

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

**4.00pm 20 MARCH 2018**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

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

**Other Members present:** Councillor Taylor

**PART ONE**

**56 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**56(a) Declarations of substitutes**

56.1 Councillor Bennett was present as substitute for Councillor Brown.

56.2 Councillor Janio was present as substitute for Councillor Peltzer Dunn.

**56(b) Declarations of interest**

56.3 There were none.

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

56.4 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).

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

**57 MINUTES**

57.1 Councillor Atkinson requested a deletion to paragraph 53.16 as shown in strikethrough below:

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.

57.2 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 23 January 2018 be approved and signed as the correct record subject to the above correction.

## 58 CALL OVER

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

- Item 62: Official Feed and Food Controls Service Plan 2018/19
- Item 64: Management of Hove Park 3G Football Facility
- Item 65: 2018/19 Local Transport Plan Capital Programme
- Item 66: Air Quality Programme Update
- Item 67: Response to Government Consultation on Major Road Network
- Item 69: School Parking Enforcement
- Item 70: Central Hove and Portslade Property Level Protection Scheme- Permission to Procure

58.2 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 63: Health and Safety Service Plan
- Item 68: Blue Badge Traffic Orders

## 59 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

### (A) PETITIONS

#### (i) Henley Road Taxi Rank

59.1 The Committee received a petition signed by 3 people requesting the removal of the taxi rank on Henley Road.

59.2 The petitioner was not present at the meeting therefore a response was provided in writing as follows:

*“Thank you for your petition regarding this rank.*

*We have asked the taxi trade for their views on the need for this rank and they have made these comments; the size of the hackney Carriage fleet has grown over the last 15 years and only one additional rank has been provided during this time in Woodingdean.*

*This rank has been in existence for more than 30 years and is frequently used by the general public and as an area rank for Whitehawk, Roedean and Ovingdean. It is in use both night and day.*

*If this rank is removed taxis will not be able to service these areas alongside the Marina.*

*Hackney Carriages are compelled by the Byelaws of the City to proceed to the nearest rank and if that is not available to proceed to the next nearest rank.*

*Therefore at this stage we would require a lot more evidence over a longer period that this rank is not being used before continuing any discussions with the taxi trade”.*

59.3 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the petition.

**(ii) Friar Road area parking consultation**

59.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 161 people requesting the Council to undertake a controlled parking zone consultation in the Friar Road area.

59.5 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your petition and I fully appreciate the parking problems in your area. They are the same problems being experienced by other communities across Brighton & Hove so that is why in October last year, this committee agreed to include the Surrenden area, which will include Friar Road, in the parking scheme consultation timetable. That parking timetable lists the other areas in Brighton & Hove, some of which have not been consulted on a parking scheme and are therefore patiently waiting to be consulted.*

*A report to this committee is planned for later this year to outline and discuss the extent of the consultation area and ward councillors views will be sought in readiness for this. In addition to the ward councillor’s view, the views of residents that have been forwarded to us will also all be taken into account”.*

59.6 Councillor Nemeth asked for clarification on the legal position relating to potential problems for access to the road by the emergency services.

59.7 The Chair clarified that such instances should be reported to Sussex Police.

59.8 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the petition.

**(C) DEPUTATIONS**

**(i) Consultation on a controlled parking zone in the Surrenden Area**

59.9 The Committee considered a deputation requesting that the scheduled consultation on a controlled parking zone in the Surrenden area be brought forward to be before the end of 2018.

59.10 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for coming to the committee with your deputation in relation to the planned consultation on a controlled parking scheme for the Surrenden area and I do understand why you would wish this to be moved forward.*

*However, after debate at the October 2017 meeting of this committee, the timetable for parking scheme consultations was set and officers are now allocating resources and working to that timetable.*

*Parking income as a whole is already built in to the council’s agreed budget.*

*This work includes implementing agreed schemes and reviewing existing schemes as directed by the committee when those permissions for implementation were given. And so when the committee agreed to implement new parking schemes, at the same time we gave a commitment that those schemes would be reviewed this year and that will happen as well as preparing for new consultations as for the Surrenden area.*

*So all the other areas on the parking scheme timetable that are experiencing the same problems as you and your neighbours are, already know and have the assurance that this committee has taken the decision and they are awaiting that timetable to be put into place and receive their consultation as has been democratically agreed.*

*This work is carefully planned and the consultations are extensive.*

*Later this year a report will come to this committee detailing proposals for the area to be consulted in relation to a potential parking scheme for the Surrenden area. Input from your ward councillors will be important and views received from residents will all be considered.*

*This work is already factored into the officers' programme alongside all of the work on the other areas that I have outlined and so we will be sticking to the agreed timetable and work programme".*

