



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

COUNCIL ADDENDUM

4.30PM, THURSDAY, 18 MARCH 2010

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

| ITEM | | Page |
|-------------|--|----------------|
| 60. | WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. | 1 - 2 |
| 62. | WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS. | 3 - 10 |
| 68. | PROPOSALS FOR TRANSFORMING MEETINGS OF FULL COUNCIL | 11 - 14 |
| 71. | NOTICES OF MOTION. | 15 - 24 |

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed for questions submitted by a member of the public who either lives or works in the area of the authority at each ordinary meeting of the Council.

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

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

(a) Ms Vivien Hill

“Why is the Council considering the inappropriate development of a Downland greenfield site on urban fringe bordering a housing development as a waste recycling facility, instead of using a brownfield site, with no reference in Agenda Item 47, to the detrimental effect on the local community who are united in their opposition to this proposal, both in potential devaluation of their properties, (20% according to local agents,) and the detrimental health and polluting effect of dust, (potentially containing hazardous chemicals, even asbestos,) noise, and necessary implementation of at least another lane in the Sainsbury’s link road?”

Councillor Fallon-Khan, Cabinet Member for Central Services, will reply.

(b) Ms Christina Summers

“I would like to ask about speed cameras in Brighton & Hove: According to Councillor Theobald (in response to a question last December) “*Speed cameras can only be installed where specific criteria are met and are associated with casualties and excessive speed*”. Please could you tell me whether such criteria are enforceable by law and whether such a law is only applicable locally or has been set by Central Government? If, on the other hand, it is driven by local policy, please could you tell me what that policy is and where I might access it?”

Councillor G Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment, will reply.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

The following questions listed on pages 61–64 of the agenda have been received from Councillors and will be taken as read along with the written answer detailed below. The Councillor asking the question may then ask one relevant supplementary question which shall be put and answered without discussion. A second supplementary question may be asked by any other Member of the Council which shall also be put and answered without discussion:

(a) Councillor Carden

“Can the Cabinet Member of Environment confirm that assisted collections of waste for older and disabled people are continuing to be updated and adhered to when relief crews are sent to collect refuse and recycling?”

Reply from Councillor G Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

“I can confirm that we do update our records when we receive a request for an assisted collection service from a resident.

(b) Councillor Meadows

“Before 1996 when highways were under the control of East Sussex County Council, there was a by-law that allowed for police and council traffic officers to remove cars parked on grass verges. Would Brighton and Hove City Council look into reinstating this by-law so that it could also include cycle lanes, as well as grass verges?”

Reply from Councillor G Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

“Thank you for your question. Whilst I do not believe there has ever been a by-law in place dealing with these offences, there is the Local Act known as The East Sussex Act 1981 which does allow the Council to prosecute in the Magistrates Court for the offence of driving over a verge. To enforce under this legislation would be slow and costly. There are a number of reasons for this, including the need for witness evidence of the offence actually taking place. Similarly, to introduce, monitor and enforce a new by-law would be resource intensive.

There are other avenues that we can now consider with the introduction in 2008 of the Traffic Management Act. We can already enforce where there are double or single yellow lines in place. Where these restrictions are not in place, it would be possible to look at introducing a new Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting parking on the verge and over cycle lanes. This could be enforced by Civil Enforcement Officers using the existing infrastructure already in place. There would, however, be a cost to doing this as officers would need to complete the TRO process, including advertisements and consultation and would need to purchase and erect the approved signage.

(c) Councillor Hawkes

"Would the Cabinet Member for Children's Services welcome the Government scheme to provide free laptops and internet to children from low income families - I'm aware that some schools have sent information to families that have children that benefit from free school meals regarding free laptops, but please may the Cabinet Member confirm that this is the case for all schools?"

Reply from Councillor Brown, Cabinet Member for Children & Young People.

"Home Access is a government programme that helps eligible low-income families to buy a computer and internet access to support learning at home. The programme is for families in England.

