

**DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

A period of not more than fifteen minutes shall be allowed at each ordinary meeting of the Council for the hearing of deputations from members of the public. Each deputation may be heard for a maximum of five minutes following which one Member of the Council, nominated by the Mayor, may speak in response. It shall then be moved by the Mayor and voted on without discussion that the deputation be thanked for attending and its subject matter noted.

Notification of seven Deputations has been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

**(A) DEPUTATION CONCERNING THE INADEQUACY OF COACH PARKING IN BRIGHTON AND HOVE.****(Spokesperson) Mr G. Cummings**

“We are here on behalf of the Roedean Residents Association to ask the council to rectify the current situation without further delay. Brighton and Hove prospers enormously from the tourist industry and the tourists who come here and many thousands arrive by coach, dozens of coaches each week. However B & H City Council only provide 42 coach parking spaces in the city to manage the ever growing demand over recent years so officials have been quietly directing coaches to park along totally unsuitable roads adjacent to and actually within residential neighbourhoods such as Roedean Road, The Cliff, Roedean Crescent and Roedean Way being major examples.

As well as being a visual eyesore the continual mass of unofficial coach parking in this and other areas is dangerous to the road users and pedestrians alike; neither Roedean Road nor Roedean Way have pavements. Of course with no facilities provided for the drivers they are forced to resort to urinating and even defecating behind their vehicles which is an all too regular sight for local residents. Furthermore the volume of coach parking encourages lorries to park here ( there is no HGV provision either ) and as a result the whole area resembles a motorway service station without the services and not the beautiful residential neighbourhood that it actually is and deserves to remain.

Surely coach travel should be regarded as “green” and with the Green party doing everything they can to discourage the use of cars proper provision for coaches and their drivers is essential. The current provision could lead to questions on health and safety since the drivers spend many hours with no suitable rest area, food or toilets. We understand there is reluctance on the part of some companies to go to Brighton with these non-existent facilities but if these were in place they would send many more thus increasing business for the city in many different ways.

It cannot be stressed too highly the dangers this unauthorised parking creates. There is no pavement down Roedean Road, only a narrow pedestrian way marked with a white line over which most cars travelling towards the A259 are forced to drive. Any pedestrian takes his life in his hands using this way when coaches are parked. Also crossing the road is fraught with danger since there is no visibility, the bus service is

disrupted because the drivers heading to Brighton rightly consider at certain times it too dangerous to drive on the wrong side of the road. Getting on and off the bus is a major problem with no visibility of oncoming traffic. There has been a serious accident recently entirely attributable to one of the car drivers being forced on to the wrong side of the road and it is only a matter of time before there is another possibly fatal accident. The council should be aware that it will carry huge responsibility for any accident related to coach parking other than in officially designated areas.

We urge the council to stop stone-walling this problem as they have been doing for years and act immediately to provide a 21<sup>st</sup>. century coach parking provision on a suitable site for our city.”

Mrs Rosemary Shepherd  
Ms Kay O’Dwyer  
Mr Malcolm Cramp

Mr Christopher Wilson  
Dr Bernard Rocks

**Councillor Ian Davey, Chair of the Transport Committee, will respond.**

Supporting Information:

Looking eastwards down Roedean Rd (no footpath) and Note coach parked in Roedean Way (no footpath).



**(B) DEPUTATION CONCERNING GILL'S HOME AND GARDEN REGARDING  
EXERCISE OF POWER BY ELECTED OFFICIALS.**

**Spokesperson: Mr. Adam Campbell**

**Councillor Ian Davey, Chair of the Transport Committee, will respond.**

**(C) DEPUTATION CONCERNING HOME CARE CONTRACTS**

**Spokesperson: Cllr Summers on behalf of Lesley Beckman and Care Workers in general.**

“There is an urgent need to give consideration to the impact of the new home care contracts introduced by the Council. These new contracts were designed to ensure that people receiving home care received more choice and control as the previous system was not suitable for the more flexible services that are required, which is why the council changed the way providers are paid.

