

DELEGATED DECISIONS BY CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT (INCLUDING TRANSPORT)

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 9 October 2014 commencing at 10.30 am and finishing at 12.35 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor David Nimmo Smith – Cabinet Member for Environment

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor John Sanders (Shadow Spokesman for Environment)
Councillor Neil Fawcett (for Agenda Item 4)
Councillor Sandy Lovatt (for Agenda Item 4)
Councillor Richard Webber (for Agenda Item 4)
Councillor Yvonne Constance (for Agenda Item 5)
Councillor Charles Mathew (for Agenda Item 9)

Officers:

Whole of meeting G. Warrington (Law & Culture); M. Kemp (Environment & Economy)

Part of meeting

Agenda Item	Officer Attending
4.	D. Mytton (Law & Culture); D. Tole, A. Kirkwood & R. Santiago (Environment & Economy)
5.	L. Turner (Environment & Economy)
6.	D. Tole, M. Wasley and O. Payne (Environment & Economy)
7.	D. Tole & M. Ruse (Environment & Economy)
8. & 9.	T. Flanagan & N. Mottram (Environment & Economy)
10.	T. Flanagan (Environment & Economy)

The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting and decided as set out below. Except as insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

51/14 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda No. 2)

Question from Councillor Nick Hards

“Would the Cabinet Member please confirm that the soil which is filling 5 drainage gullies on the B4493 between the Mendip Heights roundabout and the Foxhall Road

roundabout, will be removed as a matter of urgency. Pedestrians who walk from Great Western Park and the Mendip Heights areas to the new Didcot Parkway transport hub are getting soaked when it rains heavily in the mornings as the photograph (circulated with the addenda sheet) shows.”

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Environment

“We are acutely aware of this problem and are very keen to get this problem fixed as soon as possible. We carried out some investigatory works a couple of months ago and found that the main highway carrier drain that runs parallel with the B4493 was blocked by a utility company service crossing. This is what is causing the gullies along the road to silt up as the drainage is only partially working and currently cannot cope with a heavy rain downpour. Works to carry out repairs will necessitate traffic signals to carry out the work safely. We are currently not able to put traffic signals up on the B4493 because there are major works taking place very nearby in Basil Hill Road where Network Rail are replacing a road bridge and our works are on the diversion route as well as being very close to the roundabout as shown on the photograph with the original query.

We hope to get on site in November to effect repairs to the highway drain and we will do so at the very earliest opportunity.”

Supplementary question from Councillor Hards

“Can you give me an assurance that work will start as soon as possible”

Reply from Cabinet Member fro Environment

As I explained a third party is involved and that is creating some problems but the County Council is keen to get the work done quickly.

52/14 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 3)

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
Councillor Angela Lawrence – Abingdon Town Council Councillor Alice Badcock – Abingdon Town Council Anthea Norman-Taylor - Resident <i>(submission presented by Martin Bowes in her absence)</i> Samantha Bowring – Resident Anne Dodd – Resident Jacqueline Cooke – Resident Roger Bush – Resident	Item 4 – Proposed Pelican Crossings – A415 Marcham Road and Ock Street, Abingdon

District Councillor Dr Jim Halliday – Vale of White Horse DC District Councillor Matthew Barber - Vale of White Horse District Council County Councillor Richard Webber (Sutton Courtenay & Marcham) County Councillor Sandy Lovatt (Abingdon North) County Councillor Neil Fawcett (Abingdon South) Andy Cattermole (Taylor Wimpey)	
Duncan Wood	5. Bridge Street, Witney – Proposed Zebra Crossing
Debbie Reeves – Resident David Moyes – Resident	7. Proposed Removal of Disabled Persons Parking Place, Playing Close, Charlbury
Councillor Charles Mathew	9. North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan – Endorsement

53/14 PROPOSED PELICAN CROSSINGS - A415 MARCHAM ROAD AND OCK STREET, ABINGDON

(Agenda No. 4)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE4) a report setting out objections and other comments received in response to re-consultation on a proposed new pelican crossing on Ock street and a re-located pelican crossing on the A415 Marcham Road, Abingdon arising from a proposed development of 159 dwellings on land adjacent to the B4017 Drayton road following an appeal decision granting planning permission by the Planning Inspectorate in 2013 which had included a condition that 'no development should take place until the crossing proposals had been implemented or the highway authority had confirmed they would be implemented.

