

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**COUNCIL****4.30pm 24 MARCH 2016****COUNCIL CHAMBER, BRIGHTON TOWN HALL****MINUTES**

Present: Councillors Hyde (Chair), West (Deputy Chair), Allen, Atkinson, Barnett, Barradell, Bell, Bennett, Bewick, Brown, Cattell, Chapman, Cobb, Daniel, Druitt, Gibson, Gilbey, Greenbaum, Hamilton, Hill, Horan, Inkpin-Leissner, Janio, Knight, Lewry, Littman, Mac Cafferty, Marsh, Meadows, Mears, Miller, Mitchell, Moonan, Morris, Nemeth, A Norman, K Norman, O'Quinn, Peltzer Dunn, Penn, Robins, Simson, Sykes, Taylor, C Theobald, G Theobald, Wares, Wealls and Yates

PART ONE**92 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 92.1. Councillor Bell declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 107(d) Notices of Motion – EU Membership Subject, as he was vice-president of the vote to leave campaign and he was a member of the all-party vote to leave group.
- 92.2. No other declarations of interests in matters appearing on the agenda were made.

93 MINUTES

- 93.1. The minutes of the last ordinary meeting held on the 28th January 2016 were approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record of the proceedings, subject to them being amended to reflect that
- (a) The record of voting being amended to reflect the presence or absence of Members consistently; and
 - (b) That Councillor Penn was invited to come forward to sign the pledge for the Time to Change Charity on behalf of the Council.
- 93.2. The minutes of the Budget Council meeting held on the 25th February 2016 were approved and signed by the Mayor as a correct record of the proceedings, subject to the record of voting being amended to reflect the presence or absence of Members consistently.

94 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS.

- 94.1. The Mayor stated that it was with great sadness that she share with the Council the news of the passing of Mr. Jim Buttimer, Former Councillor and Mayor of Hove, 1988-1989. She noted that Jim had been ill for a while and passed away at the age of 90, on 8 March and that his funeral was held on the 17th March.
- 94.2. The Mayor then asked everyone to stand for a minute's silence as a mark of respect for a former Member.
- 94.3. The Mayor thanked the meeting and then stated she would like to offer the Council's congratulations to the City Council Parking Team, who won two national awards - the Parking in the Community award and the Parking Partnerships award at the British Parking Awards on March 4.
- 94.4. The Team, in conjunction with East Sussex County Council and Sussex Police, launched Operation Bluebird to free up disabled parking spaces for people who genuinely need them. As part of the initiative the area has become the first in the country to offer offenders the option of a community resolution order, instead of receiving a criminal record. Under this order the offender watches a video featuring local disabled people, highlighting the impact blue badge misuse has on their everyday lives.
- 94.5. The Mayor then invited Yvonne Harvey, Sarah Costan, and Anthony Patchett to come forward to collect the award.

95 TO RECEIVE PETITIONS AND E-PETITIONS.

- 95.1 The Mayor invited the submission of petitions from councillors and members of the public. She reminded the Council that petitions would be referred to the appropriate decision-making body without debate and the person presenting the petition would be invited to attend the meeting to which the petition was referred.
- 95.2 Ms. Van Ransburg presented an e-petition and petition with 783 signatures concerning the Farm Green playground in Bevendean.
- 95.3 Mr. Mole presented a petition which had 850 signatures calling on Brighton & Hove to become the first pesticide free city.
- 95.4 Councillor Hamilton presented petition with 222 signatures concerning the traffic management for the i-360.

96 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

- 96.1. The Mayor reported that 3 written questions had been received from members of the public and invited Ms. Paynter to come forward and address the council.
- 96.2. Ms. Paynter asked the following question;

“Hove Museum is located in a converted 1877 dwelling house. It’s now proposed to sell Hove’s graceful, gravitas-heavy and listed early 20th century Carnegie building and to transfer a proportion of the existing library service to a new build annex space behind Brooker Hall’s warren of cubby-hole rooms. What are the last five years’, and projected, Brooker Hall repair and maintenance costs compared to the claimed cost of retaining the Carnegie Library for, say, another 20 years, regardless of whom or what will have responsibility for the ageing Brooker Hall Museum service, be it a Trust or whatever?”

96.3. Councillor Morgan replied;

“The cost of maintenance for Hove Library for the next five years will be £738,650.00 this compares to £72,265 for Saltdean Library, £88,371 for Rottingdean Library, £3,555 for Hangleton Library and £4,591 for Coldean Library. The maintenance work for the Brooker hall Hove Museum building for the next five years is estimated at £52,700.”

96.4. Ms. Paynter asked the following supplementary question;

“I wonder how a building which is nearly 40 years older than the Carnegie Library can be expected to last longer than that great big stone civic building. I wonder what kind of projected lifespan you have for the Brooker Museum.”

96.5. Councillor Morgan replied;

“The issue around capital costs isn’t really central to the issue around whether we maintain the library in its current home or not. There are staffing costs as well. Staffing costs for Hove library are £257,357 a year this compares to between £23,000 and £25,000 for Saltdean, Rottingdean, Westdean, Hollingbury, Woodingdean, Moulsecocomb and Coldean.”

96.6. The Mayor thanked Ms. Paynter for her questions and invited Mr. Hawtree to come forward and address the council.

96.7. Mr. Hawtree asked the following question;

“Would Councillor Morgan please tell us why it is only with this Library Plan that it has apparently become necessary to replace all of the roof at Hove’s Carnegie Library and, what’s more, with slate entirely at an extraordinary cost?”

96.8. Councillor Morgan replied;

“The roof needs replacement and it hasn’t just been identified in the recent past. A study was done in February 2014 and at the time the professional building surveyor’s opinion was that the existing concrete tiles were in poor enough condition to warrant replacement within a three year period from the survey date. The building surveyor would have assessed the possibility of ongoing patch repairs but considered that this would not be the right solution for the grade 2 listed building. Slate was proposed as the option that would be more in keeping with the grade 2 listed building within designated conservation area. Any roofing replacement would need to be agreed with planning.”

96.9. Mr. Hawtree asked the following supplementary question;

“Could you please tell us whether you have had any contact with Historic England which has taken over from English Heritage about this purpose built listed library and if so the upshot of this especially as the roof is not visible from the street unlike many a house?”

96.10. Councillor Morgan replied;

“That contact is something which I can’t comment upon. I’d have to check with officers and get back to you.”

96.11. The Mayor thanked Mr. Hawtree for his questions and invited Mr. Burton to come forward and address the council.

96.12. Mr. Burton asked the following question;

“The local community at Westdene is looking forward to working closely with the Council and with other bidders to run the barn at Westdene Green and it has in place a formidably qualified and experienced team to do so. Our question is can the Council acknowledge the high level of local support for turning the Westdene Barn into a community-run hub by granting us a lease on the premises so that it can be used for community events and activities to engage a wide range of local people?”

96.13. Councillor Daniel replied;

“We can of course acknowledge the amazing amount of work you’ve done as residents in such a short period of time to get together such a big group and so many pledges of support. I note your desire to deliver activities and events for people of Westdene in that space. Following an open market tendering exercise the council is working with yourself and the successful bidder from that process. I am hoping that you will be able to work collaboratively and in cooperation to be able to do both things and I know that wasn’t the answer that you were hoping for from that exercise but I know that the team have gone the extra mile time and time again on this process because they do recognise the enormous effort that the community has put in and I’d like to commend them for that.

So my understanding of the current position is that our property estates team is working with you to agree terms with both yourselves and the other party involved in that process to enable the unit to be brought back in to deliver a wider offer than either of you could provide alone with community benefits balanced against the income this Council badly needs from our property in accordance with our asset management principles. We hope that this will enable community use and a sustainable solution.”

96.14. Mr. Burton asked the following supplementary question;

“A secondary point is that given that under the covenant that governs that land and the building, the council is obliged by law to use Westdene Green and the barn for the benefit of the local community and that the covenant terms preclude any use for

commercial purposes. Should the council move responsibility for this building off its property asset department and into the communities department so that our bid can be considered using more reasonable criteria?"

96.15. Councillor Daniel replied;

"I think that you have put some of those technical and legal points to officers and I understand that's underway so it would be inappropriate for me to comment on those specifically. What I would say is that my understanding is that our officers have fully used the policy and assessed this as they should have done and that's my understanding and what I've seen. What I would say is that I've supported many, many community groups because I used to work in an umbrella organisation, well actually I've worked in three umbrella organisations, for the voluntary sector and sometimes we get really hung up on having a building that's ours and it's not going to be used 24/7 but the thing is that can become a millstone around a community group's neck and I would urge you to work collaboratively with the property services and the other tenants to see if there is a way you can use the money that you've raised and all the expertise that you've got as a group to put it to best possible use rather than sinking it in to property but put it in to equipment, events, training, other uses. I'd encourage you to use community works which is an umbrella organisation for groups like your own in the city and they can probably put you in touch with other organisations very similar to yours who have been down this road. Some own a building or lease a building and some just co-locate so that you can get their take on what's the best option for you going forward."

96.16. The Mayor thanked Mr. Burton for his questions and noted that this concluded the item.

97 DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

97.1. The Mayor reported that two deputations had been received from members of the public and invited Ms. Furno as the spokesperson for the first deputation to come forward and address the council.

97.2. Ms. Furno thanked the Mayor and stated that:

"We have come here today on behalf of our fellow residents of Trafalgar Road and Church Road and Portslade. We're truly outraged by the ludicrous proposal that traffic bringing an expected 750,000 visitors per year to the i360 in Brighton be directed by brown signs or any other method via our roads. The suggested route that traffic be directed to come along the bypass from all points north and east turn off at the Hangleton link junction come down to Old Shorham Road then reach the coast road via Trafalgar Road and Church Road is ridiculous on a number of levels. This route sends traffic away from the natural flow and direction of its destination. It is 8 miles long which means excessive additional mileage for each of the vehicles using that route and has 14 sets of traffic lights all of which will result in unnecessary air pollution in the area. The roads already suffer high levels of traffic as they are the main route for the HGV travelling to and from Shoreham harbour. An average of 8 busses an hour and numerous cars also take this route which only adds to the issue.

Both Trafalgar Road and Church Road are high residential and there are 4 schools in the area; St. Mary's Primary School, St. Peter's Infant School, St. Nicholas's Primary School and Brakenbury Primary School there is also a health centre and a community centre on these roads. All of these homes and local service generate a large number of pedestrians –both children and adults- who need to cross these already busy roads. Even with current levels of road traffic it can at time take several minutes to be able to cross the road safely. To add to the traffic levels would only exacerbate this issue. Both roads are narrow being single lanes each way for the majority of their lengths. Both of the properties have either small front gardens or none at all with front doors that open directly on to the pavement and therefore more susceptible to road side pollution. According to the diagram provided in page 9 of the Brighton and Hove City Council 'Air Quality Action Plan technical appendix' the levels of NO₂ on the northern half of Trafalgar Road and southern half of Church Road are far in excess of the legal limit. Further statistics in the appendix outline reveal the impact that the HGVs have on NO₂ levels in Trafalgar Road.

