



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

# **COUNCIL ADDENDUM**

**4.30PM, THURSDAY, 21 JULY 2016**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, BRIGHTON TOWN HALL**



# ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
16	<b>WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.</b>	1 - 2
	List of written questions received from members of the public (copy attached).	
17	<b>DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.</b>	3 - 10
	List of deputations received from members of the public (copies attached).	
18	<b>PETITIONS FOR COUNCIL DEBATE</b>	11 - 12
	<b>(a) Reintroduce Scratch Card Voucher Parking.</b> Proposed Green Group Amendment (copy attached)	
19	<b>WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS.</b>	13 - 16
	List of written questions received from Members together with the responses from the Chairs of the respective Committees (copy attached).	
23	<b>THE FOLLOWING NOTICES OF MOTION HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS FOR CONSIDERATION:</b>	17 - 30
	<b>(b) Government Education Policy.</b> Proposed Green Group Amendment (copy attached)	
	<b>(c) Rail Crisis.</b> Proposed Labour & Co-Operative Group Amendment proposed Conservative Group Amendment and proposed Green Group Amendment (copies attached).	
	<b>(d) Rottingdean Air Quality.</b> Proposed Green Group Amendment (copy attached)	
	<b>(e) Estate Agent's Board Regulation 7 Area Extension.</b> Proposed Labour & Co-Operative Group Amendment (copy attached).	
	<b>(g) Impact of Brexit.</b> Proposed Labour & Co-Operative Group Amendment (copy attached).	



**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) Christopher Hawtree**

“Would Councillor Morgan please tell us when work will commence in situ upon the reconfiguration of, and improvements to, Valley Gardens - and the envisaged completion date?”

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

**(b) Nigel Furness**

“In line with the spirit of democracy so clearly expressed in the recent Referendum on Britain's withdrawal from the European Union, could the Leader of this Council please inform us when the flags of the European Union will be removed from all Council buildings?”

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



**DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting of the Council for the hearing of deputations from members of the public. Each deputation may be heard for a maximum of five minutes following which one Member of the Council, nominated by the Mayor, may speak in response. It shall then be moved by the Mayor and voted on without discussion that the deputation be thanked for attending and its subject matter noted.

Notification of two Deputation(s) has been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

**(a) Deputation concerning Woodingdean Traffic Management  
Spokesperson Mr Stephen Roke**

Supported by: Mr J Homewood, Mr J P Amos, Mrs S Streeter, Mr P Barnard

**(b) Deputation concerning the proposed Sustainability and Transformation Plan  
Spokesperson Madeleine Dickens**

Supported by: Ken Kirk, Mitch Alexander, Carl Walker Tony Graham, Stephen Maclean





## **Deputation concerning Woodingdean Traffic Management Spokesperson – Ms. Rachel Furno**

Mr Mayor and Councillors,

I am a member of the Woodingdean Tenants and Residents Association committee and have been asked by concerned residents to attend this Council meeting, to ask the Council to acknowledge that the level of traffic passing through the village is causing real issues for the residents of Woodingdean, with the high volume of vehicles queuing twice a day, pollution levels surrounding the persistent queues in the mornings and evenings, and dangerous driving by some individuals trying to avoid the queues.

The deputation would like to ask the Council for an explanation, as to why there was a change to agreed traffic flows from the original plans under request number BH2011/02886 (agreed in 28/03/2012) to the information and plans told to a recent public meeting held in Woodingdean on the 30<sup>th</sup> June 2016 and given by Brighton & Hove representatives Mark Prior – Assistant Director, City Transport, David Parker – Head of Transport Projects, Jeff Elliott – Highway & Traffic Manager, along with Richard Beard - 3Ts Head of Communication and Engagement with the NHS and Jonathan Abbott from the building contractors Laing O'Rourke.

There have been no discussions or involvement or public information to residents given out on this change in traffic management. It seems to have been passed without public consultation.

We urge the Council to review the traffic management arrangements for the next ten years in Woodingdean, which will be exacerbated now for the foreseeable future with an additional 100+ heavy commercial vehicles, light commercial vehicles and staff cars that will be supporting the hospital development, travelling through Woodingdean twice a day, in addition to the current situation created by the Lewes Road development, to which Woodingdean residents were not involved or surveyed. We need significant changes made to ensure the safety of the residents, and the future traffic management of the village.

Thank you for your attention.

