

TOURISM, EQUALITIES, COMMUNITIES & CULTURE COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

4.00PM, THURSDAY, 17 JUNE 2021

HOVE TOWN HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBER

Agendas and minutes are published on the council's website www.brighton-hove.gov.uk. Agendas are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

Electronic agendas can also be accessed through our meetings app available through [ModernGov: iOS/Windows/Android](#)

This agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
5	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	5 – 14
	(b) List of questions from members of the public.	
	(c) Deputation from Mr. Hart.	
9	MHCLG FUNDING AWARD	15 - 16
	Cross-party amendment. Proposed by Councillor Simson.	
11	BEACH CHALET FEASIBILITY STUDY AND LETTING POLICY	17 – 3
	Appendix 6 circulated for information.	
13	VOLK'S RAILWAY POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS	33 – 34
	Labour Group amendment. Proposed by Councillor Grimshaw.	

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting for questions submitted by a member of the public.

The question will be answered without discussion. The person who asked the question may ask one relevant supplementary question, which shall be put and answered without discussion. The person to whom a question, or supplementary question, has been put may decline to answer it.

The following written questions have been received from members of the public:

1. Peter Crowhurst

On 12 June 2020, this committee claimed on the Council website that Georgian Brighton and Hove was '*built on the sugar trade and enslavement*'. At the last meeting of this committee a report was submitted saying that the *city's wealth has connections to the slave trade*. Neither I, nor Dr Sue Berry, who has researched Brighton's early history, and is the author of the seminal book on 'Georgian Brighton', have discovered any evidence to substantiate the notion that this city was built on slave money. What credible historical evidence does the Council have to support these claims?

2. Emma Andrews

As I am sure every councillor and officer is now aware. Sussex Ice Rink has submitted a detailed pre-proposal requesting consent of use of the unused land next to the King Alfred.

The King Alfred site belongs to the public and all we have is a clandestine King Alfred project board making executive decisions with little or no public involvement. The time for playing email pinball between departments is over and we demand positive transparent action and for the project to be judged on its own merit and in the spirit, it was intended.

What objections are there to this temporary facility testing the demand for an ice-skating industry in the city, on unused public land, and putting the feasibility argument to bed with a real time tangible pilot scheme once and for all. Has the council got anything to lose?

3. Roy Pennington

The Beach Chalet report, appendix 4 (page 195 survey results) omits and redacted the information-box on Question 4 (which gives respondents opportunity to make comments).

Why did officers not summarise those comments or many letters sent?

4. Anna Slater Bennison

Regarding the new duties of local authorities under Domestic Abuse Bill, the government has said "local authorities should use the expertise and knowledge of local and national specialist domestic abuse services to support in identifying

and understanding the level and types of needs” and “Services commissioned under the new duty should meet Government and the domestic abuse sector quality standards – which include a commitment that support in safe accommodation should be provided in single-gender settings. This means providing specific services for women.”

Can Brighton & Hove Council guarantee and show they are making full use of specialist expertise available in the city?

5. Ali Ceesay

In point 3.4 the OSPCC was allocated £50,000 by MHCLG (November 2020) for a variety of tasks including a needs assessment.

In recommendation 2.2 a further £25,000 requested for extra resource in BHCC for oversight.

The multimillion £ recommissioning of was October (2020).

In MHCLG terms the requirement for needs assessments and strategies review is every 3 years.

This contract must have been awarded with a needs assessment and strategy. Will the Council use this recent information and offer no further delay to the survivors in the city?

6. Nicola Bengé

In March 2021, 17 RISE DV workers supported survivors in our city, supplemented by RISE funded in-house services in an accessible building in Central Brighton.

The service was significantly oversubscribed.

From April 1st, 2021, I understand 9 remote Victim Support workers with no building or facilities were employed doing the exact same tasks.

Can the Council confirm they are confident the new provider has sufficient experienced staff to provide the level of expert service we need in the city?

7. Naomi Boss

In this report reference 4.3 a possibility is raised of exploring future alternatives to the current Pan Sussex arrangement.

Given recent issues including a public petition and the Council’s implicit acknowledgement of the urgent need for local oversight indicated by the £25,000 resource requested, / Will the Council commit to actively exploring this alternative option?

8. Ken Tancred

Following a spate of break-ins, vandalism, graffiti, violence, anti-social behaviour and flouting of the Covid-19 regulations, is it possible that solar-powered security lighting and CCTV cameras on lamp-posts could be installed adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, the beach chalet blocks at Saltdean,

Rottingdean, Ovingdean, Madeira Drive & Hove Esplanade to make these dark areas safer at night for the chalet tenants and the public in general?

When instances are reported to the police, they say there is very little they can do because of the lack of lighting in the area and it makes it difficult to monitor. With modern low-cost technology, it is now possible to install these essential security items in prime positions to prevent and discourage these illegal acts and make the whole area feel safer.

A feasibility study and implementation would be greatly appreciated by all concerned.

9. Linda Francis (to be asked by Ken Tancred on her behalf)

The whole idea of making the change of policy was so the chalets would be better used if offered and rented to local Brighton & Hove City residents only. But there is an anomaly, where several residents are now being kicked out when no mention of a residency boundary was on their contract.

Is it possible that the boundary for inclusion could be extended by 1 mile to include the whole of the BN2 postcodes and thereby avoid any embarrassment for BHCC and the unfairness of the change of policy amended to take account of residents' circumstances?

10. Ruth Farnell (to be asked by Aherns on her behalf)

The section on Sex in the Equalities Impact Assessment for Lot 5 (refuge provision) of the 'Invitation to tender' also says "Commissioned providers to be required to proactively target recruitment to communities that are under-represented in the staff profile, and to have an inclusive employment statement on all jobs being advertised, unless they can clearly demonstrate that there is there is a Genuine Occupational Requirement for the jobseeker to hold certain Protected Characteristics; this must be agreed in advance with commissioners."

Does this mean that the council is intending to encourage the new refuge provider to employ male as well as female workers in the refuge?

Can the Council give a guarantee that male workers will not be targeted for recruitment and also that the deliberate use of male counsellors, such as the new Refuge provider, Stonewater, write about using in their Asian women's refuge (in Hampshire), will not be considered appropriate support for women surviving domestic abuse?

11. Debbie Waldon

At the last meeting of this committee, the Chair said "The Council undertakes Equality Impact Assessments when designing or redesigning services which explores impacts on every protected characteristic, including sex."

Despite acknowledging the disproportionate impact of domestic abuse on women and girls, why did the Equality Impact Assessment for Lot 5 of the new Domestic Abuse contract suggest that the new refuge provider would be required to redirect resources away from single-sex services for women and girls and, I quote, "from year three to provide equal access to refuge provision for all victims experiencing domestic abuse regardless of their protected characteristics"?

Subject:	Deputations		
Date of Meeting:	17 June 2021		
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. DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- 1.1 A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting of the Committee for the hearing of deputations from members of the public. Each deputation may be heard for a maximum of five minutes.
- 1.2 Notification of one Deputation has been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the deputation be noted.

3. CONTEXT / BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 To receive the following deputation:

(1) Racism in Brighton and Hove

Spokesperson Adrian Hart

Supported by:
David Forrest;
Andrew Hampton;
Roy Pennington;
Jeremy Mustoe.

Ward affected: All

4. ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 The Committee has the option where it is considered more appropriate to call for an officer report on the matter which may give consideration to a range of actions. Should an officer report be required then an amendment to the recommendation will need to be moved and seconded to that effect.

5. CONCLUSION

- 5.1 That the committee determine what action to take and writes to the deputation spokesperson setting out the decision.

Deputation concerning Racism in Brighton and Hove - Spokesperson Adrian Hart

Residents of all ethnicities are likely to agree with me when I say that within the vibrant, diverse life of our 21st C city it is precisely the *rarity* of racist violence/abuse, ethnic tension/discrimination that makes instances so shocking. If improving trust among residents of colour is a policy-aim, the last thing a council should do is ratify a belief that racism is endemic to their council, their kids' schools and every other aspect of their lives in this city. Social policy that emerges from flawed research, unfounded beliefs and political expediency is likely to be misplaced if not harmful [1]. I ask TECC to reflect on the motives behind policies and strategy commitments approved amidst the fervour of BLM protests last summer.[2] TECC should revisit this moment and explain what it was about life in our city that justified these actions. It cannot be the case that our council was so singularly ignorant of (or indifferent to) ethnic disparities and racism in the city that it took a killing 3,000 miles away to open your eyes to the need to act? (if this were so then many councillors and officers presiding over policy across the months and years leading up to May 2020 would surely have resigned in abject shame?) You may say to me that the 'wake-up' call was one of recognising a need for action "to walk the walk"(Cllr Heley/Brighton BLM NoM 13Aug). TECC minutes state "the importance of moving fast" and "no consultation was needed" (29/07/20: 16.2) **A question arises:** was your eagerness to instigate anti-racist actions a response to material reality (to 'facts') or to the passionate demands of activists (to 'feelings')? The July report speaks of "a significant body of research that demonstrates the structural inequality experienced by [BAME residents]". It references education, employment, health outcomes yet no evidence is presented showing racism as their cause [3]. Item 3.4 merely asserts (without evidence) "Individual, institutional and structural racism exists in Brighton & Hove" [4]. **Another question arises:** have the disparities suffered by the residents you confusingly label 'BAME' been presumed to be the result of racism? (Note: over half of BAME are *not* residents of colour [5] yet in BHCC documents, 'BAME' sometimes denotes residents 'of colour') Has 'racism' become your *default explanation* for adversity disproportionately experienced by 'BAME' or by 'POC'? *Have factors unconnected with racism like class, poverty, culture been adequately considered?* [6]. One example: your Nov 19 officer report (item 3.1) makes reference to "...the evidence that the C-19 pandemic is disproportionately adversely impacting people from some ethnic groups" but adds that this is "because of racial inequalities **and systemic racism**" [my emphasis] What is the evidence of systemic racism in this instance? [7] Moreover, Cllr Rainey at July TECC referred to media reports on Sussex police stop and search. She said BAME people (B,A and ME?) were almost ten times as likely than 'white' to be stopped over the past year inferring this to be proof of institutional racism. Next to speak, the report's author made no attempt to urge caution or add essential nuance addressing TECCs misunderstanding of the link between racism and stop and search? [8]. **What is your evidence** of racism in the city's schools justifying council intervention? If you knew of it, why did you not act long before events in Minneapolis? Has TECC investigated, discussed and contextualise rates of school incidents? [9] Cllr O'Quinn challenged the false assertion that "...colonialism isn't taught in our schools"? (Cllr Heley, BLM NoMAug13) [10], correctly pointing to the "good history teachers" who already do this. Doubtless curricula can be improved in all sorts of ways but its entirely wrong that BHCC base policy on poor officer research or the litany of seemingly made-up assertions typified by Cllr Heley's 'BLM statement' [11]. The report summarises the strategy as "led by what the community tells us they want to see and what they want to prioritise" [12] This is interpreted (minutes 16.11) both as "the entire community" and "the authority's plan for being led by [BAME] residents and communities". As such, TECC improperly out-source the council's authority (exercised on behalf of all residents) to an unspecified decision-making grouping - why? [13] Do you regard this as democratic? Worse, the officer-responsibility to furnish members with well-researched evidence seems to have been abdicated altogether? Racism hasn't vanished of course but BHCC have not been transparent about the all-encompassing definition it attaches to this word [14].

