

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

**4.00pm 23 JANUARY 2018**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Mitchell (Chair) Horan (Deputy Chair), Wares (Opposition Spokesperson), Littman (Group Spokesperson), Atkinson, Brown, Nemeth, Peltzer Dunn, Robins and West

**PART ONE**

**44 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**44(a) Declarations of substitutes**

44.1 There were none.

**44(b) Declarations of interest**

44.2 Councillor West declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 54: Rights of Way Improvement Plan as the Chair of the Brighton & Hove Way Association.

44.3 Councillor Nemeth declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 51: Fees & Charges 2018/19 as his partner was a current allotment holder.

44.4 Councillor Robins declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 51: Fees & Charges 2018/19 as a current allotment holder.

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

44.5 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).

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

**45 MINUTES**

- 45.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 28 November 2017 be approved and signed as the correct record.

#### 46 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

- 46.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

*“I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate OurBike, for winning an Argus Community Star Award for the Brighton BikeShare Scheme that is now one of the best used in the country”.*

#### 47 CALL OVER

- 47.1 All items on the agenda were reserved for discussion.

#### 48 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

##### (A) PETITIONS

##### (i) Close Wolstonbury Road off to traffic

- 48.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 184 people requesting the council permanently close Wolstonbury Road off to traffic to prevent the road being used as a cut-through, to disperse parking by non-residents and to improve safety.

- 48.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for coming today to present your petition and for the information that you have sent by email.*

*As you may know, I met with one of your ward councillors last week, Councillor O’Quinn, along with the council’s Head of Traffic Management to look at the background to the problems you describe and to get an understanding of them. We discussed the problems of HGVs and other traffic taking circuitous routes through the area so as to double-back for deliveries to stores in Dyke Road and the issue of college staff parking and speeding traffic.*

*Any major change such as a road closure would have to be considered very, very carefully, particularly in relation to the impact of displaced traffic to nearby streets and there would need to be full consultation across the wider area.*

*Officers are looking into the situation and will make contact with the local stores in relation to the route that their delivery drivers are taking. We will also review the operation of the traffic signals at the BHASVIC junction to ensure their operation is optimised.*

*Alongside this, the issue of allocations of permit to schools and colleges is being looked at as part of the parking permit review that is due to start shortly.*

*We are also looking at some areas of the city where further measures may be needed to support the 20mph speed limit, although this budget is very limited. I will ask officers to look into the reported problems in Highdown Road in particular, in relation to speeding. We will keep in touch with you via your ward councillors as this work progresses”.*

- 48.3 Councillor Littman asked for clarification that the proposal was to note the petition.

48.4 The Chair clarified that research was being undertaken to consider the immediate short-term problems. A permanent closure would require a wide-ranging consultation and for funding to be identified. Therefore, the proposal at this stage was to note the petition with updates circulated as required and further communication with residents via the ward councillors.

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

**(b) Written Questions**

**(i) West Hove Parking Scheme**

48.6 Claire Sheriff put the following question:

*“Why was the second consultation for the West Hove (Area L) worded as a Mon-Sun scheme rather than Mon-Fri (as the latter was voted for by the majority of residents - 53%)?”*

48.7 The Chair provided the following reply:

*“Thank you for your question regarding the West Hove parking scheme which is currently being implemented.*

*The initial consultation was for approval for a further detailed design and the extent of the area which included various options for hours and days of operation.*

*The further consultation was undertaken to receive comments on the detailed design including suggested days of operation.*

*The reasoning for the days of operation (Monday to Sunday) was outlined in a report to this committee in March 2017. The officer recommendation was for a seven day scheme as it was felt that if a five day scheme was introduced it would lead to vehicle displacement at weekends particularly as other schemes nearby are all seven day schemes. Already in the new light touch Hanover parking scheme that operates Monday to Friday we are hearing from some residents about the difficulties parking at weekends due to no restrictions being in place so officer are quite alive to this possibility.*

*Although the West Hove respondents were originally slightly in favour of a Monday to Friday parking scheme they did have another opportunity to comment on this proposal when the detailed design consultation period was carried out, so they had another chance to think about the days of operation. And following that, the legal Traffic Order was advertised.*

