



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

# **COUNCIL ADDENDUM**

**4.30PM, THURSDAY, 22 OCTOBER 2020**

**VIRTUAL TEAMS MEETING**



# ADDENDUM

<b>ITEM</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>41</b>	<b>WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.</b>	<b>5 - 6</b>
	List of written questions from members of the public.	
<b>42</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.</b>	<b>7 - 10</b>
	List of deputations received from members of the public.	
<b>43</b>	<b>PETITIONS FOR COUNCIL DEBATE</b>	<b>11 - 12</b>
	Amendment proposed by Councillor Osborne on behalf of the Green Group.	
<b>Notices of Motion</b>		
The following amendments to the Notices of Motions listed in the agenda have been submitted by Members for consideration.		
<b>51</b>	<b>COUNCIL OWNED LAND ON THE URBAN FRINGE</b>	<b>13 - 16</b>
	(1) Amendment proposed by Councillor Hill on behalf of the Labour Group.	
	(2) Amendment proposed by Councillor Gibson on behalf of the Green Group.	
<b>52</b>	<b>IMPROVING THE AVAILABILITY OF BEACH HUTS AND CHALETS</b>	<b>17 - 18</b>
	Amendment proposed by Councillor Nemeth on behalf of the Conservative Group.	
<b>53</b>	<b>20 MINUTE NEIGHBOURHOODS</b>	<b>19 - 20</b>
	Amendment proposed by Councillor Hills on behalf of the Green Group.	
<b>55</b>	<b>PLANNING BY COMMITTEE, NOT BY GOVERNMENT</b>	<b>21 - 22</b>
	Amendment proposed by Councillor Miller on behalf of the Conservative Group.	
<b>58</b>	<b>FIELD OFFICERS</b>	<b>23 - 24</b>
	Amendment proposed by Councillor Powell on behalf of the Green Group.	



**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 question has been received from a member of the public.

**1. QUESTION From: Rob Shepherd**

As custodian of part of England's transport infrastructure, the City has a statutory duty to keep traffic flowing in and beyond its own boundaries and to liaise with other authorities, as set out in the 2004 Traffic Management Act (Network Management, Duty Guidance, Section 31) .

As the predicted traffic delays from Valley Gardens Phase 3 and Black Rock will significantly add to the problems on the already congested A259, please detail the discussions you had with ESSC to ensure traffic flows will be protected on this important section of the Major Road Network?

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

**2. QUESTION From: Nigel Smith**

Having missed your Transport Carbon Emission Reduction targets by 70% year on year since they were set post-Kyoto, please explain why they were missed and confirm that all parties involved in 2030 zero emissions planning will be fully briefed on this historic failure, so it is not repeated.

Do you agree "that reduction pathways are as important as reduction targets" or in other words that setting a nice sounding 2030 target has little value unless the path to get there is set out and monitored?

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

**3. QUESTION From: Bryan Cole**

Whitehawk is one of the most deprived areas in the city. East Brighton food co-op has been supplying over 700 hot meals per week to needy people during this crisis. What percentage of funding from the Covid emergency food fund has been allocated to this?

**Councillor Gibson, Joint Deputy Chair (Finance) of the Policy & Resources Committee will reply.**

**4. QUESTION From: Rose Bunker**

Why has the South Downs National Park's objection to the proposed Joint Venture Development on the Coldean Lane Site not been fully and publicly addressed?

They called the development 'an inappropriate scale and density for this hillside urban fringe location within the setting of the SDNP' and said that 'It would also appear to conflict with Policy SA4 of the City Plan Part One, and with the proposed designation of the site as a Local Nature Reserve'.

The number of dwellings was subsequently reduced from 250 to 242, but this in no way answers the SDNP's concerns.

**Councillor Littman, Chair of the Planning Committee will reply.**

**5. QUESTION From: James Noble**

Rejection of petitions submitted to full council:

People across our city sacrifice their time to publicises and collect signatures about issues that are important to them. Does the Mayor, therefore, agree that the unconstitutional rejection of petitions submitted to full council for debate sends a message that our council doesn't want to listen?

**The Mayor, Councillor Robins will reply.**

**6. QUESTION From: Anna de Wit**

Why is a site dangerously positioned between Coldean Lane (already an accident blackspot) and the sheer drop to the Brighton Bypass, of so steep a gradient that it was described in a 2008 Urban Study as 'undevelopable', now considered suitable for 240 dwellings in high-rise blocks?

