



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

COUNCIL ADDENDUM

4.30PM, THURSDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2017

COUNCIL CHAMBER - HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
48	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. List of written questions received from members of the public (copy attached).	1 - 2
49	DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. List of deputations received from members of the public (copy attached).	3 - 6
50	PETITIONS FOR COUNCIL DEBATE	7 - 12
(ii)	Keep Our Community Together: Report of the Executive Lead for Strategy, Governance & Law Copy attached); Amendment from the Green Group. Proposed by Councillor Phillips (copy attached).	
53	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS. List of written questions received and the responses from councillors (copy attached).	13 - 22
56	COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION REVIEW Extract from the proceedings of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee meeting held on the 30 th November, 2017 (copy attached).	23 - 26
57	REVIEW OF MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES Officer clarification to the recommendation of the Independent Remuneration Panel for approval (copy attached).	27 - 28
58	GREATER BRIGHTON ECONOMIC BOARD – ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBER TO THE BOARD Extract from the proceedings of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee meeting held on the 30 th November, 2017 (copy attached).	29 - 30
59	NOTICES OF MOTION: Brighton and Hove and Brexit. Revised Notice of Motion with the correct supporting information detailed; (copy attached).	31 - 36

Amendments to Notices of Motion:

- (4) **Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle (PHV) Licensing.** Proposed by Councillor Hyde (copy attached).
- (8) **Council Owned short-term Homelessness Accommodation.** Proposed by Councillor Meadows (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.

1. QUESTION From: Christopher Hawtree

“Would Councillor Robins please tell us how much the British and Irish Modern Music Institute pays per year to rent a room which was a cherished public part of the Hove Carnegie Library’s Reference section, and how many years this contract lasts?”

Councillor Robins, Chair of the Tourism, Development & Culture Committee will reply.

2. QUESTION From: Valerie Paynter

“Is it appropriate for council officers to have sole authority to entirely replace expert Parks & Gardens staff with ‘Pay Back’ teams carrying out their community service in caring for precious landscaping on council-owned land? Apart from lawn-mowing?”

Councillor Morgan, Leader of the Council will reply.

3. QUESTION From: Julia Davis

“There has been a sharp rise in the number of events taking place on The Level during weekends from May to October, resulting in a significant increase in drug and alcohol usage. The Oktoberfest has had the biggest impact accommodating 3500 people, playing live music at pop concert sound levels, and causing significant damage to lawns.

What impact assessment on the local residents is the council undertaking to a) bring down the number of events, b) control use of amplified music levels, and c) ensure events such as The Oktoberfest are hosted in appropriate venue locations such as the Amex?”

Councillor Robins, Chair of the Tourism, Development & Culture Committee 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 one Deputation has been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

(a) Deputation concerning Hove Park Tennis Courts**Spokesperson Mr. N. Dickson**

Supported by:

Jason Pither

Penny Telford

Don Lee

Michelle Roycroft

Georgina Gibson

Ward affected: Hove Park

Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee will reply.

(b) Deputation concerning Benfield Primary School**Spokesperson Mr. Scott Theobald**

Supported by:

Sam Scerri

Jess Keilthy

Sylvia New

Clive Bolton

Sarah Brooking

Deborah Coghill

Ward affected: Hangleton & Knoll

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

**(a) Deputation concerning Hove Park Tennis Courts
Spokesperson Mr. N. Dickson**

I represent The Hove Park Tennis Alliance; we are a group formed of all the clubs that use Hove Park tennis courts extremely perturbed at the prospect of our astro tennis courts being handed over to a football only surface after 27 years.

We have been sharing this surface quite happily with local football clubs who use it in the winter under floodlights and then handed over to tennis in the summer, when demand for our sport is high and football has the whole use of the park to set up training or 5-a-side games.

Although it has been known for some time that the astro courts at Hove park were nearing the end of their life and becoming shabby, we were only informed about 5 weeks ago that the decision had been made to resurface the courts in a 3G surface,(funded completely by 106 development money) making it available for football only.

The agenda was driven by the Head of City Parks and subsequently sanctioned by Hove Park ward councillors Jayne Bennett and Vanessa Brown alongside the Chair of the ETS committee Councillor Gill Mitchell.

As existing users of this facility we have never at any stage been consulted regarding its future and would like clarification as to how and when the decision was made.

Since learning of the Council's intentions we have been frantically lobbying councillors, seeking press coverage and demonstrating. Our view is that we are being cast aside and a feeling of political will to see the demise of tennis at the expense of other sports, perhaps due to the misconception, 'that we must all be able to pay at a private club', however, nothing could be further from the truth, we are a real diverse group, the whole ethos of Parks league Tennis set up over 60 years ago was to promote players from different socioeconomic groups.

We are asking that a new multi-sports surface be laid so that we can continue to share this facility with footballers and why not other sports who may wish to use an excellent new surface.

Whilst Hove Park councillors have been sympathetic to our cause, they refer us back to Head of City Parks to answer our questions, who in our opinion dismisses our wish for multi-sports and hides behind bureaucratic barriers regarding the use of 106 monies and has wilfully neglected to collect funds from tennis to make finances from football look like the best option.

The lateness of the decision means that 106 money has to be spent by April 2018 leaving little time for opposition, as work is due to start in February 2018.

**(b) Deputation concerning Benfield Primary School
Spokesperson Mr. S. Theobald**

Reducing Benfield Primary School to a 1 form entry school (PAN of 30) from a current 2 form entry status.