The 'Air Quality Action Plan 2015' ranks Trafalgar Road -the B2193- 8th in the table showing highest NO₂ levels in Brighton and Hove by transport corridor. That is three places above that of the much discussed Rottingdean High-street. The road has 148 residential dwellings at risk of exceeding the legal NO₂ level which is 30µg/m³ and its roadside NO₂ level is 53 µg/m³.

Given that Brighton and Hove City Council has Air Quality Management Areas, which include Trafalgar Road and Church Road, where is the sense in directing traffic via those roads, which will further compound an already extreme situation?

In summary, we ask that you reject the proposal to put up brown road signs directing the traffic from the i360 down Trafalgar road and Church Road and Portslade on the following grounds; the route itself is excessively long and detours the said traffic out of its natural flow and direction there-by causing unnecessary air pollution, that the two roads already have high levels of traffic especially HGVs in the main route to and from Shoreham harbour, that the current traffic levels mean that the roads are already difficult to cross and any additional traffic would only add to the problem making it increasingly unsafe, that the air pollution level cause by the current traffic on the two roads is already in excess of the legal limit for NO₂, the nearness of the roads and small or non-existent front gardens mean that the residents along the route are highly susceptible to roadside pollution, both roads are within the council's air quality management areas and as such no scheme should be agreed to which will add to those traffic levels and exacerbate the problem.

In short, we, the residents of Trafalgar Road and Church Road, as well as those from surrounding streets, strongly request that you consider our already difficult situation and reject this proposal."

97.3. Councillor Morgan replied,

"The opening of the BA i360 and other major developments along the seafront will, whilst being significant benefits in terms of business rates, employment and tourist income, pose significant traffic and transport challenges. The signage referred to in the media coverage is provided by the Highways Agency and not the city council. As far as

I'm aware no final decisions have been made have been made yet by them on where or how much signing will be installed to direct drivers toward the attraction. Signage will be just one of the factors affecting the routes chosen by visitors likely to be less significant than satnav and others. Council officers have been working directly with the i360 since January 2015 on website travel information, coach passenger and vehicle provision, pedestrian signing and local highway signing highway signing for drivers. The Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee approved the development of a city-wide traffic network management strategy in October of last year which will aim to disperse car journeys across a number of routes in order to achieve a more appropriate distribution of traffic and reduce the effects of congestion and air pollution. Council officers have and will continue to work with the BA i360 team to develop an approach to transport and travel which seeks to bring the greatest benefit to the city whilst minimising the impacts or effects on local neighbourhoods and residents. Once the tower is open and visitor numbers and traffic are known officers and the i360 team will reviewing the traffic and transport strategy for the attraction and suggesting or making changes accordingly. So I would stress that these are not our proposals and this is not our decision. This began with a press release from the BA i360 and the Highways Agency and we will support you in making representations to them."

- 97.4. The Mayor thanked Ms. Furno for attending the meeting and speaking on behalf of the deputation. She explained that the points had been noted and the deputation would be referred to the Economic Development & Culture Committee for consideration. The persons forming the deputation would be invited to attend the meeting and would be informed subsequently of any action to be taken or proposed in relation to the matter set out in the deputation.
- 97.5. The Mayor then noted that Mr. Berry was not present to give his deputation, but invited Councillor Daniel to respond.
- 97.6. Councillor Daniel stated:

"The deputation asks for Coldean to be described as 'Coldean village'. I am very pleased to see local people taking an interest and pride in their area and initiating this proposal.

Coldean has a strong sense of identity and of community values. I know that this request is reflected in the values of community more strongly as well as reflecting the fact that it is a beautiful area which is surrounded by trees and green spaces.

There is a formal mechanism under the local government and public involvement act 2007 involving the change of name. That it only occurs when it is part of a governance review undertaken by local authorities and my understanding is that this is not something that the area is looking for. Based on our current understanding of the law there is no mechanism for council to formally approve the proposed use of the term 'village' to refer to Coldean when it is not a result of governance review. Notwithstanding this the council in principle supports Coldean being referred to as Coldean Village if that is the preference of residence. This deputation will be referred to the Neighbourhoods, Communities & Equalities Committee and the committee will consider it in the light of legal advice and whether other agencies such as the post office need to be consulted."

97.7. The Mayor explained that the deputation would be referred to the Neighbourhoods, Communities & Equalities Committee for consideration. The persons forming the deputation would be invited to attend the meeting and would be informed subsequently of any action to be taken or proposed in relation to the matter set out in the deputation.

97.8. The Mayor noted that this concluded the item.

98 PETITIONS FOR COUNCIL DEBATE

98.1 The Mayor stated that the council's petition scheme provided that where a petition secured 1,250 or more signatures it could be debated at a Council meeting. She had been notified of three such petitions which had sufficient signatures to warrant a debate and therefore would call on the lead petitioner to present their petition before opening the matter up for debate.

(a) Homelessness Policy

98.2 The Mayor invited Mr. Harris to present the petition calling on the Council to adopt the ten point plan to address the issues related to emergency homelessness accommodation outlined in the petition.

98.3 Mr. Harris thanked the Mayor and presented the petition which called on the Council to consider the proposals listed to address issues associated with emergency accommodation for homeless people. He explained that he lived in emergency accommodation which comprised of a privately operated building with 60 rooms that were let at £28 per night – this equated to over £900 per with together a £50 service charge. Mr Harris highlighted some of his own personal background and added that the poor facilities, including inadequate kitchens, no laundry facilities and the exclusion of guests, as well as the cost of this accommodation added to his own levels of personal stress and impacted on his wellbeing. He highlighted, from a Freedom of Information Request, the amount that the Council had spent annually on this type of accommodation annually and argued that residents needed secure tenancies and improvements to accommodation standards. He asked that the Council consider the points put forward in his petition.

98.4 Councillor Meadows thanked Mr. Harris for presenting his petition and extended her concern that the housing process had caused Mr Harris this level of stress. She went on to highlight that the Council was building new homes across the city, and noted that Mr Harris had provided a number of areas for the Council to consider and revisit. She stated that with a lack of social housing in the city there was a necessity to use stock from the private rented sector, but added that the Council always sought feedback and undertook proactive work such as inspections and she provided assurance that she would personally visit Mr Harris's accommodation. Finally she highlighted that the Council already provided free Wi-Fi in libraries and civic buildings and there was work being undertaken to see if this could be extended to low-income households.

98.5 Councillor Gibson moved an amendment on behalf of the Green Group to the report's recommendation to add a further recommendation:

That Brighton & Hove City Council recommends that Housing & New Homes committee give due consideration to the following:-

- An increase in the frequency of inspections of emergency accommodation and report on the outcome of these inspections at regular intervals to Housing & New Homes Committee;
- That satisfaction surveys are undertaken with residents moving into emergency accommodation and the results reported back;
- Exploring along with other relevant committees as a matter of priority the identification of sites and explore the development of council owned low cost emergency accommodation, either through a council owned company or directly owned by the council. That this exploration focuses on non-traditional, quick to build, construction such as the Y cube and containers be considered for these sites;
- Undertaking a review of the no visitor rules and consider the outcome at a future meeting;
- Adopting a policy of only using emergency accommodation in which hot water supply is guaranteed.

Councillor Gibson took part in the debate and thanked Mr Harris for his bravery in coming forward and speaking to the Council. He noted that the petition was a very clear message that more needed to be done to reduce rough sleeping, build more social housing and urgently look into the quality of the accommodation used by the Council in the private rented sector. He noted that agreeing the proposed amendments would ensure they formed the basis of the consideration of the petition when it was referred to the Housing & New Homes Committee. Councillor Gibson noted that for some the temporary housing options were inadequate and pushed people into becoming rough sleepers, and he highlighted that the Council needed to speed up its efforts to look into alternative temporary housing solutions.

98.6 Councillor Druitt formally seconded the amendment.

98.7 Councillor Mears took part in the debate and thanked Mr Harris for bringing his petition to the attention of the Council; she went on to add that the Council needed to ensure that temporary accommodation was fit for purpose and had facilities such as adequate kitchens and running hot water as set out in the HMO guidance. Councillor Mears noted that the Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee had given a clear steer that the matter would be discussed at that Committee in full; however, she added that she would not support the amendment as she was of the view there were additional matters that needed to be considered above those put forward in the amendment.

98.8 The Mayor called on Councillor Meadows to respond to the debate.

98.9 Councillor Meadows stated that the Labour & Co-Operative Group would accept the proposed amendments and ensure they were part of the discussion at the next

Housing & New Homes Committees; she also stated that there needed to be a clear pathway in place for those in need.

98.10 The Mayor noted that an amendment had been moved and put it to the vote. This was **carried** by 48 votes with 1 abstention as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	✓			Mac Cafferty	✓		
2	Atkinson	✓			Marsh	✓		
3	Barford	<i>Absent</i>			Meadows	✓		
4	Barnett	✓			Mears	✓		
5	Barradell	✓			Miller	✓		
6	Bell	✓			Mitchell	✓		
7	Bennett	✓			Moonan	✓		
8	Bewick	✓			Morgan	✓		
9	Brown	✓			Morris	✓		
10	Cattell	✓			Nemeth	✓		
11	Chapman	✓			Norman A	✓		
12	Cobb	✓			Norman K	✓		
13	Daniel	✓			O'Quinn	✓		
14	Deane	<i>Absent</i>			Page	<i>Apologies</i>		
15	Druitt	✓			Peltzer Dunn	✓		
16	Gibson	✓			Penn	✓		
17	Gilbey	✓			Phillips	<i>Apologies</i>		
18	Greenbaum	✓			Robins	✓		
19	Hamilton	✓			Simson	✓		
20	Hill	✓			Sykes	✓		
21	Horan	✓			Taylor	✓		
22	Hyde			Ab	Theobald C	✓		
23	Inkpin-Leissner	✓			Theobald G	✓		
24	Janio	✓			Wares	✓		
25	Knight	✓			Wealls	✓		
26	Lewry	✓			West	<i>Absent</i>		

27	Littman	✓			Yates	✓		
					Total	48		1

98.11 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been carried.

98.12 The Mayor then put the recommendation to refer the petition to the Housing & New Homes Committee for consideration at its meeting on the 15th June 2016, to the vote, which was agreed.

