

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

4.00pm 26 JUNE 2018

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

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

Other Members present: Councillors Barnett, Hill, Janio, Lewry, Moonan, Wealls and Yates

PART ONE

1 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

1(a) Declarations of substitutes

1.1 There were none.

1(b) Declarations of interest

1.2 There were none.

1(c) Exclusion of press and public

1.3 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).

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

2 MINUTES

2.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 March 2018 be approved and signed as the correct record.

3 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

“Officers have been very busy in recent months responding to Government consultations, progress updates and bidding for funding.

As part of the DfT Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy consultation, a response has been submitted that focused on a number of themes including road maintenance, traffic laws and enforcement and road safety training and education.

We took the opportunity to reinforce the need for change in relation to;

- Pavement parking legislation*
- Driver training for large vehicles – which are doing locally*
- Increases in uptake of Bikeability and pedestrian training – for which there is a lot of demand.*

The Transforming Cities Fund is a £840m fund for non-mayoral city regions outside London. It has a focus on increasing productivity and access to jobs by improving intra-city routes with an emphasis on public and sustainable transport.

The council led on the preparation of the bid on behalf of the Greater Brighton City Region with a priority on the coastal strip from Worthing to Seaford, including the A259. An announcement of the shortlisted regions is expected by the end of July.

We have submitted an update report to the DfT on all of the progress being made in relation to the Access Fund for Sustainable Travel that promotes access to education, employment and training. Among the many successes of this programme are:

- Visits to over 2,500 residents to discuss their travel habits and options*
- 21 travel events with local businesses*
- Delivery of cycle training and maintenance courses for adults.*

The project has now begun work in the Lewes Road corridor before moving on to the Eastern Road corridor.

The council has been accepted onto a Horizon 2020 consortium bid for funding for research into ‘user-centric electric vehicle charging’.

We have been working with the University of Sussex, Tangent Energy – a company specialising in portable battery power based at the Sussex Innovation Centre and Ricardo, the Shoreham based company that has already helped us identify areas of spare grid capacity and the best areas to site the ‘rapid chargers’.

The other cities in the bid consortium are Barcelona, Grenoble and Brussels.

The focus of the bid is the need to explore ways to meet surges in demand in a city like ours that hosts so many events, as well as other potential solutions to provide user focused improvements to the electric vehicle charging network in the city”.

4 CALL OVER

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

- Item 7: Valley Gardens Phase-Royal Pavilion to Seafront Project Programme*
- Item 8: Low Emission Zone Update*
- Item 9: Electric Vehicle Charging Points*
- Item 10: Brighton Bikeshare Expansion*
- Item 11: New Bus Shelter Requests- Priority List for Approval*
- Item 13: Portland Road Traffic Regulation Order*

- Item 14: Phone Parking Contract Tender
- Item 15: Brighton & Hove Permit Scheme End of Year Report
- Item 17: Rollout of Communal Bins
- Item 18: Management of Hove Park Tennis Courts

4.2 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 12: Zone U Resident Parking Scheme Review
- Item 16: Road Marking and Road Stud Contract
- Item 19: Procurement of Bunkered Fuel

4.3 The Chair noted that two of the reports approved and adopted requested delegation be provided to the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture and clarified that these reports would be considered by the Procurement Advisory Board before the award of contract was made.

Note: During the meeting, Items 13, 10 and 18 were brought forward on the agenda and that is reflected in the minute item order.

5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(A) PETITIONS

(i) South Portslade Parking Consultation

(ii) Parking Permits for Vale Park area

5.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 219 people and a petition signed by 173 requesting parking consultations in the South Portslade area. Due to the similar requests of the petitions, the Chair provided a joint response as follows:

“Thank you for your petition and the views expressed at the recent public meeting at the Portslade Community Centre clearly outline the problems you are encountering and I do appreciate the issues in the South Portslade area.

It was agreed through a priority timetable agreed at this Committee last October that the South Portslade area would be consulted from autumn 2019.

A further report is planned later in 2018 to outline and discuss the extent of the consultation area and the Officer recommendations will be based on the views of the residents in your area and your petition today will also be taken into consideration”.

5.2 **RESOLVED-** That the committee note the petitions.

(iii) Please make Zone J work for people south of the railway

5.3 The Committee considered a petition signed by 374 requesting the council to introduce measures to reduce pressures on parking in the Zone J area.

5.4 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition and I’m sorry to hear about the parking problems being encountered and I think it is the case that these schemes need to be reviewed after they’ve been in operation for a length of time.

Members of this Committee agreed a timetable up to 2020/21 in October last year which includes reviews of new parking schemes and we gave permission to those parking schemes, most notably in the Hanover & Elm Grove area on the basis that they would be reviewed after a year of their operation so we have to honour that commitment .

The timetable is based on a number of factors including the need to plan the extensive consultation work in the areas agreed which puts a lot of pressure on officers both at a project management and senior level.

However, we will be reviewing this timetable in light of recent requests and an update report will be presented to the ETS Committee next year which will include a review of Area J”.

5.5 **RESOLVED-** That the committee note the petition.

(C) DEPUTATIONS

(i) Consultation on a Controlled Parking Zone in the Coombe Road area

5.6 The Committee considered a deputation requesting an urgent consultation for a controlled parking zone in the Coombe Road area using Section 106 money linked to the upcoming Preston Barracks development.

5.7 Councillor Yates addressed the committee in support of the deputation noting that Section 106 funding provided an opportunity to consult on controlled parking zone outside of the agreed timetable and one was urgently needed due to the impact of the Preston Barracks development.

5.8 Councillor Hill addressed the committee in support of the deputation and requested that Saunders Park be included in the consultation due to the knock on effect a potential zone in Coombe Road would have upon residents.

5.9 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your deputation and I do understand the concerns of residents in your area which was also outlined to this Committee last year.