Summary

Benfield Primary School governors, parents, teachers, and the community the school serves strenuously object to the reduction of the school to single form entry. The arguments for this will be given to full council and will include:

1. Benfield is a 'Good' school with areas of Outstanding, with progress in the top 25% of schools nationally.
2. Benfield has been awarded 'Teaching School' status forming an alliance with other schools, achieving this on the excellence of its leadership and teaching standards. This has been awarded on the basis of the school as a 2 form entry.
3. The school has a balanced budget, a rigorous approach to financial management and planning, and has been able to accommodate varying school numbers year on year. Unlike other schools, it is not in a budget deficit and does not require additional financial support.
4. The local community the school serves already has a choice of single form entry schools. Removing Benfield as a 2 form entry reduces choice of parents going to a larger school as the only remaining larger option would be St Nicholas, a religious school able to set its own admission criteria if over-subscribed.
5. The council know single form entry schools are not financially efficient and not an ideal model for Primary Schools. The creation of a 4th single form Primary School in the local area not only reduces choice, but also sets up a poor financial model.
6. The council expanded West Hove and St Andrews schools against the schools wishes, with those schools feeling they were large enough already, and opening the Connaught School, without strategic foresight as to the PAN across the city. This poor planning has led to the schools on the boundaries that do not want to be reduced.
7. The argument for expanding certain schools has been 'to give parents there first preference', however this is contradicted by the secondary school boundary changes that take away choice from the same parents that they expanded Primary schools for, so they don't have that same choice for secondary.
8. Benfield Primary School is a school that has been showing year on year consistent improvement, development, and progress across all areas of the school. The council should not be pulling the rug from under a school that is demonstrating remarkable results from a diverse cohort which it welcomes, accommodates, makes safe, and ultimately makes learning enjoyable.
9. A reduction in PAN is not what the school wants, it isn't what the community wants, and ultimately will not save any money given the financial prudence of the school.

Petition: Presented to CYP&S Committee 13.11.17 Signatures objecting to the reduction of the PAN at Benfield Primary School: Online 1322, Paper 167, Total = 1489 signatures

Subject:	Keep Our Community Together – Petition for Debate		
Date of Meeting:	14 December 2017		
Report of:	Executive Lead Officer for Strategy, Governance & Law		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Mark Wall	Tel: 01273 291006
	E-mail:	mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Wards Affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE**1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:**

- 1.1 Under the Council's Petition Scheme if a petition contains more than 1,250 signatures and is not petition requesting officer evidence, it will be debated by the Full Council.
- 1.2 The e-petition has resulted in triggering a debate at the council meeting, having exceeded the threshold with a total of 1,272 signatures confirmed at the time of printing the report.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the petition is noted and referred to the Children, Young People & Skills Committee for consideration at its meeting on the 15th January 2018.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION / CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:**3.1 The Petition****West Hove catchment area changes - Keep Our Community Together**

"We the undersigned petition Brighton & Hove Council to abandon proposals to change existing catchment areas until the Education & Skills Funding Agency confirms the site and the opening date for the proposed Brighton & Hove Academy."

Lead Petitioner – Ollie Tait

Additional Information

1. The proposed changes will have a serious and detrimental impact on the wider community. They place a dividing line between the families around Elm Grove, Lewes Road and Bear Road, splitting children in the area from their friends, classmates and the local families they've grown up with. This

will not only create unnecessary stress and anxiety for the children directly affected, but also change the fabric of a close-knit, established and family friendly community.

2. We believe that every child in Brighton & Hove should have access to quality local education and not be bussed across the city. Under these changes, the children effected would be unable to walk to school and would be faced with up to 7-mile return trip to school at peak hours in our already congested city. With only a small number of children effected, their safety, their ability to participate in activities out of school hours, and their ability to engage with the local community around the school will be compromised by their two hour daily commute.
3. We acknowledge that there is a need to relieve pressure on numbers on current schools but the proposed changes set a precedent that could have a negative impact for all parents across Brighton and Hove. The two principles that received the greatest support in the Council's 2016 consultation on catchment areas were minimising pupil's journeys to school and allowing children to move to secondary school with their friends. Both principles are abandoned in this proposal; the targeted area is neither the nearest to Longhill nor the furthest from Dorothy Stringer and Varndean. With further population bulges predicted in the next few years, we believe this seemingly arbitrary setting of catchment areas sets a precedent that could open the way to even more dramatic changes. Parents will no longer be able to argue on grounds of distance to school if the council decrees that their child should be sent to a school out of the city.
4. We request that catchment areas remain unchanged until a site and opening date for the proposed Brighton & Hove Academy is confirmed. We believe the proposed changes fail to take into account the possibility that the proposed Academy may open later than 2019, may not be located at the current preferred site or may fail to open at all. We argue that children in the area must remain in the current catchments until the situation of the new school is confirmed. If not, families with children coming up to secondary after this two-year period risk having their children schooled in different schools.
5. We believe the Council's so-called "light touch, temporary" proposals create significant disparity in choice and outcome for children in Brighton & Hove, which is at best unfair, and at worst discriminatory. We contend that the proposals are not in the best interests of the children who live in the areas designated to move catchment.

3.2 The options open to the council are:

- To note the petition and take no action for reasons put forward in the debate; or
- To refer the petition to the relevant Committee meeting; or

- To refer the petition to the relevant Committee meeting with recommendations.

4. PROCEDURE:

4.1 The petition will be debated at the Council meeting in accordance with the agreed protocol:

- (i) The Lead petitioner will be invited by the Mayor to present the petition and will have up to 3 minutes in which to outline the prayer of the petition and confirm the number of signatures;
- (ii) The Mayor will then open the matter up for debate by councillors for period of 15 minutes and will first call on the relevant Committee Chair to respond to the petition and move a proposed response. The Mayor will then call on those councillors who have indicated a desire to speak in the matter, before calling on the relevant Committee Chair to respond to the debate;
- (iii) Any councillor may move an amendment or recommendation, having regard to the recommendation in 2.1 above and any such proposal will need to be formally seconded;
- (iv) After the 15 minutes set aside for the debate, the Mayor will then formally put:
 - (a) Any amendments in the order in which they are moved, and
 - (b) The substantive recommendation(s) as amended (if amended).

