

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

**4.00pm 29 APRIL 2014**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor West (Chair), Councillor Sykes (Deputy Chair), Cox (Opposition Spokesperson), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), Mitchell (Group Spokesperson), Robins (Group Spokesperson), Daniel, Davey, Hawtree and G Theobald

**Also in attendance:** Councillor Meadows

**PART ONE**

**98. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**98(a) Declarations of substitutes**

98.1 There were none.

**98(b) Declarations of interest**

98.2 There were none.

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

98.3 In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ("the Act"), the Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during an item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present during that item, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A(3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100(l) of the Act).

**99. MINUTES**

99.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 4 March 2014 be approved and signed as the correct record.

**100. CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

100.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

“This is the last Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee meeting of the municipal year. I know some committee members will be moving to take up new roles and this will be their last meeting as members of this committee. I would like to take this opportunity to thank them, especially, and all members too for your contribution to our work this year.

It has been a busy year and we have certainly achieved a great deal for the city: I'm very pleased that we have agreed the introduction of the second phase of 20mph limits which means most residents in the city will now have slower, safer speed limits on their streets; and with the agreement of the bus companies we have also developed the city's first low emission zone which stands to be the first big step forward in tackling stubborn air quality in the city for decades; I'm also very proud of the work achieved with the allotment federation to develop the first allotment strategy which members heartily welcomed and endorsed at our last meeting; and I am also appreciative of the strong support expressed by members for the development of the Stanmer Masterplan, which we are currently consulting the public on ahead of the planned funding bid.

This is but a sample of our achievement, and I would like to thank our officers for their great commitment and professionalism in delivering innovation and continued good service to the city - especially in these most challenging of times. And, I would also like to express gratitude to all our partners and to residents who have contributed to consultations and attended our meetings informing our understanding and decisions. Many thanks again to you all, and may I wish those not rejoining us in the new municipal year all the best with your new roles, and I very much look forward to working with some new faces at our next meeting.

“As Members will be aware last week there was an unexpected partial collapse of a seafront arch contractors for the Fortune of War were working on. Fortunately, no one was injured but the premises are now partly closed off and there was major traffic disruption on the A259 while the safety of the situation was established. Subsequently it has been possible to reopen the road to two way traffic while maintaining safety.

As you know the seafront arches are very old, at the end of their structural life, and the need for substantial investment in renewal has been put off for decades. The sum the Council is now facing is estimated to run to many tens of million of pounds far beyond the short term means of the Council, and certainly not something we can divert other dedicated project funding towards. We have already heavily committed LTP funding to renewal of some arches, and a very good job they are, but a new and significantly heightened funding approach is needed to tackle the scale of the wider problem. Councillor Davey as lead member for Transport is taking a leading role on the project and Councillor Mitchell is chairing a cross party scrutiny looking at the problem and possible ways forward.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Davey and myself have all paid visits to the Fortune of War to see the situation for ourselves, and I found that very helpful to my understanding of the situation.

Officers and emergency services and traders are all to be commended for their swift response and good handling of the incident.

I know officers are looking at the causes of this particular problem and the remedial action that can be taken, and the current expectation is that it could take up to 8 weeks

to address the specific problems. I'd like to thank business owners and residents for their patience during the disruption".

- 100.2 Councillor Mitchell stated that the Scrutiny Panel members had identified the specific section between West Street and Shelter Hall as a priority which would require £4m of investment and be a major work. Councillor Mitchell asked if there might be emergency repair capital or funding available to carry out the work and if not, if the administration could approach the Local Enterprise Partnership to request the funding secured for the improvement project at Valley Gardens be diverted to improvement of the Seafront Arches as it was clearly a higher priority.
- 100.3 Councillor Davey stated that three applications to improve the Seafront Arches had already been submitted to the LEP and all were unsuccessful. Councillor Davey added that the Valley Gardens project had been successful on merit and the funding could not be diverted. Councillor Davey supplemented that more bids for improvements to the Seafront Arches would be made to the LEP and the Arches also formed part of the Strategic Economic Plan. Councillor Davey clarified that he also did not believe there was a direct link between the collapse at West Street and other arch related structural issues at Shelter Hall.

