



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

**ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER
MEETING
ADDENDUM**

4.00PM, THURSDAY, 17 DECEMBER 2009

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM	Page
68. PETITIONS	1 - 2
69. PUBLIC QUESTIONS	3 - 4
70. DEPUTATIONS	5 - 16
72. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS	17 - 18
79. CYCLE COUNTER DISPLAY (replacement appendix only)	19 - 20

ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 68

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: Petitions
Date of Meeting: 17 December 2009
Report of: Director of Strategy & Governance
Contact Officer: Name: Tanya Massey Tel: 29-1227
E-mail: tanya.massey@brighton-hove.gov.uk
Key Decision: No
Wards Affected:

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1 To receive the following petitions presented at Council or any petitions presented directly to the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting.

68. (i) To receive the following petition presented at Council on 10 December 2009 by Councillor Drake and signed by 40 people:

As a result of the excessive numbers of cars now parking in Tivoli Crescent North due to the introduction of Council Parking Restrictions in Zone A around Preston Park Station on 5 October 2009, the majority of residents in TCN now formally ask Brighton & Hove City Council to take the following action as soon as possible:

1. ***The painting of double yellow lines on the 'odd' house numbered side of Tivoli Crescent North.*** *Tivoli Crescent North is not wide enough for parking on both sides of the road, and even cars parked partly on the grass verge cause congestion, dangerous 'blind spots' for traffic, damage to the verges and the obstruction of emergency and other large vehicles.*
2. ***The introduction of a controlled Residents Parking Scheme for the entire 'even' house numbered side of Tivoli Crescent North.*** *This scheme would run the full length of the 'even' numbered side of Tivoli Crescent North and its object would be to provide parking for all residents of the road within a short distance of their house.*
3. ***The allowing of residents in Woodside Lodge flats to buy Residents Parking Vouchers for Zone A and thus be able to park in Woodside Avenue.*** *It is very evident that the restricted parking spaces in Woodside Avenue are currently very under-used; at any one time some 75% of spaces are empty whilst Tivoli Crescent North is swamped with cars and vans!! Residents in Woodside Lodge who used to park in Woodside Avenue are unable to get a voucher to continue to do so and are therefore adding to the congestion by parking in Tivoli Crescent North.*
4. ***A review of the effects of the parking restrictions introduced in Zone A around Preston Park Station on 5 October 2009 with a view to increasing usage of the restricted areas.*** *Just as Tivoli Crescent North (and Tivoli Crescent) have become choked with parked cars, so*

neighbouring roads with new restrictions (Woodside Avenue, Hampstead Road, Reigate Road) have become largely empty of parked cars. A better balance must be struck and this can probably best be done quickly by some relaxing of the parking restrictions – eg removing the restrictions for weekends, reducing the £4-a-day charge to £2 to encourage commuters to use the restricted spaces (and thus increase Council revenue!).

The above requests are submitted for URGENT ACTION by Brighton & Hove Council.

- 68. (ii)** To receive the following petition presented at Council on 10 December by Councillor Drake and signed by 105 people:

We, the undersigned residents of Tivoli Crescent, do thoroughly oppose the decision not to be included in the recent residents parking scheme and demand that our exclusion be overturned with immediate effect.

- 68. (iii)** To receive the following petition presented at Council on 10 December by Councillor Mitchell and signed by 1056 people who agreed with some of all of the four options detailed below in relation to the introduction of the controlled parking zone in the Preston Park Station Area Zone A:

- 1. Parking restrictions at weekends should be removed.*
- 2. A review of weekday times is required.*
- 3. I believe consultation on the CPZ was inadequate.*
- 4. 100 visitors permits per annum, per person are necessary.*

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting for questions submitted by a member of the public who either lives or works in the area of the authority.

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

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

(a) Valerie Paynter

"A dense line of mature trees and plantings, which mitigate in an acknowledged area of air quality concern, borders the 40 year old Clarendon & Ellen Estate along the entire length of Clarendon Road.

An FOI request for the age, expected lifespan and variety of the trees therein resulted in details of a number of saplings planted in surrounding areas from 2004 on. I was told this 'represents the only records the Arboricultural Team hold for this area.

Why are no records held by Arboriculture for the mature plantings?"