**KEEP OUR COMMUNITY TOGETHER
PETITION FOR DEBATE****GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT**

To add additional recommendation 2.2 as shown in bold italics below:

2.2 That the Children, Young People & Skills Committee be requested to receive a report that:

- a) details the options for catchment areas as they currently stand to remain unchanged, taking into account the option to accept the offer made by the head teachers of schools in Brighton and Hove of providing additional classes; and the confirmed opening of a new academy***
- b) details the means by which Brighton and Hove City Council can seek to work with local schools to provide additional classes for September 2018, so as to enable the existing catchment areas to 'better catch'***
- c) undertakes an assessment of population pressures on school catchment numbers for the years ahead, making allowance for the impact of Brexit***

Proposed by: Cllr Phillips

Seconded by: Cllr Gibson

Recommendations if carried to read:

- 2.1 That the petition is noted and referred to the Children, Young People & Skills Committee for consideration at its meeting on the 15th January 2018; and
- 2.2 That the Children, Young People & Skills Committee be requested to receive a report that:
 - a) details the options for catchment areas as they currently stand to remain unchanged, taking into account the option to accept the offer made by the head teachers of schools in Brighton and Hove of providing additional classes; and the confirmed opening of a new academy
 - b) details the means by which Brighton and Hove City Council can seek to work with local schools to provide additional classes for September 2018, so as to enable the existing catchment areas to 'better catch'
 - c) undertakes an assessment of population pressures on school catchment numbers for the years ahead, making allowance for the impact of Brexit.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

The following questions listed on pages 43 - 46 of the agenda have been received from Councillors and will be taken as read along with the written answers listed below.

Note: The Mayor also agreed to the inclusion of an additional 3 written questions which had been sent but due to technical issues had not been received in time to be listed in the agenda papers.

(1) Councillor C. Theobald

"I have repeatedly drawn to the attention of the Administration the disgusting condition of the Princes Place toilets adjacent to the Royal Pavilion Gardens. I asked an oral question at the Council Meeting on July 20th asking when the toilets would be put in a clean and tidy condition fit for residents and visitors to use. Councillor Mitchell stated to Members that she had, that day, instructed the Assistant Director for City Clean to, "...pay particular attention to those Pavilion Garden toilets."

Councillor Mitchell claims she received assurances on this matter, and yet more than 4 months have now passed and they are still in a disgraceful condition. So I ask yet again, will Councillor Mitchell, as a matter of urgency, have these toilets put in a decent state so that the general public can safely use them?"

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

"The new winter operating was implemented from the 1st October 2017, and soon after, a number of complaints were received in respect of Royal Pavilion Gardens. On investigation it was discovered that cleaning was not being carried out to the prescribed frequency or as it should have been by the respective toilet attendants – In addition some vandalism had also taken place at this site.

The staffing issues have now been addressed by Healthmatic and officers have independently carried out site visits and monitoring. Officers and Healthmatic representative met with Ward Councillors (08/12/17) and to improve the standard of cleaning the introduction of additional visits at the site is now taking place.

There will now be a further 3 hours per day allocated to these toilets for cleaning purposes however financial resourcing does not allow for a full time attendant on site

It is noted that there are ongoing antisocial behaviour activities at this toilet although the attendants will make every effort to deal and intervene they cannot be expected to deal with any confrontational situations which may put them at risk."

(2) Councillor Littman

“Thank you for having answered my oral question regarding recycling at the last meeting of Full Council. I have a number of supplementary questions resulting from your response.

In your response; you said: “I am pretty proud to have raised our recycling levels to the highest rate ever from the 24% under your administration to the 29.1% now”

According to the publicly available figures for CityClean performance (<http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/content/environment/recycling-rubbish-and-street-cleaning/cityclean-performance>); the rate under the Greens ranged between 25.2% to 28.8%. Could you please explain which year you were referring to?

Similarly, according to the same publicly available figures; the rate in 2008/9 was 29.5%. Can you please explain how 29.1% is ‘the highest ever’?

As I said in my question; ‘Recycling rates in the city have been below 30% every year for the last 11 years, a time period covered by administrations of all three colours.’ 29.1% is nothing to be proud of. Following the successful introduction of Green initiatives; including communal recycling, and green waste collection, can you outline your plans to raise recycling rates past those of 2008/9 and towards the 50%+ achieved by many other Local Authorities?

Finally, my supplementary question asked what work was on-going regarding collaboration with other Local Authorities, which recycle a greater range of plastics than we do. This element of the question was not answered. Given the clear support both from Councillors of all Parties, and the general public, for the safe removal of plastics from our environment; please can you tell me what you are doing about collecting plastics which we ourselves cannot recycle, for recycling by any of those Local Authorities which can?”

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

“The figure of 24% relates to Q4 for the year 2014/15 (actual rate 24.14%).

The 29.1% rate is the highest ever compared to those achieved by the previous two political administrations on leaving office and there are plans to increase this further.

The introduction of wheelie bins for recycling will assist in continuing to raise the recycling rate as shown in the last quarter performance results. Officers continue to work on a number of recycling initiatives including wheelie bin recycling, increased garden waste collections and our new WEEE recycling project funded by Defra Tech Takeback.

Officers are also working closely with other officers on Neighbourhood Action Plans which will help deliver education messages to the community and in addition are working jointly with BHEE to deliver recycling education into schools. Officers will continue to look at other opportunities and work with partner organisations to raise the recycling rate

Most UK councils now offer householders some form of plastics recycling as part of their waste collection systems and this is generating increasing annual tonnages. There are many benefits to be gained by the responsible recycling of plastics;

- Provides a sustainable source of raw materials to industry
- Greatly reduces the environmental impact of plastic-rich products
- Minimises the amount of plastic being sent to the UK's diminishing landfill sites
- Avoids the consumption of the Earth's oil stocks
- Consumes less energy than producing new, virgin polymers

However, even though nearly all types of plastics can be recycled, the extent to which they are recycled depends upon technical, economic and logistic factors.

