

### BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

### ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

4.00pm 30 JULY 2009

### COMMITTEE ROOM 1, HOVE TOWN HALL

### MINUTES

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

**Also in attendance:** Councillors McCaffery (Opposition Spokesperson, Labour) and Davey (Opposition Spokesperson, Green)

**Other Members present:** Councillors Barnett, Bennett, Janio, Kennedy, Kitcat, Lepper, Pidgeon, Randall and Rufus

### PART ONE

#### 11. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

##### 11a Declarations of Interests

11a.1 Councillor Davey declared a personal, but non-prejudicial interest in Item 26, a report of the Director of Environment seeking permission to consult on the Old Shoreham Road Cycle Route Scheme, as he worked for a cycle training organisation and was a member of the Brighton & Hove District Cycling Group (Bricycles).

##### 11b Exclusion of Press and Public

11b.1 In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ('the Act'), the Cabinet Member for Environment] considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during an item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press or public were present during that item, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A(3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100I(1) of the Act).

11b.2 **RESOLVED** – That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

#### 12. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

12.1 **RESOLVED** – The minutes of the meeting held on 4 June 2009 were approved and signed by the Cabinet Member as a correct record.

**13. CABINET MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS**

- 13.1 The Cabinet Member reported that the City Council had been shortlisted as a national finalist at the Royal Town Planning Institute Awards. The council was the only local authority with two shortlisted entries to have reached the final stage; these were (1) the One Brighton project and our work on the New England Quarter; and (2) the Urban Characterisation Study.
- 13.2 The Cabinet Member stated that the results would be announced at the beginning of next year and that there would be a significant amount of interest in the projects over the coming months.

**14. ITEMS RESERVED FOR DISCUSSION**

- 14.1 **RESOLVED** – That with the exception of the items reserved (and marked with an asterisk), the recommendations and resolutions contained therein be approved and adopted without debate.

**15. PETITIONS****15(i) Petition – double yellow lines in Mayfield Crescent**

- 15.1 Councillor Pidgeon presented a petition signed by 21 people objecting to double yellow lines in Mayfield Crescent.
- 15.2 The Cabinet Member reported that due to the amount of signatures received in the petition, the double yellow line proposal would not proceed.
- 15.3 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

**15(ii) Petition – review of seafront rents and license fees**

- 15.4 Councillor Kitcat presented a petition signed by 37 people calling for a review of how seafront rents and license fees are agreed. Mr Adam Chinery, Chair of the Seafront Business Association also spoke in support of the petition.
- 15.5 That Cabinet Member stated that the council had to follow a prescribed approach approved by, among others, the District Auditor; if an agreement could not be reached between the traders and the council both sides would have to go to arbitration and comply with the independent outcome. The Cabinet Member advised that the traders the traders group together and share the cost of arbitration.
- 15.6 The Director of Environment offered to provide Councillor Kitcat with details of the professional practice followed by the council.
- 15.7 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

**15(iii) Petition – 20mph speed limit in Hangleton & Knoll**

- 15.8 Councillor Barnett presented a petition signed by 114 people calling for a 20mph speed limit in parts of Hangleton & Knoll.

15.9 The Cabinet Member stated that the Road Safety Team would review the situation in the area, including the collision data, but that more time would be required to conduct the necessary research and obtain background information, in order to provide a detailed response. He explained that the authority currently based decisions on 20mph limits on an individual basis, taking collision data, traffic flow, etc. into consideration to ensure appropriateness and cost benefit. However, it had introduced a number of 20mph zones, particularly near schools, in busy shopping streets or in conjunction with other transport schemes such as New Road and the North Street Mixed Priority Route. He added that the Road Safety Team constantly monitored complaints and collision data, and worked closely with schools to ensure that where necessary the appropriateness of the existing speed limit is considered and action was taken when necessary.

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

**15(iv) Petition – 20mph speed limit and crossing on New Church Road**

15.11 Councillor Kemble had submitted a petition signed by 196 people calling for a 20mph speed limit and a safe crossing on New Church Road in the vicinity of The Fold School and Deepdene School.

15.12 Councillor Kemble was unable to attend the meeting.

15.13 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted and report on the issue be brought to a future Environment Cabinet Member Meeting.

**15(v) Petition – future use of Queen’s Park bowling green**

15.14 Councillor Duncan had submitted a petition signed by 93 people calling for the council to consult on the future use of the bowling green in Queen’s Park.