*In the further consultation 75% of respondents supported the idea of a 7 days residents parking scheme. During the legal Traffic Order consultation period only one comment was received that a five day scheme would be preferred to a seven day scheme. This was reported back to this Committee on the 27th June and 10th October last year where it was agreed to proceed with the parking scheme as a seven day scheme”.*

48.8 Claire Sheriff put the following supplementary question:

*“We don't believe there will be a problem with vehicle displacement at the weekends, it's a quiet area where we live, particularly at weekends with people not parking here to*

*commute to Portslade station. Why can't we have a light touch Mon-Fri scheme such as the one proposed for the Hove Park area?"*

48.9 The Chair provided the following reply:

*"At each stage of the process, the results of the consultation came back to committee and we went out to reconsult on detailed designs and residents didn't have anything taken away, they had a further chance to comment, in terms of the operation of days of the week that they wanted the scheme to cover. This final decision was based on the results that came back to us. I think the best thing to do now is get the agreed scheme up and running and if there are any significant problems with its operation in any area of the scheme, then these can be looked at"*

**(ii) Controlled Parking Zone S**

48.10 The question was withdrawn.

**(d) Deputations**

**(i) Proposed 3G at Hove Park**

48.11 The Committee considered a deputation outlining the benefits of the proposed 3G at Hove Park.

48.12 The Chair provided the following response:

*"It is really good to receive your views highlighting the positive side of the Councils decision to replace the worn out astro-turf surface with a 3G surface and to look through the range of groups that you think will be interested in using the facility. We also believe that there will be a good demand for the facility and look forward to liaising with Hove Park Colts over the details of future use. A contractor has now been appointed and it is hoped work will start on site in early February"*

48.13 **RESOLVED-** That the deputation be noted.

**49 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**

**(A) PETITIONS**

**(i) Pedestrian Crossing on the junction of Colebrook Road and Tongdean Lane**

49.1 The Committee considered a petition referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 14 December 2017 and signed by 214 people requesting a pedestrian crossing on the junction of Colebrook Road and Tongdean Lane.

49.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*"As part of the Councils Pedestrian Crossing Request Policy all requests undergo an assessment to assist in prioritising limited funding to those locations most in need. This*

*assessment considers a number of categories known to affect people's ability to cross the public highway; such as road width, number of vehicles and pedestrians using the road. The assessment also considers any previous related accidents and if the requested crossing point could improve access to services such as buses and GP surgeries.*

*Sites are usually assessed in batches, once annually; the results of the assessment are then presented to the appropriate Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee. As part of this process there have been a number of pedestrian crossings identified and installed across the city. As a result of requests from residents the Transport Projects team has recently carried out assessments on 3 separate locations on Tongdean Lane; near Eldred Avenue, Withdean Road, and by the railway bridge. The results of these assessments are currently being evaluated.*

*Officers now have your request and will be happy to include a site assessment on Tongdean Lane near Colebrook Road in the next assessment phase so that it might be considered for a crossing point using the approved methodology for assessing Pedestrian crossing points".*

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

**(ii) Pedestrian Crossing at Weald Avenue on the Old Shoreham Road**

49.4 The Committee considered a petition referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 14 December 2017 and signed by 439 people requesting a pedestrian crossing point on Old Shoreham Road in the vicinity of the Weald Avenue/Lullington Avenue junction.

49.5 The Chair provided the following response:

*"This area of Old Shoreham Road also falls within the Access Fund project boundary and as a result the School Travel Team is working with a number of schools in the area to help better understand the journey to school by looking at the barriers faced with the journeys to school and to promote road safety and active travel. The team are actively engaged with schools including; Blatchington Mill Secondary School, Hove Park Lower Secondary School, Aldrington Primary School, West Hove Infant School and Hove Junior School. Work to assist and promote safe and active travel is also being carried out with four nurseries in this area, either side of Old Shoreham Road.*

*In accordance with the Council's Policy on Pedestrian Crossings, officers will include this request on the list for formal assessment using the Pedestrian Crossing Assessment Methodology. As part of this methodology all crossing requests undergo an assessment to assist in prioritising limited funding to those locations most in need. This assessment considers a number of categories known to affect ones' ability to cross the public highway; such as road width, number of vehicles and pedestrians using the road. The assessment also considers any previous related accidents and if the requested crossing point could improve access to services such as buses and GP surgeries or if it might improve the safety on walking routes to schools.*