(b) Sue Baumgardt

"I'm sure I share the view of many other residents in Brighton and Hove who were horrified to hear of the Council's recent gassing of wild rabbits on Waterhall golf course. Could the Cabinet Member for Environment confirm whether Council officers looked at other alternatives including the advice of Humane Wildlife Deterrent experts, as recommended on the Health & Safety Executive website, before going ahead with this slaughter of wild rabbits, which could also have harmed other wildlife including badgers, foxes, weasels and stoats - which may have been a criminal offence in the case of badgers - and that, furthermore, chemicals used could have harmed the local ecosystem?"

DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Four deputations have been referred from Council on 10 December. The Cabinet Member will note the response given at that meeting and provide an update where appropriate.

- (a) Deputation concerning Tivoli Crescent Parking Issues - Mr Mark Dyson**
(Spokesperson)
- (b) Deputation concerning Clean Air, Lewes Road – Mr Duncan Blinkhorn**
(Spokesperson)
- (c) Deputation concerning Impact of Zone A Parking Scheme – Ms Jessica Balkwill** (Spokesperson)
- (d) Deputation concerning Preston Park Station Area – Zone A Parking – Mr Paul Crawford** (Spokesperson)

(a) Tivoli Crescent Parking Issues – Mark Dyson (Spokesperson)

“This deputation is brought on behalf of the residents of Tivoli Crescent with regard to the significant issues that they now face due to the failure of the local council to properly consider the impact of the recently introduced Controlled Parking Zone A to the local area. Prior to the introduction of the scheme on October 5th, we did not have anything like the problems we now face on a daily basis. The ensuing consultation leading to the introduction of the current scheme has been extremely poor and inadequate, and furthermore we have not had satisfactory responses to our many complaints since the schemes introduction thus far.

- In October 2007 residents of Tivoli Crescent received a letter asking them to vote, as well as canvassing their views on whether they wanted a residents parking scheme in their area or not. Due to a lack of any sufficient detail, many residents of Tivoli Crescent abstained from voting for or against the proposed parking scheme. Out of 138 properties surveyed, there was only a response rate of 44%, of which 64.5% said NO. On this basis the Council excluded us from further consultation.
- There was however much dissatisfaction regarding the inadequacies of the first consultation. Local resident Andy Nesbit, acted on behalf of residents by lobbying the council to be included in a second round of consultations. He was **informed** in an email (6/10/2008) quote "We will be consulting the area which is to be included in the scheme with full details over the summer and at the same time we will write to residents in Tivoli Crescent area explaining that roads Southwards are being consulted on a detailed design for a parking scheme and to check they don't want to be included,"
- He was then informed by the same council officer that he had been **misinformed** (23/6/09) and that quote "due to the high No" vote in the area it was agreed not to proceed with" the reconsultation of Tivoli Crescent. This so called 'high' NO vote represented a mere 38 out of 138 households in real terms.
- The residents were told that if they wished to be re-consulted, they should petition the council. Once it was known the measures that were going to be introduced, another resident (Keith Turvey), duly organised a petition, signed by a significant number of residents of Tivoli Crescent asking to be reconsulted on the parking scheme.
- This petition was presented to the environment committee by Councillor Ann Norman last August. However, yet again, the wishes of local residents were ignored.”

Response made by Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment at Council, 10 December 2009:

“The council is aware that the introduction of a parking scheme may cause some displacement into adjacent areas although to what level is very hard to predict.

For this reason we made sure that we consulted a wide area, not just the roads immediately next to Preston Park Station. In October 2007 a letter was sent to every household in Tivoli Crescent, Tivoli Crescent North, Tivoli Place, Matlock Road, Maldon Road and Tivoli Road. The letter did draw residents’ attention to

the fact that nearby roads may decide to opt for a scheme and asked whether they wanted to be included. However all these roads voted overwhelmingly against a scheme. 44% is a high response rate for a parking scheme consultation and so although officers have considered displacement effects the council did not feel able to proceed in these roads without a suitable mandate from the residents. Equally officers felt that not to proceed with the scheme in the immediate Preston Park Station locality would not be fair on residents suffering parking pressures and safety issues and who voted in the majority for a scheme, hence proceeding with a scheme within these roads. Following the decision at committee a postcard was sent to every address stating how their area had voted and which contained details of where to look up this report.

There was a petition from Tivoli Crescent residents which was presented in April of this year. The petition requested that all residents in Tivoli, Maldon and Matlock were consulted again to see if they would like to be included within a parking scheme. Unfortunately, such extensive consultation requires a huge amount of time and resources and by this stage the Area A parking scheme had already progressed to the final Traffic Order stage.

