

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

4.00pm 8 OCTOBER 2013

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

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

Other Members present: Councillors Mears, Shanks

PART ONE

19. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

19(a) Declarations of substitutes

19.1. Councillor Simson was present as substitute for Councillor Janio.

19(b) Declarations of interest

19.2. There were none.

19(c) Exclusion of press and public

19.3. 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).

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

20. MINUTES

20.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 9 July 2013 be approved and signed as the correct record.

21. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE CITY SUSTAINABILITY PARTNERSHIP (FOR INFORMATION)

- 21.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting of the City Sustainability Partnership be noted.

22. CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

- 22.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

“Firstly, I’d like to welcome the newest Member of the Committee and of the council, Councillor Daniel. I have known Emma for her work through various organisations in the city and look forward to working with her.

Colleagues may remember that the principles of a preferred scheme to enhance Valley Gardens were approved at the last Transport Committee in March this year. The Committee also agreed that early consideration should be given to preparation of bids for external funding for the scheme.

An initial application has now been prepared, submitted to, and accepted by the Coast to Capital Local Transport Board and could enable the council to secure up to £8m for the project starting in 2015/16, subject to further development work.

Some temporary installations have been introduced to the area to indicate how it could be used and have generated interest and some useful feedback.

I also had the pleasure of attending the launch event at the weekend for the LSTF Lewes Road sustainable Transport Corridor Scheme agreed by this Committee last year.

The scheme was launched by the former Transport Minister Norman Baker MP, the Leader of the Council Jason Kitcat and Deputy Leader Councillor Ian Davey and also supported by local residents and other stakeholders including family and representatives of the Jo Walters Trust. The scheme will provide much needed public transport and cycling facilities to support safe and active travel movement as well as supporting economic activity along this important academic corridor.

I am pleased to note our Trading Standards officers are working successfully with the Police and Licensing officers on a joint initiative to address the availability of super-strength beers, lager and cider, above 6% volume. This Sensible on Strength campaign seeks to reduce the problems of anti-social behaviour, crime and health issues associated with high strength alcohol. Businesses are being recruited to voluntarily stop selling these products and are already reporting positive benefit from reduced theft of stock. The aim is to introduce a “Scores on the doors” type window sticker system to denote accredited outlets. A report will be going to Licensing committee next month on this.

I was very pleased to attend, along with Cllrs Sykes and Janio, the recent ceremonial handing over of our partnership bid for UN Biosphere status to the UNESCO UK Chief Executive at the Preston Park Twins. We were all greatly encouraged by the news that the other UK Biosphere’s report a considerable direct financial benefit from status. Biosphere’s, it seems, more than pay for their administrative cost, and of course reap general economic benefit to their local areas too. I understand we now have to wait till the spring for the bid to be decided upon, and meanwhile I would urge that it is important we maintain our financial support for the project in readiness for accreditation.

And finally, I would like to note that the Food Partnership are this year celebrating their 10 birthday. I was unfortunately unable to make the recent party held on Hove Lawns, though I know Councillors Sykes was able to go. The City Sustainability Partnership recently received a very good presentation from the director of the Food Partnership, Vic Borrill and if members agree I think it would be welcome to create an opportunity for this committee to hear that update first hand too”.

23. CALL OVER

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

- Item 27: Parking Annual Report 2012-13
- Item 28: Highways Winter Service Plan 2013-14
- Item 30: Verge and Pavement Parking Restrictions- Formal Consultation
- Item 31: Individual Disabled Bays
- Item 32: Elm Grove, Brighton- Management of Highway Parking and Obstructions
- Item 33: Better Bus Area- Edward Street and Eastern Road- TRO Objections
- Item 34: Dyke Road Ped & Cycle Facilities- Permission to Consult
- Item 35: Access to SDNP- Ditchling Road: Permission to Construct (Phase 1)
- Item 38: Traveller Commissioning Strategy: One Year On

23.2 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 29: Citywide Bus Lane Enforcement
- Item 36: The Common Room (Ann Street/Providence Place)
- Item 37: Amendment Traffic Order

24. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(a) Petitions

(i) Woodingdean Warren Road parking improvement- Gilles Guichard

24.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 205 people that requested changes to parking arrangements on Warren Road, Woodingdean.

24.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for presenting this petition. Officers and I have been on site to investigate this matter firsthand. There are concerns about changing the parallel bays into echelon bays. Firstly, given the requirement to meet the relevant legislation, there is insufficient room for echelon bays, in some sections, without changing the layout of the pavement, which would require it to be made narrower. Secondly there would be safety concerns with vehicles reversing out onto a busy main road.

This matter has been looked at before, but in reverse, when the correct, clearly marked, parallel parking bays were created because informal echelon parking was creating a potentially dangerous situation.

In terms of the 2 hour parking limit the council agreed to prioritise limited resources on essential signing and lining maintenance so are unable to carry out non-urgent changes to parking restrictions outside of resident parking schemes, with the exception of disabled bay requests.