As I outlined previously there is a priority parking scheme timetable which runs up to 2020/21 and this was agreed by the Committee in October 2017.

The area north of Bear Road was not included in the timetable but following the allocation of external Section 106 funding for a consultation and the correspondence received, we are looking to include this consultation within the current timetable period and we will be using external support to do that which officers will look to procure.

Officers will present a report to this Committee later in the year to review the correspondence we have received including this petition as well as consideration of a viable area to consult which will take full account representations made today.

If that is agreed we could start preparation work before the end of the year and we would be looking to send out an initial consultation document early next year”.

- 5.10 Councillor West asked for further clarification as to how the area could be brought forward in the controlled parking zone consultation timetable. Councillor West added that the update report referred to should be brought to the committee in the autumn rather than in 2019 as there was too much uncertainty about the current process.
- 5.11 The Chair responded that the committee had agreed a timetable that officers were currently working to and that had given many communities confidence that they would receive a parking scheme consultation at a specific time. With regard to the response provided to the deputation, the Chair reiterated that the consultation in the area north of Bear Road could be delivered due to the availability of external funding. The Chair supplemented that the review to be received by the committee early next year would update on progress made on the timetable and detail scheduling on new requests for consultation received from residents. The Chair supplemented that the parking consultation team was small and there was limited funding available however, good progress was being made on delivering the agreed timetable.
- 5.12 Councillor Wares stated that whilst the committee had agreed a timetable, the possible introduction of a scheme north of Bear Road would have an immediate impact upon areas in Whitehawk, Moulsecomb and Coldean and place parking pressures on other areas after that. Councillor Wares stated that he believed a wider consultation was necessary, perhaps citywide.
- 5.13 The Chair replied that by way of assurance, officers would be requested to include detail of how neighbouring areas would be impacted by a parking scheme north of Bear Road and any issues could be considered in the wider progress report to be received by the committee in 2019.
- 5.14 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the deputation.

(ii) Street Bollards to Reduce Anti-Social Parking on George Street, Hove

- 5.15 The Committee considered a deputation requesting a review of street furniture in George Street, Hove to prevent anti-social parking.
- 5.16 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you Councillor Moonan and Wealls for your helpful suggestions about improvements that could be made to George Street and your commitment to help find a solution.

George Street is a busy street with many competing demands, it is mainly a pedestrian area but does obviously have to accommodate deliveries and so forth. It is the case that resources are limited but from a road safety perspective officers think that a safety audit should be undertaken to assess any risks and the current lay-out of the street will be taken into consideration as part of that assessment. This will then guide a future programme of work to deal with the key issues that have been identified. I will ask officers to keep you informed of the progress of this work. The document you brought along this afternoon will also be really helpful in guiding that”.

- 5.17 Councillor West noted that the ward councillors for Central Hove had attended a previous committee requesting an extension to the hours George Street was open to

traffic and were now asking for a reduction in parking. Councillor West stated that he was generally against adding street furniture as it created difficulties for those with impaired sight and mobility difficulties and he believed the removal of cars at all times on George Street to be the best solution.

- 5.18 Councillor Littman agreed with Councillor West and added that there was an existing system to report illegal and anti-social parking with an hour response time.
- 5.19 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that he supported the comments made by the Central Hove councillors adding that physical barriers were the only available solution.
- 5.20 **RESOLVED-** That the deputation be noted.

(iii) Ban on Juggernauts in George Street

- 5.21 The Committee considered a deputation requesting a vehicle weight restriction be introduced on George Street as a safety measure and to reduce pollution and noise.
- 5.22 The Chair provided the following response:

“By law, the businesses in George Street have to be allowed access to servicing and deliveries. The size and weight of the vehicles is determined by the logistics companies themselves and the businesses.

Environmental Traffic Orders are often used to restrict large vehicles using unsuitable routes but these relate to through traffic and within the order, access for deliveries still has to be allowed for businesses and residents. It is not possible for the council to use such an order to restrict deliveries and to do so could leave the council open to legal challenge.

I am happy to ask officers to work with you to gain an understanding of the particular deliveries carried out by these very large lorries and then to discuss this issue with the businesses concerned and to try to find out why the loading bays are not always being used”.

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

(iv) Wish Park Surgery objecting to TRO-09-2018

- 5.24 The Committee considered a deputation requesting that amendments be made to the proposed TRO-09-2018 to address concerns regarding safety and urgent access to Wish Park Surgery.
- 5.25 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for attending today and presenting your deputation about parking in Portland Road on behalf of the Wish Road Surgery Patients Participation Group. As it relates to the report Item 13 on our agenda today, so I propose that your comments are considered more fully as part of our consideration of that report and a summary of them is in the report’s appendices”.

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

- 5.27 Councillor Peltzer Dunn noted that the committee agenda had many items to consider and asked if Item 13 could be moved up the agenda due to representation at the meeting from Wish Park Surgery.
- 5.28 The Chair agreed to the request and the report would be taken as the first item of substantive business.

6 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(A) PETITIONS

(i) BikeShare Hub, George Street, Hove- Councillor Wealls

- 6.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 1,174 people requesting the Council to relocate the BikeShare rack located in George Street, Hove due to safety issues, access issues and antisocial cycling.
- 6.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“The TRO for the George Street hub was approved at ETS committee on 14th March 2017. This particular Bikeshare Hub is in the top 10 most used docking points across the entire city, attracting on average around 500 rentals from and to the facility every month. The location of the hub towards the southern end of George Street has easy access to Church Road, making it easy for users to wheel the bikes the short distance before starting to cycle. George Street has a no-cycling restriction during pedestrianised hours, 10am to 4pm, with the road open to all vehicles, including cycles, outside of those hours. The location of the hub was adapted following comments from businesses in the vicinity, resolving accessibility issues for customers. Hourbike, the operator of the scheme, is in discussions with Tesco for an additional hub to be installed on the frontage of the store on Church Road. However, the passing footfall will be much lower than on George Street and therefore a new hub is seen as an addition to George Street rather than a replacement given the demand in the area. The policy of the council is to encourage travel by sustainable modes, and removing this popular facility would impact on the overall success of the BikeShare scheme and therefore does not support that policy”.

