

Brighton & Hove City Council
Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee

4.00pm 20 September 2022

Council Chamber, Brighton Town Hall

Minutes

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

Other Members present: Councillors

Part One

17 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

17(a) Declarations of substitutes

17.1 There were none.

17(b) Declarations of interest

17.2 Councillor Platts declared a pecuniary interest in Item 21 (a written question) as she lived on a street adjoining the proposed scheme area. Councillor Platts stated that she would leave the Chamber during discussion of the item and public representations on the subject.

17.2 Councillor Hills declared a pecuniary interest in Item 21 (a written question) as she lived on a street adjoining the proposed scheme area.

17.3 Councillor Fowler declared a pecuniary interest in Item 28 she owned a shop in the area.

17(c) Exclusion of press and public

17.4 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).

17.5 **Resolved-** That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting.

18 MINUTES

18.1 **Resolved-** That the minutes of the previous meeting be approved as the correct record.

19 CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

19.1 The Chair provided the following communications:

“We’re holding this committee the day after the funeral of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II

This is a historic moment in our nation’s history as we remember the passing of The Queen and witness the start of the new reign of King Charles III. As elected politicians we recognise many people will be saddened by the news and wish to pay their respects. For that reason, I ask the committee and assembled officers and members of the public to join me in a minute’s silence.

Since this committee last met, we’ve seen a number of projects being taken forward for the benefit of Brighton & Hove.

Firstly, I’d like to congratulate officers for their work on installing cycle hangars across the city. By the end of the year we’ll have more than 100 in use for residents to safely store their bikes. I was especially pleased to see that we had a 100% take up rate for the first 20 and I’m sure the rest will prove just as popular.

We have also just completed a lengthy consultation on creating the city’s first Liveable Neighbourhood in Hanover & Tarnier – And looking ahead, I’m delighted to see so many activities and events taking place to mark Car Free Day this Thursday. An opportunity for us all to take a look at how we travel around the city.

We’ll soon be consulting on the next wave of School Streets, supporting the safer travel of Primary school children to and from their classroom.

Work is also continuing to make Brighton & Hove as welcoming as possible for residents, businesses and visitors alike.

Earlier this month we launched a year-long programme of targeted action zones to help tackle problem graffiti across the city.

The action zones will target high footfall areas and involve co-ordinated activity of graffiti removal from council property, alongside engagement with businesses about problem graffiti on commercial property.

All this week, we’re also clearing litter on the A27 from Portslade junction through to Falmer. The clean-up will take place overnight when traffic will be light. Work starts this evening and we’re expecting it to take 5 nights”.

20 CALL OVER

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

- Item 26: Parking Policies update report
- Item 27: Parking Scheme Update
- Item 29: A259 Active Travel Scheme - Walking, Cycling and
- Accessibility Improvements TRO Response
- Item 30: Transport for the South East’s Strategic Investment Plan –
- Response to consultation
- Item 31: Moving Traffic Offences

20.2 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 24: Application for a Definitive Map Modification Order, Benfield Valley, Hove
- Item 25: Highway Winter Service Policy
- Item 28: Parking Fees & Charges Update Report

Item 32 was deferred.

21 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(a) Petitions

(1) Controlled parking for Withdean Court Avenue

21.1 The Committee considered a petition signed by 23 people requesting controlled parking on Withdean Court Avenue.

21.2 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your petition regarding a residents parking scheme in Withdean Court Avenue. Officers will investigate your request and surrounding roads when reviewing the Surrenden Area parking scheme (Zone 10) in February 2023. If there is sufficient support for a scheme then further consultation with a detailed design will follow”.

21.3 **Resolved-** That the Committee note the petition.

(2) Stanford Avenue/Preston Road Traffic and Noise Calming

21.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 122 people requesting traffic and noise calming measures for Stanford Avenue and Preston Road.

21.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for taking the time to present the petition today. I do appreciate this is a busy stretch of road and sympathise with the requests you have made. Any changes to speed limits will need to be in accordance with government guidance, particularly around the nature of the road and the likelihood people will comply with a reduced speed limit. Therefore, I wouldn't want to promise anything until a full assessment has been undertaken, despite very much agreeing with you. However, this area has been identified in the Bus Service Improvement Plan, which has recently received indicative funding from the government. Whilst this will focus on measures to improve bus journey times and reliability, it is possible it will include proposals for changes to some of the traffic restrictions. If additional changes such as those outlined in the petition are deemed to be necessary, it would make sense for them to be considered and introduced as part of single scheme. Further design and assessment work will take place over the following year with public consultation to follow in due course”.

21.6 **Resolved-** That the Committee note the petition.

(3) Reinforcing Controlled Parking on Dean Street

21.7 The Committee considered a petition signed by 58 people requesting increased parking measures on Dean Street.

21.8 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for petition and am sorry to hear about problems caused by delivery drivers parking unsocially within Dean Street.

Officers are aware of the parking and driving issues here and regularly attempt to enforce parking contraventions by issuing Penalty Charge Notices, however the issue in terms of parking enforcement is that vehicles simply drive off when officers are present in the area.

A loading ban on one side of the road would not resolve the problem either as there is still a period of time before officers can issue a PCN. The signage is already very clear that it's resident permit parking only at the point of parking and officers have outlined that any advanced advisory warning signs indicating resident parking only when you enter the road would not be a solution and would increase sign clutter and possible confusion leading to PCN's not being issued or being challenged at the Parking Penalty Tribunal.

Indeed, many of these problems are not parking related especially where they involve anti-social driving or contravention of one -way Traffic Orders or driving at speed or on the pavement. These are issues that need to be dealt with by Sussex Police who have also been made aware of this issue and have at times dedicated a PC to deal with this. Officers will continue to operate our parking enforcement powers where appropriate and continue to liaise with Sussex Police on your behalf. I'm happy to ask officers to meet with you and other residents and ward councillors to discuss options going forward”.

21.9 **Resolved-** That the Committee note the petition.

(4) Bus Service to replace Madeira Drive lift

21.10 The Committee considered a petition signed by 84 people requesting a bus service to take the less mobile residents of the Kemptown area down to Madeira Drive whilst the lift was not in operation.