I also saw the important local development of a new community Library and Medical Centre that is going on opposite the shopping parade at the moment. This may be affecting the availability and use of local parking, but once this is complete I am sure that parking capacity will improve.

I appreciate this isn't the response you are looking for but I can assure you officers and myself have looked into this matter carefully".

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

(ii) Safer road crossings for Church Road and St Andrews Road- Rae Powers

24.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 814 people that requested a number of traffic calming measures to improve safety on Church Road and St Andrews Road.

24.5 The Chair provided the following response:

"Thank you for your petition. I recently met with officers from the Road Safety Team and local councillors to look at some of the highways issues in this area.

The Council has a rolling annual programme of pedestrian crossing assessments, full details of which are published on the Council's website. Assessment of over 100 sites each year is undertaken methodically, and considers the road safety history of each location as well as the levels of traffic and pedestrian activity that exists at each site.

This information is supplemented by an appraisal of accessibility, amenity and physical conditions. This entire process has been before Council and approved as the most consistent way in which to manage requests for crossing facilities.

It is proposed that your requested locations are added to the current programme for assessment".

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

(iii) Traffic calming measures on Mile Oak Road- Sarka Quesne

24.7 The Committee considered a petition signed by 113 people that requested the council install traffic calming measures along Mile Oak Road specifically between Melrose Avenue and High Street.

24.8 The Chair provided the following response:

"Thank you for your petition. Officers from the road safety team have met with local Members at this location on a couple of occasions to see if any improvements can be made to make the road and immediate area into a more pleasant environment, particularly for pedestrians, however, any options available will have significant impacts on other areas and users. I joined the most recent site meeting to see the situation for myself.

When considering any requests for traffic calming, or other measures to mitigate against the effects of traffic in a neighbourhood, the council look at the history of the area

concerned, particularly to see if there have been any injury causing collisions in the past three years, and then prioritise this request alongside the many others that we receive city wide.

I am pleased to say that this section of Mile Oak Road has a very good record when it comes to road safety with no recorded injuries in this period. However, with such a good record it is with regret that we clearly cannot prioritise it above other locations that have a poorer record and where injury collisions are happening.

I am minded that the new Kings School has opened at the former 6th form and we will of course continue to monitor the highway safety in that area”.

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

(iv) Elm Grove highway parking- Keith Newell & Cllr Daniel

24.10 The Committee considered a petition signed by 40 people requesting that the council defer any decision on pavement parking enforcement in Elm Grove for 12 months to allow for a community consultation on a solution.

24.11 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for presenting your petition. As you will be aware, there is a substantive item on the agenda relating to your petition and the points you have raised will be considered during the debate of that item”

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

(b) Written Questions

24.13 The questioner was not present at the meeting; therefore the question was not put to the Committee. The following response was provided in writing subsequent to the meeting:

“Thank you for your question. As you maybe aware the council actively encourages people to walk their children to school and I’m pleased to inform you that the council is looking into safety improvements in the Carton Hill area using funding secured from the American Express Development. These measures will be designed in order to calm traffic and make it safer for pedestrians. Once these measures have been finalised I will ask officers to contact you to provide more detail of what is planned for the area”.

(c) Deputations

(i) Verge parking Varndean Road- Nick White & Councillor Shanks

24.14 The Committee considered a Deputation presented by Nick White and Councillor Shanks that requested Varndean Road be included in the proposed pilot scheme for restricting parking on verges and footways.

24.15 The Chair provided the following response:

“As you will be aware there is a substantive item on the agenda on this item and I feel it appropriate to discuss the issues you have raised at that point”.

24.16 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

25. ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

(a) Petitions

(i) Rochester Street resident parking- Councillor Duncan

25.1 The petitioner did not attend the meeting to hear the response therefore it was provided in writing and is set out below:

“Thank you for your petition. In terms of the Bakers Bottom and Craven Vale area it was agreed by Committee in January following a Citywide Parking Review last year that this area would be put on the parking scheme priority timetable. Therefore, residents will be consulted on a resident parking scheme following your requests.

The proposal is to conduct parking surveys later in the year and then consult residents early next year with a questionnaire / plan / information pack sent to every address and staffed exhibitions in the area. If any proposal is agreed to be taken forward the intention is to operationally start a scheme next year”.

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

(ii) Road Safety on Davey Drive- Samantha Simson

25.3 The petitioner did not attend the meeting to hear the response therefore it was provided in writing and is set out below. At the request of a member of the Committee, the response was read out at the meeting.

“I have recently visited the area and acknowledge the petitioner’s objective of creating a safer environment outside the St Josephs RC Primary School.

As you will be aware the council constructed new steps outside the school to improve and make the crossing point to the bus stop safer which is working well.

Following a further site visit with officers it has been concluded that removal of the disabled parking bays to introduce more keep clears would not provide any additional benefits and may in fact increase vehicle speeds on the approach due to drivers having a straight run through this stretch.

However, I’m pleased to inform you that school travel plan officers will be meeting the new head teacher shortly to discuss how best to tackle traffic issues brought about by poor driver behaviour”.

