

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**  
**ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING**

**4.00PM 26 JULY 2010**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillor G Theobald (Cabinet Member)

**Also in attendance:** Councillors Mitchell (Opposition Spokesperson, Labour) and Rufus (Opposition Spokesperson, Green)

**Other Members present:** Councillors Alford, Allen, Bennett, Kennedy, McCaffery, Morgan, Peltzer Dunn and Steedman

**PART ONE**

**14. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS**

**14a Declarations of Interests**

14a.1 There were none.

**14b Exclusion of Press and Public**

14b.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).

14b.2 **RESOLVED** – That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

**15. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

15.1 **RESOLVED** – The minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2010 were approved and signed by the Cabinet Member as a correct record.

**16. CABINET MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS**

16.1 The Cabinet Member reported that the council had won the award for National Transport Local Authority of the Year at the National Transport Awards and that the

judges had been very impressed with the council's achievements. He thanked the Assistant Director for Sustainable Transport and the transport team for their commitment and hard work.

**17. ITEMS RESERVED FOR DISCUSSION**

17.1 **RESOLVED** - That all the items be reserved.

**18. PETITIONS**

**18(i) E-petition – Queens Park dog control order**

18.1 Councillor Fryer had submitted an e-petition and accompanying paper petition both presented at Council on 15 July 2010 and signed by 375 and 1526 people respectively requesting that the council review the operation of the dog control order in Queens Park, and return all areas to the dog-free status enjoyed prior to January 2009.

18.2 Councillor Steedman presented the petition on behalf on Councillor Fryer who was unable to attend the meeting and also submitted an additional 102 signatures.

18.3 The Cabinet Member explained that he would respond to the petition during consideration of the deputation on the same issue.

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

**18(ii) E-petition – Queens Park dog control order**

18.5 Paul Mendlesohn presented an e-petition and accompanying paper petition both presented at Council on 15 July 2010 and signed by 68 and 333 people respectively requesting that the council did not ban dogs from the Southern Lawns, lake and Wild Park areas of Queens Park.

18.6 The Cabinet Member explained that he would respond to the petition during consideration of the deputation on the same issue.

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

**18(iii) E-petition – parking, Springfield Road, Florence Road and the section of Southdown Avenue between them**

18.8 Alasdair Buchan had submitted an e-petition signed by 63 people requesting that the council include Springfield Road, Florence Road and the section of Southdown Avenue between them in the extension to the existing Controlled Parking Zone J (London Road Station area residents parking scheme).

18.9 Councillor Kennedy presented the petition on behalf of Mr Buchan and also submitted an additional 173 signatures.

18.10 The Cabinet Member explained that he would respond to the petition during consideration of Item 26 on the agenda.

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

**18(iv) E-petition – Area J Controlled Parking Zone**

18.12 Stephen Hodgkinson had submitted an e-petition signed by 26 people requesting that the council undertakes a parking survey covering all of the streets included in the Area J Extension implemented in November 2009.

18.13 The Cabinet Member explained that consideration of the e-petition would be deferred until September at the request of Mr Hodgkinson.

18.14 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be deferred.

**18(v) Petition – Ladies Mile Nature Reserve**

18.15 David Denyer had submitted a petition signed by 287 people opposing the introduction of sheep to Ladies Mile Nature Reserve.

18.16 The Cabinet Member reported that there were no plans to introduce sheep grazing to the nature reserve and added that local residents and users of the nature reserve would be fully consulted on any future plans for the reserve and listened to carefully.

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

**18(vi) Petitions – parking, the Droveaway and Elrington Road**

18.18 Councillor Bennett presented two petitions signed by 50 and 49 people respectively requesting that introduction of single yellow lines with time restrictions and that the proposed parking scheme for the area be introduced with the exception of the 11 hour limit on shared permit holders and long term parking which should be reduced to four hours.

18.19 With regard to the request for single yellow lines, the Cabinet Member advised that the council was not proposing to introduce any more single yellow lines operating for only one hour periods in the day because they have caused displacement and created problems for non-resident vehicles.

18.20 The Cabinet Member explained that residents in the Droveaway were consulted in November 2008 and they objected to the proposed resident parking scheme; the council was currently completing its agreed timetable for carrying out consultation in other areas. The proposal in the petition for resident only bays was at odds with the principle of creating the right balance between residents, visitors and business use. Schemes could not be introduced in isolated streets or for parts of roads and the Droveaway was not directly linked to the Preston Park Station parking scheme.

