

# ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

## Agenda Item 25

Brighton & Hove City Council

**Subject:** Resident parking scheme – Formal traffic order  
**Date of Meeting:** 23 July 2009  
**Report of:** Director of Environment  
**Contact Officer:** Name: Charles Field Tel: 29-3329  
E-mail: charles.field@brighton-hove.gov.uk  
**Key Decision:** Yes Forward Plan No: ENV10358  
**Wards Affected:** Preston Park; Stanford; Withdean

### 1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to address comments and objections to the draft Traffic Regulation Orders for the Preston Park Avenue, The Martlet and Preston Park Station areas parking schemes plus double yellow lines on Dyke Road.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That, the Cabinet Member for Environment, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, approves as advertised the following orders;
- (a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zone Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No\* 200\* Regulation Order 2003 (Area J Extension)
  - (b) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zone Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No\* 200\* Regulation Order 2003 (Area O Extension)
  - (c) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zone Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No\* 200\* Regulation Order 2003 (Area A)
  - (d) Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.\* 200\* (Dyke Road).
- 2.2 That the Cabinet Member for Environment agrees 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.

### 3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

#### Preston Park Avenue

- 3.1 Following detailed parking surveys which took place in April 2008 and meetings with the Ward Councillors it was agreed a letter drop would take place in a number of areas to see if residents would like to be consulted on the detailed design for a resident parking scheme in their area.

- 3.2 Following the results of the initial letter drop it was agreed that a second stage consultation incorporating detailed design would take place in Preston Park Avenue in November / December 2008. Residents & businesses had until 12 December 2008 to respond and a staffed Public exhibition was arranged at the Bowling Pavilion in Preston Park on Friday 14 November 2008. The exhibition was then available for the public to view at Hove Town Hall until Monday 15 December 2008.
- 3.3 Following the results of the second stage consultation there was a positive opinion from the majority of respondents within the road. Therefore, it was agreed at CMM on 19 February that the road should be progressed to the advertisement of a traffic regulation order.

### **The Martlet Area**

- 3.4 Following detailed parking surveys which took place in April 2008 and meetings with the Ward Councillors it was agreed a letter drop would take place in the area to see if residents would like to be consulted on the detailed design for a resident parking scheme in their area.
- 3.5 Following the results of the initial letter drop it was agreed that a second stage consultation incorporating detailed design would take place in the Martlet area shown in November / December 2008. Residents & businesses had until 12 December 2008 to respond and a staffed Public exhibition was arranged at the Church of Good Shepherd on Dyke Road from Wednesday 12 November 2005 until Thursday 13 November 2008. The exhibition was then available for the public to view at Hove Town Hall until Monday 15 December 2008.
- 3.6 Following the results of the second stage consultation there was a positive opinion from the majority of respondents within the road. Therefore, it was agreed at CMM on 19 February that the Martlet area should be progressed to the advertisement of a traffic regulation order.

### **Preston Park Station area and Double Yellow lines on Dyke Road**

- 3.7 Following detailed parking surveys which took place in April 2008 and meetings with the Ward Councillors it was agreed a letter drop would take place in the Preston Park Station area to see if residents would like to be consulted on the detailed design for a resident parking scheme in their area.
- 3.8 Following the results of the initial letter drop it was agreed that a second stage consultation incorporating detailed design would take place in the area to the south of Preston Park Station in November / December 2008. Residents & Businesses had until 12 December 2008 to respond and a staffed Public exhibition was arranged at the Church of Good Shepherd on Dyke Road from Wednesday 12 November 2005 until Thursday 13 November 2008. The exhibition was then available for the public to view at Hove Town Hall until Monday 15 December 2008.
- 3.9 Following the results of the second stage consultation there was a positive opinion from the majority of respondents within a clearly defined, smaller geographical section of the area. It was therefore agreed at CMM on 19 February to proceed with a scheme within this newly formed boundary It was

also agreed at CMM to letter drop Compton Road, Inwood Crescent and Millers Road, in order to inform residents that a scheme will go ahead in adjacent roads, and to give them an opportunity to consider the effect this may have. Residents in these 3 roads could then make an informed decision about whether to be included or excluded from the scheme. This meant the Preston Park Station area, with the possible exclusion of Millers Road, Compton Road & Inwood Crescent was progressed to final design and agreed to be advertised through a traffic regulation order.

