

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

**4.00pm 7 JULY 2015**

**THE RONUK HALL, PORTSLADE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Mitchell (Chair), Barradell (Deputy Chair), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), West (Group Spokesperson), Atkinson, Greenbaum, Miller, Nemeth, Robins and G Theobald

**PART ONE**

**1 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**1(a) Declarations of substitutes**

1.1 There were none.

**1(b) Declarations of interest**

1.2 There were none.

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

1.3 In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (“the Act”), the Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during an item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present during that item, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A(3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100(l) of the Act).

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

**2 MINUTES**

2.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 17 March 2015 be approved and signed as the correct record.

**3 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

- 3.1 The Chair paid tribute to Highways Officers, the emergency services and Brighton & Hove Bus Company for their effective response to the serious road traffic accident on North Street the previous day.

#### **4 CALL OVER**

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

- Item 9: Wheelie Bin recycling trial
- Item 10: Changes to textile collections from bring sites securing revenue for Brighton & Hove City Council and local charities
- Item 11: Progress and proposals for ultra-low emission vehicles
- Item 12: Traffic regulation order objections- Lustrell's Vale and Saltdean Vale
- Item 13: George Street- opening hours to traffic

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

- Item 8: Constitutional Matters
- Item 14: Madeira Drive- changes to the parking arrangements and tariffs

#### **5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

##### **(a) Petitions**

##### **(i) Zebra crossing for Nevill Avenue- Kate Culligan**

- 5.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 116 people requesting a zebra crossing at the end of Nevill Avenue to assist the safety of children from five local schools.

- 5.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*"Thank you for presenting your petition requesting a pedestrian crossing at the end of Neville Avenue at the Neville Road end to particularly help local school children to cross safely.*

*The council does recognise the provision of such crossings as important for allowing pedestrians to move safely around the city.*

*We do receive a large number of requests and so have an agreed policy and criteria for assessing them fairly and carefully. This includes technical as well as social factors.*

*I am pleased to say that an evaluation of the movement of pupils to school is already in hand through the Council's Safer Routes to Schools Programme and the Road Safety Manager has advised that construction work to improve crossing opportunities at that location will be carried out during the Summer".*

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

##### **(ii) Eastb. A259/Longridge Ave- Peter Wright**

5.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 79 people requesting the council to establish the left eastbound lane at the junction Saltdean, A259/Longridge Avenue as left turn only (except buses) in the interests of safety.

5.5 The Chair provided the following response:

*“I am pleased to advise that the Council’s Road Safety Team has started a Route Study of the A259 between Marine Gate and the city boundary, with a view to seeing where the safety of road users can be improved.  
The request in the petition will be included in this work.  
The results of that study will be brought to this committee when complete”.*

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

**(c) Deputations**

**(i) Controlled Parking Zone: Hanover & Elm Grove**

5.7 The Committee considered a Deputation presented by Chris Taylor that relayed the outcome of a parking survey recently conducted by Hanover & Elm Grove Local Action Team (HEGLAT) and asked the council to undertake the development of a mutually agreed proposal followed by a consultation on controlled parking in the area based on the Community Parking Plan as devised and proposed by residents and HEGLAT.

5.8 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you Mr Taylor for bringing your deputation here today. I want to congratulate you, the Hanover & Elm Grove LAT, ward councillors and all of the residents in the area that have been working so positively with the council to hopefully create a scheme that works for the majority of the Hanover & Elm Grove community.  
I attended the most recent public meeting a few months ago and was impressed by the willingness to do this.  
I can confirm that the area will be considered as part of the priority timetable for a parking scheme consultation that is being presented as a report to this Committee in October.  
Between now and then, officers will examine the suggestions put forward in your submission and the feasibility of incorporating them will be reflected in the October report.  
We look forward to continuing work with you on this”.*

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

**(ii) Controlled Parking Zone for Hollingbury Road**

5.10 The Committee considered a deputation presented by Rachel Christopher on behalf of residents in Hollingbury Road requesting consultation of their area for inclusion in the existing CPZ J.

5.11 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your deputation.*

*Following your requests officers will carry out a further investigation and ensure that this area is considered as part of the priority timetable for parking schemes which is being presented in a report to this Committee at our next meeting in October.*

*The report in October will include the feasibility for taking forward the requests outlined in your deputation.*

*It will also take into account the timescales of the Surrenden & Fiveways parking scheme consultation to see if a solution for one road can be identified as soon as possible”.*

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

## **6 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**

### **(a) Petitions**

#### **(i) One way system around the Windmill at the top of Holmes Avenue- Nigel Jenner**

6.1 The Committee considered a petition referred from the meeting of Full Council on 26 March 2015 and signed by 156 people requesting the council install a one way system around the Windmill at the top end of Holmes Avenue.

