

### BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

### ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

4.00PM 10 JUNE 2010

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

### MINUTES

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

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

**Other Members present:** Councillors Allen and Kennedy

### PART ONE

#### 1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

##### 1a Declarations of Interests

1a.1 Councillor Mitchell declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 13, a report of the Director of Environment concerning the Area H extension parking scheme proposal, as she lived in the affected area. Councillor Mitchell advised that she would leave the meeting during consideration of the item.

##### 1b Exclusion of Press and Public

1b.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).

1b.2 **RESOLVED** – That the press and public be not excluded from the meeting.

#### 2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

2.1 **RESOLVED** – The minutes of the meeting held on 11 May 2010 were approved and signed by the Cabinet Member as a correct record.

**3. CABINET MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS**

3.1 There were none.

**4. ITEMS RESERVED FOR DISCUSSION**

4.1 That all the items be reserved.

**5. PETITIONS**

5.1 There were none.

**6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

6.1 There were none.

**7. DEPUTATIONS**

7.1 There were none.

**8. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS****8(a) Letter – Anston House and adjoining site**

8.1 A letter was received from Councillor Allen concerning the occupants of the Anston House site and the site adjoining it. Councillor Allen was concerned that no progress appeared to have been made and that there were now more travellers present on the site; he requested an update on the situation and information on the council's long term proposals in relation to the sites.

8.2 The Cabinet Member explained that officers gained access onto the site during the previous week and a further multi agency meeting would take place on Monday 14 June to discuss the best course of action to remove the van dwellers. A course of action was expected to be agreed and implemented shortly after. He advised that planning enforcement officers intended to serve a Section 215 notice on the companies or individuals with an interest in the land within two weeks. The notice would require the land to be cleared of all rubbish and decaying vegetation and for the condition of the office building to be improved within 6 months. It was hoped that this would encourage those involved to bring forward a long term proposal for the site or at the very least improve its appearance and security of the land to avoid further problems arising in the future.

8.3 The Lawyer to the meeting gave assurances that achieving a resolution was a high priority and a multi-agency meeting had quickly agreed action following the last Cabinet Member Meeting. On the first attempt to access the site following the last CMM, access was refused and the correct legal procedure then had to be followed to notify the van dwellers of the Council's intention to carry out another site visit, including notification that a Court warrant would be sought if no access was granted. Having subsequently been granted access, the Council was now in the process of gathering the requisite evidence to pursue Court action. Officers were making the necessary investigations and

collecting evidence. She confirmed that, as access to the site had now been obtained, the Section 215 notices could be served imminently.

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

## 9. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

9.1 There were none.

## 10. NOTICES OF MOTION

10.1 There were none.

## 11. CHALKY ROAD, PORTSLADE CASUALTY REDUCTION SCHEME

11.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment seeking approval to enhance existing traffic calming features in Chalky Road, Portslade.

11.2 The Cabinet Member explained that, following the tragic fatal accident involving a child in Chalky Road in 2008, he had been working closely with officers and local Ward Members to ensure that action was taken to make the road safer, and that report proposed the implementation of further road safety measures.

11.3 Councillor Mitchell welcomed the report and in particular the relocation of build-outs, which were felt locally to be having a detrimental effect on road safety. She added that she hoped the need for a controlled crossing point would be kept under review.

11.4 Councillor West welcomed the measures, but raised concerns over the decision not to install a controlled crossing point; he asked for further information on the safety audits carried out and what evidence the council had used to determine that infrequently used crossing were dangerous. He also questioned whether the passive crossing point located near to the bus stop presented visibility concerns.

11.5 The Cabinet Member reported that during his visit to the site it had been evident that no single defined crossing point was preferred by pedestrians and that it would therefore not be appropriate to install a controlled crossing.

11.6 The Assistant Director for Sustainable Transport advised that the scheme had been safety audited and that a further audit would be carried out once the scheme had been given time to bed in. He explained that there was a requirement for national criteria to be met in order to install a crossing and that this included the presence of a single natural crossing point preferred by pedestrians. Any crossing point would be used infrequently and government evidence had shown that drivers would therefore be inclined to ignore it, making it more dangerous. He added that the crossing near to the bus stop was used most regularly and the intention was to adjust its location to improve visibility.

