

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

**4.00pm 25 NOVEMBER 2014**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

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

**Other Members present:** Councillors Duncan, Hawtree, Mears, Simson

**PART ONE**

**52 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**52(a) Declarations of substitutes**

52.1 There were none.

**52(b) Declarations of interest**

52.2 There were none.

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

52.3 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).

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

**53 MINUTES**

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

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

- 54.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting of the City Sustainability Partnership held on 11 September 2014 be noted.

**55 ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY URGENCY SUB-COMMITTEE**

- 55.1 **RESOLVED-** That the outcome of the meeting of the Urgency Sub-Committee on 12 November 2014 be noted.

**56 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

- 56.1 The Chair provided the following communication:

*"I am pleased to be able to update committee members on some positive news and progress on the two coastal defence strategies that the council is involved in. The strategies provide a 100-year plan for improvements to areas of the city's coastal defences, and their ongoing maintenance, taking account of current climate change predictions.*

*The Brighton Marina to River Adur coast defence strategy, which was approved by this committee in July this year, has now been approved in principle by the Environment Agency. The costs of delivering the strategy will be met jointly by the Agency, Shoreham Port Authority and the council, and works are planned to start in 2020/21. The Brighton Marina to Newhaven coastal study will be starting this month. It will include a focus on the stability of the cliffs in this area, which is our primary concern. The study is expected to be completed by April 2015 and the results will inform the development of the longer-term strategy".*

**57 CALL OVER**

- 57.1 With regard to Item 61- 20mph Programme, Councillor Theobald stated that he felt there had been a lack of consultation with ward councillors and he found the report details very unclear. Councillor Theobald proposed deferral of the report to the next meeting of the Committee in January.
- 57.2 The Chair stated that he would welcome the opportunity for officers to introduce the report as this may provide a chance to address and confusion. The Chair asked for advice on the protocol for Councillor Theobald's motion.
- 57.3 The Deputy Head of Law stated that deferral of the report was at the discretion of the Chair and agreement of the Committee and there was no protocol that restricted deferral without the report being introduced.
- 57.4 Councillor Theobald noted that there were several members of the public present at the meeting to provide representations and to hear discussion of the report and he felt it may be preferential to defer the report at this stage rather than ask them to wait.

57.5 Councillor Mitchell stated her preference that the representations still be heard but consideration of the report deferred to the next Committee. Councillor Mitchell added that she had similar concerns about the report as those expressed by Councillor Theobald and a deferral would allow for clarification of those issues.

57.6 Councillor Theobald moved a motion to defer the report to the next Committee meeting to be held on 20 January 2015.

57.7 Councillor Robins formally seconded the motion.

57.8 The Chair put the motion to the vote which was passed.

57.9 The following item on the agenda was deferred to the next Committee meeting:

- Item 61: 20mph Programme

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

- Item 62: Church Road, South Portslade- Traffic and Road Safety Improvements
- Item 63: Old Town Transport Plan

57.11 The Democratic Services Officer confirmed that the items listed above and been reserved for discussion and that the following reports on the agenda with the recommendations therein had been approved and adopted:

- Item 64: High Street, Portslade- Loading Bay

## **58 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

### **(a) Petitions**

#### **Reduce speed limit on Holmes Avenue**

58.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 280 people requesting a reduction in the speed limit on Holmes Avenue to 20mph.

58.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your comments and concerns that I too share. Regrettably the report on a speed reduction on Holmes Avenue due to be considered at this meeting has been deferred”*

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

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

#### **Old Shoreham Road cycle lane**

58.4 Linda Freedman presented the following question:

*“Prior to the installation of the cycle lane in Old Shoreham Road, Hove the houses and gardens south of the road did not experience flooding. Since the cycle lane was installed the gardens, garages and homes are impacted by flooding any time there is substantial rainfall. What does the Council intend to do to stop this happening? How will the Council compensate those householders who have been impacted by the design flaws apparent in the cycle lane?”*

