



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**COUNCIL  
ADDENDUM**

**4.30PM, THURSDAY, 17 DECEMBER 2015**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, BRIGHTON TOWN HALL**



## ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
<b>56</b>	<b>WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.</b> List of written questions received from members of the public (copy attached).	<b>1 - 2</b>
<b>60</b>	<b>WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS.</b> List of written questions received from Members together with the responses from the Chairs of the respective Committees (copy attached).	<b>3 - 4</b>
<b>64</b>	<b>COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION REVIEW</b> Extract from the proceedings of the Policy & Resources Committee meeting held on the 3 <sup>rd</sup> December 2015 (copy attached).	<b>5 - 8</b>
<b>65</b>	<b>SUPPORT FUNCTIONS REVIEW</b>  Extract from the proceedings of the Policy & Resources Committee meeting held on the 3 <sup>rd</sup> December 2015, together with the terms of reference for the Orbis Joint Committee (copies attached).	<b>9 - 14</b>

### NOTICES OF MOTION

<b>69</b>	<b>THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS TO NOTICES OF MOTION HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS FOR CONSIDERATION:</b>	<b>15 - 20</b>
(b)	<b>Trade Union Bill.</b> Amendment from the Green Group proposed by Councillor Mac Cafferty (copy attached).	15-16
(c)	<b>Multiple Births.</b> Amendment from the Labour & Co-operative Group proposed by Councillor Yates (copy attached).	17-18
(c)	<b>Multiple Births.</b> Amendment from the Green Group proposed by Councillor Mac Cafferty (copy attached).	19-20



**WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

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

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

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

**(a) Ms. V. Paynter**

“At clause 8.12.1, Supplementary Planning Guidance note SPGBH15 provides for "mid-rise" tall buildings along the Kingsway in Hove which is a designated corridor, suitable to take tall buildings. May I have, please, a definition of what is meant by "mid-rise" and how many storeys over what height this definition would allow?”

**Councillor Morgan, Leader of the Council will reply.**

**(b) Mr. C. Hawtree**

If, Heaven forbid, Hove's Carnegie Library is sold, what Use Class would it have?

**Councillor Morgan, Leader of the Council will reply.**

**(c) Mr. O. Sharpe**

“This council set up the Fairness Commission “to make sure that everyone has ... an opportunity to lead healthy and productive lives.” It will ‘make a difference’ because “The findings will inform the council's budgets”.

Last Thursday the Fairness Commission looked at the life chances of disadvantaged children and young people. Even the introductory text noted “the benefits of early intervention to improve children's life chances”.

Will the council therefore commit to waiting until the commission has reported in summer 2016 before considering any cuts to front line services that deliver early intervention for children with special educational needs?”

**Councillor Bewick, Chair of the Children, Young People & Skills Committee will reply.**

**(d) Ms. A. Jenkins**

“With our neighbouring local authorities continuing to recognise the value of qualified Teachers of the Deaf, employing them under teachers' pay and conditions, can the Lead Councillor for CYPS explain how the service in our city will not be affected if Brighton and Hove's Teachers of the Deaf, living in a city with very high living costs, are redefined as advisors, their pay and conditions cut and they find themselves forced to leave this authority, in order to do the job they've trained for and given so many dedicated years to?”

**Councillor Bewick, Chair of the Children, Young People & Skills Committee will reply.**

**(e) Ms. A. Duffy**

“One of the major arguments for moving Teachers of the Deaf off their teachers' contracts onto the Soulbury scale is the idea that these teachers are not offering a holiday service and should be moved onto a contract that offers year round cover. Is the Lead Councillor aware that that is not the case with Teachers of the Deaf in our city, for whom it is standard practise to visit a newly identified deaf child within days of diagnosis, whatever time of year, offer support to families and attend multi-agency meetings throughout the holidays?”

**Councillor Bewick, Chair of the Children, Young People & Skills Committee will reply.**

**(f) Ms. S. Cox**

“Considering the high levels of engagement and anxiety from parents and families can the Lead Councillor now commit to a formal consultation of stakeholders, parents and most importantly service users on changes to the Sensory Needs Service?”

