



# **Brighton & Hove**

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**

## **REPORT OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW OF THE WAR MEMORIAL RAILINGS**

**MEMBERSHIP OF THE SCRUTINY PANEL:**

**Councillor Kevin Allen (Chair)  
Councillor Dee Simson  
Councillor Simon Williams**

## **REPORT CONTENTS**

<b><u>SECTION</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
1. Background to the Scrutiny Review .....	2
2-4. Summary of Evidence Received by the Panel .....	2
5. Findings and Recommendations of the Scrutiny Panel .....	6
6. Further Suggestions .....	8

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1: Letter Requesting Scrutiny .....	10
Appendix 2: List of Participants in the Review .....	11
Appendix 3: Implications of the Report.....	12
Appendix 4: Minutes of meeting, 1 <sup>st</sup> September.....	13

## **1. BACKGROUND TO THE SCRUTINY REVIEW**

1.1 The War Memorial Railings Scrutiny Review was initiated by the Overview and Scrutiny Organisation Committee (OSOC) on June 2<sup>nd</sup> 2003 following a request for scrutiny submitted by Councillor Geoffrey Theobald. The Brighton Branches of the Combined Ex-Services Association and the Royal British Legion had been asking for some years for the railings around the memorial in the Old Steine to be made higher and were dissatisfied with the council's response.

1.2 The letter requesting scrutiny is included at Appendix 1 to this report. Information in support of the scrutiny request and other background papers to the review are held for reference in Brighton and Hove Town Halls and Kings House, Hove.

1.3 OSOC agreed to establish a 3-Member ad hoc scrutiny Panel with the broad remit to make recommendations on possible action to be taken with regard to the request for higher railings around the War Memorial in the Steine, Brighton.

1.4 Councillors nominated to serve on the Scrutiny Panel were Councillors Kevin Allen (Chair), Mrs Dee Simson and Simon Williams.

1.5 All Brighton and Hove City Councillors and others with a known interest in the War Memorial including members of Ex-Services Associations were personally invited to participate in the scrutiny review. Officers provided information to the Panel as required during two informal meetings with Panel Members and/or via e-mail. Appendix 2 lists those who have provided evidence.

1.6 A public meeting to hear the views of the Ex-Servicemen and Women, or others with an interest in the War Memorial, was arranged in Brighton Town Hall on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2003 and publicity was arranged via the City News and other local media. A file of key correspondence submitted to the Panel was circulated to the interested parties in advance of the meeting. Those who spoke at the public meeting had an opportunity to review and confirm the minutes, which form appendix 3 to this report.

1.7 In preparing this report of findings and recommendations, the Scrutiny Panel have taken into account all the views expressed during the review.

1.8 The Panel would like to thank all those who participated in the scrutiny review. Their final report of findings and recommendations will be considered for endorsement by OSOC on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2003 and will subsequently be presented to the Environment Committee. It will then be reported to full Council together with any response from the Environment Committee.

## **2. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE: EX-SERVICES ASSOCIATIONS MEMBERS**

2.1 During the scrutiny review the Panel received written and oral information from eight Ex-Servicemen and Women.

## The War Memorial

2.2 The War Memorial in The Steine, Brighton, built during the early 1920s, consists not only of the prominent inscribed white stone monument but also includes the Garden of Remembrance - a grassed area and a pool - currently surrounded by a low (20-inch) bow-top fence.

2.3 It is thought to be the finest on the whole of the south coast of England and probably the only one of its kind with a pool. The pool is in memory of those who lost their lives at sea.

2.4 The grassy area represents those who died on land and in the air, not only during the 1914 -1918 war but also in 20 subsequent conflicts in which British forces have served.

2.5 The Memorial is effectively also a war grave commemorating those with no known grave. The ground is consecrated each year and regimental Standards are placed there in the week before the Remembrance Day ceremony.

2.6 In addition to 2,397 inscribed names on the monument, and a plaque in memory of the fallen during World War Two, St Peter's Church holds a memorial book of further names. Names of those who died are still known to be missing from the formal records.

## Main concerns of Ex-Services Associations members

2.7 Witnesses said the War Memorial should be regarded by the City with great pride and the inscription 'Lest We Forget' should be heeded.