- 59.11 Councillor Wares stated that having visited the location, he understood the problems experienced by residents. Councillor Wares added that whilst he recognised there was a clear resident parking scheme timetable, he asked if there was anyway the Surrenden area could be brought forward or if any short-term measures to increase parking capacity could be examined in the circumstances.
- 59.12 The Chair replied that the committee had given careful consideration, thought and debate to the parking scheme priority timetable and that timetable had been agreed by the committee in October 2017. The Chair noted that a small officer team worked on several schemes at various stages of consultation or completion concurrently and therefore, it was not possible to alter the agreed timetable.
- 59.13 Councillor West noted that he had previously relayed his concerns on the length of the priority timetable and the potential time residents would have to wait to be consulted on a scheme at the meeting on October 2017. Councillor West stated that the requests for the timetable to be hastened were inevitable and in his view, the parking surplus should be used to do so.
- 59.14 The Chair reminded Councillor West that the parking surplus was used to fund concessionary bus fares.
- 59.15 Councillor Wares stated that the issue of controlled parking zones was becoming intolerable and there may be a need to reconsider or revisit the entire process.
- 59.16 Councillor Robins noted that Surrenden Road had been consulted on a controlled parking zone in 2015 and there were many other areas experiencing the same parking problems that had not yet been consulted. Councillor Robins believed that out of fairness, it would be appropriate to stick to the agreed timetable and offer an opportunity for those areas to be consulted.
- 59.17 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the deputation.

**(ii) Poets' Corner Hove Dog Fouling**

59.18 The Committee considered a deputation requesting various measures be undertaken to tackle dog fouling in the Poets' Corner area.

59.19 The Chair provided the following response:

*"Thank you for your deputation and coming to the meeting today. I very much appreciate the problems your community face and we do continue to tackle dog fouling across the city and target the behaviour of some dog owners who do not take responsibility for their pets.*

*In relation to the specific points that you have been making in your deputation, we can immediately provide more dog waste bins in the Poets' Corner area and I will ask officers to contact you regarding the most appropriate siting for the bins.*

*The Legislation is however, very clear that the provision of bags is the responsibility of the dog walkers and we could not provide bags on this area and not do so in other areas of the city.*

*Increased signage in the area would certainly be possible and again, I will ask officers to get in contact with you about the most suitable location for those signs as residents will have the best knowledge about where the most instances of dog fouling are occurring.*

*We might also be able to use pavement stencils in the worst offending areas and I'm also aware that residents in other areas of the city have put posters up in their windows where there is a particular problem. I will ask officers to discuss these options with you and any other ideas residents may have.*

*In terms of enforcement, we will request that our enforcement team increase their presence in the Poets' Corner area. Unfortunately, this won't be possible at night time but during the day there will be a more visible deterrent with the officers patrolling the area on foot.*

*In relation to increased street cleaning, the area is cleaned once a week which is accordance with the standards suggested by DEFRA in their Best Practice on Litter and Refuse. However residents should report issues directly to Cityclean, as we are able to dispatch our wash van to deal with dog fouling issues.*

*I can assure you that we will continue to try, with our limited resources to bear down on this problem and to continue to put into place our enforcement and education campaigns to warn people that this is not acceptable."*

59.20 **RESOLVED-** That the committee note the deputation.

**60 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL****(D) DEPUTATIONS****(i) Night Buses, Brighton & Hove**

60.1 The Committee considered a deputation referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 1 February 2018 requesting the Council and its partners liaise with Brighton & Hove Bus Company in relation to their recent decision to reduce the provision of night buses in Brighton & Hove.

60.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“The Night Buses are a wholly commercial service run by Brighton & Hove Buses therefore this was a decision for them to make.*

*The council does work in partnership with the local bus operators and together we have improved facilities for passengers and increased bus patronage. The council is continuing to subsidise all 19 supported bus routes for the next 3 years.*

*That said, we do regret the withdrawal of any bus service in the city and have discussed this matter with the company.*

*They have stated that they will keep their decision under review and have committed to an engagement process to collate details of the journeys made by people wanting to use night buses and this is expected to start soon.*

*It is hoped that the responses will help identify how any gaps in the night bus services, for which there is a demand, can be minimised with some additional journeys potentially taking effect from this June.*

*The company will also continue to operate its 384 journeys after midnight each week”.*

60.3 Councillor Wares stated that the reduction of the provision of night buses would cause many problems particularly for low-income families on shift work and the safety of young people. Councillor Wares asked if the council could publicise the Brighton & Hove Bus Company consultation to assist the response rate that would lead to better consultation information and in turn, better services.

60.4 The Chair confirmed that officers could communicate and publicise the consultation.

60.5 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the deputation.

## **61 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

### **(A) PETITIONS**

#### **(i) Traffic calming measures on Vale Avenue**

61.1 The Committee considered a letter from the Patcham ward councillors requesting the Council undertake traffic calming measures on Vale Avenue to reduce the speed of traffic coming from the A23 and A27 on to residential streets.

61.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Due to the substantial cost involved to carry out large scale traffic calming schemes, local authorities are moving away from undertaking those and carry out smaller scale measures where there is a proven speeding issue and there are injury causing collisions occurring.*

*In Patcham the residents were asked as part of the 20mph city wide speed limit proposals if they would like to see the speed limit in their streets reduced to 20mph but the majority voted against the proposals and were supported in this at that time by their ward councillors. This means that Vale Avenue remained at 30mph and, as part of the 20mph monitoring process; speeds were recorded in this road at 30mph which is very close to the posted limit. With the speeds at the posted limit and no injury causing collisions recorded in the past three years there isn't any firm evidence to suggest that we should divert funding to this area at this time.*

*However, I will ask the Road Safety Officers to review this location in accordance with their agreed programme to consider what other measures might be appropriate to reduce speeds”.*

61.3 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the petition.