98.13 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be referred to the Housing & New Homes Committee for consideration at its meeting on the 15th June 2016 and that the Council recommends that Housing & New Homes committee give due consideration to the following:-

- An increase in the frequency of inspections of emergency accommodation and report on the outcome of these inspections at regular intervals to Housing & New Homes Committee;
- That satisfaction surveys are undertaken with residents moving into emergency accommodation and the results reported back;
- Exploring along with other relevant committees as a matter of priority the identification of sites and explore the development of council owned low cost emergency accommodation, either through a council owned company or directly owned by the council. That this exploration focuses on non-traditional, quick to build, construction such as the Y cube and containers be considered for these sites;
- Undertaking a review of the no visitor rules and consider the outcome at a future meeting;
- Adopting a policy of only using emergency accommodation in which hot water supply is guaranteed.

(b) Save Withdean (Puppy) Park Fence Enclosure

98.14 The Mayor then invited Ms. Cox to present the petition calling on the Council to support the local dog walkers in maintaining the fenced area in Withdean Park.

98.15 Ms. Cox thanked the Mayor and stated that there was overwhelming support for the petition in the local community as the space was important for dogs and puppies and those that enjoyed the atmosphere. The area was an important space where dogs could be let off the lead without them being at risk from the traffic. The campaign group were now formally known as the Withdean Dog Walking Community and they had recruited members with a range of specialisms. The group had some start-up funding, committed volunteer time and had come up with inexpensive fundraising ideas. The group had taken up the offer of contractor hours for the needed work in collaboration

with the Friends of Withdean Park, and asked the Council to formally recognise them as a community group and consult them on any future proposed changes to the park.

- 98.16 Councillor Mitchell thanked Ms. Cox for presenting the petition and stated that the group had been able to successfully work with Councillor Wares to reach an agreement to allow residents to take on responsibility for the upkeep of the fence in the context of reductions in Council budgets. This solution was considered mutually beneficial for all and would retain the use of the space for dog walkers.
- 98.17 Councillor Wares congratulated those that had worked on the campaign and raised the number of signatures necessary to bring this item forward for Council debate, and he welcomed the agreement of a resolution before the matter had been brought to Council. Councillor Wares thanked Councillor Mitchell for her support of Officers engaging with residents; he asked that the petition be referred to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee to ensure the proposed arrangements could be formally agreed.
- 98.18 The Mayor then put the recommendation to refer the petition to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for consideration at its meeting on the 28th June 2016, to the vote, which was agreed.
- 98.19 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be referred to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for consideration at its meeting on the 28th June 2016.

(c) Save Hove Library

- 98.20 The Mayor then invited Councillor Mac Cafferty to present the petition calling on the Council to Save Hove Library.
- 98.21 Councillor Mac Cafferty thanked the Mayor and presented the petition which called on the Council to Save Hove Library. He thanked all those that had signed the petition that had now reached over 4000 signatures; he also noted the large amount of correspondence he had personally received on the matter. Previous moves to close the facility over twelve years ago had been abandoned following a local campaign from residents. In relation to the consultation there was some feeling that the wording had been 'loaded', and he was of the view that a more realistic appraisal of the building could see the costs potentially reduce in the context of the work needed to make Hove Museum a suitable relocation site for the service. He highlighted that the building was purpose built and there had been investment in recent years to ensure the building was compliant with modern accessibility standards. He highlighted that there was considerable will in the city to retain the service in the historic building.
- 98.22 Councillor Morgan thanked Councillor Mac Cafferty for presenting petition and stated that the petition suggested the service was to be withdrawn in Hove, instead he highlighted that it was being relocated to the nearby Hove Museum where the service would be better and have extended opening hours. He noted that the majority of responses in the consultation had been supportive of the proposals and the costs to retain the service in its current location would be significant over the next few years – the equivalent to the running costs of seven local community libraries. The position of

the administration was to retain library service across the city; increase opening hours and entrench libraries as community hubs.

- 98.23 Councillor Druitt moved an amendment to the report's recommendation to request officers present a worked up financial plan to keep Hove Library in the purpose-built Andrew Carnegie building. He went on to add that the Brighton Society were of the view that the provision would be reduced if the service was relocated to Hove Museum, and refuted the administration's position that the service would not be reduced. He noted that the Green Group's amendment sought to provide a full financial plan to keep Hove Library operation in its current location so that Members could be in possession of all the necessary information before a final decision was taken.
- 98.24 Councillor Mac Cafferty formally seconded the amendment.
- 98.25 Councillor Meadows reiterated that the library provision and service would remain in Hove, and she stated her view that the service would flourish in its new location.
- 98.26 Councillor Peltzer Dunn noted his agreement that the petition should be referred to the Special Policy & Resources Committee on 28 April 2016 as that meeting would be considering a full report on the future provision of the library. He went on to add that it was important the Policy & Resources Committee be provided with a full business plan to ensure that they were in possession of all relevant information before a decision was taken.
- 98.27 Councillor Bewick noted that residents in his Ward would be affected by the proposed changes to Hove Library, and he highlighted some of the literature in circulation in relation to the issue and stated his view that it was misleading. Councillor Bewick went on to add that the administration were aiming to provide a cultural centre for the residents of Hove that would be open 7 days a week.
- 98.28 Councillor Sykes stated that the decision to move the library was a political decision; whilst the service would be moved he highlighted that the building itself would be closed and no longer in use as a library.
- 98.29 Councillor Littman stated that the Green Group were proud on their record in relation to libraries during their time in administration, and they had replaced the mobile library with an improved service; he noted that the Labour & Co-Operative Group had previously tried to close the library whilst in administration and noted that it had been the weight of the resident's campaign that had stopped this.
- 98.30 Councillor G. Theobald noted that the view of the Conservative Group was to see a full business plan at the Special Policy & Resources Committee on 28 April 2016; for this reason they would not support the proposed amendment.
- 98.31 Councillor Barradell highlighted the reduced funding from Central Government and the necessity to take these types of difficult decisions; she went on to add that the Special Policy & Resources Committee would be able to consider a full business plan.

- 98.32 Councillor Wealls noted that the Green Group had not proposed any amendments to Library's budget at the recent Budget Council meeting in February; which would have provided an opportunity to consider alternative funding for the Library's service.
- 98.33 Councillor Mears noted that these types of decisions were political as it was the responsibility of the administration to set priorities and the budget.
- 98.34 The Mayor noted the information and called on Councillor Morgan to respond to the debate.
- 98.35 Councillor Morgan stated that the proposed amendment was unnecessary as a report was due to be considered at the special meeting in April, and that the Green Group had the opportunity to propose amendments to the Library's budget at Budget Council in February.
- 98.36 The Mayor noted that an amendment had been moved and put it to the vote. This was **not carried** by 7 votes to 40, with 2 abstentions, as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen		X		Mac Cafferty	✓		
2	Atkinson		X		Marsh		X	
3	Barford	<i>Absent</i>			Meadows		X	
4	Barnett		X		Mears		X	
5	Barradell		X		Miller		X	
6	Bell		X		Mitchell		X	
7	Bennett		X		Moonan		X	
8	Bewick		X		Morgan		X	
9	Brown		X		Morris		X	
10	Cattell		X		Nemeth			Abs
11	Chapman		X		Norman A		X	
12	Cobb		X		Norman K		X	
13	Daniel		X		O'Quinn		X	
14	Deane	<i>Absent</i>			Page	<i>Apologies</i>		
15	Druitt	✓			Peltzer Dunn		X	
16	Gibson	✓			Penn		X	
17	Gilbey		X		Phillips			
18	Greenbaum	✓			Robins		X	

19	Hamilton		X		Simson		X	
20	Hill		X		Sykes	✓		
21	Horan		X		Taylor		X	
22	Hyde			Abs	Theobald C		X	
23	Inkpin-Leissner		X		Theobald G		X	
24	Janio		X		Wares		X	
25	Knight	✓			Wealls		X	
26	Lewry		X		West	<i>Absent</i>		
27	Littman	✓			Yates		X	
					Total	7	40	2

98.37 The Mayor confirmed that the amendment had been lost by 40 votes to 4 with 2 abstentions.

98.38 The Mayor then put the recommendation to refer the petition to the Policy & Resources Committee for consideration at its special meeting on the 28th April 2016, to the vote, which was agreed.

98.39 **RESOLVED:** That the petition be referred to the Policy & Resources Committee for consideration at its special meeting on the 28th April 2016.

99 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS.

99.1. The Mayor reminded Council that written questions from Members and the replies from the appropriate Councillor were taken as read by reference to the list included in the addendum which had been circulated as detailed below:

(a) Councillor Miller

99.2. "Would the Chair of Environment, Transport & Sustainability please set out the cost of collection on average (including maintenance and installation of parking machines) per pound for coin operated parking machines? Could she also again clarify the cost to the council for the pay-by-phone scheme on average per pound?"

Reply from Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.

"The cost to the council of parking made by pay and display machine in cash include...

- purchasing the machine
- installation
- maintenance and repair

- vehicle and fuel costs
- cash collection

and these costs represent 38p of every £1 collected.

The cost to the council of parking using pay by phone includes

- card process costs
- the cost of providing the pay by phone service

These are almost covered by the 10p service charge paid by the driver. The council therefore receives 99p of every £1 paid by phone.”

(b) Councillor G. Theobald

- 99.3. “In view of the Conservative Group amendment that was agreed by Budget Council to allocate an extra £60k to the public conveniences budget, will the Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee please provide an update on how this money will be spent?”

Reply from Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.

“In 2015/16 the council agreed to reduce the budget for public toilets by £165,000 to be implemented in 2016/17 so officers worked up proposals to deliver those savings.

The only way that savings of that magnitude can be realised is by either reducing opening hours or by closing some sites completely.

During the budget setting process additional funding was proposed by both Labour and Conservative Councillors and with those changes, the saving requirement is now £40,000. Officers have been working up revised options taking into consideration levels of usage, the level of capital investment needed and the availability of other nearby facilities. Relevant ward councillors would be informed as part of this process.

No savings to public toilet provision have been proposed for 2016/17 and a sum of £1.5m capital investment has been secured to significantly improve their standard. A business plan is being prepared that will help put the services on a more sustainable footing and this will be brought to the relevant committee in the summer.”

(c) Councillor G. Theobald

- 99.4. “In view of the Conservative Group amendment that was agreed by Budget Council to reverse the Administration’s proposed £50k saving to the noise patrol service, will the Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee please confirm what level of service will now be provided to residents?”

Reply from Councillor Mitchell, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.