18.21 The Cabinet Member advised that officers would continue to monitor the area and introduce any small measures that might ease the problems, but that it was not possible to offer a quick solution.

18.22 **RESOLVED** – That the petitions be noted.

**18(vii) E-petition – barbeque damage to Hove Lawns**

18.23 Bill Cowell had submitted an e-petition signed by 107 people concerning damage to Hove Lawns caused by barbeques and requesting that the byelaws be enforced by the police and the council.

18.24 Mr Cowell was unable to attend the meeting.

18.25 The Cabinet Member explained that Seafront Officers enforced the byelaws, including those applying to barbeques, across the whole of our 13km stretch of seafront. In the summer months from 11.30am–7.00pm dedicated officers patrolled of the beaches from Hove Lagoon to the Peace Statue including Hove Lawns and endeavoured to make contact with any group or individual barbequing on the lawns.

It was clear that the Seafront Team were responsible for enforcing the byelaw, however, the team could not dedicate all its time to Hove Lawns; priority must be given to responding to calls of an urgent nature and supporting the beach lifeguard service along with dealing with vulnerable adults and children.

The Seafront Officers did not have the power to fine people, only the Police could issue fixed penalty notices and the Seafront Team worked closely with the Police and organised Seafront Action Days to tackle the problems together, with the next one planned for July and the team would ensure that the lawns were patrolled with the Police.

18.26 The Cabinet Member advised that where barbeques were causing annoyance or distress after 7.00pm, when the Seafront Team was no longer on duty, they could be reported to the Police who would respond accordingly.

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

**18(viii) E-petition - refurbishment of Victoria Recreation Ground, Portslade**

18.28 Jacqueline Storey presented an e-petition signed by 57 people calling for the refurbishment of Victoria Recreation Ground in Portslade.

18.29 At Ms Storey's request the Cabinet Member agreed to ask officers to look into the possibility of establishing a catering outlet at Victoria Recreation Ground. He explained that when the council was awarded Playbuilder funding officers prioritised sites for investment based on the condition and quality of the existing sites, areas that were deficient in play facilities and demographic information in relation to where most children in the city were located. The strict criteria meant that Victoria Recreation ground fell just outside the list of selected sites, however, the site was high on the priority list for investment on completion of the Playbuilder Project. On 15 July the Department for Education wrote to all local authorities in receipt of the grant funding instructing them to suspend all projects pending a spending review, and the council was currently awaiting a final decision on whether the grant funding would be forthcoming.

The condition survey of playgrounds would be updated during the current year and if the Playbuilder project was able to be completed, Victoria Recreation Ground was likely to be close to the top of the list for investment on completion of the project, but the final decision depended on the grant and the outcome of the condition survey.

18.30 The Director of Environment confirmed that if the Playbuilder Project could not be completed, the council would have to look at those parks missing out on funding when determining how to allocate the annual maintenance budget for parks.

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

**18(ix) Petition – parking, London Road Station area**

18.32 Councillor Allen presented a petition signed by 76 people opposing the inclusion of Springfield and Florence Roads in proposed Area J CPZ Extension and the petition from residents in support.

18.33 The Cabinet Member explained that he would respond to the petition during consideration of Item 26 on the agenda.

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

**18(x) Petition – grass verges, Carden Court**

18.35 Councillor Alford presented a petition submitted to Council on 15 July signed by 30 people calling on the council to install either additional trees or bollards along the grass verge in front of Carden Court to protect the it from further destruction by irresponsible drivers.

18.36 The Cabinet Member stated that he would instruct officers to meet with Councillor Alford on site, but advised that severe cuts had been made to all budgets including the maintenance budget, and the highway budget was fully committed to essential safety repairs. He added that the council's policy was only to install bollards if the parking had a significant impact on the safety of the pavement.

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

**18(xi) Petition – pavement resurfacing, College Street**

18.38 Councillor Mitchell presented a petition submitted to Council on 15 July signed by 27 people calling on the council to ensure that remedial works to the pavements in Great College Street would be undertaken without further delay.

18.39 The Cabinet Member explained that the footways were resurfaced in 2009 and it had been acknowledged that there was some bitumen on walls and the finished surface was not as smooth as expected. The contractor had already returned to remove the bitumen and arrangements were being made for the surface smoothing as soon as possible.