*Initial investigations were carried out at this location as part of the Safer Routes to Schools programme, as part of these investigations officers noted issues with limited space available for a crossing facility particularly due to access requirements for private driveways. These investigations however identified potential opportunities to install a light controlled crossing facility at the signals on Old Shoreham Road and St Joseph's Close junction.*

*Work is being undertaken to fully understand the potential costs and the available budgets for this”.*

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

#### **(D) DEPUTATIONS**

##### **(i) Hove Park Tennis Courts**

49.7 The Committee considered a deputation referred from the Full Council meeting of 14 December 2017 requesting clarification on the decision to install a 3G astro turf pitch at Hove Park and requesting that a new multi-sports surface be laid instead so that tennis users could share the facility with football groups.

49.8 The Chair provided the following response:

*“It has been known for some length of time that the current artificial grassed area has fallen into serious disrepair and, on occasions, has been unavailable for use. Senior officers have held discussions with the users of the area, with the Ward Councillors and with myself, following which the decision was taken to procure a new 3G surface utilising developer contributions money specifically available for that purpose. That money gets spent on a 3G pitch or it would get spent out of the Hove Park area. The Council's Playing Pitch Strategy has identified the need for high quality 3G football pitches in the city and the fact that hundreds of children play on this popular pitch, already just restricted to the winter months, means that we know that the demand is there for an all-weather pitch of the type that is being proposed. With its seven all-weather tennis courts, Hove Park will continue to provide very good facilities for tennis. If, in the future, there is the opportunity to provide a soft surface for tennis as part of this provision then that can be explored”.*

49.9 Councillor Littman stated that it would be beneficial for Members to receive a definitive criteria of what Section 106 money could and couldn't be used for.

49.10 The Legal Officer confirmed that clarification could be provided subsequent to the meeting in the form of a briefing note.

49.11 **RESOLVED-** That the deputation be noted.

#### **50 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

50.1 No items from Members were received.

#### **51 FEES AND CHARGES 2018/19**

51.1 The Committee considered a joint report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture and the Executive Director, Neighbourhoods, Communities & Housing that set out the proposed 2017/18 fees and charges for the service areas covered by the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee in accordance with corporate regulations and policy. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture noted an error on page 28 of the agenda and the banding of 50% discount for

resident, traders and business permits would reduce from under 110g/km to under 120g/km rather than 100g/km.

- 51.2 Councillor West stated his surprise that the administration had decided on a 2% rise in fees and charges when the consumer index was rising at 3% and the retail index rising at 4%. Councillor West expressed his concern that the proposed fees and charges were not increasing in line with rising costs. Councillor West stated that the current administration had made constant criticisms of the previous administration in relation to parking surplus yet that surplus had risen from £9m to £14m in the first two years of their administration. Councillor West noted that visitor parking permits in Zones M, W and Z were proposed to rise by 29% yet there were many low-income households in those zones. Councillor West believed that the equality implications of that proposed rise should be reviewed. In addition, Councillor West observed that fees and charges for Travellers were proposed to rise by 3.9% which was above the general rise of 2%. Councillor West believed this to be an unacceptable measure upon one of the most vulnerable communities in society and contradicted the Traveller Strategy that outlined the need for stability and encouragement of travellers to occupy the transit and permanent site. Councillor West felt the proposed increases were unjustifiable and would lead to an equalities challenge.
- 51.3 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture clarified that the proposed fees and charges were a mixture of 0%, 2% and 4% rises, with the approach taken by officers set out at paragraphs 3.1- 3.3 of the report. In relation to fees and charges for the traveller sites, the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture stated that to his knowledge, cost was not a barrier to entry to the transit or permanent site and some of those housed at the later would be entitled to housing benefit. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture supplemented that the permanent site costs compared favourably with other council tenancy costs.
- 51.4 Councillor Wares stated that he agreed with the comments made by Councillor West regarding increase to visitor permits. Councillor Wares noted that the cost of visitor permits for Zones N, Y and Z had risen by 50% over the past two years that was pushing the costs of visitor permits close to the cost of on-street parking. Councillor Wares believed this to be unfair opportunism rather than controlling demand. Councillor Wares stated that whilst overall the approach to fees and charges did accord with the corporate policy, there was a clear targeted approach. Councillor Wares stated that whilst everything that could be done to improve air quality should be done, the 25% increase on high emission vehicles, was in his view, discriminatory and unfair and only targeting a very select group of residents in certain zones, specifically those that could not afford to buy a more modern car. Councillor Wares likened the increase to a permit pollution tax that affected a small group of residents rather than commercial operators passing through the city, visitors to the city and those outside controlled parking zones that similarly had high emission vehicles. Councillor Wares believed that a serious approach to air quality should come through a properly considered report. Referring to appendix 5 of the report that covered allotment and sports fees, Councillor Wares stated that the cash value in the increase in fees was insignificant in his view. Councillor Wares stated that he believed the 4% rise was an attempt to retrieve the freeze of the previous year and whilst this might not appear a significant increase, he felt it would be a tipping point for some service users.

