

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

4.00pm 16 SEPTEMBER 2010

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor G Theobald (Cabinet Member)

Also in attendance: Councillor Mitchell (Opposition Spokesperson) and Randall (Opposition Spokesperson)

Other Members present: Councillors Fryer and West

PART ONE

30. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

30a Declarations of Interests

30a.1 There were none.

30b Exclusion of Press and Public

30b.2 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).

30b.3 **RESOLVED** – That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

31. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

31.1 **RESOLVED** – The minutes of the meeting held on 26 July 2010 were approved and signed by the Cabinet Member as a correct record.

32. CABINET MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS

32.1 The Cabinet Member explained that he would take Item 45 on the agenda as the first substantive item and respond to the two related deputations during consideration of this item.

33. ITEMS RESERVED FOR DISCUSSION

33.1 **RESOLVED** – That all the items be reserved for discussion.

34. PETITIONS

34.1 There were none.

35. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

35.1 The Cabinet Member reported that one question had been received from a member of the public.

35.2 Mr Pennington asked the following question:

“With reference to the new communal bins located at the edge of Baker's Bottom, there are 267 properties and bins have been located at the west ends of Canning Street, Hendon Street, Rochester Street (2 bins) (inexplicably, none on Bute Street):

a: are 4 bins sufficient?

b: What is the walking maximum distance for each bin?

c: what are the arrangements for those residents who cannot get to the bins?

d: how many parking spaces have been taken over by the bins?”

35.3 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:

“Thank you for your question. I shall take each of the points you have raised in turn.

Are 4 bins sufficient? Since these bins have been introduced there has not been an overflow issue which would indicate the capacity created by 4 bins is sufficient.

What is the walking maximum distance for each bin? The maximum walking distance is about 500 metres.

What are the arrangements for those residents who cannot get to the bins? There is an assisted collection service provided for those residents who are physically unable to use the bins.

How many parking spaces have been taken over by the bins? These bins take up 2 separate parking spaces.”

35.4 Mr Pennington asked the following supplementary question:

“Is there a protocol or guidance relating to the maximum walking distance expected for the location of communal bins ?”

35.5 The Assistant Director, City Services explained that bins were located as closely as possible to residents' homes. An assisted collection was available. There was no specific protocol relating to distance. This matter was considered on a case by case basis.

36. DEPUTATIONS

- 36.1 The Cabinet Member explained that he would respond to the two separate deputations received concerning the consultation on a residents' parking scheme for (a) Canning Street and (b) Queen's Park Rise during consideration of item 45 on the agenda.
- 36.2 The Cabinet Member then chose to bring forward Item 45 for consideration, in order that the matter could be dealt with in conjunction with the two deputations.
- 36.3 **RESOLVED** – That the deputations be noted.

Note: In order to maintain the continuity of the minutes, Item 45 and the decision thereon appears in consecutive order.

37. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS

- 37.1 There were none.

38. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

- 38.1 There were none.

39. NOTICES OF MOTION

- 39.1 There were none.

40. BUILDING (LOCAL AUTHORITY CHARGES) REGULATIONS 2010: NEW BUILDING REGULATIONS CHARGING SCHEME EFFECTIVE 1 OCTOBER 2010

- 40.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Acting Director of Environment concerning the introduction of a replacement scheme of charges that related to work controlled under the Building Regulations 2000 and that met the requirements of the Building (Local Authority Charges) Regulations 2010.
- 40.2 The Cabinet Member stated that he was pleased to introduce a new replacement scheme of charges for the Building Regulations Service. From 1 October, the Council would have a statutory requirement to make charges that covered the cost on a project by project basis, on delivering the Building Regulations Service. It was hoped that the additional flexibility of the new scheme, would help to make the service more competitive with the private sector particularly on major projects.
- 40.3 Councillor Mitchell expressed her support of the scheme.
- 40.4 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
- (1) That the existing scheme of charges be replaced with a new scheme for the Building Regulations chargeable function in accordance with the 2010 Regulations.