21.11 The Chair provided the following response:

“Although there isn't an existing bus service from Kemptown that serves the length of Madeira Drive there are buses serving east-west & west east along the parallel routes of Eastern Road/Edward Street, St James St (east-bound) and Marine Parade (Aquarium/Old Steine). In addition, buses 7, 14B, 21, 21A, 23, 47, 52 & N7 connect the area to Brighton Marina.

It is unlikely that there is sufficient demand for a commercial service, although users could approach bus operators to suggest that they run a service on an experimental basis. Given the commercial pressures that operators are under due to rising fuel and driver costs they may not take the risk. If the service cannot be run commercially then it

would have to be subsidised by the council, the estimated cost being in the region of £300-750K per annum, depending on route and frequency. Council resources are currently focused on maintaining and improving existing supported services which are under pressure due to higher costs and lower passenger numbers following the pandemic”.

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

21.13 Councillor Wilkinson formally seconded the motion.

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

(5) Haliburton parking proposal: Isabel Crescent

21.15 The Committee considered a petition signed by 74 people objecting to the painting on double yellow lines on Isabel Crescent.

21.16 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition. There is going to be another stage of the consultation which will give residents further opportunity to comment on the traffic regulation order and if there are strong objections Isabel Crescent can be removed from the parking scheme although residents will need to consider the impact of vehicles being displaced to this road if the overall parking scheme is approved elsewhere”.

21.17 **Resolved-** That the Committee note the petition.

(b) Written Questions

(1) Aquarium Roundabout

21.18 On behalf of a resident, Councillor Nemeth read the following question:

“Can the Chair clarify that there is no evidence to suggest the Aquarium Roundabout is one of the UKs (or even Brighton's) most dangerous roundabouts or in fact any more dangerous to road users and pedestrians than numerous traffic light junctions?”

21.19 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question. In line with a response that has been provided to a Freedom of Information request that has asked the same question, I can confirm that the council has not undertaken any analysis that compares this junction with others in the UK. References that have previously been made about the danger of the junction in a national context are based on articles that were published in the national and local media in 2019. These were based on a journalist's independent analysis of publicly available figures from the government's Department for Transport.

The council's own past and recent analysis of data for the city has shown that, out of 81 sites which included a number of traffic signal junctions, the roundabout had the highest number of collisions during those periods.

Following the considerable amount of engagement, consultation and technical analysis that has been carried out, the approved plans for the junction to become traffic signals as part of the Valley Gardens Phase 3 project will make the junction much safer for everybody using it.”

21.20 On behalf of a resident, Councillor Nemeth read the following supplementary question:

Councillor Davis assertion that the Aquarium Roundabout has one of the highest number of collisions in the city is false. No amount of slicing and dicing the stats can alter the fact that the roundabout through which 18 million journeys are made every year has entailed zero fatalities and an average of five injuries per year since March 2000. Rather than impart false facts to this committee would it be better that the Chair and Green Party try to stick to the environmental arguments for Phase 3?”

21.21 The Deputy Chair provided the following reply:

“There is a lot of statistical data about crashes that happen at junctions in our city. You can access it on a website called Crashmap which uses DfT data. Now if we look at Crashmap that roundabout has about 89 accidents in the last ten years compared to Preston Circus which has 26 and Seven Dials that has 41. So, in fact you can compare data as it’s out there and readily available. DfT data can be called upon to assess where most accidents have happened. That confirms that and hopefully ends this debate as it’s really getting quite boring”.

(2) Refuse

21.22 On behalf of a resident, Councillor Platts read the following question:

“The residents of Bristol Gate have noticed a deteriorating service over the last few years in terms of sufficiently emptying our communal refuse and recycling bins, so that we often have unhygienic and overflowing bins. What are the Council’s plans for reviewing and improving services across the city?”

21.23 The Chair provided the following reply:

“An improvement programme is in place to improve refuse and recycling collections across the city.

One of the big projects currently being worked on is procuring in-cab technology for the crews to improve the sharing of information between crews, the Cityclean depot and residents. This will improve the information the crews have to complete their collections, as well letting the depot and residents know when there are collection issues.

Cityclean also has a fleet replacement programme in place to replace older vehicles. This is reducing the number of instances when vehicles are off the road which can disrupt collections.

There are some roads that experience repeated missed collections. These are being reviewed to determine what measures can be put in place to maintain regular collections. This includes seeking Traffic Regulation Orders to implement such things as double yellow lines, to prevent vehicles parking and blocking access.

There will be a report coming to the next meeting of this committee with a further update on the work taking place to improve collections”.

21.24 On behalf of a resident, Councillor Platts read the following supplementary question:

“Based on our personal experience, since the communal bins have been put in place, the amount of recycling has overtaken the amount of refuse by some way and yet the number of bins has not changed. Does the Council keep an eye on this and adjust the number of collections accordingly?”

21.25 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The answer is yes, we do monitor that and make alternations when we need to”.

(3) Tree maintenance

21.26 On behalf of Shirley Ross, Malcolm Spencer read the following question:

“The strip of Council-owned land next to our garden is in urgent need of proper maintenance so it does not form a dense, light-obstructing hedge to our house and garden and allows a safety margin for pedestrians on narrow, often busy road. A site meeting with Peter Small on 10 May agreed some minimum action points. I am here seeking help because we are making no progress in having these points implemented and I don’t understand why emails with simple requests go unanswered when the problems and solutions have been previously agreed”.

21.27 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question.

I am sorry for the delay in taking forward the actions following the visit in May-At the meeting it was agreed that the holm oaks can be reduced in size due to the presence of some defects and to improve clearance, although the shading issue was not in itself a reason for work to be undertaken.

These works have been added to the list of pending jobs for the Arboriculture Team. Unfortunately, this piece of work is delayed due to a large volume of higher priority tree work which has arisen throughout the summer, primarily reactive elm disease control work. This element of work is likely to reduce as we approach the end of summer and elm disease season. This means the team can then begin to address the backlog of other tree work. All high priority safety works have been actioned during this period however lower priority works, such as this, have had to be delayed”.

(4) Speeding on Preston Park Avenue

21.28 William Foster read the following question:

“I wish to draw your attention to the danger posed by persistent speeding traffic along Preston Park Avenue. This is of special concern as many children, young people, and people with mobility impairments use the park and given its unfenced nature, emerge onto the roadside at almost any point often unseen between parked vehicles. I have witnessed cars travelling in excess of 50mph, an accident waiting to happen. I wish to

call on the committee to action a report into methods to improve public safety and then implement the report's suggestions. Can you please help the safety of our community?"