**Councillor Littman, Chair of the Planning Committee will reply.**

**7. QUESTION From: Jiva Masheder**

I would like to know why you are still investing in oil and gas and when you plan to divest this money and move it into funds that do not damage the climate and our living world? oil and gas companies are not aligned with the necessity of urgent carbon cuts. The emergency is now, there is no more time left to dither and not act.

**Councillor Druitt, Joint Deputy Chair (Finance) of the Policy & Resources 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 spokesperson for 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.

**(1) Deputation concerning the Gasworks site in East Brighton  
Spokesperson Marie Sansford**

Supported by:  
Keeley Bignal  
Stephen White  
Pip Tyler  
Michael Pegley

**Ward affected: East Brighton**

Councillor Mac Cafferty, Leader of the Council will reply.

**(1) Deputation concerning the Gasworks site in East Brighton  
Spokesperson – Marie Sansford**



Action on Gasworks Housing Affordability, Safety and Transparency

AGHAST presentation to Full Council 22 October 2020

Brighton Gasworks Development recently in the pre-application process.

AGHAST is a group of concerned residents of East Brighton and we are here to urge you to robustly invoke health and safety protections in dealing with this application. Berkeley Homes/St William propose to build 600-700 flats on the gasworks in blocks of up to 15 storeys, placed around gas pipes and other installations still in use. These will require deep foundations in the areas currently occupied by huge, redundant gas tanks and ducts. Soil tests for the site are unavailable and testing will be done once permission is obtained.

Brownfield sites are seen as the way forward to provide more housing. However there is a material difference between developing railway sidings, goods yards etc, and developing gasworks, because of the toxicity of the latter. When Hove gasworks was developed in the 1980s-90's, and a survey by Hove Borough Council detected untreatable toxins in the fabric of the site, it was deemed unsuitable for residential use. It now houses a Tesco and a large car park, which required shallower foundations than tower blocks.

In 2010 Ealing Council refused Berkeley's application for planning permission on the Southall Gasworks on environmental and health grounds. When, as Mayor of London, Boris Johnson overturned that decision, residents soon experienced strong toxic smells of petroleum, and were exposed to naphthalene, a known carcinogen, at levels considered too high by PHE. There has been a higher than normal incidence of ill-health involving peoples' airways, from breathing difficulties to terminal cancers. A legal case being built by local residents seeks a stop to the works on the grounds of 'Nuisance'. In Brighton similar work on the gasworks site could spread pollution over a vast residential area in which are located ten schools and colleges, parks and playing fields, golf courses and our main hospital.

Berkeley now own more than 20 gasworks sites around the country. Worried residents have created a national pressure group, Gasworks Communities United, to demand the highest standards of safety and monitoring of these developments. The Campaign for Clean Air in Southall and Hayes (CASH) is supported by the local and national Green Party, which made a film viewable on the CASH website. We understand that Green Party colleagues from Ealing have approached the leadership of B&H Council with their concerns.

We urge the Council to take seriously its responsibility for the protection of Environment and Health under DM40/41 of City Plan 2, and propose that it should follow the example of Hove Borough Council and allow only limited development of this site. If nothing else, we call upon the Council to ensure that a thorough independent assessment of the site is carried out before planning permission is even considered., We request that the findings are shared with the community before any planning permission is granted.

## **Brighton Gasworks development – pollution concerns**

### **Summary of concerns**

Development of the Brighton Gasworks site risks releasing potent toxins including carcinogens into the atmosphere. These pose a direct threat to human health as well as the surrounding natural environment including the South Downs National Park – home to rare and protected species.

### **Pollutants found on a typical gasworks**

Former gasworks sites typically contain a range of pollutants in the soil. These include polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), petroleum hydrocarbons, asbestos, metals, cyanides, sulphur, and ammonium compounds and nitrates.

### **What happens when these pollutants are disturbed through construction?**

Pollutants will be released from the soil and into the atmosphere in both particulate and gaseous form. Small particles pose the greatest danger as they can reach deep into the lungs. These light particles will remain in the atmosphere for long periods increasing the risk of exposure through inhalation.

The toxins will enter homes where they can be concentrated to harmful levels.

As well as being present in the atmosphere the toxins will settle and contaminate the soil in surrounding gardens and parks including the South Downs National Park.

