

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

**4.00pm 7 OCTOBER 2014**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors West (Chair), Deane (Deputy Chair), Cox (Opposition Spokesperson), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), Mitchell (Group Spokesperson), Robins (Group Spokesperson), Daniel, Davey, Powell and G Theobald

**PART ONE**

**24 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**24(a) Declarations of substitutes**

24.1 Councillor Powell was present as substitute for Councillor Buckley.

**24(b) Declarations of interest**

24.2 Councillor Theobald declared a general interest in item 45 as the owner of a property in Ship Street.

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

24.3 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).

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

**25 MINUTES**

25.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 7 July 2014 be approved and signed as the correct record.

**26 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE CITY SUSTAINABILITY PARTNERSHIP (FOR INFORMATION)**

- 26.1. **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting of the City Sustainability Partnership held on 16 July 2014 be noted.

**27 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

- 27.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

*We have a very full agenda today, so I will contain my remarks to celebrating some significant achievements for the city.*

*I'm very pleased to say that along with Adur Council and the Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Partnership, we have secured more than £40,000 of government funding to look at low carbon and renewable energy heating systems that would benefit hundreds of householders in Shoreham, Hove and Portslade.*

*We will now be able to look at the potential for district heating systems which would offer residents and businesses access to much lower heating bills together with a reduction in carbon emissions.*

*As members will hopefully be aware, the City Council has been highly commended for two of its major transport schemes in this year's National Transport Awards. The commendations were in the 'Improvements to Bus Services' category for the Lewes Road Sustainable Transport Corridor and the 'Road Safety, Traffic Management & Enforcement' category for the Seven Dials road safety scheme.*

*This success announced last week was hot on the heels of the council winning the top European award for clean transport, named City of the Year by Civitas.*

*In submitting for these awards the council detailed how the city's sustainable travel projects have helped the city to be recognised nationally as the UK's least car dependent city outside London by the Campaign for Better Transport. Almost 40 per cent of residents do not own a car.*

*I am sure members will wish to join with me in acknowledging the hard work of our talented officer team in delivering such fantastic improvement in sustainable transport choice, and the pivotal role Cllr Davey has played, building on the foundation laid by previous administrations, to put the city in such a leading position.*

**28 CALL OVER**

- 28.1 The following items on the agenda were reserved for discussion:

- Item 32: City Wide parking review update
- Item 34: Parking Annual Report 2013-14
- Item 35 Bakers Bottom- Area U resident parking scheme extension
- Item 36: Lewes Road Triangle Area J extension
- Item 38 Amendment Traffic Order
- Item 41: Valley Gardens governance and southern section update
- Item 42: Pedestrian Crossing Priority
- Item 43: Church Road, South Portslade- traffic and road safety improvements
- Item 45: Old Town Transport Scheme (East Street)
- Item 47: Preston Park Chalet Public Toilets condition survey

28.2 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 33: Highways Winter Service Plan 2014-15
- Item 37: Wish Ward parking scheme proposals
- Item 39: Double Yellow lines in Tongdean Lane outside Withdean Sports Complex
- Item 40: Area E (Preston Park Station North) Traffic Order amendments
- Item 44: Dyke Road cycle facility
- Item 46: Motorcycles in bus lane trial
- Item 48: Open Spaces Strategy for Brighton & Hove
- Item 49: Nominations for Centenary Fields programme
- Item 50: Allocations Policies for permanent and transit travellers sites

## 29 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

### (a) Petitions

#### (i) Denmark and Vale Road speeding

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

*Thank you for your petition regarding speeds in Denmark Road and Vale Road and for raising your concerns. It is extremely important to the monitoring and evaluation of the 20mph limits that we receive feedback from local residents on how they feel their roads have (or have not) changed since the new limits were introduced as this can help target not only monitoring but any remedial or enforcement action that might be needed to support the limits.*

*Speed surveys undertaken earlier this year (March 2014) show that current average speeds on Vale Road are 20.6 mph. As such the data does not indicate a need for further physical traffic calming measures, at this location at this time. I appreciate that things may have changed in the area since the last monitoring was undertaken and officers are in the process of undertaking further monitoring on these roads, the results of which will be presented to this committee in November. I also appreciate that the perception of speeds can be just as important as the actual recorded speeds and that this is an important issue in making our streets feel safer and more pleasant and this is something we do factor into our reviews and monitoring of individual streets and areas. Should it become necessary, the programme does allow and have some budget for, traffic calming measures to be introduced where they are needed most. We are working closely with Sussex Police on the implementation and monitoring of the 20mph limits and we will, this year, be undertaking further promotional and educational work with them that will include road side speed surveys and pulling over drivers who are found to be speeding.*

*I appreciate that this information may not answer your concerns immediately but I do hope it will reassure you that speed management and the lowering of traffic speeds where people live remains a priority for the council and one which we are working hard with partners, including Sussex Police, to deliver. Monitoring results from the 20mph programme are showing that traffic speeds in the city are reducing and that this is*

*seeing a reduction in the number and severity of collision and casualties but we acknowledge that there is still much work to be done. Petitions such as yours are extremely helpful in the ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the programme in identifying areas of concern and I will ensure that your concerns and your road continue to be reviewed.*

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

**(b) Written Questions**

**(i) Traffic in Poets Corner- Alison Donaldson**

29.3 Alison Donaldson asked the following question:

*“What recent evidence of traffic volumes is there from Council monitoring of Poet's Corner, and what specific plans are there to discourage rat-running in the area, given planned developments around Hove Station?”*

*Some background:*

- 1. The redesign of the Portland Road - Sackville Road junction has encouraged rat-running (and traffic-light jumping)*
- 2. 20mph limits and humps reduce speed but volumes remain high in peak periods.*
- 3. The Head of Transport Planning, David Parker, thinks one-way traffic would increase speeds.*
- 4. Closing off selected streets might help but wasn't popular in the last traffic calming consultation. Further consultation may be needed”.*

29.4 The Chair provided the following response:

*“The Council undertakes traffic monitoring at intervals to determine changes and impacts arising from local development, traffic schemes and traffic growth in general. With regard to land use development proposals, measures to reduce traffic impacts are usually brought forward in response to specific proposals, since it can be quite some time between applications being submitted and any traffic impacts being realised. Frequently, development characteristics change as proposals are revised and for this reason the Council's development control officers liaise with developers over suitable mitigation for affected streets and this is currently the case with developments in the Hove Station area.*

*As you will be aware, the Council has introduced measures to deter rat-running and reduce speeds in the Poets Corner residential area and the introduction of one-way traffic systems is acknowledged to encourage both of these characteristics. Similarly, the effects of street closures on through-traffic are to increase traffic flows on other roads and reduce permeability through an area. For these reasons they tend to be unpopular with residents and are not therefore something that officers feel are beneficial in residential areas.*

*However, officers are engaging with local residents in the Poets Corner area, over measures to limit traffic use of certain routes, as part of a pilot street management programme and I will also ask them to specifically look into the operation of the traffic signal junction at Portland Road/Sackville Road and determine the effects of any rat-*

*running through surrounding streets as well as traffic-light jumping by drivers and I will ask officers to respond to you directly on these concerns”.*

**(ii) Bakers Bottom controlled parking spaces- Sally Anne Taylor**

29.5 Sally Anne Taylor asked the following question:

*“I live in the basement flat and my only entrance which is street level is situated on Livingstone Street, also on the same side I have 2 below street level windows which one half is above pavement level. Any parking outside these windows has wellbeing and noise related poor effect on my living conditions, and restricts access to my main entrance, due to narrow pavement. I would like council to reconsider the parking plan. The other side of the road doesn’t have these same issues and would create less disruption”*