15.15 Councillor Duncan was unable to attend the meeting.

15.16 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted and a written response be provided.

**15(vi) Petition – removal of trees in Queen Caroline Close**

15.17 Councillor Brown had submitted a petition signed by 38 people asking the council to remove the newly planted trees on the green by Queen Caroline Close and also to remove a sign restricting use of the open space to those aged eight years and under.

15.18 Councillor Brown was unable to attend the meeting.

15.19 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted and a written response be provided.

**15(vii) Petition – selling of cars on pavements in Elm Grove**

15.20 Councillor Randall presented a petition signed by 55 people calling for the council to take action to prevent individuals for using pavements to sell cars.

15.21 The Cabinet Member explained action could only be taken if there was sufficient evidence that the sales were part of a business and the evidence gathered so far in Elm Grove had highlighted that a number of the cars had not been put up for sale by traders but by private individuals against whom action could not be taken. The Cabinet Member added that he had, however, asked the Trading Standards Team to work with the local Ward Councillors and those signing the petition to assess the evidence available and the appropriate action that could be taken.

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

#### **15(viii) Petition – street trees in Woodland Avenue**

15.23 Councillor Bennett presented a petition signed by 37 people requesting that street trees be planted in the upper section of Woodland Avenue.

15.24 The Cabinet Member explained that he would ask the Arboriculture Manager to look into the feasibility of planting trees in the upper section of Woodland Avenue respond to Councillor Bennett directly.

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

#### **15(ix) Petition – residents parking scheme at the Fiveways end of Stanford Avenue**

15.26 Councillor McCaffery presented a petition signed by 136 people objecting to a residents parking scheme at the Fiveways end of Stanford Avenue.

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

#### **15(x) Petition – residents parking scheme in the Waldegrave Road area**

15.28 Councillor McCaffery presented a petition signed by 81 people concerning the introduction of a residents parking scheme in the Waldegrave Road area.

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

#### **15(xi) Petition – road safety issues in Davey Drive**

15.30 Councillor Lepper presented a petition signed by 226 people concerning road safety issues in Davey Drive, especially at the junction with The Crossway opposite St Joseph's RC Primary School.

15.31 The Cabinet Member stated that he would ask officers to revisit the possibility of providing a pedestrian crossing in Davey Drive.

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

### **16. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

16.1 The Cabinet Member noted that two public questions had been received.

16.2 Mr Pennington asked the following question:

“Given the importance of the Madeira Drive Lift to enabled children, carers with buggies and the disabled to access the beach etc; and given that the alternative routes are over two kilometres long (ignoring the 23 stepped routes which are inappropriate for many):

Since the season started in 2009, on how many days has the Madeira Drive Lift been working with access to the public and on how many days has it been closed for repairs etc. (including the current closure which started on or about July 15th 2009)?”

16.3 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:

“Thank you, Mr Pennington, for your question and I would agree that the Madeira Lift is very important to enable access to and from Madeira Drive.

To answer your question, the Madeira Lift opened for the summer season 2009 on Friday, 10 April. In that time up to and including 19 July there have been 101 operating days, out of these 24 days have been lost due to various lift breakdowns where spare parts were required and specialist repairs to the control panel had to be carried out.

Therefore, the lift has been open to the public for a total of 77 days.”

16.4 Mr Pennington asked the following supplementary question:

“Is the Madeira Lift open for use now?”

16.5 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:

“To my knowledge, yes.”

16.6 Mr Hawtree asked the following question:

“Would Councillor Theobald please give us his view of the public seating in George Street, Hove?”

16.7 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:

“Thank you for your question, Mr. Hawtree, regarding the public seating in George Street.

The city’s public realm is something I am passionate about. Having good levels of public seating is key to enabling people to spend time in the city and I am aware that, at present, there is not as much public seating across the city as I would like. The need to redress this deficit is something that the council is aware of. Unfortunately, as I am sure you will appreciate, we cannot change everything overnight, and the city’s limited budget needs careful prioritisation.

George Street is a vibrant, successful place with some public seating provision. Whilst the area would benefit from more public seating, there is currently no budget specifically

set aside for additional seating in the city. In the short term my priority has to focus on ensuring new public seating is included in new schemes, in areas with less current provision than George Street, whenever opportunities arise. However, I will make sure that George Street is not forgotten and I will ensure that additional seating is considered as soon as an opportunity arises.”

