

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

**4.00pm 22 JUNE 2021**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Heley (Chair) Wilkinson (Opposition Spokesperson) and Nemeth (Group Spokesperson)

**PART ONE**

**1 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**1(a) Declarations of substitutes**

1.1 There were none.

**1(b) Declarations of interest**

1.2 Councillor Nemeth declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 7 as his partner was a current allotment holder.

**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(I) of the Act).

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

**2 MINUTES**

2.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 March 2021 be approved and signed as the correct record.

**3 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

3.1 There were none.

**4 CALL OVER**

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

- Item 9: Food Waste Collection Service Update
- Item 13: Waterhall Wilding Project
- Item 14: Local Transport Plan 5 Initial Engagement
- Item 17: TRO-12-2021
- Item 18: The National Bus Strategy

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 8: National Resources and Waste Strategy- Responses to Government Consultations
- Item 10: Commercial Bins on the Highway: Outcome of Public Consultation
- Item 11: Environmental Enforcement Framework
- Item 12: Binrastructure Strategy
- Item 15: Network Management Action Plan
- Item 16: Parking Policies

## **5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

### **(A) PETITIONS**

#### **(i) TRO on Sydney Street**

5.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 39 people requesting a rejection of the weekday closure of Sydney Street and reinstitute restricted access.

5.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition and your points are really well made. I use the area a lot as well so I do understand.

The Current Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) for the North Laine area is due to be reviewed shortly and a report will be presented to ETS Committee by December, We are gathering further information to support this report including traffic counts and will be organising discussions with key stakeholders including disability groups, cycling groups, businesses and residents.

The findings of these discussions and comments on the formal ETRO consultation will help form a recommendation for the future report”.

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

### **(B) PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

#### **(1) Air pollution**

5.4 Adrian Hill read the following question:

“Ella Kissi-Deborah’s prevention of future deaths report said ‘Delay in reducing the levels of atmospheric air pollution is the cause of avoidable deaths.’ We in Brighton suffer illegal air pollution with NO2 just as high as Ella was exposed to. I’m right in concluding this prevention of future deaths report by the coroner applies to Brighton just as much as it does to London. Can I have an update on the urgent changes that are required such as Clean Air Zone, electric buses, trams and preventing new building configurations that make pollution dispersal and exposure worse?”

5.5 The Chair provided the following reply:

“We agree that air pollution is a serious, public health issue and is one of the many reasons it’s important to provide opportunities for active travel. We continue to work with all of the city’s public transport operators, including buses and taxis, to reduce the effects of emissions from vehicles and have recently combined council funding with that secured from the Government for retrofitting bus exhaust systems to reduce emissions by up to 90% in some cases. We are also working with partners to bid for funding to support the use of zero emission buses and lorries and the associated infrastructure required to make this possible. We are also developing a new Local Transport Plan, which you can hear more about later on this agenda. It recognises the need to address emissions that affect our air quality and the ways in which we can do this. The development of a wider Ultra Low Emission Zone is one of those and following the report the committee considered earlier in the year, funding is now being allocated to enable further work. We will also have the benefit of the results of the latest annual Air Quality Status Review soon, and this will be followed by the development of an Air Quality Action Plan. Many of these measures will be included and people will have the opportunity to express their views on what is proposed. When determining planning applications in the city, officers and councillors take into account recognised guidance and approved policies, including those in the City Plan. These focus on the protection of the environment and health in terms of pollution and nuisance. Specialist advice is provided by our Air Quality Officer who responds on the potential impacts on air quality. This can include consideration of the design, height and alignment of buildings as well as encouraging emission-free developments without combustion on site and supporting renewable energy sources such as solar panels. Requiring sustainable travel measures such as walking infrastructure and cycle parking will also contribute to mitigating or minimising emissions from vehicle trips, by encouraging travel behaviour change and providing healthy, clean and zero carbon alternatives”.

5.6 Adrian Hill asked the following supplementary question:

“Does the future deaths report apply to Brighton?”

5.7 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I’m happy to take a closer look at it but I do recognise that we’ve often had illegal levels of pollution that are very dangerous”

**(2) Seafront Signage**

5.8 Chris Murgatroyd read the following question:

“Now that large “Bin it or take it home” banners have appeared on metal barriers in the Pedestrian Zone on the Lower Promenade, between the Peace Statue and the Artists Quarter, to discourage littering, will BHCC finally also install signs to discourage cycling in the Pedestrian Zone, except in the exercise of a lawful right or privilege - for example like the “Be kind, Be considerate” sign on the barriers near Hove Lagoon, which politely encourages people to cycle on the cycle lane, or to push their bike if they want to stay on the Lower Promenade?”

5.9 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Yes, officers are looking for further appropriate locations to mount the temporary ‘Be kind, Be considerate’ signs”

5.10 Chris Murgatroyd asked the following supplementary question:

“Are there any circumstances in which the Council will put up signs of any kind in the Pedestrian Zone between the Peace Statue and the Artists Quarter, to keep people safe and discharge its duty of care to staff, residents and others, by reminding everybody that cycling is not permitted on the Lower Promenade, save in the exercise of a lawful right or privilege - and so that there is something to point at, when a polite request to dismount is met with a surly “where does it say that?”, or often much worse?”

5.11 The Chair provided the following reply:

“There are already quite a few there but we can ask the Seafront Team to look at the matter again”

### **(3) Public Convenience refurbishment**

5.12 Derek Wright read the following question:

“In October 2018 a report/decision was made on how to finance their refurbishment, since then nothing has happened. When will the Daltons, Colonnade, Pavilion Gardens, Kings Esplanade toilets be modernised?”

5.13 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Sadly, due to other priorities and Cityclean’s response to the pandemic, the team has not been able to progress the refurbishment work as planned following the October 2018 decision.

A report had been due to go to committee for decision in March 2020 to progress the project. That did not go ahead and so the necessary decisions were not made. Following this, Cityclean has had to absolutely focus on delivering core statutory services.

I am pleased to let you know that work has restarted and an update on the refurbishment programme will be shared at Policy & Resources Committee on 1 July”.

5.14 Derek Wright asked the following supplementary question:

“People use the lower promenade as a toilet, urinating against the gates of the passageway that goes under the pier. Can you look at improving the toilet signage on the lower promenade, making it bigger and bolder so that people are directed to the toilets underneath the zip wire?”