2.8 Considerable concerns had been raised over a number of years about a small minority of the general public and some visitors who seemed to show little or no respect for the War Memorial. Many people did not realise the real significance of the Memorial.

2.9 The Garden of Remembrance was not to be used for general recreation.

2.10 Witnesses described to the Scrutiny Panel examples of trespass of the Memorial and said more should be done to help protect the Memorial from mis-use, and reduce both litter and mess caused by birds in this area. It was acknowledged that some incidents of trespass may well be genuinely unintentional.

2.11 It was also felt that general public awareness needed to be raised of the monument's history and its significance. An attractive informative interpretation board could be sited in an appropriate place near the Memorial.

2.12 The current twenty inch high fencing was felt, by all those speaking to the Scrutiny Panel, to be inadequate in that it did not reflect the fact that it surrounded a Garden of Remembrance. Nor was it a real deterrent even to the most casual or inadvertent trespasser, nor to small children or dogs.

2.13 Raising the height of the railings to three feet six inches was felt to be the best way to make clearer to all passers-by that this is a sensitive site to be treated with a respect such as one would reserve for the grave of a member of one's own family.

2.14 In addition to higher railings, improved signage was also requested, to bring to attention the full significance of the memorial and especially the Garden of Remembrance.

2.15 The Garden of Remembrance should have flowers, the Scrutiny Panel was told.

2.16 Other suggestions were brought forward to help improve the appearance of the War Memorial and the area surrounding it such as: better cleaning of the water in the pool; surfacing the pool in blue to signify the sea, more frequent litter-picking; perhaps more litter bins such as at the bus-stops nearby; new bird deterrents at the top of the monument; and the active discouragement of those who wished to feed the birds in this particular area.

2.17 Suggestions such as night-time illumination at the site and a Poppy Arch were also made.

2.18 The profile of the War Memorial could be improved by raising awareness of its significance in modern history teaching and other activities in local schools and universities.

2.19 The Council's communications arrangements could be used to promote a better understanding and all Councillors could be encouraged to take a closer interest.

2.20 The cost of higher railings and other measures was felt to be minimal compared with some other examples of recent council expenditure. Some high profile projects around the City had attracted quite considerable funding but, speakers told the Panel, these were not as significant or meaningful to the City as a whole, especially for future generations, as the War Memorial.

#### Events leading to the request for scrutiny

2.21 During the course of the review, the Scrutiny Panel became aware of some aspects of communications between the council and those expressing concerns about the War Memorial and its railings.

2.22 There appeared to have been a delay in replying formally to the requests for higher railings.

2.23 The Combined Ex-Services Association had been notified of a tender for higher railings received by the Council in January 2001 yet the reasons why the tender was not then progressed and details of the action being taken were not given.

2.24 There seemed to be disagreement about whether higher railings would increase entrapment of litter.

2.25 A mis-reading of an e-mail had led to a misunderstanding regarding 'maintenance' as opposed to 'manufacture' of railings.

### **3. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE: ELECTED MEMBERS**

3.1 An MP and six City Councillors provided information to the Scrutiny Panel; three Councillors spoke to the Panel at the public meeting.

3.2 Most were in support of raising the height of the railings in accordance with the wishes of the Ex-Services Associations.

3.3 The main points made included;

- Higher railings would afford extra protection for the War Memorial
- Greater awareness was needed and respect should be fostered for the Memorial and what it stands for
- Higher railings had been requested over a period of some time
- Improved cleaning and maintenance is needed
- People should be discouraged from feeding birds at the site

### **4. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE: OFFICERS**

4.1 Five Council officers provided information to the Scrutiny Panel at informal meetings or via e-mail.

#### **Head of Tourism**

4.2 The Head of Tourism discussed with the Panel the War Memorial and how it relates to other visitor interests in the centre of the City, which is a main interchange and bus terminus. Possible ideas for better signage and/or an interpretation board at the site, and the languages used in visitor information were also discussed.

#### **Senior Contract Officer**

4.3 The Senior Contract Officer told the Panel that the War Memorial was generally well respected, well cleaned and maintained. Graffiti had been removed from the monument twice in 16 years and the content of the graffiti had not been directed at the Memorial itself nor at what it stands for.

