

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

**4.00pm 28 JUNE 2016**

**THE RONUK HALL, PORTSLADE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor Mitchell (Chair) Atkinson, Deane, Greenbaum (Group Spokesperson), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), Miller, Moonan, Robins, G Theobald and Wares

**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 15 March 2016 be approved and signed as the correct record.

**3 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

3.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

*"I'd like to welcome our new Members of the committee; Councillor Deane, Councillor Moonan and Councillor Wares.*

*I also wish to record our thanks to Councillor Barradell who has sadly had to stand down as a councillor for family reasons.*

*Maggie's contribution as Deputy Chair of this committee was hugely valuable and her input will be missed.*

*Following last year's Committee approval of future plans for improving and investing in the city's electric vehicle infrastructure, I am pleased to be able to report that the procurement process has now been completed.*

*Over the next 3 years, we will be working with the national company, Charge Your Car, to upgrade and expand our electric vehicle charging points, especially to areas west and east of the city centre. We will also make them more widely available to drivers from across the region and country by improving and extending the membership arrangements. This will enable us to provide greater choice and contribute further to local reductions in harmful emissions from transport*

*We are currently tendering for a company to run the Bikeshare scheme and will be appointing a company in the autumn. The scheme will include a minimum of 430 bikes in around 39 locations and is expected to be operational by the summer of 2017. It is envisaged that in these 39 locations, there will be 15 docking points and there will be 11 priority station locations with 25 docking points and these would be the ones with the highest expected demand. The Bikehub locations will be finalised when the contractor is in place but they will be high density areas where people would find them most convenient; on commuter routes and near transport hubs like stations and they will have consistent coverage over the scheme area. There will be consultation through the traffic regulation order process and any representations as a result of advertising those orders will come back to the committee through the usual process. The council is looking for an operator to present a range options for hiring a bike to enable residents, workers, commuters and visitors to take advantage of a simple, effective and accessible system of travelling around Brighton and Hove by bike”.*

#### **4 CALL OVER**

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

- Item 9: City Sustainability Action Plan 2015-2017
- Item 10: Stanmer Estate Parks for People Approval of Grant Application
- Item 11: Update on Chargeable Garden Waste Collection Service
- Item 12: Wheeled Bin for Recycling Trial Update
- Item 14: Area F (Fiveways) and Area G (Hollingbury Road/Ditchling Gardens) Parking Scheme Amendment Order
- Item 15: Victoria Road Parking Proposals
- Item 17: Parking Payment Systems

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: Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee
- Item 13: Hanover, Elm Grove & Craven Vale- Initial Parking Scheme Consultation Results
- Item 16: TRO Objection- Haddington St/Close in Hove
- Item 18: Non-Motorised Vehicles

## 5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

### (a) Petitions

#### (i) Surrenden Road Parking- Andrew Symes

5.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 106 people requesting the introduction of a resident parking scheme on Surrenden Road.

5.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your petition.*

*At a Committee meeting last year it was agreed to proceed with a parking scheme in the Fiveways area which did not include Surrenden Road or other roads in the vicinity.*

*It was also agreed that if difficulties arise in roads outside the scheme area following its introduction in April then residents in the area would need to put together a petition at that stage.*

*Residents in roads just west and including Balfour Road came forward with a petition for a re-consultation on a parking scheme and this was agreed at a recent Committee meeting as it was felt these roads were suitable for inclusion.*

*Surrenden Road is lengthy with a number of side roads and closes that would require a more extensive design solution*

*Therefore, at this stage, Surrenden Road would need to be considered as part of a wider parking scheme. If residents come forward with a petition from the wider area then it can be considered for inclusion within the parking scheme priority timetable”.*

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

#### (ii) Traffic in Ovingdean- Barry Sugg

5.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 143 people requesting the council take urgent action to control the volume, speed and behaviour of traffic on the stretch of Greenways and Ovingdean Road.

5.5 The Chair provided the following response:

*“The council does sympathise with residents of Ovingdean with regard to the volume of traffic and anticipates that the majority of the traffic would be local to the immediate areas using the local access routes.*

*In response to your petition, officers will undertake monitoring of traffic speeds, volume and vehicle type in the coming weeks and will be happy to share those results with you when they are available. The Council does also appreciate that the perception of speeds can be just as important as the actual recorded speeds and that this is an important issue in making our streets feel safer and more pleasant and this is something we do factor into our reviews and monitoring of individual streets and areas.*

*Following the monitoring, I will ask officers from the council’s Road Safety Team to meet with you to discuss any further measures that may be able to be taken to improve driver responsibility as they come through the village.*

*Any closure of Ovingdean Road would need to be considered very carefully with the views of residents in Longhill Road and Beacon Hill would need to be considered as those roads would inevitably suffer from displaced traffic."*

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

**(iii) Stanmer Park Road parking- Emma Rompani**

5.7 The Committee considered a petition signed by 69 people requesting Stanmer Park Road be included in the Zone G resident parking scheme.