At present Brighton and Hove City Council only recycle plastic bottles (soft drinks, water, milk and detergent bottles). which are made of a certain type of plastic;

- PET clear bottle
- PET coloured bottles
- HDPE clear bottles
- HDPE coloured bottles
- PVC clear bottles (symbol "3" on bottle, used in the home)
- PVC coloured bottles (symbol "3" on bottle, blue tint, used in the home)
- PP clear bottles
- PP coloured bottles

There is a market for this product which provides an income and it provides the optimum recovery route in that it can be turned into a product that can be recycled again and again.

Unfortunately at present the Hollingdean MRF is not designed to take plastic pots, tubs and trays as it lacks the equipment needed to detect and separate these types of plastics. BHCC & ESCC have asked Veolia to assess the feasibility of retrofitting the facility.

The main challenge from an operational perspective is the limited space inside the hall to accommodate the sorting equipment and storage space needed for an additional material stream. It is questionable whether the existing Hollingdean site is large enough to accommodate additional sorting of pots, tubs and trays.

The biggest barrier is the lack of a sustainable end market for the volume of material likely to be generated collection. Feedback from ESCC and our contractor indicates a lack of demand from manufacturing and industry for these materials. There is also fierce competition from virgin plastics due to the

low price of oil and recent developments in China to restrict the import of recycling are also impacting on the market

Although, Cityclean will actively continue to look at future solutions with ESCC and Veolia.”

(3) Councillor Sykes

“Please can Cllr Mitchell provide quarterly figures for B&H domestic waste (not recycling) arising (kg per household) over the past five years?”

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

See table below – Information obtained from Waste Data Flow

Year	Quarter	NI191 HH waste not sent for recycling, reuse or composting – numerator	NI191 denominator: Number of households	NI191 Residual Household Waste per Household (Kg)
2011/12	Q2	26,407.27	125,460	150.73
2011/12	Q3	24,327.28	125,460	141.92
2011/12	Q4	23,780.58	126,060	136.10
2012/13	Q1	26,285.51	126,060	149.91
2012/13	Q2	26,935.16	126,060	154.26
2012/13	Q3	25,083.78	126,060	147.79
2012/13	Q4	23,744.15	126,430	140.21
2013/14	Q1	24,954.82	126,430	146.23
2013/14	Q2	26,664.24	126,430	156.23
2013/14	Q3	25,138.87	126,430	148.41
2013/14	Q4	25,398.71	127,080	147.94
2014/15	Q1	19,845.67	127,080	156.17
2014/15	Q2	19,606.31	127,080	154.28
2014/15	Q3	19,918.88	127,080	156.74
2014/15	Q4	18,704.92	127,080	147.19
2015/16	Q1	20,189.98	127,850	157.92
2015/16	Q2	20,366.74	127,850	159.30
2015/16	Q3	19,642.53	127,850	153.64
2015/16	Q4	19,189.01	127,850	150.09
2016/17	Q1	20,110.99	128,540	156.46
2016/17	Q2	20,301.56	128,540	157.94
2016/17	Q3	18,531.90	128,540	144.17
2016/17	Q4	18,420.07	128,540	143.30
2017/18	Q1	19,511.84	128,540	151.80

(4) Councillor Gibson

“a) Hanover and Elm Grove CPZ

Please can you provide as of the 1st of December:

- 1) The total number of permits issued for zones V and zone S?
 - 2) The numbers of annual and of 3 month permits issued for each of zones V and S?
 - 3) The total permit income paid to the council from permit fees for zones V and S up until 1st of December?
 - 4) The total capital expenditure incurred on markings, signage and other works needed for implementation of the CPZ in zones V and S?
 - 5) The total capital expenditure from other budgets headings spent at the same time as the CPZ (ie cycle racks)
- b) If community groups and local residents are able to fundraise the money needed for a covered cycle storage facility (at no cost to the council) and have identified a suitable location, can you confirm that, in the interests of supporting cycling with all the associated health benefits, the council will give the necessary permission to enable the facility to be installed? (subject to any consultation + planning that may be needed).”

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

“The latest total number of resident permit figures as of 1st December 2017 were the following;

Area V (Full scheme) – 2384 permits (2488 limit)

Area S (Light touch scheme) – 1791 permits issued (2288 limit)

The rest of the data requested is a significant piece of work and involves data being collected from a number of teams in the Transport Department in liaison with finance colleagues. Therefore, we will ensure you get a written response from the department by early in the New Year.”

(5) Councillor Gibson

“a) Payments for emergency and temporary accommodation

For 2016/17, please can you provide the total annual cost payable for emergency and temporary accommodation to:

- i) Helgor Trading
- ii) Baron Homes

Along with the number of households that were housed by each provider

b) Financial modelling of new council homes

Please can you provide the figures for the estimated surplus/deficit over the 60 year financial modelling period (currently used-indicating for each scheme

whether the most current assumptions have been made or those used previously) for:

- Aldwick Mews
- Brook Mead
- Darwell Court
- Flint Close
- Hobby Place
- Kite Place
- Pierre Close
- Preston Rd
- Robert Lodge (N)
- Robert Lodge (S)
- Lynchet Close
- Kensington St”

Reply from Councillor Meadows, Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

(a)

“We have a procurement framework under which contracts for emergency and temporary accommodation are awarded. The contracts awarded to the providers where information is requested took effect from April 2015. The total cost of housing homeless residents in a city with our shortage of housing is at the moment still very significant, and has been for many years.

Overall we are:

- Aiming through the Homelessness Trailblazer prevention project to reduce our use of temporary accommodation by April 2019
- Looking at all options we can to provide more affordable housing to residents, so also reducing the need for temporary and emergency accommodation
- Working with CVS on financial inclusion work and Credit Union support to help residents stay in their homes
- Bringing forward new options for providing emergency and temporary accommodation. We have recently agreed to convert Oxford Street housing office to temporary accommodation, and Stonehurst Court to temporary accommodation, and any other opportunities are also actively being explored.

