



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER  
MEETING  
ADDENDUM**

**4.00PM, THURSDAY, 6 NOVEMBER 2008**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**



# ADDENDUM

ITEM	Page
59. PUBLIC QUESTIONS	1 - 2



### WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting for questions submitted by a member of the public who either lives or works in the area of the authority.

The question will be answered without discussion. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion. The person to whom a question, or supplementary question, has been put may decline to answer it.

The following written questions have been received from members of the public.

**(i) Mr. R Pennington** (also included in the agenda)

“Given the significant discrimination against disabled persons caused by car-free developments and the associated Traffic Regulation Order, and given that the report has no comparative studies of what other authorities do to mitigate that discrimination, and given that local organisations for the disabled have not been consulted on these TRO’s in any meaningful way, and given that there is no urgency on this matter as the other elements of the TRO can be approved and the car-free elements can be delayed, why has the TRO not been designed to allow a disabled resident to have a resident’s permit?”

**(ii) Mr. T Chavasse**

“Following inadequate preparation for halving Refuse Collections from large Brunswick Town HMOs, also causing litter by collection now being on a different day to recycling, 3 out of 4 collections have been made on the wrong day. We would, however, like to help with another useful question. Would you provide an assurance that we will now really be meaningfully consulted on the planned change of Recycling day so that it again coincides with refuse collection? Thereby reverting to the most cost effective method of reducing litter and increasing recycling without further prejudicing the residents’ goodwill or another area’s requirements.”