To apply for a Home Access Grant, you must be a parent or guardian responsible for and living with a child who:

- is in school years 3 to 9 (normally aged 7-14)
- has never had a computer from Computers For Pupils or the Home Access programme
- is eligible for Free School Meals, and
- is named on the Child Benefit award letter.

Headteachers were briefed by Officers about this scheme. They were sent a follow up letter and a letter to send to parents. The take up is being monitored by a government organisation, BECTA, and we know that to date 23% of eligible families have applied. Officers will remind Headteachers about the scheme during the next round of briefings."

(d) Councillor Mitchell

"In response to concerns from East Brighton Ward Councillors over the lack of action to regenerate Madeira Drive, Councillor Geoffrey Theobald brought a report to his Environment Cabinet Member Meeting in September 2008 that stated that longer term aims for the regeneration of the area would be drawn up.

A similar report to his Cabinet Member Meeting of 26th March 2009 included as recommendation 2.3;

That the Cabinet Member for Environment requests officers to bring to a future Cabinet Member Meeting a report detailing the strategic vision action plan to address the future and ongoing regeneration of Madeira Drive.

Specifically in relation to the land to the East of the Yellowwave Beach Sports Centre, Councillor Theobald took the decision at this meeting to set out a marketing brief for the site, to proceed with the marketing, seeking expressions of interest in May 2009.

As no further reports on the administration's proposals for the regeneration of Madeira Drive have been forthcoming, will Councillor Theobald inform the council as to where the administration's "strategic vision action plan" is, whether the site East of Yellowwave was ever marketed and what the outcome was?"

Reply from Councillor G Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

"There have been improvements along Madeira Drive following years of neglect. For example new lighting has been installed under the terraces between Concord 2 and the Volks railway which has improved safety for both staff and customers using Yellowwave at night. £230,000 was allocated last year for spending on structural repairs and restoration works to the terraces and the Madeira Lift and this work will continue in the next financial year. A further £150,000 has been allocated specifically to the terraces and an additional £100,000 per annum for the ongoing maintenance of railings, shelters and benches along the entire length of the Seafront.

An architect has been appointed and has submitted a concept proposal for replacement siding sheds at the Volks Railway. Vacant properties along Madeira Drive and the lower promenade are currently being marketed, these include new artist units just to the East of Palace Pier.

The sites to the East of Yellowwave are occupied by the Adventure Golf and Grace's Place Café. Both tenants have submitted planning applications for substantial investment into their facilities. The newly appointed Seafront Development Manager is looking at schemes for the Peter Pan site.

This Administration is committed to improving the entire seafront hence the additional resources that we proposed at the recent Budget Council Meeting."

(e) Councillor Davis

"Please could the Cabinet Member for Environment outline the details and the time scale he proposes for the budget of £.03m set aside to examine and implement improved school signing along the Old Shoreham Road?"

Reply from Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

"The locations of the new signs are now being drawn up, and it is proposed that the scheme will be completed by the end of this calendar year."

(f) Councillor Elgood

“Would the Environment Cabinet member consider authorising the removal of the unused gardeners hut in Adelaide Crescent? Residents have requested its removal as it is no longer required, and the hut itself could potentially be used elsewhere to benefit another area.”

Reply from Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

“I am pleased to state that the gardeners hut will be removed by the end of May.”

(g) Councillor Hamilton

“In a letter in The Argus, Feb.25th, signed by the five Conservative councillors for Portslade and Hangleton, it is claimed that my view on the future of Hangleton Bottom is the same as theirs. I am pleased that they share my view that Hangleton Bottom should not be used as a waste transfer station but should be retained as a green field site. Since all Portslade and Hangleton councillors now share this viewpoint will Cllr Fallon-Khan now call a halt to his ill-advised marketing exercise and agree to retain Hangleton Bottom in council ownership?”

Reply from Councillor Fallon-Khan, Cabinet Member for Central Services.

“Hangleton Bottom is not being sold. This preliminary evaluation of interest in the site is being undertaken as a direct result of the decision by the previous Administration in 2005 to designate Hangleton Bottom in the Joint East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Waste Local Plan and the Brighton & Hove Local Plan. Once this exercise has been concluded the results will be communicated to residents for their consideration and opinions. However, I repeat, Hangleton Bottom is not being sold.”

