

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

4.00pm 15 JANUARY 2013

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Davey (Chair), Councillor Follett (Deputy Chair), Cox (Opposition Spokesperson), Janio, Kennedy, Mitchell, Phillips, Robins, G Theobald and West

Other Members present: Councillors Hawtree, Lepper

PART ONE

40. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

40(a) Declarations of substitutes

40.1 There were none.

40(b) Declarations of interest

40.2 Councillor Theobald declared a pecuniary interest in Item 51 related to his ownership of property in the specified area and would leave the Chamber during consideration of the item.

40.3 Councillor Janio declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 54 as a member of his family held a traders permit.

40(c) Exclusion of press and public

40.4 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).

40.5 **RESOLVED-** That the press and public not be excluded.

41. MINUTES

41.1 **RESOLVED-** That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 27 November 2012 be approved and signed as the correct record.

42. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

42.1 The Chair relayed that he had no specific Communications.

43. CALL OVER

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

- Item 47- Brighton Station Gateway
- Item 48- Seven Dials Improvement Project- consultation results and way forward
- Item 49- Amex Community Stadium residents parking proposals- consideration of informal consultation results
- Item 50- Resident Parking Scheme Consultation results
- Item 51- Old Town Traffic Regulation Orders
- Item 52- Brighton & Hove 20mph Limit- formal SLO consultation
- Item 53- City Wide Parking Review
- Item 54- Parking Fees and Charges Update
- Item 55- Highways Fees & Charges 2013/14

43.2 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 56- Introduction of payment for parking by mobile phone

43.3 The Chair proposed that Item 51 and Item 52 be brought forward in the agenda order and considered as the first and second items. The Committee was in agreement with the proposal.

44. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(a) Petitions

(i) Implementation of the 20mph Phase 1- Amgad Mechaeli

44.1 The petitioner did not attend the meeting therefore, the response was provided in writing and is set out below.

44.2 'No decision has as yet been taken as to whether or not Phase 1 of the 20mph scheme will be implemented. The scheme is due to be debated and considered at this evenings meeting.

Consultation with the taxi trade has been undertaken on the detailed proposals for the Phase 1 of the 20mph scheme.

Meetings were held between officers and representatives of the Taxi Trade to discuss the detailed proposals of the phase 1 area on, 26th November, 10th December 2012, and 9th January 2013. I personally attended the meeting in December along with my deputy Cllr Follett, I also attended the January meeting.

In addition officers attended the Taxi Forum on 6th December where the Phase 1 proposals were discussed in detail and issues raised by members of the forum were considered and noted for investigation.

The concerns and objections of the taxi trade have been recorded and investigated by Officers and will be considered as part of the report being presented to this Committee'.

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

(d) Deputations

44.4 Mr Crowhurst presented a Deputation on behalf of the North Laine Community Association that set out their objection to the re-location of a taxi rank on Fredrick Place under the Brighton Station Gateway proposals.

44.5 The Chair provided the following response:

'Thank you for your Deputation Mr Crowhurst. We do understand residents concerns. I know that it may seem strange that the current proposal features a potential taxi location that was not included on a list of possible sites in 2011.

As I'm sure everyone will agree, finding a suitable location for taxis in the vicinity of Brighton Station is a challenge. Over the years there have been discussions about alternative locations. Various potential locations have been suggested – some more viable than others. The analysis you refer to from 2011 sought to gather all the options suggested by that point and sort the impractical ideas from those that had merit for further consideration.

Frederick Place had not been considered as an option at that point and so was not included in the analysis. The possibility of a taxi rank in Frederick Place was established in early 2012 and was included in the public consultation that ended in June 2012.

I am confident that there is a general recognition of the need to improve the environment around Brighton Station. As part of the process of achieving this goal, we have a collective responsibility to identify the best possible arrangement for taxis, and to do that our decision has to be based on the merits of an option rather than the date it was proposed.

For the sake of clarity and fairness, I should also state that the most recent consultation process has seen some members of the North Laine community express support for or ambivalence to the Frederick Place proposal. Like any proposal there are views for and against.

The recent consultation process has seen a number of concerns raised about the implications of placing the taxi rank in Frederick Place. Difficult decisions around the future of the station need to be made with care. At this stage I do not feel that officers are yet able to provide definitive answers to all the concerns raised during consultation. On that basis we asked officers to carry out more work to study in detail the traffic movements around the North Laine area which as you are aware they have been doing over the last few weeks.

The recommendation before the committee today is that the project team should have more time to complete that work and consider and provide definitive answers to the concerns raised by residents. That to me seems a sensible way forward. That will allow a future Transport Committee to make an informed decision as to the best way forward. Whilst not the definitive response I know that you are seeking I hope it does provide some reassurance to residents'.

44.6 **RESOLVED-** That the Deputation be noted.