5.15 The Chair provided the following reply:

“We can look into that”.

#### **(4) Seafront Disabled Parking Bays**

5.16 Pippa Hodge read the following question:

“Video surveillance (12/9/20) of the 7 A259 seafront disabled bays was finally produced on 14/5/21. It notes a wheelchair user forced to travel in the cycle lane to access their vehicle, swerving bikes, bay abuse (eg Brighton Bike Hire) and only one mention of a wheelchair ramped van.

BADGE have been sharing photographic evidence of Inaccessibility & Danger since August. In March we were promised 5 safer Northside bays. Still nothing. Under your Active Travel Scheme ‘our’ seafront remains inaccessible for a second summer. Do Councillors find it acceptable that 10 months later, Officers still haven’t addressed these grave concerns?”

5.17 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question Pippa and for all your continued engagement, it’s really appreciated.

As part of the phase 1 works on the seafront there was no change to the number of disabled bays, but some are offset from the kerb with additional space provided either side to ensure additional safety and access at these locations. We do recognise that while this meets the design standards, people do still need to take care when near vehicles or for passengers exiting vehicles, due to the location. So we do recognise why it is still potentially dangerous to some users.

We are currently investigating additional parking bays along the seafront to further improve access. Council Officers are still investigating the viability of additional disabled bays, as there are a number of factors to consider and residents and businesses to consult and these matters do take time. I have asked Officers to continue to keep you updated.

So, to answer your question directly, I do think it’s probably taking too long but we’re doing all we can to speed it up”.

5.18 Pippa Hodge asked the following supplementary question:

“By failing to reduce physical barriers, by failing to ensure disabled people are not impeded from accessing areas of the city they would otherwise be able to and by not acting on our feedback which repeatedly raised the issue of seafront accessibility and danger for 10 long months and with these risks being identified and written into the council’s Covid-19 urgent response action plan equalities impact assessment, does this mean that Brighton & Hove Council continue to be in breach of their own equalities

impact assessment and have therefore failed to meet their public sector equalities duties?”

5.19 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The council does not feel that we are contravening equality legislation but that doesn’t mean we can’t do more and go above and beyond so we’ll continue to look at it with you”.

## **(5) Brighton Racecourse footpaths**

5.20 Mark Strong read the following question:

“Recently Brighton Racecourse closed footpaths west of the grandstand, citing the need for a secure area on race days due to COVID. While not public footpaths, they have been well used for decades, providing safe links towards Woodingdean and Whitehawk, avoiding sections of Freshfield Road with no footway. There has been no EqIA or consideration of disabled people.

We understand officers have tried to negotiate permissive access. Can the Chair update us explaining how access might be restored without an arduous Public Inquiry. In particular, how will the council use its membership of the Racecourse Trustees Board to restore access?”

5.21 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you and you’re right that we have also been raising this as I know ward councillors have too. Officers are seeking to negotiate permissive access for non-race days and those discussions are live and ongoing. We appreciate how important accessing this open space is to residents living nearby and agree that access for disabled people needs to be considered too.

The issue is that in the absence of agreed permissive access, the council as landowner cannot require the racecourse to provide the access.

An alternative option would be for those residents who have enjoyed uninterrupted access for over 20 years to submit an application to the council for an amendment to the Definitive Map for the access to be dedicated as public rights of way. The evidence submitted would be examined by the Highways legal team and an assessment report submitted to council ETS Committee. If no decision were made, or the decision contested, this may result in the matter being handed on to the Planning Inspectorate for adjudication and a possible public inquiry.

The council is represented on the Racecourse Trustees Board by Cllr Williams and Cllr West and any representation on the matter would be their decision, but I am sure they would be willing to raise this, and we can speak to them about it”.

## **(C) DEPUTATIONS**

### **(1) Pavement Obstructions**

5.22 The Committee considered a Deputation that outlines the needs for improved standards, better oversight and enforcement to keep the city's footways clear of obstructions and requested action to keep pavements safe.

5.23 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your Deputation, you raised very important points.

The council does recognise the issues caused by commercial bins on the city's highways, roads and pavements. We are committed to tackling this and I am pleased that on today's agenda, councillors are being asked to approve a model to remove these from a number of roads in the city to make them safer and more accessible. If Committee approves the recommendations, businesses in time-banding zones will only be able to place bins out between 6am and 9am and 6pm and 9pm – at all other times, bins and bags must be off the highway, otherwise they may receive a Fixed Penalty Notice.

Another item on today's agenda is proposing a public consultation on introducing enforcement measures for wheelie bins and boxes, which can also cause obstructions. Subject to approval from committee, following the public consultation, a report will be presented to a future meeting with a proposal on how this can work.

The council is also planning on carrying out a full review of its highway licensing policies later in the year. These policies have not been reviewed for some time and recent legislation changes to pavement licences means that changes to the policies need to be considered. The Highway Enforcement team are also recruiting additional temporary staff over the summer months to help support the work of this essential team in keeping outside seating and shop displays under control.

Safe and easy access around the positioning of street furniture items that are installed as part of a project will have been considered using guidance from the Inclusive mobility document and Manual for streets. Projects will carry out an Equalities Impact Assessment as part of that process”.

5.24 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Deputation.

## **6 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**

### **(A) PETITIONS**

#### **(1) Reduce resident parking permit fees**

6.1 The Committee considered a petition referred from Full Council and signed by 58 people requesting the council reduce resident parking permit fees.

6.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Parking charges are reviewed annually by the Council alongside wider environmental considerations that aim to reduce congestion, improve traffic management and improve air quality. The surplus generated from charges after direct costs contributes towards the part funding of bus subsidies, concessionary bus fares and Local Transport Plan costs. Recent charges were voted on at a meeting of all councillors back in February, when we hold budget council.

As part of this we also wanted to specifically address concerns about affordability and so brought forward proposals, agreed as part of the fees & charges proposals for 21/22, that a discount for low income households would be introduced - which is planned to be brought in within a few months”.

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

**(2) Create 45-degree parking bays on Roedale road to improve local residents quality of life**

6.4 The Committee considered a petition referred from Full Council and signed by 41 people requesting the council create 45-degree parking bays on Roedale Road.

6.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“The feasibility of this will be considered when we consult the area for a resident parking scheme. This will begin at the end of the year with the consultation due in early 2022. I am sorry this cannot be looked at before the parking scheme design takes place but it’s important this work is undertaken alongside the wider area. We need to ensure that when we consult the area the full impact of any changes to parking is communicated to all residents as part of that process”.