- 3.10 The re-consultation letter / questionnaire to Millers Road, Compton Road & Inwood Crescent was sent out in early March 2009 and residents & businesses had until Friday 27 March 2009 to respond.
- 3.11 Following the results of the re-consultation of the three roads the officer recommendation was that the Council should proceed with advertising a traffic regulation order for a resident parking scheme in this area including these three roads. This was agreed at CMM on 7 May and the further area was included in the advertisement of a traffic regulation order.

#### **4. CONSULTATION**

##### **Preston Park Avenue**

- 4.1 The draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised on 1 May 2009 with the closing date for objections on 26 May 2009. There were 3 items of correspondence received. All 3 items were received from individuals and 1 item received was an objection and 2 were in support. Copies of the correspondence will be available for inspection in the Members' room. A plan showing the proposals will be displayed at the meeting and is shown on Appendix A (i).
- 4.2 2 items of support were received from local residents thanking the Council for proceeding with this resident parking scheme proposal.
- 4.3 1 objection was received from a resident in the Surrenden Road area concerned about displacement of travellers vans.
- 4.4 The Council is concerned about displacement but it is very difficult to predict the extent and location of any displacement that could occur.

##### **The Martlet area**

- 4.5 The draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised on 1 May 2009 with the closing date for objections on 26 May 2009. There were 4 items of correspondence received - which were all received from individuals - and one petition. 3 items received were objections and 1 made general comments. Copies of the correspondence will be available for inspection in the Members' room. A plan showing the proposals will be displayed at the meeting and is shown on Appendix A (ii).
- 4.6 1 objection was received from a resident in Fulmar Close and a petition of 12 signatures from Fulmar Close concerned with the amount of parking spaces being lost on their street.

- 4.7 The issue of parking loss here was discussed at the Environment Cabinet Members meeting on 12 February 2009. Due to a number of complaints from residents about insufficient resident parking bays being allocated within the proposals officers have revisited the area and have identified that more bays can be included in the final design. With regard to Fulmer Close originally because of the narrow nature of the width of the roads in this close the Council were not going to provide any parking provision. After discussions with residents and Councillors we looked at the road again and decided a limited amount of provision could be provided despite this being against the Council's guidance on parking design. The reason for this was the very limited amount of turning movements in the close. The current proposals provide one space on the entry arm and 3 spaces at the north west corner of Fulmer Close. As previously stated we applied officer discretion to overrule guidance in order to provide some parking for residents. Officer opinion is that any further increase in parking provision would create an unacceptable road safety hazard.
- 4.8 1 objection was received from a resident in Kestrel Close wanting single yellow lines rather than a resident parking scheme and a petition from December 2008 dealt with at a previous Environment Cabinet Member meeting was enclosed.
- 4.9 The Council is currently consulting on a resident parking scheme for the area rather than a "light touch" single yellow line approach. Recommendations which were agreed by members at a previous Environment Committee meeting is not to extend any single yellow lines as a form of blanket on-street parking restriction. This is because single yellow lines when used as extensive parking restrictions cause the following problems:
- They can stop residents parking on their own street. Single yellow lines can cause serious problems for residents who have no off-street parking and cannot always be available to move their car twice a day. For example, shift workers or those who do not use their car regularly every day for purposes such as driving to work.
  - They can cause serious displacement to other areas. Single yellow lines completely deter commuters from the area but because no alternative parking options (such as Pay & Display) are provided, the commuter vehicles are likely to move to an adjacent area, thus repeating the parking problems in the next neighbourhood.
  - As individual schemes, they are not financially viable. The council needs to enforce this nearly as often and with as much resources as a full scheme, but does not receive any income from residents or Pay & Display to support this.
  - They can be confusing to visitors and people new to the area, and confusing to enforce. Because the restrictions are confusing, non residents tend to avoid these areas and park elsewhere, thus increasing displacement to neighbouring streets.
- 4.10 1 objection was received from a resident in Fulmar Close who objected to replacing advisory white access protection markings with double yellow lines across driveways.