45. ITEMS REFERRED FROM FULL COUNCIL

(a) Petitions

(i) Side view pedestrian lights- Ms Paynter

45.1 The Committee considered an e-petition signed by 83 people urging the Council to reconsider the roll-out of side-view pedestrian lights for a safer system. The e-petition had been referred from the Full Council meeting of 13 December 2013.

45.2 The Chair provided the following response:

'As far as I am aware there is no evidence to show that the old far side/pelican lanterns are safer than nearside/puffin lanterns. In fact all of the evidence to date indicates that puffin lanterns are safer as it means people crossing the road need to look towards the oncoming traffic rather than across the road, so they are more aware of potential conflict before they cross. Returning to farside/pelican lanterns will not make any extra time available for pedestrians to cross and will actually lead to increased delays for all road users including pedestrians as these lights are not responsive to useage in their timings Side view only or nearside/puffin lanterns are installed in accordance with the current design advice from the Department for Transport (DfT). With that evidence in mind it would be difficult for the council to defend a decision to ignore the DfT advice on the grounds of safety. We would be left in a vulnerable position legally in the event of any legal action with the possibility of officers/councillors being held individually accountable for changes to the crossing lights. It is possible for the council to ignore this advice if they wish but they will then be called upon to explain that decision in the event of an accident'.

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

(iii) Cromwell Road parking restrictions- Ms Clarke

45.4 The Committee considered a petition signed by 222 people requesting the amendment of parking restrictions and the installation of a zebra crossing to improve safety in the area which was close to a school. The petition had been referred from the Full Council meeting of 13 December 2013.

45.5 The Chair provided the following response:

'Thank you for your petition regarding putting loading bays in Cromwell Road.

I will ask officers to investigate current parking demands and loading requirements in the road and consider the way forward.

I can confirm that the pedestrian crossing request for Cromwell Road to enable better pedestrian access to the Surestart Nursery has been included on the pedestrian crossing request list.

It will therefore be included in the annual assessment 2013/3014 which usually takes place between April and June. The results of the assessment will enable us to determine its relative priority in the 2013/2014 priority list.

This assessment forms part of a new council-approved methodology to determine the priority pedestrian locations. The methodology uses a points scoring system to enable wide-ranging assessment, taking into account both social and environmental factors as well as collision history. Points are awarded for categories such as access to services, green spaces and other trip attractors, road speeds, vehicle and pedestrian movements, accessibility for mobility impaired pedestrians and routes to school.

Assessments are taken annually and the results are published on the Council's website, offering a fair and robust approach to the provision of pedestrian crossing points.

Officers will be in touch regarding the loading bay and whilst the pedestrian crossing assessment will come to this committee later in the year'.

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

(iii) Seven Dials Improvement Project- Dials North West Community Association

45.7 The Committee considered a petition signed by 1384 people request the Council to reject the current Seven Dials Improvement proposals which may lead to traffic being diverted onto residential streets. The e-petition had been referred from the Full Council meeting of 13 December 2013.

45.8 The Chair provided the following response:

'Proposals for improvements to the Seven Dials area have been subject to extensive public consultation and were informed by workshop sessions with local people before the consultation took place. The primary aim of the scheme is to improve the road safety problem that currently exists, which consistently means Seven Dials is one of the most dangerous areas in the city.

In response to genuine concerns about displacement of traffic into residential streets and the negative response to this element of the consultation, proposals for changes to traffic flow in Vernon Terrace and Bath St have been removed from the wider scheme. This will allay the concerns of many residents in that area.

The response to the main proposals for the roundabout has been overwhelmingly positive, with respondents voting 2 to 1 in favour of the changes. We acknowledge that there are still concerns about possible rat running in the area to the North West of the Dials, and in light of this officers have undertaken extensive traffic modelling which has confirmed that the proposed changes will not have a significant impact on the capacity of the roundabout. It is considered, therefore, that the likelihood of rat running is low.

However, detailed monitoring of traffic levels in 19 surrounding residential streets is currently being undertaken and would be repeated after any scheme has been introduced. If any road is found to have experienced a significant increase in traffic

flows, then we have made a commitment to work with local residents to address the problems.

Following the debate and the recommendation at Full Council officers presented the results of the modelling and the consultation at a well attended public meeting on 17th December. That meeting was attended by 5 members of the Transport Committee.

The proposals are on today's agenda so there will be an opportunity for members to discuss the scheme in detail before of making a final decision on whether to proceed'.

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

46. MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

(c) Letters

(i) Councillor Lepper- Extension to the Area J resident parking scheme

46.1 Councillor Lepper presented a Letter requesting the Transport Committee consider the views of the residents of Hollingdean & Stanmer ward about the proposed extension of the Area J resident parking scheme.

46.2 The Chair provided the following response:

'I see that your letter deals firstly with issues inside the proposed Area J extension and secondly with the possible effects on residents living outside the proposed scheme. The report at agenda item 50 deals with your concerns within the proposed scheme and Mr Field also wrote a detailed response to you in November last year.