### **Harmful effects of exposure to these toxins**

These toxins include carcinogens (cancer causing), mutagens (cause genetic deformations) and teratogens (harm foetus in the womb). They have a range of other impacts including causing breathing difficulties, asthma, kidney and liver damage.

There are no safe levels for many of these toxins.

### **These impacts are real and happening now at sites developed by St William**

Residents near to former gasworks developments including Southall, Hornsey and Bow in London have reported long term breathing difficulties, increases in incidences of asthma, nausea, mental confusion, eye problems, headaches.

### **Impacts on the surrounding natural environment**

The chalk grassland of the South Downs National Park hosts rare and protected species of birds, butterflies and plants. Pollutants risk ecological impacts such as altering species composition, direct toxic damage and making plants more vulnerable to frost, drought and pathogens.

**Conclusion:** The safest place for these harmful toxins is to keep them locked away in the soil and undisturbed on the site.

**Dr Keeley Signal – expertise in air pollution including PhD in motor vehicle pollution and post-doc research on combustion emissions such as PAHs.**

### Brighton Gasworks – pollution concerns. References.

<https://www.thecentriclab.com/air-pollution-health-in-southall-london>

Banks, M.K., Schultz, K.E. Comparison of Plants for Germination Toxicity Tests in Petroleum-Contaminated Soils. (2005). *Water Air Soil Pollution* **167**, 211–219

Kuppusamy S, Maddela NR, Megharaj M, Venkateswarlu K (2019) Impact of Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons on Human Health. *Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons*

Kim K, Ara Jahan S, Kabir E, Brown RJC (2013) A review of airborne polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and their human health effects. *Environment International*

Kisku GC, Tripathi S, Raj A (2018). Polycyclic-aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in environment and human health: a review. *International Journal of Advanced Research*

Jan Alexander, Diane Benford, Andrew Cockburn, Jean-Pierre Cravedi, Eugenia Dogliotti, Alessandro Di Domenico, María Luisa Fernández-Cruz, Johanna Fink-Gremmels, Peter Fürst, Corrado Galli, Philippe Grandjean, Jadwiga Gzyl, Gerhard Heinemeyer, Niklas Johansson, Antonio Mutti, Josef Schlatter, Rolaf van Leeuwen, Carlos Van Peteghem, Philippe Verger. (2008) Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Food. Scientific Opinion of the Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain. *The European Food Safety Authority Journal*

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/aug/27/londoners-claim-toxic-air-from-gasworks-damaging-their-health>

<https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wildlife-habitats/habitats/chalk-grassland/>

<https://www.rspb.org.uk/birds-and-wildlife/wildlife-guides/bird-a-z/skylark/>

<https://www.wildlifetrusts.org/wildlife-explorer/invertebrates/butterflies>

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/sep/22/residents-demand-new-clean-air-rules-for-former-gasworks-sites-in-england>

**A BASIC INCOME TRIAL FOR BRIGHTON AND HOVE  
– PETITIONS FOR DEBATE**

**GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT**

That additional recommendations 2.2 and 2.3 be added to the recommendations as shown below in ***bold italics***:

- 2.2 That the Chief Executive be requested to write to the Chancellor expressing the council's support for a basic income pilot in the area and calling on the government to undertake a feasibility study to detail how best to implement a local basic income trial for the city; and***
- 2.3 That in addition, to request that the Chief Executive includes the reply from the government in the Full Council papers after the reply is received.***

Proposed by: Cllr Osborne

Seconded by: Cllr Druitt

Recommendations if carried to read:

- 2.1 That the petition is noted and referred to the Policy & Resources Committee for consideration;
- 2.2 That the Chief Executive be requested to write to the Chancellor expressing the council's support for a basic income pilot in the area and calling on the government to undertake a feasibility study to detail how best to implement a local basic income trial for the city; and
- 2.3 That in addition, to request that the Chief Executive includes the reply from the government in the Full Council papers after the reply is received.



## LABOUR GROUP AMENDMENT

## COUNCIL-OWNED LAND ON THE URBAN FRINGE

To amend the motion with the insertion of a new point 2 and additional points 3 and 4 as shown below in ***bold italics*** and deletion of the original point 2 as struck through.

