



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

**TOURISM, DEVELOPMENT &
CULTURE COMMITTEE
ADDENDUM**

4.00PM, THURSDAY, 8 MARCH 2018

HOVE TOWN HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBER

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
55	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	1 - 2
56	MEMBER INVOLVEMENT	3 - 6

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 Chair may decline to answer and offer a written response instead. 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 a member of the public.

(a) Affordable Housing – Question from Diane Montgomery (On behalf of the Living Rent Campaign)

“The Living Rent Campaign asks why so many new private housing developments are given planning permission without meeting the council 40% quota of affordable housing, and notes that new developments in the city are aimed at the luxury market and do little to address the serious housing crisis in the area.

We also note that 80% of market rent is unrealistic for ordinary people. We suggest that the council develop affordable rented guidance based on 60% of the local market rents to define affordable (and the figure should be no more than the LHA), and that the council gives priority to allocate new affordable social housing to the council as opposed to housing associations, many of which are now no longer addressing real social need.”

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

The following questions listed on pages 17 - 18 of the agenda have been received from councillors and will be taken as read along with the written answers from Councillor Robins, the Chair of the Committee listed below.

The Chair will give an opportunity for the councillor who submitted a question to ask one supplementary question.

(a) Councillor Nemeth**ROYAL PAVILION**

Mindful that the Chairman has worked exceedingly hard to ease relations with Pavilion staff, will he now give an update on the project; an explanation of the mechanism used to delay matters (in conflict with a decision by PRG Committee and as reported in the Argus); and some indication of an updated timetable?

Reply from the Chair:

The decision of the PR&G committee remains in place until and unless a different decision is made by the Committee. However, implementation of the decision has been delayed in order to allow for a further and external review of the options. The change that has been made relates to the mechanism for implementation, to allow time for an external review. We currently expect the review and engagement of staff and trade unions will take up to the end of September. The decision of the PR&G committee remains in place until and unless a different decision is made by the Committee and, of course, the final decision as to what happens remains with Members.

(b) Councillor Nemeth**KING ALFRED**

Will the Chairman explain who will be filling the gap in council tax and business rates of approximately £1 million per annum that we are left with following delays to the development of the King Alfred site?

Reply from the Chair:

As with all major projects, the complexity of delivery means timescales are subject to change. As a result, the council's financial planning and projections of future resources from Council Tax and Business Rates do not include major projects until there is certainty of delivery and the timing of this. Council Tax and Business Rates estimates are agreed each January for the financial year ahead; estimates beyond this period use the latest information available and are updated regularly but currently do not make an allowance for increased revenue from the King Alfred site and therefore there is no gap in resource projections as a result of the revised timetable for the King Alfred development. The existing facilities at the King Alfred site continue to pay business rates. With the recent

award of Housing Infrastructure Funding to support the King Alfred project we hope the project will now be able to move forward.

(c) Councillor Nemeth

NOTICE TO BEACH HUT OWNERS OF INCREASED FEES

Given that the current beach hut 'Terms and Conditions' document states that "The Licensee shall...Pay the fee as set out over the page and any increased fee as may be notified to the Licensee at least 2 months prior to 1st April in any year.", would the Chairman confirm what date Licensees were notified of increased fees?

Reply from the Chair:

A letter was drafted at the end of January to notify Beach Hut owners of the increase in fees with 2 months' notice prior to the 1st April. For those Beach Hut owners that the Seafront Team held an email address the notification was issued on the 1st February. However, actual letters were not issued until the 8th February due to other Seafront operational issues taking priority. Therefore, as the appropriate notice has not been given to all Beach Hut owners of the increase in licence fee on 1st April 2018 there will be no increase in the licence fee for the year commencing 1 April 2018.

We will be contacting the beach hut owners with this updated position as soon as possible.

(d) Councillor Nemeth

MARLBOROUGH HOUSE

Following the expiration of an enforcement notice on 6th November 2017 for unauthorised works to this historic building, a site visit on 8th November, and subsequent legal advice immediately afterwards, would the Chairman detail precisely what action has been taken over the past four months to regularise the situation?