“It is important that the out of hours noise patrol service is reintroduced as soon as possible. As a minimum it is expected that a service will be provided along the lines of the historic service of 22:00 to 03:00am Friday and Saturday nights and it is proposed that this will be provided from early April. At the same time we are taking this opportunity to review how and when the service is delivered and ensure it meets with current customer need and demand, and risk. In addition we are making sure that any review is being done alongside the development of the City Neighbourhood, Community Collaboration and Inspection and Enforcement Programme.”

100 ORAL QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

- 100.1. The Mayor noted that 12 oral questions had been received and that 30 minutes were set aside for the duration of the item. She also noted that since the publication of the agenda she had been informed by Councillor Littman that he wished to withdraw his question.
- 100.2. The Mayor then invited Councillor Peltzer Dunn to put his question to the Leader of the Council.
- 100.3. Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked; “To the leader of the council; what are his proposals for the Hove wall of honour?”
- 100.4. Councillor Morgan replied; “All of the plaques, the historic items in the listed Hove library building will be kept.”
- 100.5. Councillor Peltzer Dunn asked the following supplementary question; “Obviously I assumed they would be kept but I think it’s much more important when we think of the magnificent tribute made to the Hovarians who gave their lives in the 1914-18 war - 632 Hovarians died - and I’d like an undertaking from the Leader of the Council that should the Carnegie building be disposed of the plaque may be re-sited and rededicated in suitable position in Hove Town Hall.”
- 100.6. Councillor Morgan replied; “Yes, of course.”
- 100.7. Councillor Druitt (on behalf of Councillor Page) asked; “No one can be unaware of the biggest humanitarian refugee crisis since WW2 in Syria with many hundreds of thousands fleeing to Europe; meanwhile our city has taken 2 small families in 6 months and offered to take three more. What more can the council do to help refugees in crisis and preserve our reputation as a city of sanctuary that values all human regardless of colour or creed?”
- 100.8. Councillor Daniel replied; “The question’s wrong, we housed 5 families in the city since the Syrian relocation program started and we are continuing to maintain that open offer as long as we can find that suitable accommodation. Officers are still working on that and we can bring reports and updates to the NC&E committee which we have done to date. I’d suggest emailing myself or officers for regular updates.”
- 100.9. Councillor Druitt asked the following supplementary question; “Five is still a pretty poor showing, there are thousands of people fleeing Syria and if we can only take 5 families, that’s quite upsetting. How can we better publicise the request for people in the city to

take refugees and how can we ensure that people who have already offered accommodation have that offer taken up?"

- 100.10. Councillor Daniel replied; "I think we have done tremendous work, I'd like to thank officers and the people of this city for coming forward with so many offers around accommodation. We're using some of the money to support case work via voices in exile which obviously has the ongoing benefit of making that organisation which works much more broadly with refugees in the city more sustainable. I think that's one of the points taken into account. The way in which the programme is being administered by the government is under a process of change at the moment and there may be a regional coordinator where we were coordinating for our own city before and also our officer who has taken a lead on this has been asked by many councils to speak to them about how she has managed to do such an amazing job in the south east; being the first council in the south east to house refugees in our city. I would say we are doing the right thing, we'll continue to do the right thing and you should continue to make sure we do the right thing."
- 100.11. Councillor Yates asked; "Tenants, tenant's residents associations and other tenant's participation groups are regularly raising issues with myself and other councillors around the delivery of the reactive response service of Mears, delivered on behalf of tenants. As well as issue with the quality of completed work, there are consistent issues raise about the speed of repairs, the avoidable costs associated with repairs, the quality and number of checks on work completed and the overall communication with tenants and tenant's representatives over specific jobs and some of the broader issues to. I'd like to know what action is being taken is ensure that the light touch monitoring that was introduced under the Tories is being toughened up to make sure that tenant's wishes for an effective, responsive repairs service is delivered with their money?"
- 100.12. Councillor Meadows replied; "The Mears Company delivers housing repairs and improvement services under a 10 year contract set up in 2010. This contract is valued at around £20 million per year and around 20% of the contact is on responsive repairs. As my colleague has stated already the council have a light touch approach through that contract that was undertaken all those years ago and it will continue until 2020. I can say that due to problems discovered earlier this year by our staff Mears are beefing up their customer services and they're looking at employing extra quantity surveyors and building surveyors to ensure the quality of the works that Mears Company undertakes is assured to both residents and tenants. Can I also mention just briefly that the contract has provided 105 apprenticeships and development opportunities and they are still currently 24 apprenticeships in progress. As I understand it the contact is delivering on its promises however we have had to tighten up certain controls around the quality of some of that service."
- 100.13. Councillor Simson asked; "At the recent budget council meeting when discussing our amendment to reinstate the £145,000 shortfall Cllr Hamilton stated that it wasn't needed as there was an underspend of £227,000 in this year's allocation. I was horrified by this admittance as I'm sure very many in the community and voluntary sector were. Knowing how desperate voluntary for even a small amount of funding to deliver vital services to our communities. This money was allocated in the budget to be used by these groups so can Cllr Hamilton please assure us that in future any

underspends are flagged up to members well in advance of the end of the financial year, so the money is allocated as it should be rather than go to plug any budget deficit?"

- 100.14. Councillor Hamilton replied; "It is not until we have the third lot of bids in that we know how much money we are going to dispose of and how much is going to be left but there is a good point there I couldn't argue with that, I did say at the meeting that there was that much underspend and I was as surprised as anyone else. I think £100,000 of that was contingency, this is for organisations who suddenly get into a serious problem where they need urgent money and fortunately this year there hasn't been anybody in that situation. The grants that we have are divided into various categories and people apply in various of those sections and in some of those sections there's not enough people applying to allocate the money. I think perhaps we can have another look at this as perhaps it might be better to make it a global pot rather than say so much for the environment, so much for communities, so much for arts and so on. I think it might be worth doing that. I am entirely in sympathy with the point that's being made there, the only consolation I can give you is that my understanding is that we can't retain that £227,000 but I understand that it is going to be used to keep the Money Works programme going for an extra year which in these difficult times I'm sure will be appreciated by people."
- 100.15. Councillor Simson asked the following supplementary question; "I know that the suggestion has been put forward to use this underspend for the Money Works programme and I know that is a really important programme and to use this instead of the funding that was already allocated to it from this year's budget. So can I ask Cllr Hamilton is he would please confirm that if this is done the money that is already allocated to Money Works through this year's budget will not be used to plug any deficit gaps as that would have the same effect as using the £227,000 underspend?"
- 100.16. Councillor Hamilton replied; "I've not discussed this in detail with the relevant officers but my understanding is that we had money this year which was going to be used for that purpose and if we use the underspend for that then it will release the same amount of money to go into Money Works next year. Without effect the grants money which we've got which of course cannot be carried forward."
- 100.17. Councillor Sykes asked; "In fulfilment of this authority's Prevent strategy we have a Prevent board and this fulfils certain requirements of the counterterrorism and security act. At this very sensitive time would the lead councillor comment on the Government's arrangements for the prevent board and in particular whether there is enough opportunity for public oversight of its activities?"
- 100.18. Councillor Daniel replied; "I am not going to comment on the government aspect. It's an emerging area how the governance works in terms of member involvement. Clearly we couldn't have public involvement in a board that's looking at counterterrorism issues as well as safeguarding and individual families or who might be affected by this. We have had families within our city affected by grooming by extremists and some of them have sadly lost their children as a result of it; so it's something that we feel very deeply as a city that we do believe that it's right to have a programme in place that helps to prevent that. I think the spirit of the question though is what is the right level of scrutiny and what is the right level of member involvement? My proposal is to look at

the emerging practise of other authorities -which is varied at the moment- and work out what's right for Brighton and Hove. I would expect some sort of paper or briefing on it within a month."

- 100.19. Councillor Wealls asked; "At the Children, Young People & Skills Committee two weeks ago there were two reports which would have benefited of someone with an understanding of the autistic community in Brighton and Hove having contributed to them. Last week was school autism awareness week and the week of the 4th of April is international autism awareness week. I wonder how many members have been made aware of this or whether anything happened in our city's schools. Does the lead member for Children's services agree with me that the role of Autism Champion/s in the city would benefit from a review which could look at the value of such role/s, how other cities view the role and how the voice of the board autistic spectrum community and their families could be better heard and will he work with me, council officers, elected members, members of the autistic community and their families and representatives to help make Brighton and Hove the best place to bring up an autistic child or to leave, study, train and work as an adult with autism?"
- 100.20. Councillor Bewick replied; "Cllr Wealls will of course be aware that under the last Green administration there was an autism report that went to Children's Committee that did make recommendations at the time that an autism champion was appointed. That role was assigned to the director of Children's services. I also further understand that when we came into administration there was a discussion between the chief executive, democratic services and the leader of the council about the role of champions generally and it was decided that it was not something that would be encouraged either at officer or member level as a general point. However, what I do think it is important to emphasise here is that under the children's act 2004 the Chief Executive, Leader of the Council, myself as lead member and the Director of Children's Services have a statutory role and duty to promote the interest, the life chances and the wellbeing of all 50,000 children and young people in the city and that includes all children with autism. However, I absolutely agree with him that we do need to make this city the best city to bring up an autistic child and I would suggest to him that we ask officers to bring a paper to the next meeting of my committee to review this issue of an autism champion and ensure that we are meeting the need of this very important group going forward."
- 100.21. Councillor C. Theobald asked; "The recent vegetation clearance works by highways England to improve lines of sight on the incredibly busy Patcham roundabout were both necessary and welcome however does Councillor Mitchell agree with me that the state in which they have left the roundabout is unacceptable for what is the main gateway into our city for motorists? What discussions has she or the council officers had with Highways England about doing something to improve the situation and to transform this roundabout into a beautiful and inspiring entrance to Brighton and Hove?"
- 100.22. Councillor Mitchell replied; "I fully appreciate your concern on this matter. As you say at the end of January Highways England undertook some work to the roundabout stating that the vegetation in place on the roundabout was a safety issue and was restricting sight lines. Underneath the roundabout there is a complex drainage system holding tanks for runoff water which are maintained by Highways England as it serves the

strategic trunk road network and the vegetation is also damaging that infrastructure. Officers in the highways team have contacted Highways England and asked that they respond swiftly with information on any plans that they have for the roundabout but as yet I'm afraid to say they have not had a full response."