## **101. CALL OVER**

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

- Item 105: Response to petition regarding Roedean area coach parking
- Item 110: Sponsorship of roundabouts
- Item 111: Recycling incentives and engagement campaign
- Item 112: East Brighton Park parking controls

101.2 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 106: Vogue Gyratory- bus lane TRO report
- Item 107: Brighton & Hove 20mph limit Phase 2- Objections to Speed Limit Orders
- Item 108: Queens Road Traffic Regulation Order
- Item 109: Lively Cities Project- Traffic Order consultation

## **102. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

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

#### **(i) Stanmer Estate Masterplan consultation: Jamie Hooper**

102.1 Jamie Hooper asked the following question:

*"The present Stanmer Estate Masterplan Consultation gives no information on planned removal (see Landuse and Mott MacDonald consultants reports, April 2012, March 2014) of planned removal of existing car parks close to Stanmer House, Church and village amounting to 150 standard (non-Blue Badge) places. Replacement would be a minimal 175 parking area near the Lower Lodges. There is no detailed plan to transport visitors from there, so most would need to walk a mile to those locations. How can visitors make informed choices in the questionnaire about their future experience on visiting Stanmer Park if denied this information?"*

102.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*"Thank you for your question regarding Stanmer Park and for your continued interest in this project.*

*Transport and parking is one of the biggest challenges for Stanmer Park. Parking is currently uncontrolled, there is displacement of cars from the university, particularly during the week, events at the Amex stadium have also caused problems and the sheer number of visitors driving to the park is causing access problems for the bus at peak times.*

*Clearly parking needs to be addressed. To this end we have commissioned a vehicle access study to start to explore the options available. This study makes some initial recommendations which were shared with Stanmer Stakeholders at the meeting last week that you and I both attended. They will form the basis of a specific consultation on parking in the park which I hope will take place later this year after the submission of the Stage 1 HLF bid.*

*Parking proposals haven't been included in the current consultation on Stanmer Park. This consultation is designed to inform the stage 1 application and is still high level. The detailed parking proposals haven't been finalised and it wouldn't be appropriate to have included them at this stage.*

*Officers will be working with you and the stakeholders in the run up to the parking consultation which will be completed to inform the final, detailed Stage 2 HLF application – assuming we are successful at Stage 1.*

*The document you refer to is a discussion of the parking problems currently faced and a possible way forward. There are no proposals at this stage on one solution".*

102.3 Jamie Hooper asked the following supplementary question:

*"Councillor Randall in his reply to a Public Question this January stated that the Council's policy was that consultations were to be fair and informed. With that in mind, will Park's Projects agree not to have any changes in car parking arrangements including charges until they have further gone to consultation giving three options. Namely, the status quo, secondly, Parks Projects' preferred options, and finally an option provided by Stanmer Stakeholders with the results of this consultation to be reported back to this committee".*

102.4 The Chair provided the following response:

*"We are exploring interim measures to address the blockage of the bus route which has been restricted on a number of occasions and sometimes cannot continue its journey leaving passengers stranded. Proposals may consider lining to remedy the problem.*

*Proposals on the wider options for parking will be consulted on at the later, detailed Stage 2 HLF application process”.*

### **103. ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**

#### **(a) Petitions**

##### **(i) Hove Station footbridge- Linda Freedman**

103.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 220 people requesting the Department for Transport and Network Rail to fund improved access to the station via Hove Station footbridge. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 27 March 2014.

