

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

4.00pm 19 MARCH 2019

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Mitchell (Chair) Horan (Deputy Chair), Wares (Opposition Spokesperson), Littman (Group Spokesperson), Atkinson, Brown, Miller, Peltzer Dunn, Robins and West

PART ONE

68 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

68(a) Declarations of substitutes

68.1 There were none.

68(b) Declarations of interest

68.2 There were none.

68(c) Exclusion of press and public

68.3 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).

68.4 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the items contained in part two of the agenda.

69 MINUTES

69.1 Referring to minute item 66.29, Councillor West asked what engagement with Members had taken place in relation to event space at Valley Gardens.

69.2 The Chair clarified that the lead opposition spokespersons for the respective political groups had been invited to a briefing with officers and herself that would provide further, more detailed updates and facilitation of discussion.

- 69.3 Councillor West expressed his concern that matters had not been progressed quick enough in relation to events to be held on Valley Gardens.
- 69.4 The Chair answered that the meeting was not intended to address the specific points raised by event organisers but to discuss progress on the entire project. The Chair added that discussions were continuing with event organisers and that would remain the case throughout the construction phase.
- 69.5 Councillor Littman noted that the recorded votes listed at item 66.60 were incorrect and should read:

Councillor Atkinson: For
Councillor Brown: Against
Councillor Horan: For
Councillor Littman: For
Councillor Miller: Not Present
Councillor Mitchell: For
Councillor Peltzer Dunn: Against
Councillor Robins: For
Councillor Wares: Against
Councillor West: For

Furthermore, Councillor Littman enquired as to progress made in obtaining independent legal advice.

- 69.6 The Chair stated that that the independent legal advice received would be shared with the lead spokesperson at the aforementioned meeting as per the recommendation.
- 69.7 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meetings held on 22 January and 7 February 2019 be approved and signed as the correct record subject to the correction identified at item 69.5.

70 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

- 70.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

“Just to highlight two government policy developments that the council has been notified of. The Future of Mobility Strategy published today and the Future Mobility Zones Fund. This will cover cross-boundary working and looking at emerging transport technologies. The fund will support the trialling of ‘new mobility services, modes and models’ via 4 zones set up in the country”.

- 70.2 Councillor Wares noted that the committee members had that afternoon received a copy of a letter sent to the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and enquired as to whether the Chair could provide any update on how that might impact upon the Council. Furthermore, Councillor Wares asked if any comment was available on the matters relating to Cityclean reported in the press earlier that day.
- 70.3 The Chair noted that the letter referred to was solely addressed to the LEP and therefore, it was for the LEP to respond in whatever way it saw appropriate. In relation to

the matters reported in the local press, the Chair stated that there was no item on the agenda relating to the matter and therefore, she did not intend to comment upon or discuss the issue.

70.4 Councillor West noted that Councillor Deane had requested a letter be included on the agenda for the January committee meeting and this committee, yet this had not happened. Councillor West stated his concern regarding democratic process in relation to the matter.

70.5 The Chair stated that it had been intended to send a response to Councillor Deane outside of the formal committee process. That response had now been sent with an apology to Councillor Deane for the delay.

71 CALL OVER

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

- Item 75: Official Feed and Food Controls Service Plan 2019/20
- Item 77: 2019/20 Local Transport Plan Capital Programme

71.2 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 76: Health and Safety Service Plan 2018-19
- Item 78: Parking Schemes Update Report

72 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(A) PETITIONS

(i) Gorilla Pizza Kitchen

72.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 210 people requesting the council make adjustments to allow Gorilla Pizza Kitchen to park outside London Road Station on Thursday evenings.

72.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“The petitioner was unfortunately unable to attend the meeting today, but I’m pleased to say that Ms Heselgrave has been in touch to confirm that the business was awarded a Street Traders Licence by the council on 15 March and will continue to operate every Thursday evening in Shaftesbury Place”.

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

72.4 The Chair stated that due to the similarity of the following petitions, the committee would hear each in turn and a joint response would be provided.

(ii) Parking Permits

72.5 The Committee considered a petition signed by 192 people requesting the introduction of parking permits in Hollingdean Terrace, Roedale, Dudley and Upper Hollingdean Roads.

(iii) Stanmer Park Road Parking

72.6 The Committee considered a petition signed by 38 people requesting the council undertake a consultation in Stanmer Park Road for a parking scheme.

(iv) Let's maintain free parking for Hollingdean residents

72.7 The Committee considered a petition signed by 364 people requesting the Council to maintain the existing parking controls in the Hollingdean area.

72.8 The Chair provided the following response to the petitions:

“Thank you for your petitions. There is absolutely no proposal on the part of the Council to implement a residents parking scheme in your area. We certainly wouldn't rush to do that without a full and proper consultation.

There are opposing views on the parking solution for certain areas while in other areas there are very clear cut requests for what people want.

There is currently a priority parking scheme timetable which runs up until 2020/21 and that includes all of the areas across the city where there is either a consultation proposed to start, a consultation actually happening, or parking schemes being implemented and some areas that are being reviewed. Those areas have all shown a strong desire for a parking consultation at the outset.