The Cabinet Member explained that following a legal challenge to the decision he had taken on this matter in March the County Council had reviewed the process and considered that as the reasons for that decision had not been made clear it had been decided to bring the proposals back to him for further and full consideration at this meeting.

Prior to hearing from the public speakers he then invited officers to set out the latest position since publication of the current report to include any additional papers which

had been received. He also acknowledged additional emails which he and officers had received including a letter from the Abingdon Town Council.

Abingdon Town Councillor Alice Badcock stated that the already notorious traffic problems on Drayton Road would be exacerbated by these new crossings. Safety issues would also be created as moving the crossings did not come with a guarantee that children would use them and it was wrong to put lives at risk for the sake of 159 houses. Utility vehicles entering the MG gardens also presented an additional risk by needing to manoeuvre on the highway to gain entry. The Town Council had realised there could be a major accident if these changes went ahead and the County Council needed to be prepared to take full responsibility if that happened.

Abingdon Town Councillor Angela Lawrence stated that nothing material had changed since the decision in March and she disagreed completely with the officer recommendation as set out in the current report. She considered the current layout at the Ock Street/Spring Road junction was perfectly adequate but adding another crossing would worsen an already bad situation and would not reflect natural desire lines. The AbITS programme had gone a long way to improving air quality but these proposals would inevitably negate any improvements by increasing queues and congestion as well as endangering school children and creating safety issues.

Martin Bowes read out a statement on behalf of Anthea Norman-Taylor who had been unable to attend. Had the developers attended the meeting in March they would have heard first-hand the concerns expressed by local people and their elected representatives. Furthermore it was quite clear from the appeal decision documents that the Inspector had wanted a full public consultation to decide this matter and not him. The Inspector and developers had accepted there was already a serious traffic issue on the Drayton Road so it was difficult to understand why this was being proposed at all. She questioned the integrity of the computer modelling and the lack of common sense attributed to the proposal with regard to traffic movements particularly those turning right when the traffic lights on the Ock Street crossing had been called. She urged the Cabinet Member to listen to local opinion and knowledge and uphold his original decision.

Samantha Bowring handed in a petition in the following terms that *'we the undersigned request that Oxfordshire County Council decides to keep the Marcham Road crossing at its current site. It was put at its current site because that is the safest and most convenient crossing point for pedestrians and that is where it should stay'*. She went on to highlight the convenience of the original Marcham Road crossing which had been situated on a natural desire line. The County Council had a duty of care to allow for those who chose not to use the crossing and to support the work of the Vale of White Horse District Council to improve air quality. Both of those things would be under threat if this proposal went ahead and the crossing should remain in its current position.

Anne Dodd stated that this proposal had been motivated purely by a planning application for housing development with a complete disregard for safety. Drayton Road was already heavily congested and this proposal certainly wouldn't improve the situation but would merely move the problem elsewhere with local residents again the

losers and housing developers the winners. She urged that a decision be taken which supported local democracy.

Jacqueline Cooke expressed a huge concern that children would inevitably take undue risks and moving these crossings as proposed went against the County Council's duty of care to protect those who took the shortest route. Barriers wouldn't help as guardrails would detract from the desire line and affect drivers by giving them a perception of increased safety. Also further developments in neighbouring areas of Drayton and Steventon would increase congestion problems in this area.

Roger Bush commented that in March 2014 someone had commented that this issue was not about road safety but about planning. That interpretation had been correct and this matter was only being considered in order to allow a housing development to proceed. He considered the safety audits unacceptable, that the crossings would be in the wrong place adding to already unacceptable queues of traffic and would serve only to worsen an already appalling local situation and therefore the only right decision would be to refuse the proposal to resite the crossings.