103.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Mrs Freedman, thank you for your petition regarding the funding of access improvements to the existing footbridge at Hove Station. I am aware from the presentation that both you and Ms Keeble made when lodging your petition with the Mayor at the full Council meeting on 27 March that one of specific issues that you are seeking to resolve is the lack of adequate access at the northern side, especially for disabled people. I have also noted that your petition is directed to the responsible, national organisations that would be expected to have initial responsibility for such an improvement, rather than the city council. In that respect, I would like to recommend to the Committee that we note the petition and request that the Executive Director for Environment, Development & Housing writes to those organisations informing them of the improvements that you are requesting from them, and that the principle of that request is supported.”*

103.3 Councillor Janio requested that the Committee receive feedback on the matter.

103.4 The Chair stated that any response received would be circulated to the Committee members.

103.5 Councillor Cox requested that any response to the letters also be circulated to the petitioner.

103.6 The Chair stated that any circulation would include the petitioner.

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

##### **(ii) Playground in central Hove- Councillor Wealls**

103.8 The Committee considered a combined paper and e-petition signed by 219 people that requested Brighton & Hove City Council to build a playground in the central Hove area, near to West Hove Infant School. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 27 March 2014.

103.9 The Chair provided the following response:

*Thank you for your petition regarding the request for a playground in central Hove. "Playgrounds are important facilities for children to socialise play and learn and are important for their development and health.*

*We are lucky that in Brighton & Hove we have 50 playgrounds across the city and we have recently completed a program of improvements to 26 of these over the last four years, mainly using external funding. These play areas have an improved range of equipment to suit all abilities and ages and have, where possible, included much improved landscaping and other opportunities for informal play.*

*Officers have looked at the provision of playgrounds around central Hove and the closest sites are: Hove Park, Stoneham Park, Aldrington Recreation Ground and St Anns Well Gardens. These sites are between a 10 and 25 minute walk from West Hove Infant School. All these playgrounds have been improved over recent years and I am aware of how popular they are.*

*Unfortunately we are not in a position to build new playgrounds. At a time of significant budget cuts we do not have the capital resources to design and build new sites and our revenue budgets to maintain the sites we currently have are also under increasing pressure".*

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

**(iii) Crossing across Eastern Road at Sussex Square- Councillor Mitchell**

103.11 The Committee considered a petition signed by 82 people that requested Brighton & Hove City Council to install a pedestrian controlled crossing across Eastern Road at Sussex Square. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 27 March 2014.

103.12 The Chair provided the following response:

*"Thank you for your petition.*

*This location is currently under investigation following your representations. Site observations have been carried out and assessments of driver awareness and behaviour are in the process of being undertaken – as well as a review of pedestrian crossing activity.*

*This petition for a change to the form of crossing will be assessed in line with the Council's adopted procedure for pedestrian crossings and any justification for a change to the existing crossing will be brought before the ETS Committee".*

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

**(iv) Petition for Wild Park- Councillor Meadows**

103.14 The Committee considered a petition signed by 638 people requesting Brighton & Hove City Council to install physical measures to prevent incursions into Wild Park by Travellers.

103.15 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your petition and may I state that I understand the strength of feeling on this matter and assure residents that the council always takes petitions and residents concerns seriously.*

*I have discussed this matter with officers who also take residents concerns very seriously and I know there have been thorough conversations with residents on the matter.*

*The council do not welcome unauthorised encampments and act swiftly on encampments on open parks. Protection has recently been increased in Wild Park although this had not stopped incursions.*

*Officers have agreed to put further measures into place specifically, a steepening of banks to act as a deterrent.*

*It is possible that a determined element will continue to try to gain unauthorised access but we are going to invest in further protection measures and I hope these will be sufficient”*

- 103.16 Councillor Theobald stated that he sympathised with the petition and with residents. Councillor Theobald added that the Conservative Group had on several occasions formally requested for an increase in use of Section 61 powers and he believed it was a pity the other political groups had not supported those requests.
- 103.17 The Chair replied that it had been explained a number of times that only Sussex Police could use Section 61 powers and they had made it clear that these powers would be used proportionally.
- 103.18 **RESOLVED-** That the petition be noted.