An update report is due to be presented to the ETS Committee on 8th October 2019 on the parking scheme timetable. We will ensure representations will be considered as part of this report alongside requests from other areas so what you said today will be taken into account.

Any parking consultation would allow officers to gauge the strength of opinion in areas on the options that might be available and as part of that consultation, people are encouraged to send in any other ideas, if they have them. If any consultation is taken forward it would be across a very wide area to capture as many views as possible but also to take into account, any potential displacement effect. As part of that, the full results including a road by road analysis would be included in a further report to allow this Committee to decide the way forward. The road by road analysis is simply that within a wider area, Councillors can see where there is more support than some areas than perhaps in others.

I understand the concerns regarding the car club bay in the Hollingdean area taking up additional space, but research suggests that for each car club car, the need for between five and eight privately owned vehicles may be removed. Car clubs can help to reduce congestion and relieve the pressure on parking spaces in residential areas”.

72.9 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the petitions.

(B) WRITTEN QUESTIONS**(i) Aquarium Roundabout**

72.10 Andrew Peters put the following question:

“Could the Chair provide the taxi trade with information as to when any resolution will be made in relation to the existing ‘No Right Turn’ (West) at the junction of the Queens Hotel/Kings Road whereby there will be no longer the ability to use the roundabout to loop back around to head back westbound?”

The Chair will recall that this was demonstrated to herself and Nick Hibberd on February 11 2019 and that this issue was raised in the Trade Submission dated November 21 2018 and raised as part of the trades Deputation request at the Committee on November 27 2019”

72.11 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question Mr Peters. I do appreciate that the Taxi Trade have participated in workshop sessions and made representations and asked questions about the Valley Gardens Phase 3 project on a number of occasions and these, alongside all other responses that have been received, have been welcomed and helped in the development of the preliminary design and I’m sure this communication will continue. Regarding this particular issue, the possibility and implications of changing the right turn ban for taxis at the junction of Little East Street and the A259 will be fully explored as part of the early stages of the road safety audit process for the project, which will be finalised and completed during the detailed design stage, which should be completed by the end of this year”

72.12 Andrew Peters asked the following supplementary question:

“Please can the Chair confirm that these stats have shown that there have been no fatalities and the average daily traffic count through the roundabout was 50,000 equating to approximately 91,250,000 journeys using the roundabout over a five year period. To help with the question, I’d like to quote the stats provided by the Council which you can confirm in your response: Motorcycles of all types 1 serious, 4 slight, Bus/coach 4 slight, Van/HGV 1 slight, Taxi 1 serious, 3 slight, Car 16 slight, Cycles 8 serious, 16 slight, Pedestrians 1 serious, 4 slight, total 11 serious, 53 slight overall 64 casualties based on 91 million journeys. Further, can the Chair confirm that with respect to pedestrians, of the five casualties, three were injured on the pedestrian crossing, one on the pavement behind the safety railing and one in the middle of the road?”

72.13 The Chair provided the following reply:

“We can provide a reply in a more detailed way after the meeting. What I will say is that we look at all types of accidents including the unfortunate fatality, so we do know that this particular junction has the highest level of injury causing accidents which we seek to reduce”

(ii) 1-3 Old Steine

72.14 Gary Farmer put the following question:

“With the current road and bus layout directly outside 1-3 Old Steine currently being a 3 lane pinch point and the current plans at this point increasing to a 5 lane north/south bottleneck and pedestrianised area adjacent how do the plans for this take into consideration the historical, environmental, health concerns and physical geography at this exact point and only here without referencing other areas of the scheme?”

72.15 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The existing southbound, one-way road layout in this location of the Old Steine was designed very many years ago as part of the gyratory road system that currently exists. The planned changes to the road lay-out in this location will be supported by a number of more modern features including technically advanced traffic signals to enable people and traffic to move through the area more smoothly, efficiently and safely to reduce queuing and emissions.

Also included will be pavement extensions and the realignment of Princes Street that the Section 106 contribution is intended to fund in addition to loading and servicing access. The design will also include appropriate vegetation and planting with the historic environment of the area being respected with sympathetic design and use of materials”

72.16 Gary Farmer asked the following supplementary question:

“The section which is two lanes wide which is basically the same as your two desks here, you are telling me and everyone here that five lanes can fit in that two-lane section and this has been engineered correctly and the statistics and the information which backs up how two becomes five is there for all to see and will be shared?”

72.17 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I believe you do have a meeting arranged and I believe we are going to share with you the scale drawings, so I hope that meets with your approval and will help. More generally, I do want to assure you that the final preliminary design does meet the requirements of all the statutory legislation and that the project is considered to achieve an appropriate balance between its implications and outcomes for traffic congestion, air quality, sustainable transport and the public realm benefits on which there are many. So, I hope your further meeting goes well and that you are able to see the drawings for yourself”

(iii) St James’s Street

72.18 On behalf of Nic Roe, Gary Farmer put the following question:

“Removing almost three meters of paving around the junction of St James's Street in order to fit five lanes of traffic - one of the busiest crossing points in the city is recklessly dangerous. It cuts back the space that is currently used for pedestrians. Does that not directly contradict the key ambition of the Valley Gardens project to create a better and safer environment for pedestrians?”

