

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

4.00PM 25 MARCH 2010

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor G Theobald (Cabinet Member)

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

Other Members present: Councillors Bennett, Brown, Cobb, Davis, Fallon-Khan, Kennedy, Oxley, Randall and Taylor

PART ONE

94. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

94a Declarations of Interests

94a.1 Councillor Mitchell declared a personal, but non-prejudicial interest in Item 112, a report of the Director of Environment concerning a review of Stanmer Conservation Area, as she chaired the Estates Conservation Trust.

94a.2 Councillor Davey declared a personal, but non-prejudicial interest in Item 106, a report of the Director of Environment concerning the Old Shoreham Road Cycle Route scheme, as he worked for a cycling charity.

94b Exclusion of Press and Public

94b.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).

94b.2 **RESOLVED** – That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

95. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

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

96. CABINET MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS

96.1 There were none.

97. ITEMS RESERVED FOR DISCUSSION

97.1 **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.

98. PETITIONS**98(i) Petition – proposed parking restrictions, Court Farm Road**

98.1 Councillor Bennett presented a petition signed by 65 people requesting that the Council alter proposals for double yellow lines in Court Farm Road to single yellow lines.

98.2 The Cabinet advised that he would consider the petition when discussing Item 109 later on the agenda.

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

98(ii) Petition – on-street parking contract

98.4 Councillor Elgood had submitted an e-petition signed by 40 people requesting that the council to bring the on-street parking contract back in-house when the contract came up for renewal in two year's time.

98.5 Councillor Elgood was unable to attend the meeting and had requested that consideration of the e-petition be deferred until the next meeting.

98.6 **RESOLVED** – That the e-petition be deferred.

98(iii) Petition – on-street parking contract

98.7 Mr Jorg Thieme had submitted an e-petition signed by 118 people calling for the introduction of a congestion charge in the city centre to improve public transport.

98.8 Mr Thieme was unable to attend the meeting.

98.9 The Cabinet Member confirmed that the Administration had no intention introducing a congestion charge in Brighton and Hove.

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

98(iv) Petition – Worcester Villas parking

98.11 Ms Julia Jeyes presented an e-petition signed by 37 people asking the council to bring forward and commit to a specific date for the residents of Worcester Villas to be consulted on a parking scheme for residents and visitors.

98.12 The Cabinet Member advised that he agreed for the consultation to take place as agreed at the Environment Committee in 2008 and that it would take place against the background of a city-wide review of parking schemes to determine how schemes could be best managed in the future to limit the displacement into neighbouring areas. It was not possible to commit to a specific date at this time.

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

98(v) Petition – provision of salt/grit bins

98.14 Mr Roy Pennington had submitted an e-petition signed by 9 people asking the council to provide more salt/grit bins throughout the city in time for the next severe weather spell.

98.15 Mr Pennington had requested that consideration of the e-petition to be deferred until the next meeting.

98.16 **RESOLVED** – That the e-petition be deferred.

98(vi) Petition – pedestrian and road safety at the junctions of Old Shoreham Road and The Drive and The Upper Drive

98.17 Ms Paula Slinn had submitted an e-petition signed by 131 people calling for the council to implement measures to reduce speed and ensure a safer crossing at the junctions of Old Shoreham Road and The Drive and The Upper Drive.

98.18 Councillor Davis presented the petition on behalf of Ms Slinn who was unable to attend the meeting.

98.19 Councillor Davis also submitted a paper petition signed by 299 people bringing the total number of signatories to 430.

98.20 Councillor Fallon-Khan also spoke in support of the petition.

98.21 The Cabinet Member advised that meeting of the Full Council to consider the council's budget, an amendment was made to allocate £50,000 for an improved pedestrian crossing at the junction of the Old Shoreham Road and The Upper Drive. He reported that work had begun and that he expected major progress to have been made by the end of the year.

98.22 **RESOLVED** – That the e-petition be noted.