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

**18(xii) Petition – metered parking, Co-op in Whitehawk**

- 18.41 Councillor Morgan presented a petition submitted to Council on 15 July signed by 160 people opposing the introduction of metered parking outside the Co-op in Whitehawk.
- 18.42 The Cabinet Member stated that, while he appreciated that free parking had been available for a long time, ward councillors had supported the inclusion of the area in the Area H parking scheme and no objections from the Co-op had been received because perhaps they felt that short term parking use would benefit their business. The scheme would be given at least six months to bed in before it was reviewed and if there was a strong view on removing the whole road from the scheme it would be considered.
- 18.43 Councillor Mitchell advised that she had declared an interest when the scheme had been considered and played no part in the decision making.
- 18.44 Councillor Morgan added that he had supported consulting residents and listening to the majority view rather than the scheme itself.
- 18.45 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

**18(xiii) Petition – parking, Tivoli Crescent North**

- 18.46 Councillor Mrs Norman had submitted a petition presented at Council on 15 July 2010 signed by 34 people calling for Tivoli Crescent North (Withdean Road to Tivoli Crescent section) to be included within Brighton Controlled Parking Zone A.
- 18.47 Councillor Mrs Norman was unable to attend the meeting.
- 18.48 The Cabinet Member explained that he would respond to the petition duration consideration of the deputation on the same issue.
- 18.49 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

**18(xiv) & (xv) Petitions – Stoneham Park climbing frame**

- 18.50 Councillors Kemble and Peltzer Dunn presented petitions submitted to Council on 15 July signed by 780 adults and 516 children respectively requesting that the council replace the climbing frame in Stoneham Park recently damaged by arson.
- 18.51 The Cabinet Member reported that funding had been made available for the playground through S106 developer contributions. Officers were currently working with the local Community Development worker and had canvassed the views of park users at the Stoneham Community Festival Days on 10 and 17 July on how to spend the money that was available to improve the playground. It may involve replacing the burnt section of climbing frame and/or improvement to the overall play space with new equipment and landscaping. The feedback from the Festival Days was being analysed and would be used to draw up some design proposals for an on-site public consultation which was planned for August and where park users could talk to the

project team and give feedback on their preferences. Construction work was due to start in the Autumn.

18.52 **RESOLVED** – That the petitions be noted.

**19. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

19.1 The Cabinet Member reported that two questions had been received from members of the public.

19.2 In response to a request from Mr Pennington to record the answer to his question the Cabinet Member explained that this was not permitted and the Lawyer to the meeting confirmed that the council's policy was not to permit members of the public to take recordings of council meetings.

19.3 Mr Pennington asked the following question:

“Given the need for transparency, well-being and true democracy and given that Hanover & Elm Grove Residents Parking Review confined the area in question to the streets specified by the accompanying map and no other streets either in adjoining zones or otherwise, thus preventing the creation of any smaller zone or zones or amalgamating any of those streets into one of the current zones, is not the consultation so seriously flawed that any subsequent TRO will be completely compromised?”

19.4 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:

“Thank you for your question. It was made clear in the information sent out to residents and at several public meetings that the boundary for any parking scheme would be established from the answers we received. A TRO would not be compromised as if advertised there would be a further opportunity for formal comments. The full road by road analysis will be presented to the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 16 September 2010. This report will take into consideration the consultation results and the views of ward councillors.

19.5 Mr Pennington asked the following supplementary question:

“Given that the area abounding Canning Street and Rochester Street, known as Baker's Bottom, sits on the boundaries of CPZs U, C and H, will it be put in a zone of its own or put in one of the existing zones?”

19.6 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:

“That will be discussed in September.”

19.7 The Cabinet Member advised that he would answer the public question from Mrs Sandra Magson during consideration of the deputation on the same issue.

**20. DEPUTATIONS****20(a) Deputation – parking management for Brighton & Hove**

20.1 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation from Mr Robert Rosenthal concerning parking management in Brighton & Hove. Mr Rosenthal outlined problems he had identified with parking management in the city and a number of solutions to tackle the issues. He stated that any strategic review of parking should be driven by principles determined by elected Members, not technical matters. He urged the Cabinet member to delay any further decisions on parking management until after a strategic review had taken place.

20.2 The Cabinet Member thanked Mr Rosenthal for his deputation and the interesting ideas he had put forward. He explained that the council had to comply with government legislation and take into account the legal and financial implications of any parking schemes proposed. Any report on the future of parking schemes that may come forward would be presented at a future Environment Cabinet Member Meeting and officers would note Mr Rosenthal's comments when compiling the report, but this was unlikely to be in September.