Councillor Jarrett has stated that the council is not responsible for the way independent providers pay their staff and has no power to control them, but is keen to work with them to provide a minimum live-able wage of £7.19 per hour. This figure being less than a shop assistant can earn in this city. This shows how little Councillor Jarrett, and all those who support this figure, value both the care workers and those they serve across this city despite statements to the contrary. He also states that he is looking into ways to support the home care industry locally in terms of both recruiting and retaining home care workers, and trying to address the issue of rising fuel costs. Work is being undertaken to look at initiatives that can be implemented to help providers (not staff) with these costs.

The council is charging its clients a maximum of £21.50 per hour to run its in-house services, yet expects that outside agencies will provide the same high level of service for just £14.50 per hour. How does that work? However, nothing done properly is done cheaply and that is a trap the Green council has fallen into when changing the way providers are paid. The council no longer pays enhancements for weekends/anti-social hours and expects lone agency workers to visit service users up to 10pm, yet council workers visit in pairs. It no longer pays fuel allowance nor does it even make provision for it or for wasted time travelling between calls (which increases working hours) or depreciation of vehicles, nor does it pay enhancements to providers to ensure continuity of care. All this apparently gives service users more choice, control and flexibility - how?

You have all seen the effects that the new contracts have had on one small local agency within this city in the 3 months since the contracts have begun, and the costs that those care workers who remain are expected to swallow in order to continue working. 8 workers with between 4 and 7 years' experience have left and more may follow. This agency previously had an excellent staff retention record, and was rated in the care quality commissions report as a well-performing caring agency. The staff who have left have been replaced mainly by students who work in their spare time to fund their studies, and by the time they are experienced they will have left to pursue their dreams and so the cycle will continue.

At the last Adult Care & Health Committee meeting Councillor Jarrett confirmed that across the city, in the 3 months since the contracts began, 153 care workers have been recruited and 60 have left. How long the remaining 93 will stay remains to be seen. However, it was curious to note that the number of home care staff across the city has not, according to Councillor Jarrett, diminished. This then begs the question whether or not it has, in fact, been increased in order to meet the demands of an increasing number of people receiving home care! Much of this information, and

more, has been presented at the last 2 Adult Care & Health Committee meetings and is also supported, as you can see, by both Unison and Michelle Mitchell of Age UK.

This deputation requests that the council reconsiders the position it has placed care workers in, and seeks to address the imbalance caused with a report to the next "Adult Care & Health Committee meeting."

**Councillor Rob Jarrett, Chair of the Adult Care & Health Committee, will respond.**

Supporting Information:

# Elderly care 'reduced to a production line of tasks'

COUNCILS are treating vulnerable pensioners as a mere 'production line' of tasks to be completed by hard-pressed carers, according to a report which lifts the lid on the horrendous state of home care for the elderly.

Many are left 'suffering' in loneliness because councils are commissioning ever shorter visits, the report says, revealing the practice of 'call cramming' - when care workers spend as little as 15 minutes at someone's home.

In one case, a carer was forced to

**Daily Mail**  
CAMPAIGN  
**DIGNITY FOR  
THE ELDERLY**

leave a blind woman to eat a meal without assistance.

Another case was cited in which someone was left with no help to get to the lavatory.

Public sector union Unison questioned more than 400 care workers, 79 per cent of whom said they frequently had to leave clients too soon because they had so many visits to complete in a day.

One worker said elderly people were 'suffering' because of the 15-minute slots, adding: 'Some of these people do not have any family and a care worker is the only person they see but you have to practically run in and out again.'

The survey also revealed how little training care workers receive before

By **Daniel Martin**  
Whitehall Correspondent

being expected to perform complicated tasks such as lifting people in and out of baths and changing urine bags.

Some 24 per cent said they had never received any training for dispensing medicines, while 41 per cent said they had not received training on clients' special medical needs such as dementia and stroke.

One worker said it was only a 'matter of time' before an accident happens, adding: 'You can't put time on human beings.'

