

**Brighton & Hove City Council**  
**Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee**

**4.00pm 18 January 2022**

**Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall**

**Minutes**

**Present:** Councillor Davis (Joint Chair), Heley (Joint Chair), Lloyd (Deputy Chair), Wilkinson (Opposition Spokesperson), Nemeth (Group Spokesperson), Bagaeen, Fowler, Hamilton, Hills and Platts

**Part One**

**62 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**62(a) Declarations of substitutes**

62.1 There were none.

**62(b) Declarations of interest**

62.2 Councillor Nemeth declared a pecuniary interest in Items 69 and 75 as his spouse was an allotment holder. Councillor Nemeth stated that he would leave the Chamber during consideration of the item.

62.3 Councillor Wilkinson declared a pecuniary interest in Items 69 and 75 as an allotment holder. Councillor Wilkinson stated that he would leave the Chamber during consideration of the item.

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

62.4 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).

62.5 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting.

**63 MINUTES**

63.1 **Resolved-** That the minutes of the previous meeting be approved and signed as the correct record.

**64 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS**

64.1 The Assistant Director, City Transport provided the following verbal update:

At November Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee officers were asked to carry out a physical review of the Valley Gardens Bus Gate signs situated on the 'public transport corridor' alongside the western side of the gardens.

Officers have now carried out a further review of these signs and associated road markings. While all regulation signs are correct some additional sites have been determined for new bus gate repeater signs along Marlborough Place, a directional sign at the bottom of North Road to highlight key routes only and also the removal of existing non-essential signs to avoid confusion. These additional signs have been ordered and will be in place early in this new year. Temporary 'New Road Layout' signs will also be re-installed for a maximum of six months to support media campaigns and to encourage users to use the correct routes. Lining and road markings will also be refreshed with additional red surface at each bus gate to further highlight this feature.

Independent adjudicators have also studied the signs in Valley Gardens and have advised that, the authority have gone above and beyond to make the bus gates clear. At the time of writing, we have not lost one case at the independent Traffic Penalty Tribunal, which is the final appeal stage for Penalty Charges relating to the signs. In addition to the sign review officers have alerted satellite navigation companies of the restrictions around Valley Gardens which are now showing on systems such as Google Maps.

We will continue to promote and educate drivers about bus gates and restrictions in place. To date we have the changed road layout and restrictions in a number of ways by;

- Updating the council website with information about the bus gate, including a map showing the new layout
- Producing a video showing drivers where they need to turn if travelling north on Marlborough Place. This is published on council social media channels
- Circulating letters to businesses in the area with information about the new layout
- Creating a new video, educating motorists of bus gates, this is being produced and will be published on the council website and social media channels.

We have seen that the numbers of Penalty Charge Notices are dropping naturally as people become used to the new road layout. This has understandably taken longer for people to adjust due the travel restrictions imposed on all of us during the pandemic. Our latest figures show that the number of Penalty Charge Notices issued between October and November dropped by 23%, followed by a slight increase of 8% during December due to the larger number of visitors in the area.

We consider these measures appropriate to address some of the key reasons users give for traveling though the bus gates and we will continue to monitor the numbers issued which are expected to continue to decline.

**65 CALL OVER**

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

- Item 69: Fees & Charges 2022/23
- Item 70: National Bus Strategy: Bus Service Improvement Plan
- Item 73: Madeira Drive Active Travel Fund ETRO-10-20-2021
- Item 74: Washington Street: Outcome of consultation
- Item 75: Allotments: Response to Notice of Motion

65.2 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 71: Parking Annual Report 2020-21
- Item 72 Real Time Air Quality Monitoring System

## 66 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

### (A) Petitions

#### (1) Speed Camera on Beaconsfield Road

66.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 9 people requesting the installation of a speed camera on Beaconsfield Road.

66.2 The petitioner was not present so the Chair stated that a written response would be provided.

66.3 Councillor Platts moved a motion to request an officer report on the matter.

66.4 Councillor Wilkinson formally seconded the motion.

66.5 **Resolved-** That the Committee receive a report to a future meeting responding to the petition request.

### (B) Written Questions

#### (1) Cycle Security

66.6 Anthony Pusey read the following question:

“In November my wife and I securely locked our electric bikes - £2,500 each - to bike posts opposite the main toilets in Marine Drive in full view to passers by with 2 gold rated locks.

Unfortunately, they were stolen. I think that most new cycle initiatives are useless if people are frightened to leave their bikes.

What can BHCC do to make our bikes more secure when locked up in public places?”

66.7 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I am really sorry to hear about the theft of your bikes and appreciate how frustrating this must be given the sensible precautions you took.

The Council works with Sussex Police to publicise the steps cyclists can take to reduce theft. These include robust locking systems and leaving bikes in areas with good natural surveillance or CCTV cover, both of which you clearly did.

We also recommend registering the unique frame number, which is found on the underside of the frame below the bottom bracket, with websites such as immobilise.com and bikeregister.com. These records help the police to identify as stolen any bikes they recover and return them to the owners.

Investigations are a matter for the police, but the Council does assist with CCTV footage on the public highway when this is requested and available. Sussex Police have successfully caught bike thieves in areas of the city where they have been prolific, so it is important to report thefts to provide an accurate picture of the wider pattern of thefts. They also recommend checking online selling sites for local listings and reporting these where there is a close correlation with the bike they have lost.

The Council recently completed a city-wide survey regarding suitable locations for the forthcoming rollout of cycle hangar units. Cycle hangars are secure cycle storage units, which can store up to six bikes. Set criteria are being used to assess the viability of each suggested site, A shortlist for the first phase will soon be created and residents on the relevant streets will be informed. While this won't solve all security issues at public cycle parking sites like Madeira Drive, we hope it will reduce thefts across the city over time and encourage more uptake of cycling".

## **(2) Trees in Saltdean Drive**

66.8 Philip Rose read the following question:

"The canopy of trees in Saltdean Drive are now too big for the road causing problems with the BT lines and making pavements slippery with excessive leaf fall and bird droppings. The roots are lifting the pavements and damaging crossovers. They were given a light thinning in 2013 and due a full canopy reduction in rota 2017/2018. It is now 9 years since the street trees on Saltdean Drive have been pruned.

Regular maintenance is essential to keep them healthy and prevent damage to both the pavements and nearby properties.