58.5 The Chair provided the following reply:

*“The pedestrian and cycle facilities were completed in June 2012 and were designed with awareness of existing flat topography of the area and historical surface drainage issues. Designs therefore incorporated adequate surface water drainage gulleys. Overall drainage capacity along Old Shoreham Road is determined by the existing surface water sewer rather than the number and location of individual gulleys. In July 2014 73mm of rain fell on Brighton & Hove in 3 hours. The usual monthly average at that time is 40mm. The city has had similar severe weather events in October 2014. It should be noted that on Old Shoreham Road the gullies connect to the Southern Water surface water sewer and in extreme events, such as those experienced in July and October of this year, the road drainage can only clear the water from the road as fast as the sewer allows.*

*Radinden Manor and The Upper Drive are indicated as flow routes by the Environment Agency’s updated Flood Map for Surface Water. The Highway Maintenance Manager and Flood Engineer have suggested that gullies along this route would benefit from a more frequent cleansing schedule and whilst all gulleys located on this section of Old Shoreham Road have been cleansed recently, we are looking at this.*

*Our contractors will also be instructed to increase the opening of existing side-inlet gulleys and put in an additional surface gully adjacent to an existing surface gully located outside no. 54 Old Shoreham Road. Council contractors will aim to complete this work by Christmas 2014”.*

58.6 Linda Freedman asked the following supplementary question:

*“Why did the council opt for a raised curb in deference to a painted cycle lane on the existing road? Surely this would have been the cheapest option, offering identical protection for cyclists but would not have increased the flooding risk”*

58.7 The Chair stated that he would provide a written response to the supplementary question.

## **59 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**

### **(a) Petitions**

#### **(i) Mile Oak Improvements- Ms Soanes**

59.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 1388 people requesting improvements to the equipment and access to Mile Oak recreation ground. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 23 October 2014 that had also passed recommendations to the Committee to consider.

59.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“As members will recall this petition was debated at Council and recommendations were made to this committee which are offered on page 47 of our agenda.*

*Central Government Playbuilder funding provided a very welcome opportunity to provide better play facilities for the children of the City. However, we now have a great deal of equipment to maintain in the context of Government funding cuts which are diminishing our budget.*

*In the short term this is not a problem as new equipment requires little repair but as the equipment ages unless more money is put into maintenance we will not be able to keep the equipment we currently have.*

*Officers are undertaking a comprehensive review of our play parks and will be identifying possible ways of dealing with the funding gap we face as we go forward. I have asked for the Committee to receive this report by June.*

*Officers have already met with residents and I am happy to ask that they meet residents again to consider what improvements at Mile Oak Park residents wish to see and how residents might be able to make that a viable long-term possibility. But I have to be clear, there is currently little to no capacity in the parks project team to facilitate developing an Improvement Plan for Mile Oak Park, nor is there any money available in the parks budget to buy new equipment, and in the event we did receive external funding there will be no money to maintain new equipment once it starts to wear out. I appreciate this is a bleak outlook but this I'm afraid is the situation the Council is now placed in by Government funding cuts”.*

59.3 Councillor Mitchell stated that whilst she understood the continuing financial constraints placed upon the council, she felt it would be appropriate for the Committee to receive a report on this specific matter that could examine options for external funding and the possibility of maintenance by the local community.

59.4 The Chair stated that the future of Mile Oak recreation ground needed to be considered in the wider picture of all the authorities parks and would be a part of a report to the Committee in the summer.

59.5 Councillor Robins stated that he disagreed with the Chair's suggestion as that was not what was agreed by Full Council and June was some way off.

59.6 The Chair stated there were no funds available in the parks budget to undertake works and that Members had to be realistic in their ambitions in the context of severe budget cuts. The Chair added that Officers had indicated that a plan could not be drawn up for this one park outside of a wider review and suggested that a meeting between residents and Officers may lead to a solution that could be brought back to Committee.

59.7 Councillor Theobald stated that Carden Park, which was in his ward, was maintained by funding raising events by local residents and that was a possible solution for Mile Oak recreation ground.