29.6 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your comments.  
These matters are being discussed in a report later in the meeting when members of the Committee will decide on the way forward.  
However, I would like to assure residents that if a scheme goes ahead, vehicles will not be parking on the pavements anymore and the amount of daylight will hopefully be increased due to this”.*

**(iii) Area U resident parking scheme extension- Roy Pennington**

29.7 Roy Pennington asked the following question:

*“The Council’s controlled parking zone development is piecemeal and apparently confusing to some people (see ETSC Oct 7th 2014 agenda item 35, para 5.28 in the report), in which light-touch such as Zone U adjoins full-touch such as the larger Zone C and in both of which there is no waiting list : what financial costs would there be now to consult and implement a partial transfer of the new extended light-touch Zone U (to consist of Bakers Bottom streets plus Dawson Terrace and Cuthbert Road) into the current full-touch Zone C?”*

29.8 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your comments.  
These matters are being discussed in a report later in the meeting when members of the Committee will decide on the way forward.  
As stated in the report the Bakers Bottom area is being proposed as an extension to Area U as it adjoins this parking scheme and it would be confusing to extend it to another zone such as Area C. We would have to re-consult residents in other roads within Area U to become part of Area C instead and this is unlikely to be popular as there are not currently any issues within this zone.  
Residents in Area U were consulted in 2010 on whether they would like a full scheme such as Area C and 95% were in favour of retaining the existing light touch Area U scheme. This Included 100% of respondents from Dawson Terrace, 92% of respondents*

*from Cuthbert Road and 82.5% of respondents from Sutherland Road which adjoins the proposed area”.*

**(c) Deputations**

**(i) Old Town transport scheme- Olivia Reid**

29.9 The Committee considered a Deputation that set out a case in support of proposals to close East Street to traffic between the hours of 11am and 7pm.

29.10 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your comments and presenting your Deputation all of which the Committee will consider when it comes to discuss the item later in the agenda”*

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

**(ii) Church Road, South Portslade traffic and road safety improvements- Rae Powers**

29.12 The Committee considered a Deputation that set out community consensus and initiatives in support of a crossing location at the junction of St Peters and Church Road.

29.13 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you Rae for your continued drive in support of local residents in South Portslade and the parents of children attending the St Peter’s Community Primary School. As you will note, a report is being brought before today’s Committee for members to deliberate and consider the results of work undertaken by officers and we shall certainly include the comments you have made today in our debate”*

29.14 **RESOVLED-** That the Deputation be noted.

**(iii) Support for Area J extension- Sarah Smith**

29.15 The Committee considered a Deputation that urged the approval of the traffic order associated with the implementation of the extension of Area J in the Lewes Road Triangle area.

29.16 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your comments. As one of your ward councillors I’m acutely aware of the parking problems faced by the area, and it is very pleasing to see the amount of support received for the parking scheme. This scheme is being discussed in a report later in the meeting when members of the Committee will decide on the way forward”.*

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

**(iv) Old Town proposals- Stuart Wilkie**

29.18 The Committee considered a Deputation that requested the Committee to reject the proposals for Old Town in their current form.

29.19 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your comments and presenting your Deputation all of which the Committee will consider when it comes to discuss the item later in the agenda”.*

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

## **30 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**

### **(a) Petitions**

#### **(i) Refurbishment of the public toilets adjacent to the Rotunda Café in Preston Park- Lee Wares**

30.1 The Chair provided the following response:

*“May I again thank the petitioners for bringing this petition to the Council. The petition was fully debated at the Council meeting on 17 July where it was resolved to call for an officer report to be presented to this committee meeting. We will be considering that report later in the meeting under item 47”.*

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

#### **(ii) Road Surface, Coombe Road- Councillor Meadows**

30.3 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Coombe Road has been identified as one of the roads in the city which needs attention and is therefore on our Forward Works Plan. However, Coombe Road is a long road that will require substantial funds to resurface its entire length.*

*I’m afraid that this financial year, we are prioritising our funds on certain stretches of road which are experiencing structural failure and need very urgent attention.*

*However, subject to more detailed budget allocation and providing no more urgent priorities arise, it is proposed to carry out resurfacing works in the next financial year.*

*This would probably be programmed for August 2015 to avoid the school term-time.*

*In the meantime, Coombe Road is regularly inspected by the Highways team, who also respond to public reports about potholes or other hazards, and who will arrange for safety repairs to be carried out as required”.*

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

#### **(iii) Matlock Road parking restrictions- Councillor K Norman**

30.5 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Lead Members and officers have considered the issues being raised here by businesses and their customers, and ward members representing Matlock Road. Committee will be considering proposals responding to these concerns under agenda item 40. We will certainly take all your views into account when we have that discussion”*

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

**(iv) Pedestrian Crossing, Bexhill Road**

30.7 That Chair provided the following response:

*“Following the introduction of the Skate and Play Park in late summer 2012 inspections were carried out by officers to assess safety and access issues, none were identified at that time or over the subsequent period. In the last three years there have been no related collisions on Bexhill Road opposite the Skate and Play Park.*

*The council have a points based system by which we use to assess and prioritise pedestrian crossing requests. Each crossing request is assessed based on 12 criteria which not only covers collisions but also considers access to public transport and other services & local environmental conditions.*

*Surveys have been carried out on Bexhill Road in Woodingdean to determine its priority and suitability for a pedestrian crossing point. However the location did not meet our initial criteria and therefore is not a priority on the Council’s pedestrian crossing list.*

*More information on the pedestrian crossing process can be found on the councils webpages where the full priority list can be viewed.*

*The council is however consulting on proposals for phase 3 of the 20mph scheme in Woodingdean. If introduced on Bexhill Road opposite the play & skate park reduced speed limits could assist pedestrians crossing the road safely”.*

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

**(v) Traffic in Woodingdean- Councillor Wells**

30.9 The Chair provided the following response:

*“The city council’s cross-party transport committee unanimously agreed plans on 2nd October 2012 to make transport improvements to the Lewes Road corridor. This followed an extensive public consultation exercise where the majority of those who responded indicated they were in favour of the proposals.*

*The scheme included measures to improve public transport services and safety for pedestrians and cyclists as well as the upgrade of traffic signals at key junctions to improve the efficiency of the route for car drivers.*

*In order to monitor the impact of this scheme on the surrounding areas, 7-day traffic counts were undertaken before construction on a range of residential roads that could be considered possible ‘rat runs’ or alternative routes, including Falmer Road on the approach to Woodingdean. These surveys were replicated following the completion on the scheme in October 2013.*

*These initial survey results suggested that there had been no appreciable increase in traffic using alternative routes. In the case of Falmer Road, a reduction of around 50 vehicles on average per day has been recorded since the Lewes Road scheme was completed.*



*Further surveys are being programmed to take place in the new year following the completion of the improvements at the Vogue Gyratory. Should these surveys show an increase in traffic in any of the surrounding areas then further action will be considered at this time.*

*In the meantime, an officer of the Council would be happy to meet with a representative of the petitioners should they wish to elaborate on their concerns in relation to specific roads”.*

- 30.10 Councillor Theobald stated that there was a widespread perception that traffic was now worse in Woodingdean due to the work carried out and ongoing on Lewes Road and he would like to receive traffic counts for the area.
- 30.11 The Chair stated that the work at Vogue Gyratory was ongoing and it would be logical to receive traffic count data after that work was complete.
- 30.12 Councillor Mitchell stated that the original report and accompanying leaflet gave a commitment that the Lewes Road scheme would be monitored, including traffic counts, after six months but that had not yet happened and was long overdue.
- 30.13 The Head of Transport clarified that there was a commitment for further monitoring of the scheme and the impact on traffic in the wider area once the works at Vogue Gyratory had been completed and that would be reported to Committee.
- 30.14 Councillor Theobald stated that he would like to receive previous traffic counts associated with the scheme.
- 30.15 The Head of Transport stated that he would pass this information to the Committee and Woodingdean ward councillors.
- 30.16 **RESOLVED-** That the petition be noted.