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

**20(b) Deputation - byelaws relating to pleasure grounds, public walks and open spaces**

20.4 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation from Mr M Murray calling for the review of byelaws relating to pleasure grounds, public walks and open spaces. Mr Murray requested that the byelaws drawn up by his colleague Vanessa Bishop be passed to the council's legal team for refinement and be brought into force as soon as possible and published on the council's website.

20.5 The Cabinet Member acknowledged the amount of work put into preparing the petition and suggested that officers meet with Mr Murray and Ms Bishop to talk through the proposals. He advised that experience had shown that byelaws in themselves did not change or eradicate anti-social behaviours.

20.6 The Cabinet Member thanked Mr Murray for his contributions to the council's work during his time living in the city and wished him well in his relocation plans and future endeavours.

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

**20(c) Deputation – application to have Tivoli Crescent North (Withdean Road to Tivoli Crescent section) included within Brighton & Hove Council controlled parking Zone A**

20.8 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation from Mr Peter Meekings, and accompanying petition, calling for Tivoli Crescent North to be included in controlled parking Zone A. Mr Meekings advised that the problems experienced by residents in Tivoli Crescent North were similar to those encountered by residents of Tivoli



Crescent, for whom re-consultation on inclusion in Zone A was being proposed, and that they should also be re-consulted because residents now wanted to be included in the parking scheme.

- 20.9 The Cabinet Member explained that there was a recommendation later on the agenda to consider Tivoli Crescent for a consultation as it was considered to be the missing link to the current Area A resident parking scheme, which created a natural boundary and officers had always felt that Tivoli Crescent should have been included in the existing scheme. Tivoli Crescent North was further north and there was concern that it should only be considered in the future if other roads in the vicinity requested to be re-consulted on a resident parking scheme.

There were good facilities for off-street parking on Tivoli Crescent North which had virtually all detached houses with garages; this was not the case in Tivoli Crescent where houses were largely terraced with no off street parking. There were also double yellow lines currently marked up on Tivoli Crescent North to prevent obstruction on one side of the road.

- 20.10 Mr Meekings queried whether residents could submit suggestions for changes to parking arrangements in the Preston Park Station area.
- 20.11 The Cabinet Member advised that schemes were usually reviewed after six to nine months of operation and that representations from residents were always welcome.
- 20.12 **RESOLVED** – That the deputation be noted.

**20(d) Deputation – dog control order, Queens Park**

- 20.13 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation from Mrs Sandra Magson calling for the council to review the operation of the Dog Control Order in Queens Park, and return all areas to the dog-free status enjoyed prior to January 2009.
- 20.14 The Cabinet Member also considered the supporting petition submitted by Councillor Fryer and the opposing petition from Mr Mendlesohn.
- 20.15 On behalf of Councillor Fryer, Councillor Steedman reported that the petition had also been signed by dog walkers and that, although local opinion was not unanimous, the number of signatures collected showed that the majority were in favour of returning Queens Park to the previous arrangements.
- 20.16 Mr Mendlesohn stated that the area left for dog owners would not be sufficient, particularly for those with families. He advised that dog owners were concerned that if the Dog Control Order was altered for Queens Park, this would set a precedent for the rest of the city.
- 20.17 Mrs Magson had also submitted the following question:

“Regarding Councillor Theobald’s response to our deputation at full Council on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2010 requesting strong evidence of a clear community view for change prior to

embarking on the process of another consultation, would Councillor Theobald agree that:

- (a) a petition signed by 1,900 park users and
- (b) the support of:
  - 1. the constituency M.P.
  - 2. the Councillors for Queens Park ward
  - 3. local schools
  - 4. the two most influential local residents groups for Queens Park ( Friends of Queens Park and Local Action Team) constitute significant and substantial evidence of such community support.

If not, what further evidence is required to persuade Councillor Theobald to set in motion the process for reinstatement of the dog free zone in the park?"

- 20.18 In response to all of the representations made the Cabinet Member explained that the original Dog Control Order was made following the Environment Committee meeting on 7 June 2007, Cabinet meeting on 12 June 2008, and a Notice of Motion at Full Council on 17 July 2008 and that all councillors had been fully aware of the changes to dog control. The purpose of the new Dog Control Order had been to provide a consistent, clear, fair, enforceable, framework of rules for dog control.