59.8 Councillor Cox stated that he felt there should be a specific report on this issue. Councillor Cox added that he was aware of a perception of neglect from residents

living in the outskirts of Brighton and Hove and focus on these types of issues may reduce that somewhat.

59.9 Councillor Daniel noted that the will of Full Council was for an officer report on the matter and not to do so may undermine resident's confidence and trust in the council.

59.10 Councillor Cox moved a motion for a report to be presented to a future meeting of the Committee considering options for improvement and refurbishment of Mile Oak recreation ground.

59.11 Councillor Mitchell formally seconded the motion.

59.12 The Chair put the motion to a vote which passed.

59.13 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee receive an officer report considering options for improvement and refurbishment of Mile Oak recreation ground.

**(ii) Ban animal circus acts- Ms Baumgardt**

59.14 The Committee considered a petition signed by 141 people requesting Brighton & Hove Council to refuse any circuses using animal acts from performing in the city. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 23 October 2014.

59.15 The Chair provided the following response:

*“While the Economic Development & Culture Committee was considering the annual renewal of the application for Zippo’s Circus, a request arose for this Committee to review the Animal Welfare Charter.*

*At our meeting on 1 July 2014, Members considered an officer report on updating the Charter.*

*The Committee was asked to consider authorising a consultation for removing or retaining the exemption in the Charter relating to performances involving equestrian acts on council land. The recommendation was put to the vote which was not carried.*

*Having considered the issues in depth in July, and in the absence of any new information which would lead to a different decision, it is not proposed to call for another report”.*

59.16 Councillor Buckley noted that she had originally proposed a review of the Charter that lead to the report presented in July 2014 and moved a motion requesting an officer report into the matter.

59.17 Councillor Davey seconded the motion.

59.18 The Chair put the motion to a vote that failed.

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

**(iii) Bus shelter Grand Avenue- Mr Magee**

59.20 The Committee considered a petition signed by 375 people requesting a bus shelter and real time bus information display at the northbound bus stop located outside Warnham Court. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 23 October 2014.

59.21 The Chair provided the following response:

*"I am pleased to confirm that, following previous representations, the request for a shelter at the bus stop on the west side of Grand Avenue has already been added to the council's list of shelter requests. Whenever additional shelters become available officers prioritise this list, taking account of the location. Officers look at a number of factors, including how busy the bus stop is in terms of people boarding buses there; whether the location is exposed and how far it is to an alternative bus stop with a shelter. The council is in the process of retendering the contract for bus shelter provision and we hope that new shelters will become available during the next twelve months, with the start of the new contract. At that stage officers will certainly consider the bus stop on the west side of Grand Avenue as a potential site for a shelter, along with other stops in the city where shelters have been requested. Unfortunately we do not currently have funds for the provision of new real time bus information signs as these are generally funded by new developments around the City. However I am sure that Stagecoach will provide timetable information similar to that supplied for the other shelter on Grand Avenue".*

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

**(iv) Event Day Parking- Councillor Marsh**

59.23 The Committee considered a petition signed by 140 people requesting the council properly enforce the Amex event day parking scheme in the Moulsecoomb area. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 23 October 2014.

59.24 The Chair provided the following written response:

*"It is disappointing to hear that despite the work of the Club and our enforcement officers, some motorists attending matches and events at the AMEX Stadium are still choosing to flout the parking restrictions which then impacts upon local residents. Currently, we deploy at least 4 Parking Officers to enforce the AMEX event day parking scheme whenever there is a football match or other event. We deploy 2 Civil Enforcement Officers on each side of the scheme area. We only enforce the scheme during match times to avoid penalising residents as much as possible. This does limit the amount of streets we are able to visit but we always aim to enforce as much as possible and focus on the most affected streets. We also enforce the area on non-match days in the same way as anywhere else in the outer areas but only to enforce Double Yellow Lines, School Keep Clears, Bus stops and so forth. So far this season we have issued 306 PCN's in the scheme. We would not usually tow any vehicles as a matter of course; we would only tow from certain restrictions such as bus stops, loading bans and suspended bays.*

*We would be keen to work more closely with residents to identify streets that are particularly problematic. This way we can ensure that we visit them, if we don't already, to improve matters”.*

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

**(v) Pedestrian Crossing on Whitehawk Road- Councillor Mitchell**

59.26 The Committee considered a petition signed by 1020 people requesting the council to provide a pedestrian crossing at the southern end of Whitehawk Road near the Steiner School. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 23 October 2014.