When will the trees on Saltdean Drive be pruned?"

66.9 The Chair provided the following reply:

"The trees along Saltdean Drive are within an area of the city which has been allocated for tree inspections, and any subsequent pruning works, in the 2024/25 pruning period. Although these trees have not been pruned significantly since 2013, following a site visit, the Arboriculture Team does not have concerns regarding their size in terms of stability. (Stability is the primary concern and why street trees are maintained in a more compact form).

The Arboriculture Team will continue to monitor trees within areas such as Saltdean Drive, where there is longer to wait for pruning works.

The Team will intervene if it is determined that works cannot wait until the allocated year. However, it must be noted that the limited resource needs to be focused on works where safety and/or property contact demands action".

66.10 Philip Rose asked the following supplementary question:

“It’s now been 15 years since the trees are being pruned and I think leaving it another few years is going to be too long. So I do think you need to take it back to the relevant department and tell them these trees do need some reduction”.

66.11 The Chair provided the following reply:

“We’ll be happy to get them to get that double checked for you”.

### **(3) Valley Gardens**

66.12 Daniel Nathan read the following question:

“How is it possible for key stakeholders in the city to comment upon or ask questions about Valley Gardens Phase 3 Revised Scheme with Detailed Design Principles when background papers and detailed design plans have been withheld from public inspection despite numerous requests to the Chair and senior planning officer?”

66.13 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question, Daniel. Throughout the development of the final section of the Valley Gardens, there has been extensive and ongoing engagement and consultation with a wide range of organisations and representatives of various interests. This has really helped to inform the technical and engineering aspects of the design to ensure that the previously agreed core objectives and decisions of this committee are fulfilled.

No background papers or plans have been withheld from people but bringing all this information together has involved a considerable amount of effort and time to ensure that the design can be considered by this committee. This included a meeting of the Member Working Group on Friday 7th January, which has oversight of the Valley Gardens project, to discuss particular aspects of the scheme. Unfortunately, this did delay the publication of the report but was a necessary part of finalising some details of the design that we will be considering today”.

66.14 Daniel Nathan asked the following supplementary question:

“The lengthy officer report refers to air quality, noise pollution and traffic modelling and also a traffic stimulation model that astonishingly, even the bus company only got to see at 10am on Friday last week. This data appears to still be secret. So my question is, please confirm that you will share all of this data and modelling and the simulation publicly within the next seven days”.

66.15 The following response was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“What we’re able to do is ensure that all the relevant information in terms of outputs that are required for making a sound decision are available, we have no problem in sharing that information. Some of the information that you might be requesting is not necessarily in a format that can be easily shared. We’re not looking to hide any information here is in a data format that would require certain software to use. We are happy to engage with stakeholders throughout the process of the Valley Gardens scheme and I’m sure there

will be debates about that in the committee later. You will also see in the papers there is a full record of all the engagement that has taken place to date”.

**(C) Deputations**

**(1) Play area refurbishment**

66.16 The Committee considered a deputation requesting increased resident input into play area refurbishments and for a pause in the current consultation whilst options for that was undertaken.

66.17 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your deputation. As you rightly observe, play is vitally important for the development of children and young people through its promotion of health and wellbeing.

We are pleased that you acknowledge the importance of the council’s £3 million investment, creating the UK largest playground refurbishment programme in 20 years but I am sorry to hear about your bad experiences.

In Autumn 2020 during the pandemic, an audit of play facilities across the city identified that over 100 play apparatus needed to be removed, as they had come to the end of their safe working life.

In response to this extreme loss of facilities, City Parks quickly had to identify funding and a delivery process to replace the failing apparatus.

Over a period of around six months, a finance and refurbishment package was created and signed off by this committee in January 2021 and Policy & Resources Committee in March 2021.

26 of the 45 playgrounds will be completed by March 2022 and are contractually committed. The remaining 19 sites will be installed over the next three years.

To date, City Parks have carried out consultation, with the resources available, for each of the parks planned for refurbishment before the end of March 2022. This includes working with Friends groups, local councillors, accessibility groups and holding on-site pop-up consultations.

Last year’s media release for the Preston Park playground highlights the impact that the Friends Groups have on the refurbishment programme. Through the Friends of Preston Park, 600 members were consulted about what they would like to see for their children in the future

More informal consultations have always been undertaken with park users through the Play Development Officer whilst on site. I encourage the general public to support and join their local Friends Groups as the simplest way to keep up to date with park changes.

In response to the six points you have raised for consideration, City Parks will do the following:

Because City Parks have made good progress in delivering the Programme to date, the team will explore the possibility of pausing the Programme to identify what further consultation can take place, within the resources and time available. The team believe that it is possible to complete online consultations for the remaining sites and this will be explored further.

Furthermore, consultations can only take place within the resources available. Therefore, the council cannot commit to more than online consultations at this stage, but this will be explored further.

The council's online consultation portal will be utilised to obtain feedback on the remaining sites within the Programme. All stakeholders, including SEND groups, can use this means to provide feedback.

City Parks have been seeking to utilise a representative from the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Children's Forum to participate in the consultation process and review sites during and after completion. How this can be better used will also be explored.

City Parks will look at how the council currently engage with children and young people within other service areas to see where there are opportunities to use existing networks and channels.

I hope this has provided acknowledgement that we have given your deputation due consideration, and we would like to thank you again for bringing this important matter to our attention. I will ask City Parks to continue to engage with you to improve the consultation.

66.18 Councillor Wilkinson moved a motion to request an officer report on the matter.

66.19 Councillor Platts formally seconded the motion.

66.20 **Resolved-** That the Committee receive a report to a future meeting responding to the petition request.

## **(2) Liveable Neighbourhood**

66.21 The Committee considered a deputation requesting a Liveable Neighbourhood be initiated in the Lower North-East Hanover area.

66.22 The Chair provided the following response:

"Thank you for your deputation and for attending today on behalf of your community, Matt. I really welcome that you have worked closely with your neighbours to consider the consequences of traffic impacts on your community and have also set up a petition to gather support for this.

The creation of Liveable Streets and Neighbourhoods across the city is a key priority for us which will help deliver a wide range of benefits for local people, a number of which you have identified in your deputation. Residential areas which are safe, healthy and sustainable places to live in and move around are really important ways to make our city a better place to live in. As you have recognised, tackling transport and travel issues by lowering traffic levels in certain streets will really contribute to this.

