

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

11.00am 11 DECEMBER 2013

BANQUETING ROOM, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor West (Chair), Councillor Sykes (Deputy Chair), Cox (Opposition Spokesperson), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), Mitchell (Group Spokesperson), Robins (Group Spokesperson), Daniel, Davey, Hawtree and G Theobald

Also in attendance: Councillor Gary Peltzer-Dunn

PART ONE

53. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

53(a) Declarations of substitutes

53.1. There were none.

53(b) Declarations of interest

53.2. There were none.

53(c) Exclusion of press and public

53.3. In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (“the Act”), the Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during an item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present during that item, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A(3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100(I) of the Act).

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

54. CHAIRS COMMUNICATIONS

54.1 The Chair provided the following Communications:

“Welcome to this special meeting of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee at which we will be considering the report on the 20mph limit phase 2 consultation.

I have called this special meeting, with the agreement of the lead opposition committee members, Councillor Theobald and Councillor Mitchell, to allow an extended period for public and member consideration of this particularly important matter. I am grateful to all members of the committee, and officers for making the time in your busy diaries to be here today.

There have been a number of documents received relating to the 20mph phase 2 proposals. While many have been emailed to members at different stages, and they have all been deposited in the Members room, for clarity I asked officers to circulate hard copies to members as a bundle. I trust you have all received these from the deputy head of law in the courier on Monday. For the record, the following items were circulated in the bundle”:

(List of documents read out by the Deputy Head of Law at the meeting)

- Copies of the written consultation responses received from:-

GMB dated 03 October 2013

Woodland Drive Action Committee dated 03 October 2013

Local resident dated 04 October 2013/26 September 2013/11 September 2013/21 March 2013

Brighton & Hove Streamline Ltd dated 04 October 2013

Local resident (Dyke Road Avenue) dated 16 August 2013

Local Resident (Boundary Road) dated 27 August 2013

Friends of the Earth dated 02 October 2013

Brighton & Hove Bus and Coach Company dated 02 October 2013

Bus Users UK dated 02 October 2013

Southern Taxi's, Brighton Streamline, Brighton & Hove Radio Cabs dated 03 October 2013

Copy of a Petition (unnamed) received on 03 October 2013

- List of consultation responses to Question 3 of the consultation documents, listed street by street. (Emailed to councillors on 27 November 2013; published on the council website on 28 November 2013 and placed in Members' Rooms on 29th November)
- Letter from Bricycles/CTC dated 04 October 2013 in response to the consultation. (Emailed to councillors on and copies added to information in the Members' rooms on 03 December 2013.)
- Email in relation to page 27 of the report which relates to the removal of duplicate submissions (emailed to councillors on 29 November 2013 and placed in Members' Rooms on 29th November)
- Copy of a Petition received on 04 October 2013 regarding Friars Road and Woodbourne Avenue

- Solicitors letter from Howlett Clark Cushman dated 06 December 2013 and officer response dated 09 December 2013. (Emailed to Councillors on 09 December and added to Members' rooms on 091213.)

“At my request the Deputy Head of Law also circulated by email yesterday an additional item relating to the proposals for the Patcham and Hollingbury area. Hard copies of this item have been distributed to the meeting.

I'm sorry to say that for personal reasons, Emma Sheridan, who was due to present the report on 20mph today is unable to be with us. Martin Heath, Road Safety Manager will be introducing the report along with Dave Parker, Head of Transport Planning.

The consultation on initial proposals for phase 2 of 20 mph has received a very high response from the public, with close to 58,000 surveys circulated and nearly 15,000 responses received. 28 staffed exhibitions were held at 18 locations, which along with special stakeholder meetings, additional correspondence, and a number of petitions, have all together made this perhaps the largest transport consultation the council has ever conducted.

I would like to thank residents, businesses and other stakeholders as well as members for their input, and I am sure members of the committee will also wish to join me in thanking Emma Sheridan and other officers involved for all the hard work they have put into this project so far.

I'm sure as we hear from public and members, and consider the proposals in the report, we will all be particularly mindful of the aims of the Council's 20 mph programme, as set out in section 1.2 of the report, and that at the heart of those aims is our shared desire to improve safety for all road users; particularly the young, old and other vulnerable people in the city”.

55. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

(b) Written Questions

55.1 Amanda Brace presented the following Question:

“As residents and users of Freshfield Road we have noticed higher traffic and speeds since it became the boundary of the Phase 1 20mph area. We were concerned that Phase 2 didn't recommend 20mph. That's why 78% of residents supported 20mph – one of the highest levels in the city!

It is almost totally residential and not a main road, so there is no reason for 30mph. It's on the way to school not just for St Lukes pupils but also children at Queens Park and Royal Spa.

We ask councillors to support 20mph in Freshfield Rd. We also welcome city-wide 20mph”.

55.2 The Chair provided the following response:

“Traffic speed monitoring on Freshfield Road has shown that, in line with a number of the boundary roads to the phase 1 area, traffic speeds on Freshfield Road have in fact reduced slightly (by 0.9mph) since the implementation 20mph limits in central Brighton and Hove. It understandable however, that as traffic speed has slowed on nearby

streets with the introduction of lower limits, that residents of this area would be more aware of the higher speeds on roads like Freshfield in comparison.

I note that in response to the consultation on phase 2 of 20mph, responses were received from 57% of properties, with 78% expressing support for Freshfield Road to become 20mph.

Proposals for the second phase of the 20mph programme will be debated and considered at this meeting and include, in recognition of the strength of views expressed by local residents, a recommendation for the speed limit on Freshfield Road to be reduced to 20mph. This has been supported by a number of stakeholders including Brighton and Hove Bus Company”.

55.3 Amanda Brace asked the following supplementary question:

“We really welcome the recommendation of the report and parents and residents were really pleased to know that was in there. If we could know what the process and time limit would be for looking at the measures mentioned at 4.62 of the report and how the community and school can be involved in making sure that any measures implemented in Freshfield Road to make 20mph self-enforcing”

55.4 The Chair provided the following response:

“If Members agree to the recommendations today, there will be a further opportunity to consult through the speed limit orders. With regard to the request to support speed reduction measures, I will ask Officers to get in contact with you and explain how that can be done”

(c) Deputations

55.5 The Deputies were unable to attend the meeting therefore a formal response was provided in writing as follows and was also read out at the meeting at the request of the Committee:

“Thank you for your deputation. We have always been very clear that the key arterial routes into the city such as Old Shoreham Rd which runs along the south side of Hove Park should remain at 30 mph.

In terms of Hove Park Road, Goldstone Crescent, Orchard Road and the westernmost section of The Droveaway, the basic reason for the areas cited not being included, was a clear absence of support from local residents in that area (not just the roads cited but the area as a whole) for lower speed limits.

There is also no significant identified collision/casualty problem in the area.

Whilst a consultation is not (as the deputation points out) a referendum, the DfT guidance is clear that 20mph limits should be considered in consultation with local communities.

As with other areas, on those streets proposed to be reduced to 20mph speed limits and those proposed to remain at 30mph, officers will continue to monitor casualty and collision data together with traffic volumes and speeds alongside local community opinion as part of the ongoing monitoring and evaluation of speed limits across the city”.

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

56. MEMBER INVOLVEMENT

56.1 No items were received.

57. BRIGHTON AND HOVE 20MPH LIMIT PHASE 2 - RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- 57.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing that outlined the results of the recent public consultation on proposals for Phase 2 of the 20mph programme; presented revised proposals informed by the findings of the consultation and sought approval of those proposals and to proceed to the advertising of the associated Speed Limit Orders (SLO's).
- 57.2 Councillor Peltzer-Dunn made a representation to the Committee. Councillor Peltzer-Dunn explained that he supported 99 per cent of the proposals and had always believed that 20mph was an acceptable limit on suburban roads. Councillor Peltzer-Dunn stated his concern that, despite the majority of local residents voting against the introduction of 20mph in their area and a request from Brighton & Hove Buses to retain the existing speed limit on Portland Road, the proposals sought to introduce a 20mph limit on the road. Councillor Peltzer-Dunn stated that whilst officers were correct in highlighting the poor accident record on Portland Road, local residents appreciated and understood local issues and had made a clear statement that they were against the introduction of 20mph. Councillor Peltzer-Dunn requested that the Committee acknowledge the result of the consultation and support the proposed amendment to retain the existing speed limit on Portland Road.
- 57.3 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Theobald formally moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.2 and an additional recommendation 2.3 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.2 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit as described in the revised Phase 2 proposals outlined in this report and presented in map format in Appendix 1, ***subject to recommendation 2.3 below.***
- 2.3 ***That in view of a) the concerns expressed by Brighton & Hove Bus Company and the taxi trade and b) the lack of support from residents for a 20mph limit, that a decision on including Portland Road in the proposed scheme be deferred to enable further monitoring and analysis of road safety and accident data and that a report on the results of that work be brought back to a future meeting of this Committee.***
- 57.4 Councillor Theobald explained that Portland Road was an important bus route and Brighton & Hove Buses had made clear that retaining the existing speed limit would allow them to maintain bus frequency and prompt service. Councillor Theobald also noted that the majority of local residents had voted against 20mph on Portland Road.
- 57.5 Councillor Janio formally seconded the motion.