**(B) WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

**(i) Parking enforcement procedures**

61.4 Councillor Nemeth put the following question:

*“Following discussions with a group of local plumbers, gas engineers and other tradesmen, who ultimately fund the Council’s trader permit scheme, would the Chairman explain the disparity in parking enforcement procedures between local tradesmen (whose work may include emergency call-outs) where enforcement is strict, and regional or national firms (such as BT) whose work often has no safety element but who are allowed to park illegally or dangerously for hours on end?”*

61.5 The Chair provided the following reply:

*“Trader permits allow parking in all permit zones until 5pm. Works vehicles can only be parked on double yellow lines if they are part of the site and signed and guarded appropriately. BT vans can park on yellow lines and in bays when working on junction boxes to maintain the phone network. If national firms need to work within parking bays they have to pay for the suspension of the bays so they have the space they need to work, and any vehicles parked within those suspensions have to be part of the works site.*

*BT vehicles and national firms can and do receive Penalty Charge Notices and any vehicles parked where they should not be can be reported directly to our enforcement contractor”.*

61.6 Councillor Nemeth asked if the council’s parking enforcement contractor could be reminded of their duties relating to issuing PCN’s to national firms parking illegally.

61.7 The Chair confirmed a reminder could be sent.

**(C) LETTERS**

**(i) Verge posts**

61.8 The Committee considered a letter from Councillors Wares and Janio requesting clarification on various matters relating to the continuation of the verge post installation service.

61.9 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Officers apologise for any confusion on this matter, there was a temporary issue with the Contractor who undertakes this work for a period of time which meant there was a delay in being able to deal with residents requests.*

*I'm pleased to say this matter has now been resolved, therefore in relation to your second question I can assure you that the service is now running as normal albeit with a queue of resident requests.*

*In relation to your last point, Officers will now be contacting those residents who have raised their concerns; the conversations with residents will include providing guidance on the correct type of infrastructure to avoid residents installing inappropriate solutions. I have also asked Officers to offer you a meeting to provide an update on progress”.*

61.10 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the letter.

**(ii) Road Safety Measures for Mile Oak Road**

61.11 The Committee considered a letter from Councillor Atkinson requesting an urgent safety and traffic assessment be undertaken on a stretch of Mile Oak Road.

61.12 The Chair provided the following response:

*“In the stretch of Mile Oak Road referred to there have been three slight injury causing collisions and one serious injury in the past three years. Two of these slight collisions were caused by drivers hitting parked vehicles and the third involved an unattended car rolling down the hill into a car that was parking. The serious collision was the motorcycle referred to in your letter that was speeding and failed to stop behind a vehicle that was giving way to a vehicle approaching from the opposite direction. Officers have investigated the road’s safety record and on the ranking scale it does not figure in the top 30 of the roads and junctions within the city that give greater cause for concern. During the implementation of the city wide 20 miles per hour limit, a seven day count was undertaken at two points in Mile Oak Road and these showed that the highest average speed was 24.2mph. This is broadly in line with the posted limit. With this in mind I am afraid that we cannot justify any expenditure at this time from our very limited road safety budgets.*

*It should also be noted that the Highway Code rule 243 specifically states that drivers should not stop or park on or near the brow of a hill and it will be a matter for the Police to tackle this dangerous parking. Officers will make them aware of this.*

*Waiting restrictions can also be considered, however, that may have the effect of speeding up the traffic.*

*Officers will be happy to discuss these last two points further with you meanwhile residents should, if possible, report any dangerous parking to the Police via the Operation Crackdown website”.*

61.13 **RESOLVED-** That the letter be noted.

**(iii) Parking in the Surrenden Road area**

61.14 The Committee considered a letter from the Withdean ward councillors requesting that the Surrenden Road area be brought forward in the resident parking priority timetable to address parking stress in the area.

61.15 The Chair provided the following response:

*“At this stage we cannot move the consultation forward. Our consultation is planned around the resources available to us and officers move very efficiently to keep that programme moving forward. Consultations and implementations are all being carried out in sync. It’s not possible to do everything across all of those areas on that timetable all at once; we simply do not have those resources.*

*However, your letter will be considered alongside the deputation that we have received on the agenda and we are planning a further parking report in 2018 to consider the Surrenden Road area and a consultation based on the representation received alongside other parking demands in the City. Officers will be in touch with you and Ann and Ken Norman to seek your views in relation to the area to be consulted as well as having listened to the views of your residents”.*

61.16 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the letter.

**(D) NOTICES OF MOTION**

**(i) Clean Air Day**

61.17 The Committee considered a Notice of Motion referred from the Full Council meeting of 1 February 2018 requesting a report be brought to the Committee exploring the potential to introduce a Cleaner Air Day from 2018 with consideration of the roads to be closed, the most practicable date and any economic and environmental costs and effects.