- 51.5 The Chair answered that there would be a report submitted to a future meeting of the committee detailing all of the work currently being undertaken on air quality.
- 51.6 Councillor Littman stated that whilst most increases in fees were reasonable or an inflationary rise, a few were not. Councillor Littman believed that the increase in charges for Regency Square Car Park could change the cost ratio between on and off street parking that could lead to a dangerous impact on congestion in the area. Councillor Littman agreed with the comments made in relation to the increase in visitor permits that he believed would impact most upon the elderly and vulnerable and represented an equalities issue. Councillor Littman also agreed with the observations made regarding fees for traveller sites adding that whilst he welcomed the assurance provided by the Executive Director, there had to be absolute certainty that fees would not deter occupancy. Councillor Littman expressed his disappointment in the 4% rise in sports fees as the economic and social benefits of health and activity were well established.
- 51.7 In relation to the question raised on Regency Square Car Park, the Head of Parking Services clarified that there was very little pay and display or shared bays in the locality and the limited parking was for up to a four hour period only. The Head of Parking Services added that a budget impact equality assessment was undertaken for all parking charges.
- 51.8 In relation to fees for manual renewal of scaffolding licences, Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked for clarification on the significant difference in fees for under 12m and over 12m. Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked for confirmation of what the parking charges for would be for the new CPZ Area L.
- 51.9 The Assistant Director- City Transport answered that there was an online process for applications for scaffolding licences and the necessity for manual renewal of scaffolding licences related to the need for officers to attend the site to check the licence was valid. It was often found that the licences had expired and therefore, officer time was required to prepare an issue a new one.
- 51.10 Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked why additional checks were required if the licence information was retained via the online system.
- 51.11 The Assistant Director- City Transport clarified that the approach was one of proactive regulation to ensure that the contractor was putting scaffolding up and taking it down within the set period and to ensure the highway was clear and properly managed. The Head of Parking Services clarified that the implementation of CPZ Area L had been brought forward at the request of ward councillors into the 2017/18 financial year. The price of a visitor permit would be £3.50 and it had been outlined in the consultation document that any prices would be subject to the annual parking permit review.
- 51.12 Councillor Wares noted the substantial rise in traders permits and asked officers if they were aware of how many permit holders this would apply to.
- 51.13 The Head of Parking Services replied that a precise figure was not known but traders permits applied to approximately 6% of all permits issued.

51.14 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that he did not understand why there were two separate charges for attended greens and unattended greens as a season ticket holder was permitted to bowl on any green in the city.

51.15 The Parks & Open Spaces Operations officer clarified that the difference in price represented the better service provided at attended greens.

51.16 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That Committee approves the proposed fees and charges for 2018/19 as set out within the report and its appendices.
- 2) That Committee delegates authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Environment & Culture (in relation to paragraphs 3.4-3.6 and 3.10-3.14) and to the Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Communities & Housing (in relation to paragraphs 3.7-3.9) to increase any charges for fees as notified and set by central Government during the year.