72.19 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The design of the road layout and pavements in this area partly reflects some of the balances that have to be struck in redesigning a busy area of our city centre in a way that aims to prioritise public transport and provide for safe and sustainable travel including for pedestrians.

The changes to bus stops and the introduction of a new pedestrian crossing on the southern side will alter the pattern of movement in the area and relieve some of the areas that currently suffer from high volumes of pedestrians by providing more choice for people, therefore redistributing people to use different points around the St James’s Street junction.

Narrower traffic lanes will also reduce driver speeds and therefore the preferred design option will achieve the scheme objective of creating a safer environment for pedestrians, especially at what is currently one of the city’s most dangerous junctions.

The preliminary design includes an overall net gain in public space and footway area on the east side of the corridor. All planned changes within the design will also be subject to the formal stages of an independent road safety audit. Further checks will be then made following construction to ensure the safety of all road users, especially pedestrians”

72.20 On behalf of Nic Roe, Gary Farmer asked the following supplementary question:

“Can you please just qualify that you will be speaking to local residents and businesses on this particular junction and that you will take into consideration exactly what we are saying regarding this crossing. I live as well as work by that crossing so I witness it on a daily basis”

72.21 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Yes, I can give that undertaking as this is exactly what we did when we were implementing Phases 1 and 2. We kept up the dialogue with people as the detailed design was being worked through and very often, this was in connection with road safety aspects of the scheme and I’m very sorry to hear about your accident”

(iv) Traffic Movements

72.22 David Rochford put the following question:

“The scheme has been adjusted giving three southbound carriageways including a bus lane but only two northbound, including a bus stop that will make it effectively single carriageway when occupied. The team have stated bus movements to this stop are uncertain as buses using the stop have not been decided. How can effective modelling be undertaken when the inputs are unknown and why is northbound traffic not given the same level of importance as southbound? Has the traffic modelling been rerun for variations proposed and are the original results in respect of congestion, journey times and pollution unchanged?”

72.23 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Officers have been working very closely with the city’s bus companies regarding the design and layout of the bus stops and priority lanes, and they in turn have been reviewing and proposing changes to their bus routeing, that work is still going on. This work will continue to be tested and refined during the detailed design stage so that means it will continue to be modelled.

The outcomes of the design process have not been based on competition between different directions of travel but aim to provide the right balance between the different types of transport that people use to reach or pass through this area. Modelling is an iterative process and helps to inform the development of designs and the location of the northbound bus stop will be tested during the detailed design process. I can confirm that traffic modelling for the revised design following the consultation does show that there would be a forecasted improvement in the overall journey times for both buses and general traffic with the inclusion of the consultation design changes.

An initial review of the environmental impacts by our consultant has reported, on balance, that overall impact on air quality will be relatively low. Increases in the volume of traffic is not anticipated given trends in vehicle counts conducted by the council and the DfT over many years which actually, surprisingly show a reduction. The sustainable transport qualities of the scheme will reduce the need for local movements by car and support a reduction in emissions. Improved bus flow and journey times for both morning peak and evening peak times will support a reduction in emissions as will new engine technology coming on stream. The local Air Quality Dispersion model will be updated to further assess forecast impacts on air quality across the site and this work will be completed at detailed design stage, so a lot of work is still going on”

72.24 David Rochford asked the following supplementary question:

“To say ‘I am going to do this’ is nonsense unless you are saying ‘I’m doing this, and these are the inputs’. Every time you change an input, the output changes. Any business plan looks at something, you change it, you adjust it, you come back with a new output. No-one has provided anything to any of us who have been asking for this question as to what’s getting better by the new design and I think we’d really like to see it as we’re all losing total faith in this process and total understanding that anyone listens to a word that we say”

72.25 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The process of the scheme is continuing as planned. So, we have made revisions after the consultation to the preferred option. The next stage of the process as I have said is the detailed design, that will be the next main stage of work. During that stage, final decisions will be arrived at, via modelling, over things like bus stop locations, loading bays, parking spaces and so on. Therefore, until that work is undertaken, I cannot give you an assurance here today that will tell you exactly where all of those things or how those things are going to be arrived at. But they will be arrived at via engagement with the groups we have already been talking to as part of this process, including the Valley Gardens Forum”

(v) Consultation

72.26 Paul Crawford put the following question:

“On the 25th of January, in a statement reported by The Argus, Cllr Mitchell gave an undertaking that "a further two rounds of consultation will be proposed following a meeting of the environment, transport and sustainability committee on February 7". When will these consultations take place, in what form, what will be their scope, and can the Chair give an explicit guarantee that Phase 3 in its entirety will be consulted upon, including carriageway layouts and junction treatments and that no irrevocable contractual or financial commitments will be made until these consultations are complete, and their outcomes analysed and published?”