5.8 The Chair provided the following response:

*"Thank you for your Petition*

*Over the next few months the Council will be taking into consideration the comments received from a number of roads in the area and discussing this with Ward councillors. Residents from a number of roads have been advised to outline their concerns in the form of a petition to enable the Council to gauge the strength of feeling for a resident parking scheme in certain areas following the introduction of the Hollingbury Road and Ditchling Gardens (Area G) parking scheme.*

*If any directly adjoining road or area is highlighted by residents then this could be considered within the parking scheme timetable which was agreed at the ETS Committee last year.*

*The petition also refers to people parking in Stanmer Park Road while shopping at Fiveways. However, it is worth highlighting that free short term parking is still available at Fiveways following the introduction of the residents' parking scheme (Area F). Drivers can park for up to one hour outside shops and other businesses In Preston Drove, Ditchling Road and around the Fiveways junction".*

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

**(b) Written Questions**

**(i) Pedestrian Crossing, Church Road, South Portslade- Simon Clydesdale**

5.10 Simon Clydesdale put the following question:

*Traffic on Portslade's Church Road is increasing as Shoreham Port becomes busier & more successful and the i-360 attraction on the seafront is set to open, where the road is part of the recommended western approach sat nav route. Will the committee now take urgent action to ensure that the previously promised safe pedestrian crossing for families attending St Peter's School and for residents in the area is provided?*

5.11 The Chair provided the following response:

*"As you probably know, the council's Road Safety Team has carried out assessments to determine if the site in Church Road that is the focus of the ongoing campaign, met the council's agreed criteria for a crossing.*

*Those initial assessments showed that the location did not meet the criteria. Therefore, the council did propose two options to provide safer crossing facilities that included a*

*crossing being installed at another site in the vicinity, but this was not welcomed by local parents, and so the other option of implementing measures to reduce traffic speeds such as central islands, painted pinch points, an improved pedestrian refuge and electronic warning signs was approved and installed at the site favoured by local people and parents.*

*Church Road will be assessed again for a pedestrian crossing and this will identify any increases in traffic and numbers of pedestrians crossing Church Road. We will then be able to determine its priority as a location against other requests from across the city. The results of those assessments will be discussed at a further committee later on this year.*

*Finally, as you are aware we have been trying for some time to recruit a Crossing Patrol Officer for the site. I'm very pleased to announce that we have interviewed a successful candidate and subject to final checks, we are hopeful of this person being able to start before the end of term or at the latest in September.*

*Regarding your concerns about any possible impacts associated with the BA i360, I have been advised that the BA i360's website promotes the use of sustainable forms of travel and no longer recommends a specific route. The company is not directing people to travel through Portslade or to specifically use Trafalgar or Church Roads.*

*Of course, the council cannot control what information SatNav devices give to drivers as they optimise the best choice of route based on current road conditions."*

5.12 Simon Clydesdale asked the following supplementary question:

*"We understand that the council uses Pv2 methodology for pedestrian crossing assessments but the Department for Transport has confirmed that this method is out-dated. What framework and adjustment factors were used three years ago to assess Church Road and when will you carry out this new re-assessment of the site and will you look at the methodology before you do so"*

5.13 The Chair provided the following response:

*"In terms of the technical detail you have requested, I would be very happy to ensure that you are provided with that in terms of what methodology was used for the assessment".*

**(ii) Play equipment at Hove Lagoon- Danny Stockland**

5.14 Danny Stockland put the following question:

*"Given the recent investment of £20,000 that the Big Beach Café has made to public play equipment at Hove Lagoon, and now that summer is upon us, we and other members of the newly-formed Friends of Hove Lagoon are hugely disappointed that the Council has failed to deliver on its promise of further items of play equipment and therefore request that the Chairman gives a firm date for installation as a matter of urgency".*

5.15 The Chair provided the following response:

*"Thank you for your question and the investment by the proprietors of the Big Beach Café in the play area at Hove Lagoon is most appreciated.*

*We apologise to the Friends of Hove Lagoon and to the proprietors of the Café for the delay in progressing the further improvements to the play area. An initial scheme had been designed for the available funding, but additional S106 funding is now available for play equipment. Therefore, rather than proceed with the original scheme, we are confident that we can bring forward an enhanced scheme for the play area and that is being developed.*

*We welcome your involvement in a working group from the Friends of Hove Lagoon so that we can achieve the best possible improvements to the play area, and also ensure that a firm date for installation can be established as soon as possible”.*

5.16 Danny Stockland asked the following supplementary question:

*“Would you also please commit to working with the Friends of Hove Lagoon to bring focus on the issues of bin emptying, recycling, security, planting, landscaping and event organisation over the coming weeks, months and years?”*

5.17 The Chair provided the following response:

*“We can certainly commit to that, and I think you are asking for a more joined up approach from different council services which is really important”*

**(c) Deputations**

**(i) Traffic and Air Pollution in Rottingdean- Rottingdean Parish Council**

5.18 The Committee considered a Deputation requesting the Committee to take a series of action to reduce traffic and air pollution on Rottingdean High Street.

