

From: colinbbennett <colinbbennett@onetel.com>
To: colin@bennett.uk.com
Date: Tue, Apr 13, 2004, 2:40 PM
Subject: Fwd: St James's Place, Brighton

Begin forwarded message:

> From: "British Toilet Association" <enquiries@britloos.co.uk>
> Date: Thu Mar 25, 2004 4:42:28 pm Europe/London
> To: "colinbbennett" <colinbbennett@onetel.com>
> Subject: Re: St James's Place, Brighton

> Mr Bennett

> Many thanks for your e-mail.

> The BTA is fully aware of the toilet closures and related problems
> that are
> happening all over Britain and we are trying to prevent these and
> alert all
> parties to the need to raise standards of all 'away from home' toilets.

> We have taken note of your comments, which will help build our
> campaigning
> platform.

> Regards

> Richard Chisnell

> Director, BTA

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: "colinbbennett" <colinbbennett@onetel.com>
> To: <info@planningsanity.co.uk>
> Cc: <ashbrookk@aol.com>; <eugenes@london.ramblers.org.uk>;
> <enquiries@britloos.co.uk>
> Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2004 3:04 PM
> Subject: St James's Place, Brighton

>> Dear Chris Maile of Planning Sanity

>> I'm taking you up on your kind offer to further assist in this
>> matter.

>> I believe a big principle is at stake; namely the privatisation of
>> public highways to suit the particular interests of local house owners
>> and perhaps to relieve the Council of its responsibilities towards
>> those highways. You will recall that I sent you a copy of my letter to

>> Brighton and Hove Council's environment Committee. That letter was
 >> heavily based on your advice and you approved it.
 >> I attach below three documents from the Council's website. You will
 >> see that they do not address most of the points I raise in my letter.
 >> I
 >> suspect that the Council is minded to privatise St James's Place and
 >> is
 >> using what I see as illegal means to do so. The main applicant is a Mr
 >> Hari Virk, a solicitor. It is fair to say that he is not universally
 >> well regarded. I draw your attention to the sentence "The Council as
 >> highway authority cannot grant any 'rights' as it would have no
 >> interest in the land after the stopping-up order was confirmed." This
 >> must mean that should the stopping-up order be confirmed, St James's
 >> Place becomes private property without even a right of way over it.
 >> Hitherto the Council has led me to believe that the only effect of the
 >> stopping-up order would be to restrict the rights of way during
 >> essentially the hours of darkness.
 >> I believe it's a unique idea that a highway being a cul-de-sac
 >> renders
 >> it not suitable highway for the public other than those who live in
 >> houses abutting the highway. Any town has a great number of
 >> "cul-de-sacs" which might lend themselves to stopping up if this
 >> bizarre principle were employed. One can think of several squares and
 >> cul-de-sacs in the Inns of Court area of central London. Of course,
 >> more and more streets in urban areas are being made cul-de-sacs
 >> (certainly for motor traffic) all the time.
 >> I do wish to fight on this as a matter of national interest. A
 >> friend
 >> of mine heard a short item from "Living Streets" on Radio 5 Live
 >> recently. It seems they are concerned about the growth of "gated
 >> communities" and of course the proposed stopping up of St James's
 >> Street is an attempt to create a gated community. Perhaps it might be
 >> a
 >> good idea to go for a full public enquiry to get the matter aired. I
 >> hope to get Living Streets involved (by chance I am a member) and
 >> perhaps to encourage interest by national newspapers with an
 >> environmental bent eg Guardian, Independent.
 >> I'm game for this!
 >>
 >> Best wishes
 >>
 >> Colin Bennett
 >>
 >> Please note I have sent this from my other email machine. It's
 >> slightly
 >> better to reply to my normal email address - colin@bennett.uk.com
 >>
 >>
 >
 >