NOTES: [1] (a) On the steady decline of racism in Britain: Although it sometimes feels like a salaried ‘anti-racism industry’ actively wants to refute this decline in order to stay relevant/stay paid (and political parties engage in their own version of this), I want to set-aside my scepticism and extend good faith to my council. In this respect my deputation simply asks BHCC to revisit its assumptions, re-visit the mind-set that overwhelmed it last summer, and either reassure citizens that it has reviewed this question from all sides or will now make efforts to do so. To quote BBC R4s Tim Harford *‘The pandemic has shown how a lack of solid statistics can be dangerous. But even with the firmest of evidence, we often end up ignoring the facts we don’t like’* (See Guardian 10/09/20) This is no less true of the ‘race debate’. Any balanced council officer-assessment would have looked at national trends analysed by Prof Rob Ford, Sunder Katwala at British Futures, & others looking at data from 30 years of British Social Attitudes surveys (see: [Racial Prejudice Report](#)). A public authority must show that it has NOT acted on flimsy “evidence” hastily gathered in support of the conclusions it prefers. Typically, the systemic racism argument amounts to: (a) taking the UK black population (3%) and lazily pointing to a large *over-representation* in prison population, stop and search, deaths in custody, being sectioned, unemployment) and (b) *under-representation* in top professions, Oxbridge, football management, Parliament, corporate boardrooms and so on (See DG in Unherd). To regard disparity, in and of itself, as proof of racism is patently absurd. If this is what BHCC have done it is a dereliction of a public authority’s duty. “Racism still exists” is a statement we can all agree on. However, if the sentence were to continue, ‘... [but over decades] things have improved to a point where many ethnic minority Britons *do not experience it as a regular feature in their lives...*” I suspect many councillors – especially those under 40 years old – are likely to regard it as palpably absurd. Nonetheless, I hope officers have advised them that, despite the fact that Brighton BLM is entirely free to advance its arguments for systemic racism via Cllr Heley and others, our council is not free to accept this ‘evidence’ without scrutiny. Listening to ‘lived experience’ is important but these testimonies form just one piece of evidence in the jigsaw. Influential officer-reports have an obligation to present councillors with all the available evidence when key decisions effecting the people of this city are approved. To be clear: even the recent CRED report (if anyone had read it!) states that racism exists in institutions and in structures (see: [British future.org](#)) Perhaps officers discussed the evidence of where it does and does not exist with councillors behind the scenes? However, your statements speak of a very specific, racialised, all encompassing conception of systemic racism that appears to which ‘evidence’ conflates with disparity or testimony taken to be proof of its cause. [1(b)] If a problem is misdiagnosed we risk leaving the real issue untreated while allowing the unintended, adverse consequences of fixing something that wasn’t broken in first place. (c) On **trust**: An example of flat-footed anti-racism policies (with echoes of the seeming assumption of BHCC that unequal health outcomes between ethnic groups are caused wholly or substantially by racism) came to the fore some years ago. The fact that British African Caribbean people are more likely than white people to be diagnosed with mental illness, sectioned, forcibly restrained and placed in seclusion keys directly into their tendency to register distrust medical services. Prof Swaren Singh summarised this: *“Erroneous allegations drive a wedge of mistrust between ethnic minority patients and mental health services, creating a self-fulfilling prophecy whereby patients seek help only in a crisis, disengage from services prematurely and have repeated admissions with poor outcomes. One reason why ethnic minority patients are disproportionately detained is that they or their families are initially reluctant to accept treatment. But then a serious incident occurs, and doctors are required to use forcible means”*. He presents his research in the British Medical Journal: [BMJ Journal](#) (d) Nor is it appropriate to assign racism to medical conditions suffered by certain ethnic groups more than ‘white’. For example, African Caribbean people are more prone to high blood pressure but less prone to coronary heart disease. [NB **On anti-Semitism**: I want to make clear that in my view anti-Semitism is most definitely **NOT in decline**. There is no space to elaborate on this here but I’d make this point: In relation to the

colour-focussed anti-racism that BHCC endorses via the concept of 'white supremacy/privilege' too many who applaud this outlook and view it as 'progressive' also see Jews as powerful and privileged – unlike other minorities, who are cast as victims.

[2] (a) Re: policies to tackle systemic racism: they include training on White Privilege and associated concepts for staff, for councillors, for school governors, heads, teachers, pupils, parents; commemorative items and street names removal committee; formation of CAG, appointment of 2 x POC co-optees to committees; tackling BHCC racism; third-party hate crime reporting system. (b) We all watched in shock as images of George Floyd's killing emerged from Minneapolis. A mass protest here in Brighton (reinforcing solidarity around the sentiment black lives matter) was both commendable and inspiring. But since when did a demo and its placards become a driver for sweeping policy and strategy commitments?

[3] On education: What is Emma McDermott's evidence? Is it *teacher racism* = low attainment? (it can't be exclusion rates – see answer to Cllr Clare's question at Full Council 23/07/20. Rigorous research (eg Steve Strand at Oxford) shows that, among poorer groups, black Caribbean boys along with white working class boys have performed least well but black boys from immigrant West African backgrounds do much better. Yet BHCC associate 'education' with a system of racism born of white supremacy. How so? On Employment: there is indeed evidence of structural racism. As Katwala points out "Nobody who has looked at those CV studies disagrees that we're looking at something systemic". So BHCC, let's evaluate *actual* evidence but also ask if the xenophobia of far too many employers backs up the view of an endemic society-wide systemic racism rooted in whiteness? and note: Inter-ethnic Asian/Af-Caribbean employer/employee discrimination reported too eg Birmingham. On health outcomes:

[see 1c and d] - [4] See note 1a.[5] 2011 Census states city population as BME = 53,351 of which Black/Asian/Mixed = 25,874. Therefore 'Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic' includes 19,524 'other white', 3,772 Irish and 4,181 gypsy/traveller/Arab/Any other ethnic. See: [BHCC report](#) p6.

[6] For example see: [Rethinking Race](#) and [How We Think About Disparitiy](#) [7] Under 'Anti-Racist Council' McDermott's report asserted BAME structural inequality as "starkly evidenced by disproportionate impact of C-19. In November Rachel Sharpe makes the presumption of racism as root cause explicit with the same assertion when stating "...because of racial inequalities and systemic racism". Yet by November clear evidence existed in the public domain that (a) the impact of C-19 on black and Asian Brits was no different to any other group suffering economic deprivation and (b) (because of this) the presumed role of 'racism' was in question. Moreover, the issue of insufficient Vitamin D for citizens with melatonin-rich skin had become a talking point (see: [Guardian report](#)). In April 2020 the high number of black and brown health workers dying from C-19 including well-off consultants ill-fitted explanations of social deprivation (or claims that racism had withheld PPE) and raised the issue of Vit-D deficiency following winter 2019/20. Asian doctor organisations issued warnings throughout UK and offered free 100k loading doses of Vit-D recommending 4k units thereafter. The spike in .consultant/doctor deaths fell to zero. Did BHCC officers not know of this? What do we pay them for? [8] On Stop and Search: My new book contains a case-study of Sussex S&S practices. I can tell you that yet another plank in BHCCs view of systemic racism in all areas of city life falls away once the 'x times more likely than white' assertion is unpacked. It doesn't factor-in movements in and out of Sussex - student populations, tourists, 'county line' visitors; it presumes all are random stops yet known individuals are stopped multiple times; it ignores the 'available population' factor (that is, people present out and about, on street corners and so on). This group is more likely to be African Caribbean/white working class boys/young men and once factored-in disproportionality in relation to overall ethnic resident population shares (never mind visitors) vanishes (indeed in one national study 'white' became over-represented). Last – in Brighton, as with other south coast towns, police are responding to 'Rescue and Response' initiative re: victims of county lines criminals, often black teens missing from home. Parents pleading with police to apprehend in order to rescue. It seems for BHCC a s&s data, which ought to point back to the varied factors that produced it, is a marker of the racism imagined endemic to both Sussex police, our city and society at large.

