

Subject: Petitions
Date of Meeting: 14 March 2017
Report of: Monitoring Officer
Contact Officer: Name: John Peel Tel: 29-1058
E-mail: john.peel@brighton-hove.gov.uk
Wards Affected: Various

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 To receive any petitions submitted directly to Democratic Services or any e-Petition submitted via the council's website.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.2 That the Committee responds to the petition either by noting it or writing to the petition organiser setting out the Council's views, or where it is considered more appropriate, calls for an officer report on the matter which may give consideration to a range of options, including the following:

- taking the action requested in the petition
- considering the petition at a council meeting
- holding an inquiry into the matter
- undertaking research into the matter
- holding a public meeting
- holding a consultation
- holding a meeting with petitioners
- calling a referendum

3. PETITIONS

3. (i) Hove Station Footbridge- Mike Gibson

To receive the following petition signed by 550 people

"We the undersigned members/supporters of Hove Station Neighbourhood Forum and local residents urge Brighton & Hove Council to:

- *improve the standard of cleanliness of the footbridge*
- *identify and implement any short term measures which will improve the appearance of the footbridge*
- *establish the most appropriate longer term action needed- either major refurbishment or replacement with lift provision*

- *secure funding from a combination public sector sources and the developer contributions generated by successive major redevelopment projects which will be starting in the vicinity of the bridge next year”*

3. (i) Hanover & Elm Grove controlled parking zone proposals- Ian Berry

To receive the following petition signed by 106 people

“We the undersigned being residents of the "top triangle" request as part of the proposed CPZ consideration be given allowing for some pavement parking as is currently common practice here & in other councils, with compliance to at least meet minimum recommendations. This will help ease the considerable disruption the current proposal will cause to residents due to the substantial loss of available parking and the known high ownership of cars in the area. We understand that part of any costs incurred in allowing this can be offset by the extra revenue generated by the additional permits sold. Although we also note that the current pavement structure appears to withstand the extra loading from being parked on it with almost no damage”.