This Council

1. Expresses its preference that the land on the urban fringe of Brighton & Hove which is presently owned by Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC), or subsequently acquired by BHCC, would not be used or disposed of (including through joint ventures) for housing development.; ~~and~~
- ~~2. That Policy & Resources Committee be requested to call for a report in order to establish such a policy to protect the urban fringe for the benefit of the City's residents.~~
2. ***Notes that the inclusion of urban fringe sites in the City Plan was expressly required by the current government's Planning Inspector, and the council's refusal to consider sites would have resulted in a failure to adopt a plan and an inability to apply local policies;***
3. ***Expresses concern that the government's planning reforms do not by default consider urban fringe sites to be "protected", provide no guarantees that the urban fringe sites which would be protected from development in the proposed City Plan Part 2 would remain so, and do not rule out development on so-called "protected sites" in any case; and***
4. ***Notes that the city's current urban fringe policies providing amenity to residents, such as increased public access, biodiversity net gain, food growing, and sustainability are at risk from the government's proposed reforms.***

Proposed by: Cllr Hill

Seconded by: Cllr Childs

**Motion if carried to read:**

This Council

1. Expresses its preference that the land on the urban fringe of Brighton & Hove which is presently owned by Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC), or subsequently acquired by BHCC, would not be used or disposed of (including through joint ventures) for housing development.; and

2. Notes that the inclusion of urban fringe sites in the City Plan was expressly required by the current government's Planning Inspector, and the council's refusal to consider sites would have resulted in a failure to adopt a plan and an inability to apply local policies;
3. Expresses concern that the government's planning reforms do not by default consider urban fringe sites to be "protected", provide no guarantees that the urban fringe sites which would be protected from development in the proposed City Plan Part 2 would remain so, and do not rule out development on so-called "protected sites" in any case; and
4. Notes that the city's current urban fringe policies providing amenity to residents, such as increased public access, biodiversity net gain, food growing, and sustainability are at risk from the government's proposed reforms.

## GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT

## COUNCIL OWNED LAND ON URBAN FRINGE

That the motion be amended to insert the text as shown in ***bold italics*** and delete the text as struck through.

This Council

- ***Requests that the Chief Executive contacts Robert Jenrick MP, to express council's preference that the land on the urban fringe of Brighton & Hove which is presently privately owned or owned by Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC), or subsequently acquired by BHCC, should not be put at risk, used or disposed of (including through joint ventures) for housing development by housebuilding targets imposed through central government planning policy, and that our preference is for brownfield development.; and;***
- ***Stating that while the council's City Plan means that over 85% of new residential development will take place on brownfield sites, the requirement to meet centrally set housebuilding targets continues to force councils to use urban fringe sites for housing development***
- ~~***That Policy & Resources Committee be requested to call for a report in order to establish such a policy to protect the urban fringe for the benefit of the City's residents.***~~

Proposed by: Cllr Gibson

Seconded by: Cllr Littman

**Recommendation if carried to read:**

This Council

- Requests that the Chief Executive contacts Robert Jenrick MP, to express council's preference that the land on the urban fringe of Brighton & Hove which is presently privately owned or owned by Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC), or subsequently acquired by BHCC, should not be *put at risk*, used or disposed of for housing development by housebuilding targets imposed through central government planning policy, and that our preference is for brownfield development; and
- Stating that while the council's City Plan means that over 85% of new residential development will take place on brownfield sites, the requirement to meet centrally set housebuilding targets continues to force councils to use urban fringe sites for housing development.



**CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT****IMPROVING THE AVAILABILITY OF BEACH HUTS AND CHALETS**

To amend the motion with the insertion of the final paragraph as shown below in ***bold italics***.

This Council notes that we are currently conducting a consultation on beach chalets and that due to demand, the waiting lists are currently closed; Council also notes that a report is due to go before committee after the current consultation ends in November in order to receive the findings of this consultation;

Council requests that this report:

1. Explores options to finance the building of additional beach chalets or beach huts to rent or to purchase;
2. Identifies locations for more chalets and huts along parts of the seafront including less well-visited parts to help regenerate those areas and provide essential footfall for local businesses including east of the Palace Pier;
3. Identifies how beach huts and chalet income east of the Palace Pier could support additional borrowing and regeneration of Madeira Terraces and contribute to the wider area's regeneration and renewal.