- 57.6 On behalf of the Conservative Group, Councillor Theobald formally moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.2 and an additional recommendation 2.3 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.2 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit as described in the revised Phase 2 proposals outlined in this report and presented in map format in Appendix 1, ***subject to recommendation 2.3 below.***
- 2.3 ***That in view of the lack of a clear mandate from residents for introducing a 20mph limit in the area bounded by and including Ditchling Road, Surrenden Road, Braybon Avenue (including Old Farm Road and Graham Avenue) and Carden Avenue (excluding the Carden Avenue service road), that a decision on including these roads in the proposed scheme be deferred.***
- 57.7 Councillor Theobald stated that the amendment addressed the concerns made by Brighton & Hove Buses and taxi companies and retaining the existing limit on the specified roads could make a significant difference. Councillor Theobald added that 63.5% of residents were against 20mph in the specified areas and 55.1% were against 20mph for the street they lived on. Councillor Theobald stated that there had to be sufficient mandate for wholesale change and in this case the majority were against the introduction of 20mph. Councillor Theobald stated that the issue could be re-visited if there was demonstrable support sometime in the future perhaps associated with access to the South Downs National Park. Councillor Theobald added his support for traffic infrastructure works on Windfield Avenue, Braybon Avenue, Carden Avenue and Surrenden Road.
- 57.8 Councillor Cox formally seconded the motion.
- 57.9 On behalf of the Labour & Co-Operative Group, Councillor Mitchell formally moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.2 and an additional recommendation 2.3 as shown in bold italics below:
- 2.2 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit as described in the revised Phase 2 proposals outlined in this report and presented in map format in Appendix 1, ***subject to recommendation 2.3 below:***
- 2.3 ***The section of Surrenden Road and Braybon Avenue linking Preston Drove with Carden Avenue remain at the current speed***
- 57.10 Councillor Mitchell explained that the introduction of 20mph in the city had to balance enhanced safety whilst preserving key public transport corridors in order for them to run efficiently and maintain public safety at night. The specified roads were a key north to south route and retention of the current limit was supported by Brighton & Hove Bus Company and representatives of the taxi trade.
- 57.11 Councillor Robins formally seconded the motion.

57.12 On behalf of the Labour & Co-Operative Group, Councillor Mitchell formally moved a motion to amend recommendation 2.2 and an additional recommendation 2.3 as shown in bold italics below:

2.2 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit as described in the revised Phase 2 proposals outlined in this report and presented in map format in Appendix 1, ***subject to recommendation 2.3 below:***

2.3 That the following roads are excluded from the 20mph scheme and remain at current speed limits by reason of them both being key bus and taxi routes and a majority of residents in both roads having voted against these roads being included within the 20mph scheme.

(i) Preston Drove from the junction with Preston Road and Ditchling Road at the 5 ways.

(ii) Stanford Avenue from the junction with Preston Road and Ditchling Road at the 5 ways.

57.13 Introducing the motion, Councillor Mitchell stated that the roads specified were a key public transport route from east to west and linked up with roads proposed to remain at 30mph, were wide roads and areas where residents had voted against the introduction of 20mph.