## **104. MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

### **(d) Notices of Motion**

#### **(i) Dealing with flooding- Green Group**

- 104.1 The Committee considered a Notice of Motion, as detailed in the agenda, that had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 27 March 2014
- 104.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“With respect to the first part of this Notice of Motion, the Chief Executive wrote to the Secretaries of State for Environment Food and Rural Affairs, and Communities & Local Government on the 17<sup>th</sup> April. I am not aware that she has received any response, as yet.*

*With respect to the second part, the Committee will recall that it considered and approved the council’s Surface Water Management Plan on 26th November 2013. The Surface Water Management Plan identifies seven hotspots as priority locations for schemes to reduce flood risk within the city. These include locations in:*

- Ovingdean

- *Moulsecoomb*
- *Bevendean*
- *Patcham*
- *Carden Avenue/ Warmdene Road*
- *Mile Oak*
- *Blatchington Mill School*

*Considering the localised events over the winter, a meeting of technical officers took place on 11th March with representatives from the city council and our consultants, Southern Water, the Environment Agency. This began our technical review to understand how flood risk was managed in the recent emergency and to consider mitigation measures.*

*In addition, we have made an application to the Environment Agency for funding through the Flood Defence Grant in Aid and they are currently being assessed.*

*On the 6th of May, a meeting of senior officers with our partner agencies (the Environment Agency and Southern Water) has been arranged to agree what, if any, action can jointly be taken. Following this, a further meeting will be organised with the relevant interested political representatives to discuss future steps to particularly reduce flood risk in Patcham”.*

- 104.3 Councillor Theobald stated that he had pointed out at a meeting the previous day that the proposed permanent travellers site at Horsdean would only make flooding risk greater. Councillor Theobald stated that he did not believe the administration were considering such issues at the planning application stage.
- 104.4 The Chair replied that the South Downs National Park Authority and other partners of the council supported the council’s planning application for the permanent Horsdean traveller site.
- 104.5 Councillor Sykes stated that he had raised the Notice of Motion as a means to not only raise Committee awareness of the issue but also to draw attention to government Ministers of the severity of the problem, and that the recommendations of the Pitt Review had not been undertaken.
- 104.6 Councillor Janio stated that many of the requests in the Notice of Motion had already been or were in the process of implementation and he was concerned that the Notice of Motion was simply a political manoeuvre on a popular issue.
- 104.7 Councillor Hawtree stated that he was surprised at Councillor Janio’s remarks as he believed people were very concerned about environmental changes and the associated effects.
- 104.8 **RESOLVED-** That the Notice of Motion be noted.

## **105. RESPONSE TO PETITION REGARDING ROEDEAN AREA COACH PARKING**

- 105.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that set out recommendations for a Traffic Regulation Order banning coaches and HGVs in The Cliff, Cliff Approach, Roedean Crescent, Roedean

Way, Roedean Vale and Roedean Heights following a request by Committee to investigate options in response to a petition presented to their meeting on 14 January 2014.

- 105.2 Councillor Cox stated that whilst residents welcomed the report recommendations, there was some concern that the scheme would not be in place for the beginning of the main tourist season in July. Councillor Cox asked for clarification of the schedule of implementation and any legal requirements regarding illuminated signage.
- 105.3 The Head of Highways Operations replied that, subject to Committee approval, the TRO for the scheme would be advertised immediately and if there were no objections to that TRO, the scheme would be ready in June 2014. In the event there were objections to the TRO and these could not be resolved by officers, there would be a requirement for a report to return to the Committee to consider those objections which might lead to a delay. On the matter of illuminated signage, the Head of Highway Operations stated that the signs would be ready quickly and were legally required to enforce the controls.
- 105.4 Councillor Mitchell stated that local residents had asked if the signs could be put in place as soon as possible and be connected to the electricity network later.
- 105.5 The Head of Highway Operations clarified that the signs were often put into place before connection to an electricity supply although they would not be enforceable by Sussex Police and any prosecution would be open to challenge if they were not illuminated.
- 105.6 Councillor Robins asked if there were any other areas in the city that had such measures in place.
- 105.7 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that there were some HGV bans in place but these were for access to thoroughfares rather than parking restrictions.
- 105.8 Councillor Robins asked if there were any restrictions in place in the city on public service vehicles.
- 105.9 The Head of Highway Operations stated that there were not as the city's expansive public bus network meant that such measures were not feasible or logical.
- 105.10 Councillor Cox thanked officers and Members for their work on the issue and those residents who had led a sensible campaign highlighting an unacceptable situation. Councillor Cox added that residents had made a reasonable request and he was pleased this had been responded to with a pragmatic solution. Councillor Cox supplemented that he believed this was a very specific problem and did not believe it would set a precedent or cause displacement issues.
- 105.11 Councillor Robins welcomed the report as a resolution to a great nuisance caused to local residents although he was concerned such measures could set a precedent.
- 105.12 Councillor Hawtree welcomed the report and passed his congratulations to the campaigners who had brought the issue to the council's attention. Councillor Hawtree