**Councillor Bewick, Chair of the Children, Young People & Skills Committee will reply.**

**WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

The following questions listed on pages 51 - 52 of the agenda have been received from Councillors and will be taken as read along with the written answers listed below:

**(a) Councillor Taylor**

“Will the Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee estimate the cost of installing single yellow lines per metre and the cost of their enforcement?”

**Reply from Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.**

“The cost of installing single yellow lines is approximately £10 per metre but this doesn't include the legal traffic order cost (depends on amount of proposals within the order which we batch up for economies of scale) and the signing involved (about £100 per sign required).

The enforcement costs cannot be worked out per metre as we don't work costing from the contract on this basis.”

**(b) Councillor Simson**

“At a recent meeting of the Children, Young People and Skills Committee the Chair stated that it was the Administration's policy not to agree any amendments to recommendations put forward in Committee reports. Will this policy be consistent across all Committees for the remainder of the Administration's term?”

**Reply from Councillor Morgan, Leader of the Council.**

“I can confirm that the Administration recognises the right of any Councillor to put forward an amendment for consideration. Indeed we are happy to discuss any proposed changes to recommendations prior to a meeting which may lead to an improvement. At the recent Children, Young People and Skills Committee, Councillor Daniel, as a committee member, was representing the view that the Labour Group Members did not feel that the proposed amendment under discussion was substantively improving the recommendation, because the recommendation as it stood covered the scenario that the amendment related to, but did not name any specific provider. You will note that the administration abstained rather than voted against the amendment for that reason, which allowed the amendment to go through. There was no intention to suggest that there had been a change of policy in respect to amendments to recommendations, which anyway would have to go to the Council's Constitutional Working Group.”

**(c) Councillor G. Theobald**

“What does the Council do to monitor the reliability of bus services in the City and do they work with the bus companies to try and improve this?”

**Reply from Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.**

“Bus companies are required to supply an annual punctuality figure to the council. The Key Performance Indicator figure, which is then supplied to the Department of Transport, was 85.5% for 2014-15. The figure was slightly lower than the previous year’s figure of 89.4% because of the number of road works that were temporarily impacting on the bus network (including North Street and Brighton Station), combined with the essential partial closure of the A259 west of Brighton Pier for structural works.

The council employs a bus inspector to monitor the performance of supported bus services, which represent 3% of the city’s bus network. 97% of the bus network is operated commercially: the council does not monitor them but does work with the bus operators, through the Quality Bus Partnership as well as the Transport Partnership, to tackle issues which impact on the reality of bus services.”



**Subject:** Extract from the proceedings of the Policy & Resources Committee meeting held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2015 - Council Tax Reduction Review

**Date of Meeting:** 17 December 2015

**Report of:** Head of Legal & Democratic Services & Monitoring Officer

**Contact Officer:** Name: **Ross Keatley** Tel: **29-1064**  
E-mail: [ross.keatley@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:ross.keatley@brighton-hove.gov.uk)

**Wards Affected:** All

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE*****Action Required of Council:***

To receive the report referred from the Policy & Resources for decision.

**Recommendations:**

- 1) That it be noted that the Council undertook formal consultation as a part of this review and that as part of the formal consultation a draft scheme was published and people were invited to give their views on that scheme;
- 2) That the outcome of that consultation (appendix 1) which has been summarised in section 5.4 be noted;
- 3) That it be noted that an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) (appendix 2) has been undertaken on the proposed changes in the draft scheme and the recommendations in this report. It should further note that, to meet their Public Sector Equality Duty, members must give conscientious consideration to the findings of this assessment when making a decision on the recommendations in 2.9.1 – 2.9.4. The actions which will be undertaken as a result of this EIA are set out in section 7.4.
- 4) That it be noted that the Chief Finance Officer (s151) will, prior to 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016, exercise delegated powers to increase the appropriate calculative elements of the scheme to give effect to national changes.

**Proposed scheme from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016**

- i. The changes set out in 2.9.2 and 2.9.3 are made to the Council Tax Reduction Scheme (Persons who are not Pensioners)(Brighton & Hove City Council) 2013 to take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016.
- ii. That people on CTR will receive up to an 80% discount on their Council

Tax meaning the minimum contribution people of working age pay towards their Council Tax be changed from 15% to 20%.