In terms of what was paid to specific providers, the total annual gross cost payable for emergency and temporary accommodation for 2016/7 for Baron Homes was £3,189,085 and for Helgor Trading was £932,772. However, this is not the net cost to the council, as tenants are eligible for housing benefit, as they would be if their accommodation was provided in another way, meaning that the net cost to the council is considerably lower.

We are looking into the second part of this request taking into account legal and commercial considerations.

(b)

These schemes were all considered and approved by the Housing & New Homes Committee taking into account the long term implications for the ring-

fenced Housing Revenue Account including consideration of appropriate scheme costs and rent levels. A number of the schemes are now occupied by tenants with costs and rental streams being as anticipated.

Remodeling the financial impact of new build schemes over 60 years is a significant piece of work and officers will therefore provide a written response to this question as soon as practicably possible.”

(6) Councillor Taylor

“In my previous oral question I asked the Administration what it planned to do should we have a similar situation for 2018/19 admissions in the Dorothy Stringer Varndean catchment to which I did not receive a satisfactory response.

Since then the two schools concerned have written to the Council expressing an interest in expansion of their PAN on a temporary basis but last year were not asked by the Council to accommodate additional numbers.

Therefore can Councillor Chapman please indicate how many pupils are expected to not be offered one of their catchment schools and if this is the case can he confirm that the Administration will work with the two schools to limit the impact on local residents?”

Reply from Councillor Chapman, Chair of the Children, Young People & Skills Committee

“The Cross Party School Organisation Working Group will be meeting on 20 December to consider the recommendations to the Children Young People & Skills committee following the public consultation. Within the 907 responses received was a joint response from the governing bodies of Varndean and Dorothy Stringer schools and their suggestion will be considered alongside those of all other respondents. Officers have since met with the Chairs of Governors and Headteachers of both schools to discuss their response further and I wait to hear more about this at the meeting on the 20th December. Having attended the majority of public meetings I am also aware of the concerns of residents about the impact any decisions taken will have on local residents regarding admissions in 2019.

The council determined its admission arrangements for 2018 in January 2017 and parents were advised in the information booklet that there is no guarantee of a place at a catchment area school. Every pupil who requires a place will be offered one within the city. The closing date for applications was 31 October and late applications, with good reason, will be accepted up until 22 January 2018. We will not hear from city schools who are their own admission authority about who will receive places until 20 December and from neighbouring authorities until late January 2018. Therefore it is not possible to indicate how many pupils are expected to not to be offered one of their catchment schools at this time and what actions would be appropriate as a result.”

(7) Councillor Wares

No.56 Subsidised Bus Route

“Councillor Mitchell advised at full Council on the 2nd November, that officers had had meetings with The Big Lemon bus company about 50% reduction in the No.56 bus route link around Patcham and Hollingbury and that officers would be in touch with us to reassure residents. Some six weeks later we have still not had any communication, the link remains reduced by 50% and the life line this service provides remains severed. Please could Councillor Mitchell advise what precisely has taken place, what the discussions have been, what is proposed and when the service will be reinstated to the levels it was before?”

Reply from Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, transport & Sustainability Committee

“Thank you for your question. An information document is being prepared. This will be circulated to all councillors and other stakeholders and gives details of changes to bus services from 14 January 2018. The changes to service 56 result from feedback received by the council and The Big Lemon bus company since the new bus service contracts started on 17 September. The information document will say the following:

Following requests from passengers, the service 56 timetable has been revised to improve the service to Patcham. Generally buses will run every 75 minutes. This will allow more time for buses to complete their journeys and provide a reliable service.

Buses will leave Knoll Estate for Patcham at 7.10am, 8.30am, 9.30am, 10.45am, 12.00, 1.15pm, 2.30pm, 3.45pm, 5pm and 6.15pm. The 6.15pm journey will terminate at Hollingbury ASDA (there is not currently a journey at this time).

Buses will leave Patcham at 8.02am, 9.35am, 10.45am, 12.00, 1.15pm, 2.30pm, 3.45pm, 5pm and 6.15pm. All journeys will leave from Old London Road Co-op, with the exception of the 8.02am, which will start from Ladies Mile Road Shops (as has always been the case with this journey). The 6.15pm journey terminates at Old Steine.

An additional, later journey will leave Hollingbury ASDA at 7.09pm, terminating at Old Steine.

The changes will also be publicised in new editions of individual route leaflets and in the new edition of ‘Bus Times’, which will be available early in January. All bus stop timetables will also be updated in advance of the 14 January service change.”

(8) Councillor Wares

Street Tree Planting

“Subsequent to the revelation at ETS Committee on 28th November that officers are implanting street tree planting in the East of the City and working West, we have subsequently learnt that Councillor Mitchell agreed it will be carried out in zones over a four-year period. It appears this was a unilateral decision by

Councillor Mitchell that had no consultation at Ward or Committee level, has no future funding plan and affects everybody in the City. Further, it appears that officers have been delegated authority to decide what the zones are and what will happen in them. Please could Councillor Mitchell advise how, when and why this key strategic decision was taken and in detail, precisely what the four year plan is?"

Reply from Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, transport & Sustainability Committee

"For budgetary and operational reasons the city has been divided into four zones for street tree planting in order to get maximum value from the considerably reduced budget available. There has been no additional maintenance budget for these additional trees, only a budget for planting. This will mean increased pressure on the maintenance budget as the trees mature.

Planting of new trees are high maintenance in the first year, have to be watered more frequently and monitored closely, therefore the zones make it more efficient and cost effective to give this more intensive maintenance to trees in fairly close proximity than if the trees were spread across the city.

Zone 1 encompasses Hove focussing on the streets off New Church Road/Portland Road and working West to East:

- There are 152 trees ordered
- 5 are replacement trees for Patcham Peace Garden (Watering by Volunteers/Park Staff)
- 14 are to go into parks (Watering by Park Staff)
- 115 are to be planted into streets (Watering by City Parks)
- 9 of which are Memorial Trees
- 17 are for Cemeteries (Watering by Cemetery Staff)."