There had been two petitions and a deputation at Council on 15 July. The Friends of Queens Park had requested a return to Southern Lawns being dog free, while a second petition supported the current set of rules. The deputation had explained that the 1900 signature petition had the support of the local MP, councillors, schools and community groups.

The Cabinet Member advised that he had asked for clear consensus before determining the best course of action, but that he appreciated that the subject attracted strong and opposing views. On balance, in view of the number and range of people supporting a change, the Cabinet Member stated that it was in the best interests of the public to call for officers to begin the statutory consultation process proposing that the Southern Lawns return to their dog free status.

- 20.19 Mrs Magson asked the following supplementary question:

"Would Councillor Theobald accept an invitation to meet the Friends of Queens Park on site to discuss the matter further?"

- 20.20 The Cabinet Member reiterated that he had made the decision to consult on proposals to return the Southern Lawns to their dog free status and that a statutory consultation would follow.

- 20.21 The Lawyer to the meeting confirmed that a specific statutory process would be followed and that it provided for a minimum period of consultation. A report based on the consultation results would be put before the Cabinet Member at a future meeting.

20.22 **RESOLVED** – That the deputation be noted and the statutory consultation process be started.

**21. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS**

21.1 There were none.

**22. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

22.1 There were none.

**23. NOTICES OF MOTION**

23.1 There were none.

**24. PORTLAND ROAD LOADING BAY**

24.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the way forward following a request for a loading bay in Portland Road.

24.2 The Cabinet Member reported that, following a letter from ward councillors at the meeting on 25 March opposing the creation of a loading bay, council officers have reached an agreement with ward councillors, residents and Sainsburys to agree a way forward.

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

(1) That, having taken into account all of the duly made representations and objections, approval be given for the recommendations to create an additional amendment order to the Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 with the following amendments:

(a) Controlled Parking Zone R – proposed loading bay in Portland Road and an additional shared parking place in Portland Road, which shortens the proposed loading bay to allow an extra space for a shared pay & display parking space

**25. TIVOLI CRESCENT RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME CONSULTATION**

25.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the inclusion of Tivoli Crescent in Controlled Parking Zone A and recommending that residents be re-consulted on the proposal.

25.2 The Parking Strategy Manager explained that officers had taken into account representations made and agreed that the best way forward was to proceed with proposals to include Tivoli Crescent in Zone A.

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

- (1) That the residents of Tivoli Crescent be consulted on an extension to Area A (Preston Park Station area).

**26. LONDON ROAD STATION AREA - RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME FORMAL CONSULTATION**

- 26.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment addressing comments and objections to the draft traffic regulation order for the London Road Station parking scheme proposal and recommending an extension to the scheme south of the railway line.
- 26.2 The Cabinet Member also considered the petition presented by Councillor Kennedy calling for Springfield and Florence Roads to be included in Area J.
- 26.3 The Cabinet Member explained that the results of the original consultation carried out in June 2009 showed clear support for the introduction of a parking scheme to the south of the railway line and this was supported by ward Councillors Davey and West, who had recently written again in favour of the current proposals. Residents in the area north of the railway line were clearly opposed to being included in a scheme. Following further requests another consultation took place in the area north of the railway line in late November/early December 2009 with the same outcome.

The Cabinet Member reported that he had attended a recent public meeting where residents in the area again expressed their disapproval of being included in a parking scheme and that he was therefore unable to support further consultation north of the railway line.

- 26.4 Councillor Kennedy requested that if re-consultation was not an option, that the area be considered as a high priority if a strategic review of parking was undertaken.
- 26.5 The Cabinet Member also considered the petition presented by Councillor Allen from residents opposing the inclusion of Springfield and Florence Roads because of the impact it would have on other roads north of the railway line.
- 26.6 Councillor Allen called for an early review of the scheme following implementation in order for the impact on the surrounding areas to be analysed.
- 26.7 The Cabinet Member reiterated that residents living south of the railway line had been in favour of joining a scheme and that this was supported by ward councillors, while residents north of the railway had voted against the scheme; therefore a scheme was not proposed for the area.
- 26.8 The Cabinet Member reported that Philip Wells, Chairman of the Viaduct Rise Working Group had also written in support of the proposed scheme.
- 26.9 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
  - (1) That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the following order be approved as advertised;

- (a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zone Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No\* 20\*\* (Area J Extension).

- (2) That any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers are added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment Traffic Regulation Order.

## **27. STREETScape DESIGN GUIDELINES**

- 27.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning new Streetscape Design Guidelines setting out standard design and installation specifications for the elements that make up the highway corridors, such as street furniture and surface materials, along with the issues that should be considered when choosing and implementing them.