21.29 The Chair provided the following reply:

"Thank you, William, for your question. I can understand the concerns you have raised and know how well used this area is. We receive a number of similar requests to this committee and do, I'm afraid, need to prioritise them based on immediate need. This will take account of things such as recorded speeds and collision history.

Data for the past three years shows that there were two minor incidents, and, for these, the police recorded driver error rather than speed as a factor.

Council Officers also conducted speed surveys in the Summer and Autumn of 2021 using a vehicle activated sign attached to a lamp column. This showed that the average speed was recorded at marginally over 20mph and the maximum speed recorded was 45mph. I know that this is an area of big concern for residents and there is a report coming to this committee with similar requests from other roads so I will ask officers to include Preston Park Avenue into that road safety work".

(5) Queens Park Road

21.30 Deborah Burnie read the following question:

"What data are you working with to ensure that the traffic on Queens Park Road will not increase with attendant air and noise pollution as well as traffic congestion as a consequence of the Hanover and Tarner LTN?"

21.31 The Chair provided the following reply:

"Thank you for your question. The development of the project so far has taken into account a number of different datasets, such as traffic and cycle flows and driver speeds, and will also assess noise and air quality data. Traffic modelling will also be used to inform and support the selection of a final scheme in principle. We are sorry that that the baseline data report has taken far longer than expected to produce. I am advised that it should be made available later this week. An outline Monitoring Framework has also been established and will be a key part of understanding how the design for this pilot project is working, what effects it is having, and if any changes are required during the Experimental Traffic Order period".

(6) Traffic and air pollution

21.32 Ruth Farnell read the following question:

"A question related to the Hanover LTN. You monitored the traffic and pollution in the Hanover area and were going to publish the findings that will inform the design of the proposed Hanover and Tarner LTN. When will this report be made available to local residents? We were advised this would be made available during the consultation which has now closed".

21.33 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for putting your question. As I explained in my previous response, we are sorry about the delays to finalising the baseline data report and it should be available later this week”.

21.34 Ruth Farnell asked the following supplementary question:

“How is local and non-local traffic monitored?”

21.35 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

“It won’t necessarily be possible to differentiate between local and non-local traffic from the data that has been collected but we will be analysing it and setting the levels of through traffic that are utilising or using the area and that information has informed the design to date and will be part of baseline data report that will be published later this week”

(7) Queens Park Road

21.36 Katia Toy read the following question:

“There is very little information about the proposed improvement to Queens Park Road as a consequence of becoming a boundary road for the Hanover and Tarner LTN. How will you ensure the following residents are not negatively impacted? For example, access for care workers, the vulnerable, emergency vehicles as well as space for pushchairs and mobility scooters on the pavements of Queens Park Road”.

21.37 The Chair provided the following reply:

“We’re committed to making the roads that border the liveable neighbourhood scheme more people friendly, which is why we have put an extra £1.1m into improving these roads. The proposals that we have consulted on include pedestrian crossing points, traffic calming measures and vegetation/greening for Queen’s Park Road. The details are still being explored and we want residents to be part of the conversation. Green councillors in the area are meeting with people on Queen’s Park Road and are working with them on defining the changes that would be most appropriate there. We would be keen to involve more local people – so I can pass on your details if you are interested. The next meeting is tomorrow evening.

Once the principles of the final design are established, based on the responses that we receive to the consultation, we will be able to provide a clearer indication of the measures that will be included in the street.

One of the primary objectives of the Liveable Neighbourhood is to enable and increase active travel. Within the overall area of the scheme, we therefore want to ensure that there is a positive change for people’s access and movement, especially when using pavements and crossing roads. Access for essential vehicles will also improve if there is a reduction in the amount of local traffic in the area as a result of increases in active travel”.

21.38 Katia Toy asked the following supplementary question:

“Why do residents on Queens Park Road not matter as much as those in Hanover?”

21.39 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Residents do matter in Elm Grove and Queens Park Road hence the reason for making provision to actually look at improvements in Elm Grove and Queens Park Road as part of the scheme. So, residents aren’t being excluded and residents needs is included as part of the overall scheme”.

(8) Economic Impacts of Hanover & Tarner LTN

21.40 Carolyn Lewis read the following question:

“How are you going to convince me that the proposed Hanover and Tarner Liveable Neighbourhood pilot will not undermine the very local economy that makes Hanover a liveable neighbourhood? I’m talking about our local tradespeople and businesses such as carpenters, gardeners, painters & decorators, plumbers, electricians, dog walkers, our local shops, our pubs, the Orchard Nursery, the post office, doctors’ surgery and pharmacy”.

21.41 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question. Through the engagement and consultation that has been promoted and taken place so far within the local community, I very much hope that we will have captured many views from a range of stakeholders, including businesses. Low traffic schemes in other areas have boosted retail trade as people prefer shopping and spending time in low traffic areas. But we know that vehicle access needs to be balanced against the need to discourage car use. We know deliveries are important and we’ve yet to get down to that level of detail in the plans - we’ll work with local businesses on this. And we are encouraging tradespeople who can to transition to ecargo bikes for some of their journeys and deliveries through our ecargo acceleration project. These will be varied and reflect the differing needs that people will have on a day to day basis and which we will need to balance when finalising the design. I know that Councillor Hills has been in discussion with local businesses and she, along with, Councillor Davis, Lloyd and Gibson have met with some local businesses to discuss their views. Feedback from businesses will be considered in the next version of the plan. As I explained in an earlier response, the traffic order process means that there will be opportunities for further comments when the scheme is up and running. If changes are needed to accommodate certain business requirements then we will review these and make them where we can”.

(9) Speed Limit on Greenways

21.42 Malcolm Spencer read the following question:

“In an Ovingdean residents survey 79% of those responding would support changing speed limits on Greenways: 40mph to 30mph, 30mph to 20mph. The 40mph section is used as beach parking, where vehicles are offloaded directly into the road, which is crossed to a pavement. In the 30mph section vehicles carry speed towards the 20mph shared space which is at the entrance to a school. We believe that 20mph should be introduced earlier to slow vehicles before that school entrance.