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

(iii) Crossing on Brentwood Close- Councillor Rufus

25.5 The petitioner did not attend the meeting to hear the response therefore it was provided in writing and is set out below. At the request of a member of the Committee, the response was read out at the meeting.

“Thank you for your petition. The Council has a rolling annual programme of pedestrian crossing assessments, full details of which are published on the Council’s website. Assessment of over 100 sites each year is undertaken methodically, and considers the road safety history of each location as well as the levels of traffic and pedestrian activity that exists at each site. This information is supplemented by an appraisal of accessibility, amenity and physical conditions. This entire process has been before Council and approved as the most consistent way in which to manage requests for crossing facilities.

I propose that your requested location is passed to officers and added to the current programme for assessment”.

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

26. MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(b) Written Questions

(i) Councillor Cox- Coach Parking

26.1 Due to the similarities in the question subject, the Chair requested Councillor Cox and Councillor Mears present their questions in succession and a response would be provided for both.

26.2 Councillor Cox asked the following question:

‘The Council’s Seafront Strategy, as part of the aim to grow the number of visitors arriving by public transport, includes an objective to ensure parking for coaches is easy to locate and of high quality. What progress has been made in meeting this objective?’

(ii) Councillor Mears- Coach parking study

26.3 Councillor Mears asked the following question:

“Will Councillor West please update me on progress with the coach parking study agreed by Cllr. Davey at the Transport Committee meeting of 27th November 2012?”

26.4 The Chair provided the following response:

“Taking Councillor Cox’s question first, provision for coaches (including their passengers and drivers) is one of a number of important issues supporting visitors to come to the city using sustainable transport. The main area of dedicated provision for parking coaches is in Madeira Drive. It is directly on the seafront and its operation is well-run. It therefore meets those criteria you quoted.

Suggestions for a new purpose-built facility to complement the existing on-street provision, alongside parking or traffic controls to manage coach parking in other areas such as Roedean have been raised by residents and ward councillors.

And that brings me on to Councillor Mears’ question. Officers have taken up Councillor Davey’s earlier request to look at 1) demand; 2) capacity; and 3) possible solutions to the coach parking problem. They have looked at available data which indicates that :-

Peak demand in the summer is estimated to be between 60 to 80 spaces and the average stay of a coach is about 8 hours.

Capacity in Madeira Drive is estimated to be about 50 spaces and in the Marina about 10 spaces – but as residents and ward councillors have highlighted, coaches do also park elsewhere where parking controls currently allow for it, such as the Roedean area. In terms of possible solutions, we already know through the lengthy discussions and debates about Park and Ride, that to deliver this type of purpose-built, transport infrastructure requires both spare land and huge financing – both of which are in short supply in this city.

Another option is building a purpose-built coach park. The most obvious and frequently-suggested sites that would fulfil the criteria stated by Cllr Cox are 1) the Gasworks site by Marina Way and 2) the Black Rock site.

To progress the work much further and develop detailed plans has not yet been possible this financial year given the existing priorities, commitments and resources agreed by Full Council and committees.

However a review of the council's Local Transport Plan is beginning, and we will consider how we can address the issue of coach parking and associated facilities in that strategy – along with allocation of resources.”

26.5 Councillor Mears asked the following supplementary questions:

“I would like clarity as to why our administration were advised by officers that £100,000 was sufficient to provide temporary coach parking facilities in the city when this has been established as insufficient and at least £200,000 was required”

“Please can the feasibility of a 2 hour parking measures for Roedean Road be examined?”

26.6 The Chair replied that he would provide a formal response to Councillor Mears supplementary questions in writing subsequent to the meeting.

26.7 Councillor Cox stated that whilst increasing coach parking provision in the city was not an easy task; the council could do better particularly if the administration had real concern for sustainable transport.

(c) Letters

(i) Councillor Mitchell- Future use of Rottingdean pitch & putt golf course

26.8 Councillor Mitchell stated the central matter of her letter had changed since her submission of the letter as she was aware that the operator had now withdrawn their proposals. Councillor Mitchell stated that she welcomed this development as there had been a lot of local concern about the proposals. Councillor Mitchell hoped that there would now be a proper consultation on further proposals as to future use of the site.

26.9 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your questions about the Rottingdean Pitch and Putt. The lease for the Rottingdean Pitch and Putt site has expired and in line with normal procedures officers advertised the site through the Council's land agents. The site is

located approximately one mile from the Roedean Pitch and Putt and the initial marketing exercise showed that re-letting the site as a golf course was not financially viable.

The option to incorporate the site in to the nature reserve was discussed at that stage with ward councillors. Given the significance of the site to the local community the decision was made to re-advertise it to encourage a wider recreational use which complemented the site's sensitive nature and location.

Orb360 were the preferred bidder with their proposal to reopen the café, rent out segways and provide community activities and facilities. The company has experience of working in sensitive locations having operated the Zorbing business near Devil's Dyke for a number of years.