4.4 The water at the pool was changed regularly but it did discolour occasionally - such as when the fountain was not in operation - as it is fed from an artesian system, full of nutrients which encourage growth of algae and pondweed.

4.5 Incidents of significant anti-social behaviour had not been observed by the officers at the War Memorial and the recent ban on drinking was having a noticeable effect. However it is recognised that 'mis-use' of the area and what is 'anti-social' can be interpreted in different ways.

4.6 The existing railings had been recently painted. Higher railings would not stop people from jumping over them. If the low bow-top fencing were to be removed it would not be possible to use it around the Old Steine gardens as had been suggested, as the shapes of the two areas were different.

4.6 Work was in hand to investigate possible ways to improve the colour of the water in the pool and other suggestions regarding birds and litter, would be looked into.

#### Emergency Planning Officer

4.7 The Emergency Planning Officer had reservations about higher railings in the event of an emergency, during any protest for example.

#### Grounds Maintenance Inspector

4.8 A misunderstanding had arisen when the word in an e-mail 'maintenance' had been mistaken for 'manufacture.'

#### Conservation and Regeneration Manager

4.9 The War Memorial was designed by John W Simpson, a noted architect of primarily the pre-first world war period. He also designed Roedean School (1897 – 1910).

4.10 The monument was a listed building and any enclosure or alteration may perhaps require planning consent. This would need to be considered formally. Erection of a well-placed and discreet interpretation board is unlikely to require planning consent.

## **5. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SCRUTINY PANEL**

### Height of the Railings

5.1 On the basis of information received during the Scrutiny Review the Panel agree that higher railings would help protect the memorial from casual trespassers and help raise awareness of the significance of the War Memorial.

5.2 Higher railings would also allow for any appropriate signage attached to the railings to be more visible to passers-by and help reduce inadvertent trespass.

5.3 The fencing around the north area of St Peter's Church is thought to be one good example of an appropriate style of railings. However it may be necessary to carry out a

risk assessment of any safety implications for example in the event of an emergency at the centre of the City, and there was a question of planning consent.

#### RECOMMENDATION 1

That the railings around the war memorial in the Steine be raised in height to 3feet 6 inches in line with the wishes of the Combined Ex-Services Association (Brighton Branch).

#### Communication with Ex-Services Associations

5.4 Having heard the views of the Ex-Services Associations, the Scrutiny Panel agree that the general public, council officers and councillors may not all be fully aware of the depth of symbolism and significance as a war grave of the water and grassed areas of the War Memorial.

5.5 That being the case, the full reasons for the Ex-Services Associations' requests for higher railings and their importance to those most closely concerned with the War Memorial may not have been fully clear.

5.6 The Panel note that officers had not themselves observed significant intentional anti-social activities. However the Panel are aware that there are very different perspectives of what constitutes anti-social behaviour, especially in the specific context of the War Memorial.

5.7 The Panel heard praise for the Outdoor Events Officer and the successful arrangements for planning and co-ordinating the annual Remembrance Day Parade. However there was disappointment that this Officer was unable to deal with a wider range of issues such as litter and cleanliness and other concerns and suggestions raised at the public scrutiny meeting.

5.9 Turning to other communications issues, the Panel have been informed of the circumstances of the January 2001 tender for the provision of new railings and the delay in a formal reply to those requesting higher railings.

5.10 The Panel heard that a review of the use of the War Memorial area was carried out and no significant incidents were observed. However during a transfer of responsibilities following restructure, the Ex-services Associations had not been kept fully informed about this.

5.11 The Panel are of the view that a comment from one officer, that overseas visitors would be offended if their language were omitted from any sign at the War Memorial, was questionable. The Panel are also not convinced that higher railings would lead to more entrapment of litter, as had been suggested in a letter.

5.12 A single mistaken word in an e-mail had led to a misunderstanding and expectations of the manufacture, not maintenance, of railings.

5.13 Overall the Panel feel there needs to be better communications in future between those with a close interest in the War Memorial and the council.



5.14 Moreover, the examples above have drawn to the Scrutiny Panel's attention the importance of up-to-date officer contact information for Councillors, so that Members' initial queries on different aspects of all the service areas can be directed to the appropriate person.

