

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY URGENCY SUB-COMMITTEE

9.00am 23 MARCH 2015

COMMITTEE ROOM 1, BRIGHTON TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Davey (Chair), Cox and Mitchell

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(I) of the Act).

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

2 COAST TO CAPITAL LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY MEETINGS – 25 MARCH 2015

2.1 The Urgency Sub-Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Environment, Development & Housing that detailed a number of decisions to be taken by the Local Transport Body (LTB) at their meeting on 25 March 2015 and sought agreement on the authorities position in respect to those matters in order for the council’s representative on the LTB to agree and, if necessary vote, on those recommendations at the 25 March meeting. Two of the proposals related specifically to the Brighton and Hove area: a BikeShare scheme and a package of Intelligent Transport System (ITS) measures.

- 2.2 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy noted a correction to item 3.5 of the report. The figures listed in the table were incorrect and the Local Contribution would in fact be £60,000 for 2015/16, £230,000 for 2016/17 and £290,000 in total, £50,000 less than listed in the table (£340,000).
- 2.3 The Chair noted that he had accepted a request from Mr. Lambe, a local businessman to speak at the meeting. Addressing the Urgency Sub-Committee Mr. Lambe outlined his support for a BikeShare scheme that in his view would be a benefit to the mobility of people working in the city and would boost tourism. Mr. Lambe added that the proposals had received unanimous support at a recent meeting of twenty five business owners in the city. Mr. Lambe supplemented that he believed the consultants estimate of £400,000 in operational costs was over-estimated and he strongly believed the scheme would self-sustaining.
- 2.4 Councillor Mitchell praised the proposed ITS initiative as a measure much needed. Councillor Mitchell asked if it would be a simple matter to provide the further information requested by the independent assessors as noted in the LTB papers.
- 2.5 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy stated that further discussions would be held with the independent assessors and LEP ahead of the LTB meeting. He explained that it was the view of the council that the independent assessors had made rigorous and onerous requests above and beyond what would be expected of a scheme of this size and information that would take significant time to resource.
- 2.6 Councillor Cox asked which roads the ITS would apply to.
- 2.7 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy clarified that use of ITS would apply to the A259, the Old Shoreham Road section of the A270 and sections of the A23, primarily at junctions of importance.
- 2.8 Councillor Mitchell explained that she had significant concerns regarding the viability of the proposed BikeScheme. Councillor Mitchell stated that the scheme appeared over ambitious and perhaps could be operated on a smaller scale on a trial basis and expanded if successful. Councillor Mitchell noted the observation of the independent assessor that the scheme could result in a £200,000 annual operating loss that would fall upon the council. Furthermore, the independent assessor had made a number of other statements about the scheme; that the business case was not robust and concerns about some of the estimates provided including the benefit to cost ratio. Councillor Mitchell stated that overall, there was insufficient evidence the proposal represented a secure scheme and that she could not support the recommendations to be considered by the Board and outlined on page 49 of the addendum.
- 2.9 The Chair noted correspondence from Nextbike and the council's consultant that he had circulated to Councillors Cox and Mitchell. The Chair stated that Nextbike, who had implemented a number a similar schemes in across Europe and the council's consultant had fundamentally disagreed with the observations made by the LEP's independent assessor regarding benefit cost ratio and potential revenue. The Chair added that it was his view that the scheme would not need subsidy but that any potential operational loss would be met by the council's approved operator and would form part of the procurement process.

- 2.10 Councillor Cox stated that it was his view that the proposals represented an exciting opportunity for the city and whilst there was an element of over-optimism in the scheme proposal, it had been challenged well by the assessor. Councillor Cox added that the city needed a bike scheme and this was perhaps the only opportunity it would get to do so. Councillor Cox agreed that in the unlikely event the scheme would make a loss, the operator would be asked to meet that and the proposals would be cost neutral to the authority. Councillor Cox added that he was encouraged by the support of the local business community for the proposals, that the public health benefits could not be understated and that the Clinical Commissioning Group also supported the scheme. On that basis, he would be supporting the recommendations.
- 2.11 The Chair asked if there would be further discussions with the LEP and that might lead to the conditions being removed ahead of the LTB meeting on 25 March.
- 2.12 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy clarified that officers would be in constant communication with LEP officers and a meeting would also be held between the two that afternoon with the ambition to remove the conditions set out in the recommendations.
- 2.13 The Deputy Head of Law advised that Members were required to agree the authority's position in respect to recommendations to be discussed at the LTB at this meeting. That could be via approval of the recommendations as set out or through an amendment to the current recommendations to give approval on the basis that the conditions were removed.
- 2.14 The Chair stated that he agreed with the removal of the condition that the authority would provide subsidy in the event the scheme did not make an operating surplus.
- 2.15 Councillor Mitchell stated her support for that view.
- 2.16 The Chair stated that it would be clearly set out at the procurement stage that there would be no public subsidy to the scheme.
- 2.17 The Chair moved the following motion to amend recommendation 2.2 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.2 That the Urgency Sub-Committee supports the recommendations being made to the LTB with respect to the proposed programmes of 2015/16 investment in Sustainability & Resilience schemes ***subject to the general condition on page 49 of the Addenda regarding the promoting authority providing assurance that the scheme will be subsidised in the event that it does not make an operating surplus being removed.***
- 2.18 Councillor Mitchell formally seconded the motion.
- 2.19 The Chair then put the recommendations, as amended, to the vote which passed.
- 2.20 **RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the Urgency Sub-Committee welcomes the positive recommendations being made by the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership [LEP] to its Local Transport Body [LTB] to conditionally approve the council's two bids for Sustainability & Resilience funding for a BikeShare scheme and a package of 'Intelligent Transport System' [ITS] measures.
- 2) That the Urgency Sub-Committee supports the recommendations being made to the LTB with respect to the proposed programmes of 2015/16 investment in Sustainability & Resilience schemes subject to the general condition on page 49 of the Addenda regarding the promoting authority providing assurance that the scheme will be subsidised in the event that it does not make an operating surplus being removed.
- 3) That the Urgency Sub-Committee authorises the Executive Director for Environment, Development & Housing to develop robust and comprehensive cases that can be presented to the Coast to Capital Local Transport Board [LTB] in order that the requirements of the recommended conditional approvals for funding of the council's BikeShare and 'Intelligent Transport System' [ITS] schemes can be satisfactorily fulfilled, and enable full approval for funding to be approved.
- 4) That the Urgency Sub-Committee supports the recommendations being made by the LEP to the LTB with respect to:-
 - a) Surrey Wider Network Benefits;
 - b) Epsom 'Plan E' Highway Improvements;
 - c) Crawley Area Transport Package (Phase 1); and
 - d) A284 Lyminster Bypass.
- 5) That the Urgency Sub-Committee agrees the recommendations above may be subject to minor variations tabled at the LTB, which do not alter the substance of the decision.
- 6) That the Urgency Sub-Committee agrees that if an alternative (or new) recommendation is tabled during the LTB meeting which alters the substance of the original recommendation, a further decision will be sought from the Urgency Sub-Committee prior to proceeding.

The meeting concluded at 9.45am

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