We are already working on the development of a pilot scheme for the Hanover & Tarnar area and will be consulting on proposals later this year. The committee has also agreed to develop an assessment process to enable the evaluation of requests for similar measures from other parts of the city. This will provide the opportunity to assess and prioritise locations in a transparent and consistent manner. I can confirm that your request will be considered within that assessment process, alongside other requests that have been received, once it has been agreed. In the meantime, it will be helpful to receive any further information that you have compiled about some of the issues that

you have identified and how they may be overcome. I will ask officers to write to you requesting this.

Funding has also been allocated to provide pocket parks, street trees and cycle hangars across the city – measures which will also help to make local streets a better environment for communities to use and enjoy. We also have a programme of School Streets, which is being delivered and involves close working with local communities on their development and their operation”.

66.23 **Resolved-** That the Committee note the deputation.

## 67 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

### (A) Petitions

#### (1) Bring back Brighton & Hove In Bloom

67.1 The Committee considered a petition referred to it by Full Council that requested the return of the City in Bloom competition.

67.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“In Bloom has changed a great deal and has moved away from an emphasis on traditional floral displays to sustainable displays that support biodiversity, aims that I support.

The way In Bloom used to operate was not inexpensive.

In 2007/2008, the year before funding was reduced, the budget was £61,810.

In the current financial situation, it would unfortunately not be easy to provide such funding due to the huge amounts of cuts we have to make due to years of austerity and enormous cuts to local government”.

67.3 Councillor Nemeth moved a motion to call for an officer report on the matter.

67.4 Councillor Bagaeen formally seconded the motion.

67.5 **Resolved-** That the Committee receive a report to a future meeting responding to the petition request.

## 68 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

### (B) Written Questions

#### (1) Green Flag Status

68.1 Councillor Platts read the following question:

“I would like to commend the work of Council staff and the community on the award of prestigious Green Flags for seven of our parks and open spaces because they are well maintained, provide a good community focus and have excellent facilities. What steps are being taken to secure Green Flag status for East Brighton Park?”

68.2 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question.

Currently, there are no resources identified to increase the number of Green Flag parks in the City.

Despite the impact of Covid on the overall condition of parks, City Parks has managed to maintain all our Green Flags accreditations.

It is hoped that the imminent restructure of City Parks will attract some additional skilled gardeners which, combined with the level of additional funding received to City Parks, could open up opportunities to seek more Green Flag accreditations.

Brighton & Hove has a spread of Green Flag parks across the city. If further accreditations are sought, this committee will need to decide which parks to put forward as it is not realistic in the current economic climate to expect to get all parks to this standard.

There will be a report to committee on this when the budget situation is clearer for next year”.

**(2) Bins at Saltdean Oval Park**

68.3 Councillor Fishleigh read the following question:

“I have been requesting new bins for Saltdean Oval Park since being elected in May 2019. Sadly, none have been forthcoming and in fact 2 have been removed. Please don't refer to the bininfrastructure survey in your answer. I don't need a survey to know that new bins are needed in a park which is 50m from my home. If I buy bins to put by the skate park and the football court, will BHCC empty them on a regular basis please?”

68.4 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question and for your offer to buy bins for Saltdean Oval Park. Sadly, and as has been mentioned at previous committees, it's not as simple as just placing the bins.

City Environment must have the capacity and resources to empty the bins on a regular basis and, at present, is unable to do so. You referred to Bin Infrastructure in your question and it is through delivery of this Action Plan (not survey), that Cityclean is looking at how to create additional capacity without the need for additional resources. A project is in place to progress this, and senior officers have recently told me that the service has not had the capacity or resources to move things as quickly as we would have liked”.

68.5 Councillor Fishleigh asked the following supplementary question:

“If I buy the bins and I ask residents to pick up and put the turquoise bags next to the existing bin, will the council take those bins away please?”

68.6 On behalf of the Chair, the following response was provided:

“I can't give a response here but would be happy to speak with Councillor Fishleigh outside the meeting”.

**(3) Ovingdean Waste Bins**

68.7 Councillor Fishleigh read the following question:

“Residents of Ovingdean have repeatedly come to committee to ask for general waste bins to be provided on the village’s main pedestrian routes. They have even provided suggested locations - and the residents association has said it has funds to contribute. Please would you give me an update on progress?”

68.8 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question.

My response is based on answers to previous similar questions and to the reply provided to the previous question.

The sites suggested by residents have been reviewed and feedback on these was provided to this committee in September 2021. The locations that are possible will be considered as part of the wholesale review of the bin infrastructure across the city. As I said earlier, Cityclean needs to ensure it has the resources to empty these bins once they are installed, which is why it is not possible to implement immediately. The potential locations will be included as part of this”.

68.9 Councillor Fishleigh asked the following supplementary question:

“What are the timescales for the completion of the Binrastructure survey and the rollout of new bins in Ovingdean, Saltdean and Rottingdean?”

68.10 On behalf of the Chair, the following response was provided:

“That’s not something I have to hand; we’ll have to get back to Councillor Fishleigh”.

**(4) Car Free City**

68.11 Councillor Fishleigh read the following question:

“Do you agree that a car-free city is not the same as a liveable city and therefore the terms shouldn’t be used interchangeably by officers or councillors at BHCC?”

68.12 The Chair provided the following reply:

“A report on options for a Liveable City Centre was presented to ETS Committee in January last year and made clear the move away from using the term ‘Car Free City Centre’ which had previously been used. Additionally, the city’s local theme to mark the annual World Car Free Day last September, was ‘A liveable city for everyone’, paying recognition to the aims of becoming a liveable city and promoting travel that is active and inclusive.

In order for us to create a liveable city which can be carbon neutral by 2030, requires a shift in travel habits away from car use, particularly for shorter journeys. These are principles outlined in the draft Local Transport Plan 5”.

68.13 Councillor Fishleigh asked the following supplementary question:

“Are you familiar with the Mobility Index produced by the Economist Intelligence Unit that ranks cities across five critical capacities: stability, healthcare, education, culture and environment. Therefore, to use this phrase is just another buzzword the council has latched onto and is using incorrectly”.

68.14 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I have heard of it but I’m happy to look into it further”.

