

# **BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

## **ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**5.00PM – 26 MAY 2005**

**COMMITTEE ROOMS 2 & 3  
BRIGHTON TOWN HALL**

### **MINUTES**

Present: Councillor Mitchell (Chair); Councillors Turton (Deputy Chair), Elgood, Fitch, Kemble (OS), Meegan, Norman, Peltzer Dunn, Pennington, Smith (Culture & Recreation OS) and Wrighton.

### **PART ONE**

#### **ACTION**

#### **1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

##### **1A Declarations of Substitutes**

- |     |                              |                       |
|-----|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.1 | <u>Substitute Councillor</u> | <u>For Councillor</u> |
|     | Pennington                   | Battle                |

##### **1B Declarations of Interest**

- 1.2 Councillors Smith and Norman declared personal interests in Item 29 (Use of Withdean Stadium by Brighton & Hove Albion: Results of Monitoring for 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 Seasons) as season ticket holders.
- 1.3 Councillor Elgood declared a personal interest in Item 25 (Floral Clock) as a local resident.
- 1.4 Councillor Smith declared a personal interest in Item 31 (Experimental Closure of Downland Road and Seaview Road) as a family member lived in the area.

##### **1C Exclusion of Press and Public**

- 1.3 The Committee considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or

exempt information as defined in Section 100A(3) or 100 1 of the Local Government Act 1972.

1.4 **RESOLVED** - That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any items.

## 2. MINUTES

2.1 **RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2005 be approved and signed by the Chair.

## 3. CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 The Chair requested that the Environment Committee confirm the Membership of the Planning (Applications) Sub-Committee. The Committee confirmed that the Members were as agreed at Annual Council on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2005.

3.2 Chair advised the committee of correspondence from Councillor Watkins (Chair Overview & Scrutiny Organisation Committee) in respect of planning enforcement.

3.3. Chair announced the intention of the Council to re-advertise its intention to make a Traffic Regulation Order to permit a section of Carden Avenue to be closed. In addition all people who made a representation to the January 2004 advertisement would be written to and advised of the course of action being taken. They would also be informed that if they still wished to make a representation they must do so again, as those representations made to the January 2004 advertisement could not be taken into account in respect of the new advertisement. It was the intention that any representations received in response to the re-advertised proposals would be considered by Environment Committee at its meeting on 8th July 2005.

## 4. CALLOVER

4.1 **RESOLVED** - That, with the exception of the items reserved (and marked with an asterisk), the recommendations and resolutions contained therein be approved and adopted without debate, excepting Notices of Motion, Deputations, Petitions and letters

## 5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

5.1 There were none.

## 6. LETTER FROM COUNCILLORS

6.1 None received.

**7. PETITION: 'NO MORE DELAYS OR SURVEYS!!!'**

7.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 102 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor Brian Oxley.

'No More Delays or Surveys!!!

As residents of Carlisle Road we the undersigned want action to implement residents parking in our street – NOW. As residents and tax payers, we feel it is our right to be able to demand a scheme that will enable us to park outside our own properties again.'

7.2 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

**8. PETITION : SPEEDING AT SACKVILLE GARDENS, HOVE**

8.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 47 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor Brian Oxley.

'Speeding at Sackville Gardens, Hove.

We, the undersigned wish to express our concerns about motorists which use Sackville Gardens as a rat run and drive at speeds we consider dangerous. We wish the council to note our concerns and take action to stop this situation before a serious accident occurs.'

8.2 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

**9. PETITION : RESIDENTS OF THE KNOLL ESTATE CALL ON BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL TO INSTALL A PEDESTRIAN CROSSING ON THE INCREDIBLY BUSY OLIVE ROAD**

9.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 248 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor Peter Willows.

'We, the undersigned residents of the Knoll Estate, call on Brighton & Hove City Council to install a pedestrian crossing on the incredibly busy Olive Road. The current situation whereby schoolchildren, the elderly and the disabled have to literally take their life in their hands if they want to cross the road is totally unsustainable and requires urgent action by the council.'