## **31 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

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

#### **(i) Councillor Mitchell- refuse collection**

- 31.1 Councillor Mitchell presented a question regarding the poor condition and lack of maintenance of refuse bins and frequency of checks for fly-tipping of waste.
- 31.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you very much for your question regarding the condition of the communal bins. Cityclean does have a crew, who as part of their responsibilities, repair and maintain communal bins on site and will also respond to reports of graffiti on bins. Street Cleansing Teams also have wipes and black paint to remove graffiti from bins. However many of the bins have now been in place for five or more years and need to be taken off the street for more significant refurbishment or replacement. The roll out of communal bins was subject to prudential borrowing to pay for the vehicles and bins. This capital has now been repaid and will result in £111,000 per year being*

*available from April onwards which will be reinvested in a rolling program for the maintenance of the bins. The bins will be audited and recorded on an asset register before that time and the refurbishment/ replacement work will begin in April. There are approximately 700 communal refuse bins in place across the city and on a rolling program with the current resources all bins should be replaced or refurbished every five years. This work will include putting clear signage on the bins to clarify that they should only be used for household waste and to remind people to recycle. In terms of fly-tipping our street cleansing crews check the areas around bins on a daily basis as part of their rounds. Any fly-tips reported to our contact centre are forwarded to street cleansing crews to be cleared. Officers will also follow up on any reports of businesses fly-tipping their waste in communal bins”.*

**(c) Letters**

**(i) Communal refuse bins- Councillor G Theobald**

31.3 Councillor Theobald presented a letter regarding the poor condition and lack of maintenance of refuse bins and recent service disruption.

31.4 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you very much for your letter regarding the condition of the communal bins and the refuse and recycling collection service generally much of which seems similar to Cllr Mitchell’s question, so may I refer you to the answer just given.*

*With regard to flytipping of bulky waste around communal bins, street Cleansing Crews are proactive in clearing these items. Unfortunately it is often very difficult to take formal action if there is no evidence as to who dumped the items there in the first place. This said, we are considering options for enhanced responsiveness and enforcement as part of a redesigned service.*

*In your letter you comment on the ongoing issues with the refuse and recycling service. The service was starting to bed down and nine new refuse and recycling collection vehicles are due to come in to service by the end of October which will replace the older, less reliable vehicles.*

*It is very unfortunate that since your letter HGV drivers at Cityclean have undertaken industrial action in the last month causing further disruption for residents. I am sure you share my desire to see this issue resolved in a manner which is fair to all council employees.*

*The current situation is delaying service improvements and the launch of the incentive and engagement campaign which this committee approved earlier this year to help improve recycling rates.*

*I can assure you and the public that officers are doing their utmost to resolve this difficult situation and I would urge the trade union to continue to engage to come to a resolution so that we can focus on improving the service.*

*I am disappointed that our recycling rate declined last year which was at least in part due to the disruption following the negotiations on pay and subsequent round reorganisation.*

*The city has never had a high recycling rate under any previous administration and this Administration has looked at ways to increase recycling rates. We were particularly keen to introduce food waste collection which can increase recycling rates more significantly.*

*The cost of providing this service is prohibitive at a time when we face significant reductions to our budgets which is why we have not been able to pursue this. I am hopeful that communal recycling will increase recycling rates in the city centre and I am keen to implement the engagement and incentive scheme that this committee approved earlier this year.*

*I am pleased to say that DCLG has announced a further national fund of £5million for incentive schemes. Following our successful application to the DCLG fund for communal recycling officers are now looking at opportunities to resource further incentive work through this grant. Because of the tight deadline for submissions officers will be asking to meet with members to talk through the proposals later this month. Richard Bradley has taken up his post as Head of Cityclean and City Parks and he has joined us at a very challenging time. I know that Richard and the team are working on all the issues I have mentioned, with the priority being to improve the reliability of the service.*

*As you are aware, we are currently seeking GMB agreement to a proposed redesign of the service. We have dealt with pay fairness, now we can move forward together on developing a much better service the whole city may be proud of”.*

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

**(ii) Blocked drains and gullies- Councillor Robins**

31.6 Councillor Robins presented a Letter detailing problems with drain and gully clearance and a request for further information on the prioritisation of drain and gully clearance.

31.7 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your letter regarding drains and gullies.*

*The weather on the 28<sup>th</sup> of July was indeed exceptional and caused flooding to houses, businesses and even our own offices. I certainly have a great deal of sympathy for the people who have been affected by this devastating experience.*

*Initial estimates from the Environment Agency and Southern Water suggest that the storm on the 28<sup>th</sup> of July exceeded a 1 in 100-year event. There was between 50 -100 mm of rainfall in the space of three hours, more than the entire average rainfall for July. The highway drains and Southern Water sewers are not designed to cope with such extreme events, and this can be made worse if gullies are also covered by leaves, debris, and litter or parked.*

*There are over 20,000 gullies across the city which are cleared every 12 or 18 months by our contractor. The frequency of clearance is decided based on historical information on how quickly they fill up. For every gulley that is cleared data is automatically stored on how full it was prior to being cleared which provides the baseline information.*

*With regards to the roads you mention I have asked officers to clarify when the gullies were last inspected, their recorded condition and action taken. I have a detailed response on these specifics that I will ask officers to share with you.*

*In relation to your last point, the likelihood of more heavy rain will increase as we get into autumn and winter. Our contractors work year round to empty gullies as per their work schedule, which prioritises those sites which fill up most quickly. This helps minimise the risk of flooding where it is most likely to occur.*

*When we do experience heavy rain and localised flooding, Cityclean street cleansing staff clear the covers of gullies to try and alleviate the immediate problem. If this does*

*not work and there is an immediate safety risk or a risk to property, we will use our emergency call out service to try and manage the situation”.*

- 31.8 Councillor Robins asked why clearance was not conducted when officers were aware that six drains were blocked one month.
- 31.9 The Head of Strategy & Projects clarified that measurements on drain blockage were taken immediately before the drains were cleared. The drains in question were emptied the same day that the measurement was taken.
- 31.10 Councillor Robins stated that he was not convinced that the drains had been cleared and suggested using temporary notices to ensure cars were not parked over drains on the day they were scheduled to be cleared.
- 31.11 The Chair stated that he would request officers to meet with Councillor Robins to investigate the issue subsequent to the meeting.
- 31.12 **RESOLVED-** That the Letter be noted.

**(iii) Hove Station footbridge- Councillor Janio**

- 31.13 Councillor Janio presented a Letter requesting a report be presented to a subsequent meeting of the Committee examining possible options for funding access improvements to Hove Station in partnership with Network Rail and the DfT.
- 31.14 The Chair stated that he believed the issue was very complex and agreed that a report to a future meeting would be helpful to Committee.
- 31.15 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive a report on the matter to a future meeting.