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

## **7 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

### **(B) WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

#### **(1) Freshfield Road Safety**

7.1 Councillor Childs put the following question:

“Following the petition for a crossing and traffic calming on Freshfield Rd in January, when will action be taking to address ongoing speeding and provide a crossing to keep children travelling to school safe?”

7.2 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Following the petition received in January, a mobile vehicle speed activated sign was installed on Freshfield Road. The sign was in place for approximately six weeks in March and April. During this time, speed data was collected from this equipment which showed an average speed of just under 22mph and a calculated upper range speed of 27mph.

We recognise that residents have concerns about school safety and want to promote a safer walk to school. As you’ll be aware this is one of the key principles behind, for example, our school streets programme and our ongoing work on active travel, so we share the aspirations of residents about the walk to school.

However, as you’ll also be aware, resources are limited. Interventions take place within this context and there is a need to prioritise areas where there is a collision history.

Based on this information that is the National Standard methodology for assessing local design speed and the collision history at this location which I'm pleased to say is good, this area would therefore be low priority when compared to other locations across the city where there are both higher speeds and higher accident figures. However, I will ask Officers to continue to monitor the situation and report back if there are any significant changes at this location. The original request for an upgrade to the existing informal crossing remains on the pedestrian crossing priority list for consideration as part of the next round of assessments.

A School Street road closure is currently being trialled at St Luke's Primary school. Officers are working on developing a School Streets programme and are in the process of assessing the eligibility of every infant, junior and primary school in the city for a closure. Queen's Park Primary School is included in this assessment. A report will be presented to the next meeting of the ETS Committee in September for consideration by members"

7.3 Councillor Childs asked the following supplementary question:

"In January you responded to my question saying that the current procedure for assessing whether to install road safety measures would be reviewed as it is currently based on accidents and incidents and I think it was agreed that wasn't fit for purpose. I wonder if you could provide an update on whether this policy has been changed and if not, a timescale for that?"

7.4 The Chair provided the following reply:

"I'll have to get back to you on that. We don't have one, but we need one"

## **(2) Verge and pavement parking**

7.5 Councillor Childs put the following question:

"Will the Committee implement an ETO to prevent verge and pavement parking in Valley Gardens?"

7.6 The Chair provided the following reply:

"An Experimental Traffic Regulation order would not work in this situation as currently the council do not have powers to enforce verge and pavement parking for particular circumstances.

The Government's Department for Transport consultation on various possible options to tackle pavement parking closed in November last year and it generated more than 15,000 responses. The council inputted to this highlighting our current concerns.

One option suggested by the consultation to address unnecessary obstruction of pavements would not need any additional signage and officers could therefore enforce straight away. The alternative of a London-style complete pavement parking ban would require us to survey the city's streets, consult with residents and sign streets only where pavement parking is to be permitted. However, this could take another two years to complete.

I am pleased to say that the council is represented on the national Joint Committee for parking by our colleague, Cllr Steve Davis, and it receives regular updates on the

progress with pavement parking enforcement. Our expectation is that whatever choice is made by the Government the council will finally be in far stronger position to tackle this issue and make our streets safer and more accessible for people and less dominated and damaged by vehicles.

In the meantime, we can make minor changes to roads to mitigate the risk of pavement parking and these options are being currently considered by officers. One such example is to install dropped kerbs to allow access to driveways or frontages where this is safe and feasible. Officers could then enforce if drivers park adjacent to a dropped kerb, as this is a contravention of the Highways Act.

The overall solution to this problem in Valley Gardens and elsewhere in the city is therefore Government legislation rather than a local, Experimental Traffic Regulation Order. I will ensure that councillors are kept updated on this important issue”.

7.7 Councillor Childs asked the following supplementary question:

“My understanding is that it is possible to introduce an ETRO’s indeed, one has been introduced in Pool Valley and one on Portland Road after concerns raised by Councillors Peltzer Dunn and Nemeth. So could you just clarify whether that is the case?”

7.8 On behalf of the Chair, the Assistant Director, City Transport provided the following reply:

“In Valley Gardens, there a number of TRO’s carrying out certain functions so to apply an ETRO would actually be overlaying one type of order over a separate permit order which would make it invalid and possible to challenge legally. Officers have looked at the powers we have and felt that it was not suited to that particular location and we are looking at other options to deal with this problem of pavement parking”.

### **(3) Queens Park**

7.9 Councillor Childs put the following question:

“Given the parlous and disgusting state of the toilets in Queens Park, when will the toilets in Queens Park be renovated and or rebuilt?”

7.10 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Sadly, our public toilet sites have not been invested in for years and so it is a struggle to maintain old and uncared for buildings.

An update on the refurbishment programme will be shared at Policy & Resources Committee on 1 July”.

### **(4) Speed Trials**

7.11 Councillor Nemeth put the following question:

“What discussions are taking place with organisers of the Speed Trials - the country's oldest motor race - to ensure that changes to the layout of Madeira Drive do not prejudice the relevant licences being issued”

7.12 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The Council’s Transport and Events Officers have met throughout the development of the Madeira Drive proposals to ensure the introduction of the final scheme could accommodate a range of events, including the speed trials, and events such as the Classic Car Run have recently gone ahead on the Drive once again. More recently, in liaison with speed trial organisers, we have agreed to install additional infrastructure to accommodate speed trial barriers required as a safety measure to enable the event to take place. The track has already had a preliminary inspection by the Motor Sports Association, the sports’ governing body, with no major concerns being raised”.

7.13 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“Given that Full Council has voted for the Speed Trials to continue, what would the Council’s position be if it turns out that we’ve inadvertently breached the events licensing requirements?”

7.14 The Chair provided the following reply:

“We’re not anticipating that will be an issue. If it were an issue we would need to consider that at the time and consider what solutions we can come up with”.

#### **(5) Green Wall**

7.15 Councillor Nemeth put the following question:

“Where did accountability lie for the damage that was done to the Green Wall on Madeira Drive, the country’s oldest living wall, during recent works to cycling infrastructure on the street?”

7.16 The Chair provided the following reply:

“As you know, the council has committed to a full review of how this situation arose, although we have also been clear in saying that the road safety audit for the works in this area had clearly stated the need for bushes here to be made safe, but obviously not to the extent that happened which we all agree was awful. The extent to which the greenery was cut will be addressed in the current review which is being undertaken by the audit team. We are expecting answers to these questions by the middle of July when the review will be fully completed”.