Will Brighton & Hove City Council please listen to residents and reduce the allowed speed limits on this road?"

21.43 The Chair provided the following reply:

"Thank you for your question. We receive a number of requests for speed limit changes and traffic calming measures but unfortunately are not able to satisfy them all. However, we do regularly monitor locations around the city where we have been made aware of potential issues with speed limit compliance. To help us prioritise requests such as yours, officers are currently developing a prioritisation process which will also be used to consider requests for Liveable Neighbourhoods. A report on this is due to be presented to a future meeting of this committee.

In relation to Greenways specifically, I acknowledge the case that you have put forward for a reduction in the speed limit. This will need to be fully assessed and any changes will need to be compliant with national guidance on setting speed limits".

(10) Tree

21.44 The Chair accepted a late question submitted by Marcia Hasler as follows:

"7 years ago the wrong type of tree was planted by the council outside my house. This tree is not a street tree - it has long dangerous spikes and drops thousands of berries across the road and pavement for months. It was a mistake to plant it. Everyone has failed me in trying to keep the highway and pavement clear.

So now I come to this committee to beg that you help. You're my last resort. The spikes and berries are dangerous. Can you get the tree replaced with a tree like all the others across Hove?"

21.45 The Chair stated that a reply would be provided in writing.

(c) Deputations

(1) Rottingdean High Street Planter

21.46 The Committee considered a deputation requesting the removal of the planter located on Rottingdean High Street.

21.47 The Chair provided the following response:

"Thank you for your deputation today. The planter was not part of the Experimental Traffic Regulation order but was part of a wider Air Quality Monitoring Area trial to improve Air Quality in the lower High Street.

It was never intended as a traffic calming measure and the Council has never claimed it was.

Sightlines to the Zebra crossing were considered in the design phase.

There have been no pedestrian injuries in the area recorded by Sussex Police in the last three years which relate to the planter.

Officers recently met with Parish Councillors and Cllr Fishleigh to present the latest Air Quality monitoring results. For the first time in Rottingdean since monitoring began, sensors are recording higher Nitrogen Dioxide levels on the north side of the A259

Marine Parade than anywhere in the High Street. It is too soon to confirm whether this is only a temporary change, but Nitrogen Dioxide readings in the High Street now all meet the national legal limits.

A full city-wide Air Quality report is scheduled for the November meeting.

The Parish Council has confirmed to officers that it has not formally taken a position regarding the removal or retention of the planter.

The project group including ward and parish councillors is due to meet in late October to consider options, including removing the planter or a left turn ban out of Park Road.

Parish Councillors will then review the impact of the planter and other measures at their next meeting in November.

I hope this provides some assurance for you regarding your concerns”.

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

(2) Reigate Road speeding

21.49 The Committee considered a deputation relating to resident concerns about speeding on Reigate Road.

21.50 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for the deputation and we appreciate that many residents are keen to see improvements to Reigate Road to reduce the impact of through traffic. As I’ve mentioned in a previous response, that we have had a lot of interest in similar measures across the city. To help us assess and prioritise these requests, officers are developing a prioritisation framework which will be presented to a meeting of this committee in the near future. We would very much like to consider improvements in future and I would like us to be able to address the concerns that have been raised but, unfortunately, there is a need for us to prioritise funding”.

21.51 Councillor Lloyd moved a motion to request an officer report on the matter.

21.52 Councillor Platts formally seconded the motion.

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

(3) Adoption of New TRO Amendment Mechanism in Support of Car-Free Development

21.54 The Committee considered a deputation relating to the council’s car free development policy.

21.55 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for presenting this deputation. Seeking to ensure that we can manage and reduce the impacts of increased vehicles on our streets is an important part of our overall transport strategy and planning policies.

The approach that has changed since January 2022 has arisen following local planning appeal decisions regarding the use of a planning condition to manage parking permit eligibility. This process will now be overseen by Parking Services via the ongoing Traffic

Regulation Order process but will still take account of the response to planning applications made by the council as the Highway Authority. Therefore, if the highway or parking impacts of a development are considered to require it, recommendations will be made regarding the eligibility for residents' parking permits. We are making it clearer that the removal of a planning condition through the planning permission does not automatically result in a change to a TRO".

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

(4) Clean Air Plan

21.57 The Committee considered a deputation requesting the council to take a number of actions to improve air quality in the city.

21.58 The Chair provided the following response:

"Thank you for presenting your deputation today on behalf of your colleagues. Your views as healthcare professionals about the impacts of poor air quality on public health are very welcome. They will also be shared by members of the council's Health & Wellbeing Board, which has received presentations from the council's Council Public Health and Air Quality officers on this topic.

As part of the plan, we will aim to bring forward interim targets, referencing 2021 World Health Organisation guidelines that are much more ambitious than current UK legislation. The plan includes many of the measures that you refer to - an Ultra Low Emission Zone, a citywide Smoke Control Area and alternative fuels for public transport, both for taxis and buses

Legislation and regulation for air quality is set nationally and the council will continue to work to within it. Seeking tighter controls would require concerted, widespread lobbying of the government, alongside additional resources to then provide sufficient enforcement.

The action plan is due to be reported to our next committee – and we will work hard to make the plan as robust as possible - and the responses and representations that we have received will be reflected in the plan that is presented. Thank you for putting forward your views today".

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

(5) Residents' Priorities for Elm Grove

21.60 The Committee considered a deputation relating to a number of traffic and anti-social parking issues in Elm Grove as well as the proposed Hanover and Tarnier Low Traffic Neighbourhood Proposals.

21.61 The Chair provided the following response:

"Thank you for your detailed deputation. I really appreciate your concern about traffic being pushed onto boundary roads. While evidence from around the country is varied it is not clear. For example, Hackney Council has seen a decrease in their traffic across all boundary roads. We will be monitoring data over the Low Traffic Neighbourhood very carefully.

You will of course be aware of the detailed work that you have all been contributing to as well as the extensive public consultation that has generated over 1300 responses to the survey questions. Officers are now working on analysing these over the next few weeks. Your range of questions and concerns will no doubt have been raised within the overwhelming number of responses that we have received from across the community. These will provide us with the basis on which to further inform and shape the design where necessary and bring back a revised proposal and plan on how to proceed to this committee.