6.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“I would like to thank Mr Jenner for his petition presented on behalf of residents in the Holmes Avenue area.*

*I am pleased to report that the council’s Road Safety Manager has investigated the traffic management issues in the roads passing each side of the windmill and improvement measures were implemented in April.*

*At the present time it is not considered that necessary to implement a one-way system that may have the adverse effect of speeding up traffic. Records indicate 1 slight collision reported to police in the last 5 years.*

*However, the Road Safety Manager will be pleased to meet with any residents that have continuing concerns about traffic management in that area”.*

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

#### **(ii) Pedestrian crossing for Freshfield Road- Faye Bridgewater**

6.4 The Committee considered a petition referred from the meeting of Full Council on 26 March 2015 signed by 1369 people requesting the council install a pedestrian crossing point on Freshfield Road.

6.5 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your petition and congratulations on getting a large number of signatures. As I have outlined to the previous petitioner for a crossing, there is a commitment to road safety in the city and we have a methodology for assessing the sites requested for crossings.*

*I have asked the council's Road Safety Manager to add this location to that programme, the outcome of which will be posted on the council's website. Your local ward councillors will also be informed. I know that Councillor Morris has been supportive of your request".*

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

**(iii) Save the Mazda fountain- Sarah Brooker**

6.7 The Committee considered a petition referred from the meeting of Full Council on 26 March 2015 and signed by 1055 people that requested the council retain the Mazda Fountain in its current position in Victoria Gardens.

6.8 The Chair provided the following response:

*"Thank you for your petition and for getting so many signatures.*

*The design work for the gardens is at a preliminary stage and not yet at the detailed design stage. Any abortive design that relies on the fountains' inclusion or exclusion will be avoided. This means a final design will work with or without the fountain in its current location.*

*As a Labour Administration we are keen for the fountain to stay in its current location and the size of your petition reflects the fact that many people hold a similar view.*

*The final designs will be brought to committee for debate and a final decision"*

6.9 Councillor Theobald asked if a final decision on the design of the Valley Gardens scheme would be taken by this Committee.

6.10 The Chair stated that she understood that would be the case as only the contractual aspects of the scheme would need to be agreed by Policy & Resources Committee.

6.11 The Head of Transport stated that it was intended to submit the final designs for the gardens and highways and contractual matters in one report to Policy & Resources Committee.

6.12 Councillor Theobald stated that he was very concerned by that proposal as he had always believed that the final design should be decided by this committee.

6.13 The Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing stated that officers would look again and the timeframe for the scheme and an Urgency Committee could be convened if necessary in order for Members of this committee to approve the scheme.

6.14 Councillor West stated that a decision had already been taken on the removal of the fountain by this committee when it had agreed the concept design.

6.15 The Chair stated that the a decision on the scheme would be taken by this committee that would provide two design proposals- one incorporating the Mazda Fountain and one with the Fountain removed.

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

**(iv) Brighton & Hove's Live Music Venues- Mark Stack**

6.17 The Committee considered a petition referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 26 March 2015 and signed by 4698 people requesting the council to review its procedures and protocols in respect of noise abatement notices served on live music venues in the city. The petition had been debated by Full Council in March and a recommendation had been passed to the committee that it considers the establishment of a Policy Panel to review the issues raised in the petition.

6.18 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your petition and may I congratulate you on getting a large amount of signatures.*

*As Members will be aware, the committee was requested by Full Council to consider the establishment of a Policy Panel to review the issues raised in the petition.*

*Members will note that the Terms of Reference for the Policy Panel are set out in pages 31-40 in the agenda.*

*I would like to propose that the committee notes the petition and agrees to the establishment of a Policy Panel”*

6.19 Councillor West stated that the Terms of Reference were not directly relevant to a Policy Panel on this issue.

6.20 The Chair replied that the Terms of Reference would allow scope for the Panel to agree its work and remit as Scrutiny Panels had done previously.

6.21 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee notes the petition and agrees to the establishment of a Policy Panel to review the issues raised in the petition.

## **7 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

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

#### **(i) Trip-wires across cycle paths- Councillor West**

7.1 Councillor West presented the following question:

*“I note with increasing concern a number of local reports of dangerous trip wires being strung across cycle paths. Recently cyclist Darren Gibson was dragged from his bike by a near invisible trip wire while cycling in woodland near East Brighton Golf Course, breaking his collar bone. I understand Police are also investigating at least two other local instances where riders have been injured by trip wires in Coldean Woods. This is not however just an isolated local problem but part of an alarming national picture: neck high wires have also been found strung across cycle paths in Suffolk and spikes have been found deliberately scattered on a hairpin bend in Wales. In 2008 a 17 year old was killed by a trip wire strung across a path in Merseyside.*

*What urgent action is being taken by Council officers and Police to identify the culprits of the trip-wires in the City? What security measures are being employed to deter other anti-cyclists from creating similar hazards? And, what education will be offered to help combat anti-cycling sentiment that leads to some extremists taking life threatening action?”*

7.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your question.*

*These are very concerning events which can only be regarded as criminal actions.*

*The council’s Rights of Way Officers have made an investigation of the local incidents and none have occurred on public rights of way they are in off-road areas used by people on off-road bikes, but that does not diminish the seriousness of the actions.*

*The police are the principal agency handling this matter and so any action to bring the culprits to justice is a matter for them.*

*In terms of combatting the anti-cycling feeling that may be leading to such criminal behaviour, the council will continue to promote understanding between all users of public spaces, both in and outside the built up area of the city and ensure that our City Parks and Ranger services are fully aware of the potential for these dangerous activities”.*

7.3 Councillor West stated that given the seriousness of the offences, he hoped high priority could be given to the activities before somebody was more seriously hurt and that regular updates could be provided to Members.

