

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

**4.00pm 19 JANUARY 2016**

**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

**PART ONE**

**51 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**51(a) Declarations of substitutes**

51.1 There were none.

**51(b) Declarations of interest**

51.2 Councillor Janio declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 57: Fees and Charges 2016/17 as his partner was the owner of a Traders Permit.

51.3 The Deputy Head of Law confirmed that Councillor Janio had been granted dispensation under the Council's Code of Conduct to speak on Item 57.

**51(c) Exclusion of press and public**

51.4 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).

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

**52 MINUTES**

52.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 24 November 2015 be approved and signed as the correct record.

**53 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

59.1 The Chair relayed that Item 59: Parking Schemes Consultation Work would be brought forward to the first item of business due to public interest in the matter.

## **54 CALL OVER**

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

- Item 58: Fees and Charges 2016/17
- Item 59: Parking Schemes- Consultation Work
- Item 62: Traveller Service Waste Contract Procurement
- Item 63: Stanmer Park Restoration Programme- Update and Permission to Consult

54.2 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 60: Disabled Bay Traffic Order
- Item 61: Pedal Cycle Parking Places (Phase 2)

## **55 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

### **(a) Petitions**

#### **(i) Fiveways and Surrenden Parking Scheme- Katharine Butcher**

55.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 417 people that requested Balfour Road, Herbert Road, Gordon Road, Bates and Loder Road be included in the proposed Fiveways and Surrenden Parking Scheme.

55.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for presenting your petition and I appreciate the work that has gone into it. It was made clear in the consultation literature that other roads may vote in favour of a scheme. Your petition is certainly useful in helping demonstrate the desire across the petition area for a re-consultation on becoming part of the Fiveways parking scheme.*

*As has been previously stated, if there is sufficient strength of feeling, and your petition helps in this regard, the area can be re-consulted this Summer.*

*Over the next three months it would be useful if residents gain more signatures. These can be sent directly to the Transport team and I will ensure that the contact details to do so will be included in my formal written response to you”.*

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

### **(b) Written Questions**

#### **(i) Freshfield Road crossing- Faye Bridgewater**

55.4 The spokesperson was unable to attend and therefore a formal response was provided in writing by the Chair as follows:

*“Thank you for your question.*

*I am aware that Officers have arranged a meeting with ward councillors to discuss potential proposals for Freshfield Road. Once this meeting has taken place officers will invite you to a meeting where proposals can be shared”.*

**(c) Deputations**

**(i) Citypark Rangers and their importance to our environment, a volunteer perspective- Cliff Munn**

55.5 The Committee considered a Deputation that provided detail on the role of volunteers and the Citypark Ranger service plus the benefit to the wider area and requested that the service retain its funding going forward.

55.6 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your deputation to this Committee.

As most people now know, the Council is being forced to close a £68 million spending gap, due in large part to the central government reducing the Council's grant to nearly zero by 2019/20.

Nobody wants to make these cuts and as part of our consultation and engagement with our staff and community groups, we are now in a position to look again at these proposals in a way that will retain additional staff as well as still delivering on the proposed budget savings.

We recognise the work that our volunteers and communities do for our City and our intention has always been to build on that collaboration and we very much look forward to this partnership work continuing. I hope that provides some re-assurance”.

55.7 Councillor West commented that he believed the Citypark Ranger service to be crucial and the council should instead be discussing methods in broadening the scope of volunteer numbers rather than reducing the service and cutting the skill base. Councillor West noted his concern that any cut to the service may put the city's biosphere status at risk.

55.8 Councillor Janio stated that he had seen first-hand the excellent function carried out by Citypark Rangers and his group would be seeking to retain the service in the upcoming Budget discussions.

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

**56 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

56.1 No items from Members were received.

**57 FEES AND CHARGES 2016/17**

57.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that set out the proposed 2016/17 fees and charges for the service areas covered by the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee in accordance with corporate regulations and policy.