5.19 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your deputation.*

*I am pleased to say that since 2010, overall air quality across Brighton and Hove has been improving thanks to sustained efforts in relation to the promotion of sustainable transport and other policies.*

*However, there are still some stubborn areas such as here in Portslade as indeed Rottingdean as well as some roads in the city centre.*

*The Council is fully committed to improving air quality in all areas of the city and is seeking to understand and tackle this problem through the Council’s Air*

*Quality Action Plan and the Local Transport Plan because the primary cause of potentially harmful Nitrogen Dioxide emissions has been identified is transport, in its many forms.*

*The issues in Rottingdean are recognised by its designation as an Air Quality Management Area and relate to traffic volumes in that narrow High Street. This has been acknowledged in the development of the Local Transport Plan. Unfortunately, the Council finds itself in very challenging economic times. Therefore, has to prioritise its limited resources.*

*In November 2015 this committee considered and agreed new priorities for its Delivery Plan over the next few years. This was focused on local shopping areas based on a broad assessment framework which included air quality and other objectives.*

*The LTP programme assessment work concluded that other areas such as Station Road and Boundary Road in Portslade should be prioritised. And so improvements to Rottingdean High Street will need to be considered as part of any future, longer term programme.*

*Meanwhile, the council will continue to monitor the area and stay in touch with and communicate with the Parish Council on this matter”*

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

## **6 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL**

### **(a) Petitions**

#### **(i) Farm Green Playground- Jane Van Ransberg**

6.1 The Committee considered a petition referred from the Full Council meeting of 24 March 2016 and signed by 783 people requesting the council renovate and improve Farm Green Playground.

6.2 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your petition and we do recognise the importance of play spaces to the development of children and young people.*

*As part of the background work progressing for the new Open Spaces Strategy, a review is being undertaken of all the play areas in the city. This review will help inform future decisions on the investment in play areas in light of the reducing financial resources available.*

*In the meantime, city parks officers have met with the friends group on two occasions and are working with them to improve the play equipment at Farm Green.*

*I’d like to thank you all for your involvement and very much hope that the council and the local community can continue to work on getting some improvements to the Playground.”*

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

#### **(ii) Pesticide-Free Brighton/Notice of Motion: Use of Pesticides**

6.4 The Committee considered a petition referred from the Full Council meeting of 24 March 2016 and signed by 850 people requesting the council cease use of hazardous toxic pesticides and a Notice of Motion referred from the same meeting requesting the end of the use of glyphosate for weed killing and for the implementation of a trial in the use of non-chemical and mechanical alternatives for pesticide control.

6.5 The Chair provided the following response to both items due to the similarity in the topic matter:

*“It is acknowledged that the reliance upon chemical methods of weed control is not sustainable.*

*It is in fact the International Agency on Cancer Research that are suggesting that glyphosate probably could cause cancer, not that it probably does, and there is a distinction between the two.*

*But the issue here is that now the issue has been raised there is a duty to ensure user safety is considered and Local Authorities and landowners will have to make alternative arrangements for a more integrated method of weed control and not just rely on weed killers.*

*It is important to remember that the Council complies with Control of Substances hazardous to Health Regulations 2002 (COSHH). This is quite important as it ensures the spread of herbicides to the area being treated and the frequency is confined to no more than necessary.*

*Where reasonably practicable to do so, alternative methods are used as mulching around trees and in parks and shrub beds.*

*Some non-native species such as Giant Hogweed and Japanese Knotweed are incredibly difficult to control and are a serious problem in many areas. Chemical applications are currently the only form of weed control for these particularly invasive species.*

*Government guidance exists in the form of DEFRA guidance, which the Council complies with, which again, makes clear the need for selective treatment rather than blanket coverage. EU directives are that we must “keep the use of pesticides to levels that are economically and ecologically justified.*

*We do only allocate a budget of £30,000 for weed control on our hard surfaces across the entire City, so our actual usage is quite low in reality.*

*The Council does also trial alternative solutions, such as steam treatment, foam products and flame devices. So far, these are not proven to be cost effective or a reasonably practicable solution to the problem.*

*We also need to remember that the Council has a legal duty to ensure footpaths are clear from trip hazards, which weeds can be a contributing factor toward.*

*We are again meeting with the Pesticide Action Network in July to see if they have any alternative suggestions that will enable the Council to maintain its statutory duties, within the small budget available that we have to carry out this activity. And I will speak to officers before the next contract is let”.*

- 6.6 Councillor Greenbaum asked for clarification that no new trials would be initiated.
- 6.7 The Waste Contracts & Projects Manager confirmed that the council would be trialing new methods and the council would shortly be receiving a report from the Pesticide Action Network that would set out their recommendations on alternative, pesticide free options. Trials would take place over August 2016.
- 6.8 The Chair stated that any suggestions on alternative methods of weed control would be readily received.
- 6.9 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the petition and Notice of Motion.

**(iii) Withdean Park- Fenced Area for Dogs**

- 6.10 The Committee considered a petition referred from the Full Council meeting of 24 March 2016 and signed by 1980 people requesting the council retain the fenced area of



Withdean Park used by local dog owners. The petition had been debated at the meeting of Full Council on 24 March.