- (2) That the Head of Building Control, in consultation with relevant members, be authorised to agree the monetary value of the charges for work outlined in Appendix C (Fees and Charges), following advice from the service accountants.
- (3) That the flexibility contained within the Regulations to vary the scale of charges set depending on the individual circumstances to ensure the service can cover its costs on a project by project basis and help to improve our competitive position with the private sector be noted.

41. PATCHAM CONSERVATION AREA REVIEW

- 41.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Acting Director of Environment concerning a consultation on a revised character statement for the Patcham Conservation Area and a change to its boundary.
- 41.2 The Cabinet Member stated that the character statement formed part of the current review of the five downland village conservation areas and followed the adoption of the Stanmer Character Statement in March and consultation on Portslade Old Village in June. The review sought to describe the character of the area in order to inform future development decisions. It suggested changes to the boundary and recommended further planning controls to preserve architectural features.
- 41.3 It was recommended that the character statement and its proposals were now published for public comment. This would allow the council to make sure that the final document was robust and the recommended changes well supported.
- 41.4 Councillor Mitchell was pleased to see that the review was on track and expressed her support for this work.
- 41.5 Councillor Randall stated that he had enjoyed reading the report and had been interested in reading the history of Patcham. The village had made an important contribution to the City's heritage. He asked for news about the future use of Patcham Place and Patcham Court Farm.
- 41.6 The Cabinet Member replied that Patcham Place was occupied by the Youth Hostel Association, and was currently being considered for another use; meanwhile, he hoped there would soon be a scheme in place for Patcham Court Farm.
- 41.7 The Acting Director of Environment explained that the planning team were closely working with the property team to bring forward a scheme for Patcham Court Farm.
- 41.8 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:
 - (1) That the draft Patcham Conservation Area character statement and boundary change be approved for public consultation.

42. PORTSLADE OLD VILLAGE CHARACTER STATEMENT

- 42.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Acting Director of Environment concerning approval of the Portslade Old Village Conservation Area Character Statement, which seeks to define the character and appearance of the conservation area and assists in securing the preservation and enhancement of the city's historic built environment.
- 42.2 The Cabinet Member explained that the report sought to identify the character of the area and update the current boundary to inform future development control decisions. It also proposed to introduce an Article 4(I) Direction to control incremental change to unlisted dwellings. Public consultation had been carried out and the Cabinet Member was pleased to say that the Character Statement was generally well received with a number of amendments made in response to representations.
- 42.3 Councillor Mitchell was pleased to note the proposed additions were welcomed, and supported the report.
- 42.4 Councillor Randall welcomed the report and found it interesting to read.
- 42.5 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
- (1) That the Portslade Old Village Conservation Area Character Statement be adopted, subject to any minor grammatical and non-material text and illustration alterations agreed by the Director of Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment.
 - (2) That an Article 4(1) Direction is made for unlisted dwellings in the area under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (1995), as recommended by the Portslade Old Village Conservation Area Appraisal and detailed in annex 3.
 - (3) That the proposed boundary changes, as set out in the Character Statement and illustrated in annex 4, be approved and formally designated.

43. RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SAFETY OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ON 'AN INVESTIGATION INTO 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS/ZONES'

- 43.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Acting Director of Environment responding to the recommendations of the Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee's panel on 'An Investigation into 20 mph speed limits/zones'. The findings and recommendations of the review were contained in Appendix A to the report. These findings had been considered by officers and a full response to all the recommendations was contained in Appendix B. A number of council departments, local and national organisations and groups were invited to submit comments and the Panel also heard evidence from numerous groups and organisations as listed in Appendix C.