- 6.3 Councillor West stated that he was interested to learn that the site was of the top ten docking points in the city which meant it was bringing people to George Street and boosting trade. Councillor West stated that relocating the docking point to the nearby supermarket would divert trade away from George Street. Councillor West added that reinforced his point that George Street needed to be reconfigured to a pedestrian space.
- 6.4 **RESOLVED-** That the committee note the petition.

(ii) Consultation for a CPZ in Hangelton & Knoll south of the Old Shoreham Road- Councillor Janio

- 6.5 The Committee considered a petition signed by 77 people requesting a parking consultation to the area of Hangelton & Knoll ward south of the Old Shoreham Road to alleviate displacement caused by the newly introduced parking scheme in Wish ward.
- 6.6 The Chair provided the following response:
- “I do understand the concerns of residents regarding vehicle displacement and all requests up to that point were considered in a parking scheme priority timetable report and it was agreed by members of the committee in October that the timetable would run up to 2020/21.
The timetable is based on a number of factors including the need to plan the work and extensive consultations in the areas already agreed.
However, I will be requesting officers to review this timetable in light of all recent requests and to bring an update report to this Committee next year. I would advise you to keep surveying your residents and keep in touch with officers and we will be able to consider the area in that report”.*
- 6.7 Councillor Wares asked if any potential surplus from the Section 106 funding to be used for the parking scheme consultation could be used for the area identified in the petition and other areas.
- 6.8 The Chair clarified that there was a clear requirement that Section 106 funding be spent on a designated and specific area.
- 6.9 Councillor Janio noted that the area concerned was small and it was hoped that it could join the existing Wish scheme.
- 6.10 The Chair responded that this could be taken into account as part of the progress report to be received by the committee next year.
- 6.11 **RESOLVED-** That the committee note the petition.

(C) LETTERS

(i) Mackie Avenue junction alterations- Councillors Wares, G Theobald and C Theobald

- 6.12 The Committee considered a Letter requesting the immediate implementation of the pedestrian crossing identified for Mackie Avenue as agreed by the Committee in the Pedestrian Crossing Priority List report in October 2016.
- 6.13 The Chair provided the following response:
- “At its meeting in October 2016 the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee considered a list of ten priority locations for pedestrian crossing facilities. This list of ten locations also included a recommendation that a pedestrian crossing in Marine Drive near the junction with Rifle Butt Road be reinstated to the priority list, making eleven outstanding priority locations. The report to the committee also noted that the funding needed to implement the priority list was more than provided and therefore additional funding would be required.*

Since 2016 four crossing schemes have been implemented using the annual funding made available through the Local Transport Plan (LTP) budget, leaving seven outstanding. The remaining seven priority locations in the priority order set by the Committee are as follows: -

1. *Church Road Hove near Hove Villas*
2. *Sackville Road at Old Shoreham Road*
3. *Old Shoreham Road near Olive Road*
4. *Eastern Road between Chesham Street and Chichester Place*
5. *Goldstone Villas and Station Approach*
6. *Mackie Avenue near Ladies Mile Public House*
7. *Millers Road at Highcroft Villas*

Work is ongoing to both finalise the detailed designs and to identify additional sources of funding for the remaining seven priority locations. Regarding the proposals for crossing facilities in Mackie Avenue, a satisfactory design has not yet been arrived at but it is being worked on”.

- 6.14 Councillor Wares noted that the LTP budget had decreased due funding pressures on the Shelter Hall project and stated that he found it unacceptable that residents had been waiting for the crossing for 20 months.
- 6.15 The Chair replied that the Pedestrian Crossing Priority list was being delivered with the resource available and that had clearly been set out in the report agreed by committee in October 2016.
- 6.16 **RESOLVED-** That the committee note the Letter.

(ii) Progress on previously agreed items- Councillor Wares

- 6.17 The Committee considered a Letter requesting an update on commitments given at previous meetings of the Committee.
- 6.18 The Chair provided the following response:

“Firstly, I am sorry Councillor Wares that you have not received a reply to your questions and that has meant that you have needed to bring a Letter to today’s meeting. In response to your first question, Direct Revenue Funding (DRF) of parking capital schemes was used in 2016/17 and 2017/18 to reduce future year borrowing repayments. This was taken as additional savings as part of 2018/19 budget setting and funded from the overachievement of parking income primarily due to the new parking schemes. DRF could be taken in 2018/19 to reduce future year borrowing repayments should the TBM position for parking improve sufficiently over the next few months. However, we would need to consider this alongside the overall TBM position for the council subject to the restrictions upon which parking income can be spent which may mean we could consider using this for the Local Transport Plan. In terms of historic debt relating to highways from the early 2000’s, the servicing of this debt sits within a centralised financing budget and there is currently no opportunity to restructure our external debt relating to these works.

In relation to your second question, following the meeting of the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee of 20th March 2018, officers have looked at the potential options for traffic calming in Vale Avenue. The most suitable options would likely be vertical deflection methods such as speed humps. A budget cost for such a traffic calming scheme would be in the region of £60,000 though the actual estimate would be subject to outline design work.

Officers have also looked at this road's safety record over the most recent three years and note that there has been no road traffic injury accidents along this route and as advised to the committee at its meeting in March it would be difficult to justify the diversion of resources from other roads and streets in the City where road traffic injury accidents do regularly occur and will continue to occur without road safety engineering interventions”.

6.19 Councillor Wares contended that there may be lower cost solutions to traffic calming measures on Vale Avenue such as signage.