It was therefore too late to begin consultation again within the Tivoli area. Any future consultation would have to look at the area as a whole rather than individual roads and the current timetable is committed up to 2011 consulting other areas of the city who have been waiting for some years. However, the council will look at future schemes when resources become available.”

Tivoli Crescent Parking Issues - Supporting Information:

So what are the issues that have been created by the Councils so called Parking Strategy?

The Issues surrounding Displacement

With the introduction of this new residents parking scheme next to the Tivoli area, the council have essentially created approx. a 400 metre stretch of FREE PARKING right on the edge of a controlled parking zone, and a 2 minute walk (via the commonly used steps to Hampstead Rd.) from a busy commuter railway station at Preston Park. This is Tivoli Crescent. Residents now find it extremely difficult to park near to their house which is not an unreasonable expectation, with non residents cars displaced from the zone being left for days and even weeks. There is no overflow now available because Tivoli Crescent is bordered at either end by Woodside Avenue and The Drove - two roads now in new zone with its excessive restrictions. Take a drive along these roads and spot the difference! Even the council officer responsible has had to admit that:

"We do monitor schemes as they first go in and ask that residents give things some time to settle down. We do appreciate that currently commuters appear to be resisting paying to park, which has not been the case in other schemes..." Charles Field, Parking Strategy Manager. 10/09 email in response to official residents' complaints.

Residents now have first hand experience of the issues this has created. Most important are issues are around **safety and accessibility** which now affect families, children and the elderly.

- **Cars now park extremely close to each other.** What is the effect? Dorothy who is 86, and has suffered numerous falls in her own home and like Peter 84, have great difficulty in negotiating tightly parked cars to get into waiting transport to take them to meet family and friends. Can councillors imagine what it is like having to take a detour around several cars with an elderly resident who has great difficulty walking in order to get into a waiting vehicle? Other elderly residents with mobility or disability issues have also raised similar issues. This is a situation that has been created by the local council's parking scheme.
- **Cars routinely double park.** Families, trades people, visitors routinely double park in the street as they have little option. Parents with young children are understandably not prepared to leave children unattended in cars parked in a different street whilst they transfer their shopping. Trades people similarly have little option other than to double park when transferring heavy tools and equipment to sites. All of this adds to the congestion in the area with a number of vehicles regularly having to double park.
- **Parking on verges and corners .** This has become much more frequent creating added danger for children who play in the street. Visibility for traffic using the road has been reduced significantly.

These issues of **safety and accessibility** have been created by the council with the introduction of the residents parking scheme in the surrounding area. These issues need to be addressed immediately and we cannot wait another two years to be slotted into a future timetable. May we please remind you that the Council has legal obligations in this respect:

"The Council's powers and duties under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 must be exercised to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all types of traffic and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway."

What do Tivoli Crescent residents want?

It is now patently obvious that Tivoli Crescent should have been included in the scheme, judging by the criteria applied to other roads (Inwood Crescent & Millers Rd). In the March 2008 Item 146 Environment report to which we refer.

4.3.5 Only two roads were against inclusion and officer recommendation is that these roads could suffer displacement and cause confusion over scheme boundaries if they were excluded.

4.3.4 In order to draw up a viable scheme with clear boundaries, and to minimise any displacement, officer recommendation is to include all the roads around the Preston Park Station area in one parking scheme zone.

We have liaised with local residents through meetings and door to door discussions. The vast majority of residents believe that there is now no possible way forward without introducing a residents parking scheme in Tivoli Crescent. However, as zone A have found out to their cost any scheme need only be 9-6pm week days and should exclude weekends. Anything beyond this is excessive and punitive, spoiling the character of the area and simply designed to generate revenue for the council. We fully support residents in Zone A campaigning for a change to their scheme.

We have been informed by the Parking Strategy Manager that 'if, after the scheme has been running a while, residents would still like the times or days reviewed, then the best course of action would be to raise a petition stating what is preferred.' Residents have raised two petitions now and believe that Tivoli Crescent should be urgently included within the current Controlled Parking Zone A, with the restrictions on parking **9am-6pm excluding weekends.**"

(b) Clean Air, Lewes Road – Duncan Blinkhorn (Spokesperson)

“This week sees two events which highlight the links between fossil fuel emissions and public health.