- 100.23. Councillor Mears asked; "The Council presented its consultation position paper 'Brighton and Hove Rough Sleepers strategy 2016' to the Housing committee on the 2nd March this year. As many of us know it's not just what the strategy contains but the reality of what is happening in the city as with the deputation on homelessness we have heard earlier. Is the chairperson now able to answer the questions I tabled at the last Housing committee in regards to the reduction in rough sleeper beds in the city from 97 reduced to 83 a loss of 14 beds? The accommodation now used at Dyke Road and St. Aubyns will only take mental health referrals for the Rough Sleepers Strategy to be successful the Council needs to ensure that we don't go backwards with fewer beds than we had before."
- 100.24. Councillor Meadows replied; "I may have to provide a written response as you have asked for specific details because I'm aware that we have 300 hostel beds in the city that have not reduced in fact we are increasing numbers and we still unfortunately have 200 on the waiting list for them. I'm aware that's not quite what you asked for. In developing this new Rough Sleepers Strategy it is the first time we've put everyone together to be able to have a consistent message and a consistent approach to rough sleeping in the city but I will make sure you get a written response to that question."
- 100.25. Councillor Mears asked the following supplementary question; "Can the Chair of Housing also answer the concerns I raised regarding a new way of working with placements for rough sleepers? In the past rough sleeper teams worked closely with hostels and would know when a bed became available and it would be filled quickly. With a panel made of different agencies this can often be biweekly. Can the Chair of Housing confirm that with this new way of working steps will be taken to ensure that beds are not left empty for possibly a week which also has a knock on effect with a potential loss of housing benefit of £195 per room per week?"
- 100.26. Councillor Meadows replied; "I can confirm that as beds become vacant they are very quickly filled, they are never left empty at all Councillor Mears."
- 100.27. Councillor Miller asked; "With six of the secondary schools in the city advertising for maths teachers and struggling to recruit them would the chair of the committee please outline what steps the local authorities are taking to assist the recruitment of these maths teachers to ensure pupils in our city don't miss out on essential maths education?"
- 100.28. Councillor Bewick replied; "I'll resist straying too far into the territory of the wasted policy of Tory forced academisation which will of course make the teacher recruitment crisis even worse both in this city and in indeed nationally. The Council is working extremely hard with head teachers as part of the school partnership to look at the ways in which we're attracting maths teachers to the city. It is worth highlighting to Members of course that in the last five A*-C GCSE results round in the summer for the first time we were 1% above the national average for our maths scores although we've still got some further work to do at key stage 2 and key stage 3. This is the best city to live in of

course in the whole of the United Kingdom and if that's not attractive enough for our maths teachers but I do accept that we need to do more and now I know more detail about Councillor Miller's question I will write to him with a more detailed response about how we are going to recruit those important maths teachers."

100.29. Councillor Miller asked the following supplementary question; "I'd just like to point out that some really proactive local authorities are assisting their secondary schools to fill these roles by offering more strategic financial inducement, international recruitment or encouraging teach first to come to their local area. I'd invite the Member to look at what more could be done and whether these potential approaches could be used in our city."

100.30. Councillor Bewick replied; "I think it's worth emphasising that under our current families of schools approach in the city where our schools work together of course governors and head teachers already have a very large degree of discretion and autonomy about how they market recruitment posts within their particular schools. I'm informed by the Director of children's services that this is an area that we are looking at and again I'd like to suggest that we bring that plan around what is by the way a nation problem around teacher shortages in maths and indeed other science subject that we bring that plan to my committee for full discussion at a later date."

100.31. Councillor Taylor asked; "Bowel cancer nationally is the fourth most common cancer and only the second in the number of lives it takes each year. It is also the most treatable if detected early enough. According to Cancer Research UK less than the national average of people in Brighton and Hove over 60 take the screening test that is offered to them. Can I ask the chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board what can be done to improve participation rates in the city?"

100.32. Councillor Yates replied; "In terms of our screening programme there's two issues and we've had a report to Health and Wellbeing Board in 2014, we had a report back in 2015 in July about our cancer screen targets overall because cancer screening is an issue in Brighton and Hove. In terms of our numbers we're at 55.4% against the national target of 52% to try to get people participating from the ages of 60-74 in the national bowel cancer screening programme. In terms of where that weights us nationally we have an average across the nation of 57.8% so we are behind that number and we have an average within the Sussex bowel cancer screening service as a whole of 58.8%. All of that is based on data up to the end of financial year 2015 so that's only up to March 2015 and hopefully in July this year we should get last year's figures. What's more worrying to me is with slightly lower rates of screening we're seeing higher rates of positive findings. So we're seeing rates of positive findings around 2.2% against an average in this area of about 1.7%. So actually not only are we struggling to get as many people taking part in the screening programme as we would expect we're also finding more bowel cancer and that's the more serious things but that's also the good thing because every bowel cancer that we identify through screening we can start taking proactive action on to identify is it just a polyp is it something more serious and what action need to be taken on it? Obviously we've been working with our partners; the Clinical Commissioning Group and also Albion in the community over January and February we're running as part of the 'what's the bottom line?' campaign we're specifically out there promoting using a lady called Sue Brown (Heath Coordinator). Specifically promoting getting active participants, especially in

groups that are harder to reach in groups of people in their 60s and 70s who may not usually want to take part in a screening programme especially one that feels so difficult to take part in as the bowel screening programme. What we need to do is to get people taking it seriously. I know that the CCG are making sure that the bowel screening programme are getting information out to people and are making sure people are aware of the programme both of the first attempt but also subsequently every two years because that's the intention now that between 60 and 74 people should have hopefully 8 screening opportunities to make sure we are identifying bowel cancer early and treating it early."

100.33. Councillor Taylor asked the following supplementary question; "By the end of the year the Conservative Government will have fully implemented scope screening or flexible-sigmoidoscopy which will be offered to everyone nationwide to those over 55, a test which can sharply reduce incidence of the disease. Is the Health and Wellbeing board working with the CCG representatives to ensure all those eligible in the City of Brighton and Hove will take up this new scheme?"

100.34. Councillors Yates replied; "The simple answer is yes. We recognise that sigmoidoscopy is a more effective tool it's both more discriminatory and it enables us to identify and get rid of false positives at a much earlier stage which gives people more assurance about what the findings of the screen may be and it also gives them more confidence and the opportunity for us to take action at a much earlier level. So yes the intention will be eventually to move to having a fully rolled out system across the whole country and we're having to work with Public Health England and also with our colleagues at the CCG to make sure there's an effective strategy to deliver that."

100.35. Councillor Barnett asked; "At the last full council meeting I asked Councillor Barradell if she could give me an explanation as to why Parks department have to pay out of their own budget which is for the residents of Brighton and Hove to repair all the damage that the Travellers make; when the gates are broken, the locks are broken and the mess they leave behind. It comes out of the Parks Department's budget. I did ask Councillor Barradell to answer this question, she said she'd write if she can't find out, won't find out or doesn't know the answer maybe you'd get Councillor Mitchell to answer for you?"

100.36. Councillor Mitchell replied; "I will try to get you that information Councillor Barnett. Your question refers to ongoing maintenance and repairs to our parks and open spaces across the city from the City Parks Budget. I do not know whether the City Parks offices make a special arrangement for delineating any repairs that they think are necessary due to damage or alleged damage by Travellers. I'm not quite sure how they would go about proving that and I'm not quite sure if they do that. However if they do keep a separate column for that figure I will make sure that you get it."

101 CALL OVER FOR REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

(a) Callover

101.1. The following items on the agenda were reserved for discussion:

Item 102 – Annual Investment Strategy 2016/17

- Item 104 – Library Plan
- Item 105 – Adoption of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 1
- Item 106 – Statement of Licensing Policy

(b) Receipt and/or Approval of Reports

- 101.2. The Democratic Services Manager confirmed that Items 104 – 105 had been reserved for discussion; and that the following reports on the agenda with the recommendations therein had been approved and adopted:

Item 103 – Pay Policy Statement 2016/17

(c) Oral Questions from Members

- 101.3. The Mayor noted that there were no oral questions.

102 ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2016/17

- 102.1. Councillor Morgan formally moved the report and recommendations that Council approve the Annual Investment Strategy for 2016/17.
- 102.2. Councillor Wealls stated that the Conservative Group commended the report, with the exception of the inclusion of investment funds as set out in paragraph 3.8 of the report. He went on to add that, despite additional information and assurance from Officers following the consideration of the report at the report at the Policy & Resources Committee, he remained of the view that the level of risk associated with property funds made this asset class inappropriate for Council investment.
- 102.3. Councillor Hamilton noted that the matter of investment in property funds had been discussed at the Policy & Resources Committee; however, he noted that 144 other local authorities invested in this asset class, and he was satisfied with the assurance that Officers would consult with key Members before any decision to invest in such funds was made. He stated that the Labour & Co-Operative Group would support the recommendation in the report.
- 102.4. **RESOLVED** – That Council approve the Annual Investment Strategy 2016/17 as set out in Appendix 1 to this report.

103 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2016/17

- 103.1. **RESOLVED** – That Council adopt the pay policy statement 2016/17 attached at Appendix 1.

104 LIBRARY PLAN

- 104.1. Councillor Morgan introduced, and formally moved, the report recommending that Council adopt the Libraries Plan 2016-2020. He stated that in the last year 106 libraries had closed across the country and more were under threat or had been moved to operation by the private sector, as well as operating with reduced hours. Furthermore the growth in the internet and eBooks threatened their future; however, libraries still

had a key role in society and the city benefitted from an above average number of library users. They had the potential to provide a base for a wide range of services; which was the position put forward by the Department for Culture, Media & Sport, and the Council had been ahead of many in pushing this agenda. The Jubilee Library was one of the top five most used libraries nationally and the position of the administration was to oppose the closure of branch libraries. The administration would ensure that libraries continued to be operated by the Council and open for the use of all residents.

- 104.2. Councillor Peltzer Dunn stated his principle concern was the level of library service for the residents of the city; he noted that the report that had been considered by the Economic Development & Culture Committee, and highlighted there was much in the report that he was able to support. However, he was concerned that both the Committee and Council were being asked to take a decision without the full business plan for the future of the Carnegie Hove Library. He stated that he had decided to support the report on the basis that the Special Policy & Resources Committee on 28 April 2016 would consider a full business plan, and went on to request that, were the plan found to not be viable, the decision on the future of the Carnegie Hove Library be put on hold until an appropriate plan could come forward.
- 104.3. Councillor Wealls noted the difficulty of the decision in relation to the future of the library provision in Hove, and he extended his appreciation of the genuine concern expressed by the local community, particularly in relation to future of the purpose built Carnegie building. He clarified that he was uncomfortable with some of the rhetoric that to keep the Carnegie building open it would be necessary to close seven branch libraries, and he would support the report, not on that basis, but because he approved of the proposed move and new facilities at the co-located site with Hove Museum. The Carnegie building was no longer fit for purpose and the new site at Hove Museum would provide a more usable space with the added advantage of outside space – he also added that the walk between the two buildings was approximately four minutes. There needed to be proper planning for disabled parking around the new site, and he noted his agreement with Councillor Peltzer Dunn that the viability plan was key to the project, especially given the listed nature of the Carnegie building.
- 104.4. Councillor Robins stated it was important to consider the full proposals for the future of library provision across the whole city that were outlined in the report, and he commended the work of Officers to bring forward proposals that both saved money and improved the service. The Carnegie building needed significant investment to stay open, and to do this would be at the detriment of seven branch libraries in the city. He highlighted that libraries were a statutory service that had to be provided free of charge; alternative options could potentially leave the Council open to challenge.
- 104.5. Councillor Nemeth noted his concern in relation to the distribution of space in the co-located facility at Hove Museum, and he felt this was not clear in the report. He went on to query the proposed repair figures on the basis that these costs could be staggered and more could be done with the existing Carnegie building. There was no business case currently for Members to consider in relation to the Carnegie building, and he was concerned that the proposed conversion might not be appropriate for the Hove Museum building. He stated his view that the service in Hove should remain a dedicated library service.