7.4 The Chair stated that she would request officers to ask Sussex Police for updates.

**(ii) Horsdean traveller site- Councillor Wares**

7.5 Councillor Wares presented the following question:

*“We are aware of serious environment and sustainable issues relating to the proposed project to extend Horsdean to provide 12 permanent pitches, namely but not limited to:-*

- 1. The site is now acknowledged as prone to flooding evidence by the Council’s plans to mitigate this.*
- 2. Surface water from the proposed 21 transit pitches just runs off to ground. This risks contaminants entering the ground and eventually to the drinking water supply. The site is directly above a man-made adit that collects the City’s drinking water that is pumped through Waterhall.*
- 3. The risks of contaminants causing pollution are considered high by the Environment Agency evidenced by their letter dated 17<sup>th</sup> June 2015 that it lists prohibited chemicals and liquids banned for use and storage on site as for example oils, fuels, bleaches, white spirits, paints. All commonly associated with the travelling community.*
- 4. The Council’s management plan is to evict if such pollutants are stored or used. That prevents a repeat but not an initial accidental or deliberate spillage causing contamination.*
- 5. If access to the site means not bringing pollutants on then a significant number of travelling families could not enter the site rendering it useless.*
- 6. The 21 transit pitches will be served by one toilet. 21 transit pitches could accommodate 100-150 people. This is a wholly inadequate standard to provide a reasonable amenity for any community.*

*Will the Administration therefore agree to suspend the project to enable a fuller environmental study and to revisit the designs and amenity for the transit pitches?”*

7.6 The Chair provided the following response:

*“The council has always been aware that there are environmental sensitivities around the Horsdean site. The planning of the site has carefully factored-in these environmental concerns in order to ensure that they are successfully mitigated. I am not aware of any recent issues that should cause the council to reverse its intention of securing the new permanent travellers site. With regard to the issues you have raised in your question, my response is as follows:*

- 1. The site has experienced occasional flooding at times of exceptionally heavy rainfall, as have many parts of the city and the wider area. Such rare floods have always drained away very quickly. The nature of localised surface water runoff during the January flooding incident has been taken into account in the landscaping design of the proposed facility, which will serve to divert water flows and protect against future flooding. The design has been signed off by the South Downs National Park Authority.*
- 2. The purpose of the treatment components within the soakaways is precisely to prevent contaminants from entering the ground and from affecting the drinking water supply. The design of the surface water soakaways has been supported by the Environment Agency and has been signed off by the South Downs National Park Authority.*
- 3. The Environment Agency has not stated that the risks of contaminants causing pollution are high. If this was the case, it is unlikely that the Environment Agency would accept the principle of the permanent site in this location. In order to minimise the risk of contaminants from entering the site there will be a ban on storage or use of hazardous materials that will be a condition of tenancy for future residents of the permanent site.*
- 4. The threat of eviction for breaches of the ruling against the use or storage of hazardous materials should not be taken lightly. There is considerable demand for the 12 permanent units from the traveller community, who will need to enter into appropriate tenancy agreements with the council. The site will be monitored and a process of continued education will take place with the community regarding the environmental sensitivities of the site and the consequences for non-compliance with site rules and regulations.*
- 5. There is already an existing ban on bringing hazardous materials onto the transit site, but that does not stop the site from being well used by the traveller community. A process of continued education already takes place on the transit site and environmentally friendly cleaning products are made available to minimise the threat of pollution.*
- 6. There are in fact six, not four, toilets in the current transit site wash block. I recognise, however, that this level and standard of toilet facilities for the transit site is not ideal. The development of the permanent site will result in the net loss of two transit site pitches, so there will be a slight easing and no exacerbation of the long-standing situation. In any case, this level of provision is at least better than the lack of any facilities, which is the normal situation on illegal encampments.*



*There is no justifiable reason for the administration to suspend the project to enable a fuller environmental study. The scheme has been through considerable scrutiny from the South Downs National Park Authority, statutory bodies such as the Environment Agency and non-statutory amenity groups such as the Patcham and Hollingbury Conservation Association.*

*The scheme has been refined and improved to take on board a wide range of environmental concerns and now has planning permission for work to commence. With regard to the transit site, I have asked officers to see if improvements can be secured to the toilet block within existing financial resources.*

*Whatever the outcome, there is no valid reason to suspend work on securing the new permanent facility which received its original grant back in 2008, since when considerable time and effort have been spent in site selection exercises, consultation and planning in bringing the scheme to fruition”.*

7.7 Councillor Wares asked the following supplementary question:

“I would ask that the Committee reconsiders its decision on the location of the site on the basis of new information”

7.8 The Chair thanked Councillor Wares for his comments.

7.9 Councillor Janio asked officers if water tracing experiments been conducted on the site.

7.10 The Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing stated that the position of officers was the necessary consents had been obtained for the site.

