywide scheme.
- 24.6 Councillor Barradell stated that it was essential to note that the preferred scheme agreed by the committee in October 2014 differed from the scheme detailed in the Business Case.
- 24.7 Councillor Theobald expressed his support for the revision of the scheme as it was very important to make sure it worked effectively and efficiently. Councillor Theobald added that it was imperative that the scheme remained traffic neutral.
- 24.8 Councillor Janio stated that the re-modelling and new surveys would be important in light of the significant work undertaken at key points in the city in the past few years including Seven Dials, Lewes Road and Edward Street.
- 24.9 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That Committee notes the update and timeline in 3.6-3.11.
 - 2) That Committee notes the urgency of gathering updated traffic data within the October 'neutral period'.
 - 3) That Committee agrees that the Project Management Board should oversee project progress along-side formal Committee decision-making processes.

25 PARKING ANNUAL REPORT 2014-15

- 25.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that requested approval of the publication of the Parking Annual Report 2014-15 for submission to the Department for Transport, Traffic Penalty Tribunal and for general publication under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004.
- 25.2 Councillor Atkinson asked for assurance that the locations of pay and display machines were convenient now their number had been significantly reduced and that instructions for how to use the pay-by-phones were very clear, particularly for elderly people. Councillor Atkinson also noted that London Road car park was under-used on a Sunday and asked if there was any scope to encourage use of the car park.
- 25.3 The Policy & Development Manager stated that his team welcomed feedback on the location of pay and display machines and had acted in instances where there had been requests from members of the public for specific machines to remain in place. He added that people could also pay for parking at Paypoint locations.
- 25.4 The Head of Transport added that the Fees & Charges report would be presented to the committee in January that would set out the tariffs for London Road car park and an Intelligent Transport System (ITS) would be introduced in the city in the near future that would better direct people to car parks that had available spaces.

- 25.5 Councillor West stated that he welcomed the report and thanked officers for their hard work. Councillor West expressed his dismay that central government were intending to withdraw the option for council's to use CCTV for prosecution particularly with regard to unsafe driving. Councillor West stated that he felt cycle parking facilities were not keeping up with demand and a proper survey of cycle ownership in the city was required to give a clear policy steer on the matter. Councillor West added that he believed businesses should also play a greater role in providing cycle parking and some were particularly poor in being aware of this need.
- 25.6 Councillor Robins stated his support for the pay-by-phone system that had been very useful for him as a trader moving around the city.
- 25.7 Councillor Theobald stated that a sign on the A23 directing drivers to London Road car park may encourage use. Councillor Theobald asked the reasons behind the decline in issuing of hotel permits year on year.
- 25.8 The Policy & Development Manager replied that it was difficult to be clear on the exact causes behind the decline in hotel permits particularly as visitor numbers to the city had risen. One possible cause was an increase in on-street parking via the pay-by-phone system that many visitors based in London would be familiar with.
- 25.9 Councillor Nemeth asked if the council had reviewed its systems and procedures in light of Coin Collection International entering administration at significant loss to the council.
- 25.10 The Policy & Development Manager clarified that the council had reviewed its procedures and an update had recently been reported to the Audit & Standards Committee.
- 25.11 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee endorses the publication of the Parking Annual Report for 2014-15 under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004.
 - 2) That the Committee authorises the Head of Transport Operations to produce and publish the report which will also be made available on the Council's website.

26 RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME PRIORITY TIMETABLE

- 26.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that recommending a parking scheme priority timetable based on recent representations to the committee and requests from ward councillors.
- 26.2 Councillor Gibson addressed the Committee on the proposals, expressing his support and that the committee agree to the timetable.
- 26.3 Councillor West expressed his support for the proposals and hoped it could address some of the parking problems experienced by residents who had attended the committee. In reference to Hollingbury Road and Ditchling Gardens, Councillor West

noted that the scheme would be comprised of just those roads and iterated his view that the scheme needed to be broader due to potential displacement difficulties.

26.4 Councillor Nemeth asked if light touch schemes were intended to be self-enforcing.

26.5 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that light-touch schemes were not as heavily enforced as full schemes and going forward, officers would make that clear to residents requesting such schemes. In reference to Hollingbury Road, the Parking Infrastructure Manager explained that only that road had approached the committee with a request to be part of a scheme and no further action could be taken in the wider area until similar requests were received. Hollingbury Road could not join the adjoining Zone J scheme as it was already to capacity.