**52 NEW BUS SHELTERS - CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF SITES**

52.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that proposed a robust assessment methodology for bus shelter site requests. The Senior Project Manager noted that there was a factual error in paragraph 3.4 of the report and “cost which can be ten times more” should read “cost which can be *considerably more*”.

52.2 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Wares moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.1 as shown in bold italics below:

2.1 That committee approves the methodology attached (Appendix A) for the assessment of requests for new bus shelters ***with the following amendments:***

***i. Delete Scoring Detail for Initial Criteria, Criterion 3, NB1***

***ii. Point a) of Scoring Detail for Sites Identified as Feasible to read “Each site would be observed during a one hour morning ***and afternoon/evening*** peak and one hour morning ***and afternoon/ evening*** off-peak period, and numbers of users counted. They would then be prioritised in order of popularity ***in conjunction with the bus stop usage figures supplied by the bus operators***”.***

***iii. To Scoring Detail for Sites Identified as Feasible add point c) to read “Locations with high demographic numbers of elderly and/or vulnerable people, as measured by partner organisations such as Brighton & Hove Connected, would be given an additional point”.***

52.3 Councillor Peltzer Dunn formally seconded the motion.

52.4 Councillor Atkinson welcomed a more transparent and robust criteria. Councillor Atkinson stated that he had some initial concern about the removal of point 3 in the

amendment but believed that was balanced out by adding point c) to the feasibility assessment.

52.5 The Chair put the motion to the vote which were passed.

52.6 The Chair put the recommendations, as amended to the vote which were passed.

52.7 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That committee approves the methodology attached (Appendix A) for the assessment of requests for new bus shelters with the following amendments:
  - i. Delete Scoring Detail for Initial Criteria, Criterion 3, NB1
  - ii. Point a) of Scoring Detail for Sites Identified as Feasible to read “Each site would be observed during a one hour morning and afternoon/evening peak and one hour morning and afternoon/ evening off-peak period, and numbers of users counted. They would then be prioritised in order of popularity in conjunction with the bus stop usage figures supplied by the bus operators”.
  - iii. To Scoring Detail for Sites Identified as Feasible add point c) to read “Locations with high demographic numbers of elderly and/or vulnerable people, as measured by partner organisations such as Brighton & Hove Connected, would be given an additional point”.
- 2) That officers bring back to a subsequent committee for approval the existing (and updated) list of requests with the new methodology applied.

**53 STANMER PARK RESTORATION - PROCUREMENT OF HLF PROJECT WORKS AND RELOCATION OF CITYPARKS DEPOT**

- 53.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that summarised the progress made to date on the Stanmer Park restoration project and sought agreement to recommend to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee (PR&G) to proceed with tendering and appointment of the main contractor for the HLF project. Furthermore, the report sought approval to recommend to PR&G Committee permission to progress the relocation of the CityParks depot to Hangleton Bottom with the necessary competitive tendering and appointment of contractors.
- 53.2 Councillor West explained that whilst he fully supported the Stanmer Park project, he had a number of misgivings about logistical management that was the subject of this report. Councillor West stated that he could not understand why planning permission had not been sought to re-site the depot in Hangleton Bottom, particularly as the issue had been the subject of discussion for a long time. Councillor West expressed his disappointment that Members had only recently been provided with site maps. In relation to the plans, Councillor West stated that the depot would take up a significant space in the Hangleton Bottom area with the only level access via the link road. Councillor West stated that this would cause complications in the future if the site was deployed as a waste site in line with its current designation. Councillor West observed that such questions would be asked at the planning stage by the council’s strategic

partners and the council may be asked to choose an alternative location as a designated waste site. Councillor West noted that the site itself was not ideal as a waste site and had indeed been rejected as a site by Brighton & Hove Energy Service co-operative for a food waste composting facility due to the topography, size and access issues associated. Councillor West stated that Policy & Resources Committee had agreed to the move in principle two years before and he was very dissatisfied that the CityParks depot would have to temporarily move for nine months awaiting the development of Hangelton Bottom at a cost of £100,000 that could have been avoided if the project had moved forward more quickly. In addition to that, there was an additional £300,000 shortfall in the expected capital receipts from property sales meaning a request would have to be made of Budget Council to make up the shortfall. Councillor West highlighted that such uncertainty potentially jeopardised the Stanmer Park project moving forward and he was very concerned about its future.

