

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

4.00PM 26 JANUARY 2010

COMMITTEE ROOM 3, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor G Theobald (Cabinet Member)

Also in attendance: Councillor Davey (Opposition Spokesperson, Green)

Other Members present: Councillors Watkins and West

PART ONE

81. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

81a Declarations of Interests

81a.1 There were none.

81b Exclusion of Press and Public

81b.1 In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ('the Act'), the Cabinet Member for Environment 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 nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press or 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 100I(1) of the Act).

81b.2 **RESOLVED** – That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

82. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

82.1 **RESOLVED** – The minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2009 were approved and signed by the Cabinet Member as a correct record.

83. CABINET MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS

83.1 The Cabinet Member wished to record his, and the Council's, thanks to all staff within the Environment Directorate who had worked hard during the recent snowfall. In particular, officers from City Clean, City Parks and the Seafront Office had made huge

efforts to tackle the difficult conditions, in addition to working with colleagues in Adult Social Care to reach vulnerable people.

84. ITEMS RESERVED FOR DISCUSSION

84.1 **RESOLVED** - That all the items be reserved for discussion.

85. PETITIONS

85(i) Petition – Parking Zones M, N and O

85.1 Councillor Watkins presented a petition signed by 120 people requesting that controlled parking zones M, N and O be merged.

85.2 The Cabinet Member stated that as there was also a deputation relating to the same matter, he would deal with them together late on the agenda.

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

85(ii) Petition – Traffic in Ditchling Rise

85.4 Councillor West presented a petition signed by 170 people requesting a meeting with traffic engineers to discuss measures to reduce the amount of traffic in Ditchling Rise.

85.5 Local resident, Mr Steve Foster, explained the problems of rat-running in Ditchling Rise and use of the road by heavy vehicles.

85.6 The Cabinet Member advised that arrangement had already been made for officers to meet with local residents and councillors to discuss the issues and that officers would report back on possible measures.

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

85(iii) Petition – Use of bus travel cards for the disabled

85.8 Councillor Phillips had submitted a petition signed by 45 people with disabilities requesting the right to use their travel cards in order to get to work.

85.9 Councillor Phillips was unable to attend the meeting.

85.10 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted and a written response be provided.

85(iv) Petition – communal bins in Brunswick Town

85.11 Councillor Elgood had submitted a petition signed by 35 people requesting that pedal assisted communal bins be returned to Brunswick Town.

85.12 Councillor Watkins presented the petition on behalf of Councillor Elgood, who was unable to attend the meeting due to Council business.

85.13 The Cabinet Member explained that one of the main problems with the communal bins with the foot pedals was that the pedals would frequently break and residents ended up having to lift a larger and heavier lid instead. He stated that the council advised residents to take smaller amounts of rubbish to the communal bins and that where residents could not use the bins the council was able to offer assistance.

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

85(v) Petition – gating order, Farman Street

85.15 Councillor Elgood presented a petition signed by 70 people requesting that the Council agree to fit a gate to the Western Road end of the Farman Street alley to prevent improper use at night.

85.16 Councillor Watkins presented the petition on behalf of Councillor Elgood, who was unable to attend the meeting due to Council business.

85.17 The Cabinet Member reported that officers had met with local councillors and residents to listen to the concerns and discuss possible ways forward; the setting up of a local working group had been agreed. The council had an agreed Gating Order protocol to follow and officers were working with the local community to gather information in support of a potential Gating Order and identifying the specifications of a feasible scheme. He advised that officers hoped that the information gathered, along with the residents' incident reports, would enable a draft scheme to be produced for consultation and which could form the basis of a Gating Order.

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

86. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

86.1 The Cabinet Member reported that one public question had been received.

86.2 Mr Davys asked the following question:

"Have the developers of the Brighton O entered into and/or signed any form of development agreement with Brighton & Hove City Council?"

86.3 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:

"There is no development agreement as such between the Council and Paramount Attractions Limited, who are the proposed developers of the Brighton O. If planning permission were to be granted there would be a s106 Agreement entered into as well as relevant property documentation.

There is, however, an Exclusivity or Lock Out Agreement which expires on 31.03.10. That Agreement includes termination provisions and provides that all planning and challenge risk is with the developer.

Scott Marshall, Director of Culture & Enterprise, has recently been appointed as the Project Director for the Brighton O and he is working with other officers to see if

development of the O is possible, in such a way that does not prejudice the Sailing Club, the i-360, the West Pier Trust and the seafront generally. This includes looking at alternative sites.”

86.4 Mr Davys asked the following supplementary question:

“Is there any more you can tell us?”

The Cabinet Member advised that there was nothing else he could add, but asked the lawyer to the meeting, who was also the council’s lawyer for the i360, as well as the Brighton O project, if he could provide any further information.