**32 CITY WIDE PARKING REVIEW UPDATE**

- 32.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that provided a progress update on the recommendations of the city wide parking review approved by the Transport Committee in January 2013 and consideration of the council's response to requests from residents in parts of the city for consultation on new or extended resident parking schemes.
- 32.2 Councillor Mitchell stated that she welcomed limited stay free parking proposed for a location in Area H and Councillor Mitchell asked if that related to the Broadway shopping area on Whitehawk Road.
- 32.3 The Programme Manager and Policy Development Officer confirmed that the proposal did relate to the Broadway shopping area.
- 32.4 Councillor Robins noted that paragraph 6.14 noted that referred to the parking sensor technology. Councillor Robins enquired as to the cost of the potential investment and who had decided not to proceed with its introduction on that basis. Councillor Robins also noted that the report specified that two out of five households now no longer owned

a car and that there were now .86 cars per household. Councillor Robins asked if this figure was a distorted by the lack of car ownership in the city centre.

- 32.5 The Programme Manager and Policy Development Officer noted that the sensors were expensive, would include further costs in infrastructure and therefore had not been deemed feasible adding that full costings were not available at the meeting but could be sent to Councillor Robins. The Programme Manager and Policy Development Officer supplemented that figures on car ownership were taken from the most recent census in 2011 that demonstrated that whilst car ownership was low in the city centre and higher in the suburbs, this was not a uniform pattern.
- 32.6 Councillor Cox noted that paragraph 5.4 stated that only one ward councillor out of three in Withdean had expressed support for a parking survey in that ward and the Committee were being asked to proceed with a survey, yet both of the ward councillors in Hove Park had also made requests yet this was not reflected in the recommendations of the report.
- 32.7 The Programme and Policy Development Officer stated that this was because Withdean ward would just be a technical survey of the area and Hove Park, which had already been identified in the previous City Wide parking review, was for a formal consultation on a parking scheme.
- 32.8 Councillor Janio noted that paragraph 6.2 noted that implementation of grass verge and pavement parking controls had worked but were financed by a one off revenue allocation. Councillor Janio asked if the schemes would be rolled out wider and would continue.
- 32.9 The Programme and Policy Development Officer noted that extensive conversation with lead transport members for each party had expressed a clear preference and agreement for a concentration and focus to the scheme in the specified areas.
- 32.10 Councillor Daniel asked if consideration had been given to reducing the fee for personalised disabled bays. In relation to paragraph 6.3, Councillor Daniel stated that whilst she was happy that measures introduced had improved visibility at junctions in the Elm Grove area and would appreciate a further update however, drivers were still parking on hard verges where they could. Furthermore, Councillor Daniel noted that a petition previously received by the Committee signed by 1500 people had requested capital works on the road that the community were involved in yet proposals did not appear forthcoming.
- 32.11 The Chair noted that charges for personalised disabled bays would be submitted to the Committee via the Fees & Charges report and monitoring discussions on a parking solution in Elm Grove between local groups before making any advancement.
- 32.12 The Programme and Policy Development Officer stated that it was usual that data for road traffic accidents was accumulated over a one year period and as the measures for Elm Grove were agreed in November 2013, he hoped the data could be shared soon.

32.13 Councillor Theobald stated that his group would be voting against recommendation 2.1 of the report as the majority of ward councillors in the area were against a survey and it did not pay heed to financial constraints currently faced by the council.

32.14 Councillor Davey stated that it was worth noting the record of Committee in acting upon requests and concerns made by residents for parking schemes. Councillor Davey welcomed the report that indicated waiting lists for permits were down significantly, personalised disabled bays had been introduced, time limited free parking bays had been introduced and that many residents were taking advantage of cheaper permits for low emission vehicles. Councillor Davey noted that whilst the census data indicated car ownership had fallen in many areas of the city, it also showed rises in car ownership in the Elm Grove and Withdean areas. Increasing demand, density and pressure on parking required a pro-active response to assist residents and parking survey would provide the authority considered data and information to react.

32.15 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the committee authorises officers to commission parking surveys in early 2015 in streets north of Preston Drove set out in paragraph 6.1 and shown in the plan in Appendix A. A report is expected to be taken to committee next summer to determine the design and detail of any scheme of parking controls that would be put out to consultation.
- 2) That the committee approves the policy recommendations in paragraphs 6.5 a-d inclusive ( highway verge and pavement parking controls) and 6.16 (limited stay “free” bays)
- 3) That committee notes the progress reports in paragraphs 6.6-6.15 inclusive and 6.17 – 6.19 inclusive

**33 HIGHWAYS WINTER SERVICE PLAN 2014-15**

33.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approves the Brighton & Hove City Council Highways Winter Service Plan 2014-15 as attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

**34 PARKING ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14**

34.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing set sought approval for the publication of the Parking Annual Report 2013-14 to the Department for Transport, Traffic Penalty Tribunal and for general publication under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004.

34.2 Councillor Theobald welcomed the presentation of the report however, he noted that there were several reference to Environment Cabinet Member Meeting that had been

decommissioned and there appeared to be no information relating to Trafalgar Street car park.

- 34.3 The Policy & Development Manager clarified that there appeared to be an error in the report that showed a page as blank, likely to be that relating to Trafalgar Street. The Policy Development Manager stated that he would circulate this information to Members and details of expenditure and income were details on page 121 of the agenda.
- 34.4 Councillor Robins asked for the category or explanation for a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) to be written off for other reasons.
- 34.5 The Policy & Development Manager stated that the other reasons category was hard to define as a typical scenario but could include for example, medical reasons that meant that people could not return to their car on time.
- 34.6 Councillor Powell welcomed the report, specifically the focussed work on Blue Badge enforcement in co-ordination with Sussex Police which was a huge problem nationally and welcomed the proposal for a dedicated Blue Badge enforcement officer.
- 34.7 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee endorses the publication of the Parking Annual Report for 2013-14 under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004.
  - 2) That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee authorises the Head of Transport Operations to produce and publish the report which will be made available on the Council's website.

### **35 BAKERS BOTTOM - AREA U RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME EXTENSION**

- 35.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that addressed comments and objections to the draft traffic regulation order proposing an extension of the Area U resident parking scheme into the Bakers Bottom area.
- 35.2 The Chair noted the concerns raised by East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service and those of Councillors Bowden and Powell, ward councillors for the area.
- 35.3 Councillor Davey asked if there was any information on the current utilisation and capacity of bays in Area U.
- 35.4 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that utilisation of data was difficult due to data protection issues although figures suggested that car ownership was low in the area.
- 35.5 Councillor Mitchell asked if any answers could be provided to the issue brought forward by a member of the public earlier in the meeting that parking be located on the opposite side of the road.