- 4.11 It is proposed that double yellow line restrictions will apply across all vehicle accesses. Whilst this means that residents or their guests will not be able to park across a garage or drive access, it will ensure that these remain unblocked and enforceable by the Civil Enforcement Officers at all times. Unfortunately, white return lines are only advisory and cannot be enforced by the Civil Enforcement Officers.
- 4.12 1 comment was received from a resident in The Martlet asking for the shared pay & display bays to be minimised in the road, clarification of the permit policy and a request for double yellow lines outside 36 The Martlet due to difficulties getting out of the shared drive.
- 4.13 In regard to the parking layout all parking in the Martlet area Closes are resident permit only. Shared pay and display is only being proposed in the Upper Drive.
- 4.14 In terms of the permit allocation if a resident / household has sufficient space to park vehicles in an off-street space then a resident / household will not be issued a resident parking permit in the first allocation. However, if after the initial allocation there are still resident parking permits available a resident / household would be able to apply to purchase resident parking permits for further vehicles as long as they don't have space available for further vehicles in their off-street parking facility. Within this area, there is very likely to be a second allocation of permits as the majority of residents in this area have an off-street parking facility.
- 4.15 Due to the reasons outlined by the resident it has been agreed to remove one parking space and double yellow lines are now to be placed directly outside no.36 The Martlet opposite the shared driveway.

#### **Preston Park Station area**

- 4.16 The draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised on 14 May 2009 with the closing date for objections on 8 June 2009. There were 33 items of correspondence received. 29 items received were objections, 3 were general comments and 1 was in support. 29 items were received from individuals and 3 from businesses. There were a total amount of 17 different reasons for objection with 65 objections from the 29 items of correspondence. Copies of the correspondence will be available for inspection in the Members' room. A plan showing the proposals will be displayed at the meeting and is shown on Appendix A (iii).
- 4.17 14 objections were received regarding the hours and days of the resident parking scheme. 10 wanted shorter hours / days while 4 objections argued that there should be evening / overnight enforcement as that is when the parking issues are.
- 4.18 The 9am-8pm Monday to Sunday resident parking scheme proposal was designed by officers as it was felt this would be the best scheme for the area taking into account previous experience of implementing resident parking schemes over the last few years. This seven day proposal takes into account possible displacement at weekends and evenings (if the roads were not restricted) into the area from other resident parking schemes and restricted areas (for example Area Q in the Prestonville area which is a 7 day parking scheme up to 8pm), other proposed schemes in the area and proposed double yellow lines

on Dyke Road. The 9am-8pm Monday to Sunday resident parking scheme proposal has been through extensive consultation and there has been little correspondence asking the Council to change the hours or days of the scheme.

During the main consultation only 23 people made a comment about the operating hours / days which was only 6.5% of the total response.

- 4.19 13 objections were received regarding the results of the informal consultation and stating that because the results were 50/50 a scheme should not have been proceeded with. Comments were also made that Compton Road, Inwood Crescent and Millers Road should not have been re-consulted as they were against the parking scheme proposal.
- 4.20 The Cabinet report presented to the Environment Cabinet Members meeting on 19 February 2009 analysed the breakdown of results and concluded that in a particular identified area (not including Compton Road, Inwood Crescent and Millers Road), the majority of residents who voted were for a scheme. This identified area was proposed for a scheme, and the report stated that certain roads had been included in this remaining area despite voting against in order to ensure that the proposed scheme was geographically viable.
- 4.21 It was stated in the Council's original letter in October 2007 that "The boundary for any parking scheme will be established from the answers we receive. Ultimately the council has to have a boundary for parking schemes that is economically and geographically viable. This means a scheme has to be introduced for an area rather than for individual or isolated roads."
- 4.22 Part of Dyke Road has been included in the results because residents in this road will be eligible for a resident permit to park in the resident parking scheme. This is because double yellow lines are proposed on this side of the road. Even if the results of Dyke Road had not been included there would still be an overall majority of residents in favour within the resident parking scheme area agreed at the Cabinet Members Meeting and taken forward to the legal Traffic Regulation order stage.
- 4.23 With regard to Inwood Crescent, Millers Road, and Compton Road, it was geographically possible to exclude these. However, the council felt that the fairest way forward was to make residents in these roads aware that scheme proposals would still go ahead in adjacent roads and to give them an opportunity to consider this accordingly. The results of this consultation was presented to the Environment Cabinet Member meeting on 7 May 2009 and it was agreed to proceed with these three roads.
- 4.24 9 objections have been received from people arguing that the proposed parking scheme is just a revenue raising exercise for the Council.
- 4.25 When introducing new residents parking schemes the Council must demonstrate that these would be self financing. This is why charges have to be made for On-street parking through permits and pay & display. Any surplus from the revenue received from the proposed parking schemes goes back into transport improvements throughout the City.
- 4.26 8 objections received argued that there was no parking problem.