6.20 The Chair stated that she would request officers to meet with Councillor Wares to discuss other options.

6.21 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Letter.

(iii) Recycling wheelie bins for allotments- Councillor Wares and Janio

6.22 The Committee considered a Letter requesting the Committee receive a report to a future meeting restating the Council's commitment to the Allotment Strategy, options for providing redundant wheelie bins free of charge to allotment users, options for a voluntary opt-in or opt-out arrangements on concessions for allotment users and options for a voluntary overpayment mechanism for allotment users.

6.23 The Chair provided the following response:

“The 360 wheeled bins that had been stored at Stanmer and subsequently recycled were communal bins. These are 3200ltr and made of metal and as such, it is be unlikely that they would be suitable for use on allotments or for general use elsewhere due to their size.

Plastic wheeled bins are also recycled but in far fewer numbers. However, officers have recently been in contact with Allotment Federation and the Heads of Cityclean and Cityparks have agreed that bins that would normally be recycled for such reasons as no lids or painted house numbers on the side will now be offered to allotment holders. Indeed, recently a small batch of plastic wheeled bins were delivered to the Moulsecoomb Estate allotment to trial.

In discussion with the Allotment Federation, at present there is demand to reuse split plastic wheeled bins on allotments as composters, but should that change, these too can be made available.

There is already in place a voluntary opt in opt out scheme for allotment concession payments however, allotment holders must notify the council prior to invoices being raised

Following discussions between Cityparks and the council's finance team, there is a fairly straightforward way of providing a facility for overpayments. This would involve providing plot holders with a single invoice number against which anyone wishing to make an

additional allotment payment could do so. Payments against this could then be passed to the allotment accounts. I appreciate that this is not exactly what has been asked for but would provide opportunity for anyone keen to contribute. It is intended to implement this facility in the near future.

And finally, would like reiterate that the Council is committed to the allotment strategy and will continue to work with the Allotment Federation”.

6.24 **RESOLVED-** That the committee note the Letter.

(D) NOTICES OF MOTION

(i) Commercial Recycling for Small Businesses

6.25 The Committee considered a Notice of Motion referred from the Full Council meeting of 19 April 2018 requesting the Committee agree to receive a report on options for Cityclean to provide an affordable and suitable commercial recycling service for small business and sole traders.

6.26 The Chair provided the following response:

“The Council does provide a service that is suitable for many who operate their businesses from home. Those businesses that believe they do not warrant a bin contract either because they generate a limited amount of commercial waste or its frequency is irregular can purchase commercial waste sacks for disposing of their waste.

The sacks cost just £2.25 per sack with no VAT to pay, are sold in rolls of 25 so you only pay for what you need, come with a Duty of Care Certificate, there are no monthly administration fees and the sacks can be deposited in on-street communal refuse bins. There are of course many other commercial collection providers including co-operatives such as Magpie. Furthermore, there is a local Waste Directory on the Environment Agency’s website.

Any further expansion by Cityclean into the commercial collection of the small home based business market would put at risk those co-ownership and co-operative working organisations that provide a more adapted and custom-made collection service. Some of them have been in touch with me about this motion and the potential impact on them. Given the services in place and the risk to important local agencies of any expansion of the Cityclean service, I do not believe a report to committee is necessary at this stage”.

6.27 Councillor Wares asked for clarification that the Council contractor had suspended fines to small business and sole traders not disposing of their recycling waste to the correct process.

6.28 The Chair clarified that the press had misreported the issue and there had been no suspension.

6.29 Councillor Wares asked if consideration could be given to making clear the options available to small businesses and sole traders relating to waste and if that could be hosted in one place.

6.30 The Chair replied that such a review could be undertaken and discussions were also underway regarding the creation of a designated Cityclean contact for small businesses and sole traders.

6.31 **RESOLVED-** That the committee note the Notice of Motion.

7 PORTLAND ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

7.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out proposed parking revisions to the former Gala Bingo site on Portland Road.

7.2 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that measures to combat pavement parking were welcome however; he was surprised that it was intended to retain the taxi rank as it was seldom used. Furthermore, Councillor Peltzer Dunn queried the reasoning behind allocating two loading bays in the location as many of the close by businesses were non-retail and small retailers therefore, there appeared little demand. Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked if there could be a re-consideration or postponement of that portion of the Order for further discussions to take place and for an assessment of the impact of the wider parking scheme to be assessed.

7.3 The Chair noted that recommendation 2.3 covered any further amendments that may be required.

7.4 Councillor Peltzer Dunn replied that his understanding of recommendation 2.3 was that the Order would be introduced as proposed and there would be the option of a review whereas he felt there should be a delay to that aspect for further discussion before implementation.

7.5 The Head of Parking Services explained that it was an important the Order was put into place in its entirety as if any element was postponed, postponed, it could leave the council open to legal challenge. The Head of Parking Services clarified that if the committee agreed the Order, it could be monitored and any changes reported back to the committee within six months that would be the same process as any postponement without a legal Order in place.

7.6 Councillor Peltzer Dunn noted that the Order was subsequent to the parking scheme which was already in operation so he was unclear on the logic being applied to the overall legal status.

7.7 The Head of Parking Services answered that an Order had not been placed into effect at the same time as the development of the former Gala Bingo site was complete so it was important that was addressed.

7.8 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that he believed the two Orders were standalone and that one could be approved and the other postponed for further consideration without impacting upon the legality of the parking zone as no Order currently applied to the site.