- 104.6. Councillor Morris stated that he appreciated the strength of feeling in relation to retaining the service at the Carnegie building, and that there could potentially be a case for the building to become an asset of community value. The plan before the Council would protect library service in the city for a generation against the increased tide of library closures nationally. He noted that the majority of libraries no longer run by local authorities were operated by volunteers, but in the context of increased hours this would not be appropriate for the service in the city. To protect the service at the Carnegie building it would be necessary to invest in the building year on year and this would affect five to seven other branch libraries in the city.
- 104.7. Councillor C. Theobald noted she was pleased that the report did not propose the closure of any libraries in the city, and she welcomed the increased service at Hollingbury Library with access to a café and comfortable space. The report also proposed increased opening hours at Patcham Library. Whilst the Carnegie building was well-loved it needed significant investment, but she stated she would have preferred to see a full business plan when the report was considered by the Economic Development & Culture Committee – despite this she felt much of the plan was sound.
- 104.8. Councillor Cobb noted her concern that, were the plan to co-locate the Hove Library Service implemented, this would lead to a loss of a significant amount of the green space around Hove Museum – which was currently the only green space in Westbourne Ward. She did not believe that the Carnegie building should be sold; instead it should be retained or another appropriate use found if the service was moved. If this were to go ahead she would prefer to see a reduced extension to better protect some of the green space and that it in-keeping with the surrounding area. As it stood, Councillor Cobb stated she would not support the plan.
- 104.9. Councillor Sykes stated that he had visited Hove Library that day and testified that the service was very well used; in contrast he noted that Hove Museum was not a purpose built facility. Whilst some of the plan had merit, he felt that the closure of the Carnegie building was unacceptable, and he felt the administration should own the decision as a political one. He expressed concern that the wording of questions in the consultation was ambiguous as it had not specifically referenced the closure of the purpose built building – he also noted he agreed with the concerns raised by Councillor Cobb in relation to the loss of the open space. He noted the receipt from the sale of the building would not be significant, and he reiterated that the building was of local importance both in and outside.
- 104.10. Councillor Druitt stated that the report contained a number of very good and positive proposals for the future of library services in the city such as use as community hubs and increased opening hours; however, there was concern with issues such reduced staffing, lone working and reduced space. He was of the view that the consultation had taken place before all the information was known and the Economic Development & Culture Committee had been asked to take the decision without the full business case. He noted that the proposed amendment to the petition debate recommendations discussed earlier in the agenda (Item 98) would have allowed more information as had been requested by some Members in the debate, but this had not been supported. He noted that as the Libraries Plan stood it could not be supported by the Green Group.

- 104.11. Councillor Littman welcomed the comments from the Conservative Members that sought to protect and retain the service in Hove at its existing location. He noted he had grown up in Church Road and even now used the facility with his grandchildren. He added that both the previous Green and Conservative Administration had ensured that the budget protected the future of the facility; there was also the will in the community to retain dedicated use of the Carnegie building.
- 104.12. Councillor Moonan noted that she had initially had concerns in relation to proposals to move Hove Library; whilst the ideal solution would be to retain the Carnegie building, she was much assured by the service offer at the proposed co-located site. Hove would retain a full library service, open to residents with a full range of services expected from a modern library. She noted that the consultation had showed a majority of respondents in favour of the proposals, and this was further evidenced by some of the feedback she had received in her own Ward speaking to residents. Councillor Moonan acknowledged that the new space would not be as large as the existing, but the vast majority of the service could be fully provided at the co-located site; she added that she was confident the business would further evidence that this was sensible option. Finally it was reiterated that Hove would be retaining a library service and she would support the report in full.
- 104.13. Councillor Mac Cafferty noted that it was difficult to imagine another use for the Carnegie building; he also added that notion of the costs of retaining the building being equivalent to five to seven branch libraries was not to say that branch libraries would have to close if the Carnegie building was retained; this was simply a comparison in terms of running costs. He went on to highlight the political choice being made by the administration, and raised concern that the building now needed significant investment having only been updated 10 years. He referenced the survey of the building which stated that both the external and internal fabric of the building was either fair or in good serviceable condition which questioned the argument that the building needed significant investment to retain the service in that location.
- 104.14. Councillor Miller noted that he welcomed many aspects of the report, but his concerns related to Council making a decision when the full business case for the future of the Carnegie building had not been agreed. He highlighted that that the choice was not between the service in its existing location or the closure of five to seven branch libraries as it was within the gift of the Council to retain the service in full if it was so minded. He highlighted the 'costly' PFI contract that had been agreed for the Jubilee Library the last time the Labour & Co-Operative Group had formed the Administration in the city and stated his view that the a co-located service would not be sufficient.
- 104.15. Councillor Bell noted that the changes could make it more difficult for some residents to access the internet through libraries, and asked that Administration be sure this was thought through.
- 104.16. Councillor Penn referenced the results of the consultation, stating that residents had expressed how much they valued the library service in their local area, but wanted increased opening hours – the proposals around Library Plus would achieve just this. Residents had also expressed a desire for libraries to become community hubs as they were already used in a variety of different ways. Only 9% of Hove residents regularly

used Hove Library and the current location made access more difficult; it was important that the Council listen to residents and provide a modern, fit for purpose library service.

104.17. Councillor Janio stated that his concern related to the future of the Carnegie building, and he could not support the report until he had details of the full business case.

104.18. Councillor G. Theobald noted that the Conservative Group had a free vote on the matter before Council and highlighted the necessity of providing the full business case for the future of the Carnegie building. He queried the status of the Libraries Plan were it to be agreed at the meeting, but the business case not be agreed by the Policy & Resources Committee in April. He had not received a significant number of emails from residents in relation to the matter; nor, was there a large public presence in the Chamber opposing the approval of the report. He also added that he was pleased with the proposed resolution of the service at Hollingbury and Westdene Library.

104.19. Councillor Taylor noted the proposed changes to the service at Westdene Library, and noted he had received assurances that people would be benefitted through extended opening hours; as well as the local school benefitting from the additional classroom space that would be provided. He noted that in absence of the full business case in relation to the Carnegie building he would have to abstain from the vote.

104.20. Councillor Daniel stated that co-locating the service would maximise the potential and allow residents to use their local library in a new and modern way. She stated the proposals were exciting and would help to increase the use of the space; the proposals also included digital upgrades for all libraries ensuring that internet access was increased for those that did not have access to it at home. The Libraries Plan was a means to expand and reenergise the role of libraries in a modern city; it was important that Members consider what was best for the city as a whole and this was a means to take the service forward in a digital age.

104.21. Councillor Morgan replied to the debate and thanked the Head of Library Services for the thorough and considered report before Council. The report sought to keep libraries services open in the face of reductions to Council budgets. He recognised the points that Members had raised in relation to the business plan, but provided assurance that the necessary detail was in place. It was explained that volunteers would not be replacing paid staff, and there was concern that much of criticism of the consultation was due to a dislike of the outcome. He asked that Council be bold and support the Libraries Plan as means to provide a service to meet the modern needs of the city.

104.22. The Mayor noted that the report and the recommendations had been moved and put them to the Council; which were **carried** by 23 votes to 17 with 10 abstentions, as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	✓			Mac Cafferty		X	
2	Atkinson	✓			Marsh	✓		
3	Barford	<i>Absent</i>			Meadows	✓		

4	Barnett		X		Mears		X	
5	Barradell	✓			Miller		X	
6	Bell		X		Mitchell	✓		
7	Bennett			Abs	Moonan	✓		
8	Bewick	✓			Morgan	✓		
9	Brown			Abs	Morris	✓		
10	Cattell	✓			Nemeth		X	
11	Chapman	✓			Norman A			Abs
12	Cobb		X		Norman K			Abs
13	Daniel	✓			O'Quinn	✓		
14	Deane	<i>Absent</i>			Page	<i>Apologies</i>		
15	Druitt		X		Peltzer Dunn			Abs
16	Gibson		X		Penn	✓		
17	Gilbey	✓			Phillips	<i>Apologies</i>		
18	Greenbaum		X		Robins	✓		
19	Hamilton	✓			Simson		X	
20	Hill	✓			Sykes		X	
21	Horan	✓			Taylor			Abs
22	Hyde			Abs	Theobald C			Abs
23	Inkpin-Leissner	✓			Theobald G			Abs
24	Janio		X		Wares			Abs
25	Knight		X		Wealls	✓		
26	Lewry		X		West		X	
27	Littman		X		Yates	✓		
					Total	23	17	10

104.23. **RESOLVED** – That Council adopts the Libraries Plan 2016-2020, and the changes to Library Services proposed as part of this Plan, as contained in the appendix to this report, and outlined in brief in section 3 with amendments in section 6.