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

**10. PETITION : CHANGES TO THE BUS STOP OUTSIDE OUR FLATS**

10.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 11 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor Older

'As residents of 10-12 Goldstone Villas, Hove, we would like to complain about the disruption caused by the changes to the bus stop outside our flats. There is extensive noise from not only the buses themselves but also people waiting for buses. Due to the fact that

the number 7 bus is a 24 hours service people who have been in pubs or clubs drinking often tend to use it, especially at weekends. This regularly causes severe noise and disturbance throughout the night meaning that not only are we woken up, but it is often impossible to get back to sleep for long periods. During the day time the sheer volume of people waiting at the bus stop causes a great deal of noise, meaning that the windows can't be left open.'

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

**11. PETITION : COMMUNAL BINS IN WATERLOO STREET AND LOWER BRUNSWICK STREET**

11.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 31 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor Paul Elgood.

'I do not want communal container bins in Waterloo Street and Lower Brunswick Street.'

11.2 **RESOLVED** - That the petition be noted

**12. PETITION : INTRODUCTION OF WHEELIE BINS TO THE PRESTON PARK WARD**

12.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 17 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor Mallender.

'The undersigned residents of the Preston Ward do not agree with the introduction of wheelie bins to the Preston Park Ward where they will be permanently stored on the public highway due to access restrictions.

We do not wish our neighbourhood to be littered with the green plastic wheelie bins causing hazards for pedestrians, eyesores for residents and the possible devaluation of our properties.'

12.2 **RESOLVED** - That the petition be noted

**13. PETITION : WHEELIE BINS ON PAVEMENT OUTSIDE BRIDGEN STREET**

13.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 39 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor McCaffery.

'Petition against wheelie bins located on the pavement directly outside our front doors in Bridgen Street.'

13.2 **RESOLVED** - That the petition be noted

**14. PETITION : AGAINST MANDATORY INTRODUCTION OF WHEELIE BINS IN SANDGATE ROAD**

14.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 39 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor McCaffery.

'This is a petition against the mandatory introduction of wheelie bins in our road (*Sandgate Road*). We would like the council to look into alternative solutions that do not involve the storage of refuse on the pavement.'

14.2 **RESOLVED** - That the petition be noted

## **15. PETITION : REQUESTING REMOVAL OF WHEELIE BINS**

15.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 46 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor McCaffery.

'We the undersigned are requesting that removal of the recently delivered Wheelie Bin placed outside our homes by City Clean. Whilst accepting that in some areas a Wheelie Bin could well make the streets cleaner our road is completely unsuitable for this method...'

15.2 **RESOLVED** - That the petition be noted

## **16. PETITION : AGAINST SUPPLY OF WHEELIE BINS IN THE FIVE WAYS AREA**

16.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 126 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor McCaffery.

'... Those who signed are opposed to the decision to supply wheelie bins without consultation or consideration of their impact on the urban environment. (... of Five Ways). Therefore, we ask the Council to remove the bins from our streets while considering alternatives. We also ask to be advised of how the success or failure of the trial will be assessed, that consideration be given to how residents are adapting to the scheme and if its impact on our urban environment ...'

16.2 **RESOLVED** - That the petition be noted

## **17. PETITION : TO BAN HGV AND REFUSE VEHICLES IN RUGBY ROAD**

17.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 91 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor Mallender.

'We call upon the council to:

- 1) Instigate an HGV ban in Rugby Road (and other nearby traffic-calmed roads west of Ditchling Road)
- 2) Instruct refuse vehicle drivers to avoid Rugby Road (and other nearby traffic calmed roads) as a through route.
- 3) Seek or make provision for alternative routes for refuse vehicles'.

17.2 **RESOLVED** – That a report be brought to a future meeting regarding the above.