- 7.9 The Head of Parking Services clarified that the fact the Order had now been advertised that made the issue more technical and complex adding that a legal briefing could be provided subsequent to the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 17:50 and recommenced at 18:05

- 7.10 The Deputy Head of Law provided opinion that it was important to regularise the Orders detailed in recommendations 2.2 and 2.3 to ensure there wasn't a gap in relation to the wider parking zone.
- 7.11 Councillor Peltzer Dunn thanked officers for legal clarification and requested assurance that the specific area could be closely monitored with any rectification necessary reported back to committee.
- 7.12 The Chair gave assurance that officers would be closely monitoring the area and any action required would be reported back to committee for approval.
- 7.13 **RESOLVED-** That, having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections, the Committee:-

- 1) Approve the Brighton & Hove (Various Roads) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verges or Footways) Order 2013 Amendment Order No.* 201* (reference number:TRO-9a-2018) for an exclusive paid parking bay and a loading bay in Portland Road, just east of School Road;
- 2) Approve the Brighton & Hove (Various Roads) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verges or Footways) Order 2013 Amendment Order No.* 201* (reference number:TRO-9b-2018) for a no stopping or waiting on footway or verge restriction on the north side Portland Road between School Road to Shelley Road; and
- 3) Request that City Transport officers review the use of the parking and loading bays and, if required, propose any further amendments in consultation with ward councillors as part of the citywide Traffic Regulation Order.

8 VALLEY GARDENS PHASE 3 - ROYAL PAVILION TO SEAFRONT: PROJECT PROGRAMME

- 8.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out the Valley Gardens Phase 3 Core Design Objectives and requested approval of the Project Programme and to move to the next stage of the design process.
- 8.2 Councillor West noted there had been some delay to the project and he welcomed the opportunity to move forward. Councillor West stated that the roundabout represented a challenge to the project, in particular its connectivity to the A259 and A23. Councillor West stated that the area had a high accident rate for cyclists and he hoped strong proposals would be put forward to make the area safer.
- 8.3 Councillor Miller stated that the area had a lot of unused space and did need rejuvenation however, he was sceptical of some of the design options proposed such as the 'hybrid' option and a T junction that may cause more congestion.

- 8.4 Councillor Wares stated that whilst the initial proposals included exciting designs, he was minded that the area was an important cultural and heritage sight and he hoped the final design could retain that aspect. Councillor Wares asked if the traffic modelling for phase 3 would be based on the current Valley Gardens layout or whether it would be correlated to the traffic modelling for phases 1 and 2 and whether changes could be made to phases 1 and 2 if the traffic modelling for phase 3 highlighted difficulties. Furthermore, Councillor Wares queried how it was intended to link phase 3 into the other initiatives in the city and create behavioural change.
- 8.5 In response to the questions raised, the Principal Transport Planner replied that reducing the accident rate at the roundabout was a key objective of the design, that modelling for phases 1 and 2 would be reviewed as the scheme progressed and phase 3 modelling would be combined with that with the surveys currently underway creating key reference points. The Assistant Director, City Transport added that modelling from phase 3 would be fed back into the phase 1 and 2 design. Furthermore, the Traffic Network Management plan would assess the impact of other initiatives in the city on Valley Gardens and vice versa and that would be collated in the traffic modelling.
- 8.6 Referring to paragraph 7.1 of the report, Councillor Wares stated his concern relating to the other possible sources of external funding referred to as this inferred that full funding was not in place. In addition, Councillor Wares noted that no crime and disorder implications had been listed that gave the impression that lessons had not been learned from the redesign of the Level.
- 8.7 The Assistant Director, City Transport explained that funding for phase 3 was already in place and the wording of the financial implications covered opportunities to seek additional funding opportunities beyond that such as through the Local Enterprise Partnership. In relation to crime and disorder implications, the Principal Transport Planner explained that the issue would be kept under review and informed by the project at the Level and phases 1 and 2 of the Valley Gardens scheme.
- 8.8 Councillor Littman asked what mitigating measures were being made for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists during the inevitable disruption the construction for phases 1, 2 and 3 would cause.
- 8.9 The Principal Transport Planner clarified that the finalisation of the procurement was close and as soon as the construction phases were known, there would be a clearer understanding of the mitigating measures that would be required.
- 8.10 Councillor Miller asked whether any approval from Planning Committee would be required and whether that had been phased into the project timeframe.
- 8.11 The Principal Transport Planner clarified that as phase 3 mainly focussed on highway changes, it was not currently envisaged that planning consent would be required however, there was capacity with the project timeframe to obtain that if needed.
- 8.12 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee approves the Phase 3 Core Design Objectives, as set out in Appendix 2 of this report.
- 2) That the Committee approves the Three (Phase 3) Project Scenario options, as set out in paragraph 4.3 of this report to be taken forward for further investigation, to include detailed assessment of how effectively options to be developed through the Project Scenarios meet the Core Design Objectives.
- 3) That the Committee authorises officers to undertake the development of an Outline Business Case and to report this back to November 2018 ETS Committee.
- 4) That the Committee approves the Project Programme, as set out in Appendix 3 of this report.
- 5) That the Committee requests officers to fully brief and consult its Lead Councillors as the preliminary design work progresses.

9 BRIGHTON BIKESHARE EXPANSION

- 9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided an update on the expansion plan and new sites identified for the Brighton & Hove BikeShare scheme.
- 9.2 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Wares moved the following motion to amend recommendation 2.1 and add recommendation 2.2 as shown in bold italics and strikethrough below:
 - 2.1 That Committee Members note the success of the Bikeshare scheme and **support** the expansion plan for the west of the City
 - 2.2 ***That the existing site at George Street, Hove is reviewed together with alternative and/or additional nearby sites, to ensure usage is maximised, safe cycling is supported, pedestrians are safe and all residents and nearby businesses benefit from the locations chosen.***
- 9.3 Introducing the motion, Councillor Wares explained that it linked directly to the petition presented earlier in the meeting by Councillor Wealls and the problems detailed therein. Councillor Wares made clear that the motion requested a review of the location and not instant removal of the hub.
- 9.4 Councillor Miller formally seconded the motion.
- 9.5 Councillor Atkinson thanked officers for the report welcomed confirmation that the scheme would be extending to Portslade.
- 9.6 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that he felt the report downplayed the success of the scheme that in his view had been phenomenal.
- 9.7 Councillor Miller asked if one of the three additional locations identified in paragraph 3.7 would be in Rottingdean.