57.2 Councillor West noted that there was a proposed rise in allotment fees that would include a forward on the charges for water fees. Councillor West noted his concern over the potential lack of engagement on this matter with the Allotment Federation. Councillor West stated that he welcomed pest control moving to a commercially viable operation as he believed there had been undercharging in the service for a number of years which was disappointing as it provided a service better than most of its private sector competitors. Councillor West noted that he surprised the new administration were seeking to increase parking charges after a number of years rejecting such rises when in opposition. Councillor West moved the following motion to add a recommendation on behalf of the Green Group:

***2.1 b) That the Committee recommends to Policy & Resources Committee that Low Emission Vehicle and Car Club permits be frozen at current rates***

57.3 Councillor Greenbaum formally seconded the motion.

57.4 Councillor Janio stated that he disagreed with the overall 2% rise in parking fees and charges and felt that these could have been maintained at a neutral level whilst achieving sustainable transport aims.

57.5 Councillor Miller stated that he hoped the proposed rise in Zone M parking related to the development and expected demand associated with the i360 would not extend across the seafront at a later point. Councillor Miller noted that parking fees in Rottingdean High Street were proposed to rise by 25% which he found to be a negative step when many businesses were struggling or closing in the area. Councillor Miller repeated the point made by Councillor Janio that he could not support a 2% overall rise in charges and that a neutral basis would have been preferable and attainable.

57.6 The Joint Acting Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing confirmed that discussions had taken place with the Allotment Federation on the proposed competitively priced increase and discussions on the subsidy of water usage would continue over the next few months.

57.7 Councillor Barradell stated that she supported the proposed fees and charges that were cleverly targeted and had responded to resident complaints.

57.8 Councillor Atkinson stated his agreement that the fees and charges were very well targeted, well thought through and an attempt to control or decrease demand. Councillor Atkinson stated that he had previously raised the point that London Road car park was underused at weekends and he would like further information on its usage.

57.9 Councillor Theobald stated that he believed it possible that the council could seek a cross subsidy from the Public Health budget to control increases in sport fees. Councillor Theobald noted that charges were increasing in animal welfare services but he understood the council were seeking to reduce the Animal Welfare team. Councillor Theobald stated that he could not support rises to business and trader permits and his group had been clear on that for a number of years. Councillor Theobald observed that many people using Preston Park station as a commuter point and noted that should be

extended from 11 hours to 12 hours as it may not be sufficient for those travelling to and from London for employment.

- 57.10 The Head of Transport clarified that there had been very strong demand for traders permits which had increased three fold mainly as there was more flexibility to the permits including being able to park in resident permit bays. In terms of Preston Park station, the durations and pricing could be reviewed for the next budget.
- 57.11 Councillor Theobald noted that page 26 of the agenda set out the Fees and Charges budget by Service Area and for Sports Booking this figure was £219,000. Councillor Theobald asked if this dealt with sports booking services and if so, this was very costly to run.
- 57.12 The Joint Acting Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing clarified that this was a cost related to sports booking and was due in part to seasonal staff and the expense of cash handling which could be costly. This was one of the areas to be part of the discussions due with sports clubs in the city over the coming months.
- 57.13 Councillor Janio stated that he would be support the Green Group motion as he believed it was a very good idea.

57.14 The Chair then put the motion to the vote which passed.

57.15 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to the vote which passed.

57.16 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That Committee:
  - a) Approves the proposed fees and charges for 2016/17 as set out within the report and its appendices with the exception of the item referred to at b) below
  - b) That the Committee recommends to Policy & Resources Committee that Low Emission Vehicle and Car Club permits be frozen at current rates
  - c) Delegates authority to the Acting Director of Environment, Development & Housing to increase any charges for fees as notified and set by central Government during the year.

**58 PARKING SCHEMES – CONSULTATION WORK.**

- 58.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that provided an update on the current position for parking scheme proposals in Hanover & Elm Grove including the Craven Vale area, the Fiveways area and Hollingbury Road/Ditchling Gardens and sought permission to proceed.
- 58.2 Councillor West noted that a strong response had been received from residents living in the roads adjacent to Fiveways and it was clear that the impact of the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) had not been fully realised in the consultation process.