6.11 The Chair provided the following response:

*“The request made of this Committee by Full Council was to acknowledge Withdean Dog Walking Community as a group. I am also pleased that the council has been working with your group to maintain the fences and replace the gates and thank you for all your efforts. I believe that you held a work day last Sunday and hope that went well.”*

6.12 **RESOLVED-** That the petition be noted and that Members agree the Council recognise Withdean Dog Walking Community as a community group.

## **7 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT**

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

#### **(i) Zone G Parking- Councillor Hill**

7.1 Councillor Hill was unable to attend the meeting. The Chair provided the following written response to the question.

*“Overall we have issued 105 Resident permits in total for Zone G. In Ditchling Gardens we have currently issued 17 permits and there are currently 26 Resident permit parking places available. Ditchling Close is a private area and no permits have been issued. 88 resident permits have been issued in Hollingbury Road and there are 102 Resident permit only spaces and 16 shared permit/paid spaces. The Council has undertaken an extensive and detailed two stage consultation process for these schemes which have received full support. Therefore, as part of the overall process we intend to undertake a period of monitoring. If there are continued difficulties for residents in Ditchling Road and surrounding areas with their Area J permit and a number of spaces remain in Ditchling Gardens this should be evidenced in a deputation or petition to a future Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee. Residents should also outline exactly their properties that would require an Area G permit i.e. those with a back garden onto Ditchling Gardens”.*

### **(c) Letters**

#### **(i) Tree Management Strategy- Councillors Janio and Druitt**

7.2 Councillor Janio presented a letter requesting the committee consider a report within the next six months consisting of a schedule of work that would review the council’s existing Tree Management Strategy whilst also recommending to the Economic Development & Culture Committee that they consider whether a new Supplementary Planning Document on Trees should be added to the City Plan Part 2 Framework.

7.3 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your letter which sets out the important role of trees have in the city. In terms of the Tree and Woodland Strategy I can confirm this was updated and agreed in 2008 in response to the 2007 Scrutiny Report. This sets out a clear strategy for managing the city’s stock of trees and is available on the council’s website. We can provide you with a link to the document.*

*In terms of planning decisions - there is a clear planning framework for assessing the impact of new development proposals on existing trees and prioritising planting of new trees particularly to improve the public realm. There are policies relating to trees in the Local Plan (QD11 Trees and Hedgerows) and the City Plan Part One (CP10 Biodiversity and CP13 Public Streets and Spaces). Detailed planning guidance on Trees and Development Sites (a supplementary planning document) was adopted in 2006. I am advised that the City Parks Team is currently looking at the wording of the standard planning conditions.*

*There is also an opportunity to address more detailed policy issues on trees in Part 2 of the City Plan – the Scoping Document was agreed recently and will be out consultation on 30 June for three months. You will have an opportunity to raise matters relating to policies for tree protection and planting in your comments on this.”*

7.4 Councillor Janio stated that he was pleased to hear that this issue was being considered and that a Tree & Woodland Strategy existed as he had been informed otherwise by officers.

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

**(ii) Waste Enforcement- Councillors Janio and Greenbaum**

7.6 Councillors Greenbaum and Janio presented a letter that outlined concerns regarding the conduct of the recently appointed contractor responsible for enforcement of anti-social waste and asked that a monitoring report detailing the results and feedback of the service be brought to the committee.

7.7 The Chair provided the following response:

*“As part of the new strategy to reduce waste, increase recycling and have cleaner streets that was approved by this Committee and P&R Committee last year, it was agreed that we need to do something about the scourge of littering and fly-tipping, among other environmental crimes.*

*When that report was agreed, it committed to bringing a report before the committee after six months of operation and there will be a full update when we meet in October.*

*Cllr Greenbaum, Richard Bradley the Acting Director and myself have had email correspondence about this over the past weeks and it has been made very clear that an update report on the service will come to ET&S Cttee in October in line with the recommendations to this committee and to P&R. That has never been in doubt but I am happy to confirm it again.”*

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

**(iii) Hangelton Public Toilets- Councillors Barnett, Janio & Lewry**

7.9 The Committee considered a letter from Councillors Barnett, Janio and Lewry that requested to keep the public toilets in Greenleas open all year round and to reverse the decision for closure of the public toilets sited at the Grenadier Parade.

7.10 The Chair provided the following response:

*“Thank you for your letter and I can appreciate your concerns as ward councillors for this area.*

*You will remember that when the council’s budget was set and supported by the Conservative Group, both the Labour Administration and the Conservative Group had put additional resources back into the public toilet budget. Unfortunately this did still leave a £40,000 saving to be made in that budget so officers had to work up proposals to set criteria to deliver those savings*

*The only way that savings of that magnitude can be realised is by either reducing opening hours or by closing some sites completely.*

*The criteria for analysing each site was based upon:*

- *Level of Usage*
- *Destination park/green flag*
- *Distance to alternative toilets*
- *Condition surveys*
- *Could opening/attendance be reduced without reducing the level of service*
- *Winter opening*
- *Investment required*
- *Future charging*
- *Contractor and operational feedback*

*Unfortunately, the sites in Hangleton did not rank high enough to be prioritised with the reduced funding available.*

*I appreciate that will be a disappointment to you and your fellow ward councillors and I would be happy to consider any alternative arrangements should you have any ideas or suggestions to that end.”*

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

#### **(d) Notices of Motion**

##### **(i) Extending Enforcement of Grass Verge Parking**

7.12 The Committee considered a Notice of Motion referred from the Full Council meeting of 24 March 2016 that recommended the Committee extension of the current limited grass verge parking enforcement scheme to other areas of the city and options to do so be presented in a report to the committee at the earliest available opportunity, subject to resources.