7.11 Councillor Janio stated that he wished to move a motion for a six month suspension to any works on site until assurance was provided that the necessary checks had been carried out.

7.12 The Chair stated that as the question was put directly to her as Chair and not to the committee, it was not possible under the terms of the council’s constitution to permit a motion.

7.13 Councillor Theobald noted that the former Chairman of Southern Water had provided evidence against the site location to the South Downs National Park Authority. Councillor Theobald asked the Deputy Head of Law if the Conservative Group could vary the response provided by the Chair or to take a vote on a decision to suspend work on the site until the necessary checks were conducted.

7.14 The Chair stated that she would not be putting her response to the vote as by the terms of the constitution, Written Questions were put to the Chair and no debate or decision by the wider Members was required.

7.15 Councillor Theobald asked if he could have this confirmed by the Deputy Head of Law.

7.16 The Deputy Head of Law confirmed that the Chair was correct and that the procedure in question was dealt with exclusively by the Chair and there was no remit for a resolution by the committee.

**(c) Members Letters**

**(i) Lewes Road- Woodingdean Traffic- Councillors Simson and Bell**

7.17 Councillor Simson presented a letter on behalf of the Woodingdean ward councillors that traffic monitoring in relation to the impact of Lewes Road be undertaken as a matter of urgency due to the large increase in traffic through Woodingdean that was of great concern to residents.

7.18 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your letter seeking an update to the response you received back in October 2014.*

*I fully acknowledge the concerns about traffic volumes raised by residents in Woodingdean and the desire to see these addressed.*

*I am pleased to say that a period of post scheme monitoring of the Lewes Road corridor has now commenced and this is being done in two stages.*

*Traffic volume and speed data has been collected for the Woodingdean area as part of the first stage.*

*Second stage surveys are programmed for September following which an evaluation will be made of the overall impact so that any mitigation measures can be considered.*

*I will ensure that you are both kept fully briefed as this work continues”.*

7.19 Councillor West noted that the intention in the design of Lewes Road was to create a reduction in traffic by encouraging a shift to sustainable transport. Councillor West stated that he hoped any report detailing traffic monitoring would also detail the way people living in Woodingdean were travelling to give a wider picture.

7.20 The Chair stated that Councillor West’s question related more to travel planning that the council was monitoring in different ways and the information requested by the Woodingdean ward councillors was a valid request and a separate matter.

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

**(ii) Coach Parking- Councillor Theobald**

7.22 Councillor Theobald presented a letter requesting that the Administration urgently prioritise a clear timetable for establishing a new coach park whether temporary or permanent for the summer of 2016.

7.23 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your letter.*

*I agree with you that as traffic levels and visitor numbers rise, it is important that sustainable transport modes are encouraged. I fully take your point about the i360 and*

*the other developments planned that will boost visitor numbers and support the local economy.*

*The inclusion of the provision of a coach park within the Local Transport Plan reflects the following representations*

- *From Roedean residents*
- *The views of the tourism and business industry*
- *The condition of Pool Valley Coach Station*

*To ensure that a modern coach park with all the driver and passenger facilities can be realised, we will need to have:*

- *An investment plan with an allocated budget*
- *A site identification process along with any associated planning and other consultation*
- *Decisions in relation to the ongoing operation, management and security of the site*

*All of this will form one of the several key work streams from the LTP that will need to be prioritised by this committee according to available resources.*

*So, at this stage, I can't commit to bringing forward any one work stream in isolation. I can commit to bringing forward the report to committee this year that will set out options for taking forward these work streams in a coherent programme within budget".*

7.24 Councillor West noted that the previous Administration had put significant efforts into obtaining a coach parking site in the city to no avail as it was very difficult to find a valid, permanent site.

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

**(iii) Local shopping centres- Councillor Janio**

7.26 Councillor Janio presented a letter requesting a report for significant design changes to the Grenadier Shopping area could be improved in relation to transport accessibility.

7.27 The Chair provided the following response:

*"Thank you for your letter and I am sorry to read that the measures undertaken so far to improve the parking around The Grenadier have not lived up to expectations. I fully agree with your 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph in relation to the accessibility of local shopping centres.*

*As I have mentioned to Cllr Theobald in terms of a coach park being included as a work stream within the LTP, the work to support the accessibility and viability of neighbourhoods and local shopping areas is another of the work streams identified within the LTP, as your letter points out, where the committee will decide on a programme of priorities.*

*Other work streams in addition to the two mentioned includes Use of Technology & Travel Information and a review of the city's route hierarchy.*

*Resources do not allow all of this work to be progressed at once- hence the commitment to bringing a report to committee later this year to get agreement on prioritisation.*

*This will be a transparent and fair assessment of the city's strategic and local needs".*

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

**(iv) Craven Vale Estate Controlled Parking Zone- Councillor Barradell**

7.29 Councillor Barradell presented a letter on behalf of Craven Vale Community Association detailing a survey they had carried out with residents on a potential controlled parking zone and requesting a report be brought to a future committee with proposals for a way forward. Councillor Barradell provided an update to the survey results that demonstrated from a response rate of 28%, 78% were in favour of a scheme for the area.