- iii. For customers entitled to CTR on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016 transitional protection be provided until either the claim ends; the customer moves property; or 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017 (which ever occurs first) to minimise the increase paid by any household to £1.65 per week inclusive of the separately agreed Council Tax rise as a result of the change set out in 2.9.2 only.
- iv. The discretionary fund used to support the CTR scheme be set at a minimum of £0.1m and maintained at the 2015/16 level of £0.15m through the use of up to £0.05m from the Welfare Reform reserve.

## BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

### POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

4.00pm 3 DECEMBER 2015

#### AUDITORIUM - THE BRIGHTELM CENTRE

#### MINUTES

**Present:** Councillors Morgan (Chair), Hamilton (Deputy Chair), G Theobald (Opposition Spokesperson), Mac Cafferty (Group Spokesperson), Janio, Meadows, Mitchell, A Norman, Sykes and Wealls

#### PART ONE

### 82 COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION REVIEW

82.1 The Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director for Finance & Resources in relation to Council Tax Reduction Review. The Council introduced a local Council Tax Reduction scheme from 1 April 2013 as a result of national changes localising the previous Council Tax Benefit system. Under legislation the Council Tax Reduction Scheme must be reviewed each year. The purpose of the report was to set out that review the resulting recommendations.

82.2 Councillor Mac Cafferty expressed concern in relation to the report as he felt it would have an adverse impact on some of the poorest residents in the city; he felt the full implications of the decision before the Committee were not clearly set out in the report; which could lead to potential legal challenge and the conclusions drawn in the report did not reflect the consultation responses that had been received. Councillor Mac Cafferty reiterated his concern that the report did not accurately reflect the full impact of the proposed decisions.

- 82.3 In response to issue of potential legal challenge the Head of Legal & Democratic Services stated he was of the view that the Council had complied with the legal requirement to consult.
- 82.4 Councillor Sykes stated that the report needed to be considered in the context of the reduction in support from Central Government and the impact would be felt by the poorest families in the city; he highlighted the further complication of the issue when personal allowances were considered. He stated that increasing the minimum liability made it more difficult for families when Council Tax was increased and reduced the flexibility to be more creative with how Council Tax operated.
- 82.5 Councillor Hamilton highlighted that consultation had been undertaken with every recipient of Council Tax Reduction, but that exercise had only received a 2% rate of response which was not considered a reliable guide. He went on to highlight the £1.4m that the Administration were committing towards the scheme and, whilst there was an increase, this was low and had been the product of very careful consideration.
- 82.6 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote:
- 82.7 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee:

- 1) Notes that the Council undertook formal consultation as a part of this review and that as part of the formal consultation a draft scheme was published and people were invited to give their views on that scheme.
- 2) Notes the outcome of that consultation (appendix 1) which has been summarised in section 5.4.
- 3) Notes that an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) (appendix 2) has been undertaken on the proposed changes in the draft scheme and the recommendations set out in 2.9.2 – 2.9.4 in this report. The committee should further note that, to meet their Public Sector Equality Duty, members must give conscientious consideration to the findings of this assessment when making a decision on the recommendations in 2.9.1 – 2.9.4. The actions which will be undertaken as a result of this EIA are set out in section 7.4.
- 4) Notes that the Chief Finance Officer (s151) will, prior to 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016, exercise delegated powers to increase the appropriate calculative elements of the scheme to give effect to national changes.

#### **RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL**

- 5) It notes that the Council undertook formal consultation as a part of this review and that as part of the formal consultation a draft scheme was published and people were invited to give their views on that scheme.
- 6) It notes the outcome of that consultation (appendix 1) which has been summarised in section 5.4.

- 7) It notes that an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) (appendix 2) has been undertaken on the proposed changes in the draft scheme and the recommendations in this report. It should further note that, to meet their Public Sector Equality Duty, members must give conscientious consideration to the findings of this assessment when making a decision on the recommendations in 2.9.1 – 2.9.4. The actions which will be undertaken as a result of this EIA are set out in section 7.4.
- 8) It notes that the Chief Finance Officer (s151) will, prior to 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016, exercise delegated powers to increase the appropriate calculative elements of the scheme to give effect to national changes.