7.17 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“Is it through Audit & Standards that this will take place or is it the Audit team that reports back generally or publicly?”

7.18 The Chair provided the following reply:

“It’s the council’s Audit team that is undertaking the investigation and there is a cross-party working group that oversees the Black Rock project so the findings will go to that working group”

**(6) Allotments**

7.19 Councillor Nemeth put the following question:

“How many allotments are currently not let and to what degree has the waiting list grown since the first lockdown?”

7.20 The Chair provided the following reply:

“On 16 June 2021, there were 184 unlet plots. On 20 January 2020, there were 196 unlet plots. On 16 June 2021, there were 2485 residents on the waiting list. On 5 February 2020, there were 1338 residents on the waiting list. Some new tenancies were let during the pandemic, but not at many as normal and not as many as we would like. 135 allotments were let in 2020. To date, 89 have been let in 2021.

7.21 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“Do you happen to know why we do so badly normally? Why are plots not let generally? In ten phone calls you can let ten plots”.

7.22 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I’m not sure it’s the case we were doing so badly previously Councillor Nemeth and we would probably need to look more closely at it to draw that conclusion. There has been a slight slowdown in terms of letting and that has been because we stopped the use of volunteers and because we’ve had to introduce more complex processes ourselves due to the various covid safety requirements and risk assessments we’ve had to undertake”.

7.23 The following questions were published in the agenda and a written response provided. The respective response are as follows:

**(7) Cycle lane on Marine Parade- Councillor Childs**

Response:

“In the medium to longer term the council are developing plans to improve the cycle network as cycling on the pavement is a clear indication that adequate cycle links are not available for this particular area. Marine Parade has been identified as a route that does need to be improved for both cyclists and pedestrians in the early discussions on the Local Walking & Cycling Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), which will be out to public consultation later this year”.

**(8) Tarner Park- Councillor Childs**

Response:

“It is disappointing to hear of the drug use and anti-social behaviour taking place in Tarner Park. Officers have been discussing this issue with local residents to identify how to tackle this.

Where people are climbing the wall to access the park, work will be carried out to make it harder to climb.

Volunteers will also start locking the park. However, it is important to note that these volunteers will not be removing those involved in anti-social behaviour from the park or locking anyone into the park.

It is not clear what impact this will have but officers are keen to support local residents who wish to try this.

The council is not in a position to employ security staff to clear and secure parks at night.

Officers do not consider raising the railings along the Sussex Street boundary as solution either. If there is not a reliable waste of clearing and locking the park at night. Sussex Police are arranging for temporary closed circuit television to be installed.

**(9) Road Safety- Councillor Fishleigh**

Response:

“Thank you for your question Cllr Fishleigh. There are a number of other locations in the city where this has also been raised.

The council is currently developing its Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, and I can confirm that your comments and request about pedestrian and cycling issues in this location have been noted by officers and will be taken into account as part of this ongoing work.

No further update can be provided on this issue until the plan has been completed and a programme of works has been prioritised and approved at this committee”.

**(10) Damage to an allotment- Councillor Fishleigh**

Response:

“I am sorry for the damage caused to the allotment holder in Rottingdean.

The suppliers advise that delivery will be in approximately 12 to 15 weeks’ time. and City Parks have apologised for the time it is taking to resolve”.

**(11) Pavement weeds- Councillor Fishleigh**

Response:

“Additional staff are recruited each spring and summer to complete seasonal tasks, such as weed removal, and help keep the city clean and tidy as a result of the additional footfall, particularly along the seafront.

Unfortunately, Cityclean has had difficulties with its seasonal staff recruitment this year.

The additional resources that Cityclean has managed to obtain are being used in a flexible way and deployed to where there is most need.

This means that the weeding crew, on occasion, has been deployed to the seafront, and interrupting the planned weed removal programme.

I have asked Cityclean’s Head of Operations to speak to the operatives covering the east of the city to see if your request is possible and will make sure they get back to you. I’d be grateful if you could send us a list of the worst affected areas for us to focus on.

**(12) Car Club- Councillor Fowler**

Response:

“The terms and conditions on which the Enterprise Car Club is operated are part of the agreement between the company and its members when they join. The council is not involved in the day to day use of vehicles in any way.

I do agree with you that a car club provides an excellent way of providing access to a car without needing to own one. They are part of the city’s sharing economy – just like the BikeShare – and can help to reduce the number of vehicles on our streets.

The operation of car clubs in the city began with a single car in the Hanover area, and because it has become so successful there have been up to 3 companies operating in the city at the same time, based on those companies commercial decisions. However, the council does not control or manage how car club companies operate in the city, so there is no contractual arrangement. The demand for, and use of, vehicles will determine their success and growth. If companies do approach officers, a business model would usually be requested to enable further discussions to take place.

Requests from the current car club operator for dedicated spaces are considered individually by council officers and then advertised through a relevant Traffic Regulation Order. This allows a consultation period for people to comment and a report would be to committee if a certain number of objections were received.

I am pleased to see that car clubs are also evolving in ways that will help us meet our carbon neutral target and community wealth building aims, as the committee will be receiving a report later in the year about a local electric vehicle co-operative car club, following a deputation earlier this year”.

**(13) Citywide access- Councillor Williams**

Response:

“As you recall the 24th November Report to this committee sought to outline the Council’s approach to meet the specific needs of Blue Badge Holders and Disabled People as well as the interests of the community as a whole and other road users. The Report also set out the Council’s actions to deliver the important Emergency Active Travel Programme whilst purposefully seeking to balance the demands of Blue Badge, Disabled Groups, wider community and road users as set out in the report. Achieving this balance is a means of meeting the Council’s wider duty of care to all transport users in relation to the pandemic and road safety, as well as the Public Sector Equality Duty. By adding a recommendation in relation to actions already identified within this report the Labour Amendment sought to further “appraise” the impacts and seek to improve access within the schemes and projects as part of the Council’s agreed Urgent Response Transport Action Plan.

I can confirm that each and every scheme being taken forward has included meaningful engagement with these stakeholder groups and has looked for every opportunity to ensure that Blue Badge Parking and Disabled Access is improved.

The issue of disabled access to the city is vitally important to get right and there are a number of other areas where this can be appraised.