- 43.2 The Cabinet Member explained the Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee had recognised the need for a consistent and structured approach to the application of 20mph speed limits and zones within the city.
- 43.3 Whilst the Cabinet Member welcomed the good work that had gone into the report and its recommendations, there were significant resource issues for the City Council that would need to be considered against other priorities.
- 43.4 The Cabinet Member invited Councillor West, who had chaired the scrutiny panel, to introduce the panel's report.
- 43.5 Councillor West was pleased to present the report from the Scrutiny Panel. He thanked everyone who had given evidence and his fellow Panel Members, Councillors Bennett, Mitchell, Watkins and Wells, along with the hardworking professional officers. The supporting evidence had extended to over 130 pages.
- 43.6 Councillor West explained that the Panel had heard evidence that slower speeds needed to be used on residential road and areas used most by vulnerable road users; however, as traffic in the city needed to be kept moving, it was proposed that main through routes should not be included in the speed reduction initiative. The Panel had further heard evidence that a reduction to 20 mph would help to reduce casualties for all road users and would reduce the burden on the emergency services and hospitals.
- 43.7 Councillor West referred to an area-wide 20 mph scheme introduced in Portsmouth which had led to a reduction of accidents and casualties.
- 43.8 Councillor Mitchell considered that the case for lowering speeds was made very clearly in the report. Trunk roads that ran through the city were not recommended for 20 mph reduction. The recommendations were sensible and she was disappointed in the executive response. She understood that the proposals were expensive but would like to see more commitment to start the process. She would like to see work commencing on the first area, when the Speed Limit Review report was presented to the Environment CMM in November 2010.
- 43.9 Councillor West referred to the response from officers to the first recommendation of the Panel. He considered the response to be ambiguous. The Assistant Director, Sustainable Transport explained that the first recommendation would lead to 80% of the city having 20mph limits. The cost would run to several million pounds. School safety zones would be taken forward but 20 mph zones might not be the solution for other areas where a safety scheme may be more appropriate.
- 43.10 Councillor Mitchell referred to recommendation 4, and stated that there was no intention to introduce a 20 mph scheme to 80% of the city, in one phase. An incremental introduction was intended.
- 43.11 Councillor Randall mentioned that the ward he represented already had a 20mph scheme. Any research carried out on that scheme on the reduction of accidents, might prove useful to the proposed scheme.

43.12 The Assistant Director, Sustainable Transport agreed that in general, research had shown that it did pay to invest in traffic calming schemes but there was a significant cost involved.

43.13 **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 20mph speed limits and zones be noted.
- (2) That the the actions detailed in the officer response to Scrutiny's recommendations (Appendix B) be noted and agreed, with particular regard to timescales and any constraints identified.

44. QUEEN'S PARK SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOL SCHEME

44.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Acting Director of Environment concerning the implementation of the Queen's Park Safer Routes to School Scheme measures following consultation, which would focus on improving road safety for children, parents and carers travelling to and from nursery or school.

44.2 The Cabinet Member reported that the locations had been chosen due to the number of collisions in the area during school journey times over the last three years.

44.3 Councillor Mitchell welcomed the report. She asked how the reduction in the budget had impacted on the scheme as delivered. For example, had there been any deferral of residents' requests? The Assistant Director, Sustainable Transport replied that adjustments had been made to the budget. It was the intention to take the whole scheme forward over a two year period.

44.5 Councillor Fryer welcomed the report. She hoped the improvements would be implemented as quickly as possible.

44.6 Councillor West referred to the motorcycle bay in Freshfield Road, which was obstructing visibility. He asked if this could be removed. Councillor West also asked if there could be additional signage for the pedestrian refuge in Egremont Place. The Assistant Director Sustainable Transport replied that officers would investigate to see if additional signage was necessary. The need for the motorcycle bay would also be investigated.

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

- (1) That the measures be implemented at the identified sites:
 - Freshfield Road,
 - Egremont Place
 - Queens Park Road.

- (2) That approval be given for the advertising of an order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 in respect of elements in the preferred scheme.