We will continue to work with residents and stakeholders to ensure that we get the best mix of measures in the right locations within the budget that is available. The measures that your workshops have prioritised are all effective Liveable Neighbourhood measures to make Elm Grove safer and more people friendly and many will feature in the final design. Your offer of working together is appreciated and we are happy to work with you, along with other residents and stakeholders, as we develop the more detailed plans. I hope we can resolve your concerns to avoid delaying this fantastic opportunity for providing a comprehensive LTN in Hanover and Tarner that will deliver improvements for the whole area, which will also include Elm Grove and Queen's Park Road as integral parts of the scheme.

Disappointingly, there has been no announcement by the government on pavement parking since our last committee in June, and therefore the commitment that was made by the Chair then will be taken into account in further developing the design for the LTN to address this problem on Elm Grove. We consider this to be a priority and we will bring a TRO to a future committee”.

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

(6) Parking Zone V & S

21.63 The Committee considered a deputation requesting Carlyle Street remain in Parking Zone V.

21.64 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for bringing your deputation to this Committee. This proposal will be discussed later in the meeting under the parking schemes report agenda Item 27. It would be up to Members of this Committee to determine whether an amendment is required and agreed to recommendation 2.5 under Item 27 to either leave this road out of the overall change when advertising the Traffic Regulation Order considering other possible complaints from other residents or reconsult the whole area based on a new boundary not including Carlyle Street. The latter option would delay the parking scheme priority timetable as there are very tight deadlines so schemes outlined in the parking scheme report may not proceed as quickly as outlined in the timetable. Although the Roedean area scheme may not proceed if the recommendations are agreed at this Committee officer resources will also need to be diverted very soon to supporting with the implementation of verge parking controls in Elm Grove following the commitment made at a previous Committee meeting”.

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

22 ITEMS REFERRED FROM COUNCIL

(a) Petitions**(1) Clean Air Zone**

22.1 The Committee considered a petition referred from Full Council requesting the council enact a Clean Air Zone to improve air quality.

22.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your petition, it makes some very strong and valid points that highlight the pressing need to reduce vehicle emissions and improve air quality for the health of the whole city, but especially in locations where we know that there are levels that exceed legal limits. Air quality in the city is monitored and reported annually, so we therefore have a good understanding of what is changing, and we are seeing some overall improvements in air quality which is really encouraging news.

We have recently developed and published our draft Air Quality Action Plan for consultation. The results will be reported back to this committee later this year. It includes a number of measures and actions that are ongoing and planned between now and 2027. One of those is an Ultra-Low Emission Zone (known as a ULEZ) which aims to take the principle of the existing scheme in the city centre for buses and expand it to a wider area and for different types of vehicles. The plan recognises that an expanded ULEZ or a Zero Exhaust Zone could significantly cut transport emissions, especially in the busy central area.

We are aware of schemes that have been established in other cities. We will need to ensure that a scheme for the city achieves its objectives, maximises the benefits of reducing harmful emissions, and is affordable in terms of its business case for installation and maintenance. Looking carefully at how it could be set up and what types of charges are involved will be a key part of this. Officers are therefore working on a number of initial, technical aspects such as data and forecast modelling and funding opportunities, which are required to support the development of potential options”.

22.3 **Resolved-** That the Committee note the petition.

(b) Deputations**(1) New Accessible Foot and Cycle Bridge at Hove Station Quarter**

22.4 The Committee considered a deputation referred from Full Council requesting a new accessible foot and cycle bridge at Hove Station Quarter.

22.5 The Chair provided the following response:

“I think this is a great idea, but sadly at this moment in time there is no mandate from any council committee to seek a new footbridge across the railway, nor is there funding identified. It is, however, recognised that a feasibility study for such a bridge that demonstrated major benefits could potentially assist in future funding bids.

The spending of Section 106 funds should directly relate to providing for the impacts of the associated planning permission. To spend Section 106 money on design feasibility

work would be risky in terms of its speculative nature and there being no guarantee of securing the bridge.

If design feasibility work for the wider area clearly demonstrates the benefits of a new bridge and the council was minded to pursue this, it would be hoped that Moda Homes would jointly fund any work to assist its delivery, given the benefits it would have to the Sackville development”.

22.6 Councillor Bagaeen moved a motion to request an officer report on the matter.

22.7 Councillor Nemeth formally seconded the motion.

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

(2) Request to introduce parking restrictions in Nevill Avenue, Hove

22.9 The Committee considered a deputation referred from Full Council request the council introduce parking restrictions in Nevill Avenue, Hove.

22.10 The Chair provided the following response:

“Thank you for your deputation. In order to consider reconsulting Nevill Avenue for a residents parking scheme, strong support needs to be shown by residents not only in this road but the wider area. This would be considered when our next parking scheme priority timetable is agreed at the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee. Our current timetable goes up to 2025.

Nevill Avenue was included in the preliminary consultation for Zone P where the majority of respondents from this road voted against a scheme.

As parking schemes for individual roads are not considered as viable solutions we would advise that residents submit an area wide petition. This is how we gauge the strength of feeling for a scheme and which areas would like to be included”.

22.11 Councillor Bagaeen moved a motion to request an officer report on the matter.

22.12 Councillor Nemeth formally seconded the motion.

22.13 The Chair put the motion to the vote that failed.

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

23 MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(b) Questions

(1) Whiteways Lane between Rottingdean and Saltdean

23.1 Councillor Fishleigh put the following question:

“Whiteways Lane is a well-used path between Rottingdean and Saltdean which is very popular with walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

Unfortunately the path uneven and slippery in parts. Please would the council visit with a view to making improvements”.

23.2 The following written response was provided:

“Thank you for your question, Cllr Fishleigh. Whiteways Lane is recognised as an important link between Saltdean and Rottingdean to the strategic Falmer Road corridor in both the Rights of Way Improvement Plan and the Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan. These plans identify and prioritise routes to improve access provision for walkers, cyclists, horse riders and those with mobility difficulties. Both plans together ensure that city and countryside routes are joined up.

We do monitor the surface condition of routes and welcome reports of any issues. The Rights Of Way Officer has been made aware of your suggestion for refurbishment, and the route will be reviewed as part of our consideration of future priorities and possible upgrade.