7.13 The Chair provided the following response to the Motion:

*“There are a number of issues to consider to take this forward.*

*Firstly there are the costs involved as recent no verge schemes in Mile Oak and the Surrenden area cost between £20,000 to £40,000.*

*Secondly there are the staff resources to undertake this work as currently project officers are busy dealing with an agreed parking scheme timetable.*

*In addition to the lack of financial and staff resources, we need to consider the displacement effects of continuing with a road by road approach or to see if a citywide prohibition may be possible – as in London.*

*We have contacted the Department for Transport to see if this would be possible and where areas suitable for footway parking could be signed as such.*

*We have received a reply from Andrew Jones MP, the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, stating that “The DfT is at the stage of taking forward the concerns raised and we are examining the scope of research needed which will look more closely at the legal and financial implications of an alternative regime and the likely impacts on local authorities.*

*He goes on to say that the DfT would welcome input from this council as part of its evidence gathering.*

*I would propose that we continue to liaise closely with the DfT and lobby for these powers to be given to us.”*

7.14 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee notes the Notice of Motion.

**(ii) Use of Pesticides**

7.15 As per minute Item 6 paragraph 6.4.

**8 CONSTITUTIONAL MATTERS: ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE**

**8.1 RESOLVED-**

- 1) That the committee’s terms of reference, as set out in Appendix A to this report, be noted
- 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 CITY SUSTAINABILITY ACTION PLAN 2015-17**

9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture that provided the second six monthly update of the City Sustainability Action Plan since the plan was refreshed in 2015.

9.2 Councillor Miller referred to the comment made in the document regarding a lack of agreement between ward councillors and parish councillors in Rottingdean. Councillor Miller stated this this was expressly not the case and asked for the sentence to be removed.

9.3 The Chair confirmed that the reference would be amended.

- 9.4 Councillor Greenbaum enquired as to how an exit from the European Union (EU) would affect funding streams.
- 9.5 The Acting Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture clarified that it was still too early to be certain of the ramifications of the recent referendum result and officers had been advised by the Department for Communities & Local Government (DCLG) to take a 'business as usual' approach until the full picture was known.
- 9.6 Councillor Deane asked if the Citywide Garage Sale would be held again in 2016, if charity shops could be included in data collection for waste diverted from landfill and if the work of re-use organisations such as Freegle could be advertised on communal refuse bins as a method to reduce dumping of household goods.
- 9.7 The Chair stated that she was currently in discussion with officers at Cityclean about the signage on communal bins and this could be an item to take forward.
- 9.8 The Sustainability Programme Officer explained this was the first time data had been collected from Freegle on the tonnage of waste diverted from landfill. Whilst resource constraints meant it unlikely that data could also be collated from charity shops, it could be an option in the long-term. The Sustainability Programme Officer added that the Citywide Garage Sale would be going ahead again this year and would be co-ordinated by Cath Fletcher.
- 9.9 Referring to 3.1.5.8 of the Planning Action Progress report, Councillor Atkinson asked if Sussex Partnership Trust could be involved in work to help develop a healthy and sustainable hospital food and drink policy.
- 9.10 The Chair thanked Councillor Atkinson for a helpful suggestion and stated that the request would be relayed on.
- 9.11 Councillor Wares asked if the section on flood risk detailed on page 123 of the agenda should be expanded to include to include surface water flooding that affected the Patcham and Portslade areas of the city. Councillor Wares also asked whether officers responsible for delivering the actions detailed in the Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) also had some input into producing them.
- 9.12 The Sustainability Programme Officer confirmed that KPI's were jointly produced by the Sustainability Team and the officers responsible. Options for including surface water flooding would be reviewed for the next update.
- 9.13 Councillor Janio asked if the authority benchmarked KPI's against other authorities
- 9.14 The Sustainability Programme Officer confirmed that benchmarking was undertaken against similar authorities as comparison and for potential ways of working to learn from.
- 9.15 Councillor Robins asked if any feedback had been provided about the impact of the two rain gardens in Portslade had been provided given the recent flooding.
- 9.16 The Sustainability Programme Officer confirmed that the Flooding Officer had provided very positive feedback regarding the impact of the rain gardens.

- 9.17 Councillor Greenbaum noted that a decision had been made in July 2015 to stop using a 100% renewable energy tariff and asked if the impact of that was yet or would be known.
- 9.18 The Acting Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture stated that he would need to check with the council's Energy Team to clarify.
- 9.19 **RESOLVED-** That Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:
- 1) Notes the Action Progress Report in relation to the City Sustainability Action Plan (Appendix 1).
  - 2) Approves the City Sustainability Action Plan Key Performance Indicators list (Appendix 2) and notes the City Sustainability Action Plan Key Performance Indicators 2015-16 report (Appendix 3).