CROSS-PARTY AMENDMENT

MHCLG FUNDING AWARD

That a new recommendation 2.3 be inserted to replace the existing one and the text as struck through in 2.1 and 2.3 be deleted shown in ***bold italics*** below.

- 2.1 That the Committee notes that the Pan Sussex Partnership is undertaking a needs assessment, as required by the MHCLG funding, which will gather data and identify gaps in service provision. ~~There will be a future report to this committee as to how the funding will be spent in Brighton & Hove.~~
- 2.2 That the Committee agrees to spend a portion of the MHCLG funding to develop an extra resource in Brighton & Hove City Council to support the development of policy, and the commissioning and oversight of services in relation to domestic violence and domestic abuse. This resource would amount to approximately £25,000 until the end of March 22.
- 2.3 ~~That the Committee notes the carry forward of separate MHCLG funding from the 2020/21 financial year to Rise, to cover the continued MHCLG project funding for first two quarters of 2021/22. A further report with options on continuation of this funding, will come to committee, following the required MHCLG needs assessment exercise.~~
- 2.3 That officers produce a report back to an urgent TECC sub-committee as soon as the needs assessment has been completed in July with the following information:**
- i) That on completion of the needs assessment, and after consultation with relevant cross-party Members, that officers provide options for members to discuss and decide on how the remaining, approximately £581,000, MHCLG funding will be spent in Brighton & Hove.***
- ii) That the Committee notes the carry forward of £99,962 separate MHCLG funding from the 2020/21 financial year to Rise, to cover the continued MHCLG project funding for first two quarters of 2021/22, and that the further report as detailed above in 2.3i) will also detail the options on continuation of this funding , following the required MHCLG needs assessment exercise.***

Proposed by: Cllr Simson

Seconded by: Cllr Grimshaw
Cllr Powell

Recommendations to read if carried:

- 2.1 That the Committee notes that the Pan Sussex Partnership is undertaking a needs assessment, as required by the MHCLG funding, which will gather data and identify

gaps in service provision.

- 2.2 That the Committee agrees to spend a portion of the MHCLG funding to develop an extra resource in Brighton & Hove City Council to support the development of policy, and the commissioning and oversight of services in relation to domestic violence and domestic abuse. This resource would amount to approximately £25,000 until the end of March 22.
- 2.3 That officers produce a report back to an urgent TECC sub-committee as soon as the needs assessment has been completed in July with the following information:
 - i) That on completion of the needs assessment, and after consultation with relevant cross-party Members, that officers provide options for members to discuss and decide on how the remaining, approximately £581,000, MHCLG funding will be spent in Brighton & Hove.
 - ii) That the Committee notes the carry forward of £99,962 separate MHCLG funding from the 2020/21 financial year to Rise, to cover the continued MHCLG project funding for first two quarters of 2021/22, and that the further report as detailed above in 2.3i) will also detail the options on continuation of this funding , following the required MHCLG needs assessment exercise.

Some information has been removed where it revealed personal data about an individual.

- If chalets enable individuals and families from across the city to enjoy and store things at the beach, it seems fair that a range of people have the chance to apply for them.
- There may be occasions where people 'have a case' for keeping on their beach hut. For example, they may help older people, families in flats, or people reliant on public transport enjoy the beach differently, or they may encourage them to get out and enjoy the beach all year round.

I used to use the beach chalet more than anyone I knew, every day when the weather was good. I would swim or collect prawns from the rock pools for my husband's tea.

1. Build more chalets in Saltdean...there is plenty of room...more chalets=more revenue=more happy customers.
2. Monitor usage i.e. it is a the fact, that there are chalets in Saltdean (maybe elsewhere) that remain locked for the majority of the year.

1. I am sick and tired of seeing dozens of unused locked-up neglected beach chalets in Rottingdean (both east and west of The Gap). I am a resident and would like one.

1: build more = or out-source building more

2; allow tenants (both current tenants and the 5-year licences) to sub-let

3: improve access for the disabled tenants

more ideas to follow

13 people in my family live in Saltdean, and 2 live in Hove -between us, we have 5 households, but no 3 or 5 years at the most in order to be used by more people.

5 year tenancy, condition checked 6 monthly, treat like regular tenancy

A better criteria for keeping a beach hut is how much it is being used. Too many are consistently not used.

A deal is a deal. If that is what was agreed, then that is the answer. If they move away, ok they can have A fair waiting list system for the rental of any beach huts or chalets is what is needed!

a fairer system should be implemented and people who have lived in the area for longer should be given

A few of the chalets are used often, but a majority are barely used. What about people who have kids with

learning difficulties, such as autism being given a chance to use them ? It would help local families have

A fixed term seems fine. And definitely B and H residents only as they should be regularly used and are less

A large number are never/hardly ever used so think this is a great idea!!

That said I think there should be an option for those who use them a lot, as there is a minority that have

A mix of short, medium and long term tenancies would allow a range of people with different economical

backgrounds to benefit from the chalets. Having some short-term summer lets would be particularly

A strong community has been developed amongst the long-term chalet leaseholders. To have a turn around

within 5 years may cause tenants not to care for the upkeep of the chalets, which may increase costs to the

A year at a time the private ones are so expensive, council one would be great if they were checked regularly

About time individuals had an opportunity to enjoy these chalets instead of being held hostage by the same

families forever. Limit to one family for max one year in a five year rotation before reapplication by same

Absolutely agree that people who no longer live in Brighton or who use the beach hut only once or twice a

year should give their space up for others, but this shouldn't affect the lifelong leases for the people who use

Active Brighton residents should have access to beach chalets

Affordable prices , maybe post code lottery allocation

All tenancies should be the same

Why should some people leave after 5 years and some stay for life

This is unfair on new tenants and those waiting

One rule for all please

Allow more people to enjoy the chalets. Indefinite tenancy is not fair.

Also any in disrepair or not used should be given back. Especially if they have moved from the area. So many

Any measures to suggest how regularly these are utilised would help as if they remain unopened from one

Are any of Rottingdean Parish Council who presented the deputation to BHCC TECC on the waiting list?
If so it is flawed.

Did they declare an interest?

Are there any disabled concessions in place the waiting times?

As a Brightonian (who has never left) at the age of 52 yrs I have never been able to get a beach hut.
I do know folk that never use them or have moved here in the last 10 yrs and somehow have been successful.

It would be fairer if we could all have a chance in our life time to have the joy of a beach hut, even for a short time and allow others to do the same.

It's time for a change.

As a long term tenant, my family use the beach hut regularly and all year around, there is a strong supportive community at Ovingdean. However, I strongly believe that tenants who do not use their huts
As an indefinite chalet holder I have invested in both the chalet and the surrounding community. I have regularly painted and refurbished the interior and maintained the doors and locks, I have had great pleasure in providing a base for other Brighton and Hove residents to use the chalet for swimming from, many who wouldn't feel confident to access the beach without a base. I have supported the local outlets in the area around the chalet and regularly litter pick on the beach and surrounding area. The community of indefinite
As I live in a flat I use the beach chalet as my outdoor space. Especially at the moment when we need to be socially distancing. We use the chalet all year round, it is also a friendly community which would be lost if
As there are so few chalets and they are in such great demand, it makes sense and is fair to put a limit on tenancy period so that more people will benefit from having use of them. They are publicly owned and should be shared. I would strongly advocate for building more chalets as they would no doubt be popular
As they are so popular and. a good source of income planning to build more seems a good aim going forward
As you own the land surely you can build more and reclaim the costs through any leasing revenues
Ask for council tax each year to prove live in Brighton

Assuming the ground under the private chalets is council owned can we not try to implement a similar
Be great to have more as not enough for the amount of people waiting to get a c

Be lovely for more people to enjoy the use of them. Maybe a lottery or raffle approach would work well as I will as how long you've been on the list- otherwise just those that have managed to get their name down
Beach huts are selling for vast amounts - should the rents not go up exponentially year on year? Also if luxury live-in chalets were built into the seafront arches they could raise extraordinarily large sums and
Because your supply is limited I believe that a one year maximum let should be imposed to allow more residents of Brighton and Hove the chance to rent them. It is very frustrating to pass many of these chalets on a daily basis and seeing them unused. Perhaps you could keep some for daily/weekly hire, for Brighton
Been trying to get on the wait list for 20yrs, always closed!!

Bournemouth have 250 huts available for day, week, season hire. I would suggest you investigate this as an option as more people would be able to access the huts. You need to build more beach huts for day hire,
Build many more as a great idea and people tend to look after them. When you've built some please put my
Build more

Build more

Build more ? Build some on Madeira drive as part of the regeneration scheme

Build more beach chalets

Build more beach huts by the marina. Crowd funding would be a good way to raise funds.

Build more beach huts.

Build more beach huts. Think long term. Build new ones to last for the next 100 years. Run a competition, with a local university for designing them and building them. Get a TV production company involved that
Build more council beach huts in Hove.

Build more on Madeira terrace and also make available for people without gardens or outside space

Build more please

Build more!

Build more, the money could be raised through different avenues, through community events for example. Build more, there is plenty of space in Saltdean, clearly there is a demand, so get building.

Build them on Madeira drive

Building more beach huts or chalets would be a fantastic way for the council to generate much needed revenue for the redevelopment of Madeira drive. Demand is there. Just ensure the build project is well Building more chalets seems like an answer, another might be having an option for shared tenancies. As Can the council ones be rented out for the day/week as that would be a good income generator.