(h) Councillor Kitcat

“How long does Cllr Dee Simson feel it is appropriate disabled residents should have to wait to catch a taxi in this city?”

Reply from Councillor Simson, Cabinet Member for Community Affairs, Inclusion and Internal Relations.

“It is inappropriate for disabled residents to have to wait any longer than an able bodied person would have to in the same circumstances. That is why the Administration is currently undertaking a thorough equality impact assessment on the taxi and private hire service”.

(i) Councillor Kitcat

"I ask that Cllr Geoffrey Theobald update the meeting with the recycling rates for the city centre areas where communal bins are used and how those rates have changed in recent years?"

Reply from Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

"I think I have answered this question before. We have the recycling rate for the whole city - which for 2008/09 was 29.2%, this is an increase from 28.7% in 2007/08 and from 26.7% in 2006/07 – it is not broken down area by area."

(j) Councillor Kitcat

"I ask that Cllr Geoffrey Theobald explain how many evening noise patrol shifts does the council provide in this financial year and how many shifts are planned to be provided in the next financial year?"

Reply from Councillor Theobald, Cabinet Member for Environment.

"Deployment of staff to meet statutory duties is delegated to officers at budget holder level. Officers aim to provide a responsive noise patrol service on Friday and Saturday nights throughout the year".

(k) Councillor Fryer

"How can you justify submitting plans to the DCSF to turn Portslade Community College into an Academy before there was consultation with teachers, residents and other councillors?"

Reply from Councillor Brown, Cabinet Member for Children & Young People.

"Informal discussions took place with the Headteacher and Chair of Governors of Portslade Community College prior to the submission of a Statement of Intent to the Office for the Schools Commissioner. There are no formal proposals as yet but Ministerial agreement to the Statement of Intent is necessary before the Council develops a formal Expression of Interest. Should Ministerial approval be secured, there will then be a 30 day period of consultation with staff, governors, and parents at the college and other stakeholders from the community. The results of this consultation will be reported to Cabinet who will determine whether an Expression of Interest is submitted to the DCSF.

The consultation will be about a proposal for Portslade Community College to become an academy.

The need for structural change was agreed with the National Challenge agency, the Office of the schools commissioner (OSC), Partnership for Schools (PfS) and the DCSF. Options put to the council by DCSF were closure, federation with a high performing institution, becoming a National Challenge Trust School, or becoming an academy.

In discussion with the National Challenge agency, the Office of the schools commissioner (OSC), Partnership for Schools (PfS) and the DCSF the council believes that the academy route would best satisfy the external demands on the council and provide the best outcome from the options available, in order to secure a transformation in standards and investment in refurbishing the existing accommodation.”

(l) Councillor Davey

“Could the Leader of the Council please tell us how much has been spent in total by the council on the development of plans and the public consultation for the Old Shoreham Road cycle lane including both internal staff costs and external consultants as well as any other costs.?”

Reply from Councillor Mears, Leader of the Council.

“It is hard to identify precise figures for the cycle lane scheme alone because the work undertaken, and therefore money spent, was also integral to the proposed road safety measures along Old Shoreham Road. However if Councillor Davey has a question about a specific financial aspect of the work I will endeavour to provide him with an answer.”

(m) Councillor Simson

“As Brighton & Hove City Council’s sole representative on the Sussex Police Authority (SPA), Cllr. Duncan frequently claims to have been instrumental in overseeing an increase in the number of Neighbourhood Police Officers employed by the Force. Could he, therefore, explain to Council and the residents of this City, why, at the SPA meeting on February 11th, he voted against the Chief Constable’s budget proposals which will expand neighbourhood policing in Sussex to the tune of 31 extra officers?”

Reply from Councillor Duncan, Council Representative on the Sussex Police Authority.