## **10 STANMER ESTATE, PARKS FOR PEOPLE APPROVAL OF GRANT APPLICATION**

- 10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director of Economy, Environment & Culture that provided information on progress made on the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) grant application for Stanmer Park and requested the Committee recommend to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee to approve the submission of the HLF application for the Stanmer Project to be made in August 2016.
- 10.2 Councillor Janio thanked officers for their hard work on the Stanmer Project thus far and noted his support for the report recommendations. Councillor Janio requested that Members be kept informed of the Stanmer Project as it progressed and that the Stanmer Project Board be retained as a method of retaining openness and Member input. Councillor Janio asked if officers had met with the new tenant of Stanmer House and representatives from Plumpton College.
- 10.3 The Parks Projects & Strategy Manager confirmed that officers had met with the new tenant and discussions had found their aspirations to be parallel with the council's position. A memorandum of understanding is being developed with Plumpton College to confirm their commitment to the project. The college would be sending a letter of intent to support to the application.
- 10.4 Councillor Greenbaum stated that whilst she was supportive of the plans in principle, she had reservations with regard to the provision of parking. Under the plans, parking spaces would be increasing substantially and that was a serious issue that had not been detailed thoroughly in the report.
- 10.5 The Chair stated that a decision on parking provision had not yet been reached and requested officers to elaborate further.
- 10.6 The Parks Projects & Strategy Manager stated that the Sustainable Travel Plan is still a draft and not a document that is an actual requirement of the HLF bid submission. It is intended to bring a report on a Traffic Regulation Order for parking in Stanmer Park to committee in October.

- 10.7 Councillor Janio noted that sustainable transport options from his ward and western areas of Hove were very poor so whilst he supported an increase in parking provision to enable people to travel to the Stanmer Estate, he acknowledged the finer details of the plans were yet to be decided and a position of compromise could be reached as the project progressed.
- 10.8 Councillor Theobald stated that he understood there would be an increase in events and hospitality at Stanmer House and it appeared logical that would necessitate an increase in parking provision.
- 10.9 Councillor Greenbaum stated that in her view, the question of parking provision was important to the project and she felt the committee should be discussing the matter in more depth.
- 10.10 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee notes the progress made on the HLF bid outlined in this report and recommends that Policy, Resources & Growth Committee approve the submission of the HLF application for the Stanmer Project due to be made in August 2016.

## 11 UPDATE ON CHARGEABLE GARDEN WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE

- 11.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director, Environment, Economy & Culture that provided an update on progress on the chargeable garden waste collection service and requested the collection area be extended due to demand.
- 11.2 Councillor Wares stated that as a user of the service, he had found the collections to be excellent and he had received very positive feedback from his ward residents. Councillor Wares asked if the £52 payment could be made more flexible as some residents may find the one-off cost to be prohibitive.
- 11.3 The Waste Contracts & Projects Manager stated that this was an issue that had been considered however, the cost was based on a full year subscription and any savings would not be realised if residents made part payments and subsequently cancelled. Different options for payment would be monitored and kept under review.
- 11.4 Councillor Miller asked if a community loan, similar to that for bus travel provided by East Sussex Credit Union in partnership with Brighton & Hove Bus Company could be considered for this scheme in relation to those residents that could not afford the upfront payment.
- 11.5 The Acting Executive Director, Environment, Economy & Culture stated this was an option that could be looked into and examined further.
- 11.6 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee:
- 1) Subject to operational effectiveness (e.g. vehicle travelling) and where the original business case is still justified in terms of cost efficiency, authorises the Acting Executive Director of Environment, Economy and Culture to develop a strategy to better promote

waste minimisation & recycling and extend the chargeable garden waste collection service to other areas of the City as set out in the body of this report.

- 2) Agrees the policy approved by ETS on 13<sup>th</sup> October 2015 on garden waste collections be extended to reflect 2.1 above. This policy is set out in paragraphs 4.5 to 4.7.
- 3) Agrees a further update report to be brought to ETS in June 2017, which will enable a full year of data to be presented to the Committee.

## **12 WHEELED BIN FOR RECYCLING TRIAL UPDATE**

- 12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director, Environment, Economy & Culture that provided an update on the wheeled bin recycling trial being undertaken in Hangleton and South Portslade wards. The update would allow a full business case to be presented to the committee at a later date subject to further analysis and community engagement to seek permission to implement wheeled bin recycling to all households across the city with the exception of the communal bin areas.
- 12.2 Councillor Janio stated that the scheme had received unanimous appraisal from residents in the Hangleton ward and he hoped the whole city could eventually benefit.
- 12.3 Councillor Miller noted that the trial had led to an increase in recycling rates of 1.1kg per household and asked what that figure represented as a percentage of overall household waste.
- 12.4 The Chair stated that precise figures would be sought and an update provided.
- 12.5 Councillor Robins welcomed the results of the trial adding there was a clear visual reduction in general refuse in South Portslade.
- 12.6 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee:
  - 1) Notes the progress made against previous recommendations with regard the use of wheeled bins to collect materials for recycling.
  - 2) That a full business case is presented at October Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee, to seek permission for wheeled bin recycling to be implemented across the city, subject to an audit of appropriate streets / properties for the appropriateness of an additional wheeled bin.