The council's website also has a Rights of Way page, where there is a link to enable people to report any problems”.

(2) Vans and caravans at Black Rock

23.3 Councillor Fishleigh put the following question:

“Why does it seem to residents that the vans and caravans that stay overnight in the bus-only parking bays and paid-for bays don't receive parking tickets?”

23.4 The following written response was provided:

“The bus and coach parking bays at Black Rock are signed as operating from 10am to 6pm during which time payment to park is required and enforcement is carried out within these times and any vehicles parking illegally during this period are issued tickets. Outside of these restricted hours any vehicle can park there without payment”.

(3) Proactive sea water testing in Brighton & Hove

23.5 Councillor Fishleigh put the following question:

“Southern Water is working with Canterbury City Council and Havant Borough Council on a pilot project involving water quality testing buoys which give residents live updates on sea water pollution. Would BHCC please reach out to Southern Water to see if the trial can be extended into Brighton and, if not, investigate similar systems that could be used along the city's coast?”

23.6 The following written response was provided:

“The Leader of the Council chairs the local Water Quality Steering Group which includes representatives from the council, Surfers Against Sewage, the Environment Agency and Southern Water. The next meeting is scheduled at the end of September and officers will raise your request with Southern Water then”.

(4) Timescale for report on undercliff

23.7 Councillor Fishleigh put the following question:

“What is the process and timescales for researching and preparing a report about potential improvements to the Undercliff Walk?”

23.8 The following written response was provided:

“Although used and loved by many residents for walking and cycling the Undercliff is in fact classified as a sea defence. It was built to prevent coastal and cliff erosion and in doing so protects the A259 and adjacent properties from collapsing into the sea. The nature of the Undercliff at the base of the steep cliffs means that development of the area in terms of infrastructure is particularly complex and extremely expensive. Running services such as water and electricity would cost hundreds of thousands of pounds which is money the council just does not have. There is also limited useable space where infrastructure would not be at risk of damage from overtopping of shingle, waves or from chalk falls.

The council has made improvements in recent times where it has been possible to make use of the existing services. For example, Saltdean has a new beach shower and a new accessible beach boardwalk is due to be installed next month. The area outside the toilets has been resurfaced and new blue badge parking bays have been installed to enable those users who are less mobile to visit the seafront. In Rottingdean 7 new bike stands will shortly be installed next to the beach.

All of the litter bins from Brighton Marina to Ovingdean have been replaced with the new-style triple bins. These new bins have increased the capacity of litter bins along the Undercliff and provide residents and visitors with the option of on-the-go recycling. The public toilets at Saltdean Undercliff will undergo refurbishment this autumn following agreement of funds at Budget Council in February 2022. Funding options for refurbishing other toilets along the Undercliff continue to be explored.

A report considering further requests for improvements to the Undercliff will be presented at ET&S Committee when the preparatory work has been completed. This is likely to be early in the new year”.

(5) Speed Trials

23.9 Councillor Nemeth read the following question:

“Despite the great efforts of the organisers of the Brighton Speed Trials, there was huge disappointment again amongst motor-racing enthusiasts concerning the non-participation of motorcycles.

The decision to not allow motorcycles ultimately stems from a decision by the Auto-Cycle Union (ACU) to not grant a track licence following concerns about surface materials. Last year, there were concerns about the green cycle lane. This year, there were concerns over the type of white paint that has been used for line markings. The ACU has clearly stated that there are suitable types of white paint which are available for the job in question.

Given that this Council resolved to ensure that this event continues – with no excuses or caveats – please detail precisely what conversations and meetings took place (with dates) with the appropriate licensing authorities prior to the paint being administered”.

23.10 The Chair provided the following reply:

“Thank you for your question. You were advised by officers that as this question relates to events the question should have gone to TECC committee. The next TECC committee is on the 3rd November”.

23.11 Following a discussion between the Chair and Councillor Nemeth it was agreed to send a written response to the question which is as follows:

“Following approval at ETS committee to proceed with proposals to implement a dedicated cycle track along Madeira Drive plans were further developed. In February 2021 the plans were circulated to key stakeholders including Madeira Drive Event Organisers via our Events Team. During this period e-mail exchanges with many traders and event organisers took place and meetings were held on site. More specifically e-mail exchanges between the Speed Trial Event organiser and BHCC officers regarding the plans took place. In February 2021 a site meeting took place with the organiser of the Speed Trials to identify measures to ensure the layout was suitable. In March 2021 the plans were updated to incorporate change requests to respond to the needs of the event. These changes included removable signposts in the carriageway, removal of proposed buildouts at proposed crossing points to allow sufficient clearance for motor vehicles and the addition of extra safety bollards to protect the Concorde 2 building. In August 2021 Speed Trial organisers requested a further meeting with UK Motorsport and BHCC to detail highway changes and to prepare for the Licencing application. During this meeting the green surfacing specification was requested alongside skid resistance testing. This was circulated directly after the meeting to all attendees. During August BHCC officers were copied into an e-mail between Event Organisers and the Licencing Body detailing all required safety measures that had been put in place. On the lead up to the event all other works at the Dukes Mound end were stopped and temporary measures put in place to ensure the licenced event could take place. In December 2021 BHCC Events, Highways, Event Managers and Licence bodies attended a meeting to discuss previous events. Some concern was raised over the white lining with Event organisers offering to circulate the specification used on the Isle of Man. BHCC agreed to determine the specification of the existing white lining. In March 22 –July 22 the white lining specification was received by BHCC contractors and sent to a representative from the event organisation. The specification for the white lining laid at Madeira Drive by our experienced contractor are developed for use on all Local Highway roads and can be found Citywide”.

(6) Welcome Back Fund

23.12 Councillor Nemeth read the following question:

“A response to a written question at Full Council on 7th April 2022 confirmed broad funding arrangements for the five high streets to which the Welcome Back Fund applied. The project included both planting and street-cleaning elements. Please now provide a full breakdown of costings for each street along with an explanation as to why plants were picked that immediately died”.

23.13 The Chair provided the following reply:

“It’s not possible to provide a full breakdown of all costs for each street in the time available before this committee. The ordering of information according to street was not required by the government as financial reporting for the fund. The Welcome Back Funds were committed and reclaimed from government by 31st March 2022.