Blue Badge Parking spaces are reviewed regularly and adapted as necessary engaging with stakeholders as schemes are developed and they are subject to Equality Impact Assessments. The Highway Enforcement policy is also under review and will be reported to a future ETS Committee.

There is also a Council’s Accessibility Strategy’ proposal to develop an accessible city strategy to provide a strategic framework for the council’s work to better serve disabled residents. This will be informed by the lived experience of disabled residents in the city”.

**(14) St George's Road- Councillor Williams**

Response:

"The area of St Georges Road, Kemptown, was considered and assessed for possible funding through the governments Emergency Active Travel funding. However, due to the criteria applied to the funding it was removed during the sifting of possible schemes as it would not have met the criteria. St Georges couldn't be taken forward in EATF was that it wouldn't completely have met the EATF criteria which wanted us to largely focus on strategic corridors, other routes were therefore deemed more pertinent to this funding in the short term (schemes must be delivered by March 2022 and this scheme would likely be more complex and require longer).

Currently it does not fit any of the other funding sources and unfortunately due to resource needs has to be assessed against other areas of the city that have a poor safety record, when determining priority. The Department for Transport have recently announced that more funding is now available for Active Travel and the scheme will be assessed again to see if the criteria around the funding has changed".

**(15) Madeira Drive- Councillor Williams**

Response:

"The new layout for Madeira Drive which was approved by ETS committee in September is now substantially complete. The new cycle lane on the road was officially opened on the 29th May and since this time cyclists have been utilising the new cycle lanes providing pedestrians with the whole width of the southern footway in excess of 8 metres in places.

Informal crossing points are being finalised at 8 locations along Madeira Drive as part of the works and the general traffic running lane has been restricted to one-way eastbound with a 3.2m restriction which acts to reduce speeds and assist with pedestrian crossing points. Further buildouts have been created along the northside of the pavement at key locations where space allows including at the Colonnade and near Concorde 2. Parking is now restricted to one side of the road further improving pedestrian's visibility of the oncoming traffic when crossing between the south footway and the north footway. Furthermore, a Traffic Regulation Order has been successfully advertised to reduce the speed limit from 30mph to 20mph, signage and liming will be implemented to allow this 20mph speed limited to become enforceable again contributing to pedestrian safety along the entire route.

Officers are also looking at the longer-term future of Madeira Drive as part of the Eastern Seafront Masterplan. This work will focus on how the area can be regenerated and how the overall space can be better connected and used by everybody. It will be starting shortly and is expected to be reported to members early next year.

Since the opening of the new cycle lane, improvements to pedestrian access, crossings and the new 20mph speed limit, pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles accessing the new echelon parking for visiting the seafront and businesses along its frontage has provided a safer and much enhanced public space".

**(16) Parking bay, Broadway Whitehawk- Councillor Williams**

Response:

“No I don’t agree. This change was reported and agreed by the members of the ETS Committee in January this year and ultimately approved at Full Budget Council in February.

This was all part of the Council’s budget strategy proposals for the financial year 21/22. Following this approval, the changes came into force on Monday 10th May. The fees & charges Traffic Regulation Order which included any new changes including these particular ones were advertised in the local newspaper and on the Council’s website for consultation on 12th March until 2nd April. The Fees & Charges TRO was sent to all the Ward Councillors throughout Brighton & Hove in advance on 10th March 2021. The Sealed TRO was then advertised in the local newspaper and the Council’s Webpages on 7th May 2021. Parking staff have also worked with the Communications department to outline updates.

It is appreciated that any increase in parking charges can be challenging for all concerned and none of us enjoy having to increase parking charges across the city. As a Council and particularly within the Environment, Economy & Culture directorate we have had to make significant savings for the 21/22 financial year with tough decisions to make. Within Parking Services alone this includes £2m of savings which has helped support other Council services. We have specifically addressed concerns about affordability by bringing forward proposals, agreed as part of the fees & charges proposals for 21/22, that a discount for low income households would be introduced - which is planned to be brought in within a few months”.

**(17) Parking in Hollingdean- Councillor Fowler**

Response:

“Officers who were previously developing potential safer routes to school locations are currently working on developing a School Streets programme and are in the process of assessing the eligibility of every infant, junior and primary school in the city for a closure. A report will be presented to the next meeting of the ETS Committee in September for consideration by members, as we agree that safety of children walking to school should be a priority. Parking patrols in Hollingdean are being stepped up to tackle problem parking in the area, and I hope I can also refer you to my previous answer on national legislation we are also hoping will be introduced to help tackle pavement parking, for example”.

**(18) Park & Ride- Councillor Fowler**

Response:

“Thank you for your question. The climate assembly asked the council to look again at a park and ride in Brighton and Hove so all I will say for now is we are working on it”.

**(19) Cycle Signage A259- Councillor Fowler**

Response:

“As you might be aware the current scheme is temporary, and we are therefore continually monitoring and reviewing the scheme.

An audit is currently being conducted of the existing signage along the A259 as officers are aware that some people are unclear about where they should be positioned or in some cases choosing to ignore existing cycle signs. In regard to the poles (wands), they are designed to come out safely if they are hit by vehicles or in the event that

emergency vehicles need to access the cycle lane should the need arise. However, a repair schedule is being worked up to replace those wands which are knocked out”.

**(20) Weeds, Hollingdean Terrace- Councillor Fowler**

Response:

“Thank you for your question regarding Hollingdean Terrace and recognising the value of wildflowers and not using pesticides.

Removing weeds by hand takes much longer and Cityclean is addressing hot spots across the city and responding to complaints.

Hollingdean Terrace was cleared week commencing 14th June”.

**(21) Parking at Fiveways**

Response:

“This change was reported and agreed by the members of the ETS Committee in January this year and ultimately approved at Full Budget Council in February.

This was all part of the Council’s budget strategy proposals for the financial year 21/22. Following this approval, the changes came into force on Monday 10th May. The fees & charges Traffic Regulation Order which included any new changes including these particular ones were advertised in the local newspaper and on the Council’s website for consultation on 12th March until 2nd April. The Fees & Charges TRO was sent to all the Ward Councillors throughout Brighton & Hove in advance on 10th March 2021. The Sealed TRO was then advertised in the local newspaper and the Council’s Webpages on 7th May 2021. Parking staff have also worked with the Communications department to outline updates.