105 ADOPTION OF THE BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY PLAN PART 1

- 105.1. Councillor Mitchel introduced, and formally moved, the report that the Council adopt the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 1. Councillor Mitchell thanked the contributions and work from Officers, Members, community groups and businesses, and noted that the originally working group had been set up in 2005. Thanks were extended to Councillors Mac Cafferty and C. Theobald who worked to steer the emerging City Plan alongside Councillor Mitchell. The plan was of fundamental importance for the city and would enable local planning policy focused around local priorities and the safeguarding of sensitive sites. It would promote an integrated transport system; reduce the negative impact of traffic pollution and provide a vital means for the authority to resist inappropriate development across the city.
- 105.2. Councillor Mitchell went on to highlight that the plan would provide guidance for those wishing to invest; it also contained a sustainable infrastructure delivery plan and provided options to move to Community Infrastructure Levy. The plan had been assessed against the NPPF and the plan was strengthened by an up to date housing land assessment. It was welcomed that the Inspector has recognised the difficult position of the city between the coast and down land, and the majority of the proposed development would come forward on brownfield sites. The authority had also been able to successfully argue the necessity to maintain high energy efficiency standards. Finally Councillor Mitchell welcomed the co-operation with neighbouring authorities and the acceptable that some of the housing need for the city could be met within these authorities; this further strengthened the role of the Greater Brighton Economic Board and working on a sub-regional basis.
- 105.3. Councillor G. Theobald noted the necessity for the authority to have an approved plan, and highlighted that the aims of the Conservative Group had been to protect as many of the greenfield sites as possible. He noted his support of the report.
- 105.4. Councillor Cattell noted that she had been involved in the plan in different capacities before becoming an elected Member in May 2015. She was very pleased to commend the report for approval and noted that, if approved, the Planning Committee would use the policies straight away to determine planning applications. She thanked Officers for all their work, and welcomed the next challenge to deliver the plan. She stated that the adoption of the plan was the most important decision before Council that evening as it would shape and inform development in the city for the next 15 years.
- 105.5. Councillor C. Theobald thanked Officers for the work to reach this point in the adoption of the plan, and she paid tribute to Councillor Mitchell for her dedicated. She agreed that it was important the authority protect the urban fringe around the city by resisting inappropriate development, and noted that the challenge in Part 2 of the plan would be to ensure the delivery of 13,200 housing units. There was some disappointment with aspects of the plan, and the suitability of Toads Hole Valley for development was queried; however, the vast majority of excellent work was commended.
- 105.6. Councillor Morris highlighted the five wards in the city where the article 4 directive applied in relation to HMOs; he noted that policy CP21 in the plan provided a strong policy basis to assess the granting of HMOs consents at a time when both universities in the city were intending to expand.

- 105.7. Councillor Wealls noted the points he had raised at the Policy & Resources Committee in relation to tall buildings on the Hove Seafront, and the assurance that the City Plan would continue to resist development above 6-8 storeys.
- 105.8. Councillor Morgan stated that the Plan would support growth and create new jobs; as well as encourage new businesses by ensuring new employment space was provided. The City Plan provided the necessary policy framework to deliver a new Brighton Centre and the redevelopment of the King Alfred, as well as the necessary seafront improvements. The principal office areas would be in the centre of the city, and the plan recognised the important role of the health and educational services in providing jobs. It also recognised the arts and cultural contribution to the city's economy through support of public realm improvements in the cultural quarter.
- 105.9. Councillor Mac Cafferty thanked the work of Officers involved as well as Councillors Mitchell and C. Theobald. The plan would help shape development in the city up to 2030, and it laid out how the balance between homes, jobs and resisting inappropriate development would be achieved. The potential risk of not having an approved was highlighted; as well the work that would be required to ensure the housing was delivered through Part 2 of the plan.
- 105.10. Councillor Yates noted that the plan would help to deliver a happier and healthier city; as well as the infrastructure to ensure needs could be met. It was also important that the plan delivery consistency and ensure trust was built that the local authority was making sound decisions on resident's behalf.
- 105.11. Councillor Mitchell thanked the speakers for their positive contributions.
- 105.12. The Mayor noted that the report and the recommendations had been moved and put them to the Council for approval.
- 105.13. **RESOLVED** – That Council resolves to agree that:
- 1) The submitted Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One including its annexes and Policies Map, amended to include all the main modifications recommended by the planning inspector to make the plan sound, together with other minor modifications already noted by 16 October 2014 Policy and Resources Committee be adopted and published (including any consequential and other appropriate alterations for the purposes of clarification, improved accuracy of meaning or typographical corrections, being necessary) in accordance with Section 23 of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* and Regulation 26 of the *Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012*.
 - 2) It notes that on adoption of the City Plan Part 1 a number of policies in the 2005 Brighton & Hove Local Plan will be superseded. These superseded policies are listed in Annex 4 of the City Plan Part 1 (a copy is placed in the Members' Rooms and available on the council's website);

- 3) That the 'Objectively Assessed Need for Housing: Brighton & Hove, June 2015' study is approved as supporting evidence for the City Plan and further Development Plan Documents (summarised in Appendix 4).

106 STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY

- 106.1. Councillor Marsh moved the report which recommended adopt the revised Statement of Licensing Policy.
- 106.2. Councillor Cobb moved an amendment which reinstated the original version of the matrix that had been recommended to the Licensing Committee; namely that it should read 'Yes (11.30pm)' under the column 'Cumulative Impact Area' for café bars. The policy had been widely consulted upon and this was reflected in the report. The report had been amended at the Licensing Committee and the reasons related to the impact on businesses in the North Laine area of the city; however, the cumulative impact zone was much larger than this area and the decision could be open to legal challenge as it did not align with majority view expressed during the consultation. Furthermore the Statement of Licensing Policy would be reviewed in 12 months when any feedback from this change could be considered.
- 106.3. Councillor Simson formally seconded the amendment. She added that whilst she did not necessarily agree all the changes proposed in the report she accepted where these were being made on the basis of consultation feedback. It also noted that when applications were considered by Licensing Panels these were each on their own merits.
- 106.4. Councillor Wealls noted the potential impact in his Ward as the policy would no longer distinguish mixed commercial and residential areas; however, he was willing to support the changes on the basis that they would be reviewed after 12 months.
- 106.5. Councillor West stated that the amendment had been supported by the majority of Members at the Licensing Committee, and he was of the view that the report should be agreed as recommended by the Licensing Committee. Café bars were neither pubs nor restaurants where alcohol did not need to be served to a table or consumed with food. The risk was that all cafes could apply for licences that would essentially allow them to become vertical drinking establishments which would be in contrary to the aims of the cumulative impact zone. He urged Members to vote against the amendment proposed by Councillor Cobb.
- 106.6. Councillor Sykes stated that he did not support the proposed amendment as it would increase the number of licensed premises in the city centre.
- 106.7. Councillor Horan welcomed the amendment, and added that including café bars in the matrix in their own right would give greater strength to the weight of the policy, and the local authority should not be seeking to restrict or inhibit the creation of new businesses. Whilst she recognised the concerns of residents, it was noted that the changes would be reviewed after 12 months.
- 106.8. Councillor Marsh responded to the debate and thanked those that had taken part for their input. She went on to add that each application would still be considered on a

case by case basis, where the policy would serve as guidance; as such the amendment would be accepted, and she added that the policy reflected the need to balance the regulatory function against the needs of the late night economy.

106.9. The Mayor noted that the amendment had been moved and seconded and put it to the vote. She noted that the amendment had been **carried** by 42 vote to 8 as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	✓			Mac Cafferty		X	
2	Atkinson	✓			Marsh	✓		
3	Barford	<i>Absent</i>			Meadows	✓		
4	Barnett	✓			Mears	✓		
5	Barradell	✓			Miller	✓		
6	Bell	✓			Mitchell	✓		
7	Bennett	✓			Moonan	✓		
8	Bewick	✓			Morgan	✓		
9	Brown	✓			Morris	✓		
10	Cattell	✓			Nemeth	✓		
11	Chapman	✓			Norman A	✓		
12	Cobb	✓			Norman K	✓		
13	Daniel	✓			O'Quinn	✓		
14	Deane	<i>Absent</i>			Page	<i>Apologies</i>		
15	Druitt		X		Peltzer Dunn	✓		
16	Gibson		X		Penn	✓		
17	Gilbey	✓			Phillips	<i>Apologies</i>		
18	Greenbaum		X		Robins	✓		
19	Hamilton	✓			Simson	✓		
20	Hill	✓			Sykes		X	
21	Horan	✓			Taylor	✓		
22	Hyde	✓			Theobald C	✓		
23	Inkpin-Leissner	✓			Theobald G	✓		
24	Janio	✓			Wares	✓		

25	Knight		X		Wealls	✓		
26	Lewry	✓			West		X	
27	Littman		X		Yates	✓		
					Total	42	8	-

106.10. The Mayor then put the amended recommendation to the vote, this was **carried** by 42 votes to 8, as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	✓			Mac Cafferty		X	
2	Atkinson	✓			Marsh	✓		
3	Barford	<i>Absent</i>			Meadows	✓		
4	Barnett	✓			Mears	✓		
5	Barradell	✓			Miller	✓		
6	Bell	✓			Mitchell	✓		
7	Bennett	✓			Moonan	✓		
8	Bewick	✓			Morgan	✓		
9	Brown	✓			Morris	✓		
10	Cattell	✓			Nemeth	✓		
11	Chapman	✓			Norman A	✓		
12	Cobb	✓			Norman K	✓		
13	Daniel	✓			O'Quinn	✓		
14	Deane	<i>Absent</i>			Page	<i>Apologies</i>		
15	Druitt		X		Peltzer Dunn	✓		
16	Gibson		X		Penn	✓		
17	Gilbey	✓			Phillips	<i>Apologies</i>		
18	Greenbaum		X		Robins	✓		
19	Hamilton	✓			Simson	✓		
20	Hill	✓			Sykes		X	
21	Horan	✓			Taylor	✓		
22	Hyde	✓			Theobald C	✓		

23	Inkpin-Leissner	✓			Theobald G	✓		
24	Janio	✓			Wares	✓		
25	Knight		X		Wealls	✓		
26	Lewry	✓			West		X	
27	Littman		X		Yates	✓		
					Total	42	8	-

106.11. **RESOLVED** – That Council adopt the revised Statement of Licensing Policy.

107 THE FOLLOWING NOTICES OF MOTION HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS FOR CONSIDERATION:

(a) EXTENDING THE ENFORCEMENT OF GRASS VERGE PARKING

107.1 The Notice of Motion listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Lewry on behalf of the Conservative Group and seconded by Councillor Janio.

107.2 Councillor Lewry stated that he received more phone calls and emails on this subject than any other within his Ward as verge parking could be obstructive and dangerous; as well as impacting more of those that were elderly and visually impaired. It was an increased problem during winter and made verges look and slightly and rundown; as well sometimes damaging the adjoining footway or road. Verge parking was an offence; however, the pilot that had been run in the city had been very successful in the last two years and it was requested that this be extended. The scheme could be self-funding through using the revenue raised from fining those that committed the offence. Whilst tarmacking over verges was not considered a workable option; there were some solutions such as plastic covers that could be trialed and would still allow the grass to grow underneath. It was requested that the matter be referred to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee to extend enforcement.

107.3 The Mayor congratulated Councillor Lewry on his maiden speech on behalf of the Council.

107.4 Councillor Janio formally seconded the motion.

107.5 Councillor Mitchell moved an amendment on behalf of the Labour & Co-operative Group and stated that she recognised what a problem verge parking could cause. To take this matter forward it would be important to consider whether a piecemeal or city-side approach would be more appropriate to address matters around displacement of parking. There was only a team of Officers to undertake this and to agree an expansion of the scheme would impact on other areas of work. Councillor Mitchell stated she was happy to ask Officers to look into the feasibility of this further, but it would be necessary to ensure the resources were in place before this could be agreed.