45. HANOVER & ELM GROVE RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME REVIEW COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

- 45.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Acting Director of Environment concerning outcome of the public consultation undertaken regarding a proposed Residents Parking Scheme in the currently unrestricted Hanover & Elm Grove area and associated reviews of the existing Area U (St Luke's) and Area C (Queen's Park) controlled parking schemes.
- 45.2 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation from Ms Gail Findlay concerning the element of the consultation which considered a residents' parking scheme for Canning Street. Ms Findlay explained that Canning Street was currently a dangerous place to live. She mentioned that an ambulance had recently been stuck between two parked cars in Canning Street on the way to treat her daughter who had been seriously injured. The access was narrow in the road and 50% of cars parked on the pavement. There was a problem of displacement from other roads. Ms Findlay considered that the simple solution would be to extend Zone H to include Canning Street. As the majority of residents in Canning Street had expressed the wish to restrict parking to one side only, the inclusion of Canning Street in the parking scheme would be democratic.
- 45.3 The Cabinet Member explained that whilst residents from Canning Street and several other streets in the consultation did vote in favour of a parking scheme, nearly 75% of the total respondents across the area as a whole voted against.
- 45.4 The Council did receive a number of concerns from residents about displacement into other roads in Baker's Bottom who would find themselves surrounded by parking schemes, so it was proposed not to include Canning Street within the Zone H area.
- 45.5 On balance Canning Street could not be considered in isolation from other roads in the Baker's Bottom area and the Cabinet Member had to keep in mind that overall this area voted against the introduction of a resident parking scheme. The Cabinet Member informed Ms Findlay that he would arrange for traffic officers to meet with her to see if anything could be done to improve safety in Canning Street.
- 45.6 The Cabinet Member also considered a deputation from Ms Sarah Griffin concerning the part of the consultation which considered introducing a residents' parking scheme in Queen's Park Rise. Ms Griffin explained that Queen's Park Rise was a small residential street and the bottom half of the road had been included in the scheme. The residents of the top half of the road could not understand why their response had been linked to Freshfield Street rather than the lower end of Queen's Park Rise. She stressed that the street should be treated as a whole and responses treated on a road by road basis.
- 45.7 Ms Griffin explained the difficulties residents were experiencing. There were five disabled bays in the road and several elderly people who did not qualify for disabled bays could not park near to their houses.

- 45.8 The Cabinet Member thanked Ms Griffin for her response. He explained that he was aware that Queens Park Rise respondents voted in favour of a resident parking scheme. However, nearly 75% of residents across the entire consultation area voted against the introduction of a residents' parking scheme.
- 45.9 There are further concerns that this proposal would increase displacement to surrounding roads and would also leave Freshfield Street in isolation surrounded by controlled parking.
- 45.10 It was felt that Queens Park Rise could not be considered in isolation from Freshfield Street, who also voted against the proposal.
- 45.11 Overall, the respondents from Queens Park Rise and Freshfield Street combined were against the proposals. Therefore, it is proposed not to proceed with this request.
- 45.12 The Cabinet Member considered that the results of the consultation as set out in the report clearly showed that there was no mandate to progress a parking scheme in the majority of the Hanover & Elm Grove area.
- 45.13 However, there was clear support from residents in the existing Queen's Park Controlled Parking Zone to extend their scheme to Sundays and this was also supported by the local Ward Councillors, and the Hoteliers and Guest House Association.
- 45.14 There was also an overwhelming mandate to retain the current scheme in the St. Luke's area.
- 45.15 Councillor Mitchell was pleased to see that Craven Vale had voted no and was not included in the scheme. She considered that there was an urgent need to evaluate how residents' parking schemes were implemented. Councillor Mitchell queried what would happen if emergency vehicles could not gain access and asked who would be responsible in such a scenario. The extension of parking schemes had raised a number of issues such as the affordability of permits and a lack of ability to understand the scheme. Elderly people were being fined as a result. Councillor Mitchell expressed concern for people who needed care along with family carers, who did not qualify for a permit.
- 45.16 Councillor Fryer spoke in her capacity as a Ward Councillor for Queens' Park. She stressed the need for better public transport, but accepted that it would be a long time before that aim was achieved. In the meanwhile, the problems residents were experiencing with regard to displacement and lack of access, should not be ignored. Councillor Fryer believed that there should be one vote per person not per household. In spite of more and more consultation, peoples' wishes were being ignored. Councillor Fryer said she would like to see residents parking zones in the upper part of Queens' Park Rise and Canning Street, or alternative policies stated. Residents should be re-consulted within a year. Councillor Fryer wished to see a workable solution.
- 45.17 Councillor Randall mentioned that the Hanover and Elm Grove Local Action Team had met on 15 September, and had agreed to set up a sub-group to look at residents' parking.