Can they be done on a shared basis throughout the year?

Chalet tenants shouldn't be allowed to pass it on to family members when their too old to use them.

Chalet tenants who are current residents of Brighton and Hove and are using the chalets regularly, should be Chalets should be prioritised to local residents, eg Saltdean chalets to those who live there.

Chalets should definitely be for local residents only, like the other beach huts are.

Chalets shouldn't be passed down to family members if a leaseholder doesn't or leaves Brighton.

Could BHCC and LDC build more chalets or offer them for short term let's eg a weekend or season

Could lets be made shorter overall so that more people have a chance to make use of the chalets- so all let's are for one or 2 years perhaps? Feel strongly that local residents should be given priority as well as disabled

Could Madeira Drive have huts, some rented by the council For event like London to Brighton bike ride, car rallies, pride as treatment rooms, locker space, changing rooms etc. Would love to rent one for a weekend, as you can do at Margate. Whole family visits and stay locally spending the whole day on the beach, playing Could more be built?

Could the Saltdean chalets be painted in more cheerful, perhaps pastel colours?

Create more beach huts - maybe in the quieter end near Madeira Drive

Crowd fund to build more beach huts.

Build some more beach huts with crowd funding. Ideal why dont you building more on kemptown beach as Crowd fund to build more.

Current policies across B&H beach chalets are inconsistent & unfair:- people who joined the list up to 14 years ago in the belief they would be getting an indefinite term at an affordable rent are priced out of beach hut rental/ & or offered 5 years, not the original terms they joined the list on.

While some chalet renters no longer live in B&H, so rarely use them, people on very low incomes are excluded from ever benefiting from the opportunity to have use of a space by the sea, which could help with general well being and health management.

Currently beach chalets are obviously available online to rent for a day... this isn't correct

Definite tenancies should be phased out for those that don't actually use their beach huts.

The majority of beach huts are never in use and these should be released to residence that will use them.

Demand is likely to increase so building more is a great idea to generate revenue.

Disabled members of the community struggle greatly to enjoy the beaches on their door step. A beach hut would mean equipment could be kept there instead of breaking your back to get there and set up. We

Do an annual lottery

Do you have any further comments on the beach chalets? - Q4

Don't know how much it costs to rent one but you could argue that it'd be cheaper to rent than buy the type that you can purchase and that doesn't seem fair. More people should have a chance of renting. I own a Ensure tenants look after them and keep them well painted or lose them!

Even as someone currently on the waiting list, I do not think it fair to move people who have held their beach huts for a long period of time onto fixed term contracts. The obvious answer is to build more beach Exemptions could be made for charities etc who have a beach chalet especially if it permits people with disabilities or other disadvantages to use them.

If moving to summer only lets could they be used in the winter as part of a shelter for homeless scheme?

Existing tenants could be given the option to continue their tenancy for a further five years or less. Some of

Families should take priority

Fixed term tenancies will give everyone a fairer share

Following the B&H City Council Culture, Recreation & Tourism Cabinet Member Meeting held on 7th December 2010 (the first meeting where the Beach Chalet letting policy was discussed under item 42 and resolved for the introduction of a fixed term tenancy of five years for new tenants whilst maintaining

For the small cost of a hit and a £50 a day market rental it's a no brainer of spend to gain

Frequency of use and maintenance should be monitored and breaches of tenancy policy strictly punished

Give other people a chance to enjoy

Give the people that will make use of the chalets the ability to rent them - it's the only fair option.

Given demand, some verifiable check on tenants using them (say a minimum of 12 days a year) seems

Given 'limited council resources, wouldn't the cost of building have a reasonable payback? e.g. if rents really are as I've read, £900 / year, and they could be built for £9000 per unit it would be a good investment financially (where else can you currently get 10% p/a interest!). But in reality, if brick /concrete roofed as existing, they would be a much longer term investment and a great community asset. However, to be of great job .fixed 5yr term lets and even bi annual lets would give more residents a chance at some beach hut

Having a shorter tenancy would allow so many more Brighton and Hove residents the opportunity to have

Having been born and bred here 65yrs ago, I left the city in my 20's and returned 20yrs ago and have been

Hire them out to people with bn postcodes on a day or weekly basis

How about having some beach huts available to rent for a maximum period of 3 months, reservations open

How do you join the waiting list?

Could there be priority for disabled users?

how many people on waiting list, what is the demand

I am a tenant of chalet 18 and have used it constantly not only in the good weather but also in not so good , In the time we have had it we have put two new doors on and painted them re requirement of the lease, our chalet has always been well looked after. The enjoyment my mother of 91 with dementia gets when she is down there is wonderful .

I am an indefinite term chalet holder and along with others we were given assurance in 2011 we could keep our tenancies. By natural attrition these will slowly end. The people who are long term Chalet tenant tend to be the ones that use them very regularly . We also invest in their up keep I have had to secure and I am an owner of a beach hut and although we are charged business rates, we are unable to rent ours out. I can't understand why not as it will bring more people into Brighton and Hove and will allow them the opportunity to enjoy our lovely seafront. It will bring income into bars and restaurants as most owners will self cater but if you are on a day out, you will want to make the most of it .

I am not a chalet owner nor do I intend to apply. However, many of these I am sure have been handed down

I am part of a community of beach hut people in Saltdean over many years and have spent a lot of money

I applied for one via phone to be put on waiting list in 2010, was told I did not have a chance . The waiting

I applied to go on the waiting list but it was closed. I have been a resident in Brighton all my life. .60 years!!..

and would live the chance to rent a chalet...it should be open for all residents to have the chance of renting

I believe 5 year tenancy for all is best way forward. Too many are shut on sunny days....

I believe that people that have had these tenancies for a long time, and have maintained, loved and used often have the right to keep those tenancies. You wouldn't make the same argument for somebody's home

I do not agree that existing contracts should be changed. If occupiers with indefinite tenancies obey the

terms of their tenancy, they should be allowed to remain. If they are in serious breach of terms and

I don't have a beach hut and would like one. But the solution is to build more and there is space and it would

I feel it is a privilege to rent a beach chalet. If you walk along even on a sunny day you will see only a very

few being used. When they are being used it creates a wonderful atmosphere, and I think if people have

I feel strongly that more should be built on Madeira drive and the revenue go towards the upkeep of the

I feel that there should be special consideration for retired people. These huts are a lifeline for them and

I had no idea that they were for rent. I slwoyld like to know more about it

I have a beach chalet at Saltdean and would like to know why we have only just been informed that this deputation took place in January 2020 .

As this committee is an equalities committee why have the tenants without the Internet not being consulted. This therefore is not representative everybody needs the opportunity to be listened to.

I am very surprised and rather bemused that Rottingdean Parish Council instigated this ...my question is what is this to do with the running of a Brighton and Hove council department.

I have always wanted to rent one but the waiting list has been closed for many years

I have been a Brighton resident for 30 plus years. I am disabled and find it very difficult to manage a day on the beach with my grandkids. It would be nice to see a scheme where disabled people are offered access to some of the chalets. With a rental that is online with benefits. Maybe these could be on a shorter contract I have been fortunate enough to benefit from a indefinite tenancy and feel strongly that they should stay. The time and effort the tenants put into maintaining and improving the chalets has a huge benefit to the I have been looking for a chalet since moving to Portslade three years ago. If one was available on. Rental I have been on a waiting list for a chalet for 20 years so would be very keen to see short term lets. Many I have contacted you regularly for 4 years after I got lucky and have been on the wait list now for 3 years .we desperately want to experience a time with our own chalet ...without your new rolling scheme we I have had a chalet for many years and that has meant I have invested in keeping up the significant repairs from storm damage, break-ins and general wear and tear. This is not something the Council can afford to do and represents a large financial investment, particularly recently with the repairs needed after the February 2020 break-ins! It really does not feel fair to suddenly decide that the indefinite tenancy should change - I am not even sure that this is legal given that these were openly signed off as such at the time. Surely it is I have held a chalet tenancy for over 25 years. In the early years my family used the chalet frequently however in the last 10 years having had children and looking after elderly parents it's not been so easy to make regular use of it. Consequently I had to move away. But am moving back to Brighton this year. My family have remained in Brighton.

However, my family and I are now in the position to make good use of the chalet again, we live locally and I have lived in Saltdean for 10 years and don't even know how to get on the waiting list as thought it was closed. Many chalets are unused makes sense for all to be short term so more people can enjoy and experience it. If you no longer live in area must be returned and for Brighton Council to check if these I have owned a property in Kemptown for over three years now and have longed for a chance to rent a chalet. Even the small remaining fisherman's huts. I sea swim every day of the year and would utilise a chalet all year round. With a daughter and no garden, it really would be incredible to have the possibility of renting.

I have recently made improvements to my chalet and these cost approximately £2k. I think it would be I have to say that the questions here themselves seem extraordinary to me ?? Why on earth do we think it I hope you find a solution that allows more people to enjoy them. I have been waiting for one in Saltdean and it is sad to see the same few being used each year while most stay firmly locked. Could you put in an I know some people have had their chalets for 25 years since their children were small. This is totally unfair I like the idea that the huts/chalets are let for shorter terms. I think people would use them more if this were I live in Ovingdean and have been on a waiting list for over 5 years. I go to the beach most days summer and winter and just notice how few of the chalets are being used especially in Rottingdean. It seems such a I strongly believe this should only be for council tax paying residents of B&H. Whilst I'm sure it will be sad for some indefinite tenancy holders there are definitely some chalets (in Rottingdean) that are never used and I strongly disagree with changing indefinite tenancies. Why should these tenants lose something just because other people are now wanting a chalet. Maybe the council should build some more and rent them I think a year's let at a time is fair and reasonable with a scarce resource.