Vale of White Horse District Councillor Jim Halliday had represented the area as a District Councillor for 20 years and confirmed that the crossings had originally been sited in 1991 on clear desire lines. He expressed surprise at the submission of late documents and supported the view that children would be likely to take the shortest route with all the safety issues that that would create. The effects on air quality would be immense and additional stationary traffic would worsen an already bad situation, particularly in Spring Road. Traffic modelling was uncertain and if a decision was taken to go ahead to resite the crossing then it should be for a 2 month trial period in order to gauge its effects.

Vale of White Horse District Councillor Matthew Barber urged the Cabinet Member to support the Vale of White Horse District Council's objections submitted in March, particularly the Glanville report which had stated the new crossing would be less safe and would lead to increased traffic congestion. He endorsed Jim Halliday's comments regarding air quality and urged that the proposal to re-site the crossings should be rejected.

County Councillor Richard Webber referred to the confusion which existed as to why this matter was being reconsidered especially as the information currently before the Cabinet Member was the same as in March. He referred to issues regarding the South Abingdon development and developments associated with the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan, which included a proposed 250 houses which had received a lot of support. However, that could be put at risk by a housing development to which the County and District Councils had both objected and would have a huge impact on local traffic movements. He urged that the resiting of the crossing be resisted.

County Councillor Sandy Lovatt advised that the perception in Abingdon seemed to be that local opinion was often disregarded and this situation seemed to bear that out. He felt that County officers had not taken into account the effects of this proposal on a strategic level. The application for 159 houses had been rejected by the Vale of White Horse District Council and this report centred on that issue and not Abingdon's problem as a whole. Abingdon had grown considerably and the County

Council had invested £5m on systems to deal with its traffic and yet this scheme would go some way to negating that by causing traffic to back up into Abingdon. In his view there was sufficient evidence to refuse to resite the crossing but, at the very least, the proposal should be deferred until major network problems had been addressed.

County Councillor Neil Fawcett echoed the view that everything seemed to be in the favour of developers. He considered the issue of road safety had not been addressed adequately in the report and that clear guidance from the Department of Transport had not been mentioned as it should have been. Pedestrian desire lines were a key factor which needed to be taken into account and yet paragraph 16 of the report stated that re-siting of the current crossing further west would make the crossing less attractive and therefore by inference less safe as there was an expectation that pedestrians in particular children would continue to cross at the site of the existing crossing and he considered on that basis there was enough grounds to justify turning the proposal down. The report recognised how important local knowledge was yet it had made many assumptions regarding pedestrian movements. Paragraphs 24 and 25 stated all accidents had occurred where children were currently being encouraged to cross so it would be less safe to ask children to use a less safe route.

Andy Cattermole confirmed that issues regarding the crossings had been subject to detailed consideration by the Inspector who had concluded that the development with the associated off-site works would not have a detrimental effect on traffic conditions and commenting that Option 3 (the works for which consent is sought) should be provided to mitigate the transport effects of the scheme. He had also considered that Option 3 alone would provide relief to the Drayton Road entry to the junction whether pedestrians chose to cross on Ock street or Marcham Road and make proper provision for pedestrians and accommodate development traffic while avoiding a severe transport impact. A full safety audit as recognised in paragraph 15 of the officer report had not raised any significant issues. That had been the case in March and still was. Whilst there had been concerns raised regarding relocation consideration needed to be given to pedestrian movements in the vicinity of the site including to local schools. The report made it clear that of 3,500 residential properties south of the river Ock only 660 were on the western side of Drayton Road suggesting the majority of current users of the existing crossing would experience a reduction in the number of crossings of an A or B Class road. Representations also made significant reference to pedestrian movements associated with local schools. However, notwithstanding the comments raised for pedestrians attending Larkmead School whose journey started and ended on the west side of Drayton Road the works would reduce the number of crossings from 2 to 1. For those from the western side who would use the relocated crossing the increased length of time for the journey was just 45 seconds which could not be considered a material or detrimental change. Under the Road Safety guidelines the onus was on pedestrians to act reasonably which could be interpreted as travelling the short distance to the crossing point encouraged perhaps by provision of safety. There had been no objections from statutory consultees and it was clear that the proposal was considered by experts to be safe. The planning objections had been addressed by the Planning Inspector and he asked the Cabinet Member to support the proposal.