## **18. PETITION : TO BAN HGV AND REFUSE VEHICLES IN RUGBY ROAD**

18.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 60 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor McCaffery.

'We call upon the council to:

- (1) Instigate an HGV ban in Rugby Road (and other nearby traffic-calmed roads west of Ditchling Road)
- (2) Instruct refuse vehicle drivers to avoid Rugby Road (and other nearby traffic calmed roads) as a through route
- (3) Seek or make provision for alternative routes for refuse vehicles'.

18.2 **RESOLVED** - That a report be brought to a future meeting regarding the above.

## **19. PETITION : OBJECTION TO P.H. BECK BUILDING CONTRACTORS**

19.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 17 people, presented at Council on 26 March 2005 by Councillor Hamilton.

"We, the undersigned, strongly object to P.H. Beck Building Contractors using the industrial unit in Lincoln Road, Portslade, as a builders yard. (Please see the covering letter with reasons for this objection)."

19.2 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

## **20. PETITION : RECEIVED FROM DR. M. SEGALL**

20.1 The Committee received a Petition, signed by 127 people, which was sent direct to Council held on 8 May 2005 by Dr. M. Segall.

'We support the proposal to extend controlled parking to our area, but object to the intention to impose a double yellow line kerbside restriction in front of the drives of residential properties.

There will not be enough parking spaces for resident permit holders relative to demand and the double yellow line restriction in front of drives limits the amount of parking space available. Residents may be forced to roam far and wide to find a parking space. People virtually never park in front of the drives of others, so the restriction is unnecessary from this standpoint. On the other hand, some households have more than one car and want to be able to park in front of their own drives if they need to.

The simplest solution would be to leave the present single white line in front of residential driveways. An alternative would be for the council to issue resident parking permit holders with car stickers specifying the vehicle registration numbers and addresses in question and exempting the vehicles from the double yellow line restriction at those addresses.

We the undersigned request the council to take a practical – and not a bureaucratic – approach and not impose a double yellow line restriction in front of residential driveways.

20.2 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted (see also item 24)

## **21. DEPUTATION CONCERNING THE INTRODUCTION OF WHEELIE BINS INTO THE PRESTON PARK/FIVEWAYS AREA**

(Presented at Council - 28 April 2005)

### **21.1 Mr. Graham Hale (Spokesperson)**

Wheelie bins are becoming an eyesore on our streets which will soon be filled with lots of visually aware people from all over Brighton, Sussex, Britain and even Europe going round looking at the Open Houses. They will be horrified like us at the sights that greet them in our streets and many other areas of Brighton. The idea that we should ever have to compromise the visual aesthetics of any area, especially Conservation Areas, supposedly in the name of efficient refuse collections is, quite frankly, ludicrous.

Wheelie bins were introduced into the Preston Park/Fiveways area at the end of March without any consultation with residents. The scheme, as introduced, has caused a huge number of vociferous complaints from residents. The terraced housing, which forms a large

part of the area is particularly unsuitable for wheelie bins due to lack of off-street storage. Permanent storage of bins on the pavements is wholly unacceptable and should not be allowed, let alone suggested and in some cases forced on people by a responsible Government. The recent public meeting of over 350 residents from the Preston Park area voted unanimously against the permanent storage of bins on pavements.

A year ago there was extensive consultation in North Laine (an area of terraced housing) that resulted in a system for refuse collection fully supported by the residents. The scheme imposed on the Preston Park/Fiveways area must be reviewed immediately on a remit acceptable to the residents and a more suitable system for refuse collection agreed with these residents.

We propose that there should be a review group consisting of a limited number of residents put forward by us, local Councillors and officers to look at alternative methods of refuse collection where wheelie bins are not deemed suitable by the residents. An alternative method is already required for the streets that the Council has deemed themselves not suitable for wheelie bins, otherwise there is no encouragement for the residents of those streets to reduce landfill and recycle, nor are the other criteria of safer and more secure refuse collection met in these streets. All streets should be reviewed, as there are some places, even seemingly suitable streets, where off-street storage is impossible, especially in some multiple occupancy properties. The problems associated with storing refuse on the pavements actually outweighs the advantages because far from making the streets litter-free, as some would have us believe, it actually encourages people to flytip, putting all sorts of household rubbish on the pavements and they have less respect for their local environment.