16.8 Mr Hawtree asked the following supplementary question:

“Can we expect that improved seating will be provided in George Street before the next general election?”

16.9 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:

“I believe I have covered the issues in my previous response.”

## **17. DEPUTATIONS**

17.1 The Cabinet Member reported that two deputations had been received.

### **17(a) Deputation – road safety issues at the junction of Dyke Road Drive, Stanford Road and Highcroft Villas**

17.2 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation presented by Mr Keith Turvey concerning road safety issues at the junction of Dyke Road Drive, Stanford Road and Highcroft Villas (for copy see minute book). Mr Turvey highlighted the problems in the area and made a number of suggestions to improve road safety, and in particular requested that signage be installed to warn drivers of children in the vicinity.

17.3 The Cabinet Member thanked Mr Turvey for the deputation and stated that the council received many similar requests in relation to areas throughout the city. He agreed to ask officers to meet with Mr Turvey on site to see if any measures could be put in place to help combat the issues.

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

### **17(b) Deputation – road safety issues in Chalky Road Portslade**

17.5 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation from by Ms Stacey Howard concerning road safety issues in Chalky Road, Portslade (for copy see minute book).

17.6 As the deputation had recently been received at a meeting of the Full Council, the Cabinet Member referred those present to the response he gave at that meeting.

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

## **18. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS**

### **18(a) Letter – downland mowing policy**

18.1 A letter was received from Councillor Morgan, on behalf of the Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee, calling for review of the downland mowing policy on a site by site basis (for copy see minute book).

- 18.2 Councillor Rufus, member of the Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee, and specialist ecologist spoke on behalf of the committee.
- 18.3 The Cabinet Member explained he had met with some of the members of 'Friends of groups and appreciated the support they gave the council in managing the green spaces for wildlife; he would be meeting with them again in coming months.
- 18.4 The Cabinet Member offered Councillors Rufus and Morgan a meeting with the Assistant Director for City Services to discuss the issue further.
- 18.5 **RESOLVED** – That the letter be noted.

**18(b) Letter – 20mph speed limit in West Hill and beyond**

- 18.6 A letter was received from Councillor West calling for traffic calming and a 20 mph speed limit to be introduced into St Nicholas Road to combat road safety issues around St Paul's CE Primary School (for copy see minute book).
- 18.7 Councillor Davey spoke in support of the letter on behalf of Councillor West, who was unable to attend the meeting. Councillor Davey submitted a supporting petition signed by 43 people.
- 18.8 The Cabinet Member stated that he would ask the Road Safety Team to investigate any measures that could be taken in the area.
- 18.9 **RESOLVED** – That the letter be noted.

**19. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

- 19.1 The Cabinet Member reported that two written questions from councillors had been received.
- 19.2 Councillor Kennedy asked the following question:

“At the meeting of Full Council on the 16<sup>th</sup> July, Cllr Theobald said he would ask officers to look into the possibility of installing a new access ramp into Preston Park at the northern end of Preston Park Avenue. Please can the Cabinet member update me on this request?”

- 19.3 The Cabinet Member had circulated the following response:

“We have looked at our budget and we will not be able to carry out the works in this financial year. We will look again at projects and budgets for next year and keep you informed.”

- 19.4 Councillor Kennedy asked the following supplementary question:

“Given the council's commitment to equal opportunities for all, can I please ask officers to give this priority in next year's budget?”

19.5 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:

“Yes, we will be sure to look again at this when planning for next year.”

19.6 Councillor Davey asked the following question:

“Given the importance of the Valley Gardens area to the health and vitality of the city could the cabinet member please tell me what he is doing to bring forward the Valley Gardens project. Specifically how is he spending the £100,000 allocated for this year in the LTP and how does he plan to spend the £2.3m allocated for next year?”

19.7 The Cabinet Member had circulated the following response:

“Thank you for your question. You may recall my response to Councillor Steedman’s question about this area at the Council meeting on 19 March. I too share your interest in this fantastic part of the city, and fully support efforts to improve this area of the city for residents and visitors. However, my previous explanations about plans that were identified for improving it back in 2006 do not seem to have addressed your concerns. I will therefore partly repeat what I have said before.

This administration are aware of the issues here, and the principles that were put forward in 2005 in the second Local Transport Plan for Valley Gardens as part of the development of future programmes of investment for the whole of the city. The investment plans set out then were indicative and we are now 4 years on. Decisions about funding proposals that were included in that document need to take into account the levels of funding that are available both now and in the future.