The proposed activities are not considered to have a detrimental impact on the site or its neighbours and no additional parking would be required. The segways are silent electric vehicles which would run on the existing grass along set routes covering only a small proportion of the site. No permanent barriers would be required to prevent them straying off the set routes. The operator was keen to work with the council to enhance the conservation interest of the area, most of which would not be accessed by the segways.

The operator would have had to apply for planning permission to the South Downs National Park to upgrade the café and provide a storage facility for the segways".

26.10 **RESOLVED-** That the Letter be noted.

(ii) Councillor Theobald- Parking on A23 at Patcham Place recreation ground

26.11 Councillor Theobald presented a letter regarding dangerous parking on the A23 adjacent to the Patcham Place recreation ground.

26.12 The Chair provided the following response:

"Thank you for your letter. I am familiar with the parking issues you describe and share your anxiety about impact upon safety.

The Parking Infrastructure team and the Road Safety team are currently investigating this issue to consider a way forward. A single advisory white line has already been marked out to deter parking near the roundabout.

To enforce the parking issues in this road we are liaising with the Highways Agency to gain permission to extend the existing Urban Clearway to south of the pedestrian refuge. We are aiming to advertise this proposal through a traffic order later in the month. Alongside this we're also looking at improving road safety by changing the white road markings by the refuge.

If these measures are agreed without objection then we can restrict parking quickly, otherwise we may have to bring a report to this Committee to determine any objections".

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

(iii) Councillor Theobald- Carden Avenue Service Road

26.14 Councillor Theobald presented a letter regarding his and residents concerns about road safety on Carden Avenue service road. Councillor Theobald also highlighted the recent

cases of vehicles associated with building development work parked dangerously on the bend.

26.15 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your letter and the interesting findings from your survey. As you state Carden Avenue residents are currently being consulted on the proposal to make this road 20 mph the results of which will come to the next committee in November. In regards to the request to make the service road one-way with traffic calming I will ask officers to investigate this in more detail and report back to the same November committee”.

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

(iv) Councillor Daniel- Hanover & Elm Grove Improvement Plan

26.17 Councillor Daniel presented a letter requesting community consultation on improving the physical environment of the Hanover & Elm Grove areas including refuse collections, street sweeping, litter bin provision and community clean-ups.

26.18 The Chair provided the following response:

“We would welcome working with residents in Hanover on how we can work together to improve the cleanliness of the area. Your suggestions on graffiti and litter bins are certainly areas we can discuss and we are more than happy to look at how the services are delivered and explain why things are done in a certain way. The new refuse and recycling rounds have commenced and it maybe good to wait a month to bed these in and see how the land lies and if there are further changes needed. In the meantime I do suggest that you meet with the Cityclean team to start discussing a plan to involve the local community in shaping the service to them”.

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

27. PARKING ANNUAL REPORT 2012-13

27.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that requested approval of the Parking Annual Report 2012-13 detailing the performance of Parking Services for submission to the Department for Transport and for general publication under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004.

27.2 Councillor Cox asked why page 75 of the agenda appeared blank.

27.3 The Policy & Development Manager clarified that this was an error printing the agendas and that he would circulate the missing page via email to Members.

- 27.4 Councillor Daniel asked if the information could be presented in a more user-friendly manner in future so as to be clearer for members of the public who often took great interest in parking revenue and spend.
- 27.5 The Policy & Development Manager replied that the current format adhered to British Parking Association best practice writing guidance and certain elements had to be presented in a certain way to allow comparative analysis with other authorities. However, other elements could be reviewed in liaison with members of the public for next years report.
- 27.6 Councillor Sykes enquired what 'Dispensation Permits' were used for and sought assurance that the savings made by the council parking enforcement contractor would not result in a negative impact on how the service was delivered.
- 27.7 The Policy & Development Manager replied that Dispensation Permits were usually, but not exclusively, provided to social workers to permit parking close to or on double yellow lines where they needed close access to a property. The Policy & Development Manager added that the savings had been identified in the tender of the contract and would be made by using resources more intelligently. Amongst others, this included the provision of bicycles to enforcement officers in order for their areas to cover a wider distance and significant savings in ICT systems.
- 27.8 Councillor Simson asked if there would be an upcoming report on the work recently completed on Lewes Road.
- 27.9 The Head of Transport clarified that there would be a report assessing the changes submitted to the Committee in approximately twelve months time. This was a standard timeframe to allow the scheme to 'bed-in' and analysis made.
- 27.10 Councillor Simson noted that the authority now offered concessionary taxi fares as well as concessionary bus fares. Councillor Simson asked if the cost of doing both was included in the total figure provided at page 71.
- 27.11 The Policy & Development Manager confirmed that both costs were included in the totals.
- 27.12 Councillor Sykes commended the report that he believed was positive for motorists including shorter and fewer waiting lists and a reduction in the Penalty Charge Notice's issued.
- 27.13 Councillor Davey re-iterated the statement made by Councillor Sykes. He believed the report to be helpful to the public particularly its analysis of how the parking surplus was used.
- 27.14 **RESOLVED-**
1. That the Committee endorses the publication of the Parking Annual Report for 2012-13 under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004.

