

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENT CABINET MEMBER MEETING

10.30AM 26 MAY 2011

COMMITTEE ROOM 3, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Davey (Cabinet Member, Transport & Public Realm), Kennedy (Cabinet Member, Planning, Employment, Economy & Regeneration) and West (Cabinet Member, Environment & Sustainability)

Also in attendance: Councillors G Theobald (Opposition Spokesperson, Conservative), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson, Conservative) and Mitchell (Opposition Spokeperson, Labour & Co-operative)

Other Members present: Councillors Bennett, Bowden and Oxley

PART ONE

1. PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

1(a) Declarations of Interests

1a.1 Councillor Mitchell declared a personal, but non-prejudicial interest in Item 6b, a petition concerning parking at the Royal Sussex County Hospital, as she worked at the hospital.

1(b) Exclusion of Press and Public

1b.1 In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (“the Act”), the Cabinet Members 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 business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and 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(I) 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** – That, having been signed by the previous Cabinet Member as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2011 be noted.

3. CABINET MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS

- 3.1 Councillor Kennedy praised Councillor Theobald in recognition of his work as Cabinet Member during the last four last years and noted that he had chaired his Cabinet Member Meetings openly, encouraging debate and participation from Members and the public. She advised that the new Cabinet Members looked forward to continuing to encourage participation at meetings and to working openly and collaboratively with all Groups over the coming months.
- 3.2 Councillor Kennedy explained that, during the previous week, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Bill Randall, appointed the council's new Cabinet. The former Environment portfolio had been divided up to reflect the new Administration's belief that it was too large a brief for one Member to lead on. The Administration believed passionately in all areas covered by the former Environment portfolio and wanted to increase the focus on those areas in order to move forward on some of their key manifesto commitments, such as improving public transport, getting a better deal for walkers and cyclists, creating a zero waste city and a city that placed sustainable development at the heart of everything it did.
- 3.3 Councillor Kennedy stated that the following new portfolios had been created:
- Transport and public realm
 - Environment and Sustainability
 - Planning, Employment, Economy and Regeneration
- 3.4 Councillor Kennedy advised that over the next few weeks the Administration would consider the best ways of working in terms of meetings to reflect the new arrangements, but that today's meeting would follow the previous format, having been set up prior to the election, and that the agenda had been divided between the relevant portfolios, with herself and Councillor Davey taking decisions as appropriate.

4. ITEMS RESERVED FOR DISCUSSION

- 4.1 **RESOLVED** – That all items be reserved for discussion.

5. PETITIONS

5(i) Historic Signage in Brunswick Town

- 5i.1 Mr Brian Stone had submitted an epetition signed by 18 people calling for the council to introduce signs to denote the historic area of Brunswick Town.
- 5i.2 Mr Stone was unable to attend the meeting.
- 5i.3 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted and the following written response from Councillor Davey be provided:

“Thank you for your petition. I have noted its contents.”

5(ii) Pedestrian Crossing, Sackville Road, Hove

- 5ii.1 Councillor Oxley presented a petition signed by 100 people requesting a pedestrian crossing or island to be put in place on Sackville Road, Hove, between Montgomery Street and Livingstone Road, to enable pedestrians safe passage between the Poets Corner area and Hove Station.
- 5ii.2 Councillor Oxley called for a report or further investigation into the matter, to include the phasing of traffic lights in the area.
- 5ii.3 Councillor Davey advised that a report describing the revised methodology for assessing and prioritising pedestrian crossing requests would be considered later on the agenda and that, if it was approved, the Sackville Road crossing could be considered as part of the annual assessment. He stated that there was a clear need to improve pedestrian access to Hove train station, but noted there were already two pedestrian crossing facilities near to the requested location; those crossing facilities, alongside the other assessment criteria, must be fully considered prior to prioritising any pedestrian crossing. He added that future plans for the Sackville Trading Estate should also be considered when assessing the area to maximise the benefit of any new facility.
- 5ii.4 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

5(iii) Traffic Calming around Bevendean Pub area

- 5iii.1 Ms Maria Caulfield had submitted a petition signed by 30 people calling for the council to implement traffic calming measures in the streets around the Bevendean Pub, there having been a serious hit-and-run accident recently, and many near misses.
- 5iii.2 Ms Caulfield was unable to attend the meeting.
- 5iii.3 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted and the following written response from Councillor Davey be provided:
“Thank you for your petition drawing our attention to this serious issue.