The aim of this Council should be to eliminate refuse storage on the street totally."

21.6 **RESOLVED** – That the deputation be noted.

## **22. DEPUTATION TO COUNCIL – WASTE TRANSFER STATION AND MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY OFF HOLLINGDEN LANE**

(Presented to Council 10<sup>th</sup> March 2005)

### **22.1 Ms. Staufer (Spokesperson)**

Subject matter: Waste Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility off Hollingdean Lane at the Former Abattoir Site.

Introduction: We represent residents and the 1200 children at the



two Downs Schools, who are objecting to the proposed Waste Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility at the former abattoir site. We are upset that we have to speak here today to ask, 'when are we going to be properly consulted about this proposal?' A little public notice in the newspaper for this enormous development, telling us we have 3 weeks to comment, is inadequate. The site will be transferring and sorting all of Brighton & Hove's household waste, in the middle of a residential area! Freedom of information and stakeholder engagement – we think not!

We are here today not just to object 'nimby'. We agree with the expansion of recycling, as part of sustainable waste management.

We ask however is the site in the right place? And is the scale of the development in keeping with its location?

In the last 2 weeks we have tried to find out more to be able to answer these questions. We have found the councillors either not forthcoming or ignorant on this subject, and this makes us suspicious. We would like to outline various concerns and we are looking to you to help us get the answers. We all should make local democracy work, rather than relying on a government public enquiry to investigate the development, given it is a proposal on council land.

Children are encouraged, under the new curriculum, to play and have lessons outdoors. The Downs Schools should be entitled to playgrounds without noise and pollution.

We are opposed to this development on the following grounds:

**1) Site selection:**

We do not understand how the Hollingdean site was selected. Onyx's Environmental Report sets out the basis of site short listings. It appears to contain some highly questionable conclusions:

1. Comparison of sites concentrates on access by articulated HGVs and the distance to a main traffic route. The effect of smaller HGVs and other lorries travelling to the site through the surrounding area is hardly mentioned.
2. Hollingbury has been rejected, because it is 600m from the bypass, yet Hollingdean is chosen because it is 500m from Lewes Road, ignoring the fact that the route goes under a unsuitable railway bridge.
3. Hollingbury is also rejected because of the proximity of the Sussex Downs 'Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty' (AONB), but ignores the fact that the site is in the middle of an industrial site. The 2 schools with 1200 children and hundreds of houses are much nearer to the Hollingdean site, than Hollingbury is to the AONB!

The mechanisms used to arrive at Hollingdean as the "final choice" would appear to be solely based on the fact that the site was already in the ownership of the council.

We found the documentation for this application severely flawed.

## **2) Traffic :**

The area around the development is highly congested during the morning and afternoon school rush hours. We are really worried about the increase of traffic levels, increasing the likelihood of children being hit by a vehicle, the air pollution and the associated risks to health.

The council has not adequately informed the residents and schools of the increase in their fleet of refuse lorries. This has already started, as has the increase in the lorry traffic. There is a duty over and above the legal obligations of a few lines in the local paper to inform and consider those directly affected. We should apply for an Anti Social Behaviour Order, as City Clean are behaving very antisocially with regards to noise and being a nuisance to their neighbours.

## **3) The scale:**

What bothers us is the scale of this development, as it is for all of Brighton & Hove's household waste!

## **4) Noise:**

The Onyx reports states 'The determination of the significance of the noise effects on the Downs Infant School is considered to be 'substantial'. Has the LEA been consulted?