#### **(5) Valley Gardens**

68.15 Councillor Fishleigh read the following question:

“Could you confirm the relationship between the company that manages the cameras and the fines at the Valley Gardens Bus Gates - and Project Centre, the company that managed the detailed design and delivery of the first two parts of the Valley Gardens scheme and has been awarded a similar contract for Phase 3 too?”

68.16 The Chair provided the following reply:

“There is no relationship between the consultant that designed the first two phases of Valley Gardens and the management of Bus Lane camera income. Bus lane CCTV camera installation and enforcement is managed by Council Officers within the Council rather than by any external company. All Bus Lane PCN’s are issued through CCTV and are reviewed first by Council Officers within the Traffic Control Centre. Any appeals are also dealt with in-house by the Council’s PCN Appeals team and any unsuccessful appeals can then be dealt with independently through the Traffic Penalty Tribunal. All income from Bus Lane PCN’s and Parking Income goes to the Council, not to any external organisation”.

68.17 Councillor Fishleigh asked the following supplementary question:

“Please will you investigate further and make sure that you give me the correct information in written format within the next seven days?”

68.18 On behalf of the Chair, the following reply was provided:

“We are aware that Marston Holdings are a parent company but the answer is absolutely correct in that the management of the PCN’s for bus lanes are managed in-house by the council not by Project Centre or NSL or Marston Holdings. Any income from PCN’s whether it is on-street parking or bus lane camera enforcement comes straight to the council and not any private organisation or third party. Project Centre are a designer, they were appointed through a competitive tender using our framework and were successful in their bid to undertake the detailed design work on Valley Gardens Phase 1, 2 and 3”.

#### **(6) Wish Park Disabled Access**

68.19 Councillor Nemeth read the following question:

“What work has been carried out to restore access around the perimeter of Wish Park to all members of the community following the removal of public access along the pathway outside the Saxon Road pavilion?”

68.20 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question.

Following a similar question being asked at this committee in September 2021, I asked officers to review the situation.

Officers have reviewed again the costs and benefits of installing a new footpath within the park around the existing fencing.

The cost is at least eight-thousand-pounds which City Parks advise would not be advised expenditure at this time given there is an existing route on the western side of the nursery building”.

68.21 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“Could this be expedited and looked into as it is a council created issue?”

68.22 On behalf of the Chair, the following reply was provided:

“We will look into this further and hold a meeting with Councillor Nemeth”.

#### **(7) Mallory House Tree Removal**

68.23 Councillor Bagaeen read the following question:

“At the last ETS meeting, members were told that the cost of replacing one tree could run into thousands of pounds sterling. This month, the Council agreed that trees can be felled, as opposed to reducing their height, and officers issued a remedial notice to this effect. How has it become acceptable to fell healthy trees in Hove under your watch?”

68.24 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question.

The trees in question do not fall within a conservation area and are not covered by a Tree Preservation Order. This means the owner had no obligation to obtain the council’s permission to fell and has chosen to fell the trees.

Closely adhering to the government’s guidelines on high hedges, a remedial notice was served on the owner to reduce the height of a row of Lawson Cypress on the site.

This remedial notice stipulates a maximum height but the owner is entitled to cut to a lower height or totally remove the row of trees, if they choose.

An emergency area order TPO 2022 (1) was served on the 7th of January to prevent further removal in the short term. Officers will return to the property in the spring to confirm the TPO and identify the specific trees covered.

The high hedge legislation falls under part 8 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003”.

68.25 Councillor Bagaeen asked the following supplementary question:

“Can I request officers to investigate whether what was felled or cut back constitutes a breach of the Town & Country Regulation Order 2012”.

## **(8) Camera Fines**

68.26 Councillor Nemeth read the following question:

“Please provide an up-to-date breakdown of camera fines to motorists, by all camera locations, detailing numbers of fines, amount raised, detail of offence, and numbers of appeals won/lost for each of the last three years”.

68.27 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The information requested is very detailed and not something that can be read out with context or clarity in this meeting. I earlier provided an update on the situation for the CCTV cameras in Valley Gardens and I’ll send you all of the information and data in regard to this request subsequent to the meeting”.

68.28 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“Can I have that information quickly?”

68.29 On behalf of the Chair, the following reply was provided:

“The information is almost ready so hopefully it can be sent to you very soon”.

## **(9) Parking Permits**

68.30 Councillor Nemeth read the following question:

“What consideration has been given to extending the expiry date of visitor parking permits to take into account COVID restrictions?”

68.31 The Chair provided the following reply:

“It was agreed at the end of 2020 to extend visitor permits that had expired in 2020 for a further year as a large amount of the year was spent in lockdown and there were restrictions on having visitors due to measures implemented by central government. The Council publicised this accordingly and residents have had the time to manage the amount of visitor permits they purchased.

Given things have settled down and travel patterns by vehicles have recovered to pre-pandemic levels and in some cases exceeded these, it has been decided not to extend visitor permits that expired in 2021 for a further period. It should be for residents to plan and manage their visitor permit requirements rather than building up stocks that are carried forward into following years. It’s important to clarify residents don’t have to buy all their allocation of residents in one go. If the national picture changes in terms of new restrictions then we will review this accordingly”.

## **(10) Pavement renewal in Conservation Areas**

68.32 Councillor Nemeth read the following question:

“Following several recent controversial incidents that have led to much protest from residents and amenity societies locally, what is the Council’s policy on replacing pavement slabs with tarmac in Conservation Areas and why does it appear to have recently changed?”

68.33 The Chair provided the following reply:

“A policy has been in place for many years that sets out the approach to repair /replacement of footway materials. This policy has always promoted the use of asphalt as a material that is both long lasting and more economical in use.

The policy does include reference to conservation areas, but no specific direction and each scheme has to be considered when it is being planned. This policy is due for review and in light of the need to reduce carbon and meet the council’s objective of carbon neutrality it is clear that things need to change. The full life cycle of footway construction has to be considered and ultimately the carbon footprint for obtaining materials and then future life.

The recent schemes used asphalt as the replacement material as the existing footways suffered from trip hazards and different types of slabs, particularly where continuous vehicle overrunning adjacent to crossovers led to badly cracked slabs, asphalt is more flexible and able to (more easily) withstand vehicle damage . Each site was considered in light of the policy and the material selected to meet the sustainable low carbon objectives”.

68.34 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“When the new plan is done, however it is done, can consultation be a large factor in whatever plan is made?”