- 35.6 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that the issue had been assessed on site and it was found that locating bays on the side of the road proposed would create more spaces and it was the officers technical view that the current situation, specifically pavement parking, would be improved.
- 35.7 The Chair asked if a fresh consultation would be required if parking bays were located on the opposite side of the road.
- 35.8 The Parking Infrastructure Manager clarified that a proposal for parking on the other side of the road would very likely receive objections and complaints from residents and a new traffic order would probably not be approved. The Parking Infrastructure Manager added that the scheme could be monitored and be changed via an amendment traffic order.
- 35.9 Councillor Daniel asked if the proposed motorcycle bays could be located outside the premises in question instead.
- 35.10 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that the re-location of motorcycle bays could be examined and he would visit the site to find the best arrangement.
- 35.11 Councillor Powell thanked officers for their rapid consideration of the scheme and for the Committee's input. Councillor Powell stated that the situation in the area had changed significantly in recent years and that was clearly reflected in the drill report conducted by the Fire & Rescue Service who had encountered significant access problems.
- 35.12 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following orders;
    - (a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order 2008 No.\* 201\* (Area U extension)
    - (b) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.\* 201\*
    - (c) Brighton & Hove (Various Roads) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verges and Footways) Order 2013 Amendment Order No.\* 201\*
  - 2) That any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

## **36 LEWES ROAD TRIANGLE - AREA J EXTENSION**

- 36.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that addressed comments and objections to the draft traffic



regulation order proposing an extension of the Area J resident parking scheme into the Lewes Road Triangle area.

36.2 Councillor Daniel noted that many business located in the area were struggling in the current financial climate and in reference to paragraph 5.20 of the report, asked if the visitor spaces would be located near to shops and if they would be charged at the lowest tariff rate as recently introduced in London Road. Furthermore, in reference to paragraph 5.37 and 5.38, Councillor Daniel repeated the view that the wider area needed a half hour tariff.

36.3 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated the scheme would use the lowest tariff and that the scheme had created more shared spaces, particularly in side roads. The Parking Infrastructure Manager added that the council used to operate a half hour tariff although this had been discontinued as it was not utilised and any proposal to re-introduced such a tariff would need to be done via a wider review in the annual Fees & Charges report.

36.4 Councillor Deane thanked officers for producing report and as ward councillor for the area, she was aware it had the support of residents.

36.5 Councillor Davey stated that he welcomed the resolution to a long running problem. Lewes Road suffered from being close to the city centre and so huge demand was placed upon spaces and the proposals would make the situation easier for residents and hopefully improve air quality in the area.

**36.6 RESOLVED-**

1) That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following orders;

a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order 2008 No.\* 201\* (Area J extensions)

b) Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.\* 201\*

2) That any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

**37 WISH WARD PARKING SCHEME PROPOSALS**

**37.1 RESOLVED-** That the Committee approves:

1) That an extension of the Area U light touch resident parking scheme be considered within the Wish park area and that this proposal be progressed to the final design with the Traffic Order advertised to allow further comment (Appendix A).

- 2) That an extension of the Area R resident parking scheme be considered within Bolsover Road and that this proposal be progressed to the final design with the Traffic Order advertised to allow further comment (Appendix B).
- 3) That an order should be placed for any required pay and display equipment to ensure implementation of the new proposed parking schemes (if agreed at a further committee meeting) are undertaken as programmed.

### 38 AMENDMENT TRAFFIC ORDER

- 38.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that set out the comments, support and objections to various traffic orders and sought approval for alterations to parking restrictions within CPZ's for 100 roads.
- 38.2 Councillor Theobald stated that he could not find a plan in the agenda for the proposal to put double yellow lines on Carden Avenue outside Mayfield Manor Care Home. Furthermore, Councillor Theobald stated that this would exacerbate the problems he had previously raised regarding safety concerns on Carden Avenue and was not popular with the local action teams.
- 38.3 The apologised that the plan had been missed out but that he would circulate this document to Councillor Theobald after the meeting.
- 38.4 The Chair clarified that the location was a fair distance from the bend on Carden Avenue that Councillor Theobald was referring to and was installed at the request of the care home to allow access to the nearby bus stop.
- 38.5 Councillor Theobald urged officers to re-visit his request as the location was currently unsafe.
- 38.6 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that he would go back to the relevant team to discuss the proposal.
- 38.7 **RESOLVED-** 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) The proposed removal of a disabled parking bay in Valley Road, Portslade is to be removed from the Traffic Order as this bay is still required by a local resident.
- b) The proposed disabled parking bays in Grange Road, Granville Road, Parkmore Terrace and Pembroke Crescent are to be removed from the Traffic Order as they are no longer required by the original applicants.

- c) The proposed no loading Monday to Saturday 9am to 6pm in Camelford Street is to be amended on this Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.4
- d) The proposed car club bays in Second Avenue are to be amended on this Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.11
- e) The proposed changing of single yellow lines to double yellow lines in Medina Place is to be removed from the Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.6
- f) The proposed loading bay in Lorna Road is to be amended on this Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in section 3.12

### **39 DOUBLE YELLOW LINES IN TONGDEAN LANE OUTSIDE WITHDEAN SPORT COMPLEX.**

- 39.1 **RESOLVED-** The Committee approves the following Order (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections):

Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycles Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 amendment Order No.\* 201\*.

### **40 AREA E (PRESTON PARK STATION NORTH) TRAFFIC ORDER AMENDMENTS.**

- 40.1 **RESOLVED-** The Committee approves the following Orders (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections):

Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation order 2008 amendment Order No.\* 201\* with the following amendment;

That 6 bays (Two sections of 20m and 8m on either side of Matlock Road are changed from exclusive / shared pay & display bays into free limited waiting parking bays Monday to Friday for up to one hour with no return within one hour (Appendix C).

### **41 VALLEY GARDENS GOVERNANCE & SOUTHERN SECTION UPDATE**

- 41.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that proposed a Project Management Board structure for the project, recommended a design amendment to the existing plans that would minimise impact on open space and trees whilst maintaining carriageway capacity and sought approval to commence with a Business Case that would enable the council to access funding for Phase 3 of the scheme.
- 41.2 The Senior Project Manager noted a correction to appendix 4 where it stated that the North Street junction would operate at 92% capacity- this figure was in fact 88% capacity. Furthermore, there would be two southbound lanes between North Road and Church Street.

- 41.3 Councillor Cox asked if a community representative could be a member of the Project Board for example, from Community Works.
- 41.4 The Senior Project Manager stated that option could be investigated.
- 41.5 Councillor Janio noted that the appendix two was identified as a concept scheme. Councillor Janio asked if the plan could be changed subsequent to traffic modelling if it was found not to be at its optimum.
- 41.6 The Senior Project Manager confirmed that the scheme could be changed and officers were not bound to the current proposal.
- 41.7 Councillor Davey noted that the Project Board would be a very useful vehicle to consider minor changes to the scheme. Councillor Davey welcomed the proposals as an opportunity to realise a vision that had been a long term objective of the council and with the further funding, there was an opportunity to complete the whole vision from St Peter's Church to the Aquarium Roundabout and dramatically improve the public realm in the heart of the city. Councillor Davey added that Valley Gardens currently had ample and considerable road space that was rarely used at one time and the proposal would make use of that road space. Councillor Davey supplemented that the project was a fantastic opportunity for the city and he hoped the Committee could recognise that and support the recommendations.
- 41.8 Councillor Mitchell stated that she would not be supporting the proposals as the project appeared vague and there was no considered, thorough evidence of technical detail or economic benefit. Councillor Mitchell stated that the previous report covering Phase 1 and 2 reduced road space by 30% and the report also stated that opportunities to reduce congestion were beyond the scope of the proposal. Councillor Mitchell noted that the current report would reduce road space, a solution based on better signalling however, there were no projections or evidence made on that assertion. Councillor Mitchell stated that the scheme was still a concept design 18 months after the Committee had first considered the proposals and there was no traffic modelling data. The Committee were being request to implicitly trust that the removal of the Aquarium Roundabout would have no impact on traffic flow. Councillor Mitchell stated that she was very concerned that the report was requesting committing scarce resources to draw up a business case on the basis of a concept scheme, that such an important project had been provided in a brief, four page report and that there was no clear corporate buy-in. Councillor Mitchell added that this was of particular concern in relation to the councils own budgets and that the local authority would have to provide £4m to match fund the £18m granted by the LEP. £3m of this was planned to be taken from 2015/16 LTP funding however, the report was clear that there was no guarantee on the certainty of that funding. Councillor Mitchell stated that the administration had already borrowed £1.5m from the 2015/16 LTP allocation to complete the works to the i360 Arches. Councillors Mitchell clarified that she was extremely concerned that a total of £3m would eventually be taken from future LTP funding when it was not clear how much that funding would amount to and nor had LTP 4 been agreed. Councillor Mitchell supplemented that she was deeply concerned that this could lead to the project running out of funding or taking finance from other capital budgets that were already stretched.