Supported by:

- Mr S W Roke, Mr J Homewood, Mr J P Amos, Mrs S Streeter and Mr P Barnard
- The 167 residents who turned up to the public meeting, held on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2016 at the Woodingdean Community Centre
- The remainder of like-minded Woodingdean residents who could not attend
- The Committee of the Woodingdean Tenants and Residents Association, as one voice representing the 4,000+ households in Woodingdean who drive, catch the bus or cycle through these traffic problems on a daily basis.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Roke, on behalf of the above residents



## **Deputation concerning proposed Sustainability and Transformation Plan Spokesperson – Madeleine Dickens**

### **Summary of financial arrangements imposed by NHS England**

- Comparisons of percentages of GDP spent on health and social care.
- Although the government fulfilled its NHS funding commitment – with funding increasing by an average of 0.8 per cent per year in real terms – the increases delivered were less than the estimated growth of 3 to 4 per cent per year required to meet higher costs of new medical technologies and increases in demand for health care. Over the same period local government has seen a [real reduction in spending on adult social care of 12%](#).
- Sustainability and transformation fund – the fallacy
- All but one of the 44 STPs is in deficit overall, according to research carried out by the HSJ, and about a third have deficits of more than 4% of their turnover. The STP must show how local services will become sustainable over the next five years. It must set out initiatives to manage demand, increase provider efficiency, reconfigure services and, the most important of all, balance the budget in the local area.
- The Kings Fund has said “It is inconceivable that the NHS will be able to achieve both financial sustainability and large-scale transformation within these financial constraints.”

### **Equalities impact, democracy and STP**

STP was imposed and draft plans submitted on the 30<sup>th</sup> June with no parliamentary oversight or mandate, no consultation, and by their own admission - no legal status.

There is already a rapidly growing equality gap in the health and social care economy – successive cuts and privatisation taking their toll on local services. The Public health department budget has reduced by 18%, projected to rise to 25% by 2020, since its re-creation under the Health and Social Care Act. Major services have gone out to non LA contractors, Children’s and young people’s services currently out to tender. At the same time, 9 GP practices across the city have closed (with more closures looming)...list of further services affected. These developments inevitably have the biggest impact on the most vulnerable and those most in need living in the most deprived neighbourhoods. With the level of savings necessary to balance the STP budget this equality “gap” can only widen further.

### **Local Democracy**

To break even STP Boards are going to have to implement massive change – the selling-off of NHS estate and land, workforce reductions, the even greater influx of private companies, with serious implications for local communities and the local economy. Yet in April the LGA no less highlighted the democratic deficit underlying STP, criticising -

“Pace of implementation undermining local ownership and squeezing out LA and community involvement.

Lack of democratic accountability, eroding the role of HWBs

Footprints over-ride devolution or local govt transformation boundaries.

Angry concern is being expressed by some HWBs and other bodies about STP.

### **Requested action**

- This submission be referred to the OSC to request a copy of the draft STPlan, gather evidence on its implications and to make recommendations to full council.
- The full council recommends that the HWB call public consultation meetings on STP at the earliest opportunity.
- The council look at the best means of soliciting the opinion of city residents on the tendering out of local NHS services along the lines of the University of Brighton Citizens’ Health services survey examining attitudes to privatisation.

## Background paper - NHS Funding and NHS England's Sustainability and Transformation Plans

1. The UK currently spends 8.8% of its GDP on health services. This compares with an OECD average of 8.9%, Greece spends 9.1%, France 10.9%, Germany 11%, and the big spender US 16.4%. It is true that of that proportion of UK's GDP most is public funding, but this is also the case with all other countries. So don't let's get carried away with the idea that we are big spenders on health – **we're not**. In fact under government's plans the GDP proportion spent on the UK's health is set to fall to 6.7% by 2021. **This will make us one of the lowest health spenders in the world.**
2. In 2015 the politically neutral Kings Fund said of the Coalition government  
Although the government fulfilled its NHS funding commitment – with funding increasing by an average of 0.8 per cent per year in real terms – the increases it delivered were less than the estimated growth of 3 to 4 per cent per year required to meet higher costs of new medical technologies and increases in demand for health care. Over the same period local government has seen a **real reduction in spending on adult social care of 12 per cent**. (1)  
So, to meet increasing demand the NHS requires a 3-4% budget increase, and it got 0.8% while at the same time adult social care had 12% reductions in its budget. This resulted in most hospital trusts falling into colossal deficits (2) of £2.8 billion, to pay for bills, staff wages, energy bills and drugs; unprecedented in the history of the health service.
3. The STP (3) must show how local services will become sustainable over the next five years. It must set out initiatives to manage demand, increase provider efficiency, reconfigure services and, the most important of all, balance the budget in the local area.
4. So NHS England is demanding that trusts must absorb the deficit, accumulated because of underfunding through the Coalition years, in their plans for the next five years and prove that they balance the books. So trusts ability to meet the demands for services in the next 5 years will be hampered by having to absorb the previous 5 years' deficit.
5. There is funding available for the STPs, known as the **Sustainability and Transformation Fund (STF)**. This fund is held by NHS England, but it is ring-fenced and can only be released with agreement from both the Department of Health and HM Treasury. The fund is released quarterly, in arrears, to the organisations in the STP footprint.
6. Other funding available for transformation is held by NHS England and this has been added to the pot (amounting to £339 million in 2016/17), creating a total Sustainability and Transformation Fund of £2.1 billion for 2016/17. The fund grows to reach £3.4 billion by 2020/21.
7. The catch is that none of this funding is available unless the STP footprint can show that it is able to balance its books. For 2016/17 the providers (NHS trusts) must show they are cutting their deficits and demonstrate that the plan leads to staying within their budget for 2016/17. The STP must then work to keep the footprint within its budget for the next four years in order to qualify for further funding from the STF.
8. The STPs bring together NHS trusts that are in a very difficult position financially, with almost all of them in deficit, with other organisations, including CCGs, most of which are not in deficit, although not flush with money either. The result is that the overall