“Thank you for the question. As Cllr Simson will know, I am a tireless champion of neighbourhood policing – and particularly the employment of more Neighbourhood Police Officers here in Brighton and Hove. It’s a shame she hasn’t had time to attend a meeting of Sussex Police Authority herself – they are all open to the public – to hear my views in full during any of the many debates we have had on the subject.

But in a nutshell the proposed Sussex Police Budget contained one cut too many – both as a result of the wishes of some Conservative members of the authority, and the Labour Government’s derisory grant for policing in Sussex, and I just don’t believe you can cut your way out of a recession, or maintain a first-class police service in the face of a £35m cash shortfall. Members who wish a fuller explanation for the way I cast my vote can see the budget debate in full at:

http://www.sussexpolice.ukcouncil.net/site/player/pl_compact.php?a=36554&t=0&m=wm&l=en_GB “

(n) Councillor Hawkes

“ Will Cllr Dee Simson confirm that the three new Youth Outreach pilots for 8 – 13yr olds will be located in the most deprived wards in the city according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2007 from the DCLG?”

Reply from Councillor Simson, Cabinet Member for Community Affairs, Inclusion and Internal Relations.

“As Cllr Hawkes will be aware, it was agreed by the Leader of the Council to set up a cross party working group to oversee the pilot projects. That working group has not yet met, therefore it is premature to say how and where those pilot projects might be based.”

GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT**PROPOSALS FOR TRANSFORMING MEETINGS OF FULL COUNCIL****Amendment 1.**

To remove the automatic closure of council meetings after 4 hours, ensuring matters of importance to the city are fully debated.

DELETE 4.3

~~It is proposed that:~~

- ~~(i) 4 hours after the beginning of the meeting (excluding any breaks/ adjournments) a closure motion is moved by the Mayor automatically if the meeting has not concluded by then.~~
- ~~(ii) the Mayor's closure motion be by way of termination of the meeting under Council Procedure Rule 17.~~

and REPLACE with

"4.3 Members should note that a meeting can be closed by use of Council Procedure Rule 17."

Amendment 2.

To remove arbitrary limits from member questions so that issues can be fully explored and administration Councillors can be properly held to account.

DELETE 5.4 (a) and

DELETE the final sentence of 5.4 (d) so that it reads:

"5.4 (d) A Member asking a question (but not others) may ask one supplementary."

5.4 It is therefore proposed that:

- ~~(a) A period of 30 minutes be set aside for Oral Member Question time.~~
- (b) That the order of questions be: Leader of the Official Opposition, Leader of the Green Group, Leader of the Lib Dems, then Members in the order of Conservative, Labour, Green and Lib Dem until the allocated 30 minutes is used at which time the meeting proceeds to the next business.

- (c) The groups will submit the order in which they want questions taken. The Mayor will have discretion and flexibility on how this operates in practice, including allowing the Independent Member to ask a question.
- (d) ***A Member asking a question (but not others) may ask one supplementary.*** ~~No Member may ask more than one question.~~
- (e) There be no requirement to give advance notice of the actual oral questions to be asked. However, a Member proposing to ask a question should give notice of intention to do so within current timescales for Member questions with an indication of the subject matter;
- (f) Oral questions be limited to general policy rather than technical matters. If technical questions are asked the Mayor may disallow the question or the Member who is asked the question may decline to answer or state that a written response will be sent.
- (g) The Monitoring Officer will develop guidance for Members on what is policy and what is a technical/operational matter which the Mayor and Members will have regard to in applying the criteria.
- (h) Members may submit written questions as now. These will receive written answers with the questions and replies circulated with the addendum at Council (as now) but no “supplementary” questions.
- (i) The current procedures continue to apply to Cabinet, Committees and CMMs.

Amendment 3.

To remove the proposed limit in the number of Notices of Motions that can be submitted, thus keeping freedom of expression for all Councillors.