## **5) Lack of information:**

We have not been given the opportunity to be properly consulted on this development or the Waste Local Plan. Consultation should provide a mechanism to involve a local community, in reaching good decisions. It is not just telling you, what has already been decided.

In a development of this type the planning authority should be ensuring that the developer (that is the council and Onyx) is properly engaging with us, the community; the whole of Brighton & Hove, not just the ward. We would expect there to be a proper public exhibition, attended by the developer and the council officers, where we can ask the questions, get the answers, and maybe help the council come up with the best solution – and before the planning decision is made!

It is for ALL of the above reasons that we object to this development. And we want the council to give us the time and the information to

be properly informed and the opportunity to challenge the validity of the decision and to help come up with alternatives.

22.14 **RESOLVED** - That the deputation be noted.

## **22. DEPUTATION TO COUNCIL – HGV RUGBY ROAD - A REQUEST FOR A BAN ON HGV VEHICLES IN RUGBY ROAD, BRIGHTON.**

(Presented at Council – 28<sup>th</sup> April 2005)

### **Ms Catherine Horner (Spokesperson)**

“Rugby Road has been used by a large number of heavy goods vehicles every day including weekends and these large, noisy vehicles are using it as a cut-through from Ditchling Road across to the western side of the city. The majority of these vehicles, but not all, are recycling vehicles or refuse vehicles coming from the nearby Hollingdean Depot. A recent survey by Rugby Road residents showed that on a single day more than 40 HGVs were using the road. These are starting from very early in the morning, from 6.00am in fact.

Our arguments for why we believe that we should have a ban in Rugby Road are as follows:

- It is a small residential road.
- It is in a Conservation Area.
- It is popular with families with young children.

There are already in place significant calming measures, including narrowing of the road at both ends, that is the Stanford Avenue end and Ditchling Road end, speed bumps all the way down and a 20mph speed limit. This obviously indicates that it is accepted that Rugby Road should be a traffic calmed road with no heavy goods vehicles using it. There is a very large junior school at the top end of Rugby Road, Downs Junior School, that has almost 500 pupils and as I understand it is one of the largest in Brighton. Children walk to and from the school, going up the road, going across the road and they have to dodge the HGVs as they go. That is not just at school going in time and going out time but also during the day when they go out for outings, trips, swimming, that kind of thing. Each time they do that they are being put at risk by these vehicles.

It seems grossly inappropriate, given the nature of Rugby Road, being a small residential road with significant road calming and it is on a very steep incline that large HGVs use this road. There are much safer, viable alternative routes for these vehicles to take using large A roads with no calming measures and no schools. Using these routes would cause HGV drivers very little hardship indeed. In fact it

probably only adds minutes, at most, to their journeys.

The Council clearly recognises the issues affecting Rugby Road in the past by putting the calming measures in place and the reduced speed limit. However, perversely in the absence of an outright ban on HGVs this action has actually exacerbated the problem with the speed bumps causing a stop, start, accelerate, decelerate, travel pattern and few HGVs observe the 20mph speed limit. By driving over the speed bumps at any sort of speed it makes it even more dangerous, particularly for the children and it destabilises the vehicles. It is very difficult if you think of a vehicle going up the road and over the bumps, they are slow as they go up and it is very difficult then for children to judge what speed the vehicles are travelling at. It also has a massive impact on noise levels.

Additionally the road narrowing at the top end from Ditchling Road and at Stanford Avenue creates unnecessary danger when they turn into the road and out again. This is a particular problem at the Ditchling Road end where there is Downs Junior School on the corner but also across the road Downs Infant School. The HGVs are turning across the traffic causing congestion but also turning across between two schools which I think is very dangerous indeed.

Apart from these obvious safety issues the residents of Rugby Road and the teachers at Downs Junior School are fed up with the constant noise of these vehicles. It is particularly unpleasant for residents who mostly have their bedrooms on the front of the properties and are regularly woken at six o'clock in the morning. The vibrations are also likely to cause damage to the foundations of the old Victorian houses. They are also worried about the noise pollution and the quality of the air affected by these vehicles, particularly given what is emitted from the exhaust.