Reply from the Chair:

Prosecution proceedings have commenced in respect of the failure to comply with the two outstanding Listed Building Enforcement Notices. The owner was summoned to appear at the Magistrates' Court on 14 February but the hearing was postponed on the day due to the owner's ill health and will now take place on 2 May.

(e) Councillor Nemeth

SCULPTURE TRAIL

Given the excitement surrounding the forthcoming launch of the Hove Plinth, and the unveiling of its first exhibit, might the Chairman now be more inclined to support Hove Civic Society's Sculpture Trail initiative which would come at no cost to the taxpayer?

Reply from the Chair:

The organisers of the Hove Plinth have been advised by officers in relation to their proposal, and the various restrictions which apply to existing sources of funding. The city is in the process of developing a Cultural Framework with the arts and culture sector. This has identified a need for a more considered view of how the public realm is used as a cultural space, how the natural and built environment could be improved through cultural interventions and how funds available through, for example, s106 or Community Infrastructure Levy could be used, subject to Council policy. The development of the Cultural Framework is being presented at the Committee today and includes reference to developing a clear strategic approach to public art, which will include mechanisms for managing the siting of artworks, improving commissioning and decommissioning processes, engagement with artists and building relationships with developers. I support the Hove Plinth and very much look forward to the first sculpture being unveiled. I also support art in the public realm in appropriate sites and settings and the potential for the Sculpture Trail to contribute to the objectives of the cultural framework once further work has been done to agree priorities for projects, sites and use of any funds available.

(f) Councillor Nemeth

HIPPODROME

Would the Chairman confirm what action has been taken following the painting of the front of the Hippodrome with large multi-coloured writing, presumably upon the instruction of the site's owner, which amounts to unauthorised works to a Listed Building?

Reply from the Chair:

Officers established contact with the new owner in February and will be arranging to carry out inspection of the building shortly. In the meantime, the owner has been advised of the council's concerns over the unauthorised painted 'artwork' and graffiti on the Middle Street frontage.

(g) Councillor Nemeth

PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

"Will the Chairman provide the latest figures for open and pending planning enforcement cases for (a) August, (b) September, (c) October and (d) November?, (e) December, (f) January and (g) February?"

Reply from the Chair:

	Cases received	Cases Closed	Total Live Cases
Aug-17	61	82	763
Sep-17	48	42	769
Oct-17	51	45	775

Nov-17	60	55	780
Dec-17	31	41	771
Jan-18	44	42	773
Feb-18	55	35	793

The table above sets out the number of open and pending planning enforcement cases and the number of cases closed for August 2017 - February 2018. There has been an increase in the number of cases overall, however, this remains lower than the number of open cases in April 2017 (807). For most months the number of cases closed is comparable to the number of new cases received. The Enforcement Team received a higher number of new cases in February compared to December and January due to lower levels of building work in December and January.

The number of live cases has increased to 793 and remains higher than the Team would have liked. The team are pursuing a number of measures in the next 6 months to address this. In the spring, the Enforcement Team will be reviewing and streamlining business processes which will improve the efficiency of the service. Onsite electronic solution is currently being investigated which will help streamline working. The Team is also preparing a new Enforcement Policy, which is expected to be presented to TDC Committee and will help improve the efficiency of the service. This will identify priorities for a Service for which there is high demand. An additional Planning Officer in the Enforcement Team, in the last year, has supported enforcement work on HMOs and has contributed to the number of cases closed over the last year. This resource has been extended to the end of 2018.

(h) Councillor Mears

THE BIG SCREEN

Does the Chairman feel that (a) Councillors were adequately consulted in choosing an operator for the Big Screen and (b) would he detail what matters Councillors were consulted on prior to the choosing of the operator?

Reply from the Chair:

I do feel that councillors were adequately consulted in choosing an operator for the Screen on the Beach. After the initial consultation session a further session was offered to the nominated representatives of each party to ensure that adequate consultation took place. Councillors were consulted on the outcome of the evaluation process for the applications to operate a Screen on the Beach. This included the advertised evaluation criteria of “history of the provider”, “operational plans, management and programme”, “local economic impact” and “licence fee offer”.