However, apart from this unfortunate hit and run incident, there have been no other recorded injury causing collisions in the roads surrounding the Bevendean Pub and the Police have not indicated that they consider these roads to be a particular problem with regard to speeds. Indeed the very nature of the roads themselves, having lots of twists and turns, act as a natural form of traffic calming.

On this occasion, and given these factors, we note the petition but we do not propose any further action at this time.”

5(iv) Double Yellow Lines, Findon Road

- 5iv.1 Councillor Morgan had submitted a petition signed by 11 people calling on the council to install double yellow lines at the junction of Findon Road and Whitehawk Road in order to improve visibility.

5iv.2 Councillor Mitchell advised that Councillor Morgan was unable to attend the meeting, but that she understood that work had begun on the request.

5iv.3 Councillor Davey confirmed that the matter was in hand.

5iv.4 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

5(v) Puffin crossing outside Elm Grove Primary School

5v.1 Councillor Randall had presented a petition signed by 146 people calling for the council to install a puffin crossing outside Elm Grove Primary School to improve safety following a road accident involving a child using the existing pelican crossing.

5v.2 Councillor Randall was unable to attend the meeting.

5v.3 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted and the following written response from Councillor Davey be provided:

“Thank you for your petition. Although puffin crossings do offer some safety benefits over pelican crossings, it is unlikely to have prevented the accident you refer to because the vehicle drove through a red light.

Requests for new or improved crossing facilities are prioritised in areas with the poorest safety record and the oldest equipment. The new criteria later in the agenda may also be relevant.

Furthermore, the signal equipment outside Elm Grove Primary School was installed relatively recently, so there are no immediate plans to refurbish the site. When the time comes, it will be upgraded to a puffin.”

5(vi) Double yellow lines on the Western side of St Johns Road

5vi.1 Mr Paul Elgood had submitted a petition signed by 11 people calling for the council to implement double yellow lines for a distance of 15 feet from the inset parking spaces for ‘The Sands’ north to the property known as ‘Pebbles’ in order to prevent obstruction and allow reversing vehicular access to the driveway between 23 and 23a St Johns Road at the rear of 25-28 Palmeira Square, and also requesting a revised attendant Road Traffic Order for ‘no parking at any time’.

5vi.2 Mr Elgood was unable to attend the meeting.

5vi.3 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted and the following written response from Councillor Davey be provided:

“Thank you for your petition. I will instruct officers to investigate current parking demands and traffic movements in the road and recommend the way forward.”

5(vii) Cycle lane threat - stop Council waste

5vii.1 Ms Melanie Davis had submitted an epetition signed by 169 people calling for the council to keep the cycle lane on The Drive, thus preventing a significant cost to the council tax payer and the loss of opportunities for safe cycling in Hove and Goldsmid ward.

5vii.2 Ms Davis was unable to attend the meeting.

5vii.3 Councillor Davey advised that there were three petitions on the agenda dealing with the issue of the cycle lanes on The Drive, including one that was debated at a meeting of the Full Council in March and that he would respond to all three petitions under Item 6a.

5vii.4 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

5(viii) Getting rid of Cycle Lanes in The Drive

5vii.1 Mr Dervish Bayram had submitted an epetition signed by 10 people calling for the council to remove the cycle lanes on The Drive for safety reasons.

5vii.2 Mr Bayram was unable to attend the meeting.

5vii.3 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

6. PETITIONS DEBATED AT COUNCIL**6A Save The Drive Cycle Lanes, Hove**

6a.1 Councillor Davey considered a petition that he had presented and that was referred following a Full Council debate on 24 March 2011 concerning proposals to remove cycle lanes from the Drive, Hove at a cost of £1.1m and increasing the risk to pedestrians and cyclists by increasing the traffic flow. The petition had been signed by 3,543 people. He also considered the petitions under Items 5(vii) and (viii).