In terms of 2009/10 budgets and allocations, I agreed the Local Transport Plan capital investment programme in March this year and it included £1 million worth of work on urban realm schemes. The majority of this funding is to be invested in the completion of the North Street Mixed Priority Route, which as you know runs along the southern boundary of your ward.

It is intended that the remainder of the budget will be invested in design work for a number of projects that have a good chance of being completed. One opportunity available to us is to combine a number of funding sources to help improve the environment of Richmond Parade, and also to enhance pedestrian safety in the vicinity of Gloucester Street. At this stage this work is at a very early stage, but hopefully you will welcome this news, given that the approach could enable some improvements in the Valley Gardens area.

Looking ahead, you will be aware that in February this year, a report to budget council indicated the possibility of a significant reduction in Local Transport Plan funding in 2010/11 in order to help the council meet wider commitments. I am due to consider the allocation of Local Transport Plan budget for 2010/11 in March next year, after Budget Council has set the headline figures in February. Until then, I am unable to give a definitive answer as to the levels of funding that will be awarded to specific Local Transport Plan projects in that year .



I will finish by emphasising that any transport improvements in the wider area would require the creation of an acceptable and workable balance of all the demands for movement and access that there would be. This would need to be rigorously tested using a transport model to ensure that it would work."

19.8 Councillor Davey asked the following supplementary question:

"Given that Valley Gardens is a designated Conservation Area, what are doing to address concerns?"

19.9 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:

"The planned traffic model for the city will help and we are encouraging others to improve the area, in particular the state of properties in the vicinity."

## **20. NOTICES OF MOTION**

20.1 There were none.

## **21. SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK - LAND AT GREEN RIDGE**

21.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the boundaries of the intended South Downs National Park, and in particular the omission of Green Ridge (for copy see minute book).

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

- (1) That Government's recent decision that there should be a South Downs National Park be welcomed.
- (2) That the addition of land at Roedean Crescent and Patcham Recreation ground be supported.
- (3) That a formal objection be made on behalf of the council to the Addition 6 embankments on the basis that land at Green Ridge and the adjacent Mill Road/A27 embankments should all be included in addition 6 if discussions with DEFRA fail to result in acceptance of the inclusion of Green Ridge within the National Park Designation.

## **22. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CORE STRATEGY - BACKGROUND STUDIES\***

22.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment seeking approval of five background studies as supporting evidence for the Core Strategy, part of the Local Development Framework and other Development Plan Documents and council strategies (for copy see minute book).

22.2 The Assistant Director, City Planner explained that it was important to build up the evidence base and publish it for people to access; it was a vital step in ensuring that the Core Strategy would be found to be robust and sound.

22.3 Councillor McCaffery welcomed the background studies and was particularly please to see the study on the Green Network.

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

- (1) That the final reports of the five background studies be approved as supporting evidence for the Core Strategy and other appropriate Development Plan Documents and council strategies.

**23. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION PAPER ON A NEW PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT 4: PLANNING FOR PROSPEROUS ECONOMIES**

23.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the new draft Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Prosperous Economies and seeking agreement on the proposed response to the Department of Communities and Local Government (for copy see minute book).

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

- (1) That the content of draft PPS4 Planning for Prosperous Economies be noted and the proposed response on draft PPS4 to the Department of Communities and Local Government, as set out in Appendix B of this report, be agreed.

**24. PARTIAL REVIEW OF THE REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR THE SOUTH EAST: PROVISION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE\***

24.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the South East England Partnership Board's 'preferred option' for the provision of new pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the South East in the period 2006 – 2016 and the council's response to the recommendations (for copy see minute book).

24.2 The Cabinet Member explained that the submitted proposals were largely supported and, with the exception of the allocation of Travelling Showpeople spaces, were in accordance with the council's earlier advice to SEERA regarding the local need for Gypsy and Traveller site provision. He added that there was no evidence that provision for Travelling Showpeople was required in the city.

24.3 Councillor McCaffery welcomed the proposals and the council's commitment to securing a permanent site for Travellers; she queried when the results of the contamination survey of the proposed site would be available.

24.4 The Assistant Director for Public Safety explained that the survey was ongoing, but that an interim report was expected shortly.