stated that the tariff in Madeira Drive was very cheap and was pleased there were now additional tariff periods in place.

105.13 Councillor Sykes stated that the recommendations were very positive and he was glad such measures could be introduced to help residents.

105.14 Councillor Davey welcomed the report recommendations adding that enforcement was a key issue in the scheme working effectively and that residents should raise monitoring issue with Sussex Police. Councillor Davey added that he hoped any displacement from the scheme would be to Madeira Drive which now had reduced tariffs.

105.15 **RESOLVED-**

1. That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approve the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order banning heavy goods vehicles and public service vehicles except for access in The Cliff, Cliff Road, Cliff Approach, Roedean Crescent, Roedean Way, Roedean Vale and Roedean Heights
2. That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approve the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order introducing a 4-hour tariff at Madeira Drive coach parking facility.
3. That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approve the required expenditure for this Traffic Regulation Order as outlined in 3.18

**106. VOGUE GYRATORY - BUS LANE TRO REPORT**

106.1 **RESOLVED-**

1. That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves as advertised The Brighton & Hove (Lewes Road Area) (Bus Lanes) Order 2006 Amendment No.1 201\*.
2. That the ETS Committee instructs officers to implement the wider Vogue Gyrotory Improvement scheme, as set out in this report.

**107. BRIGHTON AND HOVE 20MPH LIMIT PHASE 2 - OBJECTIONS TO SPEED LIMIT ORDERS**

107.1 **RESOLVED-** That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee approves as advertised the following orders:

- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 4) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* Amendment No. \* (TRO-9b-2014) Preston Drove, Surrenden Road (between Preston Drove and Braybon Avenue) and Stanford Avenue
- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 5) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* Amendment No. \* (TRO-9c-2014) Surrenden Road (between Braybon Avenue and Ditchling Road)

## **108. QUEENS ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**

### **108.1 RESOLVED-**

1. That, having taken account of all duly made objections and representations, the Committee approves the following order:
  - Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.X 201X (Ref TRO-4a-2014)
2. That, having taken account of all duly made objections and representations, the Committee approves the following order:
  - Brighton & Hove (Junction Road, Queens Road and West Street) (One-Way Traffic and Prohibition of Right Turns) Order 2013 Amendment Order No.1 201X (Ref TRO-4b-2014)

## **109. LIVELY CITIES PROJECT - TRAFFIC ORDER CONSULTATION**

### **109.1 RESOLVED-**

1. That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following orders;
  - (a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No. \* 20\*\* (ref. TRO-8a-2014)
  - (b) Brighton & Hove (Providence Place, Ann Street & New England Street) (Weight Restriction & One-Way) Order 201\* (TRO-8b-2014)
2. That any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

## **110. SPONSORSHIP OF ROUNDABOUTS**

- 110.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that sought approval for the tendering of a concessionary agreement in which an external supplier would secure sponsorship from other

organisations for a number of roundabouts and soft landscaping displays within the city and for the annual Sussex Festival of Nature held at Stanmer Park.