2. That the Committee authorises the Head of Transport Operations to produce and publish the report which will be made available on the Council's website.

28. HIGHWAYS WINTER SERVICE PLAN 2013-14

- 28.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that presented the Highways Winter Service Plan 2013-14 which was the result of an annual review by the highways team in partnership with other council sections, East and West Sussex authorities, the Highway Agency, the Sussex Resilience Forum and other transport operators. The Highways Code of Practice recommended that local authorities should formally approve, adopt and publish a Plan annually.
- 28.2 Councillor Simson noted the three different figures provided in the report regarding grit bin provision and asked for clarification.
- 28.3 The Head of Highway Operations stated that there were a total of 435 bins inclusive of those provided for other services and 422 exclusive public highway bins.
- 28.4 Councillor Sykes noted the information provided on use weather forecasting tools and asked if the authority co-ordinated their work with other sectors.
- 28.5 The Head of Highway Operations clarified that the authority had a joint contractor with East Sussex County Council and used one of the major three providers for winter weather system information. The Head of Highway Operations added that the weather systems in Brighton and Hove were quite unique which made it difficult to predict variations from location to location hence the need for a specific winter forecast for Brighton and Hove rather than a non-specific regional service.
- 28.6 Councillor Robins commended the excellent service provided by the Highways team which in his view did not often receive the recognition it deserved.
- 28.7 Councillor Simson stated that the Highways team had a very difficult service to operate that was carried out very well. Councillor Simson added that she had witnessed a positive impact in her ward for the first time this year that demonstrated the research and analysis work conducted. Councillor Simson supplemented that as city representatives, Members should encourage residents to help as much as possible during periods of extreme weather.
- 28.8 Councillor Theobald praised the work of the Highways team and asked if the Frequently Asked Questions section within the report could be made publically available to the public.
- 28.9 Councillor Hawtree commended the excellent service provided particularly as volatility of weather systems had increased recently and were often hard to predict.
- 28.10 Councillor Davey repeated the praise relayed by other Members of the committee and praised the information provided on the website which was very useful.

28.11 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approves the Brighton & Hove City Council Highways Winter Service Plan 2013-14 as attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

29. CITYWIDE BUS LANE ENFORCEMENT

29.1 RESOLVED-

- 1 That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee approve the extension of CCTV enforcement to all of the city's legally enforceable bus lanes
2. That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee approve the enforcement by CCTV of the parking contraventions of 'being parked in a loading place' and 'double parking', in areas already designated for CCTV enforcement

30. VERGE AND PAVEMENT PARKING RESTRICTIONS - FORMAL CONSULTATION

- 30.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that addressed the representations and objections to the draft traffic regulation order for Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verges and Footways and sought approval of the order subject to the amendments detailed in the report.
- 30.2 In response to public representation and other queries raised, the Programme Manager & Policy Development Officer explained that with regard to Varndean Road, he agreed that the specific stretch of road where vehicles are likely to come into conflict was 93 metres not 203 metres which would allow 17 out of the 20 vehicles currently on the verge to park on the road. However, he was of the view that to implement this, 4 x 15m sections of no waiting at any time would also be required on the south side. These would also act to protect pedestrian accesses to the flats and would result in the loss of about 12 spaces in an area of limited on street parking. The Programme Manager & Policy Development Officer stated that the trial areas were intended to have the consent of the local community to proceed and noted there are 15 objections from residents of Varndean Road and that 2 out of 3 ward members were not favour. It was the officer's view that any agreement to include Varndean Road within the proposals would negate that element of consent. Subject to agreement of the recommendations and resources and priorities, further consultation could take place with a view to finding a solution for Varndean Road.
- 30.3 Councillors Davey and Hawtree enquired as to possible alternative options for verge parking restrictions on Varndean Road.
- 30.4 The Chair replied that it was clear that the technical officer was very concerned about the inclusion of Varndean Road in the pilot scheme and the basis of consent of the community and safety. The Chair added that alternative options for Varndean Road could continue to be examined and the information learned from the pilot scheme would help inform that position.

30.5 Councillor Theobald welcomed the pilot scheme and agreed that the views and consent of residents and ward councillors should be respected in implementation.

30.6 **RESOLVED-**

1. That having taken account of all duly made representations and objections Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee approve The Brighton & Hove (Various Roads) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verges and Footways order 20** (TRO-15-2013) subject to the following amendments.
2. Item 2 Schedule 1 shall be amend description to “From its junction with Surrenden Road to a point 88 metres south of the junction with Carden Avenue.”
3. Delete item 9 schedule 1 Varndean Road
4. In response to safety audit recommendations officers are to prepare measures to mitigate any adverse effects that have been identified in that audit subject to monitoring and evaluation of these locations.