7.30 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your letter and as a fellow ward member I am well aware of the increasing parking pressures in the Craven Vale area. I’d like to commend the work of the Craven Vale Community Association on their survey. Officers will ensure that this area is considered as part of the priority timetable for parking schemes coming to this committee in October”.*

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

**(v) Valley Gardens Scheme- Councillors West & Janio**

7.32 The Committee considered a joint letter from Councillors West and Janio regarding delays to the Valley Garden scheme and requested that, in order for the project to remain to its original timescale agreed at the Committee’s March 2015 meeting, that Members agree that a report be submitted to the 16 July 2015 Full Council meeting covering the matters scheduled to be presented to this meeting.

7.33 The Chair provided the following response:

*“I want to be clear that this is a scheme that has the potential to deliver real public urban realm improvements for the city. Delivered well, it can benefit residents, businesses and visitors. We are committed to delivering the scheme successfully. To do this we now need to move from the overall urban realm proposal to the detailed traffic modelling – the devil really is in the detail – and that work is underway based on the conceptual designs presented to committee. The scheme will impact on the city’s main arterial roads. Every alteration we make will impact on traffic flow and we have to understand the full impact of the changes proposed. A tested traffic management plan will need to be produced. Last month, Cllr Warren Morgan and I met with officials from the Local Enterprise Partnership to explain that we needed a bit of additional time to seek these assurances. They were very understanding of our need to do this. I have committed to bringing a report to October’s Policy & Resources Committee that will detail the final designs and get the go ahead for construction to start. It will need to go to P&R because of the contractual matters. This will still enable the project to be completed within the LEP’s 3 year funding timescale and I understand they work will begin in February if not before.*

*If we are to ask businesses and residents to put up with the inconvenience of what will be a long programme of road works, we need to be sure that we get the scheme right and I think you would agree with that.*

*I'm hoping that we can all work together on this and be able to realise the long term aims and gains of the project".*

- 7.34 Councillor Janio asked for clarification on whether there would be an Urgency Sub-Committee of this committee to decide on the final design or whether a decision would be made exclusively by Policy & Resources Committee.
- 7.35 The Chair stated that the previous agreement was to consider two reports separately-one to agree the design and another to seek approval to construct. The new proposal was to package both together in one report to Policy & Resources Committee to prevent overlap and duplication of work.
- 7.36 Councillor Janio stated that he was not content that previous agreements on design would be disregarded and a new version presented for approval.
- 7.37 The Chair clarified that the design work currently underway was based on the concept designs agreed by the committee in March 2015. Furthermore, the garden design was not yet started and any decision on the future of the Mazda Fountain would be for Members to decide. The Chair added that size of the scheme accordingly meant it was extremely important not to rush work and ensure that the traffic modelling and design was right and would work.
- 7.38 Councillor West stated that a timescale had been clearly set out to the committee and its meeting in March 2015 and at previous stages and was clearly not rushed. Councillor West stated that the description of the design as a concept was erroneous as the plan agreed was the design and since then officers had been working on how to build the scheme.
- 7.39 The Chair stated that as a new Administration had committed as an manifesto pledge to conduct a rapid appraisal of the scheme and content themselves of other issues such as the wider impact of the scheme and a traffic management plan had been requested. The Chair stated that it was intended to submit a report to Policy & Resources Committee in October.
- 7.40 Councillor Miller asked if it might be appropriate to hold further Project Management Board meetings ahead of the committee meeting the report would be presented to.
- 7.41 Councillor Janio asked if Members requested to approve the design at a future committee would be presented just one design or options. Councillor Janio repeated Councillor Miller's request that the Project Management Board be reconvened.
- 7.42 The Chair stated that she was happy to re-establish the Project Management Board but she could not guarantee when the designs would be available to present to the Board.
- 7.43 Councillor Theobald stated that he had been provided assurance in the debate but he had maintained throughout consideration of the scheme that the final design was approved by this Committee not Policy & Resources Committee.

- 7.44 The Chair stated that the final design could be agreed by this Committee and asked officers if that meant the contractual and financial matters would still have to be decided by Policy & Resources Committee.
- 7.45 The Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing confirmed that the report would have to be split effectively in two with the design aspects considered by this committee and the contractual and financial matters agreed by Policy & Resources Committee.
- 7.46 Councillor Nemeth asked if the council had a deadline for completion from the Local Enterprise Partnership.
- 7.47 The Chair confirmed this was October 2015.
- 7.48 Councillor Janio thanked the Chair for her clarification on the project schedule and noted his Group would agree to note the letter and a report to the next Full Council meeting was not necessary.
- 7.49 **RESOLVED-** That the letter be noted.

### **Adjournment 17:40-17:50**

## **8 CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS**

### **8.1 RESOLVED-**

1. That the committee's terms of reference, as set out in Appendix 1 to this report, be noted; and
2. That the establishment of an Urgency Sub-Committee consisting of the Chair of the Committee and two other Members (nominated in accordance with the scheme for the allocation of seats for committees), to exercise its powers in relation to matters of urgency, on which it is necessary to make a decision before the next ordinary meeting of the Committee be approved.