**(9) Councillor Druitt
Trees**

"In the council year 2016-17 how many trees were felled by the council and what species were they, how many were diseased, what reasons are given for any that were not diseased, and how many trees were planted a) from the council's own budgets, and b) from the Tree Fund? Can the council indicate how this compares with the previous year and can the council outline the role of trees and bushes in the council's air quality strategy."

Reply from Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, transport & Sustainability Committee

"With reference to the number of trees felled, what species they were and the reasons given, this information is not available currently but will be provided.

There were 19 trees planted via donations/memorial. To the best of our knowledge no trees were planted from the council's own budget 2016-17 because tree planting was cut from the budget. No trees were planted from the

Tree Fund. In the previous year 201 trees were planted in total, of which 35 were donation/memorial and 18 were from the Hove Civic Society.

With reference to the role of trees and bushes in the council's air quality strategy, this information is not available currently but will be provided in the forthcoming Air Quality Strategy report."

(10) Councillor Druitt

Homelessness

"Does the council still aim to eliminate the need for rough-sleeping in the city by 2020, how likely is it that this will be achieved and when can we expect to see the numbers of people forced to sleep on the streets start coming down?"

Reply from Councillor Moonan, Lead Member for Rough Sleeping

"Yes the Labour administration still aims to eliminate the needs for anyone to sleep rough by 2020. This was a manifesto pledge and we will do everything we can, at a local authority level, to ensure all rough sleepers are housed. BHCC continues to drive forward with its local Rough Sleeping Strategy and there are a range of services and projects supporting the delivery of this strategy. Recent achievements include the opening of a winter night shelter; the city's first women's only hostel service and strengthening of our procedures for working across all partner agencies. We are implementing the Trailblazer project which has prevented many people becoming homeless and we have an affordable house building programme through our New Homes and Joint Venture initiatives.

This target of course remains a challenge as a result of a number of factors. We have had to absorb very significant saving across the council. We have a national housing crisis and the impact of welfare reforms is increasing the risk of homelessness, meaning rough sleeping all over the country is at unprecedented levels."

(11) Councillor Druitt

Policy on feeding seagulls and pigeons

"Whilst I commend the motives behind people feeding seagulls and pigeons, in some areas of the city, especially in our green spaces, this is having a detrimental effect on other bird species. Can the lead member for Environment, Transport and Sustainability tell me if there are any plans for a council policy on the feeding of seagulls and pigeons and can the signage that is in place in Powis Sq be erected in other green spaces too?"

Reply from Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, transport & Sustainability Committee

"We are planning to undertake an educational approach by displaying signs in certain problematic areas such as Pelham, Old Steine Memorial and Montpelier Crescent requesting that feeding does not take place."

Council

14 December 2017

Agenda Item 56

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Council Tax Reduction Review Extract from the proceedings of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee Meeting held on the 30 November 2017		
Date of Meeting:	14 th December 2017		
Report of:	Executive Lead for Strategy, Governance & Law		
Contact Officer:	Name:	John Peel	Tel: 01273 291058
	E-mail:	john.peel@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Wards Affected:	All		

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

To receive the item referred from the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee for decision:

Recommendations:

That the Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTR) be approved.

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

POLICY, RESOURCES & GROWTH COMMITTEE

4.00pm 30 NOVEMBER 2017

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Morgan (Chair), Hamilton (Deputy Chair), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), Mac Cafferty (Group Spokesperson), Bell, Mitchell, Peltzer Dunn, Sykes, Wealls and Yates.

PART ONE**61 COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION REVIEW**

- 61.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Finance & Resources in relation to the Council Tax Reduction Review. The Council introduced a local Council Tax Reduction (CTR) scheme from 1 April 2013 as a result of national changes to the Council Tax Benefit (CTB) system. Under legislation the local Council Tax Reduction Scheme must be reviewed each year. The purpose of the report was to set out that review and its recommendations.
- 61.2 Councillor Sykes noted that a decision had been made at Leaders Group that the council would not consult on the Scheme for 2018/19 meaning there was no opportunity to make changes. Councillor Sykes stated that the original decision had been made too quickly and should have included a fuller picture of budget and financial information. Councillor Sykes added that whilst he appreciated that consultation was costly and the response rate low, he felt it unfortunate that meant that the council would not be able to amend the scheme even slightly, for example to change the taper rate. Councillor Sykes expressed his concern that little was known about the decline in uptake that could relate to people leaving the city or that potential claimants were unaware of the scheme, particularly when matched against other key data such as the significant rise in food bank use. Councillor Sykes stated his group would be abstaining in response to the recommendations.
- 61.3 Councillor Hamilton stated that a consultation with the people affected held in the previous year had received a response rate of approximately 2 per cent. Councillor Hamilton noted that the consultation would cost around £15,000 to £20,000 and he did not believe that could be justified in the circumstances. Councillor Hamilton added that due to the drop of 7,000 claimants, the identified saving of £250,000 could be made without any changes to the system. Furthermore, further monies were proposed in the budget to mitigate the impact of welfare reform. Councillor Hamilton brought attention to the transitional protection arrangements that would move to Discretionary Council Tax

Reduction from April 2018, and that those that qualified for the former would be invited to apply for the latter as part of that change.

- 61.4 Councillor Mac Cafferty relayed his concern about the net effect of not consulting adding that he was sceptical as to why there had been a drop of 7,000 claimants and Members and officers needed to know the reasons behind that. Councillor Mac Cafferty added that he believed many people were unaware of the support available and it was vitally important to find out whether the scheme was working or not by conducting a consultation.
- 61.5 The Chair stated that there was a broader issue of the overall impact of welfare reform and whether the support the council provided was sufficient which was an issue the Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities & Equalities Committee could consider as the relevant portfolio holder.
- 61.6 The Executive Director, Finance & Resources stated there were many anecdotal reasons for the drop in the number of claimants although no specific research had been undertaken in Brighton & Hove.
- 61.7 The Chair stated that the Policy Team could be asked to look into the issue further and as a nationwide issue; there may be other research the council could draw upon to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of changes to the welfare system.
- 61.8 **RESOLVED-** That the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee:
- 1) Notes the review of the Council Tax Reduction scheme.
 - 2) Notes that the calculative elements of the scheme will be updated in line with national amounts. (These are the amounts used to work out CTR entitlements based on the number and age of people in the household and their circumstances)
 - 3) Notes the latest forecast reductions in claimant numbers will meet the forecast cost of the scheme included in the integrated service and financial plans (ISFPs) for 2018/19.
 - 4) Approves £150,000 funding for the discretionary fund in 2018/19; this would require one-off funding of £140,000.
- 61.9 **RESOLVES TO RECOMMEND:**
- That Policy, Resources & Growth Committee:
- 1) Recommends the scheme to Full Council.