***Further, Council recognises the distress that was caused to beach hut owners in 2018 by the local authority's threat to remove huts from the promenade if owners did not sign up to a 3,000% rise in the beach hut sales fee and pledges to work with Hove Beach Hut Association and other representatives of hut owners on hut-related issues.***

Proposed by: Cllr Nemeth

Seconded by: Cllr Mears

**Motion if carried to read:**

This Council notes that we are currently conducting a consultation on beach chalets and that due to demand, the waiting lists are currently closed; Council also notes that a report is due to go before committee after the current consultation ends in November in order to receive the findings of this consultation;

Council requests that this report:

1. Explores options to finance the building of additional beach chalets or beach huts to rent or to purchase;

2. Identifies locations for more chalets and huts along parts the seafront including less well-visited parts to help regenerate those areas and provide essential footfall for local businesses including east of the Palace Pier;
3. Identifies how beach huts and chalet income east of the Palace Pier could support additional borrowing and regeneration of Madeira Terraces and contribute to the wider area's regeneration and renewal.

Further, Council recognises the distress that was caused to beach hut owners in 2018 by the local authority's threat to remove huts from the promenade if owners did not sign up to a 3,000% rise in the beach hut sales fee and pledges to work with Hove Beach Hut Association and other representatives of hut owners on hut-related issues.

**20 MINUTE NEIGHBOURHOODS****GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT**

To amend the notice of motion with the insertion of the text as shown in ***bold italics*** and the deletion of the text as shown below:

This Council notes our shared targets set out in both the corporate plan and City Plan Part 2 to build community wealth and affordable housing and reach carbon neutrality by 2030, and the importance to these goals of fostering a circular local economy.

Council recognises that both during and after the ongoing COVID crisis there is a pressing need to grow local place-based cohesion and wellbeing, and believes launching a “20-minute neighbourhood” initiative as part of a community wealth building approach to Covid recovery ***could build on the work already agreed by ETS committee around the introduction of low traffic neighbourhoods and help*** meet these ***shared*** aims.

Council therefore calls for;

- 1) The convening of the Community Wealth Building Working Group at the earliest opportunity and;
- 2) For that group to work with officers to produce a report for committee(s) that seeks - ***alongside ward councillors and residents groups*** - to identify feasible locations to implement both micro “20-minute neighbourhood” projects (such as community gardens and edible bus stops) and a full-scale pilot scheme for the model;
- 3) That report to include the exploration of possible sources of funding to support investment in this full-scale pilot; and
- 4) That officers ***and CWB working group*** ~~be requested to seek~~ ***liaise with councillors and local community groups*** ~~to identify~~ ***both on possible locations and on identifying*** potential partners ***from other local institutions – particularly those involved in the areas of education, health and wellbeing*** for the pilot scheme ~~these~~ ***“20-minute neighbourhood” projects*** amongst other local anchor institutions, ~~particularly those involved in the areas of education and health and wellbeing~~

Proposed by: Councillor Hills

Seconded by: Councillor Heley

**Motion to read if carried:**

This Council notes our shared targets set out in both the corporate plan and City Plan Part 2 to build community wealth and affordable housing and reach carbon neutrality by 2030, and the importance to these goals of fostering a circular local economy.

Council recognises that both during and after the ongoing COVID crisis there is a pressing need to grow local place-based cohesion and wellbeing, and believes launching a “20-minute neighbourhood” initiative as part of a community wealth building approach to Covid recovery could build on the work already agreed by ETS committee around the introduction of low traffic neighbourhoods and help meet these shared aims.

Council therefore calls for;

- 1) The convening of the Community Wealth Building Working Group at the earliest opportunity and;
- 2) For that group to work with officers to produce a report for committee(s) that seeks - alongside ward councillors and residents groups - to identify feasible locations to implement both micro “20-minute neighbourhood” projects (such as community gardens and edible bus stops) and a full-scale pilot scheme for the model;
- 3) That report to include the exploration of possible sources of funding to support investment in this full-scale pilot; and
- 4) That officers and CWB working group liaise with councillors and local community groups both on possible locations and on identifying potential partners from other local institutions – particularly those involved in the areas of education, health and wellbeing for these “20-minute neighbourhood” projects.

**CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT****PLANNING BY COMMITTEE, NOT BY GOVERNMENT**

To amend the motion with the insertion of the final paragraph as shown below in ***bold italics***.