Most care workers are employed by private companies which penalise workers for staying beyond the allotted time while more than half receive a shelf-stacker's wage of around £7 per hour and are not paid for the time it takes to travel between visits.

The poor pay and conditions mean many people don't stay in the job for long, leaving elderly people confused by constant changes in staff.

The Unison report comes after a survey by the UK Homecare Association found one in ten councils were imposing limits of 15 minutes on care visits.

Unison general secretary Dave Prentis said: 'This report sadly shines a light on the reality for many people who rely on homecare - a production line mentality which limits the ability of staff to carry out their duties, and puts the dignity of those receiving care second to meeting arbitrary targets.'

Michelle Mitchell, of Age UK, said: 'This report is deeply saddening as it shows a disturbing picture of services stripped to the very bone and care staff stretched to their limits.'

'In this situation, care is, we fear, in danger of being reduced to a tick box list of tasks to be completed as quickly as possible.'

Mc  
Re  
th  
0-  
Inc  
Ex  
5y  
A  
U

**(D) DEPUTATION CONCERNING RESIDENTIAL SERVICE CLOSURES****Spokesperson: Mr. Jason Carlisle**

"I am writing to you with reference to the decision taken to close two residential services for adults with learning disabilities in Hove (with the option to close a third).

I am writing particularly to request that the report agreed at the Adult Care & Health Committee meeting on Monday 24th September be reviewed and the following points of concern addressed and if needs be a further report taken to the Committee to enable matters to be put right:

1. Capital spend information on the redevelopment of 20 Windlesham Road has not been provided to Members. What is the proposed cost of this redevelopment? How can committee members make informed decisions without proper full and correct financial information?
2. The financial information given about the annual cost to the council of running Ferndale Road was incorrect. It was claimed that annual spend on Ferndale Road was £300K; however £150K of that sum is provided by East Sussex County Council.
3. Due to this, the first report given to Members of the Committee in June was misleading. This means that if the decision had been taken then it would have been based on incorrect financial data.
4. The overall consultation process was unsound. Although timely consultation was given, the final document was published on Friday 14th September just 9 days before the Committee meeting. This document contained a significant change to the original consultation. Namely the following:
  - a. The options for councillors to choose from had been changed and renumbered without consultation of the focus group or parents and advocates. Specifically, in the original consultation, Option 1 referred to no change of service (which families and advocates favoured), but this was changed in the final document with just over a week to go, when Option 1 became the option to close Old Shoreham Road and New Church Road. This is both misleading and, I believe, procedurally incorrect.
  - b. This amended document was not advertised nor was it easy to find and was not a fair and proper reflection of the consultation previously undertaken.
5. The negative impact on the lives of those with a learning disability is incalculable financially and the likelihood of condemning individuals to heightened anxiety and negative self injuring behaviours as a result of this decision is not acceptable.
6. The decision making process at committee level was unfair and that on any other day when then standing committee member Stephanie Powell was in attendance and not on leave, the result of the vote would have been 6-4 in favour of the services remaining open. Instead Cllr Powell's replacement voted to the opposite



way and consequently the vote was split 5-5 giving Cllr Jarrett the casting vote as chair, leading to the decision to close.

It is therefore in the best interest of the vulnerable adults, whose homes are at stake that members of the council agree to a further report being presented to the committee based on full and correct information.”

**Councillor Rob Jarrett, Chair of the Adult Care & Health Committee, will respond.**

**(E) DEPUTATION CONCERNING PARKING CHARGES ON AND AROUND  
THE LONDON ROAD AREA**

**Spokesperson: Ms. Ann Townsend**

“At the beginning of April this year the cost of parking on and around the London Road went up not only significantly, but, as it turns out, also prohibitively. This has had an absolutely disastrous effect on the local businesses, with some retailers experiencing as much as a 30% decrease in trade.