61.18 Councillor Wares noted that Cleaner Air Days had previously taken place in the city but had unfortunately been stopped under the previous Green Group administration and he welcomed their change in view on the matter.

61.19 The Chair provided the following statement:

“We do support the aim of this Motion and we would agree for a report coming back because I think it’s important to manage expectations around budgets as there is no obvious budget for this. I think we do have a different opinion as to the approach and how effective just one day would be. I can remember the annual car-free days that we used to have that were only shown to have a limited impact and they do involve a lot of officer time and cost. But since then, I think much more is being done as a matter of course in relation to sustainable travel and improving air quality through local transport planning and behaviour change schemes such as those in our Active Travel programme. To outline so of that work, as it doesn’t get much publicity: in 2017/18 2,500 travel conversations have been held with residents, employees, students and parents. Regular travel events are being held in businesses, Universities and schools. Cycling is also a priority for the project with over 300 adults trained and 400 bikes fixed so they can be ridden again.

The ‘Love to Ride’ cycle challenges are ongoing with 132 organisations taking part and 2,300 individuals so far.

Cycle counters on the arterial routes show a 5% increase in cycles counted in 2017 compared to the previous year and I’m sure this is the progress we would all want to see.

So a Clean Air Day may be a way of promoting some of this work and encouraging people to take part and therefore, we would agree to a report coming back that may identify where the resources would come from and perhaps the scope of the day”.

61.20 Councillor West stated that the Green Group had made a step-change in the city on environmental projects and the benefits of that were now being to be seen. Councillor West added that there was a lot more that could be done and more attention to detail was required by the current administration.

61.21 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive a report on the matter.

## **62 OFFICIAL FEED AND FOOD CONTROLS SERVICE PLAN 2018/19**

62.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Neighbourhoods, Communities & Housing that requested approval of the Official Feed and Food Controls Service Plan 2018/19.

62.2 Referring to paragraph 3.5.11 of appendix 1, Councillor Littman noted that food-related infectious disease had gradually risen over the past three years and asked in the context of the decision made to reduce the service budget by £50,000 and the related equalities impact assessment that had outlined that the current level of service could not be maintained, how such rises could be reversed or stopped. Furthermore, in relation to paragraph 4.3.2 Councillor Littman asked if the field officers referred to were the same as those recently agreed by Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities & Equalities (NICE) Committee.

62.3 The Head of Safer Communities clarified that the field officer role was different to that recently approved by NICE Committee and a statutory qualification was required for the role outlined in the report. In relation to service budget reductions, any incident of food-related infectious disease would always be prioritised and in such an occurrence, it was likely that routine inspection work would be reduced whilst complaints were investigated.

62.4 Councillor West stated his concern relating to the budget reduction to the service and he believed it would be more difficult for officers to respond to a high-priority incident. Councillor West noted that there were a rising number of complaints in relation to the condition of premises and that could in turn lead to reputational damage to the city with the service unable to conduct sufficient, regular inspections.

62.5 **RESOLVED-** That the committee agrees the Official Feed and Food Controls Service Plan 2018/2019 set out in the appendix to this report.

## **63 HEALTH AND SAFETY SERVICE PLAN**

63.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approves the proposed Health & Safety Service Plan 2018/2019 at Appendix 1.

## **64 MANAGEMENT OF HOVE PARK 3G FOOTBALL FACILITY**

64.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture requested approval for the Russell Martin Foundation to operate Hove Park's new 3G football facility.

- 64.2 Councillor Bennett stated that as ward councillors for the area, both she and Councillor Brown were very happy with the development of the 3G facility however, they hoped that discussions could continue with the tennis club on a solution that could perhaps consider refurbishment of the tennis court.
- 64.3 The Chair stated that she had previously given assurance that every effort would be made to find a way forward in relation to the tennis provision at Hove Park and that assurance remained.
- 64.4 Councillor Littman stated that he was pleased that a non-profit organisation had been chosen to operate the facility and hoped it would be successful and a representative example for the long-term solution of the maintenance and operation of council open spaces.
- 64.5 Councillor Atkinson stated that the proposal was well-thought through and the Russell Martin Foundation were well respected in the community.
- 64.6 The Chair noted that recommendation 2.1 required a technical correction to read: *“notes that this proposal ~~has been~~ will be advertised by way of an Open Spaces Notice pursuant to s123 (2) (A) of the Local Government Act 1972;”*.
- 64.7 The Committee agreed to the correction.
- 64.8 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee notes the proposal of the Russell Martin Foundation (Appendix 1) to operate Hove Park’s 3G football facility by way of a commercial lease agreement and further notes that this proposal will be advertised by way of an Open Spaces Notice pursuant to s123 (2) (A) of the Local Government Act 1972;
  - 2) That the Committee delegates authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Environment & Culture, Assistant Director Property & Design and Head of Legal Services to approve detailed lease terms, having taken into consideration any objections or representations received.