financial situation of the STP footprints is very poor; all but one of the 44 STPs is in deficit overall, according to research carried out by [the HSJ](#), and about a third have deficits of more than 4% of their turnover.

9. *Anita Charlesworth, chief economist at the Health Foundation, has noted that, “ turning that sort of financial performance around when there are so many other underlying issues is an enormous if not impossible task.”*  
The normally cautious Kings Fund has said “It is inconceivable that the NHS will be able to achieve both financial sustainability and large-scale transformation within these financial constraints.” (4)
10. The first tranche of money from the £2.1 billion STF for 2016/17 has already been allocated to NHS trusts, however due to the dire finances of the trusts, [all £1.8 billion will be spent on bailing out the providers’ deficits.](#)
11. The government through NHS England is therefore set to limit the range of services provided, downgrade the quality of remaining services, more often than not provided by private profit-seeking companies, with reductions in staffing levels involving even lower morale with industrial disputes on an unprecedented level. What we are witnessing is the contraction of a health service from one driven by patient need and heralded by the Commonwealth Fund as the best in the world (5), to one controlled primarily by impossible financial targets.

## References

1. <http://www.kingsfund.org.uk/projects/verdict/nhs-heading-financial-crisis>
2. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/jul/17/nhs-hospitals-borrowed-record-28bn-from-government-last-year>
3. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/2015/12/long-term-approach/>
4. [http://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/files/kf/field/field\\_publication\\_file/Planning-guidance-briefing-Kings-Fund-February-2016.pdf](http://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/files/kf/field/field_publication_file/Planning-guidance-briefing-Kings-Fund-February-2016.pdf)
5. [http://www.commonwealthfund.org/~media/files/publications/fund-report/2014/jun/1755\\_davis\\_mirror\\_mirror\\_2014.pdf](http://www.commonwealthfund.org/~media/files/publications/fund-report/2014/jun/1755_davis_mirror_mirror_2014.pdf)
6. <http://www.oecd.org/unitedkingdom/Country-Note-UNITED%20KINGDOM-OECD-Health-Statistics-2015.pdf>



<b>Council</b>	<b>Agenda Item 18 (a)</b>
21 July 2016	Brighton & Hove City Council

**ITEM 18 – PETITIONS FOR DEBATE**

**A) REINTRODUCE SCRATCH CARD VOUCHER PARKING**

**GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT**

To insert an additional recommendation as shown in ***bold italics***:

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 2.1 | That the petition is noted and referred to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for consideration at its meeting on 11 October 2016.   |
| 2.2 | <b><i>That the Environment, Transport &amp; Sustainability Committee in response to this petition are requested to investigate difficulties faced by people without access to mobile phones and with mobility constraints (which are not necessarily sufficient to qualify for a blue badge) when using existing parking payment systems and recommend appropriate action to remedy any inequities of access to service for these groups.</i></b> |

Proposed by: Councillor Gibson

Seconded by: Councillor Greenbaum





**WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

The following questions have been received from Councillors and will be taken as read along with the written answer which will be included in an addendum that will be circulated at the meeting:

**(a) Councillor Littman**

“Whilst Chair of the Economic Development and Culture Committee; you said, in your Chair’s Communications at the meeting on 18th June 2015:

“A petition with over 5,300 signatures by Our Brighton Hippodrome is not being presented today. It asks the council to support plans for theatre restoration and to use all available powers and its best endeavours to facilitate such plans. I can confirm that we are now in positive discussions with Academy Music Group, the new owner of the Hippodrome, Hippodrome House and the access yard off Ship Street. We have agreed to join a stakeholders group with Our Brighton Hippodrome, Brighton Hippodrome CIC, The Theatres Trust, Historic England and the Frank Matcham Society. The stakeholder group will work with Academy Music Group to find the best way forward to bring the Hippodrome back to life. The council will assist in that process by sharing relevant information for an independent viability assessment.”