26.6 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That Committee agrees the Parking Scheme priority timetable as set out in Appendix A which would require officers commencing work immediately in the Hollingbury Road / Ditchling Road area and the Hanover & Elm Grove area.
- 2) That Committee agrees to a further report early next year on the options to take forward a consultation in the Hanover & Elm Grove area in 2016.
- 3) That Committee agrees to a further report in spring 2016 to determine the area and types of schemes to be consulted upon in the Preston Village, West Hove and Hove Park areas (if the relevant deputations are received). This report would also consider any further requests.
- 4) That Committee also notes the further requirement for additional resources to deliver this revised timetable and requests the Executive Director to investigate this possibility given the current controls on current expenditure and recruitment.

27 HIGHWAYS WINTER SERVICE PLAN 2015-16

27.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approves the Brighton & Hove City Council Highways Winter Service Plan 2015-16 as attached at Appendix 1 of the report.

28 TRAFFIC NETWORK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

28.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that sought approval for a Traffic Network Management Strategy for the city.

28.2 Councillor Barradell stated that she welcomed the report and had been surprised that such a strategy had not already been adopted by the council. Councillor Barradell added the report was a crucial piece of work that she hoped worked well and promoted sustainable transport.

28.3 Councillor West stated his support for the proposals adding that more focus was required on pedestrians and public realm in section 3.4 of the report.

28.4 Councillor Atkinson welcomed the report and thanked officers for their thorough work on the matter. Councillor Atkinson added that the strategy would provide vital joined up thinking in network operations.

28.5 **RESOLVED-** That a city wide 'Traffic' Network Management Strategy be developed.

29 REMOVAL OF NON-MOTORISED VEHICLES.

29.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that sought approval for officers to undertake a detailed investigation and consultation into the use of the Highways Act 1980 to develop a highway policy to assist the Highway Enforcement team in the removal of Non-Motorised Vehicles (NMVs) from the public highway.

29.2 Councillor Theobald stated his support for the proposals and detailed that residents in his ward had experienced extensive problems from caravans parked along Surrenden Road and would welcome resolution to the issue.

29.3 Councillor Barradell requested that the full report to be presented to a following committee detail the costs of removal and storage of NMVs.

29.4 The Highway Enforcement Manager confirmed that it was intended this information be in the more detailed report to follow the investigation.

29.5 RESOLVED-

- 1) That the Committee recommend officers undertake a more detailed investigation and consultation into the use of the Highways Act 1980 to develop a highway policy that will assist the Highway Enforcement team in the removal of NMVs from the Public Highway. A full report will be brought back to ETS committee as soon as possible after consultation.
- 2) That Committee notes that an annual budget will need to be identified to cover the costs of removal and storage of NMVs for up to 14 days

30 PARKING BAY SENSORS TRIAL

The item was withdrawn.

31 BUSINESS CASE AND PROPOSALS FOR INCREASED WASTE ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY

31.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that set out proposals for increased levels of enforcement around commercial waste and littering in the city and sought approval to procure the enforcement services.

- 31.2 Councillor Barradell stated that she welcomed the report and she hoped that the measures would improve the cleanliness of streets and change established behaviours toward littering and fly-tipping providing a better environment.
- 31.3 Councillor Janio stated that he supported the proposals and he was pleased by the method of delivery as it was an approach his group had advocated for a long time. Councillor Janio stated that he hoped the contractor would be given a steer not to be overly enthusiastic in issuing fixed penalty notices and the prosecution rate would be monitored.
- 31.4 Councillor West welcomed the proposals and hoped it would lead to an effective refuse service leading to a better environment for residents of the city. Councillor West asked if either the council or the contractor would meet the cost of appeals.
- 31.5 The Head of Strategy & Projects clarified that the contractors would prepare any evidence for an appeal and the council would lead on any prosecutions. It was hoped that once the scheme was in operation and successful prosecutions reported by the council and press, there would be a significant decrease in incidents and therefore any legal duties would be minimal.
- 31.6 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee authorises:
- 1) The procurement of a concession contract for enforcement activity in Brighton & Hove following the timeline and evaluation criteria set out in this report with a contract term of 12 months from January 2016.
 - 2) Grants delegated authority to the Executive Director for Environment, Development & Housing following consultation with the Executive Director for Finance & Resources to award the contract for a period of three years.
 - 3) Grants delegated authority to the Executive Director for Environment, Development & Housing following consultation with the Executive Director for Finance & Resources to extend the contract for one year subject to satisfactory performance of the provider in the initial contract period.