## RECOMMENDATION 2

That a specific council officer be appointed as a contact for all communications with representatives of Ex-Services Associations.

That regular meetings are established between the Ex-Services Associations and officers including those responsible for the appearance cleanliness and maintenance of the War Memorial in the Old Steine, to allow concerns about the memorial, if any, to be raised.

That other officers involved in raising awareness/education attend or provide information for the liaison meetings as necessary. (See recommendation 4 and 'further suggestions' below)

5.15 If appropriate the liaison meetings may be arranged to extend or coincide with existing arrangements for planning the Remembrance Day Parade.

### Appearance of the War Memorial

5.16 The Panel agrees that action is needed to improve the appearance of the War Memorial; including the water in the pool, a reduction in litter and deterrents against birds in the area.

## RECOMMENDATION 3

That measures be introduced in consultation at liaison meetings as recommended above, to improve the cleanliness of the War Memorial and its surroundings, in relation to the appearance of the water, the frequency of litter-picking, the provision of litter bins nearby, bird deterrents and the discouragement of those who feed the birds in this area.

### Information about the War Memorial

5.17 The Panel wish to enhance the area and make it more meaningful to a wider public, especially the young and visitors to the City. Greater understanding of the meaning of the War Memorial should in turn help lead to a generally more respectful attitude.

5.18 The Panel ask that a well-designed discreet and informative interpretation board with anti-vandalism features be appropriately placed nearby. Information on the Memorial Book of the names of those who died, and links to St Peter's Church should be included.

5.19 Further suggestions by the Scrutiny Panel for raising the profile of the War Memorial are made at section 6 below.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 4**

That an attractive interpretation board be appropriately sited, setting out the history and meaning of the Memorial and including details on how to access to the memorial book in St Peter's Church nearby.

#### **6. FURTHER SUGGESTIONS**

6.1 In addition to the formal recommendations of the scrutiny review the Panel ask that steps be taken in line with the wishes of the Brighton Branches of the Combined Ex-Services Associations and Royal British Legion and mainstreamed as far as possible within the council's service provision. These are as follows:

6.2 That a future liaison meeting as Recommendation 2 above, consider further ideas of the Ex-Servicemen and Women including flowers in the Garden of Remembrance, a poppy arch and night-time illumination of the monument.

6.3 That communications and education senior officers take a pro-active approach to help promote the profile of the War Memorial and the Remembrance Day ceremony and an understanding of the sacrifices made in past conflicts, especially using council links with schools and all local media, in two-way co-operation wherever possible.

6.4 That further research into the formal records of those killed in action be carried out with a view to completing the list of names.

6.5 That full use be made of the council's education, museums, libraries, promotional and communications links as appropriate including via:

School bulletin  
Governor Support Network  
Museum and Library Services  
Information/invitation for all the City's Councillors  
Remembrance Day promotion  
Support from the Press Team  
The City News  
The Council's Website

These to be in line with the wishes of the Ex-Servicemen and Women and where possible and timed to coincide with Poppy Day.



**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE SCRUTINY REVIEW**

David Lepper, MP  
Councillor Simon Burgess  
Councillor Mrs Pat Drake  
Councillor Brian Fitch  
Councillor Gill Mitchell  
Councillor Averil Older  
Councillor Geoffrey Theobald  
Councillor Francis Tonks

Mr E Potton  
Mr J Stevens  
Mr T Sullivan  
Major Maitland Sions  
Mr L Stafford  
Mrs Harriott  
Mr Copelin  
Mr Clarke

Head of Tourism  
Senior Contract Officer  
Emergency Planning Officer  
Grounds Maintenance Inspector  
Conservation and Regeneration Manager

<b>Meeting/Date</b>	Overview and Scrutiny Organisation Committee
<b>Report of</b>	The War Memorial Railings Scrutiny Panel
<b>Subject</b>	Report of the Scrutiny Review
<b>Wards affected</b>	All

**Financial implications**

The cost of purchase and installation of the railings was identified to be in the region of £6,000 for which at present there is no budget provision. There would also be ongoing maintenance for painting etc for which at present there is no budget provision.

*Finance Officer consulted: Alasdair Ridley*

**Legal implications**

The proposals in this report are within the Council's powers. There are no adverse Human Rights implications arising from this report.