- 41.9 Councillor Robins stated that he did not agree with the removal of the Aquarium Roundabout particularly without public support.
- 41.10 Councillor Janio stated that he supported the project as an opportunity to boost local employment and the public realm in an area that desperately needed it and there was a clear need for the project to go ahead.
- 41.11 Councillor Cox stated that he welcomed the project and did not understand the opposition to the scheme from the Labour & Co-operative Group. Councillor Cox added that £16m of funding was available to improve a key area of the city and there was no logic in rejecting that offer.

**41.12 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That Committee agrees a Project Management Board arrangement to enable cross party involvement in project delivery through to implementation.
- 2) That Committee agrees that a Business Case should be prepared that could enable the council to access approximately £6million Local Growth Fund funding to enable delivery of the Southern section of Valley Gardens.
- 3) That Committee agrees amendments to the preferred option previously presented at Committee to enable delivery of the Northern Section of Valley Gardens with reduced impact on open space and trees.

**42 PEDESTRIAN CROSSING PRIORITY**

- 42.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that presented the findings of the pedestrian crossing assessments of locations requested up to May 2013 and identified priority crossing points to be delivered over the next 12 months, subject to availability of funds.
- 42.2 The Chair urged Members to take note of the way the report set out the council's agreed methodology for assessing pedestrian crossing requests and that 22 locations had been considered across the city and 11 had met the initial criteria and been assessed in more detail. The Chair noted that the policy, agreed by a Scrutiny Panel in 2011, now weighted both safety and community issues. The Chair also drew Members attention to the limited budget available to deliver the projects.
- 42.3 Councillor Theobald stated that pages 303-307 of the report listed various requests but did not identify when these would be delivered.
- 42.4 The Transport Planner stated that those referred to all applications received and not all had met the criteria. Ten applications had been identified that could be delivered within the allocated funding and were requested for approval.
- 42.5 Councillor Janio noted that Table D listed a series of locations where the initial criteria had not been met adding that one of his requests was within this list. Councillor Janio

asked if this request would be reviewed again next year or if, because it had not met the initial criteria, would not be considered again.

42.6 The Transport Planner confirmed that as the request had not met the initial criteria, the location would not be re-considered unless there was a significant development or change in the area.

42.7 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the priority crossing list and grants permission for officers to begin implementing the prioritised pedestrian crossing locations where funding has been identified. Where crossing points require higher funding levels these should be acknowledged and identified as part of future work plans
- 2) That the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee authorises officers to construct the prioritised pedestrian crossings for which funding has been identified within the financial year 2013/14, subject to Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) being advertised prior to implementation of crossing points.

**43 CHURCH ROAD, SOUTH PORTSLADE - TRAFFIC & ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS**

- 43.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that summarised the additional surveys, analysis and public consultation carried out in response to a request for a pedestrian crossing located at the junction of Church Road and St Peters Road and requested authorisation for proposals to overcome the concerns of parents and residents using Church Road, South Portslade.
- 43.2 Councillor Robins noted that legal advice had been circulated advising Members that should they make a decision without the relevant information before them within a report, accepting the amended recommendation could potentially open the council to legal challenge should there be an accident related to the proposed new crossing. Councillor Robins enquired whether that advice had been provided with due consideration to the fact there was already a pedestrian refuge and dropped kerb at the location proposed for the crossing and that the amendment was seeking to formalise that.
- 43.3 The Deputy Head Law clarified that the advice was provided on the basis of comments from the Road Safety Manager whose comments included concerns regarding the proposed location. The Deputy Head of Law added that her advice was that if the Committee made a decision that was contrary to council policy, guidance set out by the DfT and advice from the Road Safety Manager, the council would be exposed to legal risk should there be an accident at the location proposed for a crossing.
- 43.4 Councillor Daniel commented that she felt it would be difficult to prove shared negligence with the council in the hypothetical scenario that a driver drove dangerously causing an accident at the proposed crossing location.

- 43.5 The Deputy Head Law stated that she would advise against that comment as the meeting was not only held in public, webcast and minuted, the council as a public body was expected to act reasonably and rationally including adhering to DfT guidance.
- 43.6 Councillor Mitchell stated that two years before, the council had installed a pedestrian refuge and dropped kerb at the location that a formal crossing was now desired. Councillor Mitchell stated that in doing so, the council had encouraged pedestrians to that point to cross the road and therefore she believed it would be reasonable and rational to formalise that into a pedestrian crossing.
- 43.7 On behalf of the Labour & Co-operative Group, Councillor Robins formally moved a motion to add a new recommendation 2.2 and to delete recommendations 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.1 That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee notes the growing concerns of parents and local residents and the results of the additional analysis of crossing behaviour undertaken by officers, as described in this report.
- 2.2 *That a pedestrian crossing facility is located on Church Road between the junctions with St. Peter's Road and North Street***
- ~~2.2 That, in acknowledgement that the technical criteria for a formal Zebra crossing facility is met in the section of road immediately south of St Andrew's Road, the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee authorises officers to include this site in the Pedestrian Crossing Assessment & Priority Listing for 2014/15 and recommends that the site should be closely monitored.~~
- ~~2.3 That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the interim provision of a School Crossing Patrol in the section of Church Road between St Michael's Road and St Peter's Road, subject to appropriate Health & Safety at Work requirements being met.~~
- ~~2.4 That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the implementation of traffic signs, road markings and road surface materials to support the interim School Crossing Patrol facility.~~
- 43.8 Introducing the amendment, Councillor Robins stated that the location had been used as a crossing for nearly fifty years and the area had undergone significant developments in that period. Councillor Robins stated that the crossing was fundamentally for use by children and a decision was long overdue. The proposal had the support of parents and the community at large as well as the local parliamentary candidate.
- 43.9 The motion was formally seconded by Councillor Mitchell.
- 43.10 Councillor Theobald enquired why the Road Safety Manger had provided advice not to install a crossing at the desired location and the point that appeared to be used the most by local people and instead recommended a location further to the north.