32 PROPOSALS FOR CHARGEABLE GARDEN WASTE COLLECTIONS

- 32.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that set out a business case and sought approval for the introduction of a chargeable green waste collection service.
- 32.2 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee:
- 1) Agrees to trial a chargeable garden waste collection service as set out in the body of this report.
 - 2) Authorises the Director of Environment, Development and Housing following consultation with the Director of Finance and Resources to extend the service if the

first collection round has been established and evaluated to be successful as set out at paragraph 3.15

- 3) Agrees a policy on garden waste collections as set out in paragraphs 3.17 to 3.19 of this report.

33 SUSTAINABILITY ACTION PLAN

- 33.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that presented the refreshed City Sustainability Action Plan. The Plan supported delivery of the council's priorities as set in the Corporate Plan 2015-19 and creating a more sustainable city.
- 33.2 Councillor Barradell stated that the Plan was a crucial document for providing a better environment and improving the standard of people's lives. Councillor Barradell asked if the council nominated a representative to the Biosphere Board.
- 33.3 The Joint Acting Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing clarified that the Biosphere Board was currently undergoing a transition phase following its creation to make a bid for Biosphere designation and was now moving into delivery of its action plan and a new Board would be created. The Assistant Chief Executive was the Chair of the Board in its current form and there was representation from other local authorities and agencies from across the region. The Board did not currently have elected members as representatives as it would accordingly be very large in membership and the duty was placed upon the ET&S Committee to oversee delivery of the Sustainability Action Plan.
- 33.4 Councillor West stated that he welcomed the new administrations shift in attitude toward support for sustainability and Biosphere status. Councillor West stated that he was surprised there was no mention of Bioregional who had given the council its accreditation as the world's first One Planet Living city and that the term had been replaced with One Planet Framework.
- 33.5 The Joint Acting Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing stated that the council was still working with Bioregional and the annual report on the first 18 months of the Action Plan delivery had been produced by them. He added that there was an ongoing cost in engaging with a consultancy of that kind and any future commitment and priority to that cost would be decided by Members as part of the Budget Council process.
- 33.6 Councillor Janio welcomed the report and that the document was now much more succinct and realistic in its priorities.
- 33.7 Councillor Robins stated his support for the proposals and that there was a focus on sustainable water, an issue that often went neglected and was equally important as air quality.
- 33.8 Councillor Atkinson welcomed the Plan as a very important document and he was pleased that there was reference to happiness and mental well-being as a key aspect of environment.

33.9 **RESOLVED-** That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:

- 1) Approves the City Sustainability Action Plan (at Appendix 1)
- 2) Requests that annual progress updates are presented at Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee and annual updates are also taken to the Biosphere Board

34 AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN

34.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that sought approval of the 2015 Air Quality Action Plan that the local authority had a statutory duty to produce under the provisions of Part IV of the Environment Act 1995.

34.2 Councillor Janio asked why reference to the particulate matter had been removed from the report compared to previous editions and if this was due to focus on nitrogen derivatives.

34.3 The Technical Officer clarified that there was a focus on nitrogen dioxide as this reflected the priority set out the Air Quality Management Area that was the basis of the Action Plan.

34.4 Councillor West that air quality was a serious matter and he was very concerned to read that particulates contributed to 5% of annual mortality rates in the city and NO₂ 6%. Councillor West stated that at both local and national level, air quality targets were not being met and that could lead to fines imposed by the EU. Councillor West added that initiatives had been undertaken in Lewes Road and North Street and with a Low Emission Zone (LEZ). On the basis on the report before the Committee, Councillor West stated his view that the LEZ now to be extended in distance and include a greater scope of vehicles.

34.5 Councillor Barradell stated that the city needed solutions on how behavioural changes could be made to improve sustainable travel rates particularly for the more economically disadvantaged in the city unable to benefit from the savings in paying upfront for an annual or seasonal pass.

34.6 Councillor Miller stated that he had found the report very informative and would encourage as much time and effort to be placed into Rottingdean High Street which currently had some of the highest levels of air pollution in the city.

34.7 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee agrees the 2015 AQAP and recommendations for reducing nitrogen dioxide levels across the City as set out in Appendix 1
- 2) That the Committee agree that every major council strategy including Transport, Planning and Tourism has due regard to the Air Quality Action Plan and every decision concerning Development Control and Transport Projects also has regard

to the Air Quality Action Plan, and the appropriate air quality assessments undertaken.

- 3) The Director of Public Health be given delegated authority to amend the Air Quality Action Plan to include measures introduced by the National Air Quality Action Plan, currently in draft format and going through consultation.

35 REPORT OF THE SCRUTINY PANEL ON SHORT TERM HOLIDAY LETS (PARTY HOUSES)

- 35.1. **RESOLVED-** That the Committee endorses the officer response on Short Term Holiday Lets as set out at Appendix One.

36 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

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

The meeting concluded at 7.45pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of