Council

14 December 2017

Agenda Item 57

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: Review of Members' Allowances
Date of Meeting: 14th December 2017
Report of: Executive Lead for Strategy, Governance & Law
Contact Officer: Name: Mark Wall Tel: 01273 291006
E-mail: mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk
Wards Affected: All

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

To note the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel and the officer clarification to the recommendation for Council to approve as detailed below:

Recommendation:

That the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel is noted and the Panel's recommendation *at 2.1 on page 95 is agreed.*

Council

14 December 2017

Agenda Item 58

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Greater Brighton Economic Board- Admission of New Member Extract from the proceedings of the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee Meeting held on the 30 November 2017		
Date of Meeting:	14th December 2017		
Report of:	Executive Lead for Strategy, Governance & Law		
Contact Officer:	Name:	John Peel	Tel: 01273 291058
	E-mail:	john.peel@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Wards Affected:	All		

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

To receive the item referred from the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee for decision:

Recommendations:

- (1) That Crawley Borough Council joins the GBEJC and that Gatwick Airport Ltd join the GBBP thereby becoming members of the GBEB;
- (2) That it be noted that these changes to the membership are dependent on all the local authorities represented on the Board agreeing that the new members be appointed, and the Board taking a formal decision that the new members are appointed; and
- (3) That it be agreed to amend the Board's Heads of Terms and to instruct the Monitoring Officer to amend the Council's constitution to reflect these amendments once they have been formally approved by all the constituent authorities and the Greater Brighton Economic Board.

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

POLICY, RESOURCES & GROWTH COMMITTEE

4.00pm 30 NOVEMBER 2017

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Morgan (Chair), Hamilton (Deputy Chair), Janio (Opposition Spokesperson), Mac Cafferty (Group Spokesperson), Bell, Mitchell, Peltzer Dunn, Sykes, Wealls and Yates.

PART ONE**74 GREATER BRIGHTON ECONOMIC BOARD – ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBER TO THE BOARD**

- 74.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Economy, Environment & Culture that sought approval to enable Crawley Borough Council to become a member of the Greater Brighton Economic Board (GBEB). Each local authority member of the joint committee were seeking equivalent approvals from their decision-making bodies to enable Crawley Borough Council to become a member.
- 74.2 The Chair stated that upon his appointment to the GBEB, one of the first issues discussed was the potential expansion of the Board membership and he had volunteered to begin discussions with Crawley Borough Council and Gatwick to that end. Whilst those discussions had taken some time to come to fruition, it was a huge step for the Board and would strengthen the region's voice to central government and wider influence of the region.
- 74.3 Councillor Yates stated that as a key part of the region's economy and as a key link to London, the appointment of Crawley and Gatwick made a great deal of sense.
- 74.4 **RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND-** That Policy, Resources & Growth Committee:
- (1) Recommends to Full Council on 14 December 2017 that Crawley Borough Council joins the GBEJC and that Gatwick Airport Ltd join the GBBP.
 - (2) Notes that these changes to the membership are dependent on the decision of Full Council, all the local authorities represented on the Board agreeing that the new members be appointed, and the Board taking a formal decision that the new members are appointed.
 - (3) Recommends to Full Council that it agrees to amend the Board's Heads of Terms and that it instructs the Monitoring Officer to amend the Council's constitution to reflect these amendments once they have been formally approved by all the constituent authorities and the Greater Brighton Economic Board.

Council	Agenda Item 59(4)
14 December 2017	Brighton & Hove City Council

**NOTICE OF MOTION
TAXI AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE (PHV) LICENSING**

CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

That the motion be amended inserting the words shown in ***bold italic***.

This council resolves to:

- i) Inform the LGA of our support for their call for a “Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Reform Bill” to replace outdated deregulation legislation, in order to modernise the licensing system for taxis and PHVs, to the benefit of both passengers and the trade itself.
- ii) Request the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Transport, requesting the introduction of a “Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Reform Bill” in order to legislate that:
 - All taxi and private hire journeys should either start or end in the area for which the vehicle, driver and operator are licensed.
 - Councils can take appropriate enforcement action against any driver operating in their area, irrespective of where they are licensed.
 - National minimum standards ***mirroring Brighton and Hove City Council’s Blue Book*** to be introduced for taxi and PHVs, to align licensing and safety standards across the country, while retaining local flexibility for councils.
 - ***A National Register of revocations and refusals for individuals making applications in different areas is introduced.***
 - ***A National Intended Use Policy is introduced.***
 - ***A proper definition of “Plying for Hire” is provided.***
 - ***Detailed clarification of what is a “Booking App” and a “Hailing App” is provided.***

Proposed by: Cllr Lynda Hyde

Seconded by: Cllr Lee Wares

Motion to read if carried:

This council resolves to:

- i) Inform the LGA of our support for their call for a “Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Reform Bill” to replace outdated deregulation legislation, in order to modernise the licensing system for taxis and PHVs, to the benefit of both passengers and the trade itself.