*Lawyer consulted: Abraham Ghebre-Ghiorghis, Head of Law*

**Corporate/Citywide implications**

The recommendations in the report are intended to make improvements to the Brighton War Memorial and raise its profile and significance for local people, visitors to the City, and future generations.

The Panel have received queries about the Hove War Memorial, to be followed up by the officers.

**Risk assessment**

There may need to be a risk assessment relating to higher railings in the event of an emergency in the area.

**Sustainability implications**

Increased awareness and involvement in the War Memorial and its significance helps create a sense of belonging and civic pride.

**Equalities implications**

The recommendations in this report are intended to take into account the long-standing wishes of Ex-Servicemen and Women

**Implications for the prevention of crime and disorder**

The recommendations in the report are intended to help improve the appearance of the War Memorial, reduce trespass in the pool and grass areas of the memorial and impact positively on any concerns about crime and disorder in the area.

**Background papers**

Representations received by the Panel are available to view at Brighton and Hove Town Halls and Kings House, Hove.

**Contact Officer**

*Mary Van Beinum, Committee Administrator, Tel: 29 1062*

**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**  
**WAR MEMORIAL RAILINGS SCRUTINY PANEL**  
**10.00AM – 1<sup>ST</sup> SEPTEMBER 2003**  
**BRIGHTON TOWN HALL, COMMITTEE ROOM 1**

**MINUTES**

Present: Councillor Kevin Allen (Chair); Councillors Mrs Dee Simson, Simon Williams

**PART ONE**

ACTION

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, introduced the Panel Members and outlined the background to the scrutiny review, which had been initiated by a request from Councillor Geoffrey Theobald.

1.2 The Panel's remit is 'to make recommendations on possible action to be taken with regard to the request for higher railings around the War Memorial in the Steine.' The scrutiny findings and recommendations would be reported to the parent Committee, the Overview and Scrutiny Organisation Committee on 17<sup>th</sup> November. The Panel does not have the power to make decisions. The scrutiny recommendations would be considered by the Environment Committee and reported together with the Environment Committee's reply to a meeting of the full Council.

1.3 The Panel had already heard from council officers and Members. This public meeting had been arranged particularly to hear the views of people with a close interest in the War Memorial. A file of correspondence had been circulated to all those who had been in contact with the Panel.

1.4 The Panel chair invited the members of the public and the councillors to put forward their views.

**2. INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS**

2.1 Mr Tony Sullivan said he was speaking on behalf of Mr Clarke the Chairman of the Combined Ex-Services Association and Royal British Legion who unfortunately could not be at the meeting. He said that despite the inscription on the memorial 'lest we forget' he felt that many people in Brighton including successive Councillors had indeed forgotten those who gave their lives in conflicts. The War Memorial was not generally regarded with the dignity it deserved, he said and raising the height of the railings would help to restore the dignity of the memorial.

2.2 Mr Sullivan fully supported Mr Steven's remarks, which were

included in the file of correspondence. But he said the file included a stupid remark at page 38; that a higher fence would create more rubbish. He strongly disagreed with the views of another correspondent (p15 of the file) and said he and his colleagues were not asking for the memorial to be closed off. On the contrary, it should be accessible for people to be able to pay their respects.

2.3 The views of people who do not know the significance of the memorial, ought to be disregarded, he said and many people were unaware that the water represented the Merchant Navy and the Royal Navy and the memorial gardens represented the British Army and Royal Air Force.

2.4 Brighton's monument was the finest on the South Coast and was in remembrance of the fallen, not only of World War One but also of subsequent conflicts around the world. The City should feel honoured to have the memorial at its centre, and not denigrate it.

2.5 The existing fence was much too low. A higher fence of either 36 inches or 48 inches would help to show that both the garden and pond areas should be properly respected by everyone. The higher railings would still allow for the annual parade and for the grounds maintenance staff to do their work.

2.6 Mr Sullivan had seen people leaving litter and drinks cans in the garden and said if anyone was in doubt about this, they should take a closer look at how the area was treated.