- 43.11 The Road Safety Manager stated that DfT guidance recommended that crossings be placed in locations that attract the most pedestrians. Assessments had been made of the junction of North Street and St Peter's Road and it had been found that footfall in this area was very low compared to other locations along Church Road. The recommendation proposed was concerned with the location that had sufficient demand and also provided an interim measure of a school crossing patrol to assess whether demand at the junction of Church Road and St Peter's Road would increase. If demand did significantly increase at that location, and it could be statistically proven that the crossing patrol had changed behaviours of crossings along Church Road, that would provide a basis of justification in the future to provide a formal pedestrian crossing. The Road Safety Manager added it was his view that it was currently a high risk to install a crossing at the desired location, a view that was determined by the level of use not the current facilities.
- 43.12 The Chair enquired whether the Road Safety Manager also had concerns about the width of the pavement at the desired location.
- 43.13 The Road Safety Manager stated that there were challenges to pavement space all along Church Road and significant physical measures would be required to provide sufficient space for pedestrians to wait at a crossing.
- 43.14 Councillor Mitchell asked if the survey conducted had shown peaks at school opening and closure times.
- 43.15 The Road Safety Manager stated that the survey was conducted over a twelve hour period from 7am to 7pm. From the data, the four highest hours were taken then averaged to create a value that provided clarification on level of risk.
- 43.16 Councillor Mitchell stated that she would assume that the highest level of risk for this area would be during school opening and closing times due to the proximity of the school and higher levels of traffic.
- 43.17 The Road Safety Manager confirmed that the North Street junction was predominately used for two hours of the day and that was by parents and children at school opening and closing times. Parents and children were also crossing further up the road as were pedestrians accessing shops in the location.
- 43.18 Councillor Cox asked if the amendment was passed, but for a legal reason was not installed, would that result in no crossing being provided at all.
- 43.19 The Deputy Head of Law stated that it was her understanding that any crossing required the approval and sign-off of the Road Safety Manager.
- 43.20 The Road Safety Manager clarified that there was a requirement of the road safety professional to authorise installations of crossing and he currently would not be in a position to do so with the level of risk as high as it was.
- 43.21 Councillor Davey noted that he understood crossings had to be assessed by an independent road safety auditor. Councillor Davey asked whether this could be confirmed and whether a crossing at the proposed location would pass that audit.



- 43.22 The Road Safety Manager confirmed that the safety of proposed crossings were assessed and audited by an independent auditor at the preliminary design, detail design and construction stages. The Road Safety Manager stated that it was his view that the independent auditors would request information on the need for a crossing and would likely determine that there was a lack of safety and need at this stage.
- 43.23 Councillor Daniel noted that she believed some of the language used may well be baffling to a layperson and something that had caused an element of confusion. In addition, Councillor Daniel asked if the expansion of the school would represent a significant change in circumstances and impact upon demand.
- 43.24 The Road Safety Manager stated that an expansion of the school and growth of use associated with the location would increase the viability of the location linked to demand.
- 43.25 Councillor Janio asked for clarification from the Road Safety Manager that it was his professional view that placing a formal crossing at the proposed location would increase the risk to schoolchildren.
- 43.26 The Road Safety Manager confirmed that it was his view on the basis of an assessment of the information gathered that placing a pedestrian crossing at that location would increase risk to all road users. The Road Safety Manager added that DfT guidance stipulated that wherever a crossing was placed there was a potential risk for accidents to occur.
- 43.27 Councillor Janio referred to the previous item (Pedestrian Crossing Priority) that detailed the criteria for assessment of pedestrian crossing requests and noted that he could find no reference within that report to crossing requests having low demand.
- 43.28 The Road Safety Manager stated that the assessments were a two stage process. The first stage considered the numbers of vehicles and pedestrians using the location and if that assessment was deemed high risk then the location was moved to the second stage that considered other factors.
- 43.29 Councillor Robins stated that at a public meeting where it was promised a crossing would be put in at the location proposed. Councillor Robins noted his frustration at the amount of time taken to handle the request and the frequent appeals for further time. Councillor Robins added that he could not understand why a pedestrian refuge and dropped kerb had been placed at the location if it had been deemed unsafe to direct pedestrians to that location.
- 43.30 The Road Safety Manager clarified that no promises had been made at the public meeting held although assurance was given that a recommendation would be presented to committee the issue and that road safety officers were aware that demand was too low in the specified area to justify a crossing.
- 43.31 The Chair asked for further legal clarification on the proposed amendment to the recommendations.

- 43.32 The Deputy Head of Law clarified that the recommendation 2.2 of the proposed amendment would require fully costed financial and legal implications to adhere with council procedures on decision making.
- 43.33 Councillor Janio stated that it appeared the Committee did not have the full information before them in order to make a decision and suggested deferring the report to the next meeting.
- 43.34 Councillor Robins asked if the report would purely be focussed on the viability of a crossing at the junction of Church Road and St Peter's Road and not in any other location.
- 43.35 The Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing stated that the report would set out to the committee the legal, financial and safety issues of a pedestrian crossing at the junction of Church Road and St Peter's Road or elsewhere on Church Road.
- 43.36 Councillor Robins asked that if that particular element of the report was to be deferred, he believed that the interim measures proposed of the provision of a School Crossing Patrol and implementation of traffic signs, road markings and road surface materials should still go ahead.
- 43.37 The Chair then moved a motion to approve recommendation 2.3 and 2.4 to the vote.
- 43.38 The motion was carried.
- 43.39 The Chair then moved a motion to request a report to the next Committee that set out the legal, financial and safety implications of a pedestrian crossing facility at the junction of Church Road and St Peters Road.
- 43.40 The motion was carried.
- 43.41 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the interim provision of a School Crossing Patrol in the section of Church Road between St Michael's Road and St Peter's Road, subject to appropriate Health & Safety at Work requirements being met.
  - 2) That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the implementation of traffic signs, road markings and road surface materials to support the interim School Crossing Patrol facility.
  - 3) That a report setting out the legal, financial and safety implications of a pedestrian crossing facility at the junction of Church Road and St Peters Road be considered at the next Committee meeting to be held on 25 November 2014.

**44 DYKE ROAD CYCLE FACILITY****44.1 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approve the Dyke Road Cycle and Pedestrian Proposal, as set out in Appendix 1 and authorise the Executive Director to advertise any associated Traffic Regulation Orders.
- 2) That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee support the inclusion of a £250,000 commitment in the Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) capital programme budget 2015/16 – 2017/18 as funding towards implementation of this scheme.

**45 OLD TOWN TRANSPORT SCHEME (EAST STREET)**

- 45.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that set out the objections received to the advertising of Traffic Regulation Orders in relation to the closing of a portion of East Street to traffic between 11am and 7pm each day and sought approval to proceed with the recommended Order.
- 45.2 The Project Manager noted that there was a typing error within appendix seven to the report that listed estimated additional vehicles using Little East Street on one occasion as 58 and another occasion as 57. The correct figure was in fact 85 as detailed in the main report.
- 45.3 Councillor Janio asked if it was accurate that all traffic using East Street would have to also use Little East Street.
- 45.4 The Project Manager clarified that the modelling forecast had demonstrated that all vehicles accessing East Street during its opening hours would continue to use East Street and others servicing the other areas of the Old Town would likely adapt their servicing times in order to access East Street. The remainder would exit via Little East Street but that figure would not represent the same figure as all traffic currently using East Street.
- 45.5 Councillor Theobald asked if consideration been given to the idea proposed in the public representation that closure be undertaken at weekends only.
- 45.6 The Project Manager clarified that consideration had not been consulted on as the scheme was focussed on trying to solve the issue of congestion for pedestrians in the very narrow carriageways prevalent in Old Town. Whilst pedestrian footfall in East Street and Little East Street was higher at weekends, there was also significant congestion during the week.
- 45.7 Councillor Davey commented that the closure of East Street was a long running issue and the scheme had undergone several consultations that had demonstrated a majority in favour as well as being scrutinised at a Public Inquiry. Councillor Davey stated that the element of the scheme already introduced in Ship Street had achieved an immediate benefit to pedestrians and traders using the area. Councillor Davey added that he hoped the recommendations could be supported and noted his belief that other cities across

Europe cherished the heritage areas of their cities whereas Brighton & Hove's was dominated by traffic. Councillor Davey supplemented that Brighton & Hove was not just a weekend location and such schemes had been very successful in other areas of the city. In addition, Councillor Davey stated that a cohesive scheme would allow a firmer basis to apply for funding for a superior pedestrianisation should that opportunity arise.