Government approved the city council’s plans, in consultation with local representatives, for funding to be spent on beautification such as planters, hanging baskets, floor and other surface vinyls, temporary signage and deep cleans of the high streets.

The total amount spent on local high streets was £132,858.25.

I am sorry to hear the comment that the plants died immediately. We did not receive any complaints or feedback regarding this at the time and I cannot respond further on this.”

23.14 Councillor Nemeth asked the following supplementary question:

“Will that information be sent soon?”

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

“It will take some time to go back through the £132,000 and split it down according to each street. If you would like that we can do it, but it will take quite some time”.

(7) City’s Flood Prevention Works

23.16 Councillor Nemeth read the following question:

“The Council’s main infrastructure response to the flood risk in Brighton & Hove has now concluded having only been half completed.

SCAPE, which was launched in 2017 after having been funded by an external grant, was planned to be rolled out over four phases between 2017 and 2020. However following council delays, only phases 1 and 2 (Darcey Drive and the top of Carden Avenue) have been delivered. Phases 3 and 4 (bottom of Carden Avenue and Norton Road) have been left incomplete with no indication as to whether or when they will ever be undertaken, causing concern from residents living in these flood prone areas.

Can the Chair inform the Committee of the reasons why this important project has been left incomplete and residents left in the dark and advise whether the Administration has any plans to complete the incomplete phases that might reassure the residents living in these areas?”

23.17 The Chair provided the following reply:

“The SCAPE project was a European 2-seas Interreg research project. This project had limited funding, so it was necessary to deliver a SuDS scheme to the available budget. While the SuDS scheme could not be completed to the lower end of Carden Avenue and Norton Road, the properties which had been identified at flood risk had property level protection provided in 2019/20 as part of the Property Level Protection programme. Whilst the full installation of the SuDS raingardens at Carden Avenue and Darcy Drive was incomplete, the scheme should be considered a success.

During the recent period of extreme rainfall, no properties in the Carden Avenue area reported flooding.

The Flood Risk Management Team are looking at applying the lessons learned from the Carden Avenue pilot to deliver SuDS opportunities around the city”.

23.18 Councillor Nemeth put the following supplementary question:

Beyond the four areas outlined in the SCAPE project, does the Council have a further priority list of areas in the city that need flood prevention works undertaken and if not, will the Chair commence the work to draw up a list as soon as possible?"

23.19 The following reply was provided on behalf of the Chair:

"It is planned at the moment that a new annual report will come to committee in November outlining where the new ones will be".

(d) Notices of Motion

(1) Rubbish Collection

23.20 Councillor Nemeth moved the following Notice of Motion:

This Committee:

1. Notes the financial offer of £859,000 per annum to settle the refuse strikes of 5-19 October 2021 and the lack of any significant improvement in the normal refuse and recycling collection service since then, including the continued issues of missed collections all over the city and low recycling rates; and
2. Resolves to call for a report detailing how there will be an improvement to the service for residents.

23.21 Councillor Bagaen formally seconded the Notice of Motion.

23.22 Councillor Wilkinson moved the following amendment to the Notice of Motion as shown in bold italics and strikethrough:

2. ***Notes Labour's motion to Council in February, 'Council Service Delivery', and offer of working cross-party to help resolve long-standing issues with the delivery of basic services such as rubbish and recycling collections; and***
3. Resolves to call for a report detailing how there will be an improvement to the service for residents.

23.23 Councillor Platts formally seconded the amendment.

23.24 The Chair put the amendment to the vote that passed.

23.25 **Resolved-**

This Committee:

1. Notes the financial offer of £859,000 per annum to settle the refuse strikes of 5-19 October 2021 and the lack of any significant improvement in the normal refuse and

recycling collection service since then, including the continued issues of missed collections all over the city and low recycling rates; and

2. Notes Labour's motion to Council in February, 'Council Service Delivery', and offer of working cross-party to help resolve long-standing issues with the delivery of basic services such as rubbish and recycling collections; and
 3. Resolves to call for a report detailing how there will be an improvement to the service for residents.
- (2) Failure to Keep Pavements Safe and Tidy

23.26 Councillor Nemeth moved the following Notice of Motion:

This Committee resolves to:

1. Note the ineffectiveness of the Council's current policy of keeping pavements free of weeds;
2. Recognise that the Council has a statutory duty to keep pavements free of weeds; and
3. Requests an officer report which considers reversing the Administration's unilateral decision of 27th June 2019, and subsequent ETS Committee decision of 26th November 2019 to stop weeding the pavements effectively, with options for a new policy that is both cost-effective and environmentally friendly that can be developed and trialled around the city.

23.27 Councillor Bagaeen formally seconded the Notice of Motion.

23.28 Councillor Platts moved the following amendment to the Notice of Motion as shown in bold italics and as struckthrough below:

This Committee resolves to:

1. Note the ineffectiveness of the Council's current ***efforts in*** ~~policy~~ of keeping pavements free of weeds;
3. ***Notes Labour's budget amendments that secured additional funding to tackle weeds on pavements across the city;***
4. Requests an officer report ~~which considers reversing the Administration's unilateral decision of 27th June 2019, and subsequent ETS Committee decision of 26th November 2019 to stop weeding the pavements effectively,~~ with options for a new ***alternative methods of weed removal*** ~~policy~~ that ***are*** is both cost-effective and environmentally friendly that can be developed and trialled around the city, ***and for ongoing consideration of other methods.***

23.29 Following a debate by the committee, the Chair put the amendment to the vote that was passed.

23.30 Resolved-

This Committee resolves to:

1. Note the ineffectiveness of the Council's current efforts in keeping pavements free of weeds;
2. Recognise that the Council has a statutory duty to keep pavements free of weeds; and
3. Notes Labour's budget amendments that secured additional funding to tackle weeds on pavements across the city;
4. Requests an officer report with options for alternative methods of weed removal that are both cost-effective and environmentally friendly that can be developed and trialled around the city, and for ongoing consideration of other methods

24 APPLICATION FOR A DEFINITIVE MAP MODIFICATION ORDER, BENFIELD VALLEY, HOVE**Resolved-**

- 1) That Committee agrees to make an Order on the basis that the evidence referred to in this report shows that the Claimed Routes, as defined in the report, can at least be reasonably alleged to subsist in accordance with Section 53(3)(c) (i) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

25 HIGHWAY WINTER MAINTENANCE REPORT**Resolved-**

- 1) That Committee agrees to adopt the Highway Winter Service Policy as detailed in Appendix 1 of this report.