6a.2 Councillor Davey thanked all those who signed the petition and stated that it clearly demonstrated the popularity of the cycle lane and how important cycling was a mode of travel for residents and visitors. He advised that the proposal to remove the cycle lanes, put forward by the previous Administration, was out voted at Budget Council on 24 March and that he had instructed officers to implement any minor safety measures that may be required, and to begin work on introducing measures, both in the immediate and longer term, which would increase usage, such as completing links to the north of the city and developing routes to the east and west.

6a.3 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

6B Royal Sussex County Hospital parking

6b.1 Councillor Davey considered a petition that had been presented by Councillor Bennett and that was referred following a Full Council debate on 24 March 2011 concerning parking policies at the Royal Sussex County Hospital and calling for the council to work

with the hospital to ensure that the amount of on site parking for all patients and their visitors was greatly increased. The petition had been signed by 1,745 people.

- 6b.2 Councillors Janio and Theobald queried why Councillor Bennett, who was in attendance, was not permitted to speak in relation to the petition, and raised concerns about this approach.
- 6b.3 The Democratic Services Officer advised that a different approach was taken with petitions that had already been debated at Full Council as opposed to those which had not been debated, such as those dealt with under Item 5 where speaking rights were offered. Where a petition had been the subject of a Full Council debate, the lead petitioner had already had an opportunity to present their petition, which was then debated prior to recommendations being agreed by the Full Council; the petition was then referred to the relevant Cabinet Member along with the recommendations simply for a decision to be made with no further speaking rights for the lead petitioner. The Democratic Services Officer confirmed that the same procedure was followed prior to the change of Administration.
- 6b.4 The Lawyer to the meeting confirmed that no amendments had been made to the constitution and that the approach taken had not changed.
- 6b.5 Councillor Kennedy stated that in order to deal with the concerns raised she would ask the Head of Law to write to Councillors Theobald, Janio and Bennett clarifying the approach to petitions as prescribed in the council's constitution.
- 6b.6 Councillor Bennett stated that she did not consider that the matter had been adequately debated at full council and that she therefore wished to speak on the petition again.
- 6b.7 Councillor Davey explained that when the petition was presented at Full Council in March, the debate that followed fully recognised that access to good quality healthcare facilities for patients, visitors and staff at the Royal Sussex County Hospital, both now and in the future, was a very important issue for the city and the wider area. He stated that this presented a number of challenges and with the most significant being to ensure that all transport needs were identified and addressed.

The recommendations from Full Council asked that four specific matters be considered, prompted by the proposed planning application for future development at the hospital which would create a Regional Centre for Teaching, Trauma and Tertiary Care (referred to as the "3Ts"). Councillor Davey made the following comments in relation to each of the specific matters:

1. Ensuring that parking provision took into account additional staff numbers.

The NHS Trust was continuing to work closely with the council on the preparation of its planning application, and addressing transport issues, especially car parking, was a key part of the process. Design work was ongoing and liaison meetings were being held with local residents.

The Trust was best placed to initially assess how it would manage all the transport demands that its proposals would create, and what transport measures it could provide. Once those were finalised, the public and the council's planning and

transport officers would be able to examine the issues more closely when a planning application was submitted.

2. *Actively encourage the Trust to increase the frequency and capacity of the 40X bus.*

The service had been very successful so far and the Trust had prepared a business case to help consider options for its future improvement. This had recently been circulated to all Trust staff for comment and the Trust was expected to consider the responses it received in the near future, before making any decision on a way forward.

3. *An area-wide feasibility study to see if through-traffic can be diverted away from the hospital in accordance with the council's agreed LDF Core Strategy document;*

As part of the planning process, the council had raised and discussed the matter with the Trust's transport advisors. It was expected that the Transport Assessment for the redevelopment of the hospital site would address the likely implications of changes in traffic patterns and volumes of the proposal, and this would include the effects on Eastern Road and Edward Street.