It was agreed at Environment Cabinet Member meeting in October 2010 that a number of urgent areas proceed to consultation due to requests from local residents supported by ward councillors and the fact that detailed designs already existed for these areas. This included the London Road Area J northward extension.

At the same time a Citywide Parking Review would look at displacement and other aspects of residents parking.

The review report is agenda item 53 and sets out recommendations on the future direction of residents parking schemes and a new scheme timetable.

During the consultation period officers attended community meetings in the Hollingdean and Fiveways areas but support was only expressed for consultation on residents parking in the Preston Park area, nor am I aware of any correspondence received from the Hollingbury area.

There will be a further opportunity for residents to make representations about the proposed scheme at the traffic order stage should the report at item 50 be approved'.

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

(ii) Councillors Janio and Barnett- Hangelton Link Road

46.4 Councillor Janio presented a Letter co-signed by Councillor Barnett regarding safety measures on the Hangelton Link road near the roundabout at its junction with Fox Way.

46.5 The Chair provided the following response:

'A new methodology for assessing requests for pedestrian crossings was developed under the previous administration and approved at Environment, Transport and Sustainability Cabinet Member Meeting on 26th May 2011. The new system was developed following an Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee (ECSOSC) review.

Essentially what this means is that we now have a point's based system that will be used to assess and compare all requests for new crossings, resulting in a priority list that will enable us to implement those crossings that will deliver the greatest benefit to residents.

We carryout assessments on an annual basis so that we can respond to residents and members requests for crossing points displaying a relatively proactive approach to dealing with crossing requests.

Crossing location number 34 was actually assessed on Fox Way directly adjacent to Hangleton Link and was requested by residents wanting to improve access to bus stops along this route. Officers have recently met with ward members to discuss the potential to improve crossings over the Hangleton Link roundabout to improve access for school children and I'm pleased to inform you that this request has been included on our request list and will be assessed in 2013 as part of the annual crossing request assessments.

In terms on the variable messages signs you refer to, I can inform you that they are working and are used to inform motorists of events or incidence that may effect journey times into the city as and when required and are therefore not on permanently.

Hangleton Link road is not identified as a priority under the Safer Routes to School programme as this programme uses collision history to prioritise those areas of the city where the need is greatest. Fortunately there is no collision history at this location'.

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

(d) Notices of Motion

(i) Impact of parking charges on the local economy- Conservative Group

47.4 Councillor Cox presented a Notice of Motion that requested several measures and proposals in relation to parking charges in the city. Amongst others, these included measures regarding local businesses and traders and options for future use of Norton Road car park.

47.5 The Chair provided the following response:

'The detailed modelling of different parking charge levels requested fell outside of the scope of the city wide parking review consultation which is now complete. Further work in this area would require substantial additional allocation of resources
However the report does deal with the general principle of the effect of parking controls and the level of parking charges in section 3.24.1 and references two current research papers in the field. These have been made available to members. There would be little benefit in duplicating this work.

The parking fees and charges report, outlines a real terms decrease in the cost of parking is to be delivered with the proposal to freeze on-street parking prices in most areas aligned to some decreases in others areas, these have been agreed in consultation with local businesses.

It also includes proposals to meet inflationary budget increases in off-street parking and permits whilst retaining the ethos outlined in the Local Transport Plan and in the parking review presented to cabinet in November 2011.

The issues of Norton Road and trader permits are covered in the report itself or will be picked up in the introduction by officers'.

47.6 Councillor Cox stated it would be churlish not to recognise decreases in trader's areas after campaigns however; these had to be recognised in the context of the increases of 2011/12. He stated his belief that Norton Road be adapted to a pay and display car park.

47.7 **RESOLVED-** That the Notice of Motion be noted.

47. OLD TOWN TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

47.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that presented the comments and objections received in relation to the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders in the Old Town area of Brighton.

47.2 Councillor Mitchell thanked officers for providing an informative briefing. She stated that whilst the project had good intentions to improve the local environment, there had been significant objections from local business and the taxi trade regarding such issues as loading and parking bays as well as objections from residents at the top of East Street. Councillor Mitchell supplemented that the cost of the necessary public inquiry could not be justified in the current economic climate. She believed that approval be delayed subject to further efforts to resolve the objections and a report be brought back to Committee at a later date.

47.3 Councillor Cox stated that he would like to see further pedestrianisation into East Street. He stated that he found it perplexing that democratically elected officials could not authorise the measures and that authorisation would be dependent on the approval of an Independent Inspector. Councillor Cox supplemented that he believed the cost of the Inquiry could not be justified.

47.4 Councillor West relayed that this was an important issue that had already been considered and approved in principal by the Committee. He believed that it would be to the merit of the entire city to approve the proposals which could have the added benefit of improving tourism in the city.