## 65 2018/19 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN CAPITAL PROGRAMME

- 65.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that requested the Committee to recommend to Policy & Resources Committee the 2018/19 Local Transport Plan (LTP) capital programme budget allocation of £5.365 million to projects and programmes and to note the indicative allocation of future LTP budgets to projects and programmes for 2019/20 and 2020/21 to continue to fund the LTP 4-year Delivery Plan.
- 65.2 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy referred to several corrections that were required to the report. The 2018/2019 sub-total column of the Capital Renewal/Maintenance Schemes in Appendix 2 should read £3,333 not £3,445. The 2020/2021 sub-total column of the Capital Renewal/Maintenance Schemes in Appendix 2 should read £2,110 not £1,110. Furthermore, the 2018/2019 total column of the Total LTP Allocations in Appendix 2 should read £5,365 not £5,477. The Head of Transport

Policy & Strategy noted that the corresponding figures in paragraph 7.2 of the report were correct.

- 65.3 Councillor Littman stated that following a site visit to Shelter Hall, he understood the reasons why an increased budget was required and supported the increased allocation. Councillor Littman stated his disappointment that only £0.245 million was allocated to improving transport for walkers and cyclists that was an insufficient amount to improve air quality and promote healthier lifestyles for residents. Councillor Littman enquired as to progress toward the creation of a Cycling Strategy and for clarification on paragraph 3.21 and what the £0.055m allocation would be spent on.
- 65.4 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy clarified that the £0.055m allocation referenced in paragraph 3.21 would go toward increasing provision of the city's electric vehicle charging point network. In relation to the Cycling Strategy, the Assistant Director- City Transport answered that the development of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), referenced in the following report would in turn enable the development of a specific Cycling Strategy.
- 65.5 Councillor Wares asked if parking revenue could be allocated to eligible projects. Councillor Wares noted that there were approved projects on the high-risk/pedestrian crossing sites where work had not yet started and asked for assurance that the agreed allocated funding was still ring-fenced to these projects and they would still go ahead. Furthermore, Councillor Wares queried whether the figure of £1m over a three year period was correct for Valley Gardens: Phase 3- engagement and preliminary design as it appeared excessive. In conclusion, Councillor Wares asked what increase could be expected from the allocation of £50,000 funding to undertake work on investing Section 106 contributions.
- 65.6 In response to the questions raised, the Head of Transport Policy & Strategy clarified that projects and schemes previously approved by the committee would certainly go ahead and would be delivered ahead of any others. In relation to funds allocated to Valley Gardens Phase 3, the Head of Transport Policy & Strategy answered that the figures were correct but that engagement and preliminary design would take place in 2018/19 and detailed design and construction would be expected to take place in 2019/20 and 2020/21 using funding received from the Local Growth Fund subject to the approval of a business case. In response to the query raised on Section 106 contributions, the Head of Transport Policy & Strategy clarified that the allocation would be used for staff resource to develop the design for approved projects but it was not yet possible to estimate how many projects that officer time could deliver. The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy noted that details of parking revenue allocations were not detailed in this report but in the Parking Annual Report received by the committee at its previous meeting.
- 65.7 Councillor Wares stated that he understood £2.3m worth of transport-related Section 106 projects were awaiting implementation and asked if that figure would reduce sharply with the allocation of £50,000 funding.
- 65.8 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy clarified that the majority of the £2.3m related to large, ongoing projects such as the Brighton Marina and 3T's Hospital developments. Progress could be made quickly with projects of a smaller scale.

- 65.9 In relation to Shelter Hall, Councillor Wares stated that he was aware that the project funding shortfall was known at the end of 2016 and there had been various applications for new funding through the course of 2017 to reduce or offset that shortfall. Councillor Wares stated that his cause for concern was not that additional funding was required for the project but that the shortfall was known for a significant amount of time and had not been communicated in a transparent manner. Councillor Wares added that because there had been no contingency plan in the original proposal, funding had to be taken from the LTP Capital Programme to the detriment of other projects. In relation to recommendation 2.2 of the report, Councillor Wares highlighted that he would be voting against the proposal as there were too many uncertainties and gaps in the indicative allocations.
- 65.10 The Assistant Director- City Transport confirmed that there was an awareness of a funding shortfall late in 2016 that related to unforeseen ground conditions and the extra work required to keep the public safe and highway open. The Assistant Director- City Transport explained that when funding had originally been applied for, the full scale of works required was unknown as a thorough site assessment could not be undertaken due to the possibility of structural collapse. Costs were now more certain having secured a fixed priced contract for the remaining work. The Assistant Director- City Transport explained that over the past year a number of funding applications had been made that were unfortunately unsuccessful and discussion had taken place with central government ministers and the LEP to no avail.
- 65.11 Councillor Wares noted that the bids made to the LEP and DfT were unlikely to have been successful as both were in part already made contributions to the project. Councillor Wares stated that he strongly believed that potential funding should be found from elsewhere to free up LTP Capital Funding.
- 65.12 The Chair replied that potential funding would continue to be explored as had been relayed to lead spokespersons before the meeting.
- 65.13 Councillor West expressed his disappointment that the indicative funding for 2019/20 and 2020/21 was not clear and nor was there a comprehensive list of projects. Councillor West noted that paragraph 3.20 of the report outlined the benefits of promoting the benefits of cycling and walking yet only accounted for a small percentage of the overall budget, which he found an inadequate response to the issues posed to the city. Councillor West stated his concern that the committee were yet to receive a Cycling Strategy, the development of which had been agreed by the committee some months before. Councillor West added that a Cycling Strategy should not be confused by officers with a LCWIP which was a central government directive.
- 65.14 The Chair clarified that the committee had received a Notice of Motion (NoM) approved by Full Council and had agreed to note that NoM rather than agree to the request to develop a Cycling Strategy. Subsequent to the meeting and following discussions with the lead spokespersons on the committee, she had instructed officers to begin work on a Cycling Strategy, the results of which would be presented to a future committee meeting.