I think if people move away, that it depends on how far they move away should be taken into account. e.g. you could move a few houses along some roads in Saltdean and move into a different LA.. losing your right I think it all depends on how much someone uses their hut and whether they have access to outside space of

I think it is ill-advised and frankly immoral to renege on an existing lease contract. I do think that if people are no longer resident, or pass away then the lease should be forfeit. Leases should be prohibited from being sub-leased or inherited. Joint leases should be encouraged. As per new leases - I have no feeling on I think it is really unfair that the different tenancies exist. A fixed term tenancy means more people of B & H can then have access to the chalets, moreover, when you know it is just for 5 years it means you really would make the most of it and optimise it's use rather than getting complacent about having it. Many of the I think it should be for a fixed term of 2 years. During this time the keys should be handed back. If no one wants the unit then you can have another chance of getting it back for another 2 years. If you default on I think it would be good to have some beach chalet rentals for a variety of tenancy periods at different I think it's fine how it is now as long as people take care of the properties and keep them nice and don't I think leases should be upheld within the terms of how they were signed. Therefore the council have a duty I think new let's & new beach chalets should be let on a short term let. I feel it may be unfair to change the T I think some should be reserved for use by charities and council services supporting disadvantaged people I think that as long as people are using their chalet and looking after it they they should be allowed to continue to do so. The issue is where the chalet is not used depriving others. We are very regular users of ours right through the year, obviously spring and summer months but we also use ours in the winter - we are dog owners and have a pit stop on long dog walks even in the winter. It's very much part of our lives. Who is to say you give it to someone else and they don't use it? What's the point of that? Additionally there I think that it is important that beach huts are for Brighton and Hove residents. I also think it is important that the beach huts are being used regularly.

However, I do also think it would be a terrible shame for Brighton families who use their beach huts regularly to lose out. There are many families who use their beach huts on a regular basis and are multi- I think that it is very unfair to change the licence for people who were on the waiting list for so long I think that the usage should be monitored somehow - perhaps on a random basis? Or perhaps someone could be given the role voluntarily at each of the huts - or the whole group? Maybe if each hut group had a I think that you should not be able to change the tenancy agreed upon when originally signed. I think the beach huts should be for local residents only. With such long waiting lists it would be great to have a higher rotation and see them in use more (I walk regularly along the Undercliff and see some rarely, if I think there should be a balanced provision... long term beach hut owners generally invest in the upkeep of the beach hut and use them often. I'd fear a short term let of five years or less would lead to tenants not treating them as well.

I think there's an argument for changing life time leases to 5 years or more but with a renewal option if I think they should be for everyone, so I do think each occupier should enjoy them for one year and then pass to the next person on the list.

I think they should be prioritised in terms of people with disabilities etc that otherwise can't enjoy the beach. I think those with indefinite tenancy should continue, they have paid annual fees over many years, which I think you have some short term let's, weeks or days, to allow more people to experience using them, all I totally agree that the chalets should be enjoyed by local residents. I don't think there's any need to change I understand that the purpose of this survey is to address issues of fairness and a move to a more equitable system of letting.

Having waited patiently on the list for 17 years for a Madeira Drive Chalet with the expectation for over a decade that I would have an indefinite tenancy I finally began a fixed term tenancy in 2016. I find it grossly unfair that a new tenant only had to wait for less than a year when the list was reopened in 2017! I find this disparity shocking.

I strongly believe that if it's the aim to introduce a 5 year fixed term license for all licensees then those of us I use Saltdean Beach often as does my Son and his family. We swim in the Sea .I have seen people just sitting with people in wheelchairs not really getting the benefit .They should only be leased out to people who use I waited 15 years for my chalet so why should people turn up and just expect one

I walk every day on the undercliff between Ovingdean and Saltdean. Even over the hottest parts of the summers you can count on one hand how many beach chalets are used.

I walk my dog down the seafront in Saltdean every day of the year and you almost never see people using the huts down there or at Rottingdean by the basket ball court. I think they should paint the doors bright I walk past the Rottingdean chalets most days, and I have only seen two being used since I moved here in 2017. The chalets on Saltdean beach are used by three families but not regularly. One family openly admitted they have a house in Spain so go there during the summer break. I enquired to the council to see if we could get on the waiting list but was told it is closed. My sons love the sea and we hired a beach hut at I want to keep mine, I have looked after it for years.

I was born & lived all my life in Brighton, every time I tried to get on the waiting list it is always full . I think it I wish you had some chalets that could be rented for a week for a family having a staycation.

I wonder as to the legality of changing a lifetime contract. Perhaps tenants should be asked how many times they used their chalets this year, and a request sent to those who have them, to relinquish their tenancy if I would like one

I would like one.. :)

I would like to see more of them.

I would love to see planning for more beach chalets, shorter term 5 year tenancies and some research/requirements on usage. Many of the (longer term tenanted?) beach huts appear to be sorely underused. Perhaps there could be a requirement that if tenants are not present and using their beach hut on a minimum number of a casinos over the course a specific time period (say 6 times a year?) then the tenancy would be ended with 6 months notice. I realise this would place a greater administrative burden on I would love to think having lived in Brighton my whole life that I would be able to rent a chalet in my I would prefer that more chalets be built but can understand this is not a current priority for the councils resources. It therefore seems reasonable that we all have chalets for a 5 year term and then give up the chalet to the next person on the list. In this way we can all take a turn. Hopefully with time, we will get I would really rather we got some new wooden chalets, particularly along the kemptown end of the beach. I would support building more and letting them on a very short term basis to residents only. A lottery type approach might be fairer than first come first served? The area under Madeira terraces could be used and I would support those ending their tenure being allowed to go back on to the waiting list even though the I, like many others have been on the waiting list for years. Not sure if my name will come ever come up, so if it is not possible to build more chalets I think the fairest solution would be a limited 5 year tenancy. This I'm completely opposed to changing our contract . We hold an indefinite policy , when I signed my tenancy this was the case , surely this can't just be changed ? We use our chalet everyday the sun shines and days it doesn't ! We have a good community bond with our chalet neighbours and a security WhatsApp group between us. We keep it nicely decorated and everyday someone passes comment on how nice it looks. Our children grew up using this chalet and now use it themselves , as we were hoping now to have it for ourselves or perhaps take grandchildren to in a few years. I realise there are several which have spent the I'm one year into a 5 year agreement, we spend most weekends at our Beach hut and will be disappointed when we have to give it up, we live in the village where we have our hut and see so many not being used it's not fair.

I've answered the questions on the assumption that the current incumbent of a chalet does not have a protected tenancy And that the tendency agreement dies with them. To clarify, one should not be able to I've been living in Brighton for 10 years and check the waiting list regularly and it has been closed for 10 years!

Build more beach hunts along Marine parade and this would increase revenue for the council. There's hardly any Kemp Town end.

I've been on the waiting list for many years.. in 2017 kindly advised I was at 16 on the list. It's 2020 & I've still not had the opportunity to have a chalet which is disappointing. I think a 4/5 yr tenancy is a timely tenancy. I put my name down when my children were young & it would have been great to be able to use fully at that time especially after school & during holidays. Four/Five years would provide many, not just a few, families with I'd love to see more built, rather than a focus on ending indefinite tenancies.

It would be great to be able to hire one for a day / week, so perhaps a mix of long and short term lets?

If a chalet tenant has been offered an indefinite tenancy in good faith, and they have maintained their chalet If an indefinite tenancy was signed and agreed upon, surely it should be honoured?

If demand is so great why not build more. The cost could be funded through future rent. People who use them regularly shouldn't have to give them back after 5 years. On the other hand it would be good to find a If more were built - specifically in front of Madeira Drive, and sold privately, this money could contribute to If not used for one year they should be returned.

There should be some built for daily rent like deck chairs.

Turn marina drive arches into huts with a parking space.

Some families have been using the same hut for more than one generation. Seems a pity to break that but others never can.

If people had them for a shorter time they would use them more. Most of the time the chalets seem to be If people have taken on their beach chalet on an indefinite term, they should be allowed to continue this, and only change to fixed term when it comes to an end. Changing to 5 year fixed terms to any that come free, that's another matter. Also: if people have a chalet on a lease that has no conditions on them being a B&H resident, the council should *not* be trying to change that retrospectively. For new lets, I'd agree with putting clauses into the agreement that they had to live in B&H as a permanent residence. Note: if they If someone is part of the indefinite tenancy they should provide proof that they still live in the area and use the huts, for local residents to be waiting 15 years for a chalet when there are going to be quite a few which If tenants are spending a considerable sum of money renovating and improving the interior and furnishings, there should be a means by which this is refunded should the tenancy period be shorter than 5 years since If tenants have spent considerable time and funds improving the interior of the beach chalet as well as the hinges and brackets that protect the property, this should be taken into account if the current arrangement If the chalets are not kept well they should be handed back

If the Council would like to speed up the turnover of chalets, the condition of tenancy, regarding annual redecoration of doors were enforced there would be a lot of tenants being moved on. This would greatly If there is a long waiting list then consider re-letting some by fortnight or month so that more people have the If they are not maintained or found to not have been visited for 12/18 months, then compulsory end of If they are paying for it and use it there should be no need for them to hand it back.

If you build more make them look prettier...