- 53.3 The Chair stated that she refuted Councillor West's claims adding that the current administration did not rush into decisions as the previous administration had done and instead took a careful and considered approach. The Chair stated that it would be unwise to submit a planning application without both this committee and PR&G having first considered and approved the project works and relocation.
- 53.4 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture stated that it was necessary to obtain landlord permission to use sites and PR&G Committee would be requested for that at its meeting on 25 January. The established process was for the permission to be obtained before submitting a planning application. Whilst planning permission had been sought ahead of a committee decision being approved on occasions in the past, this had sometimes led to criticisms of officers for pre-empting a committee decision. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture explained that the project had slowed since July 2017 due to a commitment of significant funding by Plumpton College. In order to accommodate the additional funding the council were able to attract, changes were made to the Stanmer Park walled garden that meant a slight delay to the project. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture stated that the CityParks depot would occupy a small portion of the Hangelton Bottom site and Planning Committee would consider the application in the context of planning policy. Estimates on capital receipts were always difficult to pre-judge and absolute assurance was needed that there was sufficient funding for the project from the outset.
- 53.5 The Parks & Green Spaces Operation officer clarified that the design of the access way in the yard would allow the rest of the site to be accessed afterwards and would not prohibit future use.
- 53.6 In relation to the points made relating to the advance submission of planning applications, Councillor Wares noted that PR&G Committee would receive a separate report at the same meeting this report would be considered for a proposed Animal Welfare Facility where planning permission had been applied for prior to any agreement by committee. Councillor Wares explained that he fully supported the Stanmer Park project however; he felt the report should have been more candid regarding the £100,000 temporary move costs as he found it unlikely that there would be much commercial opportunity in letting space next to a cemetery. Councillor Wares was of the opinion the relocation costs would be a one-off cost and as such the report should have reflected this. Councillor Wares agreed that it was possible to under-estimate capital

receipts in this instance however, the capital receipts were less than half that estimated which was quite catastrophic. Councillor Wares stated that alternatively, the depot would now cost twice as much as forecast two years ago. Councillor Wares believed it erroneous that capital resources were deemed the only option to make up the shortfall in funding and instead, reconsideration should also be given to selling further assets and the capital resource used to spend to save and provide relief to the revenue fund and benefit overall services. In relation to the proposed site, Councillor Wares noted that there would be one building for the depot and one building for animal kennels. Councillor Wares observed that the two buildings were very similar yet the depot had an estimated £750,000 build cost and the kennels an estimated £150,000 build cost. Councillor Wares asked for clarification on whether one project would be subsidising the other or whether each project could be built on a standalone basis. Councillor Wares acknowledged that whilst that would be a matter for the members of PR&G Committee to decide, the proposals appeared to him to be dysfunctional. Councillor Wares expressed his surprise that the opportunity for a single, dual purpose development had not been considered as that approach could improve economies of scale, remove duplication and achieve better value with taxpayer's money.

- 53.7 The Chair reminded Members that they were considering the report and the recommendations that applied to this committee not separate reports to PR&G Committee. Therefore, this was a standalone project with associated budget.
- 53.8 Councillor Wares agreed with the comments made by the Chair however, this committee were asked to recommend the report to PR&G Committee who would in turn be considering the report alongside a separate report for a development adjacent. Councillor Wares stated that he did not want to object to the report recommendations, nor reject proposals for Stanmer Park however, it was important for PR&G Committee to receive the observations made by this committee on the possibility for economies of scale and joined up thinking.
- 53.9 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture stated the report before committee detailed a standalone project, specifically the relocation of the CityParks depot that would unlock the Stanmer Park project and that the content outlined estimated costs at this stage. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture clarified that PR&G Committee could consider a debate for joining up of the two proposals at their meeting.
- 53.10 Councillor Wares asked for confirmation that this was a standalone project and by definition, that the budget for the relocation of the CityParks depot would not support the construction of the kennels.
- 53.11 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture answered that the Animal Welfare Facility report that would be considered by PR&G Committee was not in his directorate but an update could be provided at the meeting of PR&G Committee on 25 January.
- 53.12 Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked for clarification on the specific cost of the access road.
- 53.13 The Interim Assistant Director - City Environmental Management stated this was not available immediately but could be supplied after the meeting.