- 4.27 Several residents in this area have been requesting parking controls to the Council and Ward Councillors for a number of years and that is the why the Council agreed to include this area in the resident parking scheme priority timetable. The report to Environment Committee on 24 January 2008 listed the criteria for considering areas for parking schemes as previously agreed and presented in Sustainable Transport's strategy and policy. Parking schemes should only be introduced where there is a genuine need i.e. where there are genuinely insufficient parking spaces for residents because of the impact of commuter or other types of parking, and where the available parking capacity needs to be controlled in order to balance the need of residents and other vehicle users.
- 4.28 8 objections have been received from people parking in the roads and using the railway station including concerns that a car park should be made available for commuters to park.
- 4.29 As part of the consultation undertaken regard has been given to the free movement of traffic and access to premises since traffic flow and access are issues that have generated requests from residents and in part a need for the measures being proposed. The provision of alternative off-street parking spaces has been considered by officers when designing the scheme but there are no opportunities to go forward with any off street spaces due to the existing geographical layout of the area and existing parking provisions in the area. The Council also consulted Southern Railway as part of this current formal consultation and received no response.
- 4.30 4 objections and 1 comment were received with concerns about business parking if a scheme is introduced.
- 4.31 If the scheme is approved a business will be able to apply for up to 2 business permits if they can demonstrate a business need for their vehicles.
- 4.32 2 objections received were concerns about displacement northwards into the Tivoli Crescent area which is unrestricted.
- 4.33 Following detailed parking surveys which took place in April 2007 and meetings with the Ward Councillors it was agreed a letter drop would take place in a number of areas to see if residents would like to be consulted on the detailed design for a resident parking scheme in the area. Following the results of the initial letter drop sent out in October 2007 residents in the Tivoli Crescent area were against any resident parking scheme being introduced in their road. Therefore it was agreed that a second stage consultation would not take place in the roads northwards who were also against the proposals. Residents in this area were sent a postcard informing them of this decision in Spring 2008.
- 4.34 A further 7 individual comments were received. These were on a range of subjects regarding the permit parking placement and issuing of permits, additional street furniture, disabled provision, that there was no need for 4 hour medium term parking, motorcycle provision and that there was no evaluation of Area Q where roads should become unrestricted.