- 45.18 The Assistant Director, Sustainable Transport, responded to Councillor Mitchell's points. He reported that there was no legal obligation to bring forward residents' parking schemes on road safety grounds. Road safety solutions were needed for specific accident related issues not parking controls. He acknowledged there was an issue concerning affordability which needed to be investigated. With regard to Councillor Fryer's points, he acknowledged there were problems with boundary issues, and there was potential for displacement into other streets. However, officers had undertaken a substantial consultation and come up with the right solutions. Officers were always interested to hear the views of the Local Action Teams. It was difficult to balance every view but officers had listened and taken forward the view of the majority of residents in Hanover and Elm Grove.
- 45.19 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
- (1) That no changes be made to the St Luke's (Area U) Controlled Parking Zone.
 - (2) That the Queen's Park (Area C) Controlled Parking Zone operational times be extended from Monday to Saturday 9am to 8pm to Monday to Sunday 9am to 8pm and a Traffic Regulation Order be advertised.
 - (3) That no changes be made in the area covered by the Hanover & Elm Grove residents parking scheme review.

Note: This item was taken immediately following Item 39.

46. VARIOUS CHANGES TO CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES (CPZ) ORDER, AREAS OUTSIDE OF CPZ ORDER AND SEAFRONT ORDER

- 46.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Acting Director of Environment concerning the comments, support and objections received to an amendment Traffic Regulation Order, which contained proposals for a total of 150 roads.
- 46.2 The Cabinet Member was pleased to note that the report responded to the request of residents, businesses and Ward Councillors. The amendments included the provision of safety improvements, such as waiting restrictions, to improve visibility at junctions and often help to improve sustainable transport.
- 46.3 Councillor Mitchell expressed disappointment that Manor Hill had not been included in the amendment Traffic Regulation Order. There was a significant issue regarding that junction. The Parking Strategy Manager reported that Manor Hill would be included in an Area H Parking Order next month.
- 46.4 Councillor Fryer asked for clarification about Car Club bays. She considered that anything that supported the Car Club should be supported. The Assistant Director, Sustainable Transport reported that there was limited support for some Car Park bays. People were now objecting to Car Club bays and there was a need to take a whole city approach.