The Cabinet Member thanked everyone for their submissions. As he saw it the main issues were:

- would crossings make it safer or less safe to cross the roads in question
- significant delays at junctions.

Mr Tole then addressed a number of key issues raised:

With regard to the wider Abingdon issue this matter needed to be seen in the context of how the County Council responded to the Planning Inspector's decision irrespective of whether the County Council liked it or not.

With regard to the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan a similar proposal was expected in order to deal with traffic connected with development. If the 159 houses in Abingdon did not go ahead but the Drayton development did then the traffic problem would still exist.

With regard to road safety he accepted children did not always behave in the same way as adults.

With regard to National Guidance regarding Safe Routes the assumption had to be made, which the report had done, that if a new crossing were put in then children, drivers and adults alike would all behave reasonably.

He confirmed that the proposal met the standards for a safe walkable route to school and that barriers along the whole length had been regarded as excessive.

With regard to access to the MG gardens it was accepted that vehicles would have to stop on the highway to gain access.

With regard to air quality issues it was difficult for the County Council to comment as it was not the monitoring authority and although there had been a comment from the Vale at the last meeting it had been difficult to assess as there had been insufficient empirical data.

He confirmed the accident information in paragraphs 24 and 25 suggested there had been a good record which others were arguing by inference would only get worse if the crossings were re-sited. That was not necessarily the case. The issue came down to providing a safe route and a well-designed crossing. With regard to the issue of using a crossing to control traffic the Inspector had been of the view that this was a suitable way to deal with extra congestion arising from this development. With regard to paragraph 16 and the new crossing being less attractive to users it seemed to him to come down to it involving a longer distance and it was difficult to predict who would use what. With regard to the effect on AbITS it had been stated that the crossings could be linked as part of general traffic monitoring. It had to be accepted that there would be more delays for eastbound movements. In conclusion the County Council's hands had been partially tied by the Inspector's decision which the County Council had objected to but the County Council now had to work with.

Responding to a question from the Cabinet Member Mr Mytton confirmed that any decision would be open to challenge as had happened last time. A decision was now required in the light of previously available and new information.

Summing up the Cabinet Member confirmed that he had read the reports and all the technical information as published as well as submissions sent to him subsequently. He had listened to the views expressed to him in March 2014 and at this meeting and found the reports thorough and sound. He now needed to make a decision based on the technical information before him and the local representations as made to him in the context of whether the proposals made crossing safe or less safe and mitigated the effects of traffic from the new development. Planning permission for that had been granted so he was not here to discuss that.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him including:

- that the proposed siting of the signal equipment would have no significant impact on adjacent properties
- a safety audit of the detailed design of the proposals had not identified any significant issues in respect of the proposed layout of the crossings
- officers had applied the Road Safety GB guidelines on walked routes to school and found that the proposals had met those guidelines
- no additional new technical evidence had been submitted since the appeal and in view of this there appeared to be no new valid grounds to re-investigate this matter
- there did not appear in the light of comments on traffic impact to be any significant concern over the effects of the proposals on air quality.
- A number of the consultation responses had suggested a trial to fully assess the traffic impact before permanent installation. However, as that impact had been discussed in detail during the appeal on the basis of the results of transport modelling to which the Inspector had concluded that he was satisfied with that modelling there were no grounds to revisit the earlier decision.

The representations made to him and the further considerations set out above the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed that he had been persuaded to reverse his earlier decision and confirmed his decision as follows:

- (a) approve implementation of proposals for proposed pelican crossings on A415 Marcham Road and Ock Street, Abingdon as advertised;
- (b) monitor closely the safety performance and traffic delays following the completion of the works.