26 PARKING POLICIES UPDATE REPORT

- 26.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that updated the committee on the amendments made to the Customer Services section of the Parking Policies agreed at this Committee in June 2021. Committee approval was required due to the changes being proposed.
- 26.2 In response to a question from Councillor Platts, it was explained that alignment of permits on housing land was something being reviewed, and it was hoped an update would be forthcoming soon.
- 26.3 In response to a comment from Councillor Fowler, it was clarified that changes to the online application process would be coming via updates to the council's digital services and the feedback was appreciated.

26.4 Resolved-

- 1) That Committee approves the new Parking Policy statement with the additions and amendments highlighted in red to the Customer Service policy within the Parking Services Policy (Appendix A) taking into consideration the summary in this report.

27 PARKING SCHEME UPDATE REPORT

- 22.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that updated the Committee on the progress of recent resident parking scheme consultations.

- 22.2 Councillor Hills moved the following motion to amend the recommendations as shown in strikethrough below:

- 2.5 That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments, agrees to proceed to the next stage of advertising a Traffic Regulation Order for the Top Triangle Area (Arnold Street, Baxter Street, ~~Carlyle Street~~, Cromwell Street, Lynton Street) as detailed in this report so the area is moved into Zone S, Monday to Friday, 11am to Noon and 6pm to 7pm.

- 22.3 The Chair accepted the motion as late.

- 22.4 Councillor Lloyd formally seconded the motion.

- 22.5 The Chair put the motion to the vote that passed.

- 22.6 The Chair put the recommendations as amended to the vote that were approved.

22.7 Resolved-

- 1) That the Committee having taken account of the low response rate to the consultation agrees to end the consultation process with no controlled parking zone being implemented to the Roedean area.
- 2) That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments, agrees to proceed to the next stage of advertising a Traffic Regulation Order for the Hallyburton Road area as detailed in this report for a light touch parking scheme Monday to Friday 11am to 12pm and 6pm to 7pm.
- 3) That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments, agrees to proceed to the next stage with a detailed design for a full scheme in the smaller area within Hollingdean.
- 4) That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments, agrees to proceed to the next stage of the detailed design for the Withdean Road area.
- 5) That the Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and comments, agrees to proceed to the next stage of advertising a Traffic Regulation Order for the Top Triangle Area (Arnold Street, Baxter Street, Cromwell Street, Lynton Street)

as detailed in this report so the area is moved into Zone S, Monday to Friday, 11am to Noon and 6pm to 7pm.

28 PARKING FEES & CHARGES UPDATE

Resolved-

- 1) That Committee agrees that in relation to variable emissions charging further data should be collated to facilitate the development of proposals which should be reported to Committee in November 2023.
- 2) That Committee agrees that officers should report back to this Committee in November 2023 on the way forward for motorcycle charging.
- 3) That Committee notes the report in relation to free parking and that any changes to any area must be considered as part of the annual fees & charges process.

29 A259: WALKING, CYCLING AND ACCESSIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS

- 29.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that outlines the results of the Traffic Regulation Order consultation required for alterations to the Public Highway in order to implement the Active Travel Funded A259 Walking, Cycling and Accessibility Improvement Scheme that was previously approved at ETS committee on the 15th March 2022. The report also presents the responses we received from the consultation.
- 29.2 In response to questions from Councillor Platts, it was explained that there would be dedicated safe routes along the route to mitigate conflicts, the absence of a servicing access point at the King Alfred car park was an oversight and would be remedied. More time on blue badge parking bays would be investigated but it was important to ensure adequate turnover in these bays.
- 29.3 Councillor Nemeth and Councillor Bagaeeen requested their vote against the recommendation be noted in the record.

29.4 Resolved-

- 1) That Committee agrees Officers have suitably addressed the objections received as part of the consultation.
- 2) That Committee authorises officers to commence the construction phase and to procure the Works Contract under the authority of the Executive Director.

30 TRANSPORT FOR THE SOUTH EAST'S STRATEGIC INVESTMENT PLAN – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

- 30.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that outlined the draft response submitted by officers on behalf of the Council to the Transport for the South East draft Strategic Investment Plan.

30.2 In response to a comment from Councillor Bagaeen, the Chair stated that they had made the point about the inclusivity and diversity of its membership a number of times and would continue to do so.

30.3 Resolved-

- 1) That Committee notes the progress being made on developing Transport for the South East's Strategic Investment Plan.
- 2) That Committee notes the Council's consultation response set out in Appendix 1, which was submitted on 12th September 2022.

31 MOVING TRAFFIC OFFENCES

31.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that set out the context of the Moving Traffic Offences as the government has provided the powers by enacting part 6 of the 2004 Traffic Management Act (TMA) and sought approval to conduct the necessary consultation as set out in the Statutory Guidance and to formally apply for the powers.

31.2 In response to queries from Councillor Nemeth, it was explained that pavement parking enforcement could only be applied by the authority in areas where there are restrictions in place. This was new legislation that applied to moving traffic that was a separate issue to pavement parking.

31.3 In response to a query from Councillor Platts, it was confirmed that signage would be reviewed at every location very carefully.

31.4 In reply to a question from Councillor Bagaeen, it was clarified that box junctions were not currently included at this first stage that was more strategic about powers that could be enacted but was something under review.

31.5 Councillor Bagaeen and Nemeth requested that their vote against recommendation 2.2 be noted.

31.6 Resolved-

- 1) That Committee approve that a consultation, as set out in the statutory guidance, is conducted indicating the powers that will be sought and the rationale for the application.
- 2) That the authority is delegated to the Executive Director for Economy, Environment & Culture to consider the consultation responses and apply for the powers if they consider it appropriate.

32 GARDNER STREET AND REGENT STREET TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

The item was deferred

**33 GARDNER STREET AND REGENT STREET TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER
EXEMPT CATEGORY 2**

34 ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

34.1 No items were referred to Full Council for information.

The meeting concluded at 7.55pm