- 4.35 In terms of the permit parking we have placed resident permit areas in the most suitable locations possible alongside shared resident permit / pay & display bays. Each household in the proposed scheme will be able to apply for one permit if they do not have off street parking for that vehicle. Any household requiring more than one permit can call the Parking Information Centre to request a second permit application form. Assuming that permits are available following the initial allocation, (as has been the case with previous schemes) these will be issued to other members of the household who have applied for a second permit for that household before the scheme begins operation. First of all permits will be issued to households requiring a second permit and households with off street parking and then if permits remain to households requiring a third permit and so on. Any further permits issued are on a first come first served basis within each allocation. These further permits made at a later date (for example people moving into the area) will be dependant on demand and assessed once the scheme is in operation. The number of permits issued is based on a 1:1 ratio of spaces available in resident permit only and shared resident permit/ pay & display spaces available and a waiting list will be created at that cut off point.
- 4.36 The Council has also considered the issue of additional street furniture causing street clutter and difficulties on narrow pavements. Therefore, the Council will be putting down the minimal signing / machines possible to allow enforcement and will take into consideration pavement widths.
- 4.37 Disabled provision has also been considered and existing blue badge spaces will remain along with recent requests. Blue badge holders can also park for free in shared pay & display spaces and local residents with a blue badge can also apply for a discounted £5 resident parking permit.
- 4.38 The 4 hour medium term parking has been provided for visitors to businesses and service to the area and to allow flexibility for visitors to residents in the area as there is a limit to the amount of visitor permits allowed per year for local residents.
- 4.39 In terms of motorcycle provision we have provided one motorcycle bay on the majority of roads, however, if specific representation is received the Council would be more than happy to relocate, remove or create motorcycle bays.
- 4.40 If roads such as Highcroft Villas or Dyke Road Avenue become unrestricted in Area Q there would be likely to be a large number of objections from residents in these roads. Therefore, due to the demand from residents around Preston Park Station to be included in a resident parking scheme it was felt it was better to concentrate on these roads.
- 4.41 Further comments were received from residents of Woodside Avenue, a resident in Scarborough Road and a resident in Inwood Crescent.
- 4.42 In Woodside Avenue residents were concerned about the allocation of resident permit parking and issues with the current locations for parking. It has been agreed to extend the resident permit only parking on the west side to allow residents easier access to that side of the road.
- 4.43 In Scarborough Road there was a concern at the current parking arrangement. Officers looked into this and residents parking has been amended from the



advertised TRO location from the east side to the west (and visa versa for shared parking), due to the majority of properties and residents being located on the west side. Also the east side is better suited to shared parking as it provides more unobtrusive locations for pay and display machines. The disabled bay and motorcycle bay retain their original proposed locations.

- 4.44 In Inwood Crescent it was agreed that posts and signs would be put in sensitively and not near access areas and residents can contact the Council during the implementation stage to discuss the locations.

#### **Double Yellow lines on Dyke Road**

- 4.45 The draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised on 14 May 2009 with the closing date for objections on 8 June 2009. There were 3 items of correspondence received from individuals. All 3 items received were objections and copies of the correspondence will be available for inspection in the Members' room. A plan showing the proposals will be displayed at the meeting and is shown on Appendix A (iv).
- 4.46 3 objections were received with concerns that stopping double yellow lines in Dyke Road at the location in the current proposal would displace vehicles further up the road or into the roads around The Drove.
- 4.47 Officers and Councillors discussed the best way forward regarding the extent of double yellow lines on Dyke Road, and decided to propose up to the boundary of each scheme on each side.

#### **Conclusions**

##### ***The Preston Park Station area***

- 4.48 The recommendation is that the Preston Park Station resident parking scheme area be progressed due to the reasons outlined within the relevant background.

##### ***The Preston Park Avenue area***

- 4.49 The recommendation is that the Preston Park Avenue resident parking scheme area be progressed due to the reasons outlined within the relevant background.

##### ***The Martlet Area***

- 4.50 The recommendation is that The Martlet resident parking scheme area be progressed due to the reasons outlined within the relevant background.

##### ***Dyke Road - Double yellow lines***

- 4.51 The recommendation is that the double yellow lines proposed in Dyke Road be progressed due to the reasons outlined within the relevant background. Residents in these parts of Dyke Road will be allowed to apply for a relevant resident permit for the scheme on their side of the road.

- 4.52 Any additional amendments to the schemes approved deemed necessary through the formal consultation will be introduced during the implementation stage and advertised through a traffic regulation amendment order.
- 4.53 As part of the consultation undertaken in each of the schemes regard has been given to the free movement of traffic and access to premises since traffic flow and access are issues that have generated requests from residents and in part a need for the measures being proposed. The provision of alternative off-street parking spaces has been considered by officers when designing the schemes but there are no opportunities to go forward with any off street spaces due to the existing geographical layout of the areas and existing parking provisions in the areas.