Firstly, the Copenhagen Climate Conference, where nations are struggling to agree a plan to curb CO2 emissions.

Secondly, and closer to home, an anniversary – it’s five years since the Lewes Road and London Road were declared an Air Quality Management Area committing our City Council to make a plan, to curb vehicle emissions, along these key routes, to protect public health - a sort of local microcosm of the Copenhagen challenge.

If the plan that comes out of Copenhagen achieves for the planet what the Air Quality Action Plan has so far for the Lewes Road, then we really are doomed.

We welcome the City Council’s recent commitment to the 10:10 climate campaign and the vision of a low-carbon Brighton & Hove. Lewes Road for Clean Air would like to see this commitment applied to transport. We have also signed up to 10:10 because we aim to reduce traffic on the Lewes Road by 10% during 2010. We plan to encourage motorists, who use the road, to make a pledge to find alternatives to car use on at least one day per week. However, we fear that the emerging Council policy of ‘modal choice’ – supporting unrestricted movement of cars, flies in the face of it’s 10:10 commitment and denies others the choice to breath air that is safe.”

Response made by Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment at Council, 10 December 2009:

“I am aware of your group’s campaign work and the interest that exists in this particular area of the city about this important issue. Lewes Road is one of many important transport corridors now included in the city’s Air Quality Management Area and in which we have to seek to reduce pollution levels.

We set out to manage traffic and tackle congestion through implementing several measures and planning future proposals, providing information on transport options and travel conditions through signs on our ‘Journey-on’ website: delivering new ways of reaching the city centre such as new ‘Park and Ride’ sites: new cycle routes and new bus routes and services such as the proposed bus-based coastal transport system along the seafront. Making stations more accessible: managing, extending and enforcing parking schemes, reducing the need for some people to leave the city on a daily basis by increasing job opportunities and through the Local Development Framework planning strategy making changes to speed limits where appropriate, once the current city-wide review of speed limits is completed. And something which I am personally very keen on, and if only the Government would listen and act on, is the re-opening of the Lewes to Uckfield railway line, because I am quite convinced that quite a few people drive their motor cars from Crowborough, from Uckfield, from Tunbridge Wells into this city when they ought to be coming by rail and that’s something that, you know, I personally very strongly support.


I would just add one other point and that is that officers have checked the data that has been submitted with your deputation and we have found it to be incorrect and this is explained as follows:

The 2005 monitoring value on the graph is incorrect, out of date 2004 model predictions are being used for 2010. With the correct results for 2005 a downward nitrogen dioxide trend is seen. On central Lewes Road most NO₂ concentration is derived from sources other than cars, like heavy goods vehicles, buses and domestic equipment sources like gas boilers and cookers.

Now if it's helpful to you officers will be happy to write to you to explain this matter further."

Lewes Road Clean Air - Supporting Information:

"I'd like to show you a graph, based on the city's Air Quality Action Plan which tells the story of Air Quality on the Lewes Road during the last five years, showing actual, against predicted, nitrogen dioxide levels.



You'll see that after five years of monitoring and in spite of various measures to make the Lewes Road a 'Sustainable Transport Corridor', the air quality has, in reality, not improved at all. In 2008 it was much worse than even the 'do nothing' scenario had predicted. In May this year, planning permission for flats by the Vogue Gyratory (112-113 Lewes Road) was turned down because the air was considered so foul that it would be unsafe to open the windows. In fact you only have to spend a Friday afternoon outside the Lewes Road Co-op for your throat and lungs to tell you about the air.

Our Lewes Road for Clean Air campaign has been set up because of our deep concern about the lack of progress. We are part of Transport 21, a new umbrella of other local community groups intent on freeing our neighbourhoods from being overrun by cars and heavy traffic. We believe that Brighton & Hove can be a vibrant and prosperous city, and the Lewes Road can serve this as important transport corridor, *without* damaging the health of the people that live, work and travel along them and, one day, without damaging global climate.

The cocktail of chemicals in exhaust fumes all have a damaging impact on health - respiratory diseases, heart disease, strokes, cancers, and aggravation of conditions like asthma. A study by the European Commission (in 2005) found that air pollution reduces life expectancy by an average of nine months across the EU, resulting in 32,000 premature deaths in the UK alone each year (for Brighton & Hove that works out at 130). For those who live or work, around hotspots like the Lewes Road life expectancy can be reduced by a shocking 2-3 years.