- 65.15 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture stated that initial discussions had been held on scoping the LCWIP. That was different from a full Cycling Strategy but was a first step in how the council could explore how to attain additional funding.
- 65.16 Councillor Janio asked for clarification on why Wilson Avenue and Roedean Road had been chosen for Intelligent Transport System (ITS) improvements as the area did not appear to be a vital transport link. Councillor Janio noted that a specific project board for the Valley Gardens scheme had been very productive for phases 1 and 2 and he hoped this would be the same for phase 3. Councillor Janio stated that funding shortfall relating to Shelter Hall meant that £1.5m out of the overall £5m LTP Capital Programme was being directed to that site. Councillor Janio asked when and who had made that decision and expressed his belief that an update should have been provided to Members when the full situation was known.
- 65.17 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture stated that whilst officers were aware of the potential budgetary pressures relating to the unforeseen costs of the Shelter Hall project, the full scale was not known until a tender process for the work was finalised and this had only been completed recently. Whilst this meant that it had not been possible to inform this committee of the scope of work required, the information had been reported to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee as part of its Targeted Budget Management (TBM) and capital allocation process and to Budget PR&G Committee and Budget Council that had agreed to the allocation.
- 65.18 In relation to the ITS improvements at Wilson Avenue and Roedean Road, the Head of Transport Policy & Strategy explained that this location had been identified as a key junction to the Marina and because the lights at the junction were nearing the end of their lifespan. Furthermore, the work was associated to S106 funding relating to the 3T's development and there was a requirement that funding be spent within 2 kilometres of that location. The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy stated that phase 3 of the Valley Gardens scheme would take into account lessons learnt from phases 1 and 2 and the process would be similarly inclusive in its engagement.
- 65.19 The Chair noted that the lead spokespersons of the committee had received an email that day making clear that phase 3 of the Valley Gardens scheme would be conducted in an inclusive manner and that the three lead members of the committee would have a chance to review the proposed timetable.
- 65.20 Councillor Wares stated that whilst he acknowledged the explanation provided in relation to the unforeseen costs relating to Shelter Hall, there was an early awareness of the issue at the end of 2016 and the committee should have been notified at that stage.
- 65.21 The Chair then put recommendation 2.1 to the vote which passed.
- 65.22 The Chair then put recommendation 2.2 to the vote which failed.
- 65.23 **RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND-** That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:
- 1) Recommends that Policy, Resources & Growth Committee agree the 2018/19 Local Transport Plan capital programme budget allocation of £5.365 million to projects and

programmes and notes the additional allocations for schemes agreed at Budget Council, as set out in Appendix 2 of this report.

## **66 AIR QUALITY PROGRAMME UPDATE**

- 66.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that informed Members on the work of the Council's Air Quality Programme Board.
- 66.2 Councillor West stated that whilst he welcomed the work of the Programme Board, it was currently officer-led and in his view the Board should be more open and transparent and be Member-led. Councillor West added that more action was required on congestion and convincing leadership necessary and expressed his disappointment relating to the lack of an extension of the Low Emission Zone and sustainability impacts of the modifications to the opening hours of George Street to traffic.
- 66.3 Councillor Littman stated that it was unsatisfactory that the administration had taken three years to establish a specific Board dedicated to considering improvements to air quality in the city. Referring to page 135 of the agenda, Councillor Littman stated that it was highly disappointing that there was no cross-sector, city-wide programme to promote walking and cycling although he acknowledged that there was work underway to that end. Councillor Littman stated that vehicle idling was a serious problem in the city and was an offence and he hoped joint enforcement with Sussex Police could be taken. Councillor Littman stated that serious action on air quality would require external funding and measures that may not be popular and he hoped there would be sufficient political will and commitment to implement those.
- 66.4 The Chair provided assurance of political commitment adding the support of central government would be essential to meet the challenges set out in the report of the Board.
- 66.5 Councillor Horan reiterated the commitments made by the Chair adding that a recent application for funding to convert the remaining Brighton & Hove Bus Company fleet to low emission had unfortunately been rejected. Councillor Horan added that this decision had been based upon the decision by central government to change the focus from local authority information to national assessment results meaning Brighton & Hove was categorised with Littlehampton and Worthing on air quality assessments. Councillor Horan supplemented that the council had continued to use meter readings from locations in North Street and Lewes Road and had submitted those readings to government which was a demonstration of the administration's commitment to combatting air quality.
- 66.6 Councillor Wares noted there were several initiatives that could be undertaken in suburban areas of Brighton & Hove to improve air quality in the city such as locating Car Clubs and Bikeshare hubs on the outlier areas of the city. Councillor Wares added there were other initiatives that could be considered such as the extension of concessionary bus passes to under 16's. In relation to the application for funding to convert bus fleet to low emission referred to by Councillor Horan, Councillor Wares noted that he had researched the reasons set out by DEFRA as to why the application had been refused and would contend that the application was to poor standard rather than down to the location of meters and their readings.