98(vii) Petition – cutting down of plane trees in Clyde Road

- 98.23 Mr Alan Pipes had submitted an e-petition signed by 138 people opposing the cutting down of plane in Clyde Road.
- 98.24 Councillor Taylor presented the petition and thanked the council's Arboriculture Team for planning an event to inform residents about their work.
- 98.25 The Cabinet Member was pleased to confirm that the council had listened to residents and that the trees would undergo major pruning instead of being cut down.
- 98.26 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

99. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- 99.1 The Cabinet Member reported that one public question had been received.
- 99.2 Mr Ring asked the following question:
- “Why are Yellow Lines being considered for Brownleaf Road/Abinger Road to counter a parking problem that does not exist, which can be confirmed as correct by photo evidence as already provided?”

- 99.3 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:
- “Officers have taken into account two objections to this proposal, which are included in Appendix A of the Waiting Restrictions report, as well as one letter of support. It is proposed that this is deferred and, if appropriate, re-advertised in the next available traffic order. This will allow further time to discuss the best way forward with the ward councillors and take into account the support and opposition to this proposal.”

Note: This public question was taken at the beginning of consideration of Item 109.

100. DEPUTATIONS

- 100.1 The Cabinet Member reported that four deputations had been submitted.
- 100(a) Deputation – Old Shoreham Road/Neville Road/Sackville Road Crossroads**
- 100.2 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation from Mr John Towers concerning road safety issues at the Old Shoreham Road/Neville Road/Sackville Road crossroads.
- 100.3 As the deputation had been considered at a meeting of the Full Council the Cabinet Member advised that he could now provide an update; he reported that work had begun on design proposals that would improve safety for pedestrians.
- 100.4 In response to a question from Councillor Bennett, the Cabinet Member explained that the Council could not fund the safety improvements itself because it had not been agreed as part of the council's budget. The council would be encouraging the developer to begin work as soon as possible.

100.5 The Assistant Director City Planner advised that the phasing of the Section 106 agreement would ensure that the agreed elements were implemented.

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

100(b) Deputation – dangers of crossing the Old Shoreham Road at the junctions of The Upper Drive and The Drive

100.7 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation from Ms Paula Slinn concerning the dangers of crossing the Old Shoreham Road at the junctions of The Upper Drive and The Drive.

100.8 The deputation had already been considered at a meeting of the Full Council and the Cabinet Member advised that he had provided an update during consideration of the e-petition relating to the same matter.

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

100(c) Deputation – former Royal Alexandra Hospital site Planning Brief

100.10 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation from Mr Mike Hales concerning the Planning Brief for the former Royal Alexandra Hospital site.

100.11 The Cabinet Member advised that he would take the deputation during consideration of Item 113 later on the agenda, to which it was directly related.

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

100(d) Deputation – proposed loading bay in Portland Road, Hove

100.13 The Cabinet Member considered a deputation from Mr Stephen Eyton concerning proposals for loading bay to be created in Portland Road, Hove.

100.14 The Cabinet Member advised that he would take the deputation during consideration of Item 109 later on the agenda, to which it was directly related.

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

101. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS

101(a) Letter - request for priority re-inclusion into CPZ consultation programme

101.1 A letter was received from Councillor Kennedy requesting that a number of streets in Preston Park Ward be re-included into the council's ongoing Controlled Parking Zone consultation programme as a matter of priority.

101.2 The Cabinet Member advised that it would be very difficult to consult residents in these streets again as the council had to consult residents in other areas who had been waiting for a long time for a first consultation. He added that the council only consulted

on introduced parking schemes based on requests from residents and ward councillors.

101.3 The Director of Environment explained that the council was nearing the end of work on large-scale parking schemes and that officers would next consider which areas to revisit.

101.4 **RESOLVED** – That the letter be noted.

102. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

102.1 The Cabinet Member reported that one written question had been received from a councillor.

102.2 Councillor Kennedy had submitted the following question:

"The introduction of a residents parking scheme in Preston Park Avenue has led to increased numbers of commuters parking all day in Preston Park itself. Residents who wish to use the park for leisure are reporting that it is difficult to find a parking space for just a few hours while they enjoy the park.