Motor traffic accounts for nearly a quarter of the UK carbon footprint and generates noise, congestion and an atmosphere of danger, which further undermines our quality of life. For all these reasons we need much more concerted action to shift from private car-use to more sustainable transport.

The City's Transport Plan points out that "only reductions in car use of 10% or 20% will achieve significant improvements in air quality that are measureable and noticeable". The 10:10 climate campaign, which the council recently signed up to, has engaged thousands of people who believe that 10% is a realistic target for reducing emissions during the next year. We believe that such targets are achievable

(for CO2 and other pollutants) if we approach them with ambition and imaginative solutions.

So how busy is the Lewes Road and what would 10% look like? The Department for Transport records over 18,000 vehicle movements per day. Our own traffic surveys have found that (on an average daytime weekday) there are:

- 1,250 motor vehicles per hour (1,350 at rush hour)
- Three-quarters of which are private cars (not including 14% commercial vehicles)
- 60% of these carry only the driver.

We believe there is plenty of scope for reducing this part of the traffic. Our research has also found that many potential cyclists are scared to cycle along the Lewes Road because of the sheer volume of traffic and inappropriate parking.

Across Europe cities show what can be done, like Copenhagen. A city which, like Brighton & Hove, is a tourist destination and international conference venue with a thriving economy. They also suffer congestion, but are resolute in addressing it, introducing road pricing zones to discourage car use in the city centre. Excellent public transport and a true cycle city with 350 kilometres of cycle tracks, 'City Bikes' for hire from 100 locations, all taxis with racks for carrying bikes. Traffic lights along main routes are coordinated, in favour of cyclists during rush hour (Green Waves for cyclists). They are not complacent about what they have achieved and have upped their target for people cycling to work from 30% to 50%.

We believe there are many simple, cost effective solutions, which could be implemented quickly, within the next year even:

- Clear signage (perhaps using digital displays) to road users on the A270 to discourage car use and encourage alternatives: eg "Please help us reduce air pollution and carbon footprint, thank you for traveling by bus, bike or foot";
- Weekend Park & ride using regular buses stopping at existing vacant parking spaces (like at Brighton University sites);
- We're proposing a 'Bike Train' project of scheduled, frequent, daily mass bike rides between the Level and Falmer to create a safety-in-numbers environment which enables more people, including those who are nervous, to get on their bikes to work, to school and to university;
- New express bus routes across the city, avoiding the city centre.

There are plenty of other more ambitious solutions, including road pricing, which we would like to promote and discuss at a later stage. At the end of the day, if we can't shift the Lewes Road into a truly sustainable transport corridor, prioritising bus travel, cycling and walking, putting the health and wellbeing of people first, what hope do we, and all those bods in Copenhagen, have of achieving a low carbon future. Of course with enough will and determination we can sort this. I hope you can agree that 10% less traffic in 2010 is a good place to start."

(c) Deputation concerning Parking in Zone A – Jessica Balkwill (Spokesperson)

“We wish to express our concerns over the impact on residents of the Zone A Parking Scheme.”

Response made by Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment at Council, 10 December 2009:

“As you are aware we are also hearing from residents that changes have made a huge improvement to the parking and general environment. I believe that is the next deputation saying that they are happy with the scheme.

The 9am-8pm Monday-Sunday residents’ parking scheme proposal has, as you have said, been through extensive consultation, including leaflets with questionnaires and plans indicating proposed hours, days of operation and these went to every household. There was little correspondence asking the council to change the hours or days of the scheme. There was also a further opportunity to comment on the plans when the final draft Traffic Regulation Order was advertised in the spring of 2009 and all comments were included in the report to the Environment Cabinet Member meeting in July 2009.

The consultation procedures have also been through the Standards & Complaints Team who concluded that the consultation process had been carried out as per procedure and legislation and therefore correctly.

In terms of the finances, the council borrow the costs of setting up the scheme against the future income and schemes usually take about five to seven years to pay back the initial set-up costs. Income from residents’ parking schemes must fund the ongoing maintenance, running costs and enforcement and any surplus must be spent on transport related projects, including concessionary bus fares, public transport subsidies and safety schemes.