#### **Proposed scheme from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016**

- i. The changes set out in 2.9.2 and 2.9.3 are made to the Council Tax Reduction Scheme (Persons who are not Pensioners)(Brighton & Hove City Council) 2013 to take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016.
- ii. That people on CTR will receive up to an 80% discount on their Council Tax meaning the minimum contribution people of working age pay towards their Council Tax be changed from 15% to 20%.
- iii. For customers entitled to CTR on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016 transitional protection be provided until either the claim ends; the customer moves property; or 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017 (which ever occurs first) to minimise the increase paid by any household to £1.65 per week inclusive of the separately agreed Council Tax rise as a result of the change set out in 2.9.2 only.
- iv. The discretionary fund used to support the CTR scheme be set at a minimum of £0.1m and maintained at the 2015/16 level of £0.15m through the use of up to £0.05m from the Welfare Reform reserve.

<b>Council</b>	<b>Agenda Item 65</b>
17 <sup>th</sup> December 2015	Brighton & Hove City Council

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Extract from the proceedings of the Policy &amp; Resources Committee meeting held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2015 – Support Functions Review</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>17 December 2015</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Head of Legal &amp; Democratic Services &amp; Monitoring Officer</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name: Ross Keatley</b>	<b>Tel: 29-1064</b>	
	E-mail: <a href="mailto:ross.keatley@brighton-hove.gov.uk">ross.keatley@brighton-hove.gov.uk</a>		
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All		

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE**

<b><i>Action Required of Council:</i></b> To receive the report referred from the Policy & Resources for decision.
<b>Recommendations:</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) That Brighton &amp; Hove City Council joins the Orbis Joint Committee as a founding partner, with the terms of reference as set out in appendix 2 (as they now stand) subject to necessary modifications to reflect expanded membership and the Council's committee system.</li> <li>2) That it appoints Councillor Les Hamilton to the Orbis Joint Committee on behalf of Brighton &amp; Hove City Council.</li> <li>3) That subject to Council agreeing to recommendation 2.5 in the report and satisfactory due diligence, delegate the power to enter into the inter-authority agreement and the power to make the final decision on operational changes to the Chief Executive, Section 151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer and authorise the same to take all steps necessary or incidental to the implementation of the recommendations.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Note:</b> Since the meeting of the Policy &amp; Resources Committee, officers have agreed the terms of reference of the Orbis Joint Committee with their counterparts at East Sussex and Surrey, which are attached as an appendix 1 to the extracts.</p> <p>The Council is therefore also recommended to:</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Approve the terms of reference of the Orbis Joint Committee as detailed in the appendix 1;</li> <li>2) To agree to the appointment of a substitute Member of the Joint Committee as designated by the Leader of the Council and notified to the Chief Executive.</li> </ol>

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL  
POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**4.00pm 3 DECEMBER 2015**

**AUDITORIUM - THE BRIGHTELM CENTRE**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Morgan (Chair), Hamilton (Deputy Chair), G Theobald (Opposition Spokesperson), Mac Cafferty (Group Spokesperson), Janio, Meadows, Mitchell, A Norman, Sykes and Wealls.

**PART ONE**

**85 SUPPORT FUNCTIONS REVIEW**

- 85.1 The Committee considered a report of the Interim Executive Director for Finance & Resources in relation to Support Services Review. The report updated the Committee on the outcome of the Support Function Review; the report recommended that the Council become a founding partner of Orbis, which was currently establishing as a joint committee of East Sussex County Council and Surrey County Council to provide a full range of support functions.
- 85.2 In response to queries from Councillor Mac Cafferty the Interim Executive Director explained that the terms of reference would need to be updated to reflect that each authority would have one lead Member on the Joint Committee. The report highlighted that the Orbis option was currently the most compelling, but this did not rule out service by service reviews if outsourcing became a more viable option. Each authority in the partnership would retain its own sovereignty through the appropriate governance process. Assurance was also provided that the trade unions had been engaged, and would continue to be, in the process.
- 85.3 Councillor Wealls welcomed the report, but expressed some concerns in relation to where the control would lie and whether one authority would take a lead in the process. In response to Interim Executive Director explained that it was envisaged there would be a functional lead for each service from one of the authorities involved; any future decision on staffing levels would need to be made through each of the authorities own governance arrangements and in the case of Brighton & Hove, would go through the Policy & Resources Committee.