"I understand that as park land is not part of the 'public highway', yellow lines and prohibitive signage are not enforceable by law; they are simply there to give a clear message to the public to exercise consideration for other park users.

"However such consideration is not being shown by commuters towards genuine park users. Therefore, please can the Cabinet Member for the Environment advise me what the council's plans are to deal with all-day commuter parking in Preston Park, in order to free up parking spaces for those who genuinely wish to use the park's facilities?"

102.3 The following response had been circulated by the Cabinet Member:

"Thank you for your question.

We are reviewing the parking situation in Preston Park, but it is not easy to devise a scheme which does not affect people from using the park for leisure purposes. I really do not want to restrict people from accessing the park who wish to enjoy it.

To try and help I will ask officers to place leaflets on cars informing them that they cannot use the park for commuter parking. I would like to test this out before considering controls on parking in the park."

102.4 Councillor Kennedy asked the following supplementary question:

"When will the leaflets begin to be used and will it continue on a rolling basis?"

102.5 The Cabinet Member gave the following response:

“I would expect it to begin as soon as possible and will provide you with further details of the proposals in writing.”

103. NOTICES OF MOTION

103.1 There were none.

104. HEALTH & SAFETY - ANNUAL SERVICE PLAN 2010/11

104.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the Health & Safety Annual Service Plan.

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

(1) That the Health & Safety Annual Service Plan 2010/2011 be endorsed and recommended to Council for approval.

105. OFFICIAL FEED AND FOOD CONTROLS SERVICE PLAN 2010/11

105.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the Official Feed and Food Controls Service Plan.

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

(1) That the Official Feed and Food Controls Service Plan 2010/2011 be endorsed and recommended to Council for approval.

106. OLD SHOREHAM ROAD CYCLE ROUTE*

106.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the Old Shoreham Road Cycle Route Scheme.

106.2 The Cabinet Member explained that strong views had been expressed both in support and in opposition to the proposed scheme; the council's main concern was road safety and the potential problems were such that it would be best not to proceed with the scheme. He advised that cycling organisations did not support the proposed scheme, particularly as it did not offer a continuous route. The work that had already been completed on the scheme would not be wasted as it would contribute to work planned for some of the difficult junctions on Old Shoreham Road. He added that the council remained committed to providing cycle lanes and he hoped that the new traffic model would be able to look at cycling citywide.

106.3 Councillor Mitchell advised that the report did not provide any evidence to support not proceeding with the proposed scheme and she felt the decision had not been made in response to the consultation results. She stated that the council had accepted two tranches of Cycle Demonstration Town (CDT) funding, brought forward the scheme

and carried out a consultation; she had concerns about the £93,000 already spent and would be interested in the outcome of any investigations the council undertook in relation to this.

She stated that 66% of respondents supported the scheme and this included 62% of drivers; while there was a preference for a continuous route, the majority were in favour of the whole scheme. She questioned why responses from schools and major employers were not included in the report, particularly as all responding schools had supported the scheme.

She stated that professional bodies had given advice on safety, in addition to the council's own engineers, and that technical evidence of any safety concerns should be published.

106.4 Councillor Davey advised that safety concerns had already been present in Old Shoreham Road and that the scheme would have provided the council with the opportunity to address them. He stated that the scheme had been presented as the core CDT project for the city and that no evidence had been published to support not proceeding, in particular the safety audits had not been made available.

106.5 The Cabinet Member advised that Councillor Davey had previously spoken against the proposed scheme and that he had spoken with many cyclists who had deemed the scheme to be too dangerous.

106.6 Councillor Brown, ward councillor for Stanford Ward through which part of the proposed scheme would run, reiterated the importance of safety concerns. She advised that the road was too narrow and central reservations would have to be removed, making the road less safe for pedestrians and cars. She stated that parents of school children would find the route to be too dangerous for young cyclists.