- ii) Request the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Transport, requesting the introduction of a “Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Reform Bill” in order to legislate that:
- All taxi and private hire journeys should either start or end in the area for which the vehicle, driver and operator are licensed.
 - Councils can take appropriate enforcement action against any driver operating in their area, irrespective of where they are licensed.
 - National minimum standards mirroring Brighton and Hove City Council’s Blue Book to be introduced for taxi and PHVs, to align licensing and safety standards across the country, while retaining local flexibility for councils.
 - A National Register of revocations and refusals for individuals making applications in different areas is introduced.
 - A National Intended Use Policy is introduced.
 - A proper definition of “Plying for Hire” is provided.
 - Detailed clarification of what is a “Booking App” and a “Hailing App” is provided.

Council	Agenda Item 59(7)
14 December 2017	Brighton & Hove City Council

**NOTICE OF MOTION
GREEN GROUP
BRIGHTON AND HOVE AND BREXIT**

This Council notes the mounting evidence of damage that 'Brexit' would cause to the national economy and trans-European relationships, and the mismanagement of Brexit by the Government. Council also notes with concern the potential impact of Brexit both on our local economy and on established mutually beneficial partnerships and links with European cities such the Eurocities network. The Council requests:

- That the Chief Executive write to the President of the Eurocities Network, Mayor of Ghent Daniel Termont, expressing our desire to continue working with sister cities at this time of uncertainty for the UK, and exploring the status of Brighton and Hove's membership of Eurocities following any 'Brexit';
- That the Chief Executive writes to Sajid David, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, expressing this Council's and this city's strong desire for a referendum on the final terms of a Brexit deal, including the option to maintain full EU membership;
- That the Chief Executive writes to Hilary Benn MP, chair of the Brexit Select Committee, requesting that he share the full Brexit Impact Assessment Studies with particular relevance to the economy of our city.

Proposed by: Cllr Sykes

Seconded by: Cllr Littman

Supporting information:

- The Institute of Fiscal Studies estimated that leaving the EU would cost UK taxpayers between £20bn and £40bn a year. A Financial Times report collating analyses from major economic bodies including HM Treasury, London School of Economics and the CBI concluded: "*Rarely has there been such a consensus among economists, as there is on the damage that Brexit will wreak on the British economy.*" <http://on.ft.com/2dJEka4>
- Eurocities is an EU funded project bringing together 110 cities across Europe to develop strategies to manage EU wide issues such as migration. Brighton & Hove has also accessed EU funding and social programmes such as Interreg, European Social Fund and Erasmus Plus. Our city is chair of the [Brighton European Network \(BEN\)](#) and is a member of the Arc Manche, finding potential partners for projects that require them.
- MPs from all parties have called on the Government to publish the full results of the Brexit Impact Assessments, documents which detail the specific impact that leaving the EU would have on sectors of the UK economy bbc.in/2BvCra9

**NOTICE OF MOTION
COUNCIL OWNED SHORT TERM HOMELESSNESS ACCOMMODATION
LABOUR & CO-OPERATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT**

That the motion be amended to delete the words as struck through and insert those shown in ***bold italic***

This Council resolves:

1. ~~That as a matter of urgency,~~ **To** request that a report be brought to Housing & New Homes Committee on the business case modelling for a “spend to save” purchase of emergency/***temporary*** accommodation by the council and that this modeling:
 - (i) Estimates revenue savings on current expenditure of private provision;
 - (ii) Estimates the capital appreciation ***and rental income*** that would flow to the council through ownership of Emergency accommodation;
 - (iii) Explores the potential to offer greater support to residents of emergency accommodation from any savings achieved;
 - (iv) ~~That such modeling also consider~~ ***Should take into account and continue to build on the work already in progress on*** the feasibility of temporary housing ***options*** purchases, in addition to the existing HRA purchasing policy;
2. That ***after consideration and approval of the*** ~~That this modelling~~ ***report by the Housing & New Homes Committee any recommendations*** be reported ***referred*** to the Policy, Resources & Growth committee, ~~in order to explore acquiring such accommodation, including detail on possible timetables, plus any~~ ***such as recommendations on policy*** changes and delegated powers ~~needed to enable purchases to take place.~~

Proposed by: Cllr Meadows

Seconded by: Cllr Hill

Motion if carried to read:

This Council resolves:

1. To request that a report be brought to Housing & New Homes Committee on the business case modelling for a “spend to save” purchase of emergency/~~temporary~~ accommodation by the council and that this modeling:
 - (i) Estimates revenue savings on current expenditure of private provision;
 - (ii) Estimates the capital appreciation ***and rental income*** that would flow to the council through ownership of Emergency accommodation;
 - (iii) Explores the potential to offer greater support to residents of emergency accommodation from any savings achieved;
 - (iv) ***Should take into account and continue to build on the work already in progress on*** the feasibility of temporary housing ***options***, in addition to the existing HRA purchasing policy;

2. That after consideration and approval of the report by the Housing & New Homes Committee any recommendations be referred to the Policy, Resources & Growth committee, such as recommendations on policy changes and delegated powers.

Supporting information:

- 1) In 2016/17, £0.571m in Housing Benefit was used to cover the cost of Emergency Accommodation landlord charges in the city; and £16.66m in Housing benefit payments were used to cover temporary accommodation costs. (<http://bit.ly/2AdZ9pi>)
- 2) Given cheap borrowing rates, right to buy receipts and prospective rental income it is likely to prove cost effective for the Council to acquire buildings (e.g. via Public Works Loans Board and Right to Buy funds) to directly provide short term homelessness accommodation rather than use private providers. Current PWLB rates are just over 2% for a 30 year loan.
- 3) Investment in emergency/temporary accommodation can allow the council to save on future revenue. Reports on a similar initiative from Shepway Council detailed that providing 12 units of temporary accommodation in-house would save £0.186m per year and produce '*a far superior housing solution*' with '*long term capital asset value*' (<http://bit.ly/2zQm4I7>)
- 4) Initial modelling suggests rental income would generate a surplus which could be used to provide much-needed support services for residents, who are often at crisis point. Current private Emergency/Temporary Accommodation providers, such as Baron Homes and Helgor Trading, are not contracted to provide such support services.