- 107.6 Councillor Atkinson formally seconded the amendment and noted that verge parking generally was a complicated issue, and tackling it could easily displace the parking problems. He noted the issues in his own Ward and recognised that generally the pilot had been successful and that further expansion of the scheme could only be done if the necessary resources were available.
- 107.7 Councillor Barnett congratulated Councillor Lewry on his maiden speech and stated that as his fellow Ward Councillor she also received many complaints from residents about this. Many residents took great and pride in looking after verges and those that were damaged and unsightly gave the wrong impression; she agreed that the enforcement should be rolled out to other parts of the city.
- 107.8 Councillor K. Norman congratulated Councillor Lewry on his maiden speech and stated that the pilot had worked well in the Withdean area, but noted that in Westdene the signs prohibiting parking on verges were simply ignored by some residents as they were not enforced – he felt that a piecemeal approach would be the most effective to way to prove this scheme could work.
- 107.9 Councillor West stated that he had been Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability when the pilot was undertaken; he noted that it had focused on active community participation as these types of schemes needed to become self-enforcing. The issues relating to illegal verge parking were not only cosmetic as they could lead to collapse when the verge materials were removed through inappropriate parking and there were costs to Council caused by this problem. He noted that more schemes should be rolled out each year as the pilot had been successful; however, he did not support the approach proposed by the amendment.
- 107.10 Councillor Taylor noted that residents were increasingly concerned about the condition of verges in his Ward, and verges were one means of helping to beautify the city. He gave examples of one particular street where the state of the verges had affected the health of trees and urged all Members to support the motion.
- 107.11 Councillor Gilbey noted that some of the problem was due to short term parking; however, the same damage was still caused regardless of the length of parking. She noted that, whilst there were still some problems, the pilot had helped in her Ward.
- 107.12 Councillor Janio thanked Councillor Mitchell for her helpful response, and he agreed that a targeted approach would be best to address the problem; he stated he would support the amendment from the Labour & Co-Operative Group.
- 107.13 Councillor Lewry thanked all those that had contributed to the debate and noted he was happy to accept the amendment from the Labour & Co-Operative Group.
- 107.14 The Mayor noted that the Labour & Co-operative Group's amendment had been accepted and that the Council was happy to take it as the substantive motion. She therefore put the following motion as amended to the vote:

“This Council resolves to recommend to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee that the current limited grass verge parking enforcement scheme be extended to other areas of the city where this is a significant problem, and requests

that a report be brought to that Committee at the earliest opportunity outlining options for its introduction dependent on the availability of resources.”

107.15 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been **carried** unanimously as detailed below:

107.16 The motion was **carried**.

(b) RETAIL SECTOR

107.17 The Notice of Motion listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Robins on behalf of the Labour & Co-operative Group and seconded by Councillor Cattell.

107.18 Councillor Druitt moved an amendment on behalf of the Green Group which was seconded by Councillor Greenbaum.

107.19 The Mayor noted that the Green Group’s amendment had been accepted and that the Council was happy to take it as the substantive motion. She therefore put the following motion as amended to the vote:

“This council resolves to request the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills urging the Government to give us every assistance in supporting the retail sector in Brighton and Hove, including having a strategic approach nationally to improving wages and terms and conditions in the retail sector, encouraging career progression in retail and ensuring the creation of high quality apprenticeships within retail, and citing the success of the Brighton & Hove living wage.

Furthermore, this council commends the work undertaken to date on the city's Employment & Skills Plan, notes the recent adoption of the plan, and resolves to support both the creation of high quality retail apprenticeships within the city and the adoption of the living wage across the city's retail community.”

107.20 The Mayor confirmed that the motion 107 (b) had been **carried** by 28 votes to 19 with 1 abstention, as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen	✓			Mac Cafferty	✓		
2	Atkinson	✓			Marsh	✓		
3	Barford	<i>Absent</i>			Meadows	✓		
4	Barnett		X		Mears		X	
5	Barradell	✓			Miller		X	
6	Bell		X		Mitchell	✓		
7	Bennett	✓			Moonan	✓		
8	Bewick	✓			Morgan	✓		

9	Brown		X		Morris	✓		
10	Cattell	✓			Nemeth		X	
11	Chapman	✓			Norman A		X	
12	Cobb		X		Norman K		X	
13	Daniel	✓			O'Quinn	✓		
14	Deane	<i>Absent</i>			Page	<i>Apologies</i>		
15	Druitt	✓			Peltzer Dunn		X	
16	Gibson	✓			Penn	✓		
17	Gilbey	✓			Phillips	<i>Apologies</i>		
18	Greenbaum	✓			Robins	✓		
19	Hamilton	✓			Simson		X	
20	Hill	✓			Sykes		X	
21	Horan	✓			Taylor		X	
22	Hyde			Abs	Theobald C		X	
23	Inkpin-Leissner	✓			Theobald G		X	
24	Janio		X		Wares		X	
25	Knight	✓			Wealls		X	
26	Lewry		X		West	✓		
27	Littman	✓			Yates	✓		
					Total	28	19	1

107.21 The motion was **carried**.

(c) USE OF PESTICIDES

107.22 The Notice of Motion listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Greenbaum on behalf of the Green Group and seconded by Councillor Gibson.

107.23 The Mayor then put the following motion to the vote:

“Council resolves to:

1. Request the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee to request officers to use the opportunity of the end of the current weed spraying contract in April 2017 to end the use of Glyphosate in our city; and

2. To request that the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee gives consideration to trying non-chemical and mechanical alternatives during the testing period due to start in July this year and asks officers to inform the Members of the Committee as to which alternatives are being trialled (by its meeting on 28 June) and report on the progress of those trials to the same Committee at its meeting on 29 November this year.”

107.24 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been **carried** unanimously as detailed below:

107.25 The motion was **carried**.

(d) EU MEMBERSHIP SUBJECT

107.26 The Notice of Motion listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Littman on behalf of the Green Group and seconded by Councillor Mac Cafferty.

107.27 Councillor G. Theobald moved an amendment on behalf of the Conservative Group which was seconded by Councillor Bell.

107.28 The Mayor noted that the Conservative Group’s amendment had not been accepted and put it to the vote which was **lost** by 20 votes to 27 with 2 abstentions as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen			Abs	Mac Cafferty		X	
2	Atkinson		X		Marsh		X	
3	Barford	<i>Absent</i>			Meadows		X	
4	Barnett	✓			Mears	✓		
5	Barradell		X		Miller	✓		
6	Bell	✓			Mitchell		X	
7	Bennett	✓			Moonan		X	
8	Bewick		X		Morgan		X	
9	Brown	✓			Morris		X	
10	Cattell		X		Nemeth	✓		
11	Chapman		X		Norman A	✓		
12	Cobb	✓			Norman K	✓		
13	Daniel		X		O’Quinn		X	
14	Deane	<i>Absent</i>			Page	<i>Apologies</i>		
15	Druitt		X		Peltzer Dunn	✓		

16	Gibson		X		Penn			Abs
17	Gilbey		X		Phillips	<i>Apologies</i>		
18	Greenbaum		X		Robins		X	
19	Hamilton		X		Simson	✓		
20	Hill		X		Sykes		X	
21	Horan		X		Taylor	✓		
22	Hyde	✓			Theobald C	✓		
23	Inkpin-Leissner		X		Theobald G	✓		
24	Janio	✓			Wares	✓		
25	Knight		X		Wealls	✓		
26	Lewry	✓			West		X	
27	Littman		X		Yates		X	
					Total	20	27	2

107.29 The Mayor then put the following motion as listed to the vote:

“This Council Resolves to:

- Write to the Prime Minister expressing that, while we do not necessarily share his vision for the future, there are clear benefits for the residents of Brighton and Hove should Britain remain in the EU; and
- Therefore support Britain remaining part of the EU.”

107.30 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been **lost** by 14 votes to 24, with 10 abstentions, as detailed below:

		For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
1	Allen		X		Mac Cafferty	✓		
2	Atkinson		X		Marsh		X	
3	Barford	<i>Absent</i>			Meadows		X	
4	Barnett		X		Mears		X	
5	Barradell	✓			Miller		X	
6	Bell		X		Mitchell			Abs
7	Bennett		X		Moonan			Abs

8	Bewick			Abs	Morgan	✓		
9	Brown		X		Morris		X	
10	Cattell			Abs	Nemeth		X	
11	Chapman	✓			Norman A		X	
12	Cobb		X		Norman K		X	
13	Daniel			Abs	O'Quinn	<i>Absent</i>		
14	Deane	<i>Absent</i>			Page	<i>Apologies</i>		
15	Druitt	✓			Peltzer Dunn		X	
16	Gibson	✓			Penn			Abs
17	Gilbey	✓			Phillips	<i>Apologies</i>		
18	Greenbaum	✓			Robins			Abs
19	Hamilton			Abs	Simson		X	
20	Hill	✓			Sykes	✓		
21	Horan			Abs	Taylor		X	
22	Hyde		X		Theobald C		X	
23	Inkpin-Leissner	✓			Theobald G		X	
24	Janio		X		Wares		X	
25	Knight	✓			Wealls		X	
26	Lewry		X		West	✓		
27	Littman	✓			Yates		X	
					Total	14	25	10

107.31 The motion was **lost**.

(e) HEALTHY HOMES

107.32 The Notice of Motion listed in the agenda was proposed by Councillor Meadows on behalf of the Labour & Co-operative Group and seconded by Councillor Yates.

107.33 Councillor Gibson moved an amendment on behalf of the Green Group which was seconded by Councillor Mac Cafferty.

107.34 The Mayor noted that the Green Group's amendment had been accepted and that the Council was happy to take it as the substantive motion. She therefore put the following motion as amended to the vote:

“This council resolves to request that the Chief Executive writes to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government urging more coordinated and targeted action at a national level to reduce fuel poverty and deliver healthy homes for our city.

Further, this council resolves to continue its work to tackle fuel poverty locally and requests a report to the Housing & New Homes Committee on our ongoing work on healthy homes. This could include: research and work on district heat networks; encouraging top sustainable standards in home building from architects in schemes in the city; working with registered housing providers and housing bodies on ambitious methods to build warm and sustainable homes; improve the energy efficiency of council homes through the use of renewable energy and improved insulation.”

107.35 The Mayor confirmed that the motion had been **carried** unanimously.

108 CLOSE OF MEETING

108.1 The Mayor thanked everyone for attending the meeting and declared the meeting closed.

The meeting concluded at 11.08pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2016