68.35 The Chair provided the following reply:

“I’ve had a similar problem in my ward actually so this is something we will need to address”.

## **(11) Hangleton Park budget measures**

68.36 On behalf of Councillor Lewry, Councillor Nemeth read the following question:

The following expenditure item was agreed to at the City Budget in March 2021:

*£0.090m capital investment for: A) tree planting around phone masts; replacement play equipment in Patcham parks; resurfacing of Hangleton Park multipurpose play area; £0.020m replacement of the zip wire at Saltdean Oval Park and additional pothole repair funding. B) £0.010m invest in open space sports infrastructure such as tennis court nets and basketball hoops. The open spaces to include Hangleton and Hove seafront. C) £0.010m capital investment in replacement bins in open spaces including Hove Park, Hove Recreation ground, Greenleas Park and Knoll Park.*

Please can the Chair advise the current status of the following budget expenditure projects referred to above:

- i) Resurfacing of Hangleton Park multipurpose play area.

- ii) New basketball hoops at Hangleton Park.

68.37 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Investment is needed in our outdoor sports facilities and the additional funds allocated by council last year is very much appreciated to supplement S106 funding where it is available.

Hangleton Park Baseball hoops and back board are planned for replacement by end of April 2022.

Stoneham Park and Knoll Park Basket Ball hoops have already been completed.

Stoneham Park MUGA has been replaced this year costing approx. £113k. In March 2022 we will be commencing work amounting to £300k in two MUGAs at Carden Park and Wild Park.

Hove Park Basket Ball court and Saunders Park will be reviewed for investment in May 2022.

We will review Hangleton Park MUGA surface but please be aware that the cost of this may exceed £10k in itself. However we will look at what the options are for improvements of this and all of our outdoor sports facilities. Further to this the works will be prioritised based on need to prevent the loss of the facility and where we can raise sufficient funding to undertake the required work – for example we may be able to progress works sooner in parks where S106 funding is available”.

## (D) Notices of Motion

### (1) Hangleton Link Road

68.38 Councillor Janio moved the following Notice of Motion:

This council requests:

1. A report be submitted to the ETS Committee, detailing the funds required to fund a pedestrian bridge, and any necessary support infrastructure, across the Hangleton Link Road (A293) as near to the Hangleton Lane/Hangleton Link/Fox Way roundabout as practically possible; and
2. A report be submitted to the ETS Committee, detailing possible developments in the vicinity of the Hangleton Lane/Hangleton Link/Fox Way roundabout, that might be channelled into the crossing in 1. Above.

68.39 For the purposes of procedure, the Chair formally seconded the Notice of Motion.

68.40 Councillor Hamilton moved an amendment to the Notice of Motion as shown in bold italics below:

3. ***A report be submitted to the ETS Committee that considers all options available to provide safe forms of crossing on the Hangleton Link Road.***

68.41 Councillor Wilkinson formally seconded the amendment.

68.42 The Chair then put the amendment to the Notice of Motion to the vote that passed.

68.43 The Chair then put the Notice of Motion as amended to the vote that was approved.

68.44 **Resolved-**

This council requests:

1. A report be submitted to the ETS Committee, detailing the funds required to fund a pedestrian bridge, and any necessary support infrastructure, across the Hangleton Link Road (A293) as near to the Hangleton Lane/Hangleton Link/Fox Way roundabout as practically possible; and
2. A report be submitted to the ETS Committee, detailing possible developments in the vicinity of the Hangleton Lane/Hangleton Link/Fox Way roundabout, that might be channelled into the crossing in 1. Above.
3. A report be submitted to the ETS Committee that considers all options available to provide safe forms of crossing on the Hangleton Link Road.

**(2) Valley Gardens**

68.45 Councillor Fishleigh moved the following Notice of Motion:

This Council notes that there are a multitude of problems with the current plans that need to be resolved prior to work starting on VG3 including this small sample:

- The economic and health consequences of creating a five-lane road on the east side of the Old Steine directly in front of two city centre medical surgeries, homes and businesses
- The disbenefit of narrowing pavements by more than three metres
- How the bus loop works without a confusing, dangerous and slow filter system against oncoming traffic
- How buses and other vehicles will share lanes without causing vehicles to have to switch lanes or wait for passengers to get on and off
- Pedestrians have been placed in direct conflict with the new two-way cycle lane across the whole scheme including at Palace Pier and the planned new entrance to Pavilion Gardens.

This Council agrees that:

3. VG3 will happen but it is our responsibility to ensure that the scheme is implemented in the way that works for all users - and that there are no oversights or unintended consequences.

This Council agrees to:

Request the ET&S Committee to appoint a third-party and genuinely independent traffic consultant to evaluate the scheme as it stands at the moment. This consultant should then meet with all the stakeholders to hear their concerns about the current scheme and prepare a report that will be evaluated at a future full council.

68.46 The Chair then put the Notice of Motion to the vote that failed. Councillor Bagaeen and Councillor Nemeth requested that the official record reflected that they were in support of the Notice of Motion.

### (3) Poor Condition of Pavements in Brighton & Hove

68.47 Councillor Nemeth moved the following Notice of Motion:

This Council:

1. Reaffirms concerns that have been raised in the past about excessive use of glyphosate herbicides;
2. Notes widespread condemnation from residents and visitors alike of the current state of the pavements in Brighton & Hove;
3. Further notes that allowing weeds to take hold discourages active travel; raises the chance of injury to members of various vulnerable groups; increases costs for maintenance and compensation claims; and fosters a sense of neglect in the public realm; and
4. Calls for an urgent Officer Report to be presented to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee that sets out how pavements in the city can be rapidly brought to a high standard without excessive use of glyphosates.