I note that since then, the independent viability assessment has been conducted and an agreement is being drawn up for the “enabling development” part of the project.

In the light of this encouraging news, could Cllr. Morgan please update me on the support we, as a Council, have given, and will be giving in the future, in order to ensure the stakeholder group is able to pursue their development plans and that we ‘bring the Hippodrome back to life’?”

**Reply from Councillor Morgan – Leader of the Council**

“I can confirm that the council has continued to be represented on the stakeholder group and is supportive of the Hippodrome CIC’s efforts to access funding streams to help restore this historic Grade II\* listed building as a successful theatre and multi-event space. The council’s assistance has recently included providing the CIC with written support in respect of its £3.6 million bid to secure funding from the Coastal Communities Fund for initial restoration work to preserve the fabric of the building. The outcome of this bid is currently awaited.

Earlier in July officers from the council and Historic England met with the CIC and its appointed team to discuss their emerging plans. Obtaining the freehold interest is the key factor necessary to enable the CIC to move forward, as it would provide access to potential funding streams towards the building’s restoration that would not be available to commercial bodies. The CIC’s proposals are therefore dependent on its development partner securing a land

with Academy Music Group, current owners of the site. Assuming that such a land deal is secured, the council is committed to hold regular meetings with the CIC in order to help facilitate progress wherever appropriate.

Officers are meeting with the Academy Music Group on 25 July and this will provide us with further information on the freeholder's considerations. Whatever the outcome of current negotiations between the CIC, its development partner and the Academy Music Group, the council will continue to play whatever role it reasonably can in helping to facilitate the restoration of this important building."

**(b) Councillor Knight**

"Can the Chair of the Children, Young People and Skills Committee please confirm how many unaccompanied asylum seeking children the Council plans to take in response to the growing refugee crisis, and confirm whether the Council plans to take additional asylum seeking children beyond the Government target of 0.07% of the total child population?"

**Reply from Councillor Bewick – Chair of the Children, Young People & Skills Committee**

"Thank you for your question. As you will be aware this council has a proud record of receiving refugee and asylum seeking families and children. Last year we accepted 10 unaccompanied young people from Kent to help support the pressure they were under. As you have noted in your question the Home Office have made an assumption that each local authority area will receive additional unaccompanied asylum seeking children as part of a national dispersal programme. We have agreed to take part in this programme and are in liaison with them regarding receiving children. It is likely that children will arrive in small numbers and over an extended period but we are happy to confirm that we will accept these children who require support and help. If this means we go slightly above the 0.07% figure quoted by the Home Office we believe that this is our responsibility as a city of sanctuary."

**(c) Councillor Sykes**

"At the March 2016 meeting of Environment Transport and Sustainability committee, Cllr Mitchell undertook to provide me with a briefing in response to a Green Group Notice of Motion entitled 'Being prepared for flooding', which had been agreed by Full Council in January 2016. Please could this briefing be provided?"

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

"Following the ETS Committee a written briefing was prepared for Councillor Sykes that unfortunately was not sent. This was an error and the briefing has now been sent to Cllr Sykes."

**(d) Councillor C. Theobald**

“Will Cllr. Cattell please list the % for Art S. 106 contributions that have been agreed by the Council over the last 12 years, the monetary value of each of those contributions and what they have been spent on?”

**Reply from Councillor Cattell – Chair of the Planning Committee**

“I have provided you with two lists of public art contributions. These have been made as part of planning consents for major developments. The first is a list of developer contributions directly towards public art - this includes contributions implemented in the last 12 years as well as those secured within the last 12 years.

The second list is developer contributions for public art integrated into public realm. In some cases these payments include public realm improvements as well as public art contributions. It is not possible to provide a percentage split between the two.”