66.7 Councillor Horan replied that the DEFRA application analysis had been of surprise given that the same team had made two previous successful bids for funding to DEFRA and that could be indicative of a national trend in funding awards.

**66.8 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee note the work of the Air Quality Programme Board in aligning internal projects and programmes that are directing the Council's response to improving air quality across the City.
- 2) That the Committee agree to receive regular Air Quality policy and programme reports including an update on the Low Emission Zone at the June 2018 ETS Committee.

**67 RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON MAJOR ROAD NETWORK**

67.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out the officer response submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) consultation on the proposal for the creation of a Major Road Network in England and Wales and the officer response to the Highways England report 'Shaping the future of England's strategic roads'.

67.2 Councillor West stated that the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) had been deeply concerned about Highways England proposals to enhance the A27 as their research had indicated a decimation of the landscape and habitat that would be required to effect the widening of the junctions. Councillor West believed the SDNPA would be dismayed regarding the level of support provided in the council's response to Highways England and the proposals were effectively a road building charter that did not fit with the council's sustainable transport ambitions and priorities. Councillor West stated he strongly believed an urgency sub-committee should have been held to discuss the response ahead of the deadline and he could not support the recommendations of the report.

67.3 Councillor Nemeth requested clarification of the reasons for the deletion of the A270 Upper Lewes Road.

67.4 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy explained that the A270 in the east and west of the city had been treated differently as in the east, the A270 was the only access to traffic to the city but in the west there were a number of different access routes.

67.5 Councillor Nemeth noted that Kingsway and Old Shoreham Road A270 appeared equally busy and asked for clarification on why the former had been included and the latter had not.

67.6 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy that to include the A259, A270 and A27 would increase the mileage of the Major Road Network and central government were keen to ensure that the level of mileage in the Major Road Network was the same as the Strategic Road Network.

67.7 Councillor Littman stated that central governments approach to solving congestion and poor air quality was entirely outdated and the research methodology used was far from sophisticated. Councillor Littman stated that whilst the officer response was well considered, there was a number of points he could not support the expansion of A roads to expressways nor the inclusion of the A259.

67.8 On behalf of the Green Group, Councillor Littman moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.1 as shown with strikethrough below:

2.1 Note ~~and endorse~~ the officer response submitted to the Government's Department for Transport on 12 March 2018 on behalf of the council in response to the consultation on its proposals for the creation of a Major Road Network in England and Wales, as attached in Appendix 2 of this report, including the particular requests for additions and deletions set out in paragraph 3.9 of this report;

67.9 Councillor West formally seconded the motion.

67.10 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy explained that issues relating to the A259 and expansion of A roads to expressways were different and related to the Major Road Network and the Strategic Road Network respectively. Recommendation 2.1 related to the Major Road Network and recommendation 2.2 related to the Strategic Road Network and recommendation 2.2 of the report only requested the committee to note the response.

67.11 The Chair put the motion to the vote which passed.

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

67.13 **RESOLVED-**

That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:

- 1) Note the officer response submitted to the Government's Department for Transport on 12 March 2018 on behalf of the council in response to the consultation on its proposals for the creation of a Major Road Network in England and Wales, as attached in Appendix 2 of this report, including the particular requests for additions and deletions set out in paragraph 3.9 of this report;
- 2) Note the officer response submitted to the Government's Department for Transport on 7 February 2018 on behalf of the council in response to the consultation on the Highways England report entitled 'Shaping the future of England's strategic roads', as attached in Appendix 3 of this report; and
- 3) Note and welcome the continued progress being made by the emerging Transport for the South East Sub-national Transport Body, as summarised in paragraphs 3.20 and 3.21 of this report.

**68 BLUE BADGE TRAFFIC ORDERS****68.1 RESOLVED-****April 17 Blue Badge Parking Bays Citywide Order**

- 1) That the Committee is recommended to (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\*.

**September 17 Blue Badge Parking Bays Citywide Order**

- 2) That the Committee is recommended to (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\*.

