

**Subject:** Homeless Move On – Hollingbury Library Proposals  
**Date of Meeting:** 21 March 2019  
**Report of:** Executive Director for Neighbourhoods, Communities & Housing  
**Contact Officer:** Name: **Caroline De Marco** Tel: **29-1063**  
E-mail: [Caroline.demarco@brighton-hove.gov.uk](mailto:Caroline.demarco@brighton-hove.gov.uk)  
**Wards Affected:** All

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE**

***Action Required of the Committee:***

To receive the item referred from the Housing & New Homes Committee for approval:

That the following be referred to the Committee for consideration:

That the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee be recommended to:  
Approve an indicative budget of £2.750m financed by HRA borrowing and  
Homes England funding to form part of the HRA capital programme for  
2019/20.

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL****HOUSING & NEW HOMES COMMITTEE****13 MARCH 2019****COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**Present:** Councillor Hill (Chair); Councillor Mears (Opposition Spokesperson), Councillor Gibson (Group Spokesperson), Councillors Atkinson, Barnett, Cattell, Meadows, Moonan, Page and Wealls.

**DRAFT MINUTE****PART ONE****70 HOMELESS MOVE ON - HOLLINGBURY LIBRARY PROPOSALS**

- 70.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Neighbourhoods, Communities & Housing which concerning a final viable scheme for the Hollingbury Library site. The report would also be presented to the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee and the Estate Regeneration Members' Board. The report was presented by the Estate Regeneration Manager and the Commissioning & Performance Manager – Rough Sleeping & Homeless Support Services.
- 70.2 In answer to questions from Councillor Page it was confirmed that there would be secure cycle parking and that the site was near to bus routes. No disabled parking spaces were currently planned.
- 70.3 Councillor Wealls commented that he was finding it difficult to define 'medium support'. He referred to a scheme in Seafield Road which had not been trouble free. He asked about the difference between this proposal and Equinox. Equinox had been surprised at the need of the clients. How could anyone who had experience of such schemes have confidence that what was proposed was medium support? The Commissioning & Performance Manager stated that officers had learnt a great deal from the experience with Equinox. The Allocations Panel process would be used and there would be a Move-On Co-ordinator. The flats would be self-contained and residents would need to manage their accommodation. They would still need some support but would be looking to branch out and live independently.
- 70.4 Councillor Gibson asked if there would be a lift in the accommodation and asked about the impact that the facility would have in providing services for people in this pathway. How would it impact on and release other accommodation? Officers confirmed that there would be one lift in the accommodation and that the accommodation would be supplied for people who were ready to move on, thereby releasing accommodation for people with higher support needs.

- 70.5 Councillor Mears proposed the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Barnett.

To delete recommendations 2.3, 2.4 & 2.5 as shown below in ~~strike through~~.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Housing & New Homes Committee approves commencement of resident consultation on proposals to provide a Homeless Move On scheme on the Hollingbury Library site.
- 2.2 That the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee be recommended to:  
*Approve an indicative budget of £2.750m financed by HRA borrowing and Homes England funding to form part of the HRA capital programme for 2019/20.*
- ~~2.3 Housing & New Homes Committee approves the procurement by tender for a medium support accommodation service for homeless adults.~~
- ~~2.4 That Housing & New Homes Committee grants delegated authority to the Executive Director of Health & Adult Social Care (HASC) to undertake the procurement of a medium support service to the value of £150,000 per annum, and to award the contract for Five (5) years.~~
- ~~2.5 That Housing & New Homes Committee delegates authority to the Executive Director of HASC to extend the contract at the end of the five year term for a further period of up to two years if it is deemed appropriate and subject to available budget."~~
- 70.6 Councillor Mears stated that she could not support recommendations 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5. Paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 would be taking money from the HRA and the HRA would not be receiving rents for the property. The recommendations were asking the committee to delegate authority to the Executive Director, Health & Adult Social Care, and Housing & New Homes Committee would have no control over the scheme. The Housing Allocations Policy would not be used. There was no recommendation to bring back a report.
- 70.7 Councillor Atkinson thanked officers for the report which he considered was a good news item. Although he could understand the concerns of residents he stressed that this type of accommodation was crucial and he hoped that the local community could be reassured. The scheme was aimed at move on individuals that did not need high level support. They were not the sort of people who were likely to cause problems.
- 70.8 Councillor Moonan concurred with Councillor Atkinson and stressed that moving people on through services was a challenge. The scheme would provide desperately needed move on accommodation and she hoped it would be approved. Councillor Moonan understood the issues with Seafield Road. One issue was about density. She stressed that it was important to spread these services across the city. Residents would be unaware of the schemes if they were managed properly. Consultation was vital.
- 70.9 Councillor Gibson supported the scheme and stated that he understood that the intention was for the proposal to be cost neutral for the HRA and that there was no