Councillor West welcomed the commitment given to re-consult the area but felt this should be introduced more quickly out of respect for the response of local residents. On behalf of the Green Group, Councillor West moved the following motion:

**2.2 That an extension to the new resident parking scheme in the Fiveways area to include Balfour Road, Herbert Road, Gordon Road, Bates Road, Loder Road and Loder Place be quickly reconsulted upon and the result be brought to the next meeting of the committee for consideration. Then, subject to committee approval, progressed to final design and published for statutory consultation with the results reported to the July committee”**

- 58.3 Councillor Greenbaum formally seconded the motion.
- 58.4 The Chair sought officer advice in relation to the amendment.
- 58.5 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that the parking scheme timetable agreed by the committee in 2015 represented a significant amount of work given current resources available. Even if resources were available to prepare the consultation, the deadlines as detailed in the motion could not adhere to statutory timescales.
- 58.6 Councillor Barradell stated that the council had to be clear in its processes and could not adjust its clearly defined rules to make an exception for any specific area.
- 58.7 Councillor Janio stated that his party had been consistent in their view that a full review of parking in the city was required and that should happen as soon as possible to prevent issues such as congestion and continuing extensions of controlled parking zones.
- 58.8 The Chair stated that the Fiveways and Surrenden parking scheme process had been inherited from the previous administration and a more flexible approach to schemes would be encouraged going forward as demonstrated with proposals for Hanover & Elm Grove.
- 58.9 The Chair put the motion to the vote which failed.
- 58.10 The Chair put the substantive recommendations to the vote which passed.
- 58.11 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee:
    - (a) Agrees that an initial consultation takes place in the Hanover & Elm Grove and Craven Vale areas (Appendix C) on the schemes outlined in para 5.1.
    - (b) Agrees that a new resident parking scheme be considered within the Ditchling Gardens / Hollingbury Road area (Appendix A) and that this proposal be progressed to the final design with the Traffic Order advertised to allow further comment.

- (c) That, in relation to the following orders for the Fiveways area, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee:
- i) Approves the Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.\* 201\* as advertised but with the amendment referred to in paragraph 5.38 of this report;
  - ii) Approves the Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.\* 201\* as advertised but with the amendments referred to in paragraph 5.38 of this report;
  - iii) Agrees that any subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order which would be reported back to Committee if any objections were received following the introduction of the scheme.

## **59 DISABLED BAY TRAFFIC ORDER**

59.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections) agree the following:

- a) Approve the Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.\* 201\* and Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 amendment Order No.\* 201\* as advertised save that there shall be withdrawn from the order:
  - i) The proposed removal of the blue badge parking bay outside No.60 Sutherland Road; and
  - ii) The time limited blue badge bay outside No. 12 /13 Sutherland Road as referred to in paragraph 3.5 of this report.

## **60 PEDAL CYCLE PARKING PLACES (PHASE 2)**

60.1 **RESOLVED-** That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, Committee Members approve as advertised the following orders:

- Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.\* 201\* (ref: TRO-26a-2015)
- Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.\* 201\* (ref: TRO-26b-2015)

## **61 TRAVELLER SERVICE WASTE CONTRACT PROCUREMENT**

61.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director, Environment Development & Housing that sought approval for the procurement of a new Traveller

waste contract that would cover waste removal and disposal from official and unauthorised encampments on council land.

- 61.2 Councillor Janio stated his concerns regarding the length of contract and the procurement value. Councillor Janio added that he did not support the delegation of powers to grant an extension to the contract as he believed this should be determined by the committee and moved a motion to delete recommendation 2.2 (ii) as per the report.
- 61.3 Councillor Nemeth seconded the motion.
- 61.4 The Head of Tenancy Services stated that advice from the council's procurement and legal teams was for the contract to be advertised based on current expenditure levels although officers were of the view that the establishment of new sites would lead to a reduction in operational costs. Removing the option of a two-year extension would not reduce the cost of the contract but officers would work to the decision taken by the committee.
- 61.5 Councillor Janio noted that there had been significant problems in fluctuating costs in this area over the past few years and he believed that the committee should have determination on any extension of the contract.
- 61.6 The Acting Executive Director, Environment, Development and Housing stated that it was good practice to offer an extension to a contract as the offer of a fixed term contract normally led to an increase in cost in the tendering process. Furthermore, a decision on whether to take up that extension still rested with the council and if it was felt in three year's time that the contract did not reflect good value, the extension could be rejected. That decision would rest with the Procurement Advisory Board that was represented by Members of each political group.
- 61.7 Councillor West stated that the cost of clean-ups were high and the only way forward in reducing costs was to invest further in proper provision.
- 61.8 The Chair proposed a motion to amend recommendation 2.2 (ii) as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.2 (ii) to grant an extension to the contract referred to in 2.1 above of up to two years ~~should he/she consider it appropriate at the relevant time~~ ***following consultation with the Procurement Board.***
- 61.9 Councillor Janio stated that he was in support of the proposal and he would withdraw his motion given that assurance.
- 61.10 Councillor Miller stated he found it unfair that residents of the city had to pay for refuse collection via council tax yet those living on Traveller sites did not. Councillor Miller added that this was even more difficult to view in the context of proposed cuts to the Park Ranger service that maintained public space for thousands of people. Councillor Miller suggested the council look at the provision of bins to Traveller sites that were paid for and if these were not used, offenders be prosecuted under fly tipping laws.