106.7 Councillor Theobald advised that he had listened to the comments both in support and in opposition to the proposed scheme and reiterated that the safety concerns were too significant to proceed with the scheme. He added that he would provide opposition Members with further information in relation to the remaining funding.

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

(1) That the Old Shoreham Road Cycle Route scheme not proceed.

107. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2010/2011*

107.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning allocation of the 2010/11 Local Transport Plan (LTP) Capital Programme funding to specific works areas and individual schemes within them.

107.2 Councillor Mitchell advised that she welcomed the additional road safety grant from central government and noted that it would be split between the council and Sussex Safer Roads Partnership. She stated that the proposals did not include any major

initiatives and that it was difficult to understand in what direction the council was heading in relation to transport planning.

107.3 Councillor Davey raised concerns about the lack of money allocated for cycling initiatives, but was pleased to see urban realm improvements in New Road/Church Street included.

107.4 In response to questions from the opposition spokespeople the Assistant Director for Sustainable Transport made the following comments:

- The majority of the road safety grant would be allocated to the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership; the council would receive £88,000.
- The council was in the final year of the current LTP and a number of major projects were scheduled for completion. While the capital programme would include some larger projects, such as Woodingdean Crossroads, urban realm improvements and a feasibility study on the Station Gateway, efforts were now going into the development of the next LTP.
- The final part of the New Road/Church Street urban realm improvements was due to be completed by the middle of June.
- £0.5 million of match funding was spread through the capital programme.

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

- (1) That the Cabinet Member approves the allocation of £3.019 million worth of funding for the 2010/11 Local Transport Plan capital programme to the Integrated Transport and Maintenance work programmes set out in Appendix 1 of this report.
- (2) That the Cabinet Member approves that the Road Safety Grant of £483,863 is allocated to the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership and other road safety measures in the city.

108. HANOVER & ELM GROVE RESIDENT PARKING REVIEW COMMUNITY CONSULTATION*

108.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the outcome of the community consultation regarding the review of residents parking in the currently unrestricted Hanover & Elm Grove area, and the associated reviews of the existing Area U (St Luke's) and Area C (Queen's Park) controlled parking schemes.

108.2 The Cabinet Member reported that the community consultation had been requested by members of the public and ward councillors at a number of previous meetings.

108.3 Councillor Randall, councillor for Hanover & Elm Grove ward, welcomed the report and, along with his fellow Ward Members, agreed that the Council should proceed to the next stage of the parking consultation. He also advised that achieving the best outcome would be difficult as the area was large with varied parking issues. He explained that residents in the Hanover area were largely in favour of a CPZ to tackle

problems there, while Elm Grove residents were strongly opposed to the introduction of a scheme. He advised that a mixture of schemes might be required and that consideration should be given to a light touch scheme in the Elm Grove area. He also highlighted the ongoing problem of people parking on pavements.

108.4 The Cabinet Member explained that he wanted to be certain that ward councillors were in favour of the next stage of consultation before proceeding as he had received a large number of emails from residents against introducing a CPZ.

108.5 Councillor Mitchell advised that the Craven Vale area in her ward would form part of the area for consultation and queried which sub-area it fell into to. She explained that the housing situation was very different in Craven Vale to the rest of the proposed area and that issues of affordability should be considered. She reported that there did not appear to be much opposition to a CPZ from residents; they were aware of the consultation, but had requested more detailed information on proposals. She added that residents welcomed the attendance of officers at public meetings.

108.6 The Parking Strategy Manager advised that Craven was in Area E. He explained that the consultation would involve a wide area; areas where residents were not in favour of a CPZ would not be included in the scheme, but displacement issues would be considered as part of the process.

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

(1) That the Hanover & Elm Grove Resident Parking Review be progressed to the informal consultation stage consisting of a questionnaire and outline parking scheme map sent to all residents and businesses in the affected areas not currently subject to a controlled parking zone.

(2) That a letter and questionnaire be sent to all residents and businesses in the existing Area U (St Luke's) and Area C (Queens Park) schemes asking for their views on the current operation of those schemes including the times and days of operation.