It is appreciated that any increase in parking charges can be challenging for all concerned and none of us enjoy having to increase parking charges across the city. As a Council and particularly within the Environment, Economy & Culture directorate we have had to make significant savings for the 21/22 financial year with tough decisions to make. Within Parking Services alone this includes £2m of savings which has helped support other Council services.

We have specifically addressed concerns about affordability by bringing forward proposals, agreed as part of the fees & charges proposals for 21/22, that a discount for low income households would be introduced - which is planned to be brought in within a few months”.

**(22) Renewal Delays- Councillor Nemeth**

Response:

“The current change is moving towards My Account with intended benefits so that customers will be able to access an increasing range of services through the My account portal including council tax, schools, recycling etc. as well as being able to self-serve for common tasks such as changing their vehicle.

The new system was trialled in parking schemes with waiting lists then 'light touch' permit scheme areas first with relatively few problems identified. When the new system was rolled out more widely two IT issues were identified, and a successful IT fix was applied to both by the IT department with the support of parking staff. Parking staff are currently working hard to help customers resolve these issues and the grace period for permits was extended when it was clear that not all permit applications had been

resolved and the small number of Penalty Charge Notices issued before this have been cancelled.

Staff focus is dealing with these issues so unfortunately at this stage we can't give accurate figures on the number of residents affected but we can provide a written update soon if required. In terms of bus passes the oldest application is 4 weeks and we are still within service guidelines of 8 to 10 week for applications.

The council is sorry for the inconvenience this has caused residents, but the parking team are currently working through the backlog of permit enquiries and will be in touch with all residents who have contacted us as soon as possible.

We ask for patience and support during this period. Problems will inevitably arise during a major transition such as this, however carefully we plan. Moving to the new system is essential if we are to support the council's wider digital strategy".

**(23) Boundary Road revamp- Councillor Nemeth**

Response:

"The decision to allocate funding from within the council's Local Transport Plan capital programme to begin some initial work focused on the Boundary Road/Station Road shopping area was initially made in 2018. However, work has been unable to be progressed during subsequent financial years for a number of reasons. This was initially due to the availability of staff resources and other priority work that was already underway, and the subsequent, significant disruption that has occurred due to the pandemic. This has delayed projects further and also necessitated the reallocation of staff onto urgent, emergency programmes of work to aid the city's recovery.

However, there is currently a sum of £75,000 within the capital programme to continue work on developing ideas and proposals for the corridor. Now that there is a greater degree of stability, and as we hopefully move out of lockdown more fully, officers are reviewing the programme and considering the available resources within their teams and the data that is available to enable work to continue on existing and new projects. Once this is complete, within the next month or so, it will be possible to update members further".

**(24) Seafront Toilets- Councillor Nemeth**

Response:

"At the beginning of lockdown in 2020, and particularly as the weather warmed up, we were acutely aware of the numbers of people gathering outdoors, due to the restrictions on indoor gatherings. The restrictions meant that toilets in bars, restaurants and cafes were unavailable for use, placing a significant strain on the public toilet sites.

Since we've reopened our city, we've seen thousands of people flock to our seafront. It's therefore not surprising that there continues to be high demand for public toilets, even with the additional toilets now available in bars, restaurants and cafes.

We've now installed 24 additional temporary toilets along the seafront to ensure residents and visitors have the facilities they need.

These "festival style toilets" are the only viable option for a temporary hire for areas that do not have existing drainage and water connections. They are emptied daily and cleaned and restocked regularly throughout the day. Whilst we acknowledge that they are not the most attractive looking facilities they are only temporary, serve a very real need and have been generally well received by users of the seafront.

It's also important to remember that the public toilet sites have not been invested in for years and so it is a struggle to maintain old and uncared for buildings. Therefore, and as I have already said, it's so pleasing to be able to announce that at Policy & Resources Committee on 1 July, there will be an update on the toilet refurbishment programme".

**(C) MEMBERS LETTERS**

**(1) Bikeshare Scheme Patcham**

7.24 The Committee considered a letter from Councillor McNair regarding reservations from the ward councillors on the location chosen for a new Bikeshare scheme hub.

7.25 The Chair provided the following response:

"The process of dialogue with ward councillors on a bikeshare hub for Patcham began in July 2020. There were 6 alternative sites in the ward to consider, each with its own issues. After detailed consideration of the practicalities and councillor views on each site, officers concluded the chosen location was the only practical one for a Bikeshare hub. Ward councillors were duly informed and made their opposition clear.

On the 4th March 2021, Officers agreed to withdraw an offer to treat an email from a Patcham councillor as a formal objection. Our Legal advice agreed with the then Conservative ETS Spokesperson's position that Ward Members should be able to take a view when the TRO was published, which may or may not then lead to a formal submission on the TRO.

Ward councillors were informed via email on 30 March 2021 that the TRO consultation would be published and run from the 1st April, closing on the 29th April 2021. During the consultation period, four objections and three comments of support were submitted by residents.

It was agreed by full Council on 14 May 2020 that 6 or more objections by residents or one objection by a ward councillor to a Traffic Regulation order would trigger a referral of the matter to this committee.

Our advice is that as the letter from Ward Councillors to the committee was not received until 10 June 2021 in the form of this letter, it cannot be considered as a formal objection as it was not sent during the consultation period.

Having noted Ward Councillor concerns during preliminary discussions, Officers approached the stakeholders they identified.

The chair of Patcham Community Association (which runs the community centre) has stated that the association has no concern about the proposed siting of a bikeshare hub at Ladies Mile Road. The Methodist Church was contacted by both letter and email. An objection was received from the Vicar in a private capacity only. Both schools were also informed but raised no objections. Big Lemon buses which serves the adjacent bus stop had no concerns with the scheme. Sussex Police had no objections.

There are no shops immediately adjacent to the site, which is next to a school playing field. Parking outside business and residential frontages has not been removed, and the diagonal positioning of bikes and stands will make access to the driveway opposite for delivery and refuse collection easier than parked cars currently do".

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

**(D) NOTICES OF MOTION****(1) Tree Planting**

7.27 Councillor Nemeth moved the following Motion:

This Committee agrees:-

- 1) to receive a report to its next regular meeting appraising the options for keeping the Council's charge to residents for a new street tree at, or close to, the old lower rate of under £500 per tree in cases where fundraising for a residents' scheme commenced prior to the announcement of the huge rise in costs.