31. **INDIVIDUAL DISABLED BAYS**

- 31.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that set out the results of a review into the possibility of offering Individual Disabled Bays to residents within Brighton & Hove and requested approval to proceed with the scheme.
- 31.2 Councillor Simson asked if the bays would be enforceable.
- 31.3 The Parking Infrastructure Manager confirmed that they would be within Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's) and a telephone number would be provided to users to report contraventions for outside CPZ's.
- 31.4 Councillor Sykes asked how many individual bays were estimated to be provided if permission to proceed was granted.
- 31.5 The Parking Infrastructure Manager replied that his expectation was for twenty to be taken up at first although this figure was likely to be a lot higher as more people became aware of the scheme.
- 31.6 The Chair asked if the cost figures outlined in the report included officer time.
- 31.7 The Parking Infrastructure Manager replied that officer time would not be included in the application cost and that the figures outlined included expenditure to conduct the work only.
- 31.8 Councillor Simson enquired as to the general reaction to the proposed cost of application for members of the public.

- 31.9 The Parking Infrastructure Manager clarified that the reaction had been mixed. Some people believed the proposed costs represented value for money for a dedicated, individual bay, others thought the costs expensive.
- 31.10 Councillor Mitchell moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.1 and add a further recommendation 2.2 as shown in bold italics:
- 2.1 That the Committee approve the proposal that the council provide permit specific disabled persons parking bays subject to the criteria and charges set out in this report **and subject to 2.2 below.**
- 2.2 That the overall cost of the application is capped at £55 in recognition of the fact that many people with disabilities and in receipt of Mobility Allowance and high rate Attendance Allowance are living on low, fixed rate incomes.**
- 31.11 Councillor Robins formally seconded the motion.
- 31.12 Councillor Mitchell stated that whilst she welcomed the report basic proposals, the Labour & Co-operative Group believed the cost of the application was too high as many people with disabilities and in receipt of a higher rate benefit would be living on low, fixed rate incomes. Councillor Mitchell added that the authority received substantial parking income and it would be a good gesture to some of that to reduce the cost of the application to help those who needed it.
- 31.13 Councillor Hawtree stated that he would be keen to support the motion but would like clarification on whether such a scheme could be affordable.
- 31.14 The Head of Transport clarified that affordability was dependent upon uptake. If the expected figure of twenty bays were taken up, this would result in a four figure loss to the authority. If demand and uptake increased, this figure would naturally be a lot higher. The Head of Transport stated that it was down to Members to decide the affordability of the measures proposed in the motion.
- 31.15 Councillor Cox stated that it was difficult to make any assessment of the potential impact upon the authority with accompanying financial implications. Councillor Cox added that he would like the Labour & Co-operative Party to identify where to find the loss stipulated within the motion from the council's budget.
- 31.16 Councillor Robins stated that the cost of 20 bays would actually be £890. Councillor Robins added that even if 200 bays were taken up, this would cost £8,900 which was a small figure to help the disadvantaged.
- 31.17 Councillor Davey stated that the scheme was a real innovation, would help disabled people and was a positive outcome of the City Parking Review. Councillor Davey stated he fully expected that there would be a much higher take-up of the bays than twenty and he was concerned that to accept the Labour & Co-operative motion would place enormous financial pressure on the ability to maintain and co-ordinate the project. Councillor Davey also believed the charges to be fair for the amount of work required.

- 31.18 Councillor Sykes stated that the costs were not significant in the overall charges of operating a car. It was his view that applicants would be forthcoming and that the £100 cost of application was not unfair.
- 31.19 With regard to the Labour & Co-operative Group motion, Councillor Theobald stated that the Mobility Allowance and the Attendance Allowance were not means-tested benefit therefore; to reduce the cost of application to £55 would not benefit the disadvantaged alone.
- 31.20 Councillor Mitchell stated her disappointment that the motion was not supported highlighting the relatively low number of applicants and that advertising could be incorporated into other traffic order notices. Councillor Mitchell added that the figure the council would lose was relatively low and would help the most disadvantaged.
- 31.21 The Chair stated that he was concerned about the financial implications of reducing the application fee and that he was mindful that those who could apply were already entitled to a disabled bay and this was an optional measure to correct problems.
- 31.22 The Chair then put the motion to a vote with the following outcome:
- For: 5
Against: 5
Abstentions: 0
- 31.23 Therefore the motion was not carried.
- 31.24 The Chair then put the recommendations detailed in the report to the vote with the following outcome:
- For: 10
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
- 31.25 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approve the proposal that the council provide permit specific disabled persons parking bays subject to the criteria and charges set out in this report.
- 32. ELM GROVE, BRIGHTON- MANAGEMENT OF HIGHWAY PARKING AND OBSTRUCTIONS**
- 32.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that provided the outcome of the public consultation into proposed improvements in Elm Grove and the decision not to proceed with the proposals on the basis of the results. The report also requested authorisation to organise a joint initiative with Sussex Police to co-ordinate enforcement of parking contraventions, obstructions and other nuisances on the public highway in Elm Grove later in 2013.
- 32.2 Councillor Davey enquired as to who was involved in the previous consultation process.