DELETE 6.2 (i) and (ii) and

It is therefore proposed that:

- ~~(i) there be a limit on the number of Notices of Motion presented at Council so that there are no more than 2 Notices of Motion from the 3 largest Groups and no more than 1 from other Groups with any Member not belonging to a political group being able to table a motion at the Mayor’s discretion.~~
- ~~(ii) In the event that more than the specified number of Notices of Motion are presented from any group, the relevant Group shall decide which ones it wants tabled. In the absence of such a decision, Notices of Motion from Members of a Group will be taken in the order in which they are received.~~

REPLACE with

“6.2 Members should keep in mind the length of Council meetings when submitting Notices of Motion.”

Amendment 4.

To retain existing time limits for speakers at Council meetings to allow proper debate.

DELETE 8.2(i) and REPLACE with ***“8.2 (i) Speaking time limits will remain unchanged at 10 minutes for proposers and 5 minutes for other speakers.”***

8.2 It is therefore proposed that:

- ~~(i) speaking times be limited to 5 minutes for the proposer of a motion and 3 minutes for all other speakers.~~
- (i) Speaking time limits will remain unchanged at 10 minutes for proposers and 5 minutes for other speakers.”***
- (ii) Council retains the power to grant an extension of time on a majority vote as now.

Amendment 5.

To require cross-party support for second extensions for speakers so that the administration party cannot keep voting extensions for their speakers.

ADD 8.2

- (iii) “Second extensions of speaker time will only be granted with the agreement of the Council including at least one member of another political party or an independent member.”***

Amendment 6.

To split the mayor-making from the standard business of the annual Council meeting so that debate can be held on appointments and other business.

AMEND RECOMMENDATION 2.2 AND ADD a new recommendation ***(iv)***:

2.2 That full Council:

- (i) Approves the proposed amendments to Council Procedure Rules as set out in paragraphs 4.3, 5.4, 6.2 and 8.2 of the report ***as amended***;
- (ii) Authorises the Head of Law to amend the constitution to reflect the above, including making consequential drafting amendments.
- (iii) That the Changes come into force immediately after the Annual Council meeting in May 2010.

- (iv) ***“The annual Council meeting will be held in two parts. The ordinary business including agreement of leadership, committee and external appointments will be held first. After a 15 minute break during which guests can be seated, the Mayor-making will commence.”***

Proposed by: Cllr Jason Kitcat

Seconded by: Cllr Rachel Fryer

NOTICE OF MOTION**GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT****PERSONAL CARE AT HOME BILL**

To delete the word 'he' in the final paragraph, the word 'Honours' in the first bullet point as struck through, and insert the word 'The' at the start of the first bullet point and the words 'is met' after the word 'Doctrine' in the first bullet point. To delete the second bullet point.

"This Council believes in the principle of helping more people with care needs to stay in their own homes where they wish to do so and, therefore, welcomes the broad intentions of the new Personal Care at Home Bill.

However, this Council has serious concerns that local authorities are being asked to fund a substantial part of the costs of implementing the new Bill. The proposed Government funding to meet the costs of the scheme is inadequate and the proposed council efficiency savings entirely unrealistic.

Further, this Council shares the concerns of the Local Government Association and the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services who suggest that the total cost of the proposal will be much higher than the Government's estimated figure of £670 million due to a significant underestimate of the number of people likely to be entitled to, and take advantage of, free care.

Locally, it has been estimated that the cost of the Bill to Brighton & Hove's council taxpayers will be between £1.3 and £1.8 million per annum.

This Council notes that the Government is committed to ensuring that any new centrally-imposed responsibilities falling on local authorities are fully funded via the 'New Burdens Doctrine'. New Burdens are defined as 'any new policy or initiative which increases the cost of providing local authority services.'

This Council believes that without adequate funding, more pressure will be placed on services for people who have significant, but not critical, needs and that the shortfall may require either an increase in council tax or cuts to other council services. In their current form, these irresponsible proposals threaten to destabilise the Council financially, put undue and unfair strain on our staff and risk councils' ability to properly care for those that most need it.

Therefore, this Council resolves to request that the Chief Executive writes to the Secretary of State for Health – Andy Burnham MP – requesting that he:

- ~~Honours~~ **The** Government's commitment in the New Burdens Doctrine **is met** by fully funding the provisions of the Personal Care at Home Bill."