**List 1: Developer Contributions directly towards Public Art – either secured or implemented in the last 12 years**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>Amount</b>
2000/1760	Asda, Hollingbury	£10k
2000/3122	Clock Tower, North Street Quadrant	£20k
2001/1019	Former Alliance and Leicester Building	£40k
2001/1737	Ex BCT, Richmond Terrace	£16k
2001/2071	179 Church Road/Connaught Road	£20k
2001/2075	Varndean High School	£15k
2001/2593	9-10 Crowhurst Road	£10k
2003/0630	20-26 York Place	£14.5k
2003/3698	Land adjacent to Falmer Station	£20k
2004/1260	Knoll Primary School	£25k
2004/1573	Varndean College, Surrenden Road	£10k
2004/1705	9-11 Upper Drive	£25k
2004/2722	4-8 Somerhill Road	£30,140
2005/00142	Block K, Brighton Station	£10k
2005/0681	Carden Medical Centre	£10k
2005/2267	Nuffield, New Church Road	£17.2k
2006/0900	Hollingdean MRF/WTS	£10k
2006/1430	Block G, Brighton Station	£5.3k
2006/1761	Blocks E and F Brighton Station	£20k
2006/3882	Freshfield/Pankhurst Reservoir	£12k
2007/2192	Uni of Brighton	£42k
2007/2930	50-52 New Church Road	£26k
2007/2974	Travis Perkins, Wellington Road	£41k
2008/0210	Dresden House	£33k
2008/2303	Elmhurst, Warren Road	£10k
2009/1340	Vega Building, 331 Kingsway	£10k

2010/1824	112-113 Lewes Road	£12.5k
2010/3714	88-92 Queens Road	£40k
2011/3358	Maycroft, Carden Avenue	£8k
2012/2625	Co-op Site, London Road	£100k

**List 2: On-site Provision by Developer – Public Art integrated into Public Realm**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Amex, Edward Street/John Street	£250k
New England Quarter	£1m
1 Manor Road	£17.4k
Former Buxtons, Ditchling Road	£20.8k
Maycroft, Carden Avenue	£24.5k
Open Market	£35k
Marina, Outer Harbour	£60k min
RSCH 3Ts	No amount given
Former Royal Alex Hospital, Dyke Road	£59k
I360, West Pier	No amount given
Falmer Stadium	£70k
Circus Street	£100k

<b>Council</b>	<b>Agenda Item 23 (b)</b>
21 July 2016	Brighton & Hove City Council

## NOTICE OF MOTION

### GOVERNMENT EDUCATION POLICY

#### GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT

To delete within existing structures (as shown in ~~strikethrough~~) and insert “under Council control” as shown in ***bold italics***:

The Council resolves:

To request that the Chief Executive writes to the Secretary of State for Education stating the Council’s support for:

- improving school standards through a family of schools approach, working ~~within existing structures~~ ***under Council control***
- increased local accountability of schools, where families and communities are able to scrutinise and hold to account local plans for school improvement and action to reduce inequality of educational outcomes across communities
- protection, enhancement and valuing of the role of parents in the running of schools

To request that the Chief Executive writes to the Secretary of State for Education stating the Council’s concern in relation to:

- national top-down reorganisations of schools that do not reflect local needs. School reorganisation should be based on the strengths and needs of local communities and have local support.
- any plans that mean parents will have a reduced role in running schools.
- any plans to restrict options for 'struggling' schools, including potentially forcing schools to become academies, that may cut them off from the key support that can be offered by the LA family of schools. There is a lack of firm evidence that academisation is the only or most effective route to guarantee school improvement.
- any plans that will reduce local authorities’ vital role in educational provision, in terms of planning for school places, school admissions arrangements, support for special educational needs, staff support and development, and so limiting opportunities to reduce inequality in outcomes for young people across local communities, and ensure no young people are left behind.

Proposed by: Councillor Phillips

Seconded by: Councillor Littman

## Revised Motion if agreed:

The Council resolves:

To request that the Chief Executive writes to the Secretary of State for Education stating the Council's support for:

- improving school standards through a family of schools approach, working under Council control
- increased local accountability of schools, where families and communities are able to scrutinise and hold to account local plans for school improvement and action to reduce inequality of educational outcomes across communities
- protection, enhancement and valuing of the role of parents in the running of schools

To request that the Chief Executive writes to the Secretary of State for Education stating the Council's concern in relation to:

- national top-down reorganisations of schools that do not reflect local needs. School reorganisation should be based on the strengths and needs of local communities and have local support.
- any plans that mean parents will have a reduced role in running schools.
- any plans to restrict options for 'struggling' schools, including potentially forcing schools to become academies, that may cut them off from the key support that can be offered by the LA family of schools. There is a lack of firm evidence that academisation is the only or most effective route to guarantee school improvement.
- any plans that will reduce local authorities' vital role in educational provision, in terms of planning for school places, school admissions arrangements, support for special educational needs, staff support and development, and so limiting opportunities to reduce inequality in outcomes for young people across local communities, and ensure no young people are left behind.