4. *The council to work with the hospital Trust and other large employers in the city to provide genuine sustainable travel modes and choices for their workforce.*

Brighton & Sussex University Hospitals NHS Trust (BSUH) had been a prominent and active member of the Brighton & Hove Business Travel Plan Partnership since 2007. It hosted the Partnership's quarterly meeting in March 2011, and presented details of the successes of its current Travel Plan, as well as details of their future transport plans under the 3T's development. An example of its commitment to investment in transport provision was a new, safe and secure cycle compound with room for over 120 cycles.

6b.8 Councillor Davey advised that both the council and BSUH were committed, through the Partnership, to continue working closely together to deliver an exemplar Travel Plan for the Hospital site, which would include measures for its staff.

6b.9 Councillor Janio noted that the response to the petition did not make reference to patients or visitors.

6b.10 Councillor Theobald noted that Councillor Davey had stated that the Trust would assess parking needs for hospital staff, but that Full Council had recommended that the council work with the Trust; he advised that it was vital that both parties be involved.

6b.11 **RESOLVED** – That the petition be noted.

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

7.1 There were none.

8. DEPUTATIONS

8.1 There were none.

9. LETTERS FROM COUNCILLORS

9.1 There were none.

10. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

10.1 There were none.

11. NOTICES OF MOTION

11.1 There were none.

12. SHOREHAM HARBOUR: INTERIM PLANNING GUIDANCE (IPG) UPDATE

12.1 Councillor Kennedy considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place concerning an update of Interim Planning Guidance (IPG) for Shoreham Harbour.

12.2 The Head of Planning & Public Protection advised that the IPG had originally been produced in 2009 and had been updated to reflect the current situation and that it would guide development in the short term, alongside a proposed investment strategy.

12.3 Councillor Kennedy welcomed the updated guidance and consultation. She explained that it was an interim measure until more formal planning policies were developed jointly with Adur District Council and West Sussex County Council to guide the regeneration of the area. The IPG did not establish new planning policy, but set out each authority's existing policies. It aimed to encourage the type of development that was in keeping with the future vision of the harbour.

12.4 Councillor Mitchell noted that the number of dwellings proposed had dropped from 10,000 to 2,000 following the completion of a capacity study and questioned what had driven such a significant reduction. She added that only a small proportion of the harbour area fell within the city boundaries, but that it was the council's responsibility to make more of that area.

12.5 Councillor Kennedy welcomed the comments and instructed officers to circulate a briefing note to Members explaining the results of the capacity study. She stated that she was conscious of the loss of Regional Spatial Strategy, but added that officers were investigating working with adjoining councils.

12.6 Councillor Theobald noted that Central Government was proposing to allow issues, such as the number of dwellings, to be determined locally.

12.7 Councillor Janio highlighted the importance of improving transport links to the harbour and in the surrounding area. He noted the inclusion of Policy EM12 and stated that the emphasis on HGV traffic was not relevant to the development or indicative of a sensible transport policy.

12.8 The Head of Planning & Public Protection explained that the spirit of the IPG was the three local authorities taking local control of the development and that the number of dwellings had been reduced mainly due to concerns about transport provision; the viability study had taken account of the views expressed by the local authorities and acknowledged that employment was the focus of the development. He advised that Policy EM12 was an existing Local Plan policy that could not be altered in the short term, but that it was recognised that transport was key to the successful regeneration of the harbour.

12.9 **RESOLVED** - That, having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Councillor Kennedy accepted the following recommendation:

- (1) That consultation on the Shoreham Harbour: Interim Planning Guidance update be agreed, subject to any minor grammatical and non-material text and illustrative alterations agreed by the Strategic Director Place in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member, and agreed by Adur District Council and West Sussex County Council.

13. ROTTINGDEAN CHARACTER STATEMENT

13.1 Councillor Kennedy considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place seeking approval of the Rottingdean Conservation Area Character Statement, following a positive public response to consultation.