72.27 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The two public consultations that the council has undertaken so far to elicit peoples’ views about the area, and then to comment on the preferred design option that was agreed at committee, were appropriate for a project of this scale within the existing highway boundary and did conform to set DfT criteria for such schemes. However, as I have stated, there will be two further rounds of engagement and consultation on the overall project and the first of these will involve the continuing stakeholder workshops as the design goes through the technical, detailed design stage. We undertook exactly the same approach for phases 1 and 2 after the preliminary design was agreed. This approach was welcomed and helped to refine parts of the design and highlight further issues that needed to be resolved. The form, number and timing of these sessions for Phase 3 are being developed and will be guided by the approach taken to this stage of the work by the consultants that will undertake it. There will then be the formal public consultation on aspects of the design that require to be legally supported by Traffic Regulation Orders. This is a statutory process that will include parking, loading and traffic management controls and requires the proposals to be publicly advertised on site with a consultation period. Any unresolved objections to this consultation are reported to this committee that will make a decision on them. This is the usual process. We will also communicate how the project design is progressing and keep people informed. The business case for the Phase 3 scheme was approved by this committee and has been approved by the LEP. The funding agreement with the LEP that followed from that approval will be completed shortly”

72.28 Paul Crawford asked the following supplementary question:

“I request that this committee request officers to publish straightforward information for people to understand the full economic and environmental impacts of these proposals in language and illustrations for example on a website, that will help the citizens of Brighton to tell you if they approve or disapprove of these proposals”

72.29 The Chair provided the following reply:

“There is an awful lot of information on our website that I think will cover very many of the areas you have highlighted including all of the detailed reports that have come to this committee for decision since the scheme began and since the first consultation started”

(vi) Local Enterprise Partnership Funding

72.30 Daniel Nathan put the following question:

“We note from a Brighton & Hove City Council press release on the 7th of February, a quote from Cllr. Gill Mitchell stating “We are very pleased to have been successful in our bid for £6 million of funding for the scheme from the Local Enterprise Partnership. Yes or No, has the LEP informed Brighton & Hove City Council it is satisfied that its Valley Gardens Phase 3 funding conditions have been met?”

72.31 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The final draft of the Funding Agreement is with the LEP and when agreed and signed will provide confirmation that the LEP’s conditions for this part of the process have been met”

72.32 Daniel Nathan asked the following supplementary question:

“Following the correspondence the committee has seen this morning, the answer to my question can only be no. Chair, I am puzzled as to how it was that the LEP provided a letter of conditions to senior officers on 1 February, seven days before your special meeting convened to discuss Valley Gardens Phase 3 and yet this letter was not disclosed to elected councillors on the committee. In fact, it was only shown to them after being released for a Valley Gardens Forum FOI request. At the special committee meeting on 7 February, what did withholding this information achieve?”

72.33 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The correspondence and communications with the LEP I take, dare I say it, a usual form for schemes of this type and the LEP have set their conditions and those are then for the Council to respond to. It is then for the LEP to decide whether those conditions have been met so we await their answer”

(C) DEPUTATIONS**(i) Valley Gardens scheme outdoor event space**

72.34 The Committee considered a deputation requesting assurance relating to the provision of event space and infrastructure as part of the Valley Gardens scheme.

72.35 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your deputation. I really would like to emphasise that provision and support for Events is a very important issue for the City Council as reflected in the Outdoor Events Strategy. With regards to Valley Gardens in particular, we are investigating the feasibility of new infrastructure specifically intended to further improve the operation and success of Events including 3 Phase Power Supply, Mains Water Supply, access and other improvements but of course, while that work is undertaken there is, of necessity, some disruption.

The Valley Gardens scheme has identified public space which is designed to accommodate a range of events. The Council are working to finalise the details of this new infrastructure in order to further support events within the scheme this includes the detailed specification and location for power and water supply down into Phase 3. The Council has been clear that there will be disruption during construction and establishment of the scheme affecting events during the 2019-2021 period. While work is ongoing to facilitate as many events as possible during construction including the recent Brighton Half Marathon, Brighton Marathon, and the Warren Event in 2019, it might not be possible to accommodate, in the same way, events on the gardens during this construction period for the reasons I have just outlined. The Council will continue to work with event organisers to seek alternative locations when necessary during the construction phase of Valley Gardens. I am quite confident that by the council continuing to work with event organisers that the outdoor events programme will continue to thrive in the city. So, I would encourage you to get in touch with officers and myself if necessary, if you feel we are not communicating with you in an appropriate way so that this dialogue can continue during the construction phase”

- 72.36 Councillor Wares stated that he was concerned about the level of dialogue and consultation being undertaken with event organisers and proposed that the committee should receive a report to its next meeting giving an update on progress and consultation undertaken.
- 72.37 Councillor West supported the request made by Councillor Wares. Councillor West stated that he felt the response provided was too general and it was unlikely to have provided the Fringe Festival assurance. Councillor West explained that there was a degree of uncertainty regarding the construction phase in this area and that was having a negative impact upon organisers in terms of planning events and securing funding. Councillor West stated that Members needed proper oversight of the project and as a process, it was currently not working.
- 72.38 The Chair stated that she could provide assurance that from the outset of the scheme, all of the relevant people and stakeholders had been involved. The Chair noted that wherever possible, clarification had been provided however, in some instances, sharing of that information was down to third-parties and their schedule of works such as utility companies.
- 72.39 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture stated that he understood that it was critical to provide as much clarity as possible to the events sector both for their 2019 schedule and future festivals. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture explained that a number of things had been undertaken to strengthen engagement and oversight including the Council’s Events Manager becoming a member of the Officer Project Board and attendance by a senior council officer at meetings of the Fringe Festival Board. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture supplemented that he had personally met and conducted an on-site walkabout with some of the event organisers. The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture added that to give context, weekly meetings were being held during the Phase 1 and 2 construction phase and the same process would be undertaken for Phase 3.