Any major changes, such as size of zone or time of operation would require considerable consultation and redrafting of the Traffic Order and would have to be considered alongside other areas on the list for parking scheme consultation. However, we always advise residents to allow a scheme to settle in for a while before making decisions about major changes. This is because it takes a while for parking patterns to change and for residents and visitors to get used to how the scheme operates and fits their needs. If, after the scheme has settled in, a majority of residents would still like the times or days reviewed then the best course of action, as has already been said this afternoon, would be to raise a petition stating clearly what is preferred. Any such change though would have to apply to the entire parking area and not just to one road, so we would need to know that there was wide-spread support for any alternative proposals.”

(d) Deputation concerning Zone A Parking - Preston Park Station Area – Paul Crawford (Spokesperson)

At last residents' parking difficulties in the Preston Park Station area have been resolved. The Zone A scheme has transformed the lives of residents in this area. At last we are no longer swamped by commuters, second car dumpers and weekend white van parkers. The scheme may not be perfect and no scheme will completely satisfy every single resident in every detail. But a reasonable mix of resident, paid-for commuter and visitor parking has been achieved.

The signatories to this deputation wish to emphasise to the Cabinet Member for Environment the following:-

1. The parking situation for residents has been radically improved by the implementation of the Zone A parking scheme.
2. The Zone A scheme should be allowed to settle for at least six months before any meaningful judgements about its effectiveness can be made. It is obvious that parking patterns are changing week by week and no changes should even be considered until an equilibrium has been reached.
3. Preston Park has waited five years to gain residents' parking protection. We are well aware that other areas in the City have considerable difficulties of the sort which we faced until the implementation of Zone A. It would be selfish to demand a re-consultation here when other residents in neighbouring communities still endure parking congestion with no immediate prospect of relief until consultation in those areas is conducted.
4. Residents immediately outside Zone A are now suffering the displacement congestion of which they were repeatedly warned in the debate about the boundaries of the zone. They made their choice. They should now wait their turn for re-consultation. Residents in other areas have yet to have their voice heard for the first time. Simple fairness entitles them to a hearing before Zone A 'refuseniks' are considered for a second time.
5. Our local ward councillors, Ken and Ann Norman and Pat Drake, and the officers directly concerned with the inception of the Zone A scheme, including Charles Field and Christina Lissasides, have worked very hard over a long period to ascertain the wishes of the residents in this area and to complete the implementation of a parking scheme reflecting these wishes. We would like to record officially a vote of thanks to all those involved in the lengthy process which has resulted in the successful parking scheme which residents in the vicinity of Preston Park Station now enjoy.

Response made by Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment at Council, 10 December 2009:

"I do think that colleagues here and those out in the wider world will appreciate, if they hadn't before, what a difficult job the council's officers have in dealing with residents' parking schemes where you have some people in favour and some people maybe, think the other way.

I do want to thank Mr Crawford very much, obviously, for his remarks and, of course, particularly his remarks to the council's officers. I am very glad to hear his support for the fact that the consultation in his view has been done professionally and well and it is, as I say, rather nice to hear from residents that changes have made a huge improvement to the parking and general environment. I agree with the suggestion, and I have said this already this afternoon, that schemes do need time to settle in and that's exactly what Mr Crawford has said, because that enables residents both inside and outside the scheme to see how well it operates for their needs.

We do not review schemes as a matter of course now because there are other areas waiting on the list for consultation on new schemes. However, we can make minor changes up to twice a year: for example, addition of a disabled bay or other minor changes to the signing or lining but any major changes such as size of zone or times of operation would require considerable consultation and redrafting of the Traffic Order. It would have to be considered alongside other areas on the list for parking scheme consultation.”

ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

Agenda Item 72

Brighton & Hove City Council

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS


The following questions have been received from Councillors and will be taken as read along with the written answer to be circulated the meeting. The Councillor asking the question may then ask one relevant supplementary question which shall be put and answered without discussion.

(a) Councillor Kitcat

"Is Cllr Theobald aware of the government's plans for a 'Zero Waste Places Standard' and the financial support being planned for 'Zero Waste Places', and will he be ensuring that the council is adopting a Zero Waste strategy and applying for any additional government financial support where possible?"

Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment will respond.

Potential Locations Map A270 Moulsecomb



(C) Crown Copyright. All rights reserved Licence No: 100020999 Brighton & Hove 2009.

Date: 11/12/2009 11:16:11

Scale 1:2000

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of HM Stationery Office. (c) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Aerial imagery copyright of Cities Revealed(R) by The GeoInformation (R) Group, all rights reserved. Brighton and Hove City Council Licence No. 100020999 (2009).