- ~~Delays implementation of any proposals until at least 1 April 2011 to enable a more accurate and realistic assessment of the costs of the scheme to be undertaken and to allow social care staff more time to get to grips with the proposed new assessment procedures.~~

Proposed by: Cllr. Keith Taylor

Seconded by: Cllr Georgia Wrighton

NOTICE OF MOTION**LABOUR GROUP AMENDMENT****LETTING AGENTS**

Insert a new paragraph as shown in bold italics after the second paragraph and delete resolution (2) and replace with a new resolution (2) as shown in bold italics:

“This council notes the findings of the national Citizens Advice report *Let down* (1) on the activities of private rented sector letting agents, which revealed:

- 73 per cent of tenants interviewed were dissatisfied with the service provided by their letting agent. Common concerns included difficulties in contacting the agent, serious delays in getting repairs carried out, inadequacies in the protection of clients’ money and the frequency with which additional charges were made.
- 94 per cent of letting agents surveyed imposed additional charges on tenants on top of the tenancy deposit and rent in advance. The size of these charges varied hugely. The charge for checking references ranged from £10 to £275 and the charge for renewing a tenancy ranged from £12 to £200. In some cases additional charges for a tenancy amounted to over £600.
- Less than a third of agents willingly provided full written details of their charges to CAB workers when asked.
- 61 per cent of the tenants surveyed said that paying these charges was a problem. Some had to borrow the money, others had difficulty paying other bills or went into debt.

This council further notes:

The Citizens Advice call for:

(1) The licensing of letting agents who should be required to demonstrate professional competence, have adequate client money protection arrangements and operate a system for handling complaints and redress;

(2) The introduction of regulations specifying that no additional charges should be made to tenants for activities that are part of the routine letting and management process. The cost of this work should be included in the rent paid by the tenant and/or the management fee paid by the landlord. The ultimate sanction against letting agents breaching the regulations should be the withdrawal of the licence to operate.

This Council further notes that:

New proposals to be taken forward for consultation, as recommended in the recent independent review of the private rented sector, includes:

- ***Introducing a light-touch national register of every private landlord in England to increase protection for both vulnerable tenants and good landlords. Landlords will need to include their registration number on all tenancy agreements and could be removed from the register for persistent poor performance like failing to carry out essential repairs, or not protecting tenants' deposits***
- ***Full regulation for private sector letting agents. Letting and managing agents do not currently need to have professional credentials. This means that both tenants and landlords have no realistic redress when things go wrong. To tackle these problems, the government proposes creating an independent regulator for all letting and managing agents***
- ***An improved complaints and redress procedure for tenants. For the first time, the Government will look to set up a mechanism whereby tenants are able to register official complaints about sub-standard landlords, and if these complaints are substantial and proven then landlords may be removed from the national register***
- ***Greater local authority support for good landlords. Local authorities will be encouraged to create 'local lettings agencies' to better facilitate tenancies in the private rented sector for those in housing need, including Housing Benefit recipients.***

It therefore calls on the council

1. to request the Chief Executive to write to the Government and the major political parties seeking their support for the Citizens Advice proposals; and
- ~~2. Ask the Office of Fair Trading to carry out an investigation into the activities of letting agents.~~
2. to welcome the announcement by Margaret Beckett in May 2009 as Housing Minister, which took into account the concerns raised by the CAB and sought to improve the quality of the private rented sector by increasing professionalism, driving out bad landlords, and strengthening protections for tenants affected by repossessions.”

Proposed by: Cllr Christine Simpson

Seconded by: Cllr Anne Meadows

NOTICE OF MOTION**CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT****LETTING AGENTS**

Insert new bullet point after 'This Council further notes...' as shown in bold italics, insert wording 'In addition' before Citizens Advice and 'proposals' after as shown in bold italics.