<b>Council</b>	<b>Agenda Item 23 (c)</b>
21 July 2016	Brighton & Hove City Council

## NOTICE OF MOTION

### RAIL CRISIS

#### LABOUR GROUP AMENDMENT

To insert additional text including additional recommendations as shown in ***bold italics***:

This Council notes that good rail links and reliable train services to London are vital for Brighton and Hove's economy, and the need for investment in the rail infrastructure between Brighton and Hove and London.

This Council regrets the fact that no announcements on rail infrastructure investment were made in the last Budget.

This Council also notes the serious issues with Southern Rail services in recent months, leading to a protest by commuters at Brighton Station on June 14th, and the disappointing response from the Rail Minister Claire Perry MP.

This Council applauds the work done by local MPs, and calls on the city's MPs, the Greater Brighton Economic Board, the Coast to Capital Local Economic Partnership and other relevant bodies to press the Government to act on rail infrastructure and services at the earliest opportunity.

***This Council notes with serious concern the recent closure of Brighton Railway Station resulting in unacceptable risk and inconvenience to commuters and calls on the Permanent Undersecretary of State for Transport to ensure there is an urgent and lasting solution to the problem***

Proposed by: Councillor Horan

Seconded by: Councillor Morgan

**Revised Notice of Motion if agreed:**

This Council notes that good rail links and reliable train services to London are vital for Brighton and Hove's economy, and the need for investment in the rail infrastructure between Brighton and Hove and London.

This Council regrets the fact that no announcements on rail infrastructure investment were made in the last Budget.

This Council also notes the serious issues with Southern Rail services in recent months, leading to a protest by commuters at Brighton Station on June 14th, and the disappointing response from the Rail Minister Claire Perry MP.

This Council applauds the work done by local MPs, and calls on the city's MPs, the Greater Brighton Economic Board, the Coast to Capital Local Economic Partnership and other relevant bodies to press the Government to act on rail infrastructure and services at the earliest opportunity.

This Council notes with serious concern the recent closure of Brighton Railway Station resulting in unacceptable risk and inconvenience to commuters and calls on the Permanent Undersecretary of State for Transport to ensure there is an urgent and lasting solution to the problem



<b>Council</b>	<b>Agenda Item 23 (c)</b>
21 July 2016	Brighton & Hove City Council

**NOTICE OF MOTION**

**RAIL CRISIS**

**CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT**

To insert the wording, as shown in *bold italics*.

This Council notes that good rail links and reliable train services to London are vital for Brighton and Hove's economy, and the need for investment in the rail infrastructure between Brighton and Hove and London.

This Council regrets the fact that no announcements on rail infrastructure investment *on the Brighton line* were made in the last Budget.

This Council also notes the serious issues with Southern Rail services in recent months, leading to a protest by commuters at Brighton Station on June 14th, and the disappointing response from the Rail Minister Claire Perry MP.

This Council applauds the work done by local MPs, and calls on the city's MPs, the Greater Brighton Economic Board, the Coast to Capital Local Economic Partnership and other relevant bodies to press the Government to act on rail infrastructure and services at the earliest opportunity *and to make an early announcement to bring forward the development of BML2 (a second Brighton Main Line to London)*.

Proposed by: Geoffrey Theobald

Seconded by: Garry Peltzer Dunn

Supported by: Conservative Group of Councillors

**Revised Motion if agreed:**

This Council notes that good rail links and reliable train services to London are vital for Brighton and Hove's economy, and the need for investment in the rail infrastructure between Brighton and Hove and London.

This Council regrets the fact that no announcements on rail infrastructure investment on the Brighton line were made in the last Budget.

This Council also notes the serious issues with Southern Rail services in recent months, leading to a protest by commuters at Brighton Station on June 14th, and the disappointing response from the Rail Minister Claire Perry MP.

This Council applauds the work done by local MPs, and calls on the city's MPs, the Greater Brighton Economic Board, the Coast to Capital Local Economic Partnership and other relevant bodies to press the Government to act on rail infrastructure and services at the earliest opportunity and to make an early announcement to bring forward the development of BML2.



<b>Council</b>	<b>Agenda Item 23 (c)</b>
21 July 2016	Brighton & Hove City Council

## NOTICE OF MOTION

### RAIL CRISIS

#### GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT

To insert additional text including additional recommendations as shown in bold italics:

This Council notes that good rail links and reliable train services to London are vital for Brighton and Hove's economy, and the need for investment in the rail infrastructure between Brighton and Hove and London.