- 46.5 Councillor Fryer expressed that view that people should be invited to write to support or object to traffic regulation orders rather than be invited to object. The Parking Strategy Manager reported that all ward councillors had been consulted. Officers had taken objections and comments into account. The Acting Director, Environment undertook to look at the wording of future Traffic Regulation Orders.
- 46.6 Councillor West asked for the rationale of removing the Car Club Bays from Traffic Regulation Order. The Parking Strategy Manager mentioned that the reasons for removing the Car Club Bays from the Traffic Regulation Order were stated in the appendix to the report.
- 46.7 **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 into account of all the duly made representations and objections) the Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.* 201*, Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 amendment Order No.* 201* and Brighton & Hove Seafront (Various Restrictions) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment No.* 201* be approved with the following amendments:
 - (a) The proposed disabled bay in Mile Oak Road is being withdrawn from the Traffic Order as it is no longer required by local residents. The proposed removal of the disabled bay outside 36 Sussex Square is to be withdrawn from the Traffic Order as the bay is still required by a local resident who's recent application is still being determined
 - (b) The proposed double yellow lines in Upper Bevendean Avenue are to be withdrawn from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.3.
 - (c) The proposed double yellow lines in Winfield Close are to be withdrawn from the Traffic Order due to reasons outline in section 3.4
 - (d) The operating hours of existing single yellow lines in Albion Street are to be changed from Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm to Monday to Friday 8am to 5pm due to reasons outlined in section 3.8.
 - (e) The proposed double yellow lines in St Andrew's Road between Nos. 67c & Coastline Fire Protection will be reduced due to reasons out lined in section 3.9
 - (f) The proposed shared parking bays in Westbourne Place are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in the report under section 3.10.
 - (g) The proposed limited waiting bays in the Kingsway are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.11.
 - (h) The proposed double yellow lines at the junction of Matlock Road and Tivoli Road are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.12.
 - (i) The proposed double yellow lines and limited waiting bays in The Deneway are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.13.
 - (j) The proposed Car Club bays in Charlotte Street, Cowper Street, Sutherland Road, Lucerne Road and Rugby Road are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to reasons outlined in section 3.14.

47. CIVITAS ROAD SAFETY PROJECT

- 47.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Acting Director of Environment concerning implementation of a collection of minor measures in the London Road and Lewes Road area designed to improve visibility for all road users and withdrawal of the proposed loading bay (positioned on the north-east side of Franklin Road) from the traffic order, reference CIV/RS/Lewes Road.
- 47.2 Councillor Mitchell was pleased to note the proposals, particularly in relation to Lewes Road. The removal of clutter would improve the area.
- 47.3 Councillor West also welcomed the report, which would help vulnerable road users to be more safe.
- 47.4 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
- (1) That implementation be approved at the identified sites:
- London Road (Real Time Bus Information sign outside Iceland)
 - London Road / Baker Street junction
 - Lewes Road / Franklin Road junction
 - Lewes Road / Coombe Terrace / Coombe Road junction
- (2) That the objection to the proposal for the loading bay (positioned on the north-east side of Franklin Road) from the traffic order be upheld.

48. PARKING ANNUAL REPORT 2009/2010

- 48.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Acting Director of Environment concerning the Parking Annual Report 2009/10 on the performance of Parking Services for submission to the Department for Transport and Traffic Penalty Tribunal and for publication under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004.
- 48.2 The Traffic Management Act 2004 placed a requirement on Local Authorities to publish an annual parking report.
- 48.3 The Cabinet Member welcomed the publication of the Brighton & Hove Annual Parking Report 2009/10 following the success of the Council's award winning first annual report last year. He also welcomed the opportunity this provided to inform and engage with the public on a range of parking issues.
- 48.4 Councillor Mitchell referred to the enforcement of bus lanes and the increase in fines. She asked if this was due to enforcement on Saturdays. The Assistant Director, Sustainable Transport replied that the introduction of enforcement on Saturdays was working, however, the number of Penalty Charge Notices issued was likely to decrease next year.
- 48.5 Councillor West referred to Low Emission Permit Discounts. He suggested a sliding scale was used instead of using vehicle excise duty band A or B. The owner of a

vehicle with high emissions would pay a higher rate for a resident's permit. Councillor West referred to the rise in cost of supported bus services. He asked if more should be expected from the bus companies for the extra money they received.

- 48.6 The Assistant Director, Sustainable Transport replied that supported bus services were tendered on a three year basis.
- 48.7 The Cabinet Member commended the officers who had made the report as clear as possible.
- 48.8 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
- (1) That the publication of the Parking Annual Report for 2009/10 for submission to the Department for Transport and Traffic Penalty Tribunal under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004 be endorsed.
 - (2) That the Acting Director of Environment be authorised to produce and publish a public version of the report to be made available on the Council's website.

The meeting concluded at 5.43pm

Signed

Cabinet Member

Dated this

day of