"This council notes the findings of the national Citizens Advice report *Let down* (1) on the activities of private rented sector letting agents, which revealed:

- 73 per cent of tenants interviewed were dissatisfied with the service provided by their letting agent. Common concerns included difficulties in contacting the agent, serious delays in getting repairs carried out, inadequacies in the protection of clients' money and the frequency with which additional charges were made.
- 94 per cent of letting agents surveyed imposed additional charges on tenants on top of the tenancy deposit and rent in advance. The size of these charges varied hugely. The charge for checking references ranged from £10 to £275 and the charge for renewing a tenancy ranged from £12 to £200. In some cases additional charges for a tenancy amounted to over £600.
- Less than a third of agents willingly provided full written details of their charges to CAB workers when asked.
- 61 per cent of the tenants surveyed said that paying these charges was a problem. Some had to borrow the money, others had difficulty paying other bills or went into debt.

This council further notes:

- ***That Brighton & Hove has the sixth largest private rented sector in the country with tens of thousands of its residents having dealings with letting agents in the City.***

In addition, the Citizens Advice ***proposals*** call for:

(1) The licensing of letting agents who should be required to demonstrate professional competence, have adequate client money protection arrangements and operate a system for handling complaints and redress;

(2) The introduction of regulations specifying that no additional charges should be made to tenants for activities that are part of the routine letting and management

process. The cost of this work should be included in the rent paid by the tenant and/or the management fee paid by the landlord. The ultimate sanction against letting agents breaching the regulations should be the withdrawal of the licence to operate.

It therefore calls on the council to request the Chief Executive to:

1. Write to the Government and the major political parties seeking their support for the Citizens Advice proposals; and
2. Ask the Office of Fair Trading to carry out an investigation into the activities of letting agents.

Proposed by: Cllr Garry Peltzer Dunn

Seconded by: Cllr Maria Caulfield

NOTICE OF MOTION**LABOUR GROUP AMENDMENT****MATERNITY SERVICES IN BRIGHTON & HOVE**

Add a further paragraph after "...free-standing midwifery units (Birth Centres) or at home." with the wording in bold italics.

Amend final bullet point with the deletion of the wording as struck out and the insertion of the wording in bold italics:

"This council welcomes the news that Brighton & Hove PCT are planning to introduce a midwife led unit in the city, and recognises that this decision reflects the findings of a recent survey into local residents' views about the kinds of maternity services they desire.

"This council notes that the survey also found that:

- 88 per cent of respondents said they would like the same midwife throughout pregnancy and post natal care;
- 99 per cent of respondents thought it was a good idea to offer free counselling to women who have had a difficult birth.

"Furthermore, this council notes and supports the aims of the National Childbirth Trust's *Reclaiming Birth* campaign, which is also calling for more midwives carrying their own caseloads and looking after parents-to-be from conception to birth and post-natally, and for more women to be able to give birth in free-standing midwifery units (Birth Centres) or at home.

This Council notes that the Government has:

- ***provided record investment to the NHS including the education, training and recruitment of midwives which has led to 35,305 midwives recorded as practicing on the professional Register in 2008 – a ten year high;***
- ***provided an additional £330 million since 2008 specifically to improve maternity services over the three year period to 2011 and;***
- ***established the Midwifery 2020 programme to examine how best to maximize the contribution of midwives to improving the experience of women during their maternity care.***

However, this Council also notes that the NHS had a surplus of £1.7 billion in 2008 and shares the concern of the Royal College of Midwives that despite the

Government providing additional funding to improve maternity care services, this funding is not being consistently passed on to local heads of midwifery in England.

“Therefore this council requests the Chief Executive to:

- Write to the PCT urging them to act on the other findings of the survey with regard to midwife provision and post-natal counselling services;
- Write to the Health Secretary, Andy Burnham, ~~to call for funding to enable PCTs to better meet the needs of expectant women and new parents~~ **requesting that he instructs all NHS providers to ensure that the additional funding to improve maternity care services is passed on in full to local heads of midwifery in England”**

Proposed by: Cllr Craig Turton

Seconded by: Cllr Kevin Allen