This Council regrets the fact that no announcements on rail infrastructure investment were made in the last Budget.

This Council also notes the serious issues with Southern Rail services in recent months, leading to a protest by commuters at Brighton Station on June 14th, and the disappointing response from the Rail Minister Claire Perry MP.

This Council applauds the work done by local MPs, and calls on the city's MPs, the Greater Brighton Economic Board, the Coast to Capital Local Economic Partnership and other relevant bodies to press the Government to act on rail infrastructure and services at the earliest opportunity.

#### ***This Council requests:***

***The Chief Executive writes to the Chief Executive of Govia Thameslink railway to request that:***

- ***GTR implement a compensation scheme for passengers as outlined by the Campaign for Better Transport***
- ***Additional capacity is provided for the Pride weekend and start of the Albion season.***

***That the Chief Executive writes to the Railways Minister to:***

- ***Set out concerns over passenger safety associated with changing the role of the conductors***
- ***Urge the Government to strip GTR of its franchises, bring these into transparent and accountable public hands, and take immediate steps to restore services, reduce overcrowding and improve reliability.***

Proposed by: Councillor Greenbaum

Seconded by: Councillor Phillips

## Revised Notice of Motion if agreed

This Council notes that good rail links and reliable train services to London are vital for Brighton and Hove's economy, and the need for investment in the rail infrastructure between Brighton and Hove and London.

This Council regrets the fact that no announcements on rail infrastructure investment were made in the last Budget.

This Council also notes the serious issues with Southern Rail services in recent months, leading to a protest by commuters at Brighton Station on June 14th, and the disappointing response from the Rail Minister Claire Perry MP.

This Council applauds the work done by local MPs, and calls on the city's MPs, the Greater Brighton Economic Board, the Coast to Capital Local Economic Partnership and other relevant bodies to press the Government to act on rail infrastructure and services at the earliest opportunity.

This Council requests:

The Chief Executive writes to the Chief Executive of Govia Thameslink railway to request that:

- GTR implement a compensation scheme for passengers as outlined by the Campaign for Better Transport
- Additional capacity is provided for the Pride weekend and start of the Albion season.

That the Chief Executive writes to the Railways Minister to:

- Set out concerns over passenger safety associated with changing the role of the conductors
- Urge the Government to strip GTR of its franchises, bring these into transparent and accountable public hands, and take immediate steps to restore services, reduce overcrowding and improve reliability.

<b>Council</b>	<b>Agenda Item 23 (d)</b>
21 July 2016	Brighton & Hove City Council

**NOTICE OF MOTION**

**FINDING A SOLUTION TO THE AIR POLLUTION PROBLEMS ON  
ROTTINGDEAN HIGH STREET**

**GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT**

To insert additional text including additional recommendations as shown in ***bold italics***:

This Council acknowledges the severity of the traffic-related air pollution problem in Rottingdean High Street and the serious health impacts this is likely to be having on local residents in the village, and supports the deputation from Rottingdean Parish Council to the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee on 28 June requesting traffic modelling which was noted by the Committee.

Therefore, this Council resolves to request that a report be brought before the next meeting of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee outlining options for improving traffic flow through the village and any other measures which will reduce the levels of ***traffic and*** air pollution in Rottingdean and ***other areas included in the city's Air Quality Management Area.***

Proposed by: Councillor Page

Seconded by: Councillor Deane

**Revised Motion if agreed:**

This Council acknowledges the severity of the traffic-related air pollution problem in Rottingdean High Street and the serious health impacts this is likely to be having on local residents in the village, and supports the deputation from Rottingdean Parish Council to the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee on 28 June requesting traffic modelling which was noted by the Committee.

Therefore, this Council resolves to request that a report be brought before the next meeting of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee outlining options for improving traffic flow through the village and any other measures which will reduce the levels of traffic and air pollution in Rottingdean and other areas included in the city's Air Quality Management Area.



**NOTICE OF MOTION****ESTATE AGENTS' BOARDS REGULATION 7 AREA EXTENSION****LABOUR & CO-OPERATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT**

To delete within existing structures (as shown in ~~strikethrough~~) and insert "under Council control" as shown in ***bold italics***:

This Council resolves to recommend ***that a report is brought*** to the Economic Development and Culture Committee ***setting out all the options, including the extension of the Regulation 7 powers, that are available to the Planning Service for controlling the display of Estate and Letting Agents boards in those areas of the city where a proliferation of such boards leads to an adverse impact on visual amenity.***

~~that the current Regulation 7 Direction ban on estate agents' boards in certain areas of the city under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 be extended to other central parts of the city where this is a significant problem, and requests that a report be brought to that Committee at the earliest opportunity reviewing other roads which may satisfy the criteria and outlining options for further introduction.~~

Proposed by: Councillor Cattell

Seconded by: Councillor Hill

Supported by: Conservative group of Councillors

**Revised Motion if agreed:**

This Council resolves to recommend that a report is brought to the Economic Development and Culture Committee, setting out all the options, including the extension of the Regulation 7 powers, that are available to the Planning Service for controlling the display of Estate and Letting Agents boards in those areas of the city where a proliferation of such boards leads to an adverse impact on visual amenity.