13.2 Councillor Kennedy reported that the consultation response had been generally positive and that where appropriate changes had been made to the text to reflect the consultation responses. She welcomed the valuable contributions from the Parish Council, local Preservation Society and Councillor Hyde and advised that the character statement would help owners and designers to create development schemes that were sympathetic to the area's distinctive character, and provide a sound basis for making future development control decisions.

13.3 The Design & Conservation Manager praised the work of the Planning Officer in compiling the character statement, which provided good guidance that would be easy to use in practice.

13.4 Councillor Theobald emphasised the importance of consultation and noted that the ward councillors were supportive of the final document.

13.5 **RESOLVED** - That, having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Councillor Kennedy accepted the following recommendation:

- (1) That the Rottingdean Conservation Area Character Statement be adopted, subject to any minor grammatical and non-material alterations agreed with the relevant Cabinet Member.
- (2) That an Article 4(1) Direction be made for dwellings in the area under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, as recommended by the Rottingdean Conservation Area Appraisal and detailed in annex 3.

- (3) That the proposed boundary changes, as set out in the Character Statement and illustrated in annex 4, be approved and formally designated under section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

14. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CORE STRATEGY - UPDATED BACKGROUND STUDIES

- 14.1 Councillor Kennedy considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place seeking approval of two background studies that provide background and supporting evidence for the Core Strategy and future Local Development Framework documents.
- 14.2 Councillor Kennedy explained that the studies provided robust evidence for the Core Strategy. The first study, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), identified a supply of land for housing development for the next 15 years; it was a technical report that did not allocate sites. The second study, the Open Space Study Update, developed a scoring system to assess all of the city's open space and measured the quality of open spaces not owned by the city council. Councillor Kennedy welcomed the completion of the studies as a step towards adopting a new development plan for the city and advised that she would begin considering how progress could be made with the Core Strategy, including developing proposals to work collaboratively.
- 14.3 The Head of Planning and Public Protection advised that the council had moved closer to meeting former South East Plan housing targets, but recommended that the setting of local targets be considered to provide a better basis for the way forward with the Core Strategy.
- 14.4 Councillor Mitchell supported the proposal to set local housing targets. She was confident that the target suggested within the SHLAA was achievable, but noted that it would also be essential to invest in the surrounding infrastructure.
- 14.5 Councillor Janio queried the inclusion of references to the South East Plan. He welcomed the idea of local target setting and proposals to include all political Groups in the process.
- 14.6 Councillor Kennedy explained that it would be necessary to maintain references to the South East Plan until the Localism Bill was enacted by Parliament and that language would be updated accordingly after that time.
- 14.7 **RESOLVED** - That, having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Councillor Kennedy 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.

15. CEDARS GARDENS HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

- 15.1 Councillor Davey considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place concerning a scheme developed to provide additional footpaths, improve visibility for drivers, provide signage and introduce a one way system for entering and exiting Cedars Gardens.

- 15.2 Councillor Davey explained that the scheme was in the vicinity of Cedars Lodge, a property previously owned by the City Council, and that amount from the sale receipt was retained to pay for the highways safety improvements.
- 15.3 Councillor Janio noted the objection from Bricycles, an organisation that campaigned for better conditions for cyclists in the city, and suggested that more time be taken to consider the implications for cyclists.
- 15.4 The Lead Commissioner for City Regulation & Infrastructure explained that the design would improve conditions for cyclists and the volume of manoeuvring traffic would be halved by the new one way system and that visibility had been improved resulting in greater safety and a more logical scheme.
- 15.5 Councillor Davey confirmed that he was satisfied that the improvements would improve safety and not jeopardise the wellbeing of cyclists.
- 15.6 **RESOLVED** - That, having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Councillor Davey accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That (having taken into account of all the duly made representations and objections):
- (a) the **BRIGHTON & HOVE (CEDARS GARDENS) (ONE WAY TRAFFIC) ORDER 20**** and the **BRIGHTON & HOVE (WAITING & LOADING/UNLOADING RESTRICTIONS AND PARKING PLACES) CONSOLIDATION ORDER 2008 AMENDMENT ORDER No. * 20** (CEDARS GARDENS)** be approved.
- (b) permission be granted for officers to proceed with the highways improvements to Cedars Gardens, as laid out in Appendix 1.