If you do hire them out please consider first choice to us residents. Also if you had them once you must go I'm happy to wait for a chalet to become available under the current scheme. I don't want to take away a chalet from someone who has used it for years. I don't have a fast car or rent a council house with a garden, I'm sure most of the huts on the undercliff are never, or very rarely, used. In 20 years of living in Saltdean In my experience beach chalets are often informally sublet meaning those with tenancies can effectively make a profit whilst letting them out at low cost from the council. It would be better to ensure that as many In my opinion the tenants who have been only let into the chalets since 2011 should have a right to extensions too. Some of them might use them more often than the other too, which should be considered. Having spent some time in one of the beach chalets I have noticed that some of those indefinite tenants In other seaside resorts, some beach huts are temporary, this could easily happen on the space between the In Rottingdean/Saltdean most of them seem to be closed up all the time. It's rare to see them being used, so preferable to have shorter term lets. One or two could perhaps be rented for very short term use so In Saltdean hardly any of the chalets seem to be used. Maybe do a survey on how often they are used. I go

Indefinite tenancies on chalets definitely need to end to give more people the chance to create summer memories in the chalets. It is such a shame that the waiting list is so long and has been closed for years and local people cannot even get on it, and those on it are unlikely to ever get a chance to rent one because of a greedy few. More chalets should definitely be built and it makes sense to allow people just 1 year to rent. Indefinite tenancies should run till the holder either dies or surrenders - many of these tenants strongly rely on their chalet for health reasons. To make the policy more fair, fixed term tenants who had to wait more. It does seem so unfair that such a situation has been allowed to go on and on.

It doesn't sound like a very fair system at the moment!!! Change it so that everyone gets a chance to enjoy. It is as unfair for people to lose their chalets after five years as it is for people who have waited patiently for. It is fantastic that the chalets are in Council ownership. In order for the system to be fairer and open to. It is really frustrating when you can see the beach chalets not being used when it is something that other people would use if they got the chance. Having them unused makes the system unfair as if the rental was. It is such a shame that only about 10% of the Rottingdean chalets are ever used. It would be nice to local people who would commit to using them at least once a week to be able to have the chance to have them. It might be helpful to clarify how many beach chalets are let to charity users (if known, & by whom). These are then, perhaps, run differently to single household tenancies, e.g. having a 2/5/10 year rotation dependent on status of charity need. These would then be solely available for charity tenancies...like a brick. It seems some chalets are never used?! I walk pasted almost every day and I've never seen anyone....

It seems to be fair that when a beach hut become available the tenants are given the new 5 year contract. That way new people are given a chance to enjoy a beach hut. However it seems unfair to force people with. It seems to me this consultation is an excuse to get rid of indefinite tenancies, rather than increase the number of chalets which was stated by a Councillor on a local Facebook group. If that was the policy at the time, then it should be upheld. But for sure if the tenant moves or has moved away from the B&H area, their tenancy should end.

It seems unfair to change the licence for those who waited so long to have access. I understand there is a turnover of these older licences recently and it seems much fairer to continue with the present policy of making all new licences 5 years. There was a similar consultation a few years ago which introduced the 5. It seems very unfair if some

Elderly people who use their chalets on a daily basis And were hoping to do so indefinitely won't be able to. It should be clear that people can't rent out... large annoying parties occur with people renting out with. It would be a much fairer system if more people were given the opportunity to use them. Maybe a lease of. It would be extremely unfair to change people's existing tenancies.

If you want to add more chalets then you will need to secure funding to do so rather than steal them back from people that use them.

It would be good if people who don't live in these areas were able to hire the chalets, as surely if you live by. It would be good if the beach huts could be shared with more residents, more frequently.

It would be good if the council could build more beach huts at Black Rock

It would be good to build more to rent

It would be good to get some idea of length of waiting list to plan ahead

It would be good to have an open waiting list with a waiting list number, however long this is

It would be great for more people to have an opportunity to use these. Could they even be let out for a

It would be great if all Brighton and Hove residents had fair opportunity to rent the beach huts.

It would be great if more could be built and allowed on short term rentals for Brighton residents

It would be great to allow short-term let's to other Brighton residents (1yr etc..)

It would be great to give other local residents the opportunity to enjoy these beach huts. Indefinite

It would be nice if some of the ones Saltdean and rottingdean end were brightened up a bit. And if more people can have a chance to enjoy one for a short time that would be great but I do understand how difficult

It would be nice to build new ones for rental. Rather than remove existing ones from current tenants. Also

It would be nice to have some for rent by the day or week.

It would be useful to have smaller storage facilities on the beachfront if possible. I would obviously love a beach hut, but also just a small space to store a kayak or inflatable paddleboard would be great so that it's not a shame that I can't even get on the waiting list

It'd be nice to have a mix of short term and long term lets. I'd happily just rent for a year and pass it on to Let them to ONLY residents actually born in Brighton. Tell all the "Johnny come latelys" to do one and go Lifetime tenancies are very unfair. So many chalets sit unused whilst there are long waiting lists. Lifetime tenancies should continue. The rules shouldn't be changed, it's inequitable and would never be tolerated in any other tenancy.

There are also a group of us who applied for our chalets prior to 2011, under the old lifetime system. Having spent a very long time on the waiting list, we were then offered 5 year non renewable licences. This again is inequitable. I propose our tenancies should match the length of time spent on the waiting list (some folk waited 19 years!) A possible compromise would be to allow the initial 5 year licence to be renewed up to twice.

Waiting lists should always be open, there is no reason to close them they are managed online so no extra work is generated. The waiting lists should be surveyed annually to ensure folk still want a chalet, live in the city, and to analyse who is on the list, age, occupation etc..

Folk on the waiting lists should be put in touch with each other so they can discuss sharing a chalet and making applications for a joint tenancy

All tenants should be surveyed annually, to check they still use and wish to retain their chalet, they are city Lived in Ovingdean over 30 , can't get one. Walk past most days through the year, 90% appear unused...

Long term licensees have paid thousands of pounds to rent and have maintained the interior and external Lots of anecdotal stories about the life times ones being handed in/people living out of area

Lots of beach huts in Rottingdean and saltdean are never used could these be looked into

Lots of space build more or let people build their own .

Love them - would be brilliant to get the chance to rent one, even for just 1 year I didn't realise they were Make the lets shorter & let everyone have a chance. Perhaps make some only available on a daily or weekly Many beach chalets are in chronic disrepair and are sublet . They need to be for Brighton and hove residents Many chalets do not seem to be used

Many of these chalets are unused for most of the year this and you should review the whole process to give Maybe you could still have some indefinite agreements to continue...like 10-5% and offer them to local More beach chalets needed of different sizes and styles along Madeira Drive, Black Rock and on the deck of the restored Madeira Terraces and above the Colonnade which would prevent tagging in the area and can More chalets will require additional public toilets. These must be maintained. Both provision and More?

Most long term chalet renters are old or infirm, why kick them out and destroy their retirement and dreams ... it is cruel beyond belief.

Most of them are never used which is such a shame and a waste. I really like that you can hire them for a Most owners do not use the chalets on both days at the weekend , perhaps For new letting , families could share chalets . 2 or 3 families Agreeing to share and nominating themselves on the waiting list ,per Chalet on Must be a resident of B&H. Too many are under/ never used.

Must not be allowed to turn into 'Airbnbs'.

There are currently people who own the wooden huts advertising them for rent on some websites. This is against the terms of the lease. As these people are not being pursued by the council (I have reported the My chalet is at the bottom of my road . We walk down to the beach regularly and enjoy using our chalet . Our children have grown up by the sea .

I would like to continue to keep my chalet all the time we live in The town .

We have repaired the chalet on numerous occasions when the chalet has been broken into and vandalised . My family is on the waiting list. I believe you should be able to retain a tenancy as long as you use the chalet, but it should be returned when unused or when moving away. They should not be passed down in

My mother has had a chalet long-term and we as an extended family use it extensively, daily for a 2 week period a couple of weeks ago. That's all the children/grandchildren want to do. I would say we are in the 'heavy users' category, there are also a few others in that category, but unfortunately some just don't get. My mother has had her beach hut for over 20 years. She has invested time and money to fit it out. It would be my only concern with ending lifetime tenancies would be that some might sit empty, but I hadn't realised. My personal opinion is that tenants should be allowed to keep their tenancy, if they are using it regularly.

Much like the rules around allotment use, if the tenant does not use the chalet, or uses it infrequently, then the council should be able to terminate the tenancy & pass it on to the next person on the waiting list.

The provision of more chalets, for the use of local residents would be a much appreciated addition to the seafront.

Need to do shorter let's to give others a chance some people just keep and don't use !!

Need to have some that can be rented for shorter terms. Weekly, monthly or seasonal.

No

No

No

No more indefinite tenancies so many more people would be able to enjoy the beach huts

No thanks

None

Now I understand why my friends and I couldn't get a chalet! The current system is totally unfair and should be changed. Occupants with indefinite tenancy agreements entered into them in good faith when first taken out and had their expectation of indefinite occupancy confirmed and reinforced by the council in 2010 when it

Offer leases at a premium for a term registrable at The Land Registry

Old non-time limited tenancies should remain as such with security of tenure if that was the basis under which they were let. As they become vacant the new tenancies could be offered on a time limited basis but

Only a few of the Saltdean chalets are being used, we cannot understand why you the Council allow a person to have the tenancy but they don't use it at all. Only 4/5 are being used on a regular basis. We walk past them every day, so frustrating.

Only that I have longing been waiting 10 years to even get on the waiting list.