**69 SCHOOL PARKING ENFORCEMENT**

- 69.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out evaluated options on proposed changes to school parking enforcement following a committee request to investigate the matter.
- 69.2 Councillor West stated that anti-social parking and related behaviour was a serious issue in the city and he believed there had to be an enhancement of enforcement activity and instant fining would be a better deterrent than the issuing of warnings.
- 69.3 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Wares moved a motion to add recommendation 2.4 and 2.5 as set out in bold italics below:

***2.4 That Committee requests the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture to bring a report back to the next Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee advising on the options to introduce Traffic Regulation Orders that will give Civil Enforcement Officers instant fine capability in suitable locations and at suitable times of the day in areas around all schools.***

***2.5 That Committee requests the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture to bring a report back to the next Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee advising on options to provide body worn cameras for School Crossing Patrol officers.***

- 69.4 Introducing the motion, Councillor Wares welcomed the report that had arisen from a letter to the committee from Councillor Janio and himself. Councillor Wares stated that the intention of the first part of the motion was to investigate the introduction of loading bans in locations outside schools that would effectively create an enforcement area and allow for instant penalty notices to be issued and prevent anti-social parking. The second element of the motion would consider issuing body worn cameras to School Crossing Patrol officers as a means to protect them from the physical and verbal abuse that had become excessive.
- 69.5 Councillor Janio formally seconded the motion adding that he had made a visit to Goldstone School and had witness dangerous and anti-social parking first-hand.
- 69.6 Councillor Robins stated that he was supportive of the recommendations and Conservative Group motion however; he did fear that issuing body worn cameras to School Crossing Patrol officers may lead to recruitment difficulties due to safety fears.
- 69.7 Councillor Littman welcomed the report recommendations that outlined action that clearly needed to be taken. Councillor Littman commended the work of the School Travel Team and he hoped that more people would use their service if anti-social parking could be prevented. Councillor Littman relayed his apprehension concerning recommendation 2.5 of the Conservative Group motion and he believed it correct for the committee to receive a further report outlining the positives and negatives of issuing body worn cameras to School Crossing Patrol officers.
- 69.8 In response to the comments made relating to body worn cameras, Councillor Wares suggested that better safety protection for School Crossing Patrol officers may in fact have the inverse effect and boost recruitment.
- 69.9 Councillor Atkinson stated that he supported the recommendations and as with other Members, he had witness bizarre parking behaviour around schools. Councillor Atkinson believed the problem was caused by a minority of residents and many parents would welcome increased enforcement.
- 69.10 The Chair stated that she had been advised by officers that the requests detailed in the motion would require some work and it may not be possible to present a report to the next meeting. The Chair proposed that the motion be amended to read “next *available* Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee” with a view to receiving the report to the meeting in October 2018.
- 69.11 The Committee were in agreement with the proposal.
- 69.12 The Chair put the motion, as amended to the vote which passed.
- 69.13 The Chair put the recommendations, as amended to the vote which passed.
- 69.14 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That Committee agrees to increase by three the number of Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO) employed to cover school parking enforcement.

- 2) That Committee agrees that the 'Anti-social parking at schools – support and advice' webpage ([www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/school-parking-advice](http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/school-parking-advice)) becomes the one point of contact point and guidance for schools, residents and councillors wishing to find out steps to take if there is a problem in their area.
- 3) That Committee agrees to the School Travel Team making schools aware that the one point of contact webpage is available for support and advice, on an annual basis to coincide with the beginning of the school year.
- 4) That Committee requests the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture to bring a report back to the next available Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee advising on the options to introduce Traffic Regulation Orders that will give Civil Enforcement Officers instant fine capability in suitable locations and at suitable times of the day in areas around all schools.
- 5) That Committee requests the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture to bring a report back to the next available Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee advising on options to provide body worn cameras for School Crossing Patrol officers.

## **70 CENTRAL HOVE AND PORTSLADE PROPERTY LEVEL PROTECTION SCHEME - PERMISSION TO PROCURE**

- 70.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval to procure contractors to install Property Level Protection (PLP) measures to reduce flood risk to 63 properties in Central Hove and Portslade.
- 70.2 Councillor Nemeth asked if the scheme applied only to Central Hove and Portslade wards as the title inferred and the viability for inclusion in the scheme of a specific address in Wish ward.
- 70.3 The Flood Risk Management Officer clarified that the scheme applied to other wards and the address referred to by Councillor Nemeth located in Wish ward was one of the properties that could be included in the scheme.
- 70.4 Councillor Littman welcomed the investment however; he stated that long-term solutions were required at both local and national levels to combat the effects of climate change.
- 70.5 Councillor Robins asked why Church Road, Portslade was not included in the intended addresses for a letter drop and relayed resident's concerns that the installation of flood defence measures to their property may have a detrimental impact on property price levels and insurance premiums.
- 70.6 Councillor Atkinson stated that there had serious flooding in 2016 on Valley Road and it was not clear in the report if those residents had been or could be consulted on the scheme.
- 70.7 The Flood Risk Management Officer clarified that she understood all of Valley Road had been consulted based on the reported incidents of flooding and that information could be sent to Councillor Atkinson.

- 70.8 Councillor Janio stated that as a member of the South East Regional Flood Defence Committee, he had campaigned for many years for increased funding for surface-water flood defence funding and he was pleased to see a policy come to fruition.
- 70.9 Councillor West agreed that it was a welcome step that the Flood Defence Committee had recognised surface-water flooding as part of its remit and concurred with the statement made by Councillor Littman regarding long-term solutions to climate change.

70.10 **RESOLVED-**

That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:

- 1) Approve procurement of contractors to install the flood resilience measures for Central Hove and Portslade.
- 2) Grants delegated authority to the Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture to carry out the procurement and award of the contract referred to in 2.1 above.

**71 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

- 71.1 No items were referred for Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 7.35pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