- 61.11 Councillor Robins noted a number of positive changes listed at 3.10 specifically the charging by tonnage of waste rather than bins emptied.
- 61.12 Councillor Nemeth asked how the council's recent fly tipping campaign and policies would overlap with the proposed contract.
- 61.13 The Head of Tenancy Services stated that officers worked closely with colleagues in Cityclean and this had led to fly tipping prosecutions in the past. In reference to refuse equipment, the Head of Tenancy Service explained that the council did not charge for the provision of bins as in doing so, that the council would be giving permission to sites recognised as unauthorised encampments.
- 61.14 Councillor Nemeth stated that he understood the council had purchased expensive surveillance equipment a number of years ago and asked if this equipment was currently used.
- 61.15 The Head of Strategy & Projects clarified that he would look into this matter and provide an update to Members.
- 61.16 The Chair then put the recommendations, as amended to the vote which passed.

61.17 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the committee approves the procurement of a contract for the provision of waste services for Gypsy, Roma, Traveller sites for a period of three years.
- 2) That the committee grants delegated authority to the Acting Executive Director Environment Development & Housing, in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance-
  - (i) to carry out the procurement of the contract referred to in 1) above including the award and letting of the contract;
  - (ii) To grant an extension to the contract referred to in 1) above of up to two years following consultation with the Procurement Board.

**62 STANMER PARK RESTORATION PROGRAMME - UPDATE AND PERMISSION TO CONSULT**

- 62.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that provided an update on the Stanmer Park Restoration Programme and sought approval for the next stages of work.
- 62.2 Councillor West stated that the project was of high importance and the council needed to deliver it effectively. Councillor West stated that we welcomed a specific recommendation on the production of a Sustainable Travel Plan as it was important for those that did not have a car to be able to access Stanmer Park easily.
- 62.3 Councillor Miller welcomed the report and opportunity it would provide. Councillor Miller asked for more information as to why the Heritage Lottery Grant for Home Farm was

unsuccessful and what alternatives were being explored, why the car park near the church would be disabled only as it was significant distance from the house and café and if consideration had been given to improving existing car parks. Councillor Miller stated his was sympathetic to the views expressed by Councillor West on access and if options to and from Upper Lodge had been assessed.

- 62.4 The Head of Projects & Strategy options for Home Farm would be detailed in a forthcoming report to the Policy & Resources Committee and these would consider raising capital from sales on other properties not related to Stanmer Park, developing the former Post Office site plus other sources of income. In relation to disabled parking, the detail was still to be worked on and would correlate with issues such as the Sustainable Travel Plan and would represent the next stage of work. The Head of Projects & Strategy added that all car parks were currently in poor condition and any that were retained would require investment. Alternative access routes had been examined including from the Upper Lodges but costs had been found to be prohibitive and therefore not feasible.
- 62.5 Councillor Janio welcomed the report as a very good step supplementing that travel would be a very important matter and it was critical that people were able to visit Stanmer Park by a variety of methods, including by car.
- 62.6 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee notes the progress on the Stanmer Park Programme, and specifically the Parks for People HLF application.
  - 2) That the Committee agrees the next stages of work on the Stanmer Programme.
  - 3) That the Committee agrees the Consultation and Engagement Plan for the Stage 2 HLF Application.
  - 4) That the Committee agrees to the production of a Sustainable Travel Plan to inform final recommendations for parking and transport in Stanmer Park.
  - 5) That the Committee notes that proposals for the Home Farm buildings will be considered in more detail in a report to Policy & Resources Committee in February.

### **63 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

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

The meeting concluded at 5.50pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of