Every shop and outlet in the London Road area has the same story to tell. Overnight there was a dramatic drop in trade with customers, after expressing their disbelief, disgust and anger at the cost of the parking, then saying that they would not be returning. Time and again potential customers have been seen to park, look at the cost of parking on the meters, then just get in their cars and drive off.

Passing trade, always an important asset to retailers has as good as disappeared. Customers are now often seen to hop out of their cars to buy just a single item whilst the driver of the car drives around the block once or twice until the shopper returns to the drop off point; this is an unsatisfactory mode of shopping for both customer, trader and the environment.

Local traders will testify that nothing, not the redevelopment of the Open Market nor the recession has had such a devastating effect on their trade as this recent increase in parking charges. The £1 charge for the first hour in the London Road car park has had no positive effect in alleviating the problem. On the contrary, the exorbitant rates for subsequent hours, including the higher charges for weekend parking, has only contributed to the loss of trade. Traders have had to make staff redundant.

This situation is economically unsound. People are losing their jobs. Shop owners who have been trading in the area for many years are now losing their livelihoods. Customers are losing their preferred area of shopping and let's be honest, the London Road has long been a life-line for people on low incomes.

Once the Open Market re-opens it will struggle to survive if it sits alone in a desolate, economic wasteland. This will turn into a lost opportunity. The traders of the open market have struggled for years for this rejuvenation, to bring it in line with modern, vibrant markets where local produce can be sold, alongside more colourful products, to local people. And what about the Mary Portas Funding? What is the point of investing this money if you can't even get the basics right and when it appears that the council is not committed to one of her fundamental recommendations - cheap easy parking. Get the cars parked up as quickly as possible and get the shoppers into the shops. Will this represent another lost opportunity? None of us want to see the Open Market become the 'Green' white elephant of Brighton, but unless something is done fast this is how it will be known.

This deputation is being made to demand that the parking charges be reviewed with the utmost urgency and returned long term to less than £1 an hour, a level commensurate with an economically depressed area, in a bid to encourage the return of shoppers and trade.

For the month of December, in the run-up to Christmas, we would like to see the well-advertised suspension of all parking charges, both on street and in the car park, in an attempt to boost trade and re-coup the serious losses that have been forced upon this retail area since April. For the sake of the London Road you must act now.”

**Councillor Ian Davey, Chair of the Transport Committee, will respond.**

**(F) DEPUTATION CONCERNING THE No. 52 BUS SERVICE**

**Spokesperson: Mr. Steve Wedd**

**Please reinstate the No. 52 Bus Service on its original timings from the City Centre to Ovingdean and Woodingdean.**

- 1) Thank you for receiving this deputation. I represent Ovingdean bus users, and the Ovingdean Residents and Preservation Society.

Background

- 2) The Council reduced the subsidy it paid to Brighton & Hove Bus Company to run non commercial services. Consequently, Brighton & Hove Buses chose to withdraw its 52 (weekdays) and 57 (Sunday) services from Woodingdean and Ovingdean direct to the City centre. A reduced tender was let to Big Lemon (weekdays) and Compass (weekends). The timetable was changed, the school buses withdrawn completely, and passengers now have to change at the Marina to continue to the City by bus.
- 3) We know that money is tight at present, and that the Council has to find savings wherever it can. However, it appears that only Ovingdean has borne the full impact of those savings. All the other bus services proposed for subsidy cuts were saved.

Lost passengers, lost revenue, more car journeys

- a) Residents who gave up their private cars to choose to use the bus are now buying them back, because they cannot get to work on time.
- b) Parents who formerly entrusted children to the bus now drive them across the city.
- c) One parent told a public meeting last week about how she had chosen Cardinal Newman for her daughter, but regrets that choice, now the direct bus route has been removed.
- d) 152 school children from Cardinal Newman live in the four Deans. I don't know how many of those used the 52 service, but I witnessed many school services and they were always busy to full. BHASVIC is similarly affected – 36 students live on the route.
- e) A specialist cancer nurse can't get to work to open his 0900 clinic on time because the bus times don't suit.
- f) A man who offers his time as a volunteer at the Hove Town Hall CAB gets to his workplace 15 minutes late, which disorganises the remainder of his appointments.
- g) Those requiring medical services at RSCH can't get there by bus because the times don't suit and because of the compulsory change at the Marina.
- h) School children from Ovingdean attending schools in Rottingdean can no longer take the village bus to the coast and there change for Rottingdean. When the choice is '*miss the bus or miss school*', they miss the bus. Their parents don't buy a ticket either.