47.5 Councillor Robins agreed with comments previously made that the cost of a public inquiry could not be justified. He added that he did not feel there was an urgent need to modify the area.

47.6 Councillor Mitchell asked if consideration had been given to amending the designated loading times which would remove the need for a public inquiry.

- 47.7 The Project Manager replied that this could only happen where loading would be restricted between 7am and 10am and between 4pm and 7pm. Such a small timeframe would not achieve the objectives sought in the overall Old Town scheme.
- 47.8 Councillor Follett stated that it was unfortunate that the proposals would need to be considered by a Public Inquiry. However, he believed the Committee needed to look at the wider picture. Specifically, that Brighton was the sixth fastest growing tourism location and the proposals would help maintain and improve this. In addition, Councillor Follett felt that consideration should be given to the heritage status of the area affected by the proposals and the associated environmental benefit the scheme would provide.
- 47.9 The Chair relayed that his first involvement in local politics had concerned the pedestrianisation of George Street, Hove. This had been a similar scenario as the proposed Old Town scheme. Despite apprehension at the time, the implementation of pedestrianisation measures in George Street had been realised to the benefit of local resident, business and the wider Brighton and Hove area. The Chair believed benefits would also be realised from the Old Town proposals and, whilst the need for a public inquiry was unfortunate, he believed it to be a necessary investment.
- 47.10 Councillor Janio asked if there was a risk the public inquiry would not rule in the authorities favour.
- 47.11 The Head of City Infrastructure stated that there extensive work had been conducted to address concerns about the scheme and the project design was to a high standard. On this basis, he believed a public inquiry would find in the authorities favour.
- 47.12 The Chair then put the recommendations to a vote with the following results:

47.13 RESOLVED-

1. That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following order;
 - a) Brighton & Hove (Boyces Street) (Prohibition of Driving) Order 20** (TRO-21a 2012)

For: 9
Against:0
2. That the Committee authorises Officers to request an Independent Inspector to hold a public inquiry into the following orders:
 - a) Brighton & Hove (Brills Lane) (Prohibition of Driving) Order 20** (TRO-21b-2012)
 - b) Brighton & Hove (East Street) (Prohibition of Driving) Order 20** (TRO-21c-2012)
 - c) Brighton & Hove (Prince Albert Street) (Prohibition of Driving) Order 20** (TRO-21d-2012)

- d) Brighton & Hove (Ship Street) (Prohibition of Driving and One-Way Traffic) Order 20** (TRO-21e-2012)
- e) Brighton & Hove (Old Town) (Weight Restriction) Order 20** (TRO-21f-2012)
- f) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.** 20** (TRO-21g-2012)
- g) Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.** 20** (TRO-21h-2012)

For: 5

Against: 4

Note: Councillor Theobald was not present during discussion or voting on the item having declared a pecuniary interest.

48. BRIGHTON AND HOVE 20MPH LIMIT - FORMAL SLO CONSULTATION

- 48.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that addressed the comments and objections relating to the draft Speed Limit Orders (SLO) that outlined proposals for the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in central Brighton and Hove as Phase 1 of a proposed city wide roll out.
- 48.2 Councillor Robins formally moved an additional recommendation (2.3) from the Labour & Co-Operative Group as follows:
 - 2.3 *Subject to the above orders at 2.1, remove all A roads and B roads where they form part of the city's main bus network from Phase 1 of the 20mph scheme to reflect the recommendations in the Report of the 20mph speed limits/zones Scrutiny Panel and in line with submissions from the Bus Company and Taxi Trade.*
- 48.3 Councillor Mitchell formally seconded the motion. Councillor Mitchell stated that concerns identified at the previous Committee regarding the taxi trade and bus company were still unresolved. Councillor Mitchell raised her concern of the potential for anti-social behaviour towards taxi drivers whose passengers may not be aware of the new limits and may think drivers were deliberately driving slowly to increase fares. Councillor Mitchell added her worries for safety at bus stops at night with a less frequent service. Councillor Mitchell supplemented that whilst she appreciated the road safety issues noted, and the simplification within the scheme as proposed, she believed that the public transport system and safety issues should not be compromised. The Labour & Co-Operative motion would remove roads such as Sackville Road and the seafront routes to ensure this. In addition, Councillor Mitchell noted the Scrutiny Panel recommendations of 2010 that stated 20mph limits should be introduced on residential streets in "clusters" not a blanket scheme.
- 48.4 The Chair asked for clarification on the specific roads the Labour & Co-Operative motion would remove.