## **9 WHEELIE BIN RECYCLING TRIAL**

- 9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that sought approval to trial wheelie bins for recycling for 4,500 households in areas of Hangleton, South Portslade and North Portslade.
- 9.2 Councillor Janio asked if there were any plans to consider inserts for glass recycling in the bins as other authorities had done.
- 9.3 The Head of Strategy & Projects clarified that glass inserts could be considered for the bins against issues of capacity amongst others.

- 9.4 Councillor Robins asked if residents would have a choice on a 240L or 140L capacity bin.
- 9.5 The Head of Strategy & Projects stated that the smaller 140L bins may be more appropriate for smaller households and the area would be audited ahead of the trial.
- 9.6 Councillor West stated that he welcomed the proposal and it was something that his previous administration had been working on for some time. Councillor West stated that the black box recycling was a good idea at their inception but had become redundant over time. This new scheme would be much more helpful for both residents and Cityclean staff collecting recycling material. Councillor West stated that one potential issue was that residents would have to retain a black box for glass recycling which may create confusion but he acknowledged that an insert in the bins for glass recycling may cause the bins to be too heavy. Councillor West urged strong communication with residents on this matter to ensure it was a success.
- 9.7 Councillor Barradell stated that she welcomed the report adding that she found it surprising that it had not been introduced already as many authorities had done so. Councillor Barradell asked if the council would be collecting the black boxes no longer needed as they could be reused and if a breakdown could be provided on the £5.75 per household cost of communication materials for the trial.
- 9.8 The Head of Strategy & Projects clarified that the black boxes would be collected and reused in other parts of the city and that he would provide a breakdown of the £5.75 cost per household for communication materials subsequent to the meeting as this was not currently to hand.
- 9.9 Councillor Miller asked if there would be any prevention to residents continuing to use black boxes for recycling and asked for more information on paragraph 3.11 of the report that stated that some areas properties would be suitable for wheelie bins.
- 9.10 The Head of Strategy & Projects stated that the new bins would be a different colour and would be clearly labelled as recycling bins. The current black boxes would no longer be collected by the refuse teams and that would be made clear in the communication and engagement with residents. The Head of Strategy and Projects added that some properties would not be suitable for the new 240L bins due to a lack of space at the front of the properties and that it would not be practical to store these to the rear of the properties as many black boxes currently were as they would have to be taken through the house.
- 9.11 Councillor Nemeth noted that he had found some animosity toward the black bins and asked what colour the new bins would be.
- 9.12 The Head of Strategy & Projects stated that a decision on this matter had not yet been made.
- 9.13 **RESOLVED**
1. That the committee approve a trial to introduce wheelie bins for the storage and collection of paper, card, cans and plastic bottles for recycling.

2. That the committee approve funding for the trial, of up to £135,000 from corporate reserves in the 2015-16 financial year with repayments made over the two following financial years. The repayment will first be funded from any savings generated from increased recycling as a result of the trial, with any remaining repayment funded from identified underspends in the service area such as income generated from new textile recycling and commercial waste schemes.
3. The trial will assess the impact of the container change on recycling rates, collection efficiency and resident satisfaction with the service to inform any decisions on wider roll out of wheelie bins.

## 10 CHANGES TO TEXTILE COLLECTIONS FROM BRING SITES SECURING REVENUE FOR BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL AND LOCAL CHARITIES

- 10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that sought approval to procure a contract for the installation, maintenance and servicing of textile banks in Brighton & Hove to enable textiles to be recycled with the rising revenue ring-fenced to local charities and groups and service improvements.
- 10.2 Councillor Greenbaum noted there was no mention in the report of any consultation with the existing collection providers or any consideration to the option to license or regulate the current arrangement.
- 10.3 The Head of Strategy & Projects noted that there was currently a good network of textile collection points but no direct benefit in the revenue from those sites remained within the city. The Head of Strategy & Projects added that the council had been contacted by a number of locally based charities asking that the council help them to benefit from such collections.
- 10.4 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Janio moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 as shown in bold italics below:

(That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee):

- 2.1.2 Authorises the re-investment of **60%** of the net income from the contract in service improvements such as maintenance of on-street recycling bins and investment in wheelie bins for recycling;
- 2.1.3 Authorises the ring-fencing of **40%** of the net income from the contract to the incentive fund formally agreed by the Committee in March 2014;
- 10.5 Introducing the amendment, Councillor Janio stated his general support for the proposals noting that the scheme would only apply to council land and that collection points on private land could continue. Councillor Janio added that whilst he supported the principle, he believed local charities needed more support rather than directed to the council's General Fund and would it was his preference that the ring-fenced income directed to the incentive fund be increased from 10% to 40%. Councillor Janio



supplemented that he hoped the matter could be revisited once it had been in operation for a period.