- 45.8 Councillor Mitchell stated that the Labour & Co-operative Group had previously opposed the scheme due to the number of objections from residents and business in the area and because a comprehensive plan for the area had never been proposed nor been consulted upon. Furthermore, Councillor Mitchell stated that the pedestrianisation of East Street had not been proposed as part of the original scheme had seemingly been included at the request of a minority of business owners in that specific area. Councillor Mitchell supplemented that throughout the various proposals, there had been a clear division between businesses located in the area as demonstrated by the contrasting public representations earlier in the meeting. Councillor Mitchell added that the scheme appeared a piecemeal approach and she was also very concerned about the impact of increased traffic through Little East Street. In addition, the Public Inquiry had raised concerns that had seemingly not been addressed and whilst her group could see the benefits of a pedestrianisation scheme in the area, there was no overwhelming support for the current proposals nor was there a cohesive plan and therefore her group could not support the recommendations.
- 45.9 The Chair noted that a consultation was conducted in summer 2012 in which 3,500 people were consulted and 580 responses received; the majority in favour.
- 45.10 Councillor Theobald stated that he felt it was a disappointment that a complete pedestrianisation scheme could not be carried out. Councillor Theobald noted the comments made in the public representation that requested a weekend scheme. Councillor Theobald stated that an incremental approach such as that might be a compromise and would be an adequate test of the scheme.
- 45.11 Councillor Janio stated that he was worried about the impact for Little East Street with increased traffic and associated safety of pedestrians.
- 45.12 The Chair stated that he found the transit of people from East Street toward the seafront as an important safety matter, one that had been resolved within the scheme and not currently existent.
- 45.13 Councillor Deane stated that she felt the Committee had an opportunity to make an area of the city that was currently congested and an area of huge conflict between vehicles and pedestrians into a safer, more cohesive route between the Pavilion and the seafront.
- 45.14 Councillor Robins noted his concern for the impact upon Little East Street and that such schemes should not be just about streamlining people in a certain direction.
- 45.15 Councillor Janio stated that whilst he supported pedestrianisation in principle, he would like to see a more comprehensive scheme which the current proposals were not.

- 45.16 Councillor Theobald stated that he wished to move an amendment that the scheme be similar to Gardener Street and implement the proposals on Saturday and Sunday's as a test.
- 45.17 The Deputy Head of Law clarified that the suggested amendment would be a material change to the proposed scheme that had not been consulted upon and would require a further report to be considered by the Committee setting out what further actions would be required.
- 45.18 The Project Manager states that officers would need to review any safety implications arising from a weekend scheme as opposed to a full scheme.
- 45.19 Councillor Theobald moved a motion to defer the report to a future meeting that would outline options for a weekend scheme.
- 45.20 The Chair seconded the motion.
- 45.21 The Chair then put the motion to the vote which passed.
- 45.22 **RESOLVED-** That the report be deferred to a future committee meeting to consider implementation of the scheme at weekends on a trial basis.

#### **46 MOTORCYCLES IN BUS LANES TRIAL**

##### **46.1 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee instructs officers to revoke the existing Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) covering the bus lanes on the A259 and to create a new TRO to allow powered two wheelers (PTW) to access bus lanes from the Authority boundary at Saltdean to the Ovingdean roundabout.
- 2) That the Committee instructs officers to revoke the existing Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) covering the bus lanes on the A23 and to create a new TRO to allow PTW to access the bus lanes from Carden Avenue to Preston Drove with measures added to deal with road safety concerns identified at the Peacock Lane junction.
- 3) That the Committee agrees to a new 12 month monitored trial from December 2015, on an 18 month Experimental Order, to allow powered two wheelers to access bus lanes on the A270 in both directions from north of the Vogue Gyratory to the authority boundary at Stony Mere Way and makes funding available for this purpose.

#### **47 PRESTON PARK CHALET PUBLIC TOILETS CONDITION SURVEY**

- 47.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Environment, Development & Housing that summarised the findings of a survey of the Preston park toilets following a resolution from Full Council to do so and made recommendations regarding the next steps.
- 47.2 Councillor Robins asked when the last refurbishment of the toilets took place.

47.3 The Head of Strategy & Projects clarified that there was a small scale refurbishment recently undertaken and there was a redecoration programmed in the near future.

47.4 Councillor Cox noted that whilst he supported recommendation 2.5 (iii) he hoped that recommendation 2.5 (ii) would continue to be discussed and considered.

47.5 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That Committee notes the findings of the survey undertaken of the Preston Park Rotunda Toilets which has identified £11,200 of repairs and maintenance which should be carried out by 2016/17. More significant investment of up to £80,500 for refurbishment which should be carried out by 2018/19.
- 2) That Committee notes the findings of the survey undertaken of the Preston Park Chalet Toilets which has identified £8,200 of repairs and maintenance which should be carried out by 2017/18 and more significant investment of £69,000 for refurbishment which should be carried out by 2022/23.
- 3) That Committee agrees the short term repairs and maintenance up to a value of £11,200 are carried out at the Preston Park Rotunda Toilets in 2014/15 and £8,200 at Preston Park Chalet Toilets in 2015/16 funded through the Preston Park pay and display surplus fund. This time-scale is sooner than that recommended by the surveys.
- 4) That Committee notes there is no allocated capital budget for refurbishment works to public toilets. Any works would need to be considered as part of the capital works program as part of the annual budget setting process or through other funds such as the Preston Park ring fenced pay and display scheme.
- 5) That Committee agrees to defer a decision on the full refurbishment of both sites until the surveys of all sites have been analysed and recommendations developed taking a strategic approach to public toilet provision across the city with consideration given to the provision within the wider context of Asset Management across operational council owned buildings.
- 6) Committee agrees to a report to be produced for Policy & Resources Committee in early 2015 which updates members on the work done since the Toilet Scrutiny including the survey results of all sites. This report will form the basis for discussion and recommendations on future toilet provision in the city.

48 **OPEN SPACES STRATEGY FOR BRIGHTON & HOVE**

48.1 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee notes the importance of producing an updated Open Spaces Strategy for the city at this time.
- 2) That the Committee approves the plans to develop an Open Spaces Strategy for the city.

**49 NOMINATIONS FOR CENTENARY FIELDS PROGRAMME**

**49.1 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That Committee delegates officers to proceed with the application for four sites (The Chattri, Old Steine Gardens, East Hill Park and Patcham Peace Garden) to be dedicated as Centenary Fields.
- 2) That Committee delegates officers the authority to complete the relevant deeds of dedication to protect the sites in perpetuity, subject to the sites meeting the criteria

**50 ALLOCATIONS POLICIES FOR PERMANENT AND TRANSIT TRAVELLERS SITES**

**50.1 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee approve the Traveller's Transit Site Allocations Policy.
- 2) That The Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee approve the Traveller's Permanent Site Allocations Policy.

**51 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

- 51.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information

The meeting concluded at 8.45pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of