- 48.5 Councillor Mitchell replied that, as the motion stated, this would be all A roads and some B roads used by the public transport network. The detail of specific roads would be undertaken by technical officers.
- 48.6 The Acting Assistant Head of Law clarified that the motion was correct legally and that officers would be able to identify and implement specific roads should the motion be passed.
- 48.7 Councillor West stated that he believed the motion was ineffective as some B roads already had 20mph limits. Agreeing the motion would mean increasing the limits on those roads which was illogical. Councillor West relayed that of 3,600 respondents to the consultation, 55% were in favour of implementation and, importantly, Sussex Police had not stated any objection to the scheme. Councillor West added that the average speed of traffic in the Phase 1 area was 24mph so 20mph would not be a significant reduction and that 70-80% of journey time in the city was spent at junctions or traffic lights and 'smoother' transit arising from driving at 20mph could improve traffic flow and air quality. Councillor West highlighted that 43% of pedestrian road casualties and 48% of cycle accidents in the city occurred within the area identified for the Phase 1 scheme. The Scrutiny Panel of 2010 had stated that "vulnerable road users need to be protected" and he believed the proposals within the report would ensure this. Councillor West stated that the scheme would necessitate coherency and consistency which the proposed Phase 1 area would deliver. Councillor West did not agree that A roads and some B roads could be exempt from the scheme.
- 48.8 Councillor Theobald stated that, just as the Brighton Station Gateway scheme had been deferred on the basis of concerns raised, so should any decision on the 20mph scheme. He added that he did not believe there was sufficient support for a blanket scheme and that a 'cluster' scheme would be more popular. Councillor Theobald agreed with the concerns raised regarding taxi passengers and safety at bus stops at night. However, he added that he could not support the Labour & Co-Operative motion as he believed a scheme in that form would cost more to implement due to the need for more signage and a list of roads was not present.
- 48.9 Councillor Follett stated that it was necessary that the scheme was coherent. He noted that there was no evidence of community safety problems arising from such schemes but there was evidence that road safety showed significant improvement.
- 48.10 Councillor Phillips stated she believed the proposals would not only improve road safety but enhance the environment and surroundings. Councillor Phillips noted that a recent study demonstrated over 60% support for such schemes with that support significantly comprised of women, young people and those of pensionable age.
- 48.11 Councillor Cox stated that he supported the scheme in principle on the basis of safety. However, he had misgivings that the taxi trade and bus company did not support the proposals. Councillor Cox stated that he had concerns for bus services in the city and night journeys in particular. Councillor Cox commented that recommendation 2.2 provided scope for monitoring and remedial action. However, he stated that he could not support the Labour & Co-Operative motion as it was not costed specifically regarding the additional signage required.

48.12 Councillor Janio noted that all three Conservative Party Councillors present at the Committee had campaigned for 20mph limits in their wards. Councillor Janio relayed his concern that the Scrutiny Panel recommendation for 'cluster' 20mph areas appeared to have been rejected because of the higher cost of implementation, particularly signage. Councillor Janio also noted that similar schemes implemented in Plymouth and Oxford may be reversed because they had not been effective. He asked that because of the issues divisiveness and lack of overwhelming support, any decision should be postponed and returned to once the Green Party had included the issue in their manifesto and were successful in an election.

48.13 The Chair replied that the Green Party had included the implementation of 20mph limits in their manifesto for the 2011 local elections.

48.14 Councillor Robins relayed that he made a living through driving and had never been convinced that 20mph limits improved safety. He stated that there were parallels with this scheme and the parking charges in London Road where he felt concerns had not been listened to and the scheme implemented regardless. Councillor Robins stated that the taxi trade and bus company were telling the Committee that the scheme would not work and they should listen.

48.15 The Chair replied that equal weight should be given to the very high number of residents who had addressed the Committee and completed the consultation requesting a 20mph scheme.

48.16 Councillor Theobald moved the following motion on behalf of the Conservative Group:

That the item is deferred subject to further consultation with taxi drivers and further details on the roads affected by the removal of all A roads and some B roads from the scheme

48.17 Councillor Mitchell formally seconded the motion.

48.18 The Chair put the motion moved by Councillor Theobald to the vote with the following result:

For: 5

Against: 5

48.19 Therefore, the motion was not carried

48.20 The Chair then put the following motion moved by Councillor Robins to the vote with the following result:

2.3 Subject to the above orders at 2.1, remove all A roads and B roads where they form part of the city's main bus network from Phase 1 of the 20mph scheme to reflect the recommendations in the Report of the 20mph speed limits/zones Scrutiny Panel and in line with submissions from the Bus Company and Taxi Trade.

For: 2

Against: 5
Abstentions: 3

48.21 Therefore, the motion was not carried.

48.22 The Chair then put each of the recommendations to the vote.

48.23 **RESOLVED-**

1. That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Committee approves as advertised the following orders
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 1, Area 1) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-22a-2012)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 1, Area 2) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-22b-2012)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 1, Area 3) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-22c-2012)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 1, Area 4) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-22d-2012)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 1, Area 5) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-22e-2012)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 1, Area 6) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-22f-2012)
 - Brighton & Hove (Phase 1, Area 7) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20** (TRO-22g-2012)

For: 8
Against: 0
Abstentions: 2

2. It is recommended that, if the above orders are approved by the Committee, a comprehensive monitoring programme accompany and follow the implementation of the 20mph speed limits in the Phase 1 area and that should such monitoring indicate that the introduction of the reduced speed limit has had a significant negative impact in line with objections raised, that a report be brought to the Committee seeking approval for remedial actions

For: 8
Against: 0
Abstentions: 2

49. BRIGHTON STATION GATEWAY

- 49.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that outlined feedback from the recent consultation on the preferred option for Brighton Station Gateway.
- 49.2 The Chair commended the report author for his continuing work on engagement with the local community and traders regarding the scheme.