- 72.40 Councillor West thanked the Executive Director for an informative update however, he firmly believed that a proper process was required for Member oversight and stakeholder engagement.
- 72.41 The Chair advised that the same information had been provided at the previous committee that demonstrated that the right conversations and engagement was happening.
- 72.42 Councillor Wares stated that events hosted in the city were a major part of the local economy. Councillor Wares noted that the level of engagement from stakeholders at the committee meeting demonstrated that the current process was not working. Councillor Wares requested that Lead Members be provided copies of the project board meeting notes to keep them informed of progress and that the committee receive an update report to maintain oversight.
- 72.43 The Chair stated that whilst she understood the request, in accordance with council procedures, the committee could only request a report on the specific issues raised in the deputation that was event planning relating to the Valley Gardens project. Furthermore, the Chair stated that she had requested officers to add the matter to the agenda for the briefing between the Lead Spokespersons to be held the following week as part of a general update and discussion.
- 72.44 Councillor West agreed that it would be appropriate to receive a report addressing the points made in the deputation that could cover the type of events that would happen in Valley Gardens and new ones proposed as well as infrastructure issues.
- The meeting was adjourned at 17.15pm and reconvened at 17.25pm
- 72.45 Councillor Wares moved a motion to request that a report be received to the next meeting of the committee addressing the matters raised in the deputation.
- 72.46 Introducing the motion, Councillor Wares explained that following discussions during the adjournment, the motion would request that an update based on the deputation request be received with that report also giving consideration to further reports on the matter of events in Valley Gardens should that be deemed required.
- 72.47 Councillor West formally seconded the motion.
- 72.48 The Chair put the motion to the vote that was agreed.
- 72.49 **RESOLVED-** That the committee receives a report on the matters raised within the deputation to its next meeting.
- 72.50 The Chair noted that the Committee had received a deputation directly to the committee, a petition referred from Full Council and a deputation referred from Full Council all relating to a similar subject matter. The Chair therefore intended to receive all three items together and provide a joint response addressing the issues raised in each.

**(ii) Deputation- Climate Emergency
Petition- Commit BHCC to a target of zero carbon emissions by 2030
Deputation- Climate Change**

72.51 The Committee received two deputations and a petition requesting the council to declare a climate emergency and proposed relevant actions relating to that declaration and commit to a target of zero carbon emissions by 2030.

72.52 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for coming to the committee.

As these representations demonstrate, climate change is the most urgent and pressing issue that we face. We must reduce carbon emissions and build resilience.

And to do these three representations justice I want to set out, as briefly as I can, what we as a council are doing, the current situation with regard to recorded carbon emission levels and some next steps.

We have been implementing carbon reduction measures across the council’s buildings including renewables and energy efficiency projects, solar PV, 200 EV charging points across the city and rapid EV taxi charging.

Work is continuing with partners such as the Living Coast Biosphere, the Greater Brighton Infrastructure Board and public transport operatives on local and regional plans for water conservation, zero carbon energy, ending single use plastics, sustainable urban drainage systems, habitat creation and securing more funding for cleaner bus technology.

Council transport officers are working on a Transport Carbon Reduction Plan in line with the council’s local transport priorities.

With regard to current emission levels, we measure these for the council and for the city and report them regularly to committee. I’m pleased to say that these levels are reducing year on year.

The per capita CO2 emissions for the city published last year show a significant reduction of 40.6% from the 2005 base rate and shows that if we keep up this progress we will exceed the 42% reduction target for 2020 and the 80% target for 2050.

We also have an internal, corporate carbon reduction target of an annual 4% reduction and for 2017/18 we achieved 8.8%.

So, things are going the right way, but we do have to speed up, we need to innovate, and we need to work with communities and residents in supporting these efforts.

Change can be achieved if people come together and demand it and we saw that recently with the student demonstrations across the country and also in our own city.

To this end we were pleased to support the Green Councillors’ amendment at our recent budget setting meeting that will establish a Sustainability and Carbon Investment Fund and further enhance the sustainable transport measures detailed in a report on today’s committee agenda.

The council’s Communications Team will be publishing information on the commitment to reach zero carbon by 2030 and a report is coming to the council’s Policy, Resources and Growth Committee this week setting out the high-level principals of the Investment Fund with a further, more detailed, report to follow in June that will contain proposals for additional communication measures.

I hope that goes some way in assuring you that we are going some way in taking action”.