2.7 More Councillors should be involved in the annual parade, he said.

2.8 Asked by the Panel for his views on improving signage at the memorial Mr Sullivan said he would like to see better signs but he did not think other languages were necessary. Signs at memorials in other countries included only the indigenous language. However he would not object to other languages. A new commemoration plaque was being added at the centre.

2.9 Mrs Harriott, who served in the RAF said the fence was much too low; she or anyone else could step over it very easily; she had had to remove a man who was washing his dog in the pool, where the water represents the Royal Navy.

2.10 The area around the memorial was disgusting this morning, she said. It was disgusting that people left rubbish behind and used the area as a public toilet; this did not happen at the Whitehall cenotaph where respect was shown for those who gave their lives in World War One and in 20 other conflicts since then.

2.11 The Panel Chair said this could be an opportunity to increase public awareness of the significance of the memorial and what it stood for.

2.12 Councillor Theobald said he was a member of the Royal British



Legion (Brighton Branch). He reassured the meeting that the Panel would listen carefully to the views being put forward. He had spoken to Mr Clarke who unfortunately was unable to be at the meeting because of a hospital appointment. Mr Clarke had only recently had to move people behaving disrespectfully and their dogs, out of the area of the memorial. Councillor Theobald said that at least 80% of people in the city and visitors, probably do not properly understand all the various aspects of the memorial nor what the different parts represent.

2.13 Raising the railings seemed the obvious step to help preserve the memorial for the sake of all those who lost their lives in wars. A relatively trivial sum of money was involved and he felt that the time and effort already expended in the growing amount of correspondence and the time spent on this matter has already outweighed the cost of any new railings.

2.14 Councillor Theobald said he was delighted to be able to hear the views of his friends and colleagues, including other Councillors. He thanked everyone participating in the review especially those who had sent written information to the Panel.

2.15 Mr Leonard Stafford asked 'What is a war memorial?' and said it was not a trivial question. As many as 2,397 names were engraved on the memorial and those lost in World War Two were listed in a book in St Peter's Church, including 242 names from his own service, the Royal Air Force. A further 965 were denoted by a tablet in memory of the fallen during World War Two and subsequent conflicts

2.16 Mr Clarke had seen graffiti on the memorial, which had now been removed, said Mr Stafford.

2.17 Mr Stafford put forward to the Panel his points of view – see his letter pp7 – 9 of the file of correspondence.

2.18 The Panel agreed with Mr Stafford, that the style of fencing to the north of St Peter's Church may well be considered appropriate for use around the War Memorial to prevent people stepping over too easily.

2.19 Asked about the cleaning and tidying of the area, Mr Sullivan said some parts of the memorial were completely covered by bird droppings. The pigeon deterrent spikes had all but disappeared and so were ineffective, he said.

2.20 Some parts of the fencing had been taken down, but he did not know why.

2.21 Councillor Theobald said some while ago a lady fed pigeons every day at the War Memorial and had been asked to do this somewhere else (if at all.)

2.22 The Scrutiny Panel Chair said that there seemed to be a difference of opinion about the number of incidents and the extent of vandalism and misuse of the memorial site. However that any single incident was a cause

of major offence to many people.

2.23 The Scrutiny Panel asked what suggestions for improvements there may be to help bring alive the monument in the consciousness of people who don't realise its significance, especially young people and tourists.

2.24 Mr Sullivan suggested a push-button system of recorded information, though this may be prone to vandalism and graffiti.

2.25 Mr Stafford said it would be better if the memorial could be kept looking nice. Higher railings would mean the memorial would be less prone to vandalism.

2.26 Major Maitland Sions commented that more people were attending the Remembrance Day ceremony every year and the numbers of distinguished visitors from abroad was also rising steadily. The City Events Officer was taking this aspect very seriously and should be fully supported in this work. The Council needed to do all it could to help prevent any problems at the memorial.

2.27 Mr Stafford said the memorial could be illuminated at night; this may also help deter vandalism.

2.28 Mrs Harriott said space would be needed for loved ones to place crosses, but flowerbeds would have a very positive impact. Not only would they be very attractive, but people would be less inclined to jump over the fence into flowers

2.29 Mr Stevens, a representative of the National Ex-Servicemen's Association, addressed the meeting. He had been involved in extending the local 'no drinking' ban to the area of the War Memorial. He said it was important to remember that we are lucky to have human rights and to be living in a democracy - those who had fought for this should be remembered.