68.48 Councillor Hills moved the following amendment to the Notice of Motion as shown in bold italics below:

This Council:

1. Reaffirms concerns that have been raised in the past about ~~excessive the~~ use of glyphosate herbicides;
2. Notes ~~widespread condemnation from~~ **some** residents and visitors ~~alike~~ **have raised concern about** of the current state of the pavements in Brighton & Hove
3. Further notes that allowing weeds to take hold **may discourage** ~~discourages~~ active travel; raises the chance of injury to members of various vulnerable groups; increases costs for maintenance and compensation claims; and fosters a sense of neglect in the public realm; ~~and~~
4. ***Notes that the parking of motor vehicles on pavements is a threat to residents' safety. It leads not only to cracks in pavements, allowing more opportunities for weeds to grow, but also makes pavements dangerous for people on foot and in wheelchairs; and reaffirms council's position that Government must fast-track legislation to ban pavement parking.***
5. ***Recognises recent key challenges in removing weeds; including a shortage of manual workers caused by both Brexit and the pandemic;***
- 6.-4. ~~Calls for an urgent Officer Report to be presented to~~ ***Notes that an upcoming report to*** Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee ***will*** set out how pavements in the city can be rapidly brought to a high standard without excessive

~~use of glyphosates~~ ***the council manages weeds in the future, learning from the past few years of pesticide free removal; and***

- 7. *Further notes that improvements to walking in the city were recently consulted on as part of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).***

68.49 Councillor Fowler formally seconded the amendment.

68.50 The Chair then put the amendment to the vote that passed.

68.51 The Chair then put the Notice of Motion as amended to the vote that passed.

**68.52 Resolved-**

This Council:

1. Reaffirms concerns that have been raised in the past about the use of glyphosate herbicides;
2. Notes some residents and visitors have raised concern about the current state of the pavements in Brighton & Hove
3. Further notes that allowing weeds to take hold may discourage active travel; raises the chance of injury to members of various vulnerable groups; increases costs for maintenance and compensation claims; and fosters a sense of neglect in the public realm;
4. Notes that the parking of motor vehicles on pavements is a threat to residents' safety. It leads not only to cracks in pavements, allowing more opportunities for weeds to grow, but also makes pavements dangerous for people on foot and in wheelchairs; and reaffirms council's position that Government must fast-track legislation to ban pavement parking.
5. Recognises recent key challenges in removing weeds; including a shortage of manual workers caused by both Brexit and the pandemic;
6. Notes that an upcoming report to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee will set out how the council manages weeds in the future, learning from the past few years of pesticide free removal; and
7. Further notes that improvements to walking in the city were recently consulted on as part of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).

**(4) Strike Preparedness**

68.53 Councillor Nemeth moved the following Notice of Motion:

This Committee:

1. Calls for an Officer Report detailing what measures are now in place to deal with future refuse strikes to ensure continuity of service and safety to the public.

68.54 Councillor Bagaeen formally seconded the Notice of Motion.

68.55 The Chair put the Notice of Motion to the vote that failed. Councillor Bagaeen and Councillor Nemeth requested that the official record reflected that they were in support of the Notice of Motion.

**(5) Old Shoreham Road**

68.56 Councillor Nemeth moved the following Notice of Motion:

This Committee:

1. Reaffirms its position that it will not support the reinstatement of the removed cycle lane, or similar creation, on the Old Shoreham Road.

68.57 Councillor Bagaeen formally seconded the Notice of Motion.

68.58 The Chair put the Notice of Motion to the vote that failed.

**(6) Southern Water**

68.59 Councillor Hills moved the following Notice of Motion:

The Committee notes the critical health and environmental concerns around the dumping of raw sewage in our rivers and seas by water companies. Despite being fined £90m for illegally discharging sewage into our waters, Southern Water used the Portobello Storm Outfall near Saltdean to dump raw sewage more than 50 times last year, posing a significant threat to human health and marine ecology.

The Committee notes local residents pay to ensure water is effectively managed and considers Southern Water is not fulfilling its duty to update drainage systems to cope with the impact of climate change.

The Committee therefore requests that the Chief Executive writes to Southern Water

- asking for clarification on plans to stop sewage overflows as soon as possible, by 2030 at the latest.
- Inviting their CEO to a meeting of Health Overview Scrutiny Committee to explain recent actions and to discuss workable ways forward to improve water quality.
- Asking them to engage with local government, the public and community groups to identify investment to improve our city's drainage, in order to reduce flooding and dependence on *the combined sewer capacity*.

The Committee resolves to:

- Work with Southern Water and partners to design and implement a citywide SuDS strategy to reduce surface water flooding by 2030.
- Investigate whether funds from Southern Water's recent fines can be redistributed to pay for works.

68.60 Councillor Lloyd formally seconded the Notice of Motion.

68.61 The Chair put the Notice of Motion to the vote that was approved.

68.62 **Resolved-**

The Committee notes the critical health and environmental concerns around the dumping of raw sewage in our rivers and seas by water companies. Despite being fined £90m for illegally discharging sewage into our waters, Southern Water used the Portobello Storm Outfall near Saltdean to dump raw sewage more than 50 times last year, posing a significant threat to human health and marine ecology.

The Committee notes local residents pay to ensure water is effectively managed and considers Southern Water is not fulfilling its duty to update drainage systems to cope with the impact of climate change.

The Committee therefore requests that the Chief Executive writes to Southern Water

- asking for clarification on plans to stop sewage overflows as soon as possible, by 2030 at the latest.
- Inviting their CEO to a meeting of Health Overview Scrutiny Committee to explain recent actions and to discuss workable ways forward to improve water quality.
- Asking them to engage with local government, the public and community groups to identify investment to improve our city's drainage, in order to reduce flooding and dependence on *the combined sewer capacity*.

The Committee resolves to:

- Work with Southern Water and partners to design and implement a citywide SuDS strategy to reduce surface water flooding by 2030.
- Investigate whether funds from Southern Water's recent fines can be redistributed to pay for works.

## 69 FEES AND CHARGES 2022-23

- 69.1 The Committee considered a joint report of the Executive Director for Housing, Neighbourhoods, & Communities; Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture; Executive Director of Governance, People & Resources that set out the proposed 2022/23 fees and charges for the service areas covered by the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee in accordance with corporate regulations and policy.

