



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

**POLICY, RESOURCES & GROWTH  
COMMITTEE  
ADDENDUM TWO**

**4.00PM, THURSDAY, 19 JANUARY 2017**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL, NORTON ROAD,  
HOVE, BN3 3BQ**







**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 Committee.

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 question/s has/have been received from a member of the public.

**(a) Youth Collective – Elijah Peart**

“The proposed cuts to the youth collective target specialised services which exist for young people who may have more complicated or demanding needs than others. The help and understanding provided by these specialist youth workers is often vital in preparing these young people for adult life, with many young people quoting the Youth Collective as invaluable in their efforts to find work. How will you reconcile the fact that many young people cannot find work without the help of these professionals with Labour’s manifesto pledge to eradicate youth unemployment in the city?”

**Reply from Councillor Morgan, Leader of the Council, Chair of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee**

**(b) Voluntary Youth Services – Max Coles-Morley**

“Research has suggested that the voluntary youth services which will lose 80% of their funding actually save the council £5.56 for every £1 spent by the council. If there isn't enough money available for preventative youth work, where will the money be coming from for the necessary crisis management after services are cut?”

**Reply from Councillor Morgan, Leader of the Council, Chair of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee**

**(c) Youth Services – Seb Royle**

“Services for young people have already been massively depleted over the past 6 years, with the proposed 80% cut in funding sounding the death knell for voluntary youth work in our city. With £45 million of cuts still to come in the next three years, will there be anything left for young people in 2020?”

**Reply from Councillor Morgan, Leader of the Council, Chair of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee**

**(d) Youth Services Provision – Boudicca Pepper**

“The council seems to expect existing statutory services, such as CAMHS, as well as schools and colleges, to pick up the slack once the youth services are cut. How does the council expect these services to cope with the inevitable rise in demand caused by cuts to youth services without increased funding?”

**Reply from Councillor Morgan, Leader of the Council, Chair of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee**

**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 Mac Cafferty**

“Can the Chair of this committee please outline where the Labour administration is in making clear what non-core designations are in relation to Downland?”

**Reply from Councillor Morgan, Leader of the Council, Chair of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee.**

“The report on this agenda titled “Policy Review Panel – City Council’s Urban and Rural estates” addresses this question through the NoM presented to December PRG by the Conservative and Green groups. This requested a Policy Review Panel to look at governance and policy with respect to the City’s urban and rural estates and will include a review of the respective sections of the Corporate Property Strategy & Asset Management Plan 2014-18 (AMP) agreed by December Policy, Resources & Growth Committee as they concern Downland asset definition and disposal.

This clarification will be addressed through the Policy Review Panel and the PRG report explains how the Policy Review Panel is proposed to be set up and it is proposed that this aspect will be part of the scoping exercise and terms of reference to be agreed at the first meeting of the cross party Policy Review Panel.”





**AGENDA ITEM 111**

**LAND AT PLUMPTON HILL AND POYNINGS**

**CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT**

That the recommendation 2.1 be amended to delete the words in ~~strikethrough~~ and insert those shown in ***bold italics***, and an additional amendment at 2.2 be added as show in ***bold italics***.

2.1 That Committee notes the further requested information, analysis and consequences regarding these two pieces of land and recommends that it ~~continues with the sale of these sites to support the council's successful Stanmer HLF bid.~~ ***it –***

(a) ***proceeds with the sale of the Poynings site only – i.e. option 4 outlined in paragraph 4.7***

(b) ***requests that officers bring forward a report to a future meeting of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee identifying how the shortfall in match funding for the HLF Stanmer Park project funding can be met.***

Proposed by: Cllr: Janio    Seconded by: Cllr: G. Theobald

**Recommendation if carried to read**

That Committee notes the further requested information, analysis and consequences regarding these two pieces of land and recommends it –

(a) proceeds with the sale of the Poynings site only – i.e. option 4 outlined in paragraph 4.7

(b) requests that officers bring forward a report to the next Policy, Resources and Growth Committee identifying how the shortfall in match funding for the HLF Stanmer Park project funding can be met.



**AGENDA ITEM 111**

**LAND AT PLUMPTON HILL AND POYNINGS**

**GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT**

That the recommendation 2.1 be amended to delete the words in ~~strikethrough~~ and insert those shown in ***bold italics***, and an additional amendment at 2.2 be added as show in ***bold italics***.

- 2.1 That Committee notes the further requested information, analysis and consequences regarding these two pieces of land and ~~recommends that it continues with the sale of these sites to support the council's successful Stanmer HLF bid.~~ ***the sale of these two sites be terminated forthwith.***
- 2.2 ***That with regards to the HLF Stanmer Park project, a separate report be brought to Committee outlining alternative options for meeting the match funding requirement.***

Proposed by: Cllr: Mac Cafferty    Seconded by: Cllr: Gibson

**Recommendation if carried to read**

- 2.1 That Committee notes the further requested information, analysis and consequences regarding these two pieces of land and recommends that the sale of these two sites be terminated forthwith.
- 2.2 That with regards to the HLF Stanmer Park project, a separate report be brought to Committee outlining alternative options for meeting the match funding requirement.