## **13 HANOVER, ELM GROVE & CRAVEN VALE – INITIAL PARKING SCHEME CONSULTATION RESULTS**

- 13.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approves:
  - 1) That a detailed design proposal for a resident parking scheme as a 9am-8pm or light touch (two periods during the day) and either Monday to Sunday or Monday to Friday be consulted upon in the whole area apart from the Craven Vale area. (Appendix A).



- 2) That a detailed design proposal for a resident parking scheme as a 9am-8pm (Monday to Sunday or Monday to Friday) parking scheme or an extension to Area U (light touch scheme) be consulted upon in the Craven Vale area (Appendix A)

#### **14 AREA F (FIVEWAYS) AND AREA G (HOLLINGBURY ROAD / DITCHLING GARDENS) PARKING SCHEME AMENDMENT ORDER**

- 14.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director, Environment, Economy & Culture that set out support, comments and objections to an Amendment Traffic Order for the recently implemented Fiveways parking scheme Area F and Hollingbury Road and Ditchling Gardens (Area G). The Amendment Traffic Order included a number for changes made during implementation of the schemes along with the proposed relocation of a taxi rank from Hollingbury Terrace to Ditchling Road and double yellow lines in Adams Close.
- 14.2 The Parking Infrastructure Manger noted that further representations had been received after publication of the agenda and circulated to Members. In response to the issues raised, the Parking Infrastructure Manager explained that the proposed shared bay for taxi rank and loading bay was designated for use at separate times with the taxi rank effective between the hours of 6pm-6am and was therefore not contrary to the provisions of the Local Government Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1976. In relation to the other concerns expressed, the Parking Infrastructure Manager stated that the council would work with the Hackney Carriage Office to consider taxi rank requirements as had been done previously. If suitable nearby locations and funding were found, a proposal could be agreed via a traffic order at a later date.
- 14.3 Councillor Janio stated that after careful consideration, he was minded to support the Hollingbury Terrace taxi rank being reduced from three spaces to two rather than removed and that the rank remain designated as such for 24 hours a day. Councillor Janio noted that the recommendations were of a technical nature and sought legal advice as to how to word a motion to formally propose that view.
- 14.4 The Deputy Head of Law stated that in order to word and move a motion, technical advice was required on which Order detailed in the recommendation related to the Hollingbury Terrace taxi rank. Once that was clear, a motion to add an additional recommendation could be moved.
- 14.5 The Parking Infrastructure Manager clarified that one Order related to removing the rank and another re-locating it.
- 14.6 The Chair adjourned the meeting at 18.05 in order to seek legal clarification.
- 14.7 The meeting reconvened at 18.10.
- 14.8 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Janio moved the following motion to amend recommendation 2.1 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.1 That the Committee is recommended to (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections):

Approve the Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.\* 201\* (Ref: TRO-11a-2016) and Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.\* 201\* (Ref: TRO-11b-2016) **that do not relate to the taxi rank in Hollingbury Terrace**

14.9 Councillor Wares seconded the motion.

14.10 Councillor Deane stated that on the basis of the information provided, she would be supporting the motion as it was a position of compromise.

14.11 The Chair then put the motion to the vote which passed.

14.12 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to the vote which passed.

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

Approve the Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2015 Amendment Order No.\* 201\* (Ref: TRO-11a-2016) and Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.\* 201\* (Ref: TRO-11b-2016) that do not relate to the taxi rank in Hollingbury Terrace

## 15 VICTORIA ROAD PARKING PROPOSALS

15.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director, Environment, Economy & Culture that provided an update on the current situation for the additional parking restriction proposals in Victoria Road and sought approval of the traffic order necessary.

15.2 Councillor Robins stated that ward councillors were very supportive of the proposals following consultation with residents. The proposals would lead to an increase of 27 spaces on the south side of Victoria Road and a four hour parking time limit. Parking on Victoria Road was often constrained due to customers visiting local car franchises.

15.3 Councillor Greenbaum noted her concern that the proposals may lead to more difficulty in navigating the road for larger vehicles including an increase in waiting situations.

15.4 The Parking Infrastructure Manager confirmed that there were one or two places along the road where there would be parking on both sides of the road and the intention was for vehicles to be permitted to stop at double yellow lines and allow other vehicles through. The Road Safety Team had been consulted on the proposals and they were confident that the proposals did not represent any safety or traffic management complications.

15.5 Councillor Wares noted that the proposals went against the policy of only considering traffic conditions inside controlled parking zones. Councillor Wares noted that £2,000 had been assigned from the disposal of Portslade Town Hall for the advertising of traffic orders and asked how the works would be paid for subject to approval.