- 72.53 Councillor West noted that the deputation detailed six proposals to enable one planet living that was a process the previous Green administration had begun. Councillor West explained that at that time, that process had been inaccurately described by the opposition groups as a vanity project and furthermore, the opposition groups had made cuts to the council's Sustainability team and abandoned the one planet living project. Councillor West stated that he hoped that work was now better understood, and the funding would be put back into place although four years had been lost in that process.
- 72.54 The Chair noted that the current administration had inherited an £8m budget overspend in 2015 and therefore, had carefully reviewed council spending. As part of that review, the administration had noted a large consultancy fee being paid for the one planet living project and took the view to end payment of this fee on the basis that the council had learnt enough to embed one planet living in its own policies. The Chair stated that she welcomed a more urgent approach to action on climate change and the support of community groups.
- 72.55 Councillor Littman welcomed the deputation adding that the Green Party had for decades, consistently warned of the climate change crisis. Councillor Littman stated that urgent action was required, and he hoped that efforts to avert a crisis had not been left to late.

72.56 **RESOLVED-** That the deputations and petitions be noted.

73 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

(A) PETITIONS

(i) Commit BHCC to a target of zero carbon emissions by 2030

72.1 See minute item 72.51.

(C) DEPUTATIONS

(i) Parking restrictions in Westbourne

72.2 The Committee considered a deputation referred from the meeting of Full Council held on 31 January requesting a review of the Zone W parking scheme.

72.3 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition requesting a review of the Zone W parking scheme (Westbourne Ward) and I'm sorry to hear about the parking problems being encountered.

I do understand the concerns of residents regarding vehicle displacement within the Zone and there have already been requests to review the roads in Zone W at a previous Committee in 2018.

Members of this Committee agreed a timetable up to 2020/21 in October 2017 and that timetable does include reviews.

However, officers will be reviewing this timetable in light of recent requests and an update report will be presented to the ETS Committee on 8th October 2019 which will

include a review of the whole of Zone W as all roads will need to be considered within the zone in any re-consultation”.

72.4 **RESOLVED-** That the committee note the deputation.

(ii) Climate Change

72.5 See minute item 72.51.

74 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(C) LETTERS

(i) Road safety north and south of Preston Drove- Councillors Cattell, Littman, A Norman, K Norman and Taylor

74.1 The Committee considered a Letter from the Preston Park and Withdean ward councillors requesting the council act on a number of speeding and road safety issues in the Preston Drove area.

74.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your letter outlining residents’ concerns regarding road safety north and south of Preston Drove.

In relation to the Road safety issues you have outlined I have asked officers to investigate your concerns and report back to you directly in the coming weeks and they will be looking at how that can be accommodated in current work plans and budget allocations. In relation to your specific request to improve safety when considering future parking schemes, I can assure you that officers will always seek to improve road safety where possible as part of any new parking proposals and again, that would be done in discussion with the ward councillors who know their areas best. So, I hope that gives you and can give your residents some assurances that your list is being worked through and you will be contacted by officers at the earliest opportunity with some proposals”

74.3 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Letter.

(ii) Parking in the Surrenden Road area- Councillor Taylor

74.4 The Committee considered a Letter from Councillor Taylor requesting the committee review the parking scheme timetable with a view to immediately commence the proposed parking scheme consultation for the Surrenden Road area.

74.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“There is currently a priority parking scheme timetable which runs up until 2020/21 and this was agreed at the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee in October 2017. This covers areas which have petitioned or shown strong support to the council for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Officer resource is currently committed to the parking schemes agreed on that timetable.

What we can offer is an assurance that the preparation work for the parking scheme consultation in the Surrenden area will begin in November 2019 so that all residents will receive the consultation first thing in January 2020.

An update report is due to be presented to the ETS Committee on 8th October 2019 on the parking scheme timetable. Officers will consider the points raised in your letter although any changes would require Committee approval and the timetable will be reviewed as part of this report to this Committee.

Alongside this I will also ask officers to consider the school enforcement in the area as resource has increased in recent months as I do appreciate the concerns that have been raised by residents”.

74.6 **RESOLVED-** That the committee note the Letter.

(D) NOTICES OF MOTION

(i) Government Resources & Waste Strategy

74.7 The Committee considered a Notice of Motion referred from the Full Council meeting of 31 January 2019 that requested the committee receive a report exploring options for re-negotiating the current PFI deal on waste and budgetary resources for a food waste pilot to commence in 2019/20.

74.8 The Chair provided the following response:

“The Notice of Motion requests a report detailing the options for budgetary resource for a food waste pilot in 2019/20.

This was detailed in the City Environmental Management Update report received by the committee in January 2019 as follows:

‘Veolia has recently confirmed that garden waste customers could, if they wish, put some types of food waste out for collection within their garden waste bins. The proposal would have the benefit of removing a further percentage of waste from the municipal waste stream to be turned into a useful product via in-vessel composting. The practicalities of this option need to be carefully explored and if a secure, hygienic system can be devised, it will be included within a further report to the committee on increasing recycling. Meanwhile, the council will be making a response to the forthcoming consultation on the government’s Resources and Waste Strategy that is expected to include proposals for food waste collection and Members will be kept informed’.