109. VARIOUS CHANGES TO CONTROLLED PARKING ZONES (CPZ) ORDER AND AREAS OUTSIDE OF CPZ*

109.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning a number of requests for alterations to parking restrictions both within and outside of the Controlled Parking Zones.

109.2 The Cabinet Member invited Mr Stephen Eyton to make his deputation in relation to proposals to defer the creation of a loading bay in Portland Road, Hove.

109.3 Mr Eyton explained that Sainsbury's had considered every possible option to find an appropriate solution for deliveries to the new Sainsbury's Local store in Portland Road. Sainsbury's had conducted parking surveys to test the suitability of existing arrangements in the area, but concluded from the results that there was no alternative to the creating of a new loading bay. Mr Eyton advised that Sainsbury's understood

residents' concerns in relation to the loss of parking and enforcement issues. He stated that although up to four parking spaces would be lost, they could be accommodated within a 200 metre walk, and that Sainsbury's would be committed to working with the council to ensure that potential abuse of the loading bay did not occur.

- 109.4 Councillor Oxley, councillor for Westbourne ward, explained that the new Sainsbury's Local store was an issue that had concerned local residents and businesses for some time. Ward councillors had not been made aware of the parking surveys conducted and remained concerned about ongoing issues of congestion, loss of parking and road safety. The previous occupier of the store had used the loading bay in Shelley Road, but the new store had placed its access door on Portland Road, which already suffered from congestion and issues of double parking could materialise if a new loading bay was created. Councillor Oxley stated that Sainsbury's were expecting the council to manage the problems that were essentially caused by the creation of the new store.
- 109.5 The Cabinet Member noted the deputation and advised that three objections to the proposed loading bay in Portland Road had been received. He proposed that the decision be deferred and, if appropriate, re-advertised in the next available traffic amendment order in order that time could be made to discuss the best way forward with the ward councillors.
- 109.6 Councillor Bennett, councillor for Hove Park ward, spoke in support of residents requests to remove proposed double yellow lines in Woodland Avenue from the traffic order and also requested that the restrictions proposed for Woodruff Avenue be removed as residents did not support them. She further requested that double yellow lines proposed for the triangular area in Court Farm Road / Nevill Road be changed to a single yellow line, which could be monitored before consideration was given to introducing double yellow lines. She implored the Cabinet Member to take the views of residents into account.
- 109.7 The Parking Strategy Manager stated that all amendments were considered and proposed in response to requests from residents and businesses. He advised that there were safety concerns over allowing parking in the triangular area in Court Farm Road / Nevill Road during the night and that it was therefore not appropriate to use single yellow lines in this area.
- 109.8 The Cabinet Member reiterated that changes were proposed following requests received by the council. He explained that it was necessary to listen to the professional advice of officers and that he would be accepting the advice given on safety grounds. He advised that he would be agreeing two additional amendments to the traffic order in response to the comments made. (see paragraph 109.9(1)(f) and (g))
- 109.9 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That, having taken into account all of the duly made representations and objections, the Various Controlled Parking Zones Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No.* 200* and Brighton & Hove (Waiting & Loading/Unloading

Restrictions and Parking Places) Consolidation Order 2008 amendment Order No.* 200* be approved with the following amendments:

- (a) The proposed removal of disabled parking bays in Godwin Road and Hollingdean Terrace, are to be removed from the Traffic Order as these bays are still required by local residents.
- (b) The proposed double yellow lines in Woodland Avenue are to be removed from the Traffic Order due to the reasons outlined in the report.
- (c) The proposed double yellow lines in Court Farm Road are to be changed to single yellow lines from the shops northwards to the double yellow lines at the traffic lights due to reasons outlined in the report
- (d) The proposed removal of limited waiting bays in Old London Road (Patcham) are to be removed from the traffic order due to the reasons outlined in the report.
- (e) The proposed loading bay in Portland Road (Controlled Parking Zone R) is to be deferred in accordance with Paragraph 3.11.
- (f) The double yellow line proposal on the Brownleaf Road/Abinger Road junction is to be deferred.**
- (g) The proposed double yellow lines in Woodruff Avenue are to be removed from the Traffic Order.**