57.14 Councillor Davey asked for clarification and confirmation that the wording “to enable further consultation to take place” had been withdrawn from the Conservative motion regarding Ditchling Road, Surrenden Road, Braybon Avenue and Carden Avenue.

57.15 Councillor Theobald confirmed that he wished to withdraw that part of the motion.

57.16 In response to the amendments, the Head of Transport Planning stated that their recommendation to reduce the speed limit on Portland Road to 20mph had been due to it having the highest accident rate of any road in the Phase 2 proposals. He added that should the proposed amendment to the recommendations be approved, officers would conduct further monitoring and analysis of road safety and accident data and seek to bring a report to the Committee within twelve months. The Head of Transport Planning added that with regard to the second Conservative amendment, the results of the consultation in that area of Patcham and Hollingbury had been finely balanced but that officers viewed the option provided in the report as the preferable option. Referring to the first Labour & Co-Operative Group amendment regarding Surrenden Road and Braybon Avenue, the Road Safety Manager stated that whilst it was agreed that this was an important transport corridor, the officer recommendations correlated with the recommendations of the 20mph Scrutiny Panel recommendations from 2010 that urged for 20mph limits in areas close to residential areas and routes close to schools. Furthermore, if the responses to the consultation in the specified roads were taken together, the overall result demonstrated resident support for a 20mph limit on those roads. With regard to the second Labour & Co-Operative Group amendment, the Road Safety Manager stated that Preston Drove, Ditchling Road and Stanford Avenue were densely residential, there were major obstructions to travelling on foot and there had

been significant amounts invested by the authority in recent years to improve pedestrian facilities in the area via the Safer Routes to School programme and demand for further improvements. The Road Safety Manager added that residents still had the opportunity to make further comments, support or objections to the SLO's when it was advertised.

- 57.17 Councillor Hawtree asked for clarification on the buses that used Preston Drove as a route and the volume of children using the areas identified in Patcham and Hollingbury to get to school.
- 57.18 The Road Safety Manager confirmed that the 5B bus used a section of Preston Drove between Beaconsfield Villas and Preston Park Avenue.
- 57.19 The Chair clarified that Carden Primary School was within the area and Patcham High and Infant School and Varndean School campuses were all located close by the area identified in the Patcham and Hollingbury motion.
- 57.20 Councillor Cox noted that paragraph 4.54 of the report stated that infrastructure works were planned for Surrendeane Road and asked if these would still be implemented if the various amendments were approved or not.
- 57.21 The Road Safety Manager stated that analysis of the area was underway and confirmed that implementation was not dependent on the outcome of the amendments.
- 57.22 Councillor Robins requested clarification on the outcome of the consultation if Braybon Avenue and Surrenden Road were taken together.
- 57.23 The Chair confirmed that the consultation results showed that 55.6% of residents on Braybon Avenue supported the introduction of 20mph limits and on the section of Surrenden Road that related to the Labour & Co-Operative amendment, 57.1% of residents had supported the introduction of 20mph via the consultation.
- 57.24 Councillor Hawtree stated the proposals not only provided offered an opportunity to reduce accidents but also to promote a healthier lifestyle in encouraging more sustainable methods of transport. Councillor Hawtree noted that 33,000 people died of heart disease in the United Kingdom every year and introducing 20mph speed limits and promoting cycling and walking would go some way to reducing those figures the city and benefit for communities. Councillor Hawtree also noted evidence that demonstrated for every 1mph reduction in speed limits, there was a corresponding 6% drop in accidents. With a single death on the road losing the economy £1.7m per annum and road accidents costing £17bn per annum, Councillor Hawtree believed there was also significant economic benefits to reducing speed limits on roads. Councillor Hawtree stated his support for the recommendations as per the report and outlined reasons as to why he could not support the respective amendments. Councillor Hawtree stated that he supported reducing the speed limit in the Patcham area to 20mph due to the high number of families in the area and believed it was vital to retain Preston Drove at 20mph due to the poor road layout and driver behaviour in what was a residential area. Councillor Hawtree supplemented that the introduction of a 20mph speed limit on Portland Road would be beneficial due to the number of shops along the road, for pedestrians using the busy junctions, traffic flow and because of the high number of

nurseries and schools along that route. Councillor Hawtree also noted that bus service frequency had improved in the Phase 1 20mph area since its introduction.