- 15.6 The Parking Infrastructure Manager confirmed that £2,000 covered the traffic orders, lining and signage and any maintenance of the lining.
- 15.7 Councillor Greenbaum stated that she had not received sufficient assurance that alternative proposals had been considered for people travelling to Portslade Town Hall and could not support the report recommendations.
- 15.8 Councillor Robins stated that the proposals did not relate to transportation access to Portslade Town Hall but providing sufficient parking for local residents.
- 15.9 **RESOLVED-** Having taken into account the objection received the Committee agrees to make the Brighton & Hove Outer Areas (Waiting, Loading and Parking) and Cycle Lanes Consolidation Order 2013 Amendment No.X 201X as advertised.

## **16 TRO OBJECTION - HADDINGTON ST/ CLOSE IN HOVE**

- 16.1 **RESOLVED-** That the committee agrees to adopt the Traffic Regulation Order amendment TRO-9a-2016.

## **17 PARKING PAYMENT SYSTEMS**

- 17.1 The Committee considered a report of the Acting Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture that set out evaluated procurement options for the procurement of Pay & Display machines and requested the committee to recommend to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee to approve the preferred option for the reasons set out in the report.
- 17.2 Councillor Janio noted his long-running concerns regarding new and differing methods of parking payment systems and the speed of that change. Councillor Janio stated his concern that the new systems were a detriment on the basis of equality for some residents, particularly the elderly who may not own a mobile phone or could not adapt to the rapid change in new systems.
- 17.3 Councillor Miller stated that there were serious flaws with the financial case made for the preferred option (Option 3). Councillor Miller noted that there was a £1.6m one-off capital cost between Option 1 that would upgrade existing machines to accept the new £1 coin and Option 3 that would replace existing machines with 330 card-only Pay and Display machines and upgrade 150 machines to accept the new £1 coin and card payments. Councillor Miller stated that a £1.6 million one-off cost was not a justifiable expenditure for a new system that he felt many residents would find an inconvenience. Furthermore, Councillor Miller noted that Option 3 would only realise a £25,000 annual operational revenue cost saving compared to Option 1. On that basis, he could not see a justifiable reason to support the recommendation of the report.
- 17.4 The Policy & Development Manager stated that the report stressed the age of the current stock of Pay & Display machines. Much of the council's stock of Pay & Display machines were now 15 years old and required replacement. The existing machines had an expected life-span of 7-10 years. Furthermore, there had been 51 thefts of cash Pay & Display machines in the first three months of the year so replacing cash machines

with card only machines would represent a reduction of risk and expense in cash collection operationally. The Policy & Development Manager also referred to the impact of the recent loss of significant revenue due to the collapse of the council's cash collection contractor.

- 17.5 Councillor Miller noted that the risk of theft, operational cost and cost of replacement was also factored into Option 1 that did not include capital costs of £1.6 million. Councillor Miller reiterated his view that a card payment system would be an inconvenience to a large portion of residents and visitors using the machines.
- 17.6 The Chair stated that card payment was a very common form of payment noting that 95% of the population now owned a bank card and car drivers would need a bank account for insurance and tax purposes.
- 17.7 Councillor Atkinson stated that Option 3 was compelling firstly because it would improve and consolidate the council stock of Pay & Display machines and secondly, it provided residents and visitors the option to pay using a bank card or cash in more locations. Councillor Atkinson noted that the consultation results demonstrated that 78% of people wanted a card payment option to pay for parking, and there would be no extra fee or charge to users paying by card. Furthermore, there had been a loss to the council of £150,000 since 2008 due to theft from Pay and Display machines and increasing the number of card-only machines and reducing the cash amounts stored in card and cash Pay and Display machines would help reduce risk to the council in lost income.
- 17.8 Councillor Theobald stated that he had not received justification on why £1.6 million of capital expenditure was required particularly in light of the council's financial position.
- 17.9 The Head of Transport stated the benefits of recommended Option 3 were clearly set out in the table and that that some of the Pay & Display machines would have to be replaced anyway due to age and poor condition and the capital investment would provide opportunity to upgrade the council's stock to incorporate a more modern form of payment.
- 17.10 Councillor Robins stated he refuted the assertion that card payment would be an inconvenience particularly as significant amounts of change was required to pay at certain locations, which would be an inconvenience in itself.
- 17.11 Councillor Miller stated that he agreed with the observations made by Councillor Robins but the report was clear that the annual machine replacement was included in the report under Option 1.
- 17.12 The Chair cautioned that the new £1 coin would be in circulation very soon and there would be significant risk to the council if it did not make arrangements for that in the short-term.
- 17.13 Councillor Janio stated that officers should be tasked with presenting the financial information detailed in the report in a clearer manner and an urgency sub-committee could be convened to re-consider the report once that was complete.

17.14 In view of the debate, the Chair proposed deferring a decision on the preferred option of procurement on the basis that clearer and more detailed financial information be presented to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee for their scheduled consideration of the report on 14 July 2016.

17.15 The Committee agreed to the proposal made by the Chair.

17.16 **RESOLVED-** That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee:

- 1) Notes the procurement options evaluated in this report and recommends that Policy, Resources & Growth Committee considers the report's recommendations for the procurement of Pay and Display machines, for the reasons explained in the report.

## **18 NON-MOTORISED VEHICLES**

18.1 **RESOLVED-** That the committee agree the new policy to deal with NMV's on the public highway.

## **19 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

19.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 6.45pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