110. NATURE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT*

- 110.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the results of consultation undertaken on the draft Nature Conservation and Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and seeking approval of the changes made adoption of the SPD.
- 110.2 The Cabinet Member advised that the SPD represented a further demonstration of the city's commitment to nature conservation. The aim of the document was to provide clear guidance on securing nature conservation improvements as part of new developments. Following supportive comments received from key stakeholders, minor changes had been made to Annex 3 (the Biodiversity Checklist) and Annex 6 (Calculating Developer Contributions) to make them simpler and quicker to use, but the text of the SPD itself remained largely unchanged.
- 110.3 Councillor Kennedy praised the council's Ecologist for producing the SPD, which represented an innovative approach to nature conservation. She stated that it would provide Members and officers with clear guidance on biodiversity issues and she hoped other local authorities would learn from Brighton & Hove.
- 110.4 Councillor Mitchell echoed Councillor Kennedy's comments and added that the SPD would compliment the council's biodiversity plans.

- 110.5 The Assistant Director City Planner reported that Brighton & Hove was the first local authority to introduce such an SPD. He advised that it may be seen as negative by some developers, but that it was the council's responsibility to work with developers and make it easy to use. He added that the section relating to developer contributions would be suspended in order that the Section 106 burden was not increased at the current time.
- 110.6 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That the results of the public consultation exercise be noted and the changes made to the Nature Conservation and Development SPD be endorsed.
 - (2) That the Nature Conservation and Development SPD be adopted as part of the Local Development Framework, subject to any minor grammatical and non-material text and illustrative alterations agreed by the Director of Environment in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment.
 - (3) That the Nature Conservation and Development SPD take effect on 1 April 2010.
- 111. 19 BRUNSWICK PLACE - URGENT WORKS IN DEFAULT***
- 111.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment seeking approval to carry out urgent works to secure the preservation of 19 Brunswick Place, which is included in the council's register of Buildings at Risk, and to recover the cost of carrying out the works from the owner of the building.
- 111.2 The Cabinet Member explained that the condition of the building was not only considered to be an eyesore but that its long-term preservation was severely threatened. The owners had so far failed to give a commitment to carrying out the necessary works, estimated at a cost £32,000-£39,000, including VAT and fees. The council would seek to recover the costs from the owners through the courts. He added that he hoped the action would send out a strong message to owners of historic buildings about their maintenance responsibilities.
- 111.3 Councillor Mitchell supported the proposed action and stated that she hoped the work required could be completed within the estimated budget.
- 111.4 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
- (1) That the Cabinet Member agrees for urgent preservation works to be carried out on number 19 Brunswick Place, Hove under Section 54 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
 - (2) That action be taken to recover the costs of carrying out urgent preservation works from the owner of number 19 Brunswick Place, Hove under Section 55 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

112. STANMER CONSERVATION AREA REVIEW*

- 112.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning a review of the Stanmer Conservation Area and seeking approval for the resulting Character Statement.
- 112.2 That Cabinet Member explained that the conservation area character statement sought to identify the character of the area and update the current boundary, to inform future development control decisions. It also proposed the introduction of an Article 4(2) Direction to control incremental change to unlisted dwellings. He advised that public consultation had been carried out and that the Character Statement had been well received with a number of amendments made in response to representations.
- 112.3 Councillor Mitchell welcomed the report and stated that it represented change being made in the appropriate way. She added that parking concerns had been raised in relation to the new National Park and that she hoped the council would bring forward measures to mitigate the potential problems; Stanmer Park was a natural gateway to the National Park and was important that it did not suffer from the potential increase in demand for parking.
- 112.4 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
- (1) That the Stanmer 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(2) Direction be made for unlisted dwellings in the village (numbers 11, 12 and 19 Stanmer Village) under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (1995), as proposed by the Stanmer Conservation Area Character Statement and detailed in appendix 3.
 - (3) That the proposed boundary changes, as set out in the Character Statement and in Appendix 4, be approved and formally designated.