That this Council ***notes*** supports the call of the Local Government Association to 'Keep Planning Local' ***with caveats*** and calls on the Chief Executive to write to Robert Jenrick, MP, ***welcoming the Planning White Paper, and the proposals for more homes and affordable ones to be built across the UK, but more importantly in Brighton & Hove and in the Greater Brighton area, whilst*** urging the Government to address flaws in the Government's Planning White Paper ***heed the comments submitted in response to the White Paper*** and provide ***additional*** support for Local Planning Authorities, as follows:

- 1) to ~~consider~~ reform of the Land Compensation Act of 1961, (~~as referenced in the 2018 Letwin Review of Build Outs~~) in order to ***which enshrines in law the right of landowners – in the case of compulsory purchase by the state – to be reimbursed not only for the value of their site in its current use but for any prospective use to which it might be put in the future, and*** prevent 'land banking' and ensure affordable housing provision [1];
- 2) ***to revise the 1961 Act, so that assessments of market value do not incorporate prospective planning permissions, would reframe incentives in the land market by enabling public authorities to acquire development sites at prices closer to its existing use value; and***
- 3) to ***look to*** provide additional support to local planning authorities to address the impact of long-term austerity cuts on local planning teams [2] and equip them with the resources needed to support local communities ***levers, tools and resources needed to support local communities including allowing them to have autonomy over planning fees they can charge.***
- 4) to ~~remove the imposition of further 'housing targets' and 'zonal' plans that risk the status of green spaces in the city.~~

Proposed by: Cllr Miller

Seconded by: Cllr Bagaeen

**Motion if carried to read:**

That this Council notes the call of the Local Government Association to 'Keep Planning Local' with caveats and calls on the Chief Executive to write to Robert Jenrick, MP, welcoming the Planning White Paper, and the proposals for more homes and affordable ones to be built across the UK, but more importantly in Brighton & Hove and in the Greater Brighton area, whilst urging the Government to heed the comments

submitted in response to the White Paper and provide additional support for Local Planning Authorities, as follows:

- 1) to reform of the Land Compensation Act of 1961, which enshrines in law the right of landowners – in the case of compulsory purchase by the state – to be reimbursed not only for the value of their site in its current use but for any prospective use to which it might be put in the future, and prevent ‘land banking’ and ensure affordable housing provision [1];
- 2) to revise the 1961 Act, so that assessments of market value do not incorporate prospective planning permissions, would reframe incentives in the land market by enabling public authorities to acquire development sites at prices closer to its existing use value; and
- 3) to look to provide additional support to local planning authorities[2] and equip them with the levers, tools and resources needed to support local communities including allowing them to have autonomy over planning fees they can charge.

**GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT****FIELD OFFICERS**

That the motion be amended to insert the text as shown in ***bold italics*** and delete the text as struck through.

This council

- Notes that ~~at the last council meeting on 13 August 2020 the Administration advised that 2.5 of the City's 7 FTE field officer positions were left unfilled.~~
- ~~Notes that on 22 September the council advised~~ **as of September 2020, 3.0 FTE 2.5 of the City's 7 FTE Field Officer positions were unfilled.**
- ~~Notes that that the residents of the City pay for Field Officers through council tax and the HRA budget contributions.~~
- Calls on the ~~Policy & Resources Committee~~ **Tourism, Equalities, Communities & Culture Committee** to include in its upcoming report ~~request a report that investigates why the positions were unfilled over the summer the challenges and expectations of Field Officers, strategies to support the team going forward, and a review of what other support could be put in place - particularly to retain staff; and~~
- Asks that officers include in this urgent report a strategy to ensure that the council is effectively using all the tools at its disposal to tackle anti-social behaviour **and updating the committee on liaison with all those responsible for this work, including Sussex Police, the Community Safety Team, and Housing, so as to ensure the smooth running and appropriate support for the Field Officer service.** ~~and is making best use of not leaving precious resources unused~~

Proposed by: Cllr Powell

Seconded by: Cllr Clare

**Motion if carried to read:**

This council

- Notes that as of September 2020, 3.0 FTE of the City's 7 FTE Field Officer positions were unfilled.
- Calls on the Tourism, Equalities, Communities & Culture Committee to include in its upcoming report the challenges and expectations of Field Officers, strategies to support the team going forward, and a review of what other support could be put in place - particularly to retain staff; and
- Asks that officers include in this urgent report a strategy to ensure that the council is effectively using all the tools at its disposal to tackle anti-social behaviour and updating the committee on liaison with all those responsible for this work, including Sussex Police, the Community Safety Team and Housing, so as to ensure the smooth running and appropriate support for the Field Officer service.