To summarise the existing traffic calming measures are not sufficient to prevent HGVs using Rugby Road as a cut-through. They are actually exacerbating the problem. Hollingbury Road in the vicinity has suffered similar problems in the past and an HGV ban was successfully imposed in Hollingbury Road. Rugby Road is in precisely the same position but in addition has a large junior school. If consistency and precedent count for anything then there can be no argument against putting an HGV ban in Rugby Road. An outright ban seems to be the only way to ensure HGVs do not use this inappropriate road as a cut-through. There are alternative routes they can use, using A roads and it would mean minimal disruption to their journey times."

23.10 **RESOLVED** – That a report be brought to a future meeting in regard to the above.

**\*24. HOVE STATION (AREA T) RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME**

24.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding relating to the Hove Station (Area T) Resident Parking Scheme (for copy see minute book). Chair invited Dr. Segall to address the Committee in respect of his petition (see item 20). Following discussion of the various options suggested by Dr. Segall and an amendment moved by Councillor Mitchell and seconded by Cllr Meegan, the committee resolved the following.

24.2 **RESOLVED** - That the Environment Committee having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, approves as advertised the following orders:

(a) Brighton & Hove Controlled Parking Zone (Area T) Traffic Regulation Order 2005.

(b) Brighton & Hove Controlled Parking Zone (Area O) Traffic Regulation Order 2003 amendment order No 2 2005

(2) That in response to the petition (Item 20) a letter will be sent to all residents in Area T asking them whether they would prefer a double yellow line, a single yellow line, white line access protection, a residents parking bay marking or a residents parking bay with a white line access protection across their driveway. The letter will include the pros and cons of each option.

(3) That, following consultation with the Chair and the Opposition Spokesperson, the Director of Environment be authorised to advertise an amendment Order to allow Traffic Regulation Order to be modified to take account of resident's preferences.

**\*25. CHURCH ROAD HOVE, HIGHWAY & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT SCHEME – PHASE 1, FLORAL CLOCK**

25.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the Church Road Hove, Highway & Environmental Improvement Scheme – Phase 1, Floral Clock (for copy see minute book).

25.2 **RESOLVED** – That (1) the outcome of the full public consultation undertaken on the preliminary design for the 'Floral Clock' area be noted.

(2) That the Director of Environment be authorised to take the preferred scheme forward to detailed design and subsequent implementation on site.

**\*26. A270 LEWES ROAD – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT CORRIDOR**

**(VOGUE GYRATORY)**

26.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the A270 Lewes Road – Sustainable Transport Corridor (Vogue Gyratory) (for copy see minute book).

26.2 **RESOLVED** – That the making of 'The Brighton & Hove (Lewes Road Area)(Bus Lanes) Order 2004' be approved as advertised, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections.

**\*27. PARKING POLICY STATEMENT FOR ISSUING PARKING PERMITS**

27.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the Parking Policy Statement for Issuing Parking Permits (for copy see minute book). Officers advised that separate Traffic Regulation Orders would be required for parts of this process.

27.2 **RESOLVED** –That (1) the changes be made to existing arrangements to create a new parking policy statement as detailed in appendix B of the report.

(2) That the changes before and after the implementation of the possible changes to Central Brighton be monitored as part of the parking review

**\*28. QUEENS PARK PARKING SCHEME CHANGES AND ST LUKE'S AREA LIMITED WAITING RESTRICTIONS - OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC ORDER**

28.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the Queens Park parking scheme changes and St Luke's Area Limited Waiting Restrictions - Objections to traffic order (for copy see minute book).

28.2 **RESOLVED** - That (1) having taken account of all duly made representations and objections the following order be made, as advertised.