- 49.3 Councillor Theobald also praised the report author for his engagement and the briefings he had provided to his party. Councillor Theobald noted that he supported the recommendations to delay work to conduct further work on what were extremely difficult issues.
- 49.4 Councillor Mitchell also acclaimed the report author for his work on the project and for the briefings provided to her party throughout the process. Councillor Mitchell asked if there could be a negative impact on traffic flow if work at Seven Dials and the Station Gateway were carried out simultaneously.
- 49.5 The Project Officer provide assurance that the traffic officers worked closely as a team and had carried out traffic modelling work to ensure this would not be the case.
- 49.6 As a ward councillor for the area, Councillor West thanked residents and traders that had contributed to the consultation and informally on the project. He noted this was a big project in a compact residential area and accordingly, sometimes concerns would be realised at a late stage. Councillor West supported the delay in order to make sure the project was right.
- 49.7 The Chair agreed that this was a challenging project as a lot was desired out of a relatively small but important area of the city.

49.8 RESOLVED-

1. That members consider the feedback from public consultation.
2. That members agree that more work should be done to better understand the impact of relocating the Station taxi rank to Frederick Place, and that the outcome of this work should be reported to Transport Committee in March 2013 to enable an informed decision as to whether to progress the preferred option to detailed design.
3. That members agree that further feasibility work be carried out on options relating to the Station canopy before a decision is made on this element of the scheme at March 2013 Transport Committee.

50. SEVEN DIALS IMPROVEMENT PROJECT - CONSULTATION RESULTS AND WAY FORWARD

- 50.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that provided the outcome of the recent consultation and requested agreement for the Seven Dials Improvement Project. The report was supplemented with a presentation from the Principal Transport Planner that included current risks and hazards and a traffic model of the proposals.
- 50.2 The Chair relayed to the Committee that he had met the previous day with two visually impaired people to talk through concerns about the proposals. Whilst the issue was complex, he had found that some visually impaired people currently avoided traffic signal crossings at Seven Dials because they deemed them unsafe and some visually impaired people supported zebra crossings as long as they were clear and implemented

properly. The Chair stated that he had made a commitment to work with those that were visually impaired throughout the implementation of the project and subsequently. This included possible financial support for “re-training” of skills.

- 50.3 Councillor Theobald noted he was concerned that reducing the lanes to one on Dyke Road could lead to chaos. He asked several questions regarding the placement of the loading bay southwards of Dyke Road and the possible restrictions on the large delivery vehicle that often presented an obstacle to traffic going northwards.
- 50.4 The Principal Transport Planner clarified that, going southward, there would be a 26 metre loading bay recessed on to the pavement. No weight-restrictions on vehicles on the southwards side were proposed as vehicles would have sufficient space to go around large vehicles.
- 50.5 Councillor Janio asked if problems could arise from vehicles and cyclists turning left on a smaller roundabout.
- 50.6 The Principal Transport Planner clarified that the roundabout was designed with cycle safety in mind and for cyclists to use the middle of the road.
- 50.7 Councillor Phillips stated that she was pleased Bath Street had remained one way. She asked if the large electrical box on Chatham Place would be removed as many of her residents had commented that it was an obstruction and if residents would be provided with a schedule of roadwork’s and road closures.
- 50.8 The Principal Transport Planner replied that as the electrical box powered the traffic signals, it would no longer be needed and removed. Furthermore, he clarified that whilst the full project schedule had not been devised as planners were awaiting approval for the project from the Committee, residents would be provided with regular updates on the works when they were in place. The Principal Transport Planner expected that there would short-term disruption compensated by long-term benefit.
- 50.9 Councillor Robins stated that he was encouraged and reassured that the Chair had met with blind and visually impaired people as he had been fearful of the impact of these proposals on these groups. He stated that he would appreciate regular updates as to the works and liaison with visually impaired people. Councillor Robins enquired as to the difference between a courtesy crossing and a zebra crossing.
- 50.10 The Principal Transport Planner replied that a courtesy crossing was often placed as a route across a road that had very little traffic. Courtesy crossings, unlike zebra crossings, did not have enforceable traffic rules and regulations.
- 50.11 Councillor Mitchell stated that she welcomed the revisions to the scheme. She believed people should be kept informed of works perhaps via large posters around and on the Dials. Councillor Mitchell relayed that she still had concerns regarding the removal of the railings on the roundabout and felt they should perhaps be left in the short-term as a means of adjustment. Councillor Mitchell stated that she welcomed the Chairs efforts to meet those groups affected and concerned.