7.28 The Chair and Councillor Wilkinson formally seconded the Motion.

7.29 The Chair issued the following response:

“Historically, there has been a lot less interest in residents donating street trees and the previous methods used were low quality and low cost.

This meant the £15,000 annual tree planting budget could be used, when required, to cover the costs of occasional donation street tree planting.

It's great to now see an increase in demand for street trees and greenery, however, with higher demand and improved planting methods, it is not possible to use this small budget.

It is not as simple as planting a tree into the ground when it comes to street trees.

Planting in hard surfaces on highways to avoid future root disruption to the highway requires construction of a tree planting pit and placement of root barriers. Often, this involves planting on the site of an established tree which will involve repairing the damage caused by the previous tree, which was often to lower standards.

The Administration has put in an extra £200,000 pounds has now been allocated by the green administration to street trees. Which will hopefully attract external funding too.

We are increasing the amount of staff in the arboricultural department, we have a new tree planting officer and we have a good relationship with 'Plant your Postcode' to help plant more street trees. I believe that in certain cases like the one you've raised, there might be situation where we can use what was donated and top it up from the new budget. So happy to consider that a getting a report will be helpful to layout all those different costs because it is such a difference. I'm happy to support this.”

7.30 **RESOLVED-** This Committee agrees:-

- 1) to receive a report to its next regular meeting appraising the options for keeping the Council's charge to residents for a new street tree at, or close to, the old lower rate of under £500 per tree in cases where fundraising for a residents' scheme commenced prior to the announcement of the huge rise in costs.

**(2) Flyposting on the seafront**

7.31 Councillor Nemeth moved the following Motion:

This Committee agrees:-

- 1) that (i) posters and other items which have been stuck onto Council-controlled bins and other structures on the seafront will be removed forthwith and (ii) an update on progress will be presented at the next meeting of this Committee.

7.32 The Chair and Councillor Wilkinson formally seconded the Motion.

7.33 Councillor Wilkinson moved a amendment to the Motion as shown in bold italics and where struckthrough as follows:

This Committee agrees:-

- 1) that (i) posters and other items which have been stuck onto Council-controlled bins and other structures ***across the city*** ~~on the seafront~~ will be removed forthwith and (ii) an update on progress will be presented at the next meeting of this Committee.

7.34 The Chair stated:

“Thank you for your Notice of Motion. The action requested would raise very significant resource implications and so, in accordance with the Council’s Procedure Rules, it would require an officer report before any action could be taken at this scale. The report would consider the feasibility of taking the requested action, including its financial implications, and would recommend, for Committee decision, whether or not the action should be taken. So the next report to committee would be to outline how this might be achieved and until the committee has agreed the report and financial implications the matter wouldn’t be progressed other than the work that we have already been doing such as through the tidy up week that had last September. I therefore propose requesting an officer report considering the requests made to the Notice of Motion, do Members agree?”

7.35 The proposal was unanimously agreed.

7.36 **RESOLVED-** This Committee agrees:-

To receive a report setting out the financial and other resource implications for removing (i) posters and other items which have been stuck onto Council-controlled bins and other structures across the city

## **8 NATIONAL RESOURCES AND WASTE STRATEGY – RESPONSES TO GOVERNMENT CONSULTATIONS**

8.1 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee ratify the responses made to consultations on:
  - Environmental Principles, which closed on 2 June 2021, and presented in Appendix 1.
  - The Extended Producer Responsibility (packaging), which closed on 4 June 2021, and presented in Appendix 2

- Introducing a Deposit Return Scheme, which closed on 4 June 2021, and presented in Appendix 3.

2) That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee delegates authority for officers to complete the response on the Consistency in Household and Business Recycling consultation and submit to government, having consulted with the Chair and committee spokespeople.

## 9 FOOD WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE UPDATE

9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided Members with the outcome of research into a food waste collection service and high-level options appraisal, plus an update on associated matters. It sought approval to complete a feasibility study and business case on the preferred option, which will be subject to engagement and consultation with residents, trade unions and staff before a report is brought to a future committee for a decision.

9.2 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Nemeth moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.2 as shown in bold italics and as struckthrough below:

2.2 That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee agree that a full feasibility study and business case is developed exploring Option ~~4b~~ **1a** for the future delivery of refuse and recycling services.

9.3 The Chair and Councillor Wilkinson formally seconded the motion.

9.4 Councillor Wilkinson sought discretion from the Chair to move an amendment from the floor which was granted.

9.5 On behalf of the Labour Group, Councillor Wilkinson moved the following motion to amend recommendation 2.2 as show in bold italics below:

2.2 That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee agree that a full feasibility study and business case is developed exploring Option **1a and 1b** for the future delivery of refuse and recycling services.

9.6 The Chair and Councillor Nemeth formally seconded the motion.

9.7 The Chair then put the Conservative motion to the vote which failed.

9.8 The Chair then put the Labour motion to the vote which passed.

9.9 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to the vote that were agreed.

### 9.10 **RESOLVED-**

2.1 That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee note the report and options appraisal at Appendix 1.

- 2.2 That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee agree that a full feasibility study and business case is developed exploring Option 1a and 1b for the future delivery of refuse and recycling services.
- 2.3 That Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee agrees that the feasibility study and business case are consulted on with residents, trade unions and staff before being presented back to a future committee for decision.
- 2.4 That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee note the dependent work taking place both locally and nationally, which will be used to inform the feasibility study and business case.

## **10 COMMERCIAL BINS ON THE HIGHWAY: OUTCOME OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

### **10.1 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee note the outcomes of the public consultation in Appendix 1.
- 2) That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee note the approaches adopted in other areas across the country in Appendix 2.
- 3) That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the revised approach for managing commercial bins on the highway as set out in Appendix 3, including the roads within T-Zones, and its inclusion in the Environmental Enforcement Framework from 1 February 2022.

## **11 ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT FRAMEWORK**

### **11.1 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the updated Environmental Enforcement Framework as detailed in Appendix 1 (tracked changes version) and Appendix 2 (clean version).
- 2) That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves for a public consultation to take place on introducing enforcement measures for householders not complying with waste receptacle requirements.

## **12 BINFRAStructure STRATEGY**

### **12.1 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the Bin Infrastructure & Litter Reduction Strategy in Appendix 1 and the Action Plan in Appendix 2.

## **13 WATERHALL WILDING PROJECT**

- 13.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that updates the committee on progress on the wilding project at Waterhall and

also set out the findings of a high-level feasibility study in relation to the relocation of the clubhouse.