- 85.4 In response to Councillor Janio the Interim Executive Director explained that the process of due diligence would manage issues around specialisation and duplication of work; the Chief Executive added that the Orbis option was considered the most robust option in the longer term given the 30% savings targets identified for support services.
- 85.5 Councillor A. Norman highlighted that she was also considering the report in her role as Chair of the Audit & Standards Committee, and she felt the Council would not lose influence by joining the Orbis partnership. She added there was scope to widen the membership and potentially include district councils and noted that the joint venture would offer a means for staff to increase their skills base. She considered the proposals in the report to be the best way forward given the options.
- 85.6 Councillor Sykes highlighted that it was important the Council entered the arrangements as an equal partner, and he asked Officers to consider that any arrangements should use the same 10-1 ratio that the Council operated for salaries of the highest and lowest paid employee.
- 86.7 Councillor Hamilton noted that other Members, from the other authorities, would be Executive Members and likely be able to take decisions in their own right; in the case of Brighton & Hove decisions would need to come back to the Policy & Resources Committee.
- 85.8 Councillor G. Theobald noted that the Conservative Group would support the report; but added that this did not go far enough in terms of achieving more joint ventures with other authorities.
- 85.9 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote:
- 85.10 **RESOLVED** – That the Committee:
- 1) Note the update on the wider Support Functions Review, as detailed in this paper.
  - 2) Agrees that the council enters into an intra-authority agreement with the Orbis partners.
  - 3) Agrees that the following BHCC services partner with Orbis:
    - ICT
    - Internal Audit & Corporate Fraud
    - Human Resources & Organisational Development
    - Property & Design
    - Finance & Procurement
    - Revenues & Benefits
  - 4) Agrees that these services are delivered through Orbis as soon as practicable, with the timing of operational changes being subject to due diligence.

**RESOLVES TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL** – That:

- 1) Brighton & Hove City Council joins the Orbis Joint Committee as a founding partner, with the terms of reference as set out in appendix 2 (as they now stand) subject to necessary modifications to reflect expanded membership and the Council's committee system.
- 2) It appoints Cllr Les Hamilton to the Orbis Joint Committee on behalf of BHCC.
- 3) Subject to Council agreeing to recommendation 2.5 in the report and satisfactory due diligence, delegate the power to enter into the inter-authority agreement and the power to make the final decision on operational changes to the Chief Executive, Section 151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer and authorise the same to take all steps necessary or incidental to the implementation of the recommendations.



## **Orbis Joint Committee Terms of Reference**

### **Membership:**

1. The Committee shall comprise of Members appointed by the constituent authorities (Currently Brighton & Hove City Council, East Sussex County Council and Surrey County Council.) Each authority shall appoint one Member to the Committee in accordance with its constitution.
2. Each Councils Leader (or in the case of Brighton & Hove City Council, the Council) may appoint one substitute Member to attend meetings of the Joint Committee, should an appointed member of the Committee be unavailable or unable to attend a meeting of the Joint Committee. A substitute Member attending in the absence of an appointed Member will have full voting rights.

### **Terms of Reference:**

The Orbis Joint Committee will:

1. Oversee the delivery of the services delivered jointly through the Orbis partnership of Brighton & Hove City Council, East Sussex County Council and Surrey County Council ('Orbis').
2. Recommend proposals to meet the annual budget for Orbis, set by each of Brighton & Hove City Council, East Sussex County Council and Surrey County Council.
3. Approve the Orbis Business Plan and performance measures
4. Monitor the Orbis Business Plan and performance of Orbis
5. Make recommendations to the constituent authorities regarding revisions to the Terms of Reference of the Orbis Joint Committee

### **Meetings of the Committee:**

The Orbis Joint Committee will meet on four occasions a year, unless a different number of meetings is determined by the Committee



**NOTICE OF MOTION****GREEN GROUP - AMENDMENT****TRADE UNION BILL**

To add an additional recommendation as shown below in bold italics; that reads:

***“Support the Heart Unions week of action on 8-14 February 2016.”***

Proposed by: Councillor Mac Cafferty

Seconded by: Councillor Littman

**Revised motion:**

This Council notes with concern the Trade Union Bill which would adversely affect this Council's relationship with its trade unions and its workforce.

This Council recognises the positive contribution that trade unions and trade union members make in the workplace. The Council values the constructive relationship that it has with the trade unions and recognises their commitment, and that of staff, to the delivery of good quality public services in Brighton and Hove.