- 50.12 Councillor West stated that he was pleased with the proposals as safety at the Dials had been getting worse over the past few years and that the proposals had support from the public and local businesses. Councillor West added that he was pleased with the introduction of zebra crossings which provided pedestrian empowerment and the removal of the barriers for the same reason. Councillor West supplement that he was glad support would be offered to those visually impaired.
- 50.13 Councillor Follett stated that he wished to congratulate the Principal Transport Planner and Transport officers who had conducted the project very well.
- 50.14 Councillor Cox stated that he identified with the safety concerns at Seven Dials as he had knocked off a motorbike on the roundabout in the past. Councillor Cox commended the Chair for his efforts in meeting with members of the blind community and listening to and addressing their concerns. He hoped that reassurance had been provided on the project. Councillor Cox asked what the Transport teams determination of traffic levels increasing significantly was.
- 50.15 The Principal Transport Planner clarified that this would entail a 10% increase of traffic in residential streets directly related to the implementation of the scheme.

50.16 **RESOLVED-**

1. That the Transport Committee notes the results of the public consultation exercise.
2. That, having taken into account the responses received, committee authorises officers to proceed with implementation of the revised Seven Dials Improvement Scheme as outlined in Appendix 4.
3. That the committee authorises officers to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for changes to loading bay provision in Dyke Road. This change is not an integral part of the scheme and therefore progression of the overall Seven Dials scheme is not dependent on this element.
4. That the committee agrees to monitor the impact on surrounding residential streets six months after scheme implementation, to ensure that traffic levels have not significantly increased as a direct result of the Seven Dials scheme. If it is discovered that traffic levels in residential streets have increased significantly, then residents in those streets affected would be consulted with a view to agreeing an acceptable solution. Funding from the 2014/15 Local Transport Plan Capital Budget would be set aside for any measures deemed necessary.

**51. AMEX COMMUNITY STADIUM RESIDENTS PARKING PROPOSALS -
CONSIDERATION OF INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESULTS**

- 51.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that presented the outcome of the public consultation for a proposed match and event day resident s parking scheme in Coldean and Moulseccomb.
- 51.2 Councillor Theobald asked how the scheme would be advertised.

51.3 The Programme Manager & Policy Development Officer clarified that in other schemes variable signs were posted in the entry to the resident parking scheme areas providing seven days notice.

51.4 RESOLVED-

1. That the proposed match and event day residents parking scheme for Coldean be progressed to final design and the Traffic Order advertised.
2. That the proposed match and event day residents parking scheme for Moulsecoomb be progressed to final design and the Traffic Order advertised.

52. RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME CONSULTATION RESULTS

52.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that presented the outcome of the recent consultations undertaken for proposed extensions to the Area J residents parking scheme and requested permission to advertise the relevant Traffic Regulation Orders.

52.2 Councillor Kennedy recorded her thanks to the Parking Infrastructure Manager and his team for their superb work in consulting with residents. Councillor Kennedy noted that this was now the third consultation on the matter and, whilst she appreciated the concerns of some residents and the points made by Councillor Lepper earlier in the meeting, as ward councillor for Preston Park, she could vouch for the many people in favour of the extension.

52.3 Councillor Theobald stated he agreed with the comments made by Councillor Lepper and Downs Infant School on the matter. Councillor Theobald noted his concern for the knock on effect of the proposals in surrounding areas and the continuing extension of parking zones in the city in general.

52.4 The Chair put the recommendations to the vote with the following result.

52.5 RESOLVED-

1. That the Transport Committee approves:
 - (a) That the extension of the Area J Residents Parking Scheme into the London Road Station north area be progressed to the final design and the Traffic Order advertised.
 - (b) That the extension of the Area J Residents Parking Scheme into the Round Hill area be progressed to the final design and the Traffic Order advertised.
 - (c) That an order should be placed for all required pay and display equipment to ensure implementation of the extension of the proposed parking schemes if agreed is undertaken as programmed.