## **5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

### Financial Implications:

- 5.1 The full cost of advertising traffic regulation orders and amending the lining and signing will be covered from existing budgets. New parking schemes are funded through unsupported borrowings with approximate repayment costs of £130,000 per scheme over 7 years. The financial impact of the revenue from the proposed new schemes has been included within the budget for 2009-10 which was submitted to Budget Council on 26 February.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw*

*Date: 22/03/09*

### Legal Implications:

- 5.2 Broadly, 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. Also, as far as is practicable, the Council should also have regard to any implications in relation to:- access to premises; the effect on amenities; the Council's air quality strategy; facilitating the passage of public services vehicles and securing the safety and convenience of users; any other matters that appear relevant to the Council.
- 5.3 The Council has specific powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act to make various types of order and the most relevant in relation to the proposals in this report are summarised below.
- 5.4 Section 1 of the 1984 Act enables the Council to make orders prohibiting, restricting or regulating the use of roads. The various grounds for such action include safety, prevention of congestion and preservation of amenity and are not restricted to the roads mentioned in an order but can be for the benefit of other roads.
- 5.5 Under sections 32 and 35 of the 1984 Act, there is power to provide and regulate the use of parking places (without charges) on the highway, for the purpose of relieving or preventing congestion. The parking places powers must not be used in relation to any road so unreasonably as to prevent access to adjoining premises, or its use by anyone entitled to use it, or so as to be a nuisance.

- 5.6 Under section 45 of the 1984 Act, the Council has wide powers to designate pay parking places on highways for vehicles or classes of vehicles. It includes power to authorise parking by permit. Under subsection (3), in determining what parking places are to be designated under this section the Council must consider both the interests of traffic and those of the owners and occupiers of adjoining property, and in particular the matters to which that authority shall have regard include –
- (a) the need for maintaining the free movement of traffic;
  - (b) the need for maintaining reasonable access to premises; and
  - (c) the extent to which off-street parking accommodation, whether in the open or under cover, is available in the neighbourhood or the provision of such parking accommodation is likely to be encouraged there by the designation of parking places under this section.
- 5.7 Before making Traffic Orders, the Council must consider all duly made, unwithdrawn objections. In limited circumstances it must hold public inquiries and may do so otherwise. It is usually possible for proposed orders to be modified, providing any amendments do not increase the effects of the advertised proposals. The Council also has powers to make orders in part and defer decisions on the remainder. Orders may not be made until the objection periods have expired and cannot be made more than 2 years after the notices first proposing them were first published. Orders may not come into force before the dates on which it is intended to publish notices stating that they have been made. After making orders, the steps which the Council must take include notifying objectors and putting in place the necessary traffic signs.
- 5.8 Relevant Human Rights Act rights to which the Council should have regard in exercising its traffic management powers are the right to respect for family and private life and the right to protection of property. These are qualified rights and therefore there can be interference with them in appropriate circumstances.

*Lawyer Consulted:*

*Stephen Dryden / Liz Culbert*

*Date: 11/06/09*

Equalities Implications:

- 5.9 The proposed measures will be of benefit to many road users.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.10 The new motorcycle bays and on-street cycle parking bay will encourage more sustainable methods of transport.

- 5.11 Managing parking will increase turnover and parking opportunities for all.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.12 The proposed amendments to restrictions will not have any implication on the prevention of crime and disorder.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.13 Any risks will be monitored as part of the overall project management, but none have been identified.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.14 The legal disabled bays will provide parking for the holders of blue badges wanting to use the local facilities.

**6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):**

- 6.1 For the majority of the proposals the only alternative option is doing nothing which would mean the proposals would not be taken forward. However, it is the recommendation of officers that these proposals are proceeded with for the reasons outlined within the report.

**7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 To seek approval of the 3 schemes to the implementation stage after taking into consideration of the duly made representations and objections. These proposals and amendments are recommended to be taken forward for the reasons outlined within the report.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Appendices:**

1. Appendix A (i-iv) – Plans

**Documents In Members' Rooms**

1. Objections / representations.

**Background Documents**

1. Report to Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> May 2009 (Item 146)
2. Report to Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> February 2009 (Item 112)
3. Report to Environment Committee on March 20<sup>th</sup> 2008 (Item 146)
4. Report to Environment Committee on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2008 (Item 118)