This Council is content with the arrangements currently in place for deducting trade union membership subscriptions through payroll. This is an important part of maintaining positive industrial relations and a simple way to administer a system that supports employees. This system is an administrative matter for the Council and should not be interfered with by the Government in Westminster.

This council resolves to:

- Request the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills stating the Council's opposition to the Government's Trade Union Bill.
- Request the Policy & Resources Committee to continue the council's own locally agreed industrial relations strategy, take every measure possible to maintain its autonomy and;
  - (i) To maintain the current facility that recognised trade unions can have subscriptions deducted through payroll, unless legally obliged not to, in which case the Council will support trade unions' efforts to move members onto direct debit.
  - (ii) Maintain an adequate level of release time for Trade Union representatives.
- Support the Heart Unions week of action on 8-14 February 2016.



<b>Council</b>	<b>Agenda Item 69 (c)</b>
17 <sup>th</sup> December 2015	Brighton & Hove City Council

## NOTICE OF MOTION

### LABOUR & CO-OPERATIVE GROUP - AMENDMENT

#### MULTIPLE BIRTHS

To delete the words 'NHS England' in point 2 as struck through and insert '*Brighton and Hove CCG*' and to add a further point 3 as shown in bold italics below.

This Council notes with regret figures from the Twins & Multiple Births Association (Tamba) which state that multiple pregnancies make up 3% of all births but account for more than 7% of stillbirths and 14% of neonatal deaths.

This Council notes the £3.8bn of additional funding for the NHS allocated for 2016/17 announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and resolves to:

1. Call on NHS England to consider the allocation of funds for further assistance to parents who have experienced multiple births and investigate improvements in care to reduce the number of stillbirths and neonatal deaths.
2. Request the Chief Executive to write to ~~NHS England~~ ***Brighton and Hove CCG*** to ask to what degree the clinical guidance and quality standards published by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) have been implemented in Brighton and Hove.
3. ***Request the Health and Wellbeing Board ensure that a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment on Multiple Births is added to the work programme.***

Proposed by: Councillor Yates

Seconded by: Councillor Barradell

#### Revised Motion:

This Council notes with regret figures from the Twins & Multiple Births Association (Tamba) which state that multiple pregnancies make up 3% of all births but account for more than 7% of stillbirths and 14% of neonatal deaths.

This Council notes the £3.8bn of additional funding for the NHS allocated for 2016/17 announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and resolves to:

1. Call on NHS England to consider the allocation of funds for further assistance to parents who have experienced multiple births and investigate improvements in care to reduce the number of stillbirths and neonatal deaths.
2. Request the Chief Executive to write to Brighton and Hove CCG to ask to what degree the clinical guidance and quality standards published by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) have been implemented in Brighton and Hove.
3. Request the Health and Wellbeing Board ensure that a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment on Multiple Births is added to the work programme.



**NOTICE OF MOTION****GREEN GROUP - AMENDMENT****MULTIPLE BIRTHS**

To remove paragraph 2 and points 1 and 2 as struck through, and to add a new paragraph as shown below in bold italics;

This Council notes with regret figures from the Twins & Multiple Births Association (Tamba) which state that multiple pregnancies make up 3% of all births but account for more than 7% of stillbirths and 14% of neonatal deaths.

~~This Council notes the £3.8bn of additional funding for the NHS allocated for 2016/17 announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and resolves to:~~

- ~~1. Call on NHS England to consider the allocation of funds for further assistance to parents who have experienced multiple births and investigate improvements in care to reduce the number of stillbirths and neonatal deaths.~~
- ~~2. Request the Chief Executive to write to NHS England to ask to what degree the clinical guidance and quality standards published by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) have been implemented in Brighton and Hove.~~

***This Council requests that the Brighton and Hove Health & Wellbeing Board commissions a report from the Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England to review the performance of local health services for multiple births, then consider any further appropriate action.***

Proposed by: Councillor Mac Cafferty      Seconded by: Councillor Phillips

**Revised Motion:**

This Council notes with regret figures from the Twins & Multiple Births Association (Tamba) which state that multiple pregnancies make up 3% of all births but account for more than 7% of stillbirths and 14% of neonatal deaths.

This Council requests that the Brighton and Hove Health & Wellbeing Board commissions a report from the Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England to review the performance of local health services for multiple births, then consider any further appropriate action.