Our family has had our beach hut since approx 1995 and it is used throughout the year without fail. The whole family use it and it would mean that some elderly and disabled members of the family could no longer

Over the years we have looked after our beach chalet and become part of a very friendly community. Very little maintenance has been carried out by the council on these chalets. It's a shame the revenue created by the existing tenants couldn't be invested into creating more beach chalets or outside investors invited to

Passing the Rottingdean chalets regularly I have noticed that only a handful of these chalets are in use

Paying one's rent from each Renewal Date from first occupancy constitutes a strong case for continual occupancy unless one has broken stated rules. If no rules are broken and the upkeep of the Chalet is people who don't use their chalets should hand them back.

People who have the luxury of having a beach hut should have to use them on a regular basis. In the summer months it upsets me that when I go down to beach most days in the summer months most of the huts are shut up and people like my self would use it to its full advantage. The whole point is to have

People who live locally to the chalets should be given priority. All chalets should be on five year leases. It is perhaps look at these on a case by case basis. Whilst some people would be happy to have even a short

tenancy to give everyone a go at enjoying these brick huts, there are people who rely on them as they don't. Please build more

Please build more between the marina and Saltdean.

Please build more!

Please build more.

Please can you build more for Brighton and Hove residents.

please don't give current lifetime leaseholders any more years. they have had enough.

Please have some on one year rents

Please rent them out on a ballot basis one year per tenancy to council housing tenants who do not have outside space, especially those with kids. Make this a fair use and fair allocation perk for those who have
Provide more

Provided that they are in use and maintained properly by residents. No fixed term lease should apply.

Publication of the waiting list and ones position on it would be useful

Re question 2: I don't agree that indefinite tenancies should be phased out. They were taken on under a legal agreement. I believe that, as indefinite tenants, we provide a better standard of care because of our long term commitment compared with those with fixed terms. We also contribute positively to the general beach hut and seafront community. We have noticed that, in general, people with fixed term tenancies are very enthusiastic for the first year but their use of the chalet tails off.

Residents should send in a copy of their council rates each year to prove they still live here.

Responsibility of maintaining the beach huts is left to those renting them (rather than the council) so does not operate as a standard tenancy. As such, renters of the beach huts over a long time period have

Sadly I don't see these chalets being used enough so the current leaseholders aren't making the most of

Shame some can't be let ad hoc. Mon /max periods. Or shared tenancy. Managed somehow so that more

Should be a lottery so any B/H resident can have a chance to rent one

Should be shared fairly and take in turns. Need to be painted on much more attractive colours to make them an asset to everyone rather than a drab eyesore.

Since there is such high demand for the chalets and they are such a prominent part of the seafront, consideration should be given to increasing the rent for them and using the extra funds to make them more So few of those chalets are used at all and a lot of them are not used for what they were intended. A lot are glorified storage sheds.

So many in Saltdean are NEVER used. Time for change and breath some life into these lovely chalets.

Some appear not used on a regular basis or at all. also you should not be able to pass the tenancy to

Some chalets could be booked per day, like in Bournemouth. Booked and paid for in advance. Gives all of us

Some chalets could be made available on an annual basis, based on a lottery system.

This would give every family a chance for a short term let while their children are still young.

Some chalets have rusty hinges and locks etc, and never ever seem to be used. I assume the rents are paid etc?

As there is a long waiting list, I assume the council does not have the resources to build more chalets, so could the council tender to a private contractor to build more in exactly the same style?

Some could be held back and rented on a weekly basis for locals from may to September.

Some nice people have them, they are kind and make me tea.

I need help to get to the toilets. Sometimes they are shut so I have to use the potty in my beach hut. I could not go to the beach if I didn't have a hut.

Some of the chalets on an indefinite lease have effectively become 'hereditary' or seen to be sub-let.

In the former case the children of the original lease holders are effectively the sole users of the chalet and in the latter case you rarely see the same people in the chalet as there is a constant churn of different people.

In my experience in both cases the people using the chalet are still Brightonians Which is fair enough but I'm

Some priority for people with disabilities especially for the Chalets near beach entrance / Parking

Accessing the beach can be very difficult due to having to carry things ect having a beach chalet would make Some should only be let for a year so everyone can have a chance to hire them.

Strongly agree that if you no longer live in BTN why on earth should you still have a Chalet. Many in

Rottingdean & Saltdean believe some Chalets were taken on in the 70,80 & 90's by people who's partners

Support more being built. Maybe consider a lottery type scheme?

Survey the tenants to see if they use their chalets ! Some never seem to be open. Perhaps a financial

Tenant must evidence that they are using the beach chalet. Lots are not regularly used and those in the wait

Tenants should have to maintain and /or renovate chalets - many of them look derelict and an eyesore

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this consultation

That the tenancies should be available for all the Brighton & Hove area and should be selected fairly maybe
The Beach chalets should be used fairly to those who pay Brighton and Hove council tax.

There is nothing more frustrating to see on a bank holiday weekend none or a tenth of the beach chalets being used which has happened again this year. Those who have had indefinite tenancies for 10 of years if not more should offer them to the huge waiting list of people and those that can't even get on the waiting list. It is grossly unfair currently.

The beach huts really should benefit the residents of Brighton more equally..

The beach hut is my only comfort since my husband died

We loved it there together and he would be happy for me to keep it until it is my turn to join him.

The Council are being very cruel and unthinking trying to take it off me.

It is the only place I can sit and talk with my friends and passers by, otherwise I would be stuck at home with
The brick ones are ugly. They look like garages

The chalets at Maderia Drive should be let to people that live throughout Brighton not just to people that

The chalets at Saltdean are always closed. I think they should be handed over to people on the waiting list asap. Also, it would be great for more to be built along the wide undercliff path to the east of the whitecliffs

The chalets in Hove were let on indefinite tenancies to Hove residents, this constituted a moral agreement which shouldn't be changed. Surely this is a legal agreement that would be difficult to change?

In my experience the indefinite chalet tenants are a community that look after & protect the seafront environment and help the seafront officers. The short term tenants tend not to engage with other tenants & after the first year of enthusiasm start to peter away.

If the council believes it can change the indefinite agreement for the chalets, why would it not start to think
The council have far more pressing issues than re-writing the legal contracts around beach chalets.

If a binding contract is in place that contract should be honoured in full. Fair enough to change the contract
The council should build more. Especially in Saltdean where there is plenty of room.

The council should look at the frequency of use and the standard of upkeep. Some are infrequently used and

The current system of indefinite tenancy seems grossly unfair to the majority of residents. It allows a small
The first thing that needs to be done is to paint them!!

They look dilapidated and abandoned and ugly compared to other beach huts that we have seen around the

The income from these cement shells far outweigh their cost to build, they must make thousands profit

The leases should be more affordable to ensure a more diverse group of residents are able to enjoy them.

The life ones are the only ones that are consistently used by local families. Please don't take them away.

The long standing tenants can be depended on to pay their rent and more importantly maintain their

chalets. We are regular users who notice any problems and fix them straightaway. If tenancies became

changeable people might only visit during warm weather. Most of the maintenance is required during the
The majority of beach huts should be a fixed term lease.

Some beach huts should be put aside for daily / weekend rental as the vast majority are not used.

Much like allotments anybody not using their beach huts at least once a month should give them up.

The majority of chalets at Saltdean are never used.

The original tenancy agreement was ongoing and reviewed in 2011 with the same outcome. Which I would like to be continued indefinitely for tenants which have looked after the chalets for long periods of time creating a good community of friends with other tenants.

The people who go to the beach hut form a very tight knit group of people who rely on the beach hut to get

The rented chalets need a paint job. They look nothing like the ones in the picture you have here in

Brighton and Hove. A sunnier colour would be nice. Also I had no idea they were rented out. As a new

The situation for beach chalets who are were given indefinite right to continue to rent as agreed by the

council in 2011 should remain. However if the lease holder moves away they should not be able to continue

The tenants who have had a chalet for 20 years or more, have paid their rent without any council maintenance done bar one recent brick repoint.

There are people sub-letting and allowing their teenage children to take the chalet keys which results in large groups of boisterous teenagers drinking, smoking, swearing, playing loud music at the chalets which There are some chalets at Madeira Drive that in 6 years I have never seen in use. I live within walking distance of these chalets and probably visit the beach once a week on average over a year. I have been on There is plenty of space to build more chalets under the cliff along the path from the Marina towards Rottingdean. Rather than throwing people out of chalets they love, consider investing in building more new There was a similar consultation about beach hut tenancies I responded to several years ago and I was very disappointed that nothing changed as a result of it. I don't remember seeing the results of that consultation. Will the results of this one be published? Anyone who has an indefinite tenancy already and responds to These should definitely be on a short term let

They are an excellent resource, ideally more would get built.

I am a 5 year fixed term chalet owner, and think our term should be extended by the time we were allowed They are an extremely limited public resource so they should be as available as possible to all of the residents of our City.

To that end, should the tenancy be shorter (e.g. only for three years) so that more residents can benefit They are quite dear to rent and there doesn't seem to be any help towards the upkeep. Over the years the tenants spend a fair amount to keep their chalet intact and there always seems to be a problem with the doors not closing properly. The wonderful thing about having a chalet is a sharing and usually helpful They could be let for a day at a time, or a week, or a summer.

Some could be used as artists shops (as done in Worthing). So much more could be made of these and it They look very scruffy, if you rent one you must be able to keep it painted and maintained in traditional They need some serious upkeep, we walked past them the other day and they are in a terrible state! The only thing I think that should affect the leases is if they're not being used. A way of determining a They need to be kept a bit better. Most of them look rotted.

They need to be made slightly more affordable so that everyone can access these not just the rich.

They should be for Brighton and Hove tax payers only. I see many of them not being used at all!