Signed.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

54/14 PROPOSED PUFFIN CROSSING - A417 EAST CHALLOW

(Agenda No. 5)

The Cabinet Member for Environment (CMDE5) considered objections and other comments received to a statutory consultation on a proposed new puffin crossing on the A417, Main Street, East Challow.

Councillor Yvonne Constance confirmed that the Parish Council had been delighted to hear this scheme could now proceed although there were some concerns regarding lack of progress on the proposed layby.

Mr Turner confirmed that the Parish Council were now content with progress with regard to the proposals to provide alternative parking.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, the representations made to him by the local member and the further considerations set out above the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed his decision as follows:

approve implementation of the proposed puffin crossing as advertised and as set out in the report CMDE5.

.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

55/14 BRIDGE STREET, WITNEY - PROPOSED ZEBRA CROSSING

(Agenda No. 6)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE6) responses received to a consultation for a proposed zebra crossing on Bridge Street, Witney and acknowledged receipt of additional emails from:

County Councillor Richard Langridge (Witney North & East) who had expressed a strong objection to the proposal on the grounds of disruption to traffic movement, increased congestion and worsening air pollution which was already at dangerous levels. West Oxfordshire District Council and the Witney Traffic Advisory Committee had both objected and he suggested the high levels of support for the crossing had not come from people who actually lived in the immediate area. Local residents had repeatedly voiced their opposition to the proposal and in the face of such local opposition it should not proceed.

Hannah Watson (local resident) had set out her concerns regarding the dangers of trying to cross Bridge Street. That was likely to worsen with new housing development. The issue with shop deliveries applied to one business which had huge trucks delivering which needed to park on the pavement making the situation

even more dangerous. She considered that people’s safety came before concerns regarding noise and pollution which already existed.

Duncan Wood speaking as a Trustee of a Health Club off Bridge Street confirmed that many members had commented on the difficulties of crossing Bridge Street. There was also a dance school on the old trading estate site and comments had also been made on the dangers for children crossing. Consequently many visitors took the choice to drive which added to the high traffic levels. Bridge Street was by and large residential with lots of new houses and one shop and support for a crossing was overwhelming with objections based on grounds of congestion and air quality although it seemed to him that a pedestrian crossing might for the reasons above encourage more people to walk to local facilities thereby help to reduce traffic.

Mr Tole confirmed that there would be some loss of parking but some parking would remain. He undertook to investigate whether the length of zig-zags could be shortened. He did not accept comments that the Witney Traffic Advisory Committee had objected to the scheme. Similarly comments from WODC as referred to in paragraph 10 indicated support for new and improved pedestrian facilities although they qualified that support by referring to traffic levels in this particular area. With regard to those concerns traffic flow would depend on numbers using the crossing and as queuing was by and large at peak time it was expected that the effect on air quality would be minimal.

Addressing comments received regarding timing of this scheme in relation to other major projects in Witney such as Shores Green and the West End Link Odele Payne advised that as neither scheme had been confirmed delivery was therefore open ended. As a result the 30,000 vehicle daily flow on Bridge Street would remain suggesting a strong case for a scheme to come forward now rather than wait for major schemes to come forward. Funding for this scheme was available until 2017 and as no decision on other major infrastructure would be taken before then any delay beyond then would mean the finance would be lost. Also there was no guarantee that other major schemes would significantly reduce flows.

The Cabinet Member had visited the site and seen the difficulties being experienced in crossing and although he had some reservations as to the optimum time to install a crossing in advance of other major schemes he was convinced by the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, the representations made to him and the further considerations set out above that such a scheme would be required in the future and as the amount of time for the finance to provide such a scheme was finite the scheme should proceed.. He confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve the proposed zebra crossing on Bridge Street as advertised and set out in the report (CMDE6).

.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

56/14 PROPOSED REMOVAL OF DISABLED PERSONS PARKING PLACE, PLAYING CLOSE, CHARLBURY

(Agenda No. 7)

The Cabinet Member for Environment considered (CMDE7) responses received to a formal consultation on a proposal to remove a disabled persons parking place in The Playing Close, Charlbury.