59.27 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Brighton & Hove City Council receives many requests for pedestrian crossings and as a result has introduced a priority system to enable us to focus resources on those areas most in need.*

*The full methodology & assessment process can be found on the councils webpages. The assessment covers 12 different categories including pedestrian & vehicle numbers, current road layout, access to public transport and local environment issues.*

*Assessments are normally carried out annually and made publically available. A request for a new crossing can be made to the Transport Planning Team who will consider this request & carryout appropriate assessments.*

*In this case the bottom end of Whitehawk Road near the Steiner School has been identified for improvements as part of the planning application for the Royal Sussex County Hospital development. Highway works required by the hospital development are specified in the relating Section 106 agreement. This section 106 agreement does not include detailed design drawings but does specify signalised traffic signals & pedestrian facilities at the junction of Eastern Road, Arundel Road and Whitehawk Road junction.*

*This request will therefore be considered within the detailed design process for the overall hospital development”.*

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

**(vi) Water fountains- Councillor Duncan**

59.29 The Committee considered a petition signed by 175 people requesting a network of public drinking fountains throughout the city. The petition had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 23 October 2014.

59.30 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you Councillor Duncan for your petition.*

*Personally I am in favour of more water fountains as access to drinking water is clearly important to good health, and water available from a tap water reduces unnecessary bottle waste.*

*I'm very pleased to say that we have included two new water fountains in the redevelopment of the Level and these facilities are proving highly popular.*

*I am therefore keen that we incorporate water fountains within the Valley Gardens project and this is being discussed by project officers. Such facilities will help to support the creation of a high quality and useable open space and sustainable transport environment.*

*As ever cost of installations, their operation and their maintenance are critical factors, and in the face of government cuts it is difficult to see how we would look to add further facilities without knowing how they would be funded in the long term”.*

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

**(c) Deputations**

**(i) Hollingbury Road Closure**

59.32 The Committee considered a Deputation requesting a permanent closure of the junction between Hollingbury Road and Upper Hollingdean Road to non-essential motorised through traffic. The Deputation had been referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 23 October 2014.

59.33 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you Ms Entwistle for your deputation.*

*I have read your submission and can see that you have looked carefully at the positive and negative aspects of this proposal.*

*As you are clearly aware, closing a road permanently, particularly a through road requires very careful consideration of issues such as the impact on the nearby network, legal requirements and consultation with residents, businesses and road users.*

*Officers have looked at the traffic impact that is likely to arise from closing Hollingbury Road and have concluded that this would place greater pressure and congestion on adjoining roads in the local network.*

*As a result, I’m sorry to say that officers do not recommend proceeding with the request at this time”.*

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

**60 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

**(a) Written Questions**

**(i) HGV Vehicles in Hangleton Valley- Councillors Barnett, Cox and Janio**

60.1 Councillor Janio presented the following question:

*‘The Hangleton Valley area, and Hangleton Valley Drive in particular, is being used as a training area by driver training companies teaching learners to drive Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), coaches and Public Service Vehicles (PSVs).*

*We have witnessed a continual stream of lorries, large vans, flat bed trucks, articulated vehicles, buses and coaches (many towing trailers) being driven along these residential roads. None of these vehicles has any other purpose being in the Hangleton Valley area apart from training drivers.*

*All of the companies providing the driver training come from outside Brighton & Hove and many drive a considerable way to get there (from Lancing, Crawley and even Essex).*

*These residential roads are not built to withstand the weight of these vehicles and serious cracks are forming in the road surface: the cost of repairing this now failing, and potentially hazardous, surface, will fall on the council tax payers of Brighton & Hove. What action can the City Council take in order to deter the use of the Hangleton Valley area for these inappropriate purposes?’*