- 9.8 The LSTF Project Manager confirmed that Rottingdean was one of the three locations to be determined.
- 9.9 Councillor West stated the scheme had been encouraging for the city including the visitor economy and health and acknowledged the input of former Councillor Davey. Councillor West stated that the proposed motion dampened the positive news of the report and he could not support the review and possible removal of a very successful hub.
- 9.10 Councillor Littman agreed with the comments made by Councillor West and acknowledged the comments made by the Chair that the George Street, Hove hub was one of the top ten most popular in the city. Councillor Littman requested that the recommendations 2.1 and 2.2 in the motion be taken separately.
- 9.11 Councillor Wares explained that his motion proposed moving not removing the hub and could be incorporated into the upcoming work on other sites identified in the report.
- 9.12 The Chair then put recommendation 2.1 of the motion to the vote that passed
- 9.13 The Chair then put recommendation 2.2 of the motion to the vote that failed.
- 9.14 The Chair then put the recommendations, as amended to the vote that passed.
- 9.15 **RESOLVED**-That the Committee note the success of the BikeShare scheme and support the expansion plan for the west of the City.

10 LOW EMISSION ZONE UPDATE

- 10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided an update on the Low Emission Zone in North Street and Western Road introduced in January 2015 and requested approval to introduce an upgraded bus based Ultra-Low Emission Zone in the area.
- 10.2 Councillor West expressed his disappointment that no proposal was forthcoming to challenge cars and lorries entering the area to be low emission. Councillor West stated that a step change was required to improve air quality that needed to go beyond measures applied to buses alone.
- 10.3 The Chair noted that the bus companies had delivered one year earlier than expected on retrofits that demonstrated their commitment to improving air quality. In addition, the Chair referred to paragraph 4.4 that clearly set out the other measures being introduced in the city and future options.
- 10.4 Referring to paragraph 4.4, Councillor Atkinson asked how straightforward it would be to clearly distinguish a group of private vehicles.
- 10.5 The Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager answered that there were various methods to prohibit or charge vehicles to enter a zone. One such method was the introduction of

a Clean Air Zone that was wider in scope than the targeted method of a Low Emission Zone.

- 10.6 Councillor Littman welcomed the report that demonstrated the council was moving in the right direction on air quality and the good relations with local bus service providers. Councillor Littman expressed his disappointment that high emission vehicles such as taxis and private vehicles could continue to travel through the Low Emission Zone. Councillor Littman added that permitting heavy vehicles and lorries with poor emission standards would not achieve a zero emission standard and he urged continued work to be made.
- 10.7 Councillor Wares congratulated the bus companies on meeting the challenge to retrofit buses ahead of time and their continued commitment. Councillor Wares added that the timetable for the next stage was challenging and it was important for all partners and stakeholders to work hard to that end.

10.8 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee authorises an application to the Traffic Commissioner to amend the current Traffic Regulation Condition which established the Euro V bus based Low Emission Zone in Castle Square, North Street and Western Road to extend to the junction with Palmeira Square with a provisional start date of 1 January 2019.
- 2) That the Committee declares that the new conditions of the Ultra-Low Emission Zone will require that all new Public Service Vehicles operating in the zone should meet as a minimum the Euro VI emission standard, with only the licensed exemptions set out in this report. Bus operators will have until October 2024 to replace or convert all buses entering the Low Emission Zone to the new Euro VI standard.
- 3) That the Committee removes the current exemption for low frequency bus routes in the zone and authorises that the 'Low Emission Zone Guidance for Bus Operators' be updated in line with the new operating criteria.

11 ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING POINTS

- 11.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that requested approval for the expansion of the city's electric vehicle charging infrastructure following a successful bid to the Government's Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) for £300,000 worth of funding.
- 11.2 Councillor Atkinson congratulated officers for successfully bidding for funding. Councillor Atkinson noted that as recent report by Electric Brighton that detailed that there were 272 plug-in vehicles operating in the city that was a 12% growth in the past three months alone and that figure was expected to rise to 600 by the end of 2019. Councillor Atkinson stated that the same report highlighted the difficulty for electric vehicle owners to charge their vehicles and the high number of people who would purchase an electric vehicle if there were more charging points so the award of funding would go some way to removing those obstacles. Councillor Atkinson asked if there were any proposals for electric charging points in north or south Portslade as none were listed on the map on page 79.

- 11.3 The Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager answered that the 200 points identified were initial forecasts where it was known that a lamppost was located next to a parking bay and met other associated criteria. The Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager added the tendering process would determine how many points could be installed and if that number was above the initial forecasts, other locations in the city could be considered where they met the criteria.
- 11.4 Referring to paragraph 3.7, Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked how road markings and signage would help prevent trailing charging wires. Furthermore, Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked if permit holders could only use charging points in the zone that their permit was valid except out of restricted hours. In addition, Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked whether those with visitor permits could use charging points in the zone that their permit was valid and for confirmation that there would be difficulties in finding a parking bay with an electric charging point during restricted hours as they would almost certainly be occupied by permit holders.
- 11.5 The Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager confirmed that anyone with a visitor permit would be able to use a charging point within the zone their permit was designated to and anyone would be able to occupy an electric charging point bay outside of designated hours. In relation to road marking and signage, the Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager clarified that this was intended to prevent wires being extended to a distance further away from the charging point than was safe to such as over several parking bays. In relation to availability and demand upon electric charging point parking bays, the Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager explained that officers were considering designating bays with some as mandatory electric charging point bays and some as advisory or shared bays with that system adapting over time as electric vehicle ownership increased.
- 11.6 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that the designation of mandatory and advisory bays did not appear to be detailed in the report.
- 11.7 The Chair advised that the designation was detailed at recommendation 2.4 of the report.
- 11.8 Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked for clarification on whether the advisory bays would be in line with the proposal detailed at paragraph 3.7.
- 11.9 The Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager clarified that the proposal was for all electric charging point bays to be designated for use by permit holders with a small number identified as an advisory electric charging point bay and a smaller number still designated as a mandatory electric charging point bay where it could be demonstrated that there was significant difficulty in electric vehicle owners being able to access the bay. That process would follow the standard traffic regulation order process.
- 11.10 Councillor Littman asked for clarification that the committee was being requested to transfer to a partner organisation its existing charging point infrastructure for £100,000 and if that was the case, whether that represented value for money, what the return would be and how the transfer and contract would be monitored.