*Note: Councillor Nemeth and Councillor Wilkinson left the Council Chamber during discussion of the item due to their declared pecuniary interest.*

- 69.2 Councillor Platts moved the following motion to amend the recommendations (Amendment 1) as shown in bold italics below:

- 2.1 That the Committee ~~approves~~ ***recommends to Policy & Resources Committee that it approves*** the proposed fees and charges for 2022/23 as set out within the report and its appendices ***except that the reports and appendices shall be amended so that the following fees are increased by the percentage shown:***

- ***All 'Highways', 'Developer-Led Highway Works (including S278/38 agreements)', 'Transport Note/Statement/Assessment Scoping and Other Pre-Application Advice', 'Travel Plans', 'Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMP)', 'Scaffold Licence', 'Skip Licence' 'Building Materials', and 'Objects on the Highway' fees and charges in Appendix 1 increase – 10%***

- *All 'Flying Licences' fees and charges in Appendix 4 increase–25%*

**2.3 That the Committee asks for a report to come to a future meeting of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee exploring differential parking charges for high-emitting vehicles.**

69.3 Councillor Hamilton formally seconded the motion.

69.4 Councillor Platts moved the following motion to amend the recommendations (Amendment 2) as shown in bold italics below:

2.1 That the Committee ~~approves~~ **recommends to Policy & Resources Committee that it approves** the proposed fees and charges for 2022/23 as set out within the report and its appendices **except that the reports and appendices shall be amended so that all car parking charges in our city parks outlined in Appendix 4 are frozen.**

**2.3 That the Committee asks officers to bring a report to a future meeting of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee outlining proposals for a limited parking charge scheme at Wild Park on Brighton & Hove Albion home matchdays.**

69.5 Councillor Fowler formally seconded the motion.

69.6 Councillor Platts moved the following motion to amend the recommendations (Amendment 3) as shown in bold italics below:

2.1 That the Committee ~~approves~~ **recommends to Policy & Resources Committee that it approves** the proposed fees and charges for 2022/23 as set out within the report and its appendices **except that the reports and appendices shall be amended so that:**

**a) The 50% discount on bulky waste collections is maintained for those over 60 and those in receipt of income support or Universal Credit, Employment and Support Allowance, Job Seekers Allowance, Incapacity Benefit, Personal Independence Payment and/or Disability Living Allowance.**

**b) All concessionary charges for sports outlined in Appendix 4 are frozen.**

69.7 Councillor Fowler formally seconded the motion.

69.8 Councillor Platts moved the following motion to amend the recommendations (Amendment 4) as shown in bold italics below:

2.1 That the Committee ~~approves~~ **recommends to Policy & Resources Committee that it approves** the proposed fees and charges for 2022/23 as set out within the report and its appendices **except that the reports and appendices shall be amended to include a proposal for cycle hangar charges, in line with other local authorities and in order to generate income to invest in rolling out more**

*cycle hangars across the city.*

**2.3 That the Committee requests that officers conduct a review of the nature of motorcycle parking in Controlled Parking Zones and Council-owned car parks, with charging options presented to a future meeting of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.**

69.9 Councillor Fowler formally seconded the motion.

69.10 Councillor Lloyd stated that the Green Group would be supporting amendments 1 and 4. However, he did not believe it should be less expensive to park within a park car park than park nearby. Councillor Lloyd stated support in principle for the proposals on Bulky Waste collection however, he found this to be a matter for Budget Council not committee.

69.11 The Executive Director Economy, Environment & Culture stated that it was intended that the proposed charges on Bulky Waste collection would help expand the service and make it commercially viable. The estimated cost of amendment 3 would cost around £20,000 that would limit those ambitions.

69.12 Councillor Platts observed that fly tipping was a significant issue in the city and the proposals in amendment 3 may reduce the cost to the council in collecting flytipped waste making the proposal cost neutral.

69.13 The Chair then put amendment 1 to the vote that passed.

69.14 The Chair then put amendment 2 to the vote that failed.

69.15 The Chair then put amendment 3 to the vote that failed.

69.16 The Chair then put amendment 4 to the vote that passed.

69.17 The Chair put the recommendations as amended to the vote that passed.

69.18 **Resolved:**

- 1) That the Committee recommends to Policy & Resources Committee that it approves the proposed fees and charges for 2022/23 as set out within the report and its appendices except that the reports and appendices shall be amended so that the following fees are increased by the percentage shown:
  - All 'Highways', 'Developer-Led Highway Works (including S278/38 agreements)', 'Transport Note/Statement/Assessment Scoping and Other Pre-Application Advice', 'Travel Plans', 'Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMP)', 'Scaffold Licence', 'Skip Licence' 'Building Materials', and 'Objects on the Highway' fees and charges in Appendix 1 increase – 10%
  - All 'Flying Licences' fees and charges in Appendix 4 increase – 25%
- 2) That the Committee recommends to Policy & Resources Committee that it approves the proposed fees and charges for 2022/23 as set out within the report and its appendices

except that the reports and appendices shall be amended to include a proposal for cycle hangar charges, in line with other local authorities and in order to generate income to invest in rolling out more cycle hangars across the city.

- 3) That the Committee delegates authority to the Executive Director of Economy, Environment & Culture (in relation to paragraphs 3.4-3.23), the Executive Director of Housing, Neighbourhoods & Communities (in relation to paragraphs 3.24 - 3.26) and to the Executive Director of Governance, People & Resources (in relation to paragraphs 3.27 – 3.33) to change fees and charges as notified and set by central Government during the year.
- 4) That the Committee asks for a report to come to a future meeting of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee exploring differential parking charges for high-emitting vehicles.
- 5) That the Committee requests that officers conduct a review of the nature of motorcycle parking in Controlled Parking Zones and Council-owned car parks, with charging options presented to a future meeting of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.

## **70 VALLEY GARDENS PHASE 3 REVISED SCHEME WITH DETAILED DESIGN PRINCIPLES**

- 70.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval of Valley Gardens Phase 3 detailed design and other related matters.
- 70.2 Councillor Nemeth moved a motion to amend the recommendations as shown in bold italics below:
  - 2.1 Approves the Valley Gardens Phase 3 detailed design as shown in Appendix 1: General Highway Arrangement Plan ***subject to 2.6.***
  - 2.3 Authorises that all Traffic Regulation Orders required for Valley Gardens Phase 3 be advertised in accordance with the standard procedure ***subject to 2.6.***
  - 2.6 Calls for the release of traffic modelling data and simulations to publicly demonstrate that the proposed scheme in its current form results in no increase to average bus journey times.***
- 70.3 Councillor Bagaen formally seconded the motion.
- 70.4 Councillor Davis stated that he could not support the motion as it would unnecessarily delay the project and the modal shift it was seeking to achieve.
- 70.5 Councillor Wilkinson commended the development of the Valley Gardens scheme and stated that the Labour Group could not endorse the amendment.
- 70.6 The Chair then put the motion to the vote that failed.

70.7 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote that were agreed.