- 10.6 Councillor Theobald formally seconded the motion.
- 10.7 The Chair noted that the income received from the scheme would not be directed to the General Fund but would be used for issues such as the repair of communal bins and repayment of the wheelie bin trial just agreed by the committee.
- 10.8 Councillor West stated it wasn't true to say that the wheelie bin trial was solely dependent on a 90% re-investment of the net income from a textile collection service as the report on that matter had identified funding for the scheme would come from central funds and the issue would be how that amount was recouped. Councillor West stated he was supportive of bringing textile collection to local benefit but he was disappointed that existing providers had not been consulted and he had received a lot of correspondence from those providers on the impact of the proposals. Councillor West stated he was keen for the money to be shared fairly and would be supporting the Conservative Group amendment.
- 10.9 The Chair noted that the financial implications of the Wheelie Bin recycling trial report previously agreed had identified money generated from textile collections as an income generator for the scheme and asked what impact the proposed amendment might have.
- 10.10 The Head of Strategy & Projects noted that the Wheelie Bin recycling trial report had identified that the money for the trial would be funded from capital reserves and repaid from schemes such as textile collections, commercial waste schemes and from other savings on waste disposal. However, none of those income streams were guaranteed and a likely effect in the reduction in income would be that the repayment period for the Wheelie Bin recycling trial would have to be extended from 2-3 to 3-4 years. The Head of Strategy & Projects noted that should the Wheelie Bin trial be successful, funding for a full roll of the scheme would have to be found.
- 10.11 Councillor Barradell stated that a continuing challenge for local government in the context of funding cuts from central government would be generating income to provide services such as those on the agenda. Councillor Barradell stated that she had sought information from the Charity Commission on TRAIID and found that of a £4.9m income, £4.6m was costs and only £300,000 was passed to charities. Councillor Barradell stated that the recommendations might mean that more could be returned to local charities in Brighton & Hove. Councillor Barradell added that she was also unsure whether the European Recycling Company had charity status.
- 10.12 Councillor Greenbaum stated that she also had reservation about the legal status of some of the organisations involved in textile collections and upon researching further; it did not appear that European Recycling Company was a registered charity.
- 10.13 Councillor Miller stated that he agreed the contribution should be higher as public perception was very important on this issue.
- 10.14 Councillor Nemeth asked if there would be resources required to move the existing banks and a timescale for the council to begin its scheme.

- 10.15 The Head of Strategy & Projects stated that informal discussions had taken place. Removal of the banks would require a Notice to Remove and no issues were anticipated.
- 10.16 The Chair then put the motion to a vote which was passed.
- 10.17 The Chair then put the report recommendations as amended to a vote which passed.
- 10.18 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee:
- 1) Authorises the procurement of the contract for the installation, maintenance and servicing of textile banks in Brighton & Hove, following the timeline and evaluation criteria set out in the report with a contract term of 3 years from November 2015 with the option of a two year extension;
  - 2) Authorises the re-investment of 60% of the net income from the contract in service improvements such as maintenance of on-street recycling bins and investment in wheelie bins for recycling;
  - 3) Authorises the ring-fencing of 40% of the net income from the contract to the incentive fund formally agreed by the Committee in March 2014;
  - 4) Agrees to the review of the scheme after six months to assess income generated and its allocation within the service and to the incentive fund; and
  - 5) Authorises all necessary measures to remove the unregulated textile banks from council-owned land so that they can be replaced by those authorised under the contract;
  - 6) Grants delegated authority to the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing:
    - to award the contract for 3 years following the recommendations of the evaluation panel and the results of the tendering process; and
    - to extend the contract for 2 years subject to satisfactory performance of the provider in respect of the initial 3 year period.
  - 7) Notes that the contract will be awarded as soon as practicable allowing for the procurement process.

## 11 PROGRESS AND PROPOSALS FOR ULTRA-LOW EMISSION VEHICLES

- 11.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that outlined a number of future proposals that are required to maintain, update and expand the infrastructure required to support and facilitate the greater uptake and use of Ultra-Low Emission Vehicles (ULEV's in the city, especially electric vehicles.
- 11.2 Councillor Barradell asked if any future agreement could include access to detailed information on charging point usage without having to pay a fee for that information.

Furthermore, Councillor Barradell asked if the rapid charging point would provide free parking for just 20 minutes.

11.3 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy clarified that there had been changes with the provider of monitoring information on how charging information was obtained and the council would be looking at options available in any new arrangement. The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy added that the rapid charger was only available off-street and it was likely to only provide twenty minutes free stay as that would allow sufficient time for a full charge of any vehicle. Fast chargers would remain at three hours in accordance with the relevant Traffic Regulation Order.

#### 11.4 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Committee welcomes the progress that has been made in the city to increase the use of ultra-low emission vehicles, especially electric vehicles.
- 2) That the Committee agrees to the continued investment in Ultra-Low Emission Vehicle [ULEV] technology and infrastructure to upgrade and increase the availability of on-street charging for public use, including:-
  - i) an initial upgrade of up to four of the existing eight on-street electric vehicle charging points;
  - ii) a second phase of upgrades to the remaining, existing on-street electric vehicle charging points; and
  - iii) the installation of new on- and off-street electric vehicle charging points across the city between 2015/16 and 2018/19.
- 3) That the Committee approves the dissolution of the existing Brighton & Hove City Council Electric Vehicle Charging Point Registration Scheme and the transfer of the administration and use of all current and future charge points to an established national charging network.
- 4) That the Committee authorises officers to continue to work together with partners and stakeholders to identify and pursue opportunities to install equipment and bid for external funding to support the upgrade and expansion of Ultra-Low Emission Vehicle [ULEV] technology and infrastructure within the city.