- 11.11 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture answered that with new or emerging technology, an environment had to be created where sufficient infrastructure was available for people to feel confident to buy that new technology. Therefore, it was proposed to use the government funding available to subsidise the initial rollout of that infrastructure. The council's existing infrastructure would be transferred to a partner organisation that would invest 25% of the costs in improving that infrastructure and be responsible for supplying, operating and maintaining that infrastructure. In return, the council would receive fees in return for driver charging by the operator. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture stated that the council did not currently charge for use of its electric charging points and the pilot would give opportunity to understand the implication of the rollout of infrastructure on electric vehicle ownership, how electric charging bays would work in the council's existing parking regulations and schemes and that learning would be used by the council and government to determine what the next stage would be.
- 11.12 Councillor Wares stated that he understood the funding awards for such contracts was typically around £100,000 so the award of £300,000 in this instance was very positive. Referring to paragraph 7.3, Councillor Wares asked if the service could not be operated by the council due to the statutory regulations around sale of electricity or whether the council purchased the electricity and passed it to the partner organisation who then in turn sold that to vehicle operators. Councillor Wares asked that if it was the latter, what assurances could be provided relating to the risk that the council was reliant upon the return of that sale by the partner organisation and suggested that any revenue come first to the council who would then pay the providers. Councillor Wares supplemented that there was no information in the report as to how long the contract would be in place, the percentage of revenue share and payment terms and how the council's infrastructure would be returned. Councillor Wares suggested that once the concession contract had been drawn up, that it be circulated to lead Members to assist their understanding.
- 11.13 The Chair stated that she could give assurance that lead Members would be kept updated and informed in the most appropriate way.
- 11.14 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture clarified that councils could sell electricity but only from a specified list of energy produced from renewable sources.
- 11.15 Councillor Miller stated that it was unclear what the rate of the return to the council would be and other details were vague such as who would pay for the existing electricity and who would be liable for the increased electric bill when the charging points became more widespread.
- 11.16 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture explained that up to the point of transfer, the council was liable to pay electric bills. The post-transfer arrangement would be part of the concession contract. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture acknowledged that because the matter was moving rapidly, there had not been opportunity to address all the matters raised comprehensively however, the Chair had given a commitment to keep Members informed in the best possible manner before and throughout the award of contract.
- 11.17 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the committee notes the award of £300,000 OLEV (75% funding) to the council for new electric vehicle charging points and delegates authority to the Executive Director to procure a concession contract the terms of which will require the private sector partner to invest £100,000 (25% funding) and to supply, operate and maintain the council's charging point infrastructure in return for a proportion of the fees received from the driver for charging.
- 2) That the committee notes that the transfer of the existing free electric vehicle charging point infrastructure and any awards from subsequent successful funding bids for charging or related infrastructure during the term of the concession will be included within the scope of this concession contract.
- 3) That the committee approves the submission of further bids to OLEV and other Central Government departments or bodies for on-street charging infrastructure, in areas with no off-street parking, as well as for charging points for buses, coaches, car clubs and taxis, and bicycles at other locations in the city.
- 4) That the committee notes that officers have delegated authority to advertise Traffic Regulation Orders to allow for the designation of mandatory bays for the use of electric vehicles in those cases where an advisory bay has proved to be ineffective and further notes that any objections to mandatory bays will be brought back to committee.
- 5) That the committee notes that officers will be working to facilitate the expansion of the rapid charging infrastructure with private sector partners and UK Power Networks.

12 MANAGEMENT OF HOVE PARK TENNIS COURTS

- 12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture requested approval of a proposal for self-management of Hove Park tennis courts.
- 12.2 Councillor Atkinson welcomed the proposal and that it would operate as a co-operative model.
- 12.3 Councillor Brown stated that both she and Councillor Bennett as ward councillors for Hove Park ward were supportive of the proposal and the wider initiatives such as support for those living in poverty and mental health issues. Councillor Brown asked for assurance that the court nets would be replaced by the council ahead of transfer and expressed her hope that residents would be given sufficient time to use the courts that was an issue that should be monitored.
- 12.4 The Head of Operations- CityParks confirmed that the nets had recently been replaced and there would be a further check on their condition at the point of handover.
- 12.5 **RESOLVED-**
 - 1) That the Committee accept in principle the proposal put forward by Hove Park Tennis Alliance [HPTA] for the self-management of Hove Park Tennis Courts as set out at Appendix 1;

- 2) The Committee note that should the proposal be accepted in principle the proposal will be publicly advertised and any objections considered
- 3) That the Committee delegate the agreement of the final detail of the lease/license to the Executive Director Economy Environment and Culture