A positive response was provided to the NoM by Dr Therese Coffey MP including a recently undertaken consultation to ensure every appropriate business and householder has a weekly separate food collection with no net burden on local authorities. I will circulate that response to all committee members subsequent to the meeting”

74.9 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee note the Notice of Motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 17.55pm and reconvened at 18.00pm

75 OFFICIAL FEED AND FOOD CONTROLS SERVICE PLAN 2019/20

- 75.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Neighbourhoods, Communities & Housing that requested approval of the Official Feed and Food Controls Service Plan 2019/20.
- 75.2 Councillor West welcomed the report and commended officers for their hard work and the businesses that complied with the scheme. Councillor West noted that there was some contradiction in the report on how regularly medium risk and low risk premises were visited by officers and asked if this was an error or a resource issue. Furthermore, Councillor West asked if the financial implications were incorrect as paragraph 7.1 appeared to provide the 2018/19 budget figure.
- 75.3 The Regulatory Services Manager answered clarified that there were two separate assessments in place- food safety and food standards with a different assessment criteria for each. Food safety would relate to food preparation and hygiene whereas food standards related to other issues such as food and price labelling. The Regulatory Services Manager noted that the budget figure at paragraph 7.1 was incorrect.
- 75.4 Councillor Brown asked if the Food Hygiene Rating system was mandatory or voluntary and enquired as to the measures being undertaken to ensure that accurate and easily accessible allergen information was advertised by premises.
- 75.5 The Regulatory Services Manager explained that the Food Hygiene Scheme was voluntary and government legislation would be required to make the scheme mandatory. In relation to allergen information, the Regulatory Services Manager explained that as part of the inspections undertaken by officers, checks were made to ensure that allergen information was signposted at the front of the premises and point of sale and that staff were fully trained and aware to advise customers. Furthermore, officers proactively visited premises and enforcement action was considered where deemed appropriate.
- 75.6 Councillor Miller asked how temporary premises such as pop-ups were effectively monitored and assessed.
- 75.7 The Regulatory Services Manager clarified that information would be received from colleagues in the Licensing team at the point an application was made for a temporary premise. Food Safety Inspectors worked on a patch-based system and would monitor new premises and where it was found that traders had not registered with the council, they would be directed to the council to do so.
- 75.8 **RESOLVED-** That the committee agrees the Official Feed and Food Controls Service Plan 2019/2020 set out in the appendix to this report.

76 HEALTH AND SAFETY SERVICE PLAN 2018-19

- 76.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Committee approves the proposed Health & Safety Service Plan 2019/2020 as set out at Appendix 1.

77 2019/20 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN CAPITAL PROGRAMME

- 77.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that requested the Committee to recommend to Policy & Resources Committee the 2019/20 Local Transport Plan (LTP) capital programme budget allocation of £6.798 million to projects and programmes and to note the indicative allocation of future LTP budgets to projects and programmes for 2020/21.
- 77.2 Councillor West stated that he was pleased that the Green Group amendments passed at Budget Council had added an additional £1m to the LTP capital programme budget. Councillor West noted that a significant amount of expenditure was detailed over just two A4 pages that he found to give little committee oversight in determining that expenditure. In reference to the Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan, Councillor West stated that he hoped that would be a collaborative process with stakeholders on the actual design of the expenditure and that could be through a Member Stakeholder Working Group.
- 77.3 Councillor Miller stated that he was also taken aback by the lack of detail on expenditure within the report. Referring to page 107 of the agenda, Councillor Miller stated that there was no explanation on the forward funding from reserves, whether the increase in capital funding would place capacity constraints upon officers to deliver the various schemes and asked whether more information could be provided on Section 106 (S106) allocations as it often took a long time to spend S106 funding.
- 77.4 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy explained that more detailed information on the forward funding from reserves could be found on page 112 of the agenda that highlighted the decision made at the Budget Council of 2018 to use the reserves toward the Shelter Hall project with that amount returned to the reserves from the LTP allocation in 2020/21. The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy explained that funding allocations were variable and the figures for the past two to three years had been skewed due to the council being able to access Local Growth Fund (LGF) funding that was combined with the funding for the LTP programme to deliver the three phases of the Valley Gardens project. The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy agreed that there was sometimes slow progress of S106 spending and both this year and last year, £50,000 had been identified for officer or consultant resource to progress those projects. Information on S106 allocations was publicly available and a short summary of that could be provided to the committee members.
- 77.5 The Chair noted that S106 spending was reported to the Tourism, Development & Culture Committee as part of that committee's remit.
- 77.6 In relation to pages 103 and 111 of the agenda, Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked if the Boundary Road/Station Road corridor would include the area from Old Shoreham Road down to Kingsway and whether the proposed allocation of £125,000 was for preliminary design work.
- 77.7 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy confirmed that was the correct area and that the allocation would be for the beginning of the development of the project.