- 13.2 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Nemeth moved a motion to add a recommendation 2.4 as shown in bold italics below:

**2.4 That committee expresses the wish that no further buildings are added to the existing clubhouse site**

- 13.3 The Chair and Councillor Wilkinson formally seconded the motion.

- 13.4 In response to questions from Councillor Nemeth and Councillor Wilkinson, it was explained that officers were in continued discussions with Downland Lions and that it was anticipated that the project could succeed without parking, but provision would be made for blue badge holders and a drop off point for school buses. There was a bus route that stopped reasonably close to the site and it was anticipated that there would be people's preference to walk to the site and take in the countryside.

- 13.5 The Chair put the Conservative Group motion to the vote that passed.

- 13.6 The Chair put the recommendations as amended to the vote that were agreed.

**13.7 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That committee notes the progress of the Waterhall Wilding Project
- 2) That committee agrees to take no further action in relation to the relocating of the former clubhouse.
- 3) That committee agrees to officers exploring the option of refurbishment of the existing clubhouse to provide a visitor centre, education space and café with limited vehicle access as set out in 3.9 and 3.10 of the report.
- 4) That committee expresses the wish that no further buildings are added to the existing clubhouse site

**14 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 5 INITIAL ENGAGEMENT**

- 14.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided an update on the development of the fifth Local Transport Plan (LTP5) and sought approval of the proposed 2030 transport vision, key outcomes and principles, and to commence engagement and public consultation in late summer on the priority areas and emerging proposed interventions, as set out in the 'Developing a new Transport Plan for Brighton & Hove' consultation document.

- 14.2 Councillor Nemeth stated his Group would not be supporting the recommendations as it was not felt the consultation was sufficient as it would ask residents how to carry out the proposals rather than whether they should be undertaken at all. Furthermore, the Conservative Group did not support the current proposals for a Liveable city centre as it was felt not enough outreach had been undertaken and many residents and trade

groups had expressed worry about the proposals meaning it was too controversial to endorse.

14.3 Councillor Wilkinson stated that the Labour Group supported the report proposals, and many were critical to the city's carbon neutral ambitions. Councillor Wilkinson stated that he was looking forward to seeing more detail from the engagement and consultation.

14.4 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee approve the 2030 transport vision for the Local Transport Plan 5 (set out in paragraph 3.4 below)
- 2) That the Committee approve the Local Transport Plan 5 key outcomes (set out in paragraph 3.5 below)
- 3) That the Committee approve the Local Transport Plan 5 key principles (set out in paragraph 3.6 below)
- 4) That the Committee agree that engagement and public consultation is undertaken on the priority areas and emerging proposed interventions, as set out in the 'Developing a new Transport Plan for Brighton & Hove' consultation document (attached as Appendix 1)
- 5) That the Committee note the indicative programme to completion of Local Transport Plan 5 (set out in paragraph 3.9 below)

15 **NETWORK MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN**

15.1 **RESOLVED-**

That Committee agree:-

- 1) A trial of red routes on the designated roads London Road, Lewes Road and along with the previously approved inclusion of Valley Gardens as detailed in the Plan
- 2) The development of a specification for the replacement of the Real Time information system
- 3) To investigate and develop a business case for introducing Lane Rental into the city
- 4) The approach to managing the City's Road Network as set out in the Plan

16 **PARKING POLICIES**

16.1 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That Committee approves the new Parking Policy statement (Appendix A) taking into consideration the summary within this report.

17 **TRO-12-2021 OBJECTIONS**

- 17.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy that set out the objections to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) amendment 12-2021 proposing changes of carriageway use under the Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2018.
- 17.2 Councillor Nemeth stated his view that an objection from a ward councillor should not be treated as just a technical point and noted that a Letter on the agenda from the Patcham ward councillors explained the rationale for a different location for the proposed Bikeshare Hub. Councillor Nemeth stated that if councillors felt that issues such as this were being forced through against their suggestions, it would ultimately hurt the scheme generally. Councillor Nemeth stated that his Group would be voting against the proposals on that basis.
- 17.3 The Chair stated that the report made clear that proper engagement had been undertaken.
- 17.4 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Committee notes that there were no formal objections received from ward councillors during the consultation period for the hub proposals at South Street, Portslade and at Ladies Mile Road, Patcham, and the small number of residents' objections to the site at Ladies Mile Rd means both this site and South St can now proceed to the construction stage under delegated officer powers.
  - 2) That the committee notes the detail of the objections to the BTN Bikeshare hub at Amherst Crescent / Aldrington Halt Station in the report and approves the amendment concerning Amherst Crescent as set out in TRO-12-2021.

## 18 THE NATIONAL BUS STRATEGY

- 18.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provides recommendations for the council's initial response to the Government's National Bus Strategy, Bus Back Better in order to comply with deadlines set by the Department for Transport (DfT).
- 18.2 In response to questions from Councillor Wilkinson, the Senior Project Manager explained that the aim of the enhanced bus partnership was to improve the communication of bus service and timetabling information and the main local operator currently published all service providers information online and in paper copy. The Senior Project Manager added that there was a constant review of possible improvements to real-time service information. Furthermore, there would be a post-Covid review of bus services and supported bus services that would be presented to an upcoming meeting of the Policy & Resources Committee in addition to a further report to ET\*S Committee later in the year and options for the circular minibus service would be reviewed as part of that process.
- 18.3 In response to a question from Councillor Nemeth regarding possible increased pollution by buses when travelling in the suburbs, the Senior Project Manager explained that the Council's Senior Technical Officer for air quality would have extensive information and

data on that matter. Furthermore, it was highlighted that the council was seeking to take part in the Zero Emissions Regional Bus Area (ZEBRA) bid which would introduce hydrogen buses to the city.

#### 18.4 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee notes the National Bus Strategy and receipt of the £100k funding officers have applied for.
- 2) That the Committee agrees to publish a notice of intent to form an Enhanced Partnership with bus operators.
- 3) That the Committee notes the new opportunities available for an Enhanced Partnership and franchising and the potential benefits this could bring to the city's bus services.
- 4) That the Committee agrees to commission a feasibility study on franchising to be presented to a ETS meeting in Autumn 2021.

#### 19 **ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

- 19.1 Item 18: The National Bus Strategy was referred to the next Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 6.00pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of