- 27.2 The Cabinet Member advised that the new guidelines would help strengthen the quality of our streets in future years, enabling residents and visitors to enjoy the city to its full potential.

- 27.3 Councillor Mitchell welcomed the report. She advised that the streetscape was important to residents and the guidelines would make a real difference to the city.

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

- (1) That the Streetscape Design Guidelines be the standard approach adopted by all people undertaking work in Brighton & Hove's public realm.

## **28. RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE SCRUTINY PANEL ON 'STREET ACCESS ISSUES'**

- 28.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the executive response to the recommendations made by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee Scrutiny Panel on Street Access Issues.

- 28.2 The Cabinet Member stated that it was a complex subject that required a balance to be achieved for businesses, residents and visitors to the city. The response to the panel's findings highlighted what the council was already doing and how it intended to progress the recommendations.

- 28.3 Councillor Mitchell read out the following comments from Councillor Rufus who chaired the scrutiny panel, but was unable to stay for consideration of the report:

- Councillor Rufus was pleased that the response agreed with the panel's recommendations and that he understood the comments made in reference to impediments to immediate implementation on some on them.
- The panel had recognised that the existing council policy could be seen as generally robust, and therefore had not suggested wholesale changes, but had placed significant emphasis on proper implementation, which was seen as the main weakness.

- The panel had suggested areas where the policy could be tightened up and also addressed issues such as communal bins and bicycles which also created obstructions.
- A key element to promoting better street access would be through improved enforcement and the panel recognised the problems that had been encountered and looked forward to seeing improvements.
- The Panel welcomed the willingness of traders and disability and access groups to work together to find less obtrusive advertising boards, and hoped that with the council's support it would be successful.
- The Panel wished to thank the Overview & Scrutiny Team for their support and the Head of Network Management and her team for their input.

28.4 The Head of Network Management thanked the panel for their ideas, which were very helpful to officers. She reported that the recommendations relating to licensing matters had already been agreed by the Licensing Committee, subject to some practical issues. The recommendations would work well alongside the Streetscape Design Guidelines and the council would begin work on raising awareness.

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

- (1) That the evidence, findings and recommendations of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and its scrutiny panel in relation to Street Access Issues be noted.
- (2) That the actions detailed in the officer response to Scrutiny Recommendations 1,7,8,9,10,11,12,14 and 15 (Appendix 1) be agreed with particular regard to the timescales and constraints identified.
- (3) That it be noted that the responses to Scrutiny's recommendations 1, 2, 3,4,5,6 and 13 (Appendix 1) will be considered by Licensing Committee as they related to non executive licensing functions.

**29. RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SAFETY OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ON 'THE WINTER SERVICE PLAN REVIEW'**

29.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the executive response to the Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee Scrutiny Panel on the Winter Service Plan.

29.2 The Cabinet Member reported that he had attended and given evidence to the scrutiny panel and that it had been a valuable opportunity to discuss the experiences and learn from the previous winter's extreme snowfall, bearing in mind what could be genuinely and practically achieved during such events.

29.3 The Cabinet Member invited Councillor Morgan, Chairman of the scrutiny panel, to introduce the panel's report.

29.4 Councillor Morgan thanked the other Members on the panel and the rest of the Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee, in addition to the Overview & Scrutiny Team and all those who provided evidence to the panel. He made the following comments:

- The panel had recognised the immense pressure on staff during the periods of extreme weather in December and January and the very real safety concerns that arose.
- There had been an improved response to the January snowfall as a result of improved communications and additional resources.
- The panel acknowledged that the recommendations should be proportionate to the likelihood of such events reoccurring regularly.
- The panel was pleased that the response agreed all of their recommendations and, despite being disappointed that new gritting vehicles could not be purchased until November 2011, they hoped that implementation of the remaining actions implementation would take place prior to winter of the current year.

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

- (1) That the evidence, findings and recommendations of the Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee and its scrutiny panel in relation to the Winter Service Plan Review be noted.
- (2) That the actions detailed in the officer response to Scrutiny Panel's recommendations be agreed with particular regard to timescales and any constraints identified.

29.6 The Cabinet Member and Councillor Mitchell thanked the Director of Environment for all her hard work during her time at the council and wished her well in her new position as Chief Executive of Lewes District Council.

The meeting concluded at 5.45pm

Signed

Cabinet Member

Dated this

day of