**Councillor Ian Davey, Chair of the Transport Committee, will respond.**

Supporting Information:

Timings matter

- 1) Before September, morning commute buses used to go at 0651, 0720, 0750, 0801, and 0820. The timings were good for those commuting to London, to school, to work in Brighton.
- 2) Now, the first early morning bus is 0738, then 0838. 0738 is no good for a London commuter taking the train (London Bridge by 0946), too early for Brighton commuters; and 0838 is too late for them. All now have to change at the Marina, or hope for space on a coastway bus.
- 3) Changing the timetable must have seemed such a simple matter, but it makes the route useless for passengers trying to get to work or school. Imposing a change at the Marina is not merely an inconvenience: it causes significant delay, in a place not unknown for bad weather, onto buses that don't go where people want them to go.
- 4) The two changes together act as a positive disincentive to passengers committed to bus travel to continue on public transport.

Detail matters - why the changes?

- 5) The Big Lemon told us that the change in timetable was forced upon it, due to having to connect with the Compass service 47 from Saltdean to the City Centre. We are told now by the Council that cross ticketing was part of the tender. Why did the City Council compel the BL 52 to meet (and only to meet) Compass 47 connexions? Without that enforced connexion, times could have been left as they had been for years – times that suit passengers.
- 6) School children and students used to be able to journey direct from the eastern villages of Woodingdean, Rottingdean, Ovingdean, and Saltdean to and from schools at Cardinal Newman and BHASVIC. Now they are obliged to change – onto coastway buses that are full, or buses that don't connect at the Marina, or then again at the Railway Station. The journey time has doubled.

Appearance matters

- 7) In a city so heavily reliant on tourism, uniformity of appearance is important. Red London buses, black taxis are worldwide symbols of London. In New York, you look out for a yellow cab. In the City of Brighton, the buses are mostly red and cream except when they are purple or bright yellow.
- 8) Route timetables in the village are printed on red and cream Brighton Hove letterhead, but the bus that comes is yellow. How do tourists or students at the College know that?
- 9) We know that the contract has been let. I am sure that revoking that contract will cost more than continuing it. Over the last six weeks, I have repeatedly asked 21 questions about the tendering process as it affected the 52 compared to other

routes. I regret that up to the point of drafting this deputation paper, I have had barely an acknowledgement, and no reply.

Ticket prices matter

10) Because the new operators don't accept the smartkey card, passengers have to buy driver tickets or make complicated arrangements yesterday. £3.50 from the website well ahead of time, £4.00 from shops, but £4.40 from the driver on the route.

Taxpayers matter

11) The following suburbs of Brighton have better services than Ovingdean -  
a) Tunbridge Wells has twice as many buses as Ovingdean, Lewes 6 an hour, Uckfield – 2 buses an hour, Eastbourne 6 an hour mid-day, Steyning has three buses in both rush hours - even Ringmer has two buses an hour from Brighton.

What do we want?

12) Reversion to our old bus times. School buses back. A direct city centre service, just like Ringmer and Steyning.

13) Can you afford it? Yes. It's less than £100k. Stop improving existing cycle lanes in Lewes Road and give us back our direct buses on the original timings, please.

**(G) DEPUTATION CONCERNING THE No. 52 BUS SERVICE**

**Spokesperson: MS. Anelica Tsapparelli**

Travelling to and from Cardinal Newman School and the safety issues as a result of the changes to the 52 bus service.

**Councillor Ian Davey, Chair of the Transport Committee, will respond.**