2.30 Better signage should explain the significance of the memorial. Schools could be asked to contribute information and talks could be given to children by ex-service men and women. The children needed to understand that the memorial is a war grave and should be treated in the same way that a relative's grave would be respected.

2.31 He described the state of the War Memorial as 'disgusting' and a 'disgrace.' There was litter and the water was murky. He felt the monument should be the first priority every day for the staff responsible for cleaning.

2.32 Mr Stevens had done some research and discovered that the inscribed names in memory of those killed in World War One were incomplete. Three brothers, lost within three days of each other had been omitted for example. The supplementary list included 254 further names

and this should be looked into.

2.33 Mr Stevens specially wanted to thank Chris Coomber of the reference library who had helped in his research; also the Council officers, Councillor Theobald who had raised the matter for scrutiny, the ex- Servicemen and women, Members of the Panel and the Members giving evidence at the meeting.

2.34 Although the names can be viewed in a book held within St Peter's church, it was not clear to visitors how to get to the church nor how to gain access when the church doors are locked.

2.35 He said Councillors were in charge of maintaining the memorial and more needed to be done.

2.36 The Chair of the Panel asked what contact there was between the council and ex-Services Associations as regards arrangements for routine maintenance of the memorial and heard that there was apparently none. It was suggested that closer working contacts would be helpful in building a constructive long-term system of liaison.

2.37 Mr Copelin, Chair of Patcham Royal British Legion says he regularly checked the Patcham War Memorial and the Chattri and he contacts the Senior Contracts Officer with any problems.

2.38 Councillor Theobald said a council officer does attend a meeting of the Combined Ex-Services Association for planning the annual Remembrance Parade. However his responsibilities did not extend to maintenance and cleaning issues. This had proved very frustrating in the past so liaison meetings would be useful.

2.39 Mr Copelin said this was the only War Memorial in the country with railings only 18 inches high. Most others have railings 3 feet, or 3 feet 6 inches, high with a gate for maintenance and for the Remembrance ceremony. Edinburgh had a poppy arch leading into the garden of remembrance which would be a suggestion for Brighton.

2.40 Mr Sullivan said the public were generally unaware of the garden of remembrance and the meaning of the standards placed there in the week before the parade. He was also grateful to Councillor Older who had expressed her concern about the mess caused by pigeons.

2.41 Mr Potton, Chairman of the Burma Star, Member of CESA and the Royal British Legion, said in his view most Councillors thought the memorial was only the white stone building, whereas the whole area is part of the memorial with the grassy part being the Garden of Remembrance.

2.42 The ground was consecrated on the Thursday prior to Armistice Day by the Canon of Brighton and the Mayor of Brighton and Hove. If new railings

were erected, there should also be a notice indicating this is a Garden of Remembrance.

2.43 Referring to the file of correspondence, Mr Potton listed further letters that he felt should be added to the file as evidence to the scrutiny panel; the Committee Administrator would arrange this.

**MvB**

2.44 He said he strongly disagreed with those who did not want the railings to be raised in height; their views were based on issues of cost, visual impact and personal observation

2.45 The costs, he said were miniscule in comparison with some other projects around the City which in his view were of less consequence. If a relatively small sum of money could not be found this would be an insult to those who made the sacrifice which enabled the Councillors to be in the position they held today in a democratic system.

2.46 Remarks made about the visual impact of higher railings were risible; people in Brighton were not 6 inch dwarfs as seemed to be implied.

2.47 There was always rubbish all over the place, so anyone who disagreed with this must be observing only very rarely.

2.48 Mr Potton said as a member of the Royal Scots regiment he attended a presentation of colours by Princess Anne. He said people from Brighton would be astonished to see the memorial gardens in Princes Street kept spotless, which were a credit to Edinburgh. No one could say that Brighton's War Memorial was a credit to this City, in his view.

2.49 Asked about the best height for the railings, Mr Potton said 3 feet 6 inches would be appropriate. Flowers would also be very welcome; it was usual for memorials to have floral areas. As regards education, Mr Potton agreed with the suggestions already made regarding links with schools and teachers. He had seen interpretation boards elsewhere and felt they would also be very good idea as a way of setting out the history of the memorial and its meaning.