13 NEW BUS SHELTER REQUESTS - PRIORITY LIST FOR APPROVAL

- 13.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out five priority bus shelter sites for approval following the application of a robust methodology of over 100 potential sites.
- 13.2 Councillor West noted that a shelter had been ruled out at Stanmer Park due to its proximity to listed buildings and asked if any other options had been considered for a shelter more appropriate to the location.
- 13.3 The Senior Project Manager clarified that other options had been considered and what would be appropriate for the location would be a purpose made wooden shelter. The Senior Project Manager added that the priority list had a set timescale and it was not deemed likely that the location at Stanmer Park could be delivered within that timescale due to the possible need to obtain planning approval
- 13.4 The Chair stated that a suitable shelter could be considered as part of the wider Stanmer Park project.
- 13.5 Councillor Wares observed that there may be an anomaly in the initial criteria in that it was scored on number of requests received. Hypothetically, a shelter could be built in a location that had a low number of users but high number of requests and conversely, a shelter may not be built in a location with a high number of users due to a lack of requests. Councillor Wares added that he hoped a demonstration of how the scoring had been reached in future versions of the report as that would help Members explain the outcome to their residents.
- 13.6 The Chair confirmed that the scoring could be included in future reports on the matter received by the committee.
- 13.7 Councillor Atkinson welcomed the inclusion of New England Rise on the priority list as the area had a high number of elderly residents. Councillor Atkinson acknowledged the previous campaign work on the matter made by former Councillor Bob Carden.
- 13.8 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approve the five bus shelter locations listed in Appendix B be implemented as soon as possible.

14 ZONE U - RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME REVIEW

- 14.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee agrees that a detailed design consultation takes place in the Zone U (St Luke's Area) (Appendix A) on an extension to Zone C (Queens Park) parking scheme (9am-8pm Seven days).

15 PHONE PARKING CONTRACT TENDER

- 15.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval to undertake a competitive tendering process to procure and award a new phone parking contract.
- 15.2 Councillor Miller noted that the current system charged 30p for a text with a receipt and asked if consideration could be given to making the facility opt-in rather than opt-out.
- 15.3 The Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager clarified that the issue had been raised with the provider however, the app was based on a national model and the app had been built to be opt-out rather than opt-in. The Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager stated that other areas of the country used a gateway system where users could choose one of multiple apps and was something that could be considered in the future.
- 15.4 Councillor Wares noted that more residents and visitors were paying for parking by phone and asked if that could give opportunity to reduce the 10p cost of service.
- 15.5 The Parking Strategy & Contracts Manager clarified that there was a fixed fee for every card payment that the 10p service charge covered so there was currently no opportunity to reduce the fee.
- 15.6 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee grant delegated authority to the Executive Director for Economy Environment and Culture to take all steps necessary to:
- 1) Procure and award a new phone parking contract for a term of two years.
 - 2) Approve an extension to the contract referred to in 2.2 above for a period of up to three years following the initial two year term, subject to satisfactory performance by the provider.

16 BRIGHTON & HOVE PERMIT SCHEME END OF YEAR REPORT

- 16.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval to publish the end of year report detailing performance of the Brighton & Hove road and street works permit scheme and to implement a coring programme in the city.
- 16.2 Councillor Atkinson welcomed the report that had been of enormous benefit to residents.
- 16.3 Councillor Littman congratulated officers on what was a great scheme for the city.
- 16.4 Councillor Wares commended the scheme that had been of significant benefit to the city. Councillor Wares asked if the coring programme should be proactive rather than reactive to minimise disruption and only conduct necessary work.
- 16.5 The Head of Traffic Management stated that it was very difficult to ascertain from a visual inspection whether work had been completed to a satisfactory standard as that was determined by how the core compaction and the materials used.

16.6 Councillor West asked for confirmation that there would be a likely 60% failure rate as that was a very high figure.

16.7 The Chair confirmed the figure was accurate adding that the purpose of the coring programme was to create behavioural change.

16.8 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approves the publishing of the end of year report and future year's reports including sending a copy to the Department for Transport.
- 2) That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approves the delegation of the decision to implement a coring programme in the city to the Assistant Director for City Transport.

17 ROAD MARKING AND ROAD STUD CONTRACT

17.1 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee approve the procurement of a contractor for a five year period (with the option to extend for up to two years) to maintain and implement all existing and new road markings and road studs on the City's roads.
- 2) That the Committee grants delegated authority to the Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture to:
 - (i) carry out the procurement and award of the contract referred to in 2.1 above;
 - (ii) extend the contract referred to in 2.1 above for period(s) up to a total maximum of 2 years should he/she consider it appropriate at the relevant time.

18 ROLLOUT OF COMMUNAL BINS

18.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval on the location of communal bins for Arundel Terrace, Chichester Terrace, Lewes Crescent and Sussex Square following a consultation with residents.

18.2 Councillor Miller noted that consultation document had initially proposed seven communal refuse bins and the final document of proposed locations identified four bins. Councillor Miller asked if that meant the bins would be collected more frequently due to the reduction in number.

18.3 The Head of Operations- Cityclean clarified that the bins would be emptied daily.

18.4 Councillor Miller expressed his support for the proposals as ward councillor for the area.

- 18.5 Councillor West asked for assurance that the bins would be collected as the current level of service was very poor and was something the current administration urgently needed to take action on.
- 18.6 The Chair stated the bins would be collected daily adding that lessons had been learnt from the strike action taken under the previous administration.
- 18.7 Councillor Wares stated that he hoped the more efficient service in the consultation area would have a wider impact on collections across the city.
- 18.8 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee notes the outcome of the communal refuse and recycling consultation in Arundel Terrace, Chichester Terrace, Lewes Crescent and Sussex Square.
 - 2) That the Committee approves the placement of communal refuse and recycling for Arundel Terrace, Chichester Terrace, Lewes Crescent and Sussex Square as shown at Appendix 2.

19 PROCUREMENT OF BUNKERED FUEL

19.1 RESOLVED- That the Committee:

- 1) Approve the procurement for the supply of diesel, based on the most competitive rates for the next four years;
- 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.

20 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

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

The meeting concluded at 8.35pm