(a) The Double Yellow Lines on the Queens Park Rise / St Lukes Terrace junction to protect the kerb build outs under the Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions & Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2001 Amendment Order 2005 Queen's Park Rise & St Luke's Terrace

2) That having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the following orders be not made.

(a) The limited waiting for two hours 8am – 4pm on the south side of St Luke's Terrace between St Luke's Road and Queens Park Rise

under the Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions & Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2001 Amendment Order 2005 Queen's Park Rise & St Luke's Terrace.

(b) The limited waiting for two hours 8am – 4pm on the west side of Queens Park Rise between St Luke's Terrace and Queens Park Terrace under the Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions & Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2001 Amendment Order 2005 Queen's Park Rise & St Luke's Terrace.

(3) That the monitoring of the St Luke's area to the north of the recently introduced Queens Park (Area C) parking scheme boundary during the scheme's first six months of operation be approved, to determine the extent to which displacement of vehicles has taken place.

**\*29. USE OF WITHDEAN STADIUM BY BRIGHTON AND HOVE ALBION: RESULTS OF MONITORING FOR 2002/03 AND 2003/2004 SEASONS**

29.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the Use of Withdean Stadium by Brighton and Hove Albion: Results of Monitoring for 2002/03 and 2003/2004 Seasons (for copy see minute book).

29.2 **RESOLVED** – (a) That the club be encouraged to continue to work proactively and in partnership with the council, local community and its supporters to reduce any impacts associated with match-day activities and welcome the efforts of the club to provide and promote the continued use of sustainable transport measures on match-days;

(b) That it be acknowledged that the results of the residents' survey on local parking controls were inconclusive;

(c) That although not all of the terms of the most recent legal agreement have been met, the amenity of the area has not suffered demonstrable harm and therefore no formal penalties will be imposed for the 2002/03 and 2003/04 seasons;

(d) That, in lieu of any formal penalties relating to the exceedance of targets, the club undertake the following actions to minimise the effects of match-day parking inside the parking cordon:-

clearly establish the effects on travel patterns and parking of providing an additional 200 space park and ride site or alternative means of sustainable transport, subject to determination of the current planning application;

fund the collection of new baseline transport data; and

write to all ticket holders before the start of, and during, next season;

That, in the event that the outcome of the measures in d) do not contribute to reducing levels of match-day parking within the cordon, the club undertake a match-day car registration plate check against its season ticket holder database and fund further investigation and consultation into the possible implementation and enforcement of appropriate parking controls within the cordon.

### **30. SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**

30.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding School Keep Clear - Traffic Regulation Order (for copy see minute book).

30.2 **RESOLVED** – That the making of the Brighton & Hove City Council Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 Brighton & Hove (School Keep Clears) (Various Roads) Order 2005 be approved as advertised having taken account of all duly made representations and objections.

### **31. EXPERIMENTAL CLOSURE OF DOWNLAND ROAD AND SEAVIEW ROAD WOODINGDEAN**

31.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the Experimental Closure of Downland Road and Seaview Road Woodingdean (for copy see minute book).

31.2 **RESOLVED** – That having taken into account all duly made representations and objections, the making of a Traffic Regulation Order to permanently close Downland Road at the junction with Seaview Road, as is currently in force under the Brighton & Hove (Downland Road)(Road Closure) (Experimental) Traffic Regulation Order 2004 be authorised.

### **\*32. DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT BUDGET 2005/2006**

32.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Budget 2005/2006 (for copy see minute book).

32.2 **RESOLVED** – That (1) the budgeted DPE surplus of £5.9 million for 2005/06 be noted.

(2) To note that Policy and Resources Committee resolved, in accordance with the provisions of section 55 (4) (d) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended, that additional off-street parking accommodation within the city is currently unnecessary or undesirable.



(3) To (a) note that Council resolved, as part of the 2005/06 budget, to appropriate the surplus during 2005/06 for the eligible expenditure on public transport and the capital costs of highway and road improvement schemes and (b) approve the detail as listed in Appendix B of the report.