2.50 Mr Stafford agreed that anything that helps to educate the public would be welcome.

2.51 Mr Sullivan said he did not think modern history was properly taught in schools. Any interpretation board would need to be placed carefully and designed to deter vandalism.

2.52 It was suggested that Poppy Day would be a good opportunity to give out leaflets to children to take to school and the press including the City News should be asked to publish front page articles. There were many interesting stories showing the bravery of servicemen and women. Leaflets

to schools could perhaps be sent via the Council's courier service.

2.53 Mr Stafford had contacted former Minister for Education Jack Straw who reassured him that the Battle of Britain was indeed part of the teaching syllabus.

2.54 Councillor Older felt that a City News article on the War Memorial would be helpful. Also, all Councillors should be asked to attend the Remembrance Day ceremony.

2.55 She was concerned that pigeons were attracted to the memorial by people feeding them there, the bird deterrent spikes were almost non-existent and bird droppings had not been removed for a very long time.

2.56 An interpretation board was a good idea she said. It could be sited not directly behind the memorial structure but by the walkway between the pool and the fountain, where most people walked.

2.57 A higher fence with flowers would be a mental marker, rather than a total physical barrier. Night-time illumination would be attractive and help deter vandals. Councillor Older felt that the Council spent money on less significant projects which in comparison with the War Memorial could be regarded as a waste of money.

2.58 Mr Potton said the War Memorial would be subject to good publicity when a new granite slab is dedicated in the near future; this would be a good opportunity to raise the profile of the memorial.

2.59 He referred to the new Kohima Memorial, bearing the inscription; "When You Go Home, Tell Them Of Us And Say, For Your Tomorrow, We Gave Our Today"

2.60 Councillor Burgess said he appreciated hearing the views expressed at the meeting. He said that Remembrance Sunday was for him the most moving day of the year and he agreed that the Brighton War Memorial was the most impressive on the South Coast. The meeting had heard how little is probably known about the meaning of the War Memorial and he personally wished that more people could attend the remembrance day parade and experience the feeling of the occasion and the period of silence in the centre of a busy city.

2.61 Councillor Burgess (also Deputy Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee) said he was speaking as a local councillor. He felt that the memorial should be 150% looked after. Council Officers may feel that it is OK in comparison with other parts of the City, but the memorial is for those who made the ultimate sacrifice and it ought to be immaculate. A place could be judged by how it treats its War Memorial and it was in his view a shame that more had not been done before in this area. He could not see why that should be the case.

2.62 He told the meeting that railings would be relatively inexpensive and

easy to arrange; similarly for interpretation boards and some other ideas that had been brought forward. 'You have some pretty overwhelming evidence in front of you' he said.

2.63 Councillor Older said the first step would be to turn the remembrance garden into a real garden. She was reminded of the memorial at Bosham, surrounded by cobblestones which read 'When memory falls forgotten, remembrance shall remain.'

2.64 The Senior Contracts Officer asked if those present would prefer the pool to be painted blue, if that could be done. The general response from the meeting was in agreement; the natural green colouration was regarded as unattractive and blue would reflect, appropriately, the blue of the sea.

2.65 Mr Stevens asked whether the area could be cleaned more frequently and whether rubbish bins could be added near the bus shelters to help reduce litter in the area.

2.66 Mr Sullivan re-iterated the view that many people, including some Councillors were unaware of the significance of the memorial and asked if the Panel would be able to inform Councillors about what it represents.

2.67 The meeting heard that attention was needed at the Hove memorial in Kings Avenue and the replacement of removed turf at the Brighton memorial. The senior Contracts Officer undertook to investigate.

2.68 Councillor Theobald thanked the Scrutiny Panel on behalf of the Ex-services men and women

2.69 The Scrutiny Panel Chair thanked all the participants to the review. All the views would be taken into account. Draft notes would be circulated to confirm they were a correct record of the proceedings and a copy of the Panel's draft report would also be distributed.

## PARTTWO

### **3. ITEMS TO REMAIN EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE TO THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

3.1 **RESOLVED** - That no items remain exempt from disclosure to the press and public.

The meeting concluded at 12.10pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

2003