- 57.25 Councillor Mitchell stated that the Labour & Co-Operative Group were broadly in agreement with the proposals. Stating support for both Conservative amendments, Councillor Mitchell requested that options for additional physical measures along Portland Road particularly around local schools be examined alongside the gathering of accident data. Councillor Mitchell noted the support for the retention of a 30mph speed limit along Edward Street to Eastern Road from Brighton & Hove Bus Company and local taxi companies although it was clear this was not feasible as the beginning of Edward Street was already in Phase 1 and significant bus corridor improvements were scheduled to begin. Furthermore, Eastern Road was residential in nature and there was a lot of pedestrian activity associated with the College and hospital and therefore her group were content for these roads to be within the Phase 2 scheme. However, Councillor Mitchell specifically requested that options for turning the pedestrian crossings on the junction of Rock Street and outside Brighton College to pelican crossings be considered as there were regular near misses and accidents at both due to poor visibility. Councillor Mitchell similarly requested that improvements to the physical traffic infrastructure in particular extension of double yellow lines be considered for Whitehawk Road to improve visibility. Councillor Mitchell requested the administration also consider physical measures across both Phase 1 and Phase 2 areas to ensure 20mph speed limits were genuinely self-enforcing by design.
- 57.26 The Chair stated that although officers could not commit to such requests at this meeting, he was sure the viability of the requests could be considered in the long-term.
- 57.27 Councillor Janio stated that that the car was one of the most significant technological creations of the 20th century that had dramatically increased social mobility and he was concerned that the administration was over pre-occupied with restricting the car driver in the city. Councillor Janio added that 20mph limits were part of the Conservative coalition government policy and such schemes were good for cyclists, pedestrians and car drivers. Councillor Janio added that whilst Phase 1 appeared to be working well, the scheme had only been in place for six months and there was an absence of long-term data to support this assumption. Councillor Janio noted his fears that 20mph limits were being implemented too quickly without huge support across the city for doing so. Councillor Janio also noted his concern that people were not being given time to adjust to each Phase and that rushing through the policy could create hazards within itself.
- 57.28 The Chair stated that the report did identify the outcomes of the Phase 1 20mph scheme which demonstrated in overall 74% reduction in speed and a 9mph reduction on some of the busiest roads in the central area. It was his view that that such data proved the scheme had been a success as the reduction in road speeds had also seen a reduction in the number of accidents. The Chair added that this was backed up by evidence from many other authorities and the DfT and that 12 million people now lived on streets and areas that had a 20mph limit.
- 57.29 Councillor Sykes stated that a report published in 2009 detailing data gathered from London Boroughs that had introduced 20mph limits seven years previously found there was a 42% reduction in road traffic casualties in that period. Councillor Sykes added many London Boroughs had introduced blanket 20mph limit schemes amongst them

Islington and the City of London. Councillor Sykes supplemented that the committee had to analyse the consultation results alongside accident and safety data in deciding specific implementation of the Phase 2 scheme.