(4) That the appropriation of additional expenditure of £0.5 million as detailed in Appendix D be approved.

(5) To note that, subject to satisfactory income during the summer period, an additional programme of one-off expenditure of up to £0.5 million will be presented to the Committee in December 2005 for approval.

### **33. SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT – SHOP FRONT DESIGN**

33.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the Supplementary Planning Document – Shop Front Design (for copy see minute book).

33.2 **RESOLVED** - That the draft Supplementary Planning Document on Shop Front Design be approved for the purposes of formal public consultation..

### **\*34. APPROVED TRADER SCHEME**

34.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the Approved Trader Scheme (for copy see minute book).

34.2 **RESOLVED** - That (1) the Director of Environment be authorised to introduce the 'Buy with Confidence' scheme.

(2) That the Director of Environment be authorised to levy a charge for membership to enable scheme to be self-financing once a critical mass of membership has been achieved.

### **35. PRIDE FESTIVAL STREET PARTY**

35.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the Pride Festival Street Party (for copy see minute book).

35.2 **RESOLVED** – That the street party in St James' Street area on Saturday the 6<sup>th</sup> and Sunday the 7<sup>th</sup> August 2005 as detailed in the report be approved and the associated road closures be authorised.

**\*36. SDI PHASE VII – THE BANDSTAND RESTORATION**

36.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the SDI Phase VII – The Bandstand Restoration (for copy see minute book).

36.2 **RESOLVED** – That the (1) the link bridge to the upper level of the Bandstand be reinstated, as detailed in paragraph 3.8 of the report.

(2) That the management arrangements for the future use of the Bandstand as outlined in paragraph 4.3 of the report be approved and that Officers be authorised to seek expressions of interest for the commercial use of the Bandstand, with explicit conditions attached that allows the upper level to be used as a performance space at designated time per year.

(3) That an artist is commissioned to put forward a project to sit in the designated area within phase VII.

(4) That a small clubhouse and public toilets at the western end of the development should be the subject of future funding bids.

(5) That the financial strategy as detailed in paragraph 8.1 – 8.8 of the report (that identifies match funding for the bandstand, funding for outstanding projects and repairs to the mosaic) be approved.

(6) That the funding for the future maintenance of the bandstand as detailed in paragraph 8.4 of the report is earmarked and held appropriately to ensure liabilities are met.

**\*37. TETHERED HELIUM BALLOON PROPOSAL FOR THE LEVEL OR VICTORIA GARDENS**

37.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the Tethered Helium Balloon Proposal for The Level or Victoria Gardens (for copy see minute book).

37.4 **RESOLVED** - That (1) the proposal for the operation of a tethered helium balloon ride in the City be endorsed.

(2) That officers (a) be authorised to continue to work with Lindstrand Technologies in determining the most suitable site, negotiating possible terms for a lease and assisting them in their planning process and (b) to report progress to the Environment Committee in due course.

**\*38. DISCUSSION PAPER: FRAMEWORK FOR THE CITY'S' CULTURAL**

**QUARTER**

38.1 The Committee considered the report of the Director of Environment regarding the Discussion Paper: Framework for the City's Cultural Quarter (for copy see minute book).

38.2 **RESOLVED** – (1) To note that the Culture and Tourism Sub Committee requested that the report be presented to the Environment Committee;

(2) To endorse the view of the Culture and Tourism Sub-Committee that a coherent and joined-up approach to the city's Cultural Quarter is vital, and that the quarter's future viability and sustainability is key to ensuring that the city's cultural offer is placed centre-stage locally, regionally, nationally and internationally (enabling Brighton & Hove to "punch above its weight" and provide a powerful and compelling case for investment)

*Councillor Wrighton wished it recorded that she voted against (2).*

**PART TWO****39. ITEMS TO REMAIN EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE TO THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

39.1 **RESOLVED** - That no items remain exempt from disclosure to the press and public.

The meeting concluded at 7.30 pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2005