60.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your Letter I agree that the over use of any roads for HGV driver training is not acceptable.*

*The Highway Safety Maintenance team has confirmed that the condition of Hangleton Valley Drive is not currently causing them any specific concerns in relation to this use. It has been suggested that a standard letter be developed and then sent to HGV training providers asking them to be more considerate with their practices and frequencies of using any particular area for training drivers.*

*In order to facilitate contact with the training providers, it would be appreciated if ward councillors might provide details from the vehicles to help officers identify the company addresses”.*

**(ii) Wheels to Work- Councillor Cox**

60.3 Councillor Cox presented the following question:

*“East Sussex Wheels to Work is a not for profit company which helps people to access work, education and training using affordable rented motorcycles and scooters. The scheme receives funding from East Sussex County Council through their Local Sustainable Transport Fund.*

*Given the success of the recent ‘Powered Two-Wheeler’ bus lane trial and the potential that this scheme would have in Brighton & Hove to cut rush hour congestion and enable young people in particular to access training and employment, will the Administration agree to meet with East Sussex Wheels to Work to explore how their scheme could be extended to Brighton & Hove?”*

60.4 The Chair provided the following response:

*“I have been advised that the East Sussex ‘Wheels 2 Work’ scheme is developing successfully as a project that provides further choice for some people to overcome any barriers to reach learning and work opportunities quickly and conveniently. This success has been recognised by the scheme’s recent shortlisting in the 2014 Sussex Business Awards as Social Enterprise of the Year.*

*Officers have already suggested on a number of occasions at Transport Partnership meetings this year that we could explore the opportunity to extend the project into the city as part of the council’s next Local Transport Plan.*

*I am therefore pleased to be able to inform you that a city council officer has therefore recently met with a County Council officer and the East Sussex W2W Chief Executive to discuss and explore the potential opportunities that Wheels 2 Work could deliver within the city.*

*It appears that the eastern part of the city could be a good place to start in the city, as our geography there is more rural; some wards have high levels of deprivation; and, as you rightly point out, we have had the successful trial of motorcycles in the priority lanes for buses and taxis on the A259. Some sort of trial scheme may be beneficial and, if successful, the opportunity for greater coverage within the Greater Brighton City region may then follow”.*

**(c) Letters**

**(i) Cycle racks- Councillor Hawtree**

60.5 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillor Hawtree that welcomed the increase in cycling throughout the city and requested an increase in cycle racks outside Hove Town Hall, George Street and Blatchington Road to accompany that rise.

60.6 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you Councillor Hawtree for requesting this item to be place on the agenda. I have a more detailed response that I will send to you but will also summarise one or two points for you here.*

*As you are aware the Council has made cycling provision one of its priorities including the implementation of strategic safe cycle routes and dedicated lanes, as well as supporting infrastructure including cycle parking facilities.*

*Alongside specific allocations for cycle parking within the current Local Transport Plan we are also taking other opportunities to provide additional funding for cycle parking through developer contributions and within the design process for new parking schemes. We are also increasing the efficiency of existing cycle parking facilities through the enforcement of abandoned bikes and removal and recycling in conjunction with local charities and other organisations.*

*I very much agree that we need to maintain our commitment to increasing cycle parking to keep track with the boom in cycling we have unlocked.*

*I hope this response reassures you of our continued commitment to increasing the supply of this important resource”.*

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

**61 20MPH PROGRAMME**

The item was deferred to the next meeting on 20 January 2015 (see minute item 57).

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

62.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Environment, Development & Housing that set out the specific physical, legal and financial implications of introducing a formal pedestrian crossing facility in Church Road, south Portslade following a Committee request at its meeting on 7 October 2014.