- 32.3 The Programme Manager & Policy Development Officer clarified that the previous consultation process had been initiated by the former local councillor Matt Follett and proposals had been worked upon in co-operation with the Hanover Local Action Team and Elm Grove Community Action Group amongst others.
- 32.4 Councillor Theobald asked why yellow lines had been marked on the road if they were not enforced.
- 32.5 The Programme Manager & Policy Development Officer clarified that the lines had been marked in the 1980's and reviewed several times, most recently in 2012. The lines were mainly placed at junctions on the road. The Programme Manager & Policy Development Officer added that outside CPZ's, enforcement was discretionary according to the resources to do so.
- 32.6 Councillor Simson noted that significant increases in enforcement were made under the previous Conservative administration that had not been sustained. Councillor Simson asked how this would be done on this occasion.
- 32.7 The Programme Manager & Policy Development Officer replied enforcement measures were referred to in-depth within the report and it was certainly the authorities and Sussex Police intention to do so subject to approval of the report. The Programme Manager & Policy Development Officer stated that Elm Grove should be maintained just as anywhere else in the city and the collision and accident study referred to at 3.9 of the report, demonstrated the urgent need to do so.
- 32.8 Councillor Daniel requested that the Committee defer the report for twelve months. Councillor Daniel explained that the local community groups had recently unanimously agreed to move forward with the proposals initially with a questionnaire they all had designed. Councillor Daniel asked the Committee to defer a decision to give the local community a chance.
- 32.9 Councillor Hawtree stated that the matter of highway parking was a long running issue that had not been dealt with satisfactorily and in his view, accepting the proposals would make Elm Grove safer.
- 32.10 Councillor Mitchell stated that if the Committee accepted the proposals, it would ignore the wishes of a whole constituency and the ward councillors who had voted against the consultation proposals. Councillor Mitchell added that in her view, residents should be given another opportunity within a twelve month timeframe and if no agreement could be reached then enforcement measures should be put in to place. Councillor Mitchell supplemented that whilst she did not condone illegal parking, residents now understood the need for a solution. Councillor Mitchell requested that ward councillors, residents and the community groups be given twelve months to work on proposals for a solution. Councillor Mitchell added that whilst the current situation could not continue there was an alternative method and for any measures to work, they would require the buy-in and all the aforementioned groups and local residents.
- 32.11 The Chair stated that it was clear the entire Committee agreed that the situation was unsafe however; no amendment had been put forward as an alternative to the recommendations by any political group.

- 32.12 Councillor Cox stated that the report described long-term practice and custom of extremely dangerous driving and parking in Elm Grove that the Committee were being asked by the Labour & Co-operative Group to ignore for another year. Councillor Cox stated in his view, that was not tenable and the Committee had to consider people's safety first and foremost and a deliberate decision not to opt for enforcement would seriously question Members sense of judgement and civic responsibilities.
- 32.13 Councillor Sykes stated that he had visited the Elm Grove recently and viewed areas where parking was complete chaos. Councillor Sykes believed the Committee had to be responsible and should begin enforcement to ensure peoples safety.
- 32.14 Councillor Davey stated that the illegal parking issue in Elm Grove had a very long history adding that two years ago, the administration had agreed with the community to come up with a solution. Councillor Davey stated that the proposed solution had been rejected and he could not see any other option aside from beginning enforcement action. Councillor Davey added that he had recently been contacted three times by a shop owner in the area who had informed him of incidents of cars driving down the pavement nearly colliding with customers exiting his shop. Councillor Davey supplemented that significant efforts had been made to find a solution in partnership with the local community that had not been reached. Councillor Davey expressed his belief that enforcement actions begin which could work alongside continued work with the local community to find a holistic solution.
- 32.15 Councillor Simson stated that enforcement should have been instigated a long time ago and could not understand why such behaviour had been allowed to continue. Councillor Simson stated her empathy with the Labour & Co-operative Group's request for deferral as the best solution to fix such a long term culture would be to work up from grassroots level with the buy-in of the local community.
- 32.16 Councillor Theobald stated his support for beginning enforcement action as there were significant safety issues that the Committee could not ignore. Councillor Theobald also relayed his support for continuing to work with the local community to find a widely accepted solution.
- 32.17 The Chair then put the vote with the following outcome:
- For: 6
Against: 3
Abstentions: 1
- 32.18 **RESOLVED-**
1. That Committee notes the outcome of the public consultation on a scheme for environmental improvements in Elm Grove and that it is not proposed to proceed with the scheme in view of the majority of residents who responded being opposed to the scheme.

2. That Committee authorises officers to organise a joint initiative with Sussex Police to co-ordinate enforcement of parking contraventions, obstructions and other nuisances on the public highway in Elm Grove later this year.

33. BETTER BUS AREAS - EDWARD STREET AND EASTERN ROAD - TRO OBJECTIONS

33.1 RESOLVED-

- 1) That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approves as advertised the following orders:
 - **TRO-17a-2013** Brighton & Hove (Edward Street & Eastern Road) (Bus Lane) Order 201*
 - **TRO-17b-2013** Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.* 201*

With the following amendments:

The addition of an exemption to allow loading and unloading in the bus and cycle lanes at times other than 7am-10am and 4pm-7pm for the reasons set out in paragraphs 4.8 - 4.10.