- 110.2 Councillor Mitchell noted that the financial implications of the report indicated that any income generated would be treated as revenue income within the City Infrastructure budget. Councillor Mitchell stated that park cleansing had been reduced in the most recent council budget and asked if any income from this scheme might be used to reverse that outcome.
- 110.3 The Head of Strategy & Projects clarified that the report proposed ringfencing income for improvements to the sites where sponsorship would be hosted. The Head of Strategy & Projects added that some of the sites identified required greater expenditure for improvement than others.
- 110.4 Councillor Theobald noted that since the sponsorship scheme was discontinued in 2010, the Conservative Party had made several request including two Notices of Motion to re-instate the scheme. Councillor Theobald asked why it had taken four years for the administration to realise the scheme was beneficial, a decision which had come at the cost of four years worth of income in a period when it was needed most.
- 110.5 The Chair stated that he understood the previous sponsorship was included amongst a number of other packages and therefore that specific element could not be re-negotiated.
- 110.6 Councillor Sykes stated that he would like the scheme to begin as quickly as possible and asked if introduction may take longer as the value of the sponsorship was below the EU procurement threshold.
- 110.7 The Deputy Head of Law clarified that all council procurements had to follow the basic requirements of transparency and there were differing arrangements for the authority dependent on the value of the scheme.
- 110.8 Councillor Hawtree asked for further information on whether the companies considered for the contract were assessed on their business practices.
- 110.9 The Head of Projects & Strategy clarified that each applicant was assessed using the criteria set out in line with the corporate contract already in place for the council.
- 110.10 Councillor Robins enquired as to whether the council could withdraw from any agreement if the company responsible for sponsorship were implicated in unethical practice.
- 110.11 The Deputy Head of Law clarified that the council reserved the right to withhold or suspend any agreement in the event of a change in circumstances in accordance with its own guidelines on the matter.
- 110.12 Councillor Sykes stated that City in Bloom was seeking to improve the flowerbed located with the cities welcome sign ahead of their City in Bloom event in the summer.

- 110.13 The Head of Strategy & Projects stated that this location as know as Barcombe Flowerbed and council officers would be tidying this area in early May.
- 110.14 The Chair added that City in Bloom would be advertised on all roundabout signage.
- 110.15 Councillor Cox stated that he welcomed this proposal and the principle of community groups undertaking other maintenance duties as many had interesting ideas and in his opinion there were some services that did not need to be delivered by the local authority.
- 110.16 Councillor Janio stated that his agreement with Councillor Cox adding that he believed the scheme should not have been stopped in 2010. Councillor Janio added that he hoped this proposal might lead to some more imaginative ways to bring sponsorship into the city.
- 110.17 Councillor Hawtree stated is approval of the proposals and that the locations needing investment would receive it. Councillor Hawtree supplemented that he thought that further locations should have been considered in Portslade.
- 110.18 **RESOLVED-**
1. That the Committee approves the procurement of a sponsorship concessionary agreement or agreements for two lots – firstly, for roundabouts and other floral displays and secondly, for the annual Sussex Festival of Nature on the basis set out in this report. The agreement(s) would be for a period of three years with the option of a two year extension.
  2. That the Committee grants delegated authority to the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing to award and let the concessionary agreement(s).

## **111. RECYCLING INCENTIVES AND ENGAGEMENT CAMPAIGN**

- 111.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that set out proposals for an incentive and engagement campaign to increase recycling rates.
- 111.2 Councillor Daniel asked if schemes implemented elsewhere in the country had been investigated and which community groups and resident associations had been consulted.
- 111.3 The Head of Projects & Strategy replied that general trends in the country had been examined and were referenced in the report however; it had been very difficult to find data that directly related to a similar incentive scheme. The Head of Projects & Strategy added that incentive schemes were regularly introduced in conjunction with a service change and were focussed on personal incentives rather than community incentives and were quite complex. The Head of Projects & Strategy supplemented that there had also been investigation of schemes implemented in the private sector but similarly, these had been found to be very complex and high risk. The Head of

Projects & Strategy clarified that the officers had discussed the proposals with the Communities team who were also very positive to take the scheme forward but his team had not spoken directly with community or resident associations.