16. SUPPORTED BUS SERVICES: AREA NETWORK REVIEW CONSULTATION

- 16.1 Councillor Davey considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place seeking approval to start the Area Network Review process for new contracts for supported bus services to start in September 2012, and to undertake a full consultation process with elected members, user groups, and community groups.
- 16.2 Councillor Davey explained that the aim of the new contracts would be to fully meet the needs of the community and reflect any changes to the commercial bus network. He welcomed the division of the contracts into individual routes or groups to create more opportunities for smaller operators to bid.
- 16.3 In response to a question from Councillor Mitchell concerning the declining Value for Money budget for supported bus routes, the Lead Commissioner for City Regulation & Infrastructure explained that the review would look at existing routes and consider whether any were no longer required or whether some could be provided commercially.

- 16.4 Councillor Janio questioned whether Councillor Davey was required to declare an interest in respect of the report. He emphasised the importance of supported bus routes to local communities and the need to protect them.
- 16.5 Councillor Davey confirmed that he did not have an interest to declare and this was confirmed by the Lawyer to the meeting.
- 16.6 In response to questions from Councillor Theobald, the Lead Commissioner explained that the consultation was part of a citywide review of all supported bus routes and that comments from all parts of the community were welcomed, including those where there may be demand for a new route. He added that the new contracts were designed to support competition.
- 16.7 Councillor Davey encouraged residents to respond to the consultation and advised that all providers would be able to submit bids for routes. He reported that that he would continue discussions about cross subsidy with officers.
- 16.8 The Lawyer to the meeting advised that an amendment to recommendation 2.2 was required in order to make the next steps clear (see 16.9(2) below).
- 16.9 **RESOLVED** - That, having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Councillor Davey accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That a full consultation exercise to inform the Area Network Review be authorised.
 - (2) That a report be brought to a future Cabinet Member Meeting, once the results of the Area Network Review consultation have been collated, ~~tenders from prospective contractors have been analysed, and recommendations for the future Supported Local Bus Network have been formulated.~~
 - (3) That the enhanced vehicle emission standards specified be approved.

17. PEDESTRIAN CROSSING ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

- 17.1 Councillor Davey considered a report of the Strategic Director, Place concerning the proposed revised assessment methodology for pedestrian crossings developed following a review by the Environment & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Committee (ECSOSC).
- 17.2 Councillor Davey stated that the report demonstrated the value of good scrutiny by taking a very technical process and applying innovative thinking to introduce new criteria that would make pedestrian crossing requests more transparent and accessible. He explained that assessments will be carried out once each year and a priority list established accordingly; crossings identified as highest priority would be implemented as soon as possible after the assessment had taken place, subject to the availability of funding.
- 17.3 Councillor Theobald noted that it was often frustrating that someone had to be injured before a crossing could be installed; he welcomed the new methodology and praised the work of the ECSOSC.

- 17.4 Councillor Mitchell welcomed the implementation of the methodology following initiation by the ECSOSC. She noted that issues often arose as a result of public perception of road safety and advised the council would need to be prepared to be flexible in applying the methodology.
- 17.5 Councillor West, who had been a Member of the ECSOSC, explained that the Committee had found the existing methodology to be lacking and made a number of recommendations to officers. The new methodology addressed the Committee's concerns and demonstrated the important role of scrutiny in policy development.
- 17.6 **RESOLVED** - That, having considered the information and the reasons set out in the report, the Councillor Davey accepted the following recommendation:
- (1) That the revised pedestrian crossing assessment methodology be approved and permission be granted for officers to carry out the assessment on all sites on the pedestrian crossing request list in the financial year 2011/12. Subject to funding, sites identified as a priority would be implemented towards the end of financial year 2011/12.

The meeting concluded at 11.40am

Signed

Cabinet Members

Dated this

day of