113. PLANNING BRIEF - FORMER ROYAL ALEXANDRA HOSPITAL SITE*

- 113.1 The Cabinet member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning the consultation process undertaken in relation to the development of a planning brief for the former Royal Alexandra Hospital site and seeking approval of the draft Planning Brief.
- 113.2 The Cabinet Member invited Mr Mike Hales to make his deputation.
- 113.3 Mr Hales spoke on behalf of residents of the 'Alex Triangle', which was the area of land within the Montpelier and Clifton Hill conservation area enclosed to the rear of properties Dyke Road, Clifton Hill and Clifton Road. He highlighted amenity issues,

commercial viability issues and conservation issues and in particular raised concerns over the permitted height.

- 113.4 The Cabinet Member thanked Mr Hales for the deputation, which he noted, and advised that he would provide a detailed written response at the end of the meeting which would address the complex issues raised. He noted that the brief did deal directly with some of the issues raised. It recognised the steeply sloping land level and suggested a height restriction of two to three stories in the north-west corner of the site. It also recognised the importance of open space and landscape and stipulated that all trees with a Tree Preservation Order be retained.

He explained that the council had taken into account the many consultation responses received and produced a framework that would bring forward a development that would be both economically viable and sensitive to the wider area. He advised that the degree of weight given to the brief would ultimately rest with the Planning Committee, or possibly with a Planning Inspector in the event of any future appeal.

- 113.5 The Cabinet Member reported that the consultation had resulted in over 150 responses from members of the public and 4 formal responses. The options set out in the brief had been shared with the Conservation Advisory Group and tested by an independent Conservation expert as well as the District Valuer. The results of the assessments had been used to inform the content of the Brief, which would be used to provide up-to-date planning guidance to developers and assist the council in assessing future proposals for the site.
- 113.6 Councillor Kennedy spoke in support of the brief on behalf of the Regency ward councillors and in her capacity as a member of the Planning Committee. She thanked officers for listening to the views of residents and Members and paid tribute to Councillor Hyde, Chairman of the Planning Committee for her commitment to the retention of the main building. She added that while commercial viability was important, developers had to be aware of other concerns.
- 113.7 Councillor Mitchell welcomed the brief and paid tribute to residents and conservation groups for their interest and contribution. She added that the council should consider producing such planning brief at an earlier stage in the process of the purchase and development of major sites.
- 113.8 Councillor Davey welcomed the brief in his capacity as a member of the Planning Committee and added that it reflected the main view of the Committee.
- 113.9 The Assistant Director City Planner advised that in developing planning briefs it was important to strike a balance; developers must be able to see commercial viability and the views of residents must be incorporated. With regard to retaining the villa, he explained that viability would need to be tested, but that improvements in the market should make it more feasible. In response to the question of height raised in the deputation he confirmed that the reference to five stories was only in relation to the principal buildings.
- 113.10 The Cabinet Member reported that he had received two late representations. The Montpelier and Clifton Hill Association had written to express their preference for the

retention of the Victorian villa; the Cabinet Member advised that he was satisfied that the brief included a number of mechanisms to ensure that developers would give serious consideration to its retention. Boyer Planning, the planning agents acting on behalf of the landowner Taylor Wimpey, had raised concerns over the accuracy of Tables A and B on pages 21-22 of the brief; the Cabinet Member confirmed that the figures would be reviewed, but that as the process was unlikely to materially change the Deliverability section of the brief he would formally adopt it.

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

- (1) That the draft Planning Brief for the former Royal Alexandra Hospital site be approved.

114. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CORE STRATEGY - UPDATED BACKGROUND STUDIES*

114.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment concerning updates to two background studies that provide background and supporting evidence for the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework documents.

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

- (1) That the final reports of the two background studies be approved as supporting evidence for the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework documents.

The meeting concluded at 5.50pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of