- 111.4 Councillor Daniel stated that technology in this field was continually improving and use of that option would provide much better clarification about recycling issues than what appeared to be an interim scheme with these proposals.
- 111.5 The Head of Projects & Strategy explained that the service did currently use technology in certain areas such as weighing that provided very useful data. However, further advancement such as individual bin chips would require significant investment specifically in fleet that was not currently plausible. The Head of Projects & Strategy added that the scheme was intended to run for two years and continuation would be reviewed at the end of that period.
- 111.6 Councillor Mitchell stated that whilst she supported the pilot, she had some reservations about whether it would work effectively as the incentive might not be clear enough to individuals. Councillor Mitchell added that there was a clear problem with recycling in the city due to very low awareness and significant changes to the service and there was a need for a campaign to address this as well as regular information updates.
- 111.7 The Chair agreed that recycling needed to be easier for residents which was one of the purposes of the introduction of communal recycling that would boost recycling levels in the long term.
- 111.8 Councillor Daniel stated that whilst she would support the proposals, she felt that service issues needed to be resolved first and foremost and then an examination of the causes of low motivation to recycle apparent in certain areas.
- 111.9 Councillor Janio stated that he found it regrettable that recycling rates were dropping under this council administration but was pleased that people were being encouraged to do the right thing. Councillor Janio added that if such a system worked, it could be a template for other service areas within the council.
- 111.10 Councillor Hawtree welcomed the report proposals and any associated improvement in recycling rates as recycling waste brought in revenue to the council whereas disposing of general waste cost the council and residents money. Councillor Hawtree expressed his regret that proposals for a food waste scheme were not supported by the opposition parties.
- 111.11 Councillor Sykes agreed that there had been extensive service disruption however, the administration were pursuing policies such as communal recycling that had seen a rise in recycling rates in those areas with the facilities.
- 111.12 Councillor Robins stated that the levels of service varied in different areas in the city and recycling rates were low in those areas that suffered the most disruption. Councillor Robins stated that he believed the service disruptions needed to be resolved before this scheme be taken forward.

111.13 The Chair stated that whilst it had been a difficult year for the recycling and refuse service, it was a good service and he commended the workforce in their attempts to provide that service in periods of difficulty. The Chair added that he hoped all Members could support the scheme.

**111.14 RESOLVED-**

1. That the Committee agrees to establish a community incentive scheme to encourage residents to recycle more. The scheme would be self funded from savings to the waste disposal budget through increased recycling.
2. That Committee agrees to an engagement campaign to encourage people to recycle more. The campaign would run for a period of 12 months and be funded from existing budgets and a projected under-spend from the DCLG communal recycling grant funding.

**112. EAST BRIGHTON PARK PARKING CONTROLS**

112.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that summarised the outcome of the recent consultation on proposals for controlled parking in East Brighton Park and based on those outcomes, recommended implementation of a scheme.

112.2 Councillor Mitchell asked for further details on the responses from the sports clubs using the park and if the side streets off Wilson Avenue had been consulted due to the risk of displacement on to those streets.

112.3 The Head of Projects & Strategy clarified that all sports groups had been written to separately however, very limited responses had been provided so this issue would be revisited during the TRO stage. Mistakenly, the local cricket club had not been individually written to but this too would be addressed at the TRO stage. The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that of the five side roads off Wilson Avenue, two fell within a CPZ. All residents in the area would be invited to comment on the proposals when the TRO was advertised.

**112.4 RESOLVED-**

1. That the Committee Members note the outcome of the consultation.
2. That the Committee approves the proposals to control parking in East Brighton Park set out in this report, subject to the statutory consultation process for Traffic Regulation Orders.
3. That the Committee approves proposals to restrict parking on Wilson Avenue with single yellow lines on the west side and double yellow lines on the East Side as set out in the consultation, subject to the statutory process for Traffic Regulation Orders.

4. That the Committee instructs officers to advertise the associated Traffic Regulation Orders.

**113. ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

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

The meeting concluded at 5.55pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of