**70.8 Resolved-**

That the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee:

- 1) Approves the Valley Gardens Phase 3 detailed design as shown in Appendix 1: General Highway Arrangement Plan.
- 2) Notes that the principles and details outlined in this report will help to inform all final technical matters, with regards to this scheme, in preparation for the procurement of a construction contract by officers in line with the decision made by this committee in February 2019 as outlined in paragraph 7.2 of this report.
- 3) Authorises that all Traffic Regulation Orders required for Valley Gardens Phase 3 be advertised in accordance with the standard procedure.
- 4) Notes the increased budget requirement due to significant delay in delivering Phase 3, additional stakeholder infrastructure commitments, and significant increases in construction costs, as set out in in Appendix 2.
- 5) Recommends to Policy & Resources Committee that it approves capital borrowing of up to £5.0m to address estimated increased scheme costs arising from new Department for Transport design guidance; significant increases in construction costs and risk management; additional infrastructure, including for sustainable transport and events; as shown in Appendix 2.

**71 PARKING ANNUAL REPORT 2020-2021**

**71.1 Resolved-**

- 1) That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee endorses the publication of the Parking Annual Report for 2020/21 under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004.
- 2) That the Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee authorises the Head of Parking Services to produce and publish the report, which will be made available on the Council's website.

**72 REAL TIME AIR QUALITY MONITORING SYSTEM**

**72.1 Resolved-**

- 1) That the committee authorises officers to continue to progress the development of a real-time air quality monitoring system by upgrading the existing strategic monitoring network to enable the publication of real-time data;
- 2) That the committee welcomes the allocations of funding made by the council to invest in supporting and expanding the provision of strategic air quality monitoring stations and provide new local real-time sensors;

- 3) That the committee requests that officers continue to seek funding opportunities to enable the installation, expansion and maintenance of a real-time air quality monitoring system, including from council budgets, bids to the strategic Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) pot and government grant funding.

### **73 MADEIRA DRIVE ACTIVE TRAVEL FUND ETRO-10-2021**

- 73.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that provided an overview of the consultation process for the Madeira Drive scheme and set out recommendations in relation to the ETRO-10-2021 consultation.
- 73.2 In response to questions from Councillor Platts, the Senior Project Manager explained that specific detail on the location of consultation respondents could be provided after the meeting. The ETRO only referred to the extent of the scheme so did not include Black Rock car park with that particular car park part of a separate project that was underway.
- 73.3 The Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture added that the information in the report had to be presented in a specific way owing to the council's duties under the Road Traffic Act.
- 73.4 The Assistant Director, City Transport highlighted that the if a decision wasn't made by the committee on the ETRO then legally, the current layout would need to revert back to the original. Previous recommendations on closure had not been made under the Road Traffic Act and recommendations could only be made that were broadly in line with those set out in the ETRO. The Lawyer added that an ETRO could not be changed in the final six months and new provisions could not be added to it.

#### **73.5 Resolved-**

- 1) That the Committee, having taken account of all duly made comments and representations, agrees that the provisions of ETRO-10-2021 be made permanent.

### **74 WASHINGTON STREET: OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION ON CHANGES TO REFUSE COLLECTIONS**

#### **71.1 Resolved-**

- 1) That Committee agrees for individual refuse wheelie bins to be provided to households in Washington Street, based on the results of the consultation, and pending a wider piece of work as part of the Modernisation Programme.

### **75 ALLOTMENTS: RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF MOTION**

- 71.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that responded to the committee request to receive a report on allotments agreed at its meeting on 21 September 2021.

*Note: Councillor Nemeth and Councillor Wilkinson left the Council Chamber during discussion of the item due to their declared pecuniary interest.*

71.2 Councillor Platts moved a motion to add recommendations as shown in bold italics below:

***2.2 That the Committee calls for officers to meet with Brighton & Hove Allotment Federation (BHAF) to address the concerns they have raised and to review the BHAF's outline business case.***

***2.3 That the Committee calls for a further report that includes the findings of BHAF's business case with particular attention to the health and wellbeing, cost benefits, sustainability and the delivery of the Council's vision outlined in the corporate plan, with the scope of the report agreed with BHAF before work commences.***

***2.4 That the Committee calls for officers to examine the potential use of land either side of Tenantry Down Road near the junction of Bear Road for allotments; potentially delivering another 10 full or 20 half size plots; and reports back on these together with the sites at West Hove and Rottingdean that were previously proposed for use as allotments.***

71.3 Councillor Fowler formally seconded the motion.

71.4 Councillor Bagaeen moved a motion to add recommendations as shown in bold italics below:

***2.2 That the Committee notes that that many plots are in a poor state and that the report highlights that 249 plots are vacant; and***

***2.3 That the Committee calls for an Officer Report detailing emergency measures to let empty plots.***

71.5 Councillor Davis formally seconded the motion.

71.6 In response to a question from Councillor Bagaeen, the Head of Operations - City Parks clarified that there had been a significant increase in demand for allotments nationwide in recent years. Brighton & Hove's currently waiting list of 2785 was high but not the highest it had ever been.

71.7 The Chair then put the motion proposed by Councillor Platts to the vote that passed.

71.8 The Chair then put the motion proposed by Councillor Bagaeen to the vote that passed.

71.9 The Chair then put the recommendations as amended to the vote that were agreed.

71.10 **Resolved-**

1) That Environment, Transport & Sustainability note the response to the Notice of Motion.

- 2) That the Committee calls for officers to meet with Brighton & Hove Allotment Federation (BHAF) to address the concerns they have raised and to review the BHAF's outline business case.
- 3) That the Committee calls for a further report that includes the findings of BHAF's business case with particular attention to the health and wellbeing, cost benefits, sustainability and the delivery of the Council's vision outlined in the corporate plan, with the scope of the report agreed with BHAF before work commences.
- 4) That the Committee calls for officers to examine the potential use of land either side of Tenantry Down Road near the junction of Bear Road for allotments; potentially delivering another 10 full or 20 half size plots; and reports back on these together with the sites at West Hove and Rottingdean that were previously proposed for use as allotments.
- 5) That the Committee notes that that many plots are in a poor state and that the report highlights that 249 plots are vacant; and
- 6) That the Committee calls for an Officer Report detailing emergency measures to let empty plots.

**76 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL**

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

The meeting concluded at 9.30pm