11.7 **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 progress the recommended sites set out in the report to detailed design stage and to begin construction.

**12. QUEEN'S PARK SAFER ROUTES TO SCHOOL SCHEME**

- 12.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment seeking permission to begin public consultation on the Safer Routes to School Scheme measures.
- 12.2 The Cabinet Member advised that the locations had been chosen due to the number of collisions in the area during school journey times over the previous three years. The proposed scheme would improve safety for families and children at Queen's Park and Carlton Hill Primary Schools as well as the Royal Spa and Tarnerland Nurseries.
- 12.3 Councillor Mitchell welcomed the report and added that such schemes were a good way of involving schools and children in the process and raising awareness of road safety and sustainable travel in children at an early age.
- 12.4 Councillor West advised that, while he was supportive of the intention, he was not convinced that the measures proposed would make a significant enough difference to encourage people to feel safe enough to travel sustainably. He suggested that inclusion of Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) casualties data would have helped to inform the decision on the proposals and queried why some suggestions made in the consultation had not been taken forward. He added that it was not clear from the report what the proposals hoped to achieve.
- 12.5 The Assistant Director for Sustainable Transport explained that KSI data was not easy to follow, but that the key information had been distilled into the report. He advised that small measures were capable of making a significant difference and that officers would feed Councillor West's comments in relation to the motorcycle bay in Freshfield Road into the final proposals.
- 12.6 Councillor Theobald advised that the measures were aimed at reducing the number of casualties and that officers had proposing the best technical ways of achieving that aim. He encouraged residents and councillors to respond to the consultation.
- 12.7 The Director of Environment explained that Safer Routes to Schools schemes took an iterative approach, with the council working with the school to achieve improved safety for children travelling to and from school; the proposals in the report were intended for public consultation and the final proposals would come to a future Cabinet Member Meeting. She added that it was possible to implement a large number of smaller measures within the allocated budget in order to achieve the council's road safety priorities.
- 12.8 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That the initial principles of the proposed road safety measures be approved and permission be given to begin formal public consultation.

**13. AREA H EXTENSION AREAS - RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME FORMAL CONSULTATION**

- 13.1 The Cabinet Member considered a report of the Director of Environment addressing comments and objections to the draft traffic regulation order for the Area H extension parking scheme proposal and seeking approval for the order, subject to any amendments.
- 13.2 The Cabinet Member advised that the proposal had been outlined in an advertised Traffic Regulation Order following the decision made at the Environment Cabinet Member Meeting on 24 September 2009 and was supported by Ward Councillors. He reported that only six objections have been received to the traffic order which was a very small amount for a residents parking scheme proposal and that only four were within the affected area.
- 13.3 Councillor West suggested that it was worrying that very few responses had been received and raised concerns about the level of engagement with residents.
- 13.4 The Parking Strategy Manager explained that informal consultation had already taken place, with 60% of residents in favour of the proposals. The Council had subsequently followed the same process used for all parking scheme consultations, but received only a small number of objections; a number notices had been placed on every street and were replaced several times during the consultation period.
- 13.5 The Director of Environment explained that if officers would have expected to hear very early on in the process if residents or ward councillors opposed the proposed scheme. She added that the council was only requesting objections at this point in the process and that officers were confident that residents were aware and happy with what had been proposed.
- 13.6 The Cabinet Member stated that the proposals were well-publicised and that, if only a few objections were received, the council had to assume that residents and ward councillors were happy.
- 13.7 **RESOLVED** - That having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Cabinet Member accepted the following recommendations:
- (1) That having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the following order be advertised;
    - (a) Brighton & Hove Various Controlled Parking Zone Consolidation Order 2008 Amendment Order No\* 20\*\* (Area H Extension).
  - (2) That any amendments included in the report and subsequent requests deemed appropriate by officers be added to the proposed scheme during implementation and advertised as an amendment traffic regulation order.

The meeting concluded at 4.35pm

Signed

Cabinet Member

Dated this

day of