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

- (1) That the proposed response be agreed, as set out in this report, stating the following:
  - (a) The council generally supports the overall levels of provision proposed in the submission document for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (1,064 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and 302 spaces for Travelling Showpeople for the South East region in the period to 2016).
  - (b) The council supports the proposed allocation of 13 residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers in Brighton & Hove.
  - (c) The council supports the delegated approach to the determination of further transit provision made in the region.
  - (d) The council is unable to support the allocation of 2 Travelling Showpeople spaces to Brighton & Hove.
- (2) That the report be forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

## **25. RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME – FORMAL TRAFFIC ORDER REPORT\***

- 25.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment addressing 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 (for copy see minute book).
- 25.2 Councillor Bennett thanked officers for revisiting proposals for the Martlet area, however residents in Kestral Close and Fulmar Close remained unhappy with the proposals.
- 25.3 The Parking Strategy Manager stated that the recommendations allowed officers could look again at these areas, but that, at this stage, residents would need to petition to be excluded from a residents parking scheme. The council had previously made a commitment not to use single yellow line restrictions, and so residents needed to fully understand the implications of being excluded from any residents parking scheme; most notably that they could become an overspill area.
- 25.4 In response to a query from Councillor McCaffery the Parking Strategy Manager confirmed that the petition about Preston Park Avenue that was submitted after the consultation ended had been included in the full report considered by the Cabinet Member on 19 February 2009.
- 25.5 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
  - (1) That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the following orders be approved as advertised;
    - (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) 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.

## **26. OLD SHOREHAM ROAD CYCLE ROUTE\***

- 26.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment seeking permission to consult on the Old Shoreham Road Cycle Route Scheme (for copy see minute book).
- 26.2 Councillor Davey welcomed the scheme in general, but had hoped to see a cycle freeway or wider lane proposed to reduce safety concerns. He was also concerned about the number of gaps in the route.
- 26.3 In response to Councillor Davey's comments the Head of Transport Planning explained that the route was intended for all skill levels, but was a conceptual design and it was important to await the results of the consultation. He confirmed that the speed limit on Old Shoreham Road was 30mph in some places and 40mph in others.
- 26.4 The Director of Environment explained schools would be included in the consultation process and Cycle England would look rigorously at safety issues; the council had to prove that the scheme would attract more cyclists. She added that officers would be guided by Members on what meetings they would like to be involved in during the process.
- 26.5 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That approval be given to conduct public consultation with key stakeholders and residents along the Old Shoreham Road route as detailed in this report. Members would be informed of the outcome of the consultation and findings will be brought back at a future Environment Cabinet Member Meeting.

## **27. WOODINGDEAN CROSSROADS - PROPOSED PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

- 27.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment seeking permission to consult on proposals for the junction of the B2123 (Falmer Road)/Warren Road/Warren Way, locally known as Woodingdean Crossroads (for copy see minute book).

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

- (1) That the initial principles of the proposals to improve Woodingdean Crossroads, as set out in Appendix A, be approved.
- (2) That the Director of Environment be authorised to undertake consultation with the local community and wider interest groups within the city on the proposals and to report the outcome of the consultation to a future Environment Cabinet Member Meeting in 2009.

## 28. **DOUBLE PARKING AND DROPPED FOOTWAY ENFORCEMENT\***

28.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment seeking approval to commence enforcement of the contraventions of 'double parking' and being 'parked adjacent to a dropped footway' under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004 (for copy see minute book).

28.2 Councillor Kennedy welcomed the enforcement of the contraventions and added that it would be of most benefit to those who lived on the outskirts of residents parking schemes.

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

- (1) That the commencement of enforcement of the contraventions of 'double parking' and being 'parked adjacent to a dropped footway' under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004 be approved.
- (2) That the contravention of being 'parked in an electric vehicles' charging place during restricted hours without charging' be enforced at a later date, should it be required, under the provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004.

## 29. **CONSULTATION PLAN FOR THE LEVEL REDEVELOPMENT\***

29.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment seeking permission to carry out public consultation on proposals to improve The Level in order that a master plan could be drawn up (for copy see minute book).

29.2 Opposition councillors welcomed the report and looked forward to working with officers to take the proposals forward.

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

- (1) That the consultation plan for The Level, set out in Section 4 of this report, be endorsed.
- (2) That preparation of a funding bid to the Parks for People Heritage Lottery Fund be endorsed.

The meeting concluded at 5.25pm

Signed

Cabinet Member

Dated this

day of