question of tenants' rents being used to subsidise the project in any way even though it was being built through the HRA. This was confirmed by the Lead Regeneration Programme Manager. Councillor Gibson responded to the points made by the letter submitted by Councillors Wares and G Theobald. The council had a budget in place and a government grant. Councillor Gibson acknowledged that it was hard to find a building but the key for residents was that the consultation was meaningful and thorough.

- 70.10 Councillor Meadows stated that she was not against the scheme in principle; however, she was against giving a blank cheque to Adult Social Care for a service which was their responsibility. Paragraph 2.4 stated that they would have £750,000 for the five year contract. Paragraph 2.5 gave them another £300,000 to spend on something that was essentially an Adult Social Care service. Page 46 – Service Provision - Paragraph 4.3 mentioned that prospective residents would be assessed via an Allocation Panel. Councillor Meadows stressed that the government grant was for people at the end of the homeless process. It was not for new people coming off the homeless route. The Allocation Panel was adhering to the Allocation Policy in Adult Social Care. It was not adhering to the Housing Allocation Policy. An EIA would show that this would be totally unfair to those residents who were waiting on the housing register for a home. No report back was mentioned in the report. There was no mention of how the HRA was to be spent. Paragraph 8.9 on page 49 stated that “Health & Adult Social Care have allocated a budget of £0.150m....” Paragraph 8.6 stated that “the balance of funding would be met by HRA borrowing...”. The report went on to say the building would be handed over to Adult Social Care. There was no best value and no best consideration to the scheme.
- 70.11 Councillor Page supported the scheme and stressed that Adult Social Care was another important service in the council and was working with the most vulnerable residents in the city. The scheme would provide homes and support to vulnerable people. The residents would require medium support and would be carefully assessed.
- 70.12 Councillor Mears stated that the Conservative Group would not support the recommendations in the report. The Committee were being asked to give delegated powers to the Executive Director of Health & Adult Social Care. There was no accountability regarding the budget, no mention of a report back to committee and no accountability over contracts. Councillor Mears had never known the Housing & New Homes Committee to give delegated powers to another Executive Director. The recommendation would take away responsibility from Housing Services.
- 70.13 The Senior Lawyer confirmed that the Committee were being asked to make a decision that fell under the terms of reference for the Housing & New Homes Committee which had overall responsibility for the council's housing functions. The fact that the committee were delegating powers to another director was irrelevant. The Committee could make that director accountable for any monies spent and the committee could ask for reports back from the director. The council did not operate a system where one director was only responsible to one committee.
- 70.14 The Committee voted on the Conservative Group amendment as set out in paragraph 70.5 above. Members voted by 4 votes in favour of the amendment and by 6 votes against the amendment. The amendment was not carried.

70.15 The Committee voted on the substantive recommendations and these were agreed by 6 votes in favour and 4 votes against the recommendations. The recommendations in the report were carried.

70.16 **RESOLVED:-**

- (1) That Housing & New Homes Committee approves commencement of resident consultation on proposals to provide a Homeless Move On scheme on the Hollingbury Library site.
- (2) That the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee be recommended to: Approve an indicative budget of £2.750m financed by HRA borrowing and Homes England funding to form part of the HRA capital programme for 2019/20.
- (3) That Housing & New Homes Committee approves the procurement by tender for a medium support accommodation service for homeless adults.
- (4) That Housing & New Homes Committee grants delegated authority to the Executive Director of Health & Adult Social Care (HASC) to undertake the procurement of a medium support service to the value of £150,000 per annum, and to award the contract for Five (5) years.
- (5) That Housing & New Homes Committee delegates authority to the Executive Director of HASC to extend the contract at the end of the five year term for a further period of up to two years if it is deemed appropriate and subject to available budget.