- 57.30 Councillor Robins stated that his group had looked for a sensible compromise for residents and local transport companies and that compromise was evidenced in the amendments they had put forward.
- 57.31 Councillor Cox stated that he fully supported 20mph limits in urban areas, city centres and residential roads as the safety argument for doing so was compelling and there was no doubt that slower speeds reduced the severity of accidents. Councillor Cox noted his concern that the debate surrounding the implementation of 20mph limits in the city had become toxic and, in his view, this was because people felt they were being lectured by the current administration and because the public did not believe they were competent. Councillor Cox added that statistically the United Kingdom had amongst the safest roads in the world due to safety measures such as compulsory seatbelts, enhancements in car technology and policies on drink driving but unfortunately, safety had not improved for pedestrians and cyclists and introducing 20mph was a method of addressing that. Councillor Cox stated that he remained to be convinced that slower speed limits improved air quality although he did agree that lower vehicle speed on residential and urban roads made the physical environment more pleasant. Referring to the Conservative amendment regarding Patcham and Hollingdean, Councillor Cox stated that the consultation results were close and as elected representative for the area, Councillor Theobald knew his residents and he would respect his judgement in supporting the amendment. Councillor Cox added that some of Portland Road was within his ward boundary and he had considered the issue thoroughly. Councillor Cox stated that whilst the officer recommendation to reduce the limit on the road to 20mph due to safety was a sound judgement, he was not convinced that reducing road speed was the only possible or correct measure at this time. Councillor Cox believed more consideration had to be given to road design and he wished to see more evidence of crash data for Portland Road before going against the view of local residents something he could not do at this point in time.
- 57.32 Councillor Davey expressed his disappointment that the issue of 20mph had become one of political conflict as the scheme was concerned with safety for all residents and a focus on people becoming the basis of transport policy in the city. Councillor Davey stated that the standard of road safety in the city was appalling and Brighton and Hove resided in the bottom 10% for road safety in urban areas in the country. Councillor Davey supplemented that the current administration inherited control of a council in a city with over 1000 accidents every year which he believed to be intolerable for an authority of such size adding that every possible effort should be made by the Committee to improve upon the figure. Councillor Davey stated that initial data from Phase 1 of the 20mph scheme showed it had been a success with speed reductions of up to 5mph on some of the most hostile travel routes in the city, a 20% reduction in traffic casualties and Brighton & Hove Bus Company had reported their highest ever levels of journey time reliability and service with no impact on night time services. With reference to the respective amendments, Councillor Davey stated that Portland Road was a very busy with a thriving shopping area and nurseries, a large elderly population and the largest primary school in the city resided along its route and there was a large amount of evidence that demonstrated that it had the highest accident rate of any area

in the Phase 2 proposals. Councillor Davey added that the area in Patcham identified in the Conservative amendment was also the location for a number of schools with almost 5,000 children accessing schools along the roads identified in that amendment every day and that this demonstrated factors beyond the consultation results alone. Councillor Davey added that the residents of Surrenden Road and Braybon Avenue had campaigned for many years for safety improvements and, if taken together, the consultation results demonstrated support for 20mph on those roads. Councillor Davey noted that the recommendations of the 20mph Scrutiny Panel had been to “widen 20mph limits in residential areas, roads outside schools, routes to schools, roads outside parks, playgrounds and sport and leisure facilities, community buildings, older people’s homes and busy shopping areas”. Councillor Davey expressed his view that if the amendments were approved, the Committee would risk ignoring the Panels’ advice. With regard to the proposed amendment for Stanford Avenue and Preston Drove, Councillor Davey stated that he did not believe these roads to be bus routes as the 56 bus service used these roads once per hour and there was a short stretch of Preston Drove which was used by the 5 bus however, the geography of the area meant the bus was very unlikely to ever reach 30mph. Councillor Davey supplemented that these roads had also not been requested by Brighton & Hove Bus Company as ones they preferred to be retained at 30mph. Councillor Davey summarised that whilst he was disappointed to see the proposals unpicked, he welcomed and appreciated the broad support for the proposals and hoped that even if sections were removed through amendments to the recommendations, Members could acknowledge that the policy in general would be of benefit to all residents and the Committee could move forward together to improve road safety across the city.

- 57.33 The Chair expressed his disappointment that the amendment to the proposals for Stanford Avenue and Preston Drove had been tabled relatively late and that residents in those areas may not be aware the Committee would be debating the issue. The Chair referred to information requested by Members for the Patcham and Hollingdean area that demonstrated the majority of residents wanted 20mph in their area with the exception of the Mackie Estate which had clearly voted against. The Chair stated that he was disappointed that, if the amendments were passed, that the Committee would be going against what people in that area wanted and would obscure the consistency and clarity of the overall scheme. The Chair stated that he would like re-consideration by Members to include the request for further consultation in the Patcham area as originally expressed in the Conservative Party amendment in order to give proper consideration to the matter.
- 57.34 Councillor Theobald stated that elected Members required a clear opinion from their residents to inform their judgements on policies, particularly ones as significant as 20mph speed limits. Councillor Theobald explained that he had given the issue of 20mph in his area an enormous amount of thought and consideration. Councillor Theobald stated that not one of his ward constituents had approached him about the issue of 20mph nor had the issue been raised at Local Action Team meetings that he attended. Councillor Theobald explained that the information he had requested from officers regarding the consultation results on specific roads in the area demonstrated that there was a majority of 4 people against reducing the speed limit in that area from 30 to 20mph. Including Graham Avenue and Old Farm Road, that majority became 2. Councillor Theobald added that on the basis of the information he had requested, he did not believe there was a mandate to implement and the scheme in that area at this time.