- 53.14 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that he did not find that satisfactory as the cost of the access road was likely to be a decent proportion of a major project. Councillor Peltzer Dunn requested that this information be provided to PR&G Committee as whilst the issue would be considered by two committees, a final decision would be made as one council.
- 53.15 The Chair stated that the comments made, particularly in relation to joined up thinking had been very well made. The Chair noted that the two proposals discussed covered different directorates and it had not been possible to provide answers to all the matters raised however, assurance would hopefully be made at PR&G Committee.
- 53.16 Councillor Atkinson stated that it was encouraging to see the restoration project move forward and he keenly anticipated its development into a major attraction in the city. Councillor Atkinson added that as ward councillor for a section of Hangelton Bottom, he would be representing his resident's views through the planning process.
- 53.17 Councillor Littman noted that paragraph 3.15 detailed a nine month delay between the parks operation moving from Stanmer Park to the new depot in Hangleton. Councillor Littman observed that should planning permission not be granted, the council would not be entitled to appeal the decision as landowner and asked if that would add cost and delay. Councillor Littman was of the opinion that an application for planning permission should have been made much earlier.
- 53.18 The Parks & Green Spaces Operation officer answered that in the event of a delay through the planning process; there would be indirect effects upon efficiency but no direct budget impact.
- 53.19 Councillor Wares stated that the project was an extremely positive step for Stanmer Park however; it was important to resolve the issues associated.
- 53.20 Councillor West stated that he was very unhappy to have been forced into a position however; he would be reluctantly supporting the proposals. Councillor West stated that there were significant risks associated with addressing the shortfall in budget and applying for planning permission and the council were in jeopardy of losing the HLF funding. Councillor West added that there had been an unacceptable two year delay and believed the administration should be held to account for that.
- 53.21 The Chair replied that it had been entirely prudent to wait for the outcome of the HLF bid.

53.22 **RESOLVED-**

That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:

- 1) Notes the progress made on the Stanmer Park HLF Restoration Project as outlined in this report.

**RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND-**

That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:

- 1) Recommends the report to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee as set out in paragraphs 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 of the report.

#### **54 RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

- 54.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that requested approval of the draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) for wider consultation.
- 54.2 Councillor Wares stated that he welcomed the report however; he believed officers should consider managing expectations in relation to the budgets and associated projects listed on pages 48 and 49 of the draft ROWIP as approval of all the proposed projects may be beyond the range of the CityParks budget. Councillor Wares enquired whether the projected cost range needed amending accordingly and making clear that more projects would need additional sources of funding to be realised.
- 54.3 The Parks & Green Spaces Operations officer confirmed that Councillor Wares was correct in that not all projects could be achieved at the higher range of cost. However, over the previous ten years, the council had been very successful in attracting outside funding to deliver improvements.
- 54.4 Councillor West stated that he strongly believed the administration should put more financial commitment into downland estate access as the benefits to health and wellbeing and to the visitor economy could not be understated. Councillor West stated that any spending figures in the draft ROWIP needed to be taken seriously and met. Councillor West commended officers for the quality of the report, the Local Access Forum for being a key partner for the past ten years and tenant farmers who had been very accepting of new rights of way. Councillor West expressed his hope that that the consultation would facilitate wider discussion about the access and benefits of the downland estate. Councillor West expressed his concern that there appeared a lack of ambition on methods to engage with the public.
- 54.5 The Chair answered that there would be widespread consultation and promotion.
- 54.6 Councillor Littman concurred with the statements made by Councillors Wares and West that the draft ROWIP needed to be clearer about what was achievable in terms of resource so as not to be an obstacle to the consultation.
- 54.7 The Chair confirmed that the draft ROWIP could be altered to reflect those comments before it went out to consultation.
- 54.8 **RESOLVED-**
  - 1) That the committee approve wider consultation on the draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

#### **55 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

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

The meeting concluded at 6.00pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of