- 2) That any subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order once construction of the scheme is complete.

34. DYKE ROAD PED & CYCLE FACILITIES - PERMISSION TO CONSULT

34.1 RESOLVED-

1. That the committee grant permission to consult informally with residents, businesses and stakeholders regarding the proposals for Dyke Road.
2. That results of the informal consultation are brought back to Environment and Sustainability Committee for consideration on 26th November 2013

35. ACCESS TO SDNP - DITCHLING ROAD: PERMISSION TO CONSTRUCT (PHASE 1)

- 35.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that requested permission to proceed with the implementation of facilities on Ditchling Road which that would support people walking, cycling and using public transport to access the South Downs National Park (SDNP). The scheme was a part of the funding secured in 2012 for the 2 National Parks Local Sustainable Transport Fund to improve sustainable transport access to the SDNP.

- 35.2 Councillor Theobald welcomed the scheme but noted the concern of his residents regarding the proposals for sheep grazing either side of the road.
- 35.3 The Principal Transport Planner stated this was also the main issue raised in the consultation and it was proposed that that element of the scheme be withdrawn and further investigative work carried out.
- 35.4 Councillor Mitchell stated that, since the creation of the SDNP, it was necessary to improve the surrounding roads. Councillor Mitchell stated that she welcomed the majority of measures and the scheme itself but had reservations regarding the removal of road lining. Councillor Mitchell asked if the removal of road lining could be delayed pending a monitoring scheme for the impact of speed limit reduction.
- 35.5 The Principal Transport Planner explained that there were a number of elements to the scheme that would have to be implemented carefully and in co-operation with Sussex Police. Removal of the road lining was part of a wider package of measures for speed reduction along the road. Studies had demonstrated that drivers travelling along a road absent of lining consider their actions much more carefully than when travelling on a lined road.
- 35.6 Councillor Cox stated that the current conditions were very poor for walking to the SDNP and the area itself did not currently reflect a rural gateway to a National Park. Councillor Cox explained that whilst he had reservations about sheep grazing either side of the road, cattle grids would provide a much more suitable introduction and impression to the National Park entrance.
- 35.7 **RESOLVED-**
1. That the Committee notes the results of the informal consultation, showing 62% support for the proposal to improve the Ditchling Road environment to enable people to walk, cycle and take the bus comfortably to the South Downs National Park and 67% support the proposal to reduce the speed limit on Ditchling Road from 60mph to 40mph along Ditchling Road between Coldean Lane and Woodbourne Avenue and grants permission to proceed with those elements of the scheme not bound by Traffic Regulation or Speed Reduction Order as set out in paragraph 3.11(a) to (f) of the report.
 2. That the Committee grants permission to the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing to proceed with advertisement of a Speed Reduction Order in relation to the measures set out at paragraph 3.11(g) in the report and that any objections to the Speed Reduction Order are brought to the next Environment and Sustainability Committee for consideration.
 3. That the Committee notes that a report will be brought back to this Committee prior to the introduction of the limit and associated features.
 4. That the Committee instructs officers to submit a report to Policy & Resources Committee recommending that the land adjacent to Ditchling Road, which is currently not available for Highway use, is appropriated for highway purposes.

5. That the Committee instructs officers to investigate the legal and regulatory requirements necessary for the introduction of open grazing and to bring a further report to ETS Committee with the outcome of the investigations and any subsequent recommendations.

36. 'THE COMMON ROOM' (ANN STREET/PROVIDENCE PLACE)

36.1 RESOLVED-

1. That members of the committee note the work that has been undertaken in taking forward the successful aspects of the Lively Cities 'Common Room' pilot scheme into a draft permanent implementation plan.
2. That the committee approves the draft permanent plan for the purpose of a six week public consultation exercise commencing later this month, with the results and next stages being reported back to a future meeting of the committee to enable work to commence in Spring 2014 .

37. AMENDMENT TRAFFIC ORDER

37.1 RESOLVED-

1. That the Committee is recommended to (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections):

Approve the Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.* 201* and Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 amendment Order No.* 201* with the following amendments:

- a) That the proposed removal of disabled parking bays outside No.1 & 11 Batemans Road, Nos.101 & 105 Dean Gardens, No.9 Highview Way, No.3 The Forge Kingsthorpe Road and No.75 St Leonard's Road are to be removed from the Traffic Order as these bays are still required by local residents.
- b) That the proposed disabled parking bays to be made enforceable outside No.10 Edburton Road and No.15 Grange Road are to be removed from the Traffic Order as these bays are no longer required by local residents.
- c) That the proposed disabled parking bay to be made enforceable outside No.75 Princes Crescent is to be removed from the Traffic Order as this bay has recently been advertised on Area J Extension Traffic Order
- d) That the proposed Motorcycle bay extension in Wordsworth Street is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.6.

38. TRAVELLER COMMISSIONING STRATEGY: ONE YEAR ON

38.1 **RESOLVED-** That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee notes the progress made, achievements and challenges in delivering the strategy (Appendix 1).

39. ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

39.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 7.50pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of