## 12 **TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS - LUSTRELL'S VALE AND SALTDEAN VALE**

12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that requested Members to consider two objections in relation to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) advertised to introduce waiting restrictions in Lustrell's Vale, north of School Lane (Saltdean) and to extend the existing double yellow lines on Saltdean Vale near the junction of Arundel Drive East.

12.2 Referring to recommendation 2.3, Councillor Miller stated that the car park referred to was heavily used and he feared there would be significant displacement should charges be brought in.

- 12.3 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that the proposal to introduce parking charges for the car park was to cover the cost of the necessary maintenance and enforcement for the all the measures outlined. The Parking Infrastructure Manager added that the introduction of a four hour maximum waiting restriction would be subject to consultation with residents and businesses and officers would report the result of that to the committee.
- 12.4 Councillor Theobald stated that he too believed that introducing charges for the car park would create displacement and people would use free parking in the surrounding area rather than pay.
- 12.5 Councillor Miller moved a motion to delete recommendation 2.3.
- 12.6 Councillor Theobald formally seconded the motion.
- 12.7 The Chair put the motion to a vote which failed.
- 12.8 The Chair then put the substantive recommendations to the vote that passed.
- 12.9 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the amendment of the Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.\*\* 20\*\* (TRO-11-2015) to enable the introduction of one hour maximum waiting restrictions on Lustrell's Vale north of School Lane outside numbers 59-87 either side of the bus stop and to extend the existing double yellow lines on Saltdean Vale to a point north of the Arundel Drive East junction.
  - 2) That the Committee also approves the extension of existing waiting restrictions to a point outside numbers 114-132 Lustrell's Vale, either side of the existing bus stop to prevent long stay parking at these locations blocking deliveries and preventing a regular turnover of customer parking.
  - 3) That the Committee authorises officers to consult with residents and businesses over the introduction of a 'Pay by Phone' four hour maximum waiting restriction to the off-street car park on the corner of Lustrell's Vale and Saltdean Drive, in order to prevent long stay parking for the same reasons given at 2.2 above and to finance enforcement and upkeep.

### **13 GEORGE STREET - OPENING HOURS TO TRAFFIC**

- 12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that outlined suggested next steps for George Street in response to a petition presented to the previous meeting on 17 March 2015.

- 12.2 Councillor Greenbaum stated that whilst she agreed to proceed with consultation, she was surprised that businesses and traders had made such a request as changes such as road closure had made a positive difference since being introduced.
- 12.3 Councillor West agreed that he found the request to be unwise noting that there was a lack of support for a similar consultation in 2011. Councillor West stated that he hoped the consultation could consider the wider area and could be broader than just businesses in the direct vicinity.
- 12.4 Councillor Atkinson stated his agreement with the comments made and that an earlier opening of traffic in George Street would be unpractical to the shopping environment.
- 12.5 Councillor Greenbaum asked if the word “businesses” could be removed from recommendation 2.1 to reflect the variety of users accessing George Street.
- 12.6 Councillor Mitchell noted that the recommendation was set out to reflect the request of the petition which the committee needed to address directly.
- 12.7 Councillor Barradell asked if people that used George Street would be consulted.
- 12.8 The Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that the previous consultation had contacted residents, business and interested groups and it was intended to repeat that process if the proposals were agreed.
- 12.9 Councillor West stated that no value would be achieved from just contacting businesses.
- 12.10 The Chair noted that the recommendations outlined that a consultation letter would also be sent to interested groups.
- 12.11 **RESOLVED-**
- 1) That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee approves a consultation to businesses in George Street on whether their road should be open to traffic at 4pm all year rather than the current opening of 6pm between 1<sup>st</sup> April and 31<sup>st</sup> October. This will include a consultation letter to any interested groups.
  - 2) That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee agrees that the results of the consultation be presented to a future Committee meeting to agree the way forward.

#### **14 MADEIRA DRIVE - CHANGES TO THE PARKING ARRANGEMENTS AND TARIFFS**

##### **14.1 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That Committee agrees to remove the perpendicular parking on the north side of Madeira Drive east of the Concorde and replace this with parallel parking on both sides of the road. The parking on the north side will be further complemented with a 1.2 metre wide footway strip to provide safe means of access to and from vehicles. The parking on the southern side will also give some protection to the cycle lane and it will be further supported by extending the barriers further towards the Dukes Mound.

- 2) That Committee agrees to the installation of a section of white centre line markings at the eastern end of the road where road widths are narrower. Once finalised a Road Safety Audit would be undertaken.
- 3) That Committee approves that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is advertised so 20 parking spaces west of the Concorde are changed from high tariff to low tariff bays with the associated annual revenue loss of approximately £80,000 plus the TRO costs for the Parking & Network Operations service.
- 4) That Committee approves advertising a separate retrospective Traffic Regulation Order to incorporate any of the minor changes to bays again under the revenue budget for the Parking & Network Operations service.

## **15 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

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

The meeting concluded at 7.00pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of