David Moyes a local resident supported removal of the space in Playing Close. It was rarely used and removal would go some way to alleviating difficulties of parking close to his home largely due to commuter parking at the railway station and reduced parking following introduction of a space outside the Co-op.

Debbie Reeves a local resident also supported removal and confirmed the space was rarely used. In her view it was not needed as there was ample parking at Beechcroft and there was no justification for those residents to lay claim to an additional space on the highway.

Mr Ruse endorsed what both speakers had said regarding levels of use.

The Cabinet Member confirmed he had visited the site on a number of occasions and had never seen the space used. Therefore having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, the representations made to him and the further considerations set out above he confirmed his decision as follows:

to approve the removal of the existing disabled persons parking place in Playing Close (also referred to as Poole’s Lane) as set out in the report (CMDE7).

.....
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

57/14 CHILTERNES AREAS OF NATURAL BEAUTY (AONB) MANAGEMENT PLAN - ENDORSEMENT

(Agenda No. 8)

The Cabinet Member for Environment on behalf of the County Council had been requested to endorse the statutory Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan for 2014-19 in the light of an officer report (CMDE8).

The Cabinet Member confirmed he was the County Council’s representative on the Board and had been involved in various stages of the Plan’s preparation. It was important to endorse the Plan and so having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, he confirmed his decision as follows:

to endorse the Chilterns AONB Management Plan 2014-2019.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

58/14 NORTH WESSEX DOWNS AREAS OF NATURAL BEAUTY (AONB) MANAGEMENT PLAN - ENDORSEMENT

(Agenda No. 9)

The Cabinet Member for Environment on behalf of the County Council had been requested to endorse the statutory North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan for 2014-19 in the light of an officer report (CMDE9).

Councillor Charles Mathew as the County Council’s representative on the Board (and also the Cotswolds AONB Board) referred to the value of these Plans and the work undertaken by the Areas and supported endorsement. However, he highlighted the need for the County Council and District Councils to support the work of AONBs and help protect each one by ensuring that planning applications in a particular AONB area were necessary and he quoted a recent application to the Vale of White Horse in Harwell which affected the North Wessex Downs AONB.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him, the representations made to him and the further considerations set out above the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed his decision as follows:

to endorse the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2014-2019.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

59/14 EXEMPT ITEMS

RESOLVED: that the public be excluded for the duration of items 10E and 11E since it was likely that if they were present during those items there would be disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) and specified below in relation to each item and since it was considered that, in all circumstances of each case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information

60/14 PROCUREMENT EXEMPTION REQUEST FOR COMMUNITY ACTION GROUP (CAG) PROJECT

(Agenda No. 10E)

The information in the report CMDE11E is exempt in that it falls within the following prescribed category:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (Including the authority holding that information)

The Cabinet Member for Environment was being asked to agree an exemption from contract procedure rule 13.3 to extend the Community Action Group for a further 6 months to 30 June 2015 pending confirmation of budgets and a new OJEU procurement process to be completed.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed his decision as follows:

to agree this exemption and authorise the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning) to enter into a 6 month extension with Resource Futures for continued support of the CAG project.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

61/14 TIME EXTENSION FOR AGREEMENT TO RECYCLE STREET SWEEPER WASTE WITH LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

(Agenda No. 11E)

The information in this report is exempt in that it falls within the following prescribed category:

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (Including the authority holding that information)

The Cabinet Member for Environment was being asked to agree an exemption from contract procedure rules 13.2 and 13.3 in order to extend a service level agreement with Leicestershire County Council to continue the recycling of street sweepings and their diversion from landfill whilst the procurement of a County Council contract was completed.

Having regard to the arguments and options set out in the documentation before him the Cabinet Member for Environment confirmed his decision as follows:

.....

to agree the exemption and authorise the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Commercial) to extend the Service Level Agreement with Leicestershire County Council for the recycling of street sweepings as detailed in the report CMDE12E.

Signed
Cabinet Member for Environment

Date of signing.....

.....