- 77.8 Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that he was surprised that an overall allocation of £425,000 was only for design and preliminary work and did not include any construction costs.
- 77.9 The Head of Transport Policy & Strategy stated that the entire allocation of £425,000 may not be needed to complete the detailed design and it may be possible that the initial allocation of £125,000 may go some way towards completion of that phase, to enable construction to then start.
- 77.10 Councillor Robins stated that he was very pleased with the proposals for Boundary Road and residents would also welcome the investment. Councillor Robins stated that Boundary Road was a busy area with high retail occupancy rates but had been neglected for a number of years and this investment was much needed.
- 77.11 Councillor Wares stated that it was in fact a proposed Conservative Group amendment that had identified the extra money for the LTP capital programme and it was disappointing that the other groups had not supported that amendment as it would have increased the LTP allocation by £1.7m rather than £1m. Councillor Wares stated that in 2016, the committee had agreed the Priority Pedestrian Crossing sites however, out of the eleven high priority sites identified, only three locations had been completed. Councillor Wares expressed his hope that the additional capital budget would see the remainder progressed quickly. Councillor Wares supplemented that more could be done on enforcement to ensure that contractors made good when they carried out work to footpaths and verges as that could in turn save the council expenditure for repairs. Councillor Wares noted that a £1.8m allocation of LGF funding was detailed however, he understood that £600,000 of that figure was currently unsourced and that should be made clear. Furthermore, the council should not have to make up that shortfall as the Business Case had made clear that it would be funded by developer contributions via the Planning process. Councillor Wares stated that whilst he would support the report, he wished it recorded that he did not support the current Valley Gardens proposed Option 1.
- 77.12 In relation to the matter raised relating to LGF funding, the Head of Transport Policy & Strategy clarified that the total allocated amount for 2019/20 was £1.8m LGF funding plus the proposed £400,00 LTP allocation and that there was no requirement in 2019/20 for developer contributions.
- 77.13 Councillor Littman stated that whilst the Conservative Group had identified the additional capital funding, they could have had more input into the its designation had they not left the budget negotiations. Councillor Littman welcomed that the additional amount found had gone to roads, pavements, rights of way, cycle parking, motorcycle parking, accessible bus stops, pedestrian crossing, walking networks, Intelligent Transport Systems and bus network infrastructure and echoed the comments made by Councillor West in relation to stakeholder engagement. Councillor Littman noted that the purpose of the Budget Council amendment was to invest in sustainable transport and made a plea that the additional amount identified was specifically spent on sustainable transport. Councillor Littman explained that sustainable transport was a critical factor in achieving carbon neutrality by 2030.

77.14 The Chair thanked Councillor Littman for his comments adding that the Transport Partnership was a good demonstration of the breadth of experience and expertise in the city and that certainly could be drawn upon, specifically in the development of the Local Walking, Cycling Infrastructure Plan.

77.15 **RESOLVES TO RECOMMEND-** That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:

- 1) Recommends that Policy, Resources & Growth Committee agree the 2019/20 Local Transport Plan capital programme budget allocation of £6.798 million to projects and programmes and notes the additional allocations for schemes agreed at Budget Council, as set out in Appendix 2 of this report; and
- 2) Notes the indicative allocation of future budgets to LTP projects and programmes for 2020/21, as set out in Appendix 2 of this report.

78 PARKING SCHEMES UPDATE REPORT

78.1 RESOLVED-

- 1) That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, approves as advertised the following order below to proceed with the implementation of changing roads in the Zone U (light touch scheme) into Zone C (full scheme);

Zone U to Zone C

BRIGHTON & HOVE VARIOUS CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2018 AMENDMENT ORDER NO. * 201* (ref: TRO-1-2019)

- 2) That the Committee agrees to consult a small area known as the top triangle area which include the roads Cromwell Street, Baxter Street, Lynton Street, Arnold Street, Carlyle Street and the relevant part of Queens Park Road with a detailed design on whether they wish to join Zone V (Full scheme).
- 3) That the Committee agrees that an initial consultation be undertaken with residents in Freshfield Street and Queens Park Rise to see whether they would like to join Zone C (full scheme) or remain as they are in Zone S (light touch scheme)
- 4) That the Committee approve an update be sent to all residents within these zones with highlight findings as soon as possible to update them on the way forward.

79 PART TWO MINUTES- EXEMPT CATEGORY 5

79.1 **RESOLVED-** That the Part Two minutes of the previous meeting held on 7 February 2019 be approved and signed as the correct record.

80 PART TWO PROCEEDINGS

80.1 **RESOLVED-** That the information contained in Part Two remain exempt from disclosure to the press and public.

81 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

- 81.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information.
- 81.2 Councillor Robins noted that the Chair of the committee would be standing down at the upcoming local election and expressed his personal thanks for the time and dedication she had put in for over 25 years as a councillor and the support she had provided to him on a personal and professional level.
- 81.3 Councillor Peltzer Dunn expressed his thanks to Councillor Mitchell who he had found to be a brilliant Chair. Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated that he was saddened that Councillor Mitchell would not be standing again.
- 81.4 Councillor West stated that he had served with Councillor Mitchell on the Council for over twenty years and whilst they had not agreed on everything, Councillor West had always valued Councillor Mitchell's immense contribution and she would be a huge loss to the Council. Councillor West stated that he hoped Councillor Mitchell would continue to be civically active as the city would value her contribution.
- 81.5 Councillor Mitchell thanked Members for their contribution to the committee adding that Members had often covered controversial issues and held robust discussions on those issues, but they had been held respectfully and openly. Councillor Mitchell expressed her thanks to all the councillors who had been a member of the committee and her gratitude to officers for the preparatory work they had carried out to ensure the committee undertook its business efficiently, legally and diligently.

The meeting concluded at 6.40pm

