



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**LICENSING COMMITTEE (NON  
LICENSING ACT 2003 FUNCTIONS)  
ADDENDUM**

**3.00PM, FRIDAY, 24 APRIL 2009**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, BRIGHTON TOWN HALL**



# ADDENDUM

ITEM	Page
31. PUBLIC QUESTIONS	1 - 2



**WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Every question shall be put and answered without discussion, but the person to whom a question has been put may decline to answer. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion.

The following written questions have been received by members of the public.

**(a) Mr Bennett**

Churchill Square, Brighton is owned by Standard Life. No A boards or other obstructions are permitted either in the covered area or the northern open area. CS is not a thoroughfare but a space given over completely to trade. This is flourishing. In great contrast, the City's pavements, which are thoroughfares owned and maintained from the public purse, are obstructed by traders private clutter. Why does the Council tolerate this invasion?

**(b) Mr Chavasse**

Pavements. The recommended 1.3m norm envisages retention of 1m, with escape provisions for immobile persons trapped by obstructions, but not the many dangers to the public. Best Practice is the Dft guidance 2m norm. In our Western Road's Brunswick section 2m advantageously places all A Boards in private forecourts but, as officers know, neither 1.3 nor 1m is safe at bottleneck sites, including combinations of street furniture, active outdoor areas, trade displays and corners. Will the Committee please add a 2m norm and commission consultation to eliminate complicity in the licensing of unsafe, obstructing bottlenecks contemplated by lesser distances?