**Background:**

The introduction on 20 September 2010 of the Regulation 7 Direction ban on estate agents boards under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 has been a great success and is supported by the Brighton & Hove Estate Agents Association.

As the Secretary of State noted when the Council initially applied for the ban, these areas contain good historic architecture, including some of the highest quality, and such boards cause significant problems to the historic character of these areas. The ban should also only apply to those streets that have been most affected by the subdivision of properties and which are of greatest uniformity of townscape.

There are many streets around the Regulation 7 area, such as St Aubyns or Livingstone Road, which satisfy the Secretary of State's criteria but were not included. These roads, and many others nearby, are permanently blighted by boards and would, therefore, be ideal candidates for inclusion.



**NOTICE OF MOTION****THE IMPACTS OF BREXIT****LABOUR & CO-OPERATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT**

To insert the wording, as shown in ***bold italics***.

This council is concerned to ensure the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of the city. In furtherance of this the Council will seek to consider (within the limitation of the law):

- Maintaining the protections afforded to Council workers that might otherwise be lost following the loss of EU Directives
- Maintaining the environmental protection standards that are currently in place in Brighton & Hove as a result of our membership of the EU, especially with regard to air and water quality.

The Council requests:

- That the Chief Executive to write to the Government's new EU unit setting out concerns with the local impact of any loss of EU funding in research, higher education, infrastructure and community support, the value of free movement of people to Brighton & Hove's economy, as well as the impact on workers' rights and the environment in Brighton and Hove if legal obligations and protections under EU law are weakened on leaving the EU
- That Officer reports be presented to future meetings of the relevant Committees setting out the likely impacts of Brexit, and recommendations on appropriate mitigation measures that could be taken within areas of each committee's portfolio.
- Request the Chief Executive to ensure Brighton and Hove plays a full part in the national feedback process initiated by the LGA on the fallout of Brexit.
- ***That the Chief Executive takes a proactive role in reassuring both EU and non EU Nationals in Brighton and Hove that their contribution to the economic and cultural life of the city is fully valued in this uncertain time.***

Proposed by: Councillor Inkpin-Leissner

Seconded by: Councillor Bewick

### **Revised Motion if agreed:**

This council is concerned to ensure the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of the city. In furtherance of this the Council will seek to consider (within the limitation of the law):

- Maintaining the protections afforded to Council workers that might otherwise be lost following the loss of EU Directives
- Maintaining the environmental protection standards that are currently in place in Brighton & Hove as a result of our membership of the EU, especially with regard to air and water quality.

The Council requests:

- That the Chief Executive to write to the Government's new EU unit setting out concerns with the local impact of any loss of EU funding in research, higher education, infrastructure and community support, the value of free movement of people to Brighton & Hove's economy, as well as the impact on workers' rights and the environment in Brighton and Hove if legal obligations and protections under EU law are weakened on leaving the EU
- That Officer reports be presented to future meetings of the relevant Committees setting out the likely impacts of Brexit, and recommendations on appropriate mitigation measures that could be taken within areas of each committee's portfolio.
- Request the Chief Executive to ensure Brighton and Hove plays a full part in the national feedback process initiated by the LGA on the fallout of Brexit.
- That the Chief Executive takes a proactive role in reassuring both EU and non EU Nationals in Brighton and Hove that their contribution to the economic and cultural life of the city is fully valued in this uncertain time.

### Supporting information:

The commitment was made by all parties to work closely together to ensure that the economic and social well-being of the city is protected through the current period of financial turbulence and political uncertainty

The implementation of EU laws in the UK has improved the cleanliness of beaches, led to a decline in air and water pollution, increased recycling and renewable energy, and led to a fall in greenhouse gas emissions. The EU Birds and Habitats Directives have led to significant improvement for species and habitats. Critically for Brighton & Hove, a tough stance on air quality from the EU has forced the UK to act.

EU rules enshrined in UK law guarantee British workers four weeks paid holiday a year, 26 weeks of maternity leave, set working time limits and provide protections from redundancy, amongst many other things.