- 62.2 Councillor Davey enquired to the implications of the Committee requesting proceeding with Option 1 of recommendation 2.1 of the report contrary to the advice of the Road Safety Manager.
- 62.3 The Head of Transport clarified that the Committee had provided a string steer at the meeting in October 2014 to explore options for a crossing at the North Street/Church Road location. He added that the report set out the legal and safety concerns of the Road Safety Manager regarding a crossing located at that location and also made clear why a crossing located in the section of Church Road, south of St Michael's Road was the preferred option in his professional view.
- 62.4 Councillor Robins stated that he had recently met with local residents and campaigners who had made clear that they were now content with a crossing located south of St Michael's Road but on the basis that railings be installed at the current pedestrian refuge to prevent people using it and that safety measures to direct people to the new crossing.
- 62.5 The Traffic Technician stated that it was his view that the current facilities were not viewed as unsafe and was a refuge not a formal crossing. Furthermore, the installation of guard railings was not deemed feasible due to the narrow width of the footway.
- 62.6 Councillor Mitchell stated it was the clear view of the local community that they would now accept the council's proposals and asked officers what could be done to assist this if barriers were viewed as unfeasible.
- 62.7 The Traffic Technician stated that the current facility wasn't viewed as unsafe by the Road Safety Team and unfortunately it was difficult within the current physical environment to install any such guidance measures.
- 62.8 Councillor Davey noted that the recommendations proposed an interim provision of a School Crossing Patrol that would hopefully help guide people to the new crossing facility if agreed.
- 62.9 Councillor Cox stated that the role of councillor was sometimes about compromise and this was one of those instances as there was no clear solution. Councillor Cox stated that he was pleased that Shoreham Port was thriving as it provided jobs and apprenticeships but that inevitably led to heavy traffic movement that could not be redirected. Councillor Cox added that the road did feel dangerous to a pedestrian particularly because of the narrow pavements and he understood the concerns raised about safety. Councillor Cox supplemented that he was concerned about going against the professional safety advice and he had attended with officers and their suggestions had made sense. Councillor Cox stated that option 1 was unfeasible and it would also require huge changes to infrastructure further toward the entrance to the Port. Councillor Cox noted that he felt the pedestrian refuge performed a traffic calming function and he was unconvinced that barriers should be installed along the road. Councillor Cox stated that he would be supporting option 2 to recommendation 2.1 and urged road safety officers to continue to pursue additional traffic calming measures.
- 62.10 Councillor Mitchell stated that she would also be supporting option 2 to recommendation 2.1 and echoed Councillor Cox's plea that the area be under constant consideration for

safety and traffic calming measures particularly because the local school would be expanding in capacity.

- 62.11 Councillor Deane thanked officers for providing a site visit that had been very useful. Councillor Deane stated that she would be supporting option 2 to recommendation 2.1 as it appeared the most realistic option.
- 62.12 Councillor Janio stated that he would be supporting option 2 to recommendation 2.1 adding that he hoped the crossing could be made highly visible.
- 62.13 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves to the inclusion of a formal pedestrian crossing in the section of Church Road, south of St Michael's Road in the Council's Priority listing for 2014/15 where the City Council's adopted assessment criteria indicates that a crossing is justified as set out at paragraph 4.11 of the report.
  - 2) 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.
  - 3) That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the implementation of associated traffic signs, road markings and road surface materials necessary to support the interim School Crossing Patrol facility.

### 63 OLD TOWN TRANSPORT PLAN - EAST STREET

- 63.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Environment, Development & Housing that provided the findings of the investigation of the feasibility of closing East Street between 11am and 7pm on weekdays only following the decision made by the Committee at its meeting held on 7 October 2014.
- 63.2 Councillor Mitchell asked how long the experimental Order would be in place.
- 63.3 The Head of Transport clarified that the trial period would be in place for approximately 12 months.
- 63.4 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee authorises Officers to advertise an Experimental Traffic Order allowing East Street to be closed to traffic between 11am and 7pm on Saturdays and Sundays.

### 64 HIGH STREET, PORTSLADE - LOADING BAY

- 64.1 **RESOLVED-** The Committee is recommended to (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections):

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

**65 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

65.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 6.00pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of