Councillor Theobald supplemented that whilst certain roads in the area of Patcham affected by the amendment had supported the introduction of 20mph limits, he believed it vitally important to create a coherent area that retained the current 30mph limit where the majority of residents in that area were against its introduction.

57.35 The Chair then put the amendments to the vote with the following outcome:

2.2 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit as described in the revised Phase 2 proposals outlined in this report and presented in map format in Appendix 1, **subject to recommendation 2.3 below.**

2.3 ***That in view of a) the concerns expressed by Brighton & Hove Bus Company and the taxi trade and b) the lack of support from residents for a 20mph limit, that a decision on including Portland Road in the proposed scheme be deferred to enable further monitoring and analysis of road safety and accident data and that a report on the results of that work be brought back to a future meeting of this Committee.***

The amendment was passed

2.2 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit as described in the revised Phase 2 proposals outlined in this report and presented in map format in Appendix 1, **subject to recommendation 2.3 below.**

2.3 ***That in view of the lack of a clear mandate from residents for introducing a 20mph limit in the area bounded by and including Ditchling Road, Surrenden Road, Braybon Avenue (including Old Farm Road and Graham Avenue) and Carden Avenue (excluding the Carden Avenue service road), that a decision on including these roads in the proposed scheme be deferred.***

The amendment was passed

2.2 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit as described in the revised Phase 2 proposals outlined in this report and presented in map format in Appendix 1, **subject to recommendation 2.3 below:**

2.3 ***The section of Surrenden Road and Braybon Avenue linking Preston Drove with Carden Avenue remain at the current speed***

The amendment was passed

2.2 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit as described in the revised Phase 2 proposals outlined in this report and presented in map format in Appendix 1, **subject to recommendation 2.3 below:**

2.3 *That the following roads are excluded from the 20mph scheme and remain at current speed limits by reason of them both being key bus and taxi routes and a majority of residents in both roads having voted against these roads being included within the 20mph scheme.*

(iii) Preston Drove from the junction with Preston Road and Ditchling Road at the 5 ways.

(iv) Stanford Avenue from the junction with Preston Road and Ditchling Road at the 5 ways.

The amendment was passed

57.36 The Chair then put each of the report recommendations to the vote.

57.37 RESOLVED-

- 1) That the Committee notes the results of the public consultation on proposals to implement a City-wide 20mph scheme.
- 2) That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising the formal Speed Limit Orders (SLO) for the changes in speed limit as described in the revised Phase 2 proposals outlined in this report and presented in map format in Appendix 1 subject to the following amendments:
 - i) That in view of a) the concerns expressed by Brighton & Hove Bus Company and the taxi trade and b) the lack of support from residents for a 20mph limit, that a decision on including Portland Road in the proposed scheme be deferred to enable further monitoring and analysis of road safety and accident data and that a report on the results of that work be brought back to a future meeting of this Committee.
 - ii) That in view of the lack of a clear mandate from residents for introducing a 20mph limit in the area bounded by and including Ditchling Road, Surrenden Road, Braybon Avenue (including Old Farm Road and Graham Avenue) and Carden Avenue (excluding the Carden Avenue service road), that a decision on including these roads in the proposed scheme be deferred.
 - iii) The section of Surrenden Road and Braybon Avenue linking Preston Drove with Carden Avenue remain at the current speed.
 - iv) That the following roads are excluded from the 20mph scheme and remain at current speed limits by reason of them both being key bus and taxi routes and a majority of residents in both roads having voted against these roads being included within the 20mph scheme:
 - Preston Drove from the junction with Preston Road and Ditchling Road at the 5 ways.
 - Stanford Avenue from the junction with Preston Road and Ditchling Road at the 5 ways.

58. ITEMS REFERRED FOR FULL COUNCIL

58.1 No items were referred to Full Council.

The meeting concluded at 1.15pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of