They should be for local residents and should be available to lots of different people.

More should be built!

They should be for residents only especially as in such demand I don't think we need to build any new ones They should be let to B&H residents only for an indefinite period. If someone moves away from B&H they must return the chalet.

They should be made available to people who live within closest postcodes only - for example, 1 mile radius They're currently used as cheap storage in some cases, not for what they were intended... a resource for residents to enjoy our beautiful coastline. They're limited in number. It's only fair they be let out temporarily This change makes perfect sense and is fair to all local residents.

This comment has been removed as it includes information which is too personal in nature to include. It

This is how it used to be.

Lottery system.

Residents applied, and either you got a hut or you didn't

If you did and wanted to swap, you did.

Why it was changed to allow monied people to own our seafront, I could never fathom

This should be better policed, as there are too many people just handing them over to mates informally

Those of us who are long standing tenants are now approaching old age, and would miss very much the

Those people who rented chalets before they were extremely popular and hyped deserve to keep them

Those who have been beach chalet tenants for many years should be allowed to continue indefinitely with

To ensure it is fair for the city's residents to all have the opportunity to rent a chalet for their families this is

To me it seems really clear that what is needed is moderation in all things, and absolutely not a 'uniform' solution. After all if you share a single ice-cream between a thousand people nobody would get even one lick each! Perhaps 25% the chalets should be let on short-term, 25% on medium-term, 25% on long-term and Unless they stay longterm there is no reason to invest time and money maintaining them.

Unoccupied or unused chalets should be repossessed after a year. And personally I'd prefer options for daily Very few of the bits between the marina and saltdean are ever used. Is there a way of sharing leases or We absolutely agree that the chalets should be for local residents and that you should forfeit your chalet should you move away. We also however totally disagree that our indefinite tenancy should be considered We are beach hut users with an indefinite tenancy. Our beach hut is a huge part of our family life and is used regularly throughout the year. We are extremely happy to be part of the Ovingdean beach hut community and would be devastated if this was taken away from us. We do understand that some people We have a family beach hut at Rottingdean that has been in our family for 25 years. It used regularly and looked after by a range of family members who over the years have relocated on in Brighton and the surrounding areas. We would be devastated if it was taken away. It holds huge sentimental value to us as a hub for family occasions, particularly in more recent years when we have sadly lost family members. It also We have a limited tenancy at Ovingdean. The long term tenants have made this a welcoming and supportive WE HAVE BEEN WAITING VERY PATIENTLY FOR A BEACH CHALET IN HOVE BUT WERE CONTINUALLY TOLD THAT THERE WAS A WAITING LIST AND THAT DUE TO THE NUMBER OF APPLICANTS NO NEW NAMES WERE BEING ACCEPTED

We have kept our chalet in a good state of repair including adding fitted kitchen units. As a family we use it very frequently and in all weathers as we do not have a garden. Unfortunately, the aspects that are the council's responsibility make the front of them look very unappealing and also gives the impression that they We need more chalets built to rent. We have a thriving/expanding all year round sea swimming community We need more. Currently there are a number of empty hard-stands on the Madiera Drive beach, can these We use our chalet all the time through the spring/ summer months, and also on nice days in the winter. We maintain it and keep it clean and nice, as we treat as we would if we owned it. We know there are about three in our block that barely get used all year round which is annoying as other local residents would use it. We use our chalet all the time. Our chalet is our sanctuary. Our much loved happy place. If you we lost our We use ours regularly, in all weather and keep it in good order. We have recently spent several hundred pounds on locksmiths, security and carpentry work following a spate of attempted and actual break-ins. The chalets are otherwise poorly maintained by the council in spite of the year on year rent increases. We We walk our dog regularly in the saltdean/ rotting dean area and so many of the beach huts remain closed, how is this fair. We didn't even bother to put our names on a waiting list for one, as they never come up for We were on the waiting list for 20+ years before finally getting a chalet this year. We were told an error occurred on the list and in fact we should have got one much sooner. We are saddened to know that had this error not occurred, we would have had the tenancy indefinitely rather than the 5 years we are now granted. We would certainly welcome an extension to our term.

We would love to have one where we live in Rottingdean but no chance I guess.

How many of the chalets get used on a regular basis?

We'd love to rent a chalet as locals but the current system needs to be fairer so more families, children etc We've been on the waiting list for 10 years. If privately owned options were possible in Saltdean I would We'd like to see more action taken to identify licencees that do not use their chalets or that no longer live in Brighton and Hove. It was disappointing to wait a long time under the impression that we would have the option of the chalet for life and we would like to extend our license for a further five years. We also feel it What's the point if cars are not allowed. Do you expect families to walk to them with their stuff. This is just another way to raise rents and make money instead of admitting you have made a balls up shitting Madeira When we went on holiday to Woolacombe years ago from the Midlands we were able to rent a beach hut by the week. I think if there were some available for rental this would be attractive to holiday makers. When will water tap by Conner's court be turned back on?

Who is behind this revisiting of the policy laid down in December 2010 & December 2011?

Do they have a personal interest?

This survey is slanted against those long term chalet tenants ... there will always be more "wants" than "haves".

Where is Question 5?

Why are we revisiting this? It was confronted in 2010/2011 when the change to new tenancies being for a fixed 5 years - it is evident that many tenants are not fulfilling their maintenance agreements (decorating the doors annually), plus several have moved away and are no longer B&H residents - should this not be

Why can't you build more beach huts at Madeira terraces. As put forward by crowding funding. Surely

Why not rent out the new ones on a week by week basis

Why on earth don't you build more of them and a sea fed pool, there is plenty of space especially in rottingdean??

I think it would be awful

for some people who have been tenants for many years. There actually is a community of beach hut tenants in Ovingdean. Some have left but a few have stayed.

As a tenant of a beach hut since my kids were under 5 I am now looking forward to taking my grandchildren down there. I also share the use of the beach hut with my friends and neighbours who are also part of the community.

Obviously we pay a healthy rent for them - I am on a low income as do some of the other tenants, but we find the money.

By the way I would love an allotment in Ovingdean, how long do their tenancies last?

With regard to Q2 the answer I have given means that anyone with indefinite tenancies should be allowed to continue with them, until they decide to hand the chalet back or they die - as was the original agreement.

Would a range of tenancy terms work? For example, some 1 year, some 3, some 5. Once you've enjoyed a Would be amazing if you could build more at Madeira Drive, I would definitely have one. Although it would be nice to have forever I do agree it is fairer to let everyone have a go. Definitely think that if you move

Would be good to have more of them and some storage only options for paddle boards and kayaks.

Would be more sensible to try and monitor use, for those on indefinite leases who have not used the beach hut for at least a year it should be handed back. The beach officer who goes along the Undercliff several

Would gladly buy my rental chalet if it ever came up for sale

Would it be possible to build more wooden chalets as they would be less expensive to build.

I have lived in Rottibgdean over 20 years and the waiting list has always been closed so are you talking prior

Would love to be able to go on the waiting list!

Yes we as tenants should have been

Informed in January when this decision was taken

Yes . I can't even get on a waiting list and I live in Saltdean and many of these chalets are never used. Such a

Yes lots of older people rely on the beach huts because they live alone

Yes we should have been informed back in January .so many of the older tenants rely on the the beach

Yes, I wish they would be better cared for and painted... To help the area 🙏

Yes, people in public office should not use tax payers / Council payers money for their own gain!

You see many not being used - as they are council owned it would be fairer to let residents share short term

You should build more chalets. The cost of some concrete blocks and wooden doors shouldn't cost too much

You should not be able to change an agreement. Brighton council trying to go back on themselves again.

LABOUR GROUP AMENDMENT

VOLK'S RAILWAY POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS

That an additional recommendation 2.3 be added, along with resulting numbering changes, as shown in ***bold italics*** below.

- 2.1 That the Committee agrees as a priority the progression of the project to achieve a new accessible railcar, including a costed design and the identification of full funding for the project;
- 2.2 That the Committee agrees to £30,000 of the funding of £40,000 previously identified for signage, a new shelter and siding is instead allocated to a new accessible railcar;
- 2.3 *That officers be requested to explore the possibility of having painted signage on pavements across the city which depicts symbols rather than words for local attractions i.e. the Volks railway carriage, the Royal Pavilion, Brighton Pier and i360 and report back to a future meeting;***
- 2.4 That the Committee notes that consideration to extend the railway to Black Rock will be given during the development of the Eastern Seafront Masterplan;
- 2.5 That the Committee notes the uncertainty of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the future operation of the railway, and that the financial viability of future improvements would need to be given careful consideration to ensure the viability of the Volk's Railway is sustainable.

Proposed by: Cllr Grimshaw

Seconded by: Cllr Powell
Cllr Simson

Recommendations to read if carried:

- 2.1 That the Committee agrees as a priority the progression of the project to achieve a new accessible railcar, including a costed design and the identification of full funding for the project;
- 2.2 That the Committee agrees to £30,000 of the funding of £40,000 previously identified for signage, a new shelter and siding is instead allocated to a new accessible railcar;
- 2.3 That officers be requested to explore the possibility of having painted signage on pavements across the city which depicts symbols rather than words for local attractions i.e. the Volks railway carriage, the Royal Pavilion, Brighton Pier and i360 and report back to a future meeting;

- 2.4 That the Committee notes that consideration to extend the railway to Black Rock will be given during the development of the Eastern Seafront Masterplan;
- 2.5 That the Committee notes the uncertainty of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the future operation of the railway, and that the financial viability of future improvements would need to be given careful consideration to ensure the viability of the Volk's Railway is sustainable.