For: 5
Against: 3
Abstentions: 2

53. CITY WIDE PARKING REVIEW

- 53.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that presented the outcome of the city wide parking review that was an investigation into the way the council manages parking through consulting residents, business and other stakeholders and learning from the best practice of other authorities. The review also examined the future of controlled parking schemes including scheme boundaries, changes to existing schemes and new schemes.
- 53.2 The Chair passed his thanks to the Programme Manager & Policy Development Officer for his work on the issue.
- 53.3 Councillor Robins stated that he was worried the council was consulting early because of the domino effect of parking displacement. Councillor Robins felt an innovative new system should be looked at and expressed his belief that parking zones were full because of use by residents not displacement.
- 53.4 The Chair stated that the ward councillors for South Portslade had requested consultation of the residents of their ward for a parking scheme.
- 53.5 Councillor Robins replied that Councillor Hamilton had made this request which was more based on fear of the effects of displacement than a need for a parking scheme in their ward.
- 53.6 Councillor Follett stated that residents did not necessarily have to agree to the proposals in the consultation.
- 53.7 Councillor West stated that the Labour & Co-Operative party had first stated resident parking schemes when in administration. Councillor West added that the council had a duty to manage parking spaces and demand.
- 53.8 Councillor Robins stated he made the point that the current system did not seem to be providing solutions and that a new methodology needed to be looked at.
- 53.9 Councillor Cox stated that the implementation of controlled parking zones had gone far enough. He felt there was no overwhelming demand in Wish or South Portslade for a parking scheme. Councillor Cox felt there was now only two options remaining: extend controlled parking zones to the entire city or stop at this point.
- 53.10 Councillor Mitchell noted that item 3.9 of the agenda noted that there was significant demand for consultation on a new or extended parking scheme in several areas including South Portslade. Councillor Mitchell asked if the consultation would seek the views of ward councillors and further soundings from residents.
- 53.11 The Chair noted that ward councillors would have been the instigators of any request for consultation on a parking scheme.

53.12 The Chair then put the recommendations to a vote with the following results.

53.13 **RESOLVED-**

1. That the Transport Committee notes the report and attached appendices and:
2. Agrees the short to medium term programme of consultations on proposed new or extended resident parking schemes set out in paragraph 3.10, depicted on the indicative plan appendix A and by the timetable set out in Appendix B, subject to the outcome of consultation, committee decisions and the availability of resources;

For: 6
Against: 3
Abstentions: 1

3. Agrees the general principle in relation to the consideration of new parking schemes as set out in paragraph 3.12.2

For: 6
Against: 3
Abstentions: 1

4. Approves the policy recommendations in paragraphs 3.13 to 3.27 of the report;

For: 10

5. Makes any further recommendations arising out of the report that it considers appropriate.

For: 10

6. Requests that in order to monitor progress on the review a report is brought back to committee in 12 months time with a summary of progress.

For: 10

54. PARKING FEES & CHARGES UPDATE

54.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that outlined the proposed parking tariffs for 2013/14.

54.2 Councillor Cox noted that he wished for more information on the number of traders and business permits issued between 2011/12 and 2012/13.

54.3 The Policy & Development Manager apologised for not providing this information to Councillor Cox earlier. He clarified that approximately 600 traders permits were issued steadily each year until 2012/13. This number had now nearly doubled to 1080. 400 business permits were issued this year which demonstrated a similar, gradual rise as in previous years.

- 54.4 Councillor West stated that he interpreted the factual information provided in the report to be different to the public debate on the topic of parking. It demonstrated that the weather and rising price of fuel had had an impact and he believed the opposition parties' conduct in the debate had not done the city justice.
- 54.5 Councillor Theobald stated that he was disappointed in the removal of the 3 hour tariff in the Laines Car Park and other areas to a 2 or 4 hour tariff. He believed people had been tricked into paying more as they would automatically choose a longer stay as a safety measure.
- 54.6 The Chair replied that some increased cost were necessary to pay back the £4 million loan for the re-development of the Trafalgar and Regency car parks agreed under the previous Conservative administration.
- 54.7 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote with the following result.
- 54.8 **RESOLVED-** That the Transport Committee agrees the proposed parking tariffs for 2013/2014 set out in the report as the basis for the advertisement of the necessary traffic orders.

For: 5

Against: 1

Abstentions: 3

55. HIGHWAYS FEES & CHARGES 2013/14

- 55.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place that set out the proposed fees and charges for Highway Operations for 2013/14.
- 55.2 Councillor Cox stated he was aware there could be some confusion over the new cultivation licence fee. He asked officers if they could ensure any misinterpretation was dispelled.
- 55.3 The Head of Highway Operations replied that a press release had been issued to this end.
- 55.4 **RESOLVED-** That Transport Committee agrees the proposed fees and charges for 2013/14 as set out in Appendix 1.

56. INTRODUCTION OF PAYMENT FOR PARKING BY MOBILE PHONE

56.1 RESOLVED-

1. That the Transport Committee grants delegated authority to the Strategic Director, Place to enter into contracting arrangements defined in the 'Mobile Telephone Parking Payment Solution with Cash Option' Framework Agreement with the London Borough of Lambeth as Lead Authority, adopting the user pays model to supplement the existing Pay and Display system throughout the city.

2. That the Transport Committee authorises changes to on street furniture and signage, the advertising of Traffic Orders, including amending the relevant Traffic Orders to enable parking by mobile phone and the cash method of payment as defined in the Mobile Telephone Framework Agreement.

57. ITEMS REFERRED FOR COUNCIL

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

The meeting concluded at 7.15pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