86.5 The lawyer to the meeting explained that discussions were ongoing. Although the planning application was scheduled to be considered at a forthcoming meeting of the council’s Planning Committee and officers had recommended that approval be refused, the decision could still be deferred to allow attempts to be made to overcome the prejudice to the sailing club prior to consideration by the Committee. The council hoped to have further discussions with Paramount Attractions Ltd.

87. DEPUTATIONS

87.1 The Cabinet Member reported that one deputation had been received.

87.2 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation from Ms Juliette Hunting requesting controlled parking zones M, N and O be merged to form one central zone to alleviate the individual pressure on the each of the zones and allow residents more freedom to park (for copy see minute book).

87.3 Councillor Watkins spoke in support of the proposals detailed in the deputation and supporting petition.

87.4 The Cabinet Member advised that the objective of reducing parking pressure in Zone M could be achieved through using some of the spare parking capacity in Area O. The Area O scheme was at 89% capacity with 1,929 permits on issue for the 2,167 permit spaces available. Merging the two schemes would therefore benefit Area M residents by increasing the number of permit bays available to them. Area O residents would have less to gain from merging the two parking zones. With larger zones, internal commuting within the zone could become an issue although, due to the size and geography of the potential new OM zone, it was unlikely that this would cause significant problems.

A suggested merger of Areas O, M and N would be more problematic and would be unlikely to reap the same benefits as an OM merger. Zone N was at 97% capacity and so a merger with Zone N would not significantly increase the amount of parking available. Area N was also one of the largest zones and, if the three zones were to be merged, internal commuting within the new large zones could present problems, particularly with the draw of parking close to Western Road shops.

The Cabinet Member advised that the council would include a review of Areas O and M in the future priority parking scheme timetable to ensure that the council had the

available resources to look into it carefully. The agreement of the Goldsmid Ward councillors would be required in order to proceed with the investigation.

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

88. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS

88.1 There were none.

89. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

89.1 There were none.

90. NOTICES OF MOTION

90.1 There were none.

91. CIVITAS ROAD SAFETY CAMPAIGN

91.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the CIVITAS Road Safety Campaign project and seeking approval to progress the identified sites to Detailed Design stage and to advertise any necessary Traffic Regulation Orders (for copy see minute book).

91.2 The Cabinet Member stated that, ideally, such projects would not be needed, however, given that the need was driven by accidents, he was pleased to see that efforts were being made to improve road safety amongst the most vulnerable road users. He added that it was encouraging to hear that such minor interventions had the potential to make a significant impact on people's lives.

91.3 Councillor Davey welcomed the report and agreed that many benefits could come from small scale projects. He stated that the de-cluttering of London Road would make a significant difference to the area and improve safety. He added that the Another London Road Group were likely to appreciate the installation of central refuges.

91.4 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:

- (1) That approval be given to progress the five sites in London Road and Lewes Road to detailed design stage and advertise Traffic Regulation Orders.

92. CYCLIST PRIORITY NETWORK

92.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment seeking approval to work up recommended and contingency small scale cycling projects as part of the CIVITAS Cycle Priority Network (for copy see minute book).

92.2 The Cabinet Member explained that high quality, accessibility for all, was key to the city's cultural, financial and academic economy and that the ability to choose how to move around the city was also a priority. He stated that that were gaps in the quality of

the city's existing cycling infrastructure, and that it limited accessibility and transport choice for some residents. He advised that the report detailed proposals for improvements to the cycle network, and would in particular improve links between the city and the University.

- 92.3 Councillor Davey welcomed the report and in particular the measures proposed for Coombe Terrace.
- 92.4 The Cabinet Member added that one of the benefits of the CIVITAS project was that the council was required to report back on progress.
- 92.5 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That approval be given for work to continue on the four recommended and two contingency projects to detailed design stage and to advertise Traffic Regulation Orders.

93. FEES AND CHARGES 2010/11

- 93.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning proposed fees and charges for 2010/11 (for copy see minute book).
- 93.2 The Cabinet Member advised that two corrections needed to be made to the fees and charges detailed in Appendix 1:
- That in relation to Traders Permits, the permit period be amended to 3 months; a 1 year permit did not exist.
 - That the Norton Road car park charge for 12 hours be amended to £4.50 to bring it into line with the on road parking.
- 93.3 Councillor Davey wished to pass on Councillor Kitcat's gratitude for the new tariffs proposed for the Regency Square Car Park, which he hoped would have a positive impact in the surrounding area.
- 93.4 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That the proposed fees and charges for 2010/11 be agreed.

The meeting concluded at 4.40pm

Signed

Cabinet Member

Dated this

day of