



**Brighton & Hove  
City Council**

# **COUNCIL ADDENDUM**

**4.30PM, THURSDAY, 22 MARCH 2012**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**



## **ADDENDUM**

<b>ITEM</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>78.</b>	<b>WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.</b>	<b>1 - 2</b>
<b>79.</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.</b>	<b>3 - 4</b>
<b>80.</b>	<b>WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS.</b>	<b>5 - 14</b>
<b>83.</b>	<b>TRAVELLER STRATEGY SCRUTINY REVIEW</b>	<b>15 - 16</b>
<b>84.</b>	<b>TRAVELLER COMMISSIONING STRATEGY 2012</b>	<b>17 - 18</b>
<b>85.</b>	<b>THE COUNCIL'S EQUALITY POLICY AND ACTION PLAN</b>	<b>19 - 20</b>
<b>86.</b>	<b>YOUTH JUSTICE STRATEGIC PLAN 2012-13</b>	<b>21 - 22</b>
<b>87.</b>	<b>ADMISSIONS ARRANGEMENTS FOR BRIGHTON &amp; HOVE SCHOOLS 2013/14</b>	<b>23 - 26</b>
<b>88.</b>	<b>PAY POLICY STATEMENT</b>	<b>27 - 28</b>
<b>89.</b>	<b>SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY - DELEGATION OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FUNCTION TO CONSTITUENT AUTHORITIES</b>	<b>29 - 30</b>
<b>90.</b>	<b>REVIEW OF PART 9.4 OF THE CONSTITUTION</b>	<b>31 - 32</b>
<b>90 A.</b>	<b>ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2012/13</b>	<b>33 - 48</b>
	Extract from the Proceedings of the Cabinet meeting held on the 15 <sup>th</sup> March 2012, together with a report of the Director of Finance (copies attached).	
<b>91.</b>	<b>NOTICES OF MOTION.</b>	<b>49 - 56</b>



**WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

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

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

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

**(a) Mr Hollingdale**

“Would the Council members please consider the benefit to the community of Brighton & Hove, of the HOVE OPEN BOWLS TOURNAMENT - it takes place for one week in July of each year on the four wonderful greens in Hove on the seafront. The Tournament has been established since 1929 with the Mayor being recognized as Patron - he / she attends to open the Tournament and give prizes on Finals Day. Having duly considered, would the members consider approving some financial support from an appropriate budget on an annual basis to help securing the future survival of the Tournament?”

**Councillor Bowden, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Tourism, will reply.**

**(b) Mr Chester**

“In October every councillor voted for Saltdean Lido to be put on the forward plan. So why has it come off and why does the latest report from council officials say that the only ward affected is Rottingdean Coastal?”

**Councillor Bowden, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Tourism, will reply.**

**(c) Ms Crook**

“In view of English Heritage's visit to Saltdean Lido last week, when will the local planning authority be serving its second warning letter and a section 48 repairs notice to the leaseholder at Saltdean Lido? Given that the minimum time allowed is 2 months, how long will it be giving Mr Audley to complete the works?”

**Councillor MacCafferty, Chair of the Planning Committee, will reply.**

**(d) Ms Fishleigh**

“BHCC officials have repeatedly said that a CPO of Saltdean Lido would be expensive and so would only be undertaken as a last resort.

What risk assessments and cost estimates have been produced by the council to support this view and which CPOs around the country have they used as models?

Are there official documents which I can request under FOI?”

**Councillor Bowden, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Tourism, will reply.**

**(e) Ms Paynter**

“Automatic right of access to live planning application hard copy within City Direct was terminated on January 1st.

People are told to view material online or seek to view the case officer’s copy. This can mean only partial or very brief file access and is also planned to end shortly.

The Council gave no advance notice of intention to force engagement online. There was no public consultation to understand how this might affect engagement with the planning process. Officers took just a one month look at user numbers.

I’m shocked.

Why was there no public consultation concerning this move?”

**Councillor MacCafferty, Chair of the Planning Committee, will reply.**

**DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

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

Notification of one Deputation has been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

- (a) Deputation concerning 'The Future of Saltdean Lido'  
**Ms Crook** (Spokesperson)

**Councillor Bowden, Cabinet Member for Culture, Recreation and Tourism, will respond.**





**WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

The following questions listed on pages 77-80 of the agenda have been received from Councillors and will be taken as read along with the written answers listed below:

**(a) Councillor Turton**

“How many staff currently employed by the City Council are (a) casual/temporary staff; (b) what percentage of the Council's total workforce are casual/temporary staff; (c) what is the average length of time the Council employs a casual/temporary member of staff for; (d) what is the longest period of time a current casual/temporary member of staff has been employed for?”

**Reply from Councillor Kitcat, Cabinet Member for Finance and Central Services.**

“The terms ‘casual’ and ‘temporary’ are often mixed, but they do have a more formal definition that it may be useful to understand:

A casual worker does not have an employment contract with the council and is not obliged to work and the council is also not obliged to offer work (non mutuality of obligation).

A temporary employee has a contract of employment with the council for a minimum of three months and is obliged to work the contracted hours that the contract states.

Casual workers provide a valuable service to the city council providing a wide variety of skilled workers who have been recruited and are available for work in a great many service areas. There are currently 1140 casual workers on our books, excluding schools where there are similar number including directly employed supply teachers. The length of time a casual worker remains on our books varies greatly. If a casual does not work for twelve weeks they are removed from payroll and made a leaver as the relevant checks including Criminal Records Bureau checks are not valid beyond this time.

Overall, just over 16% of the total number of people who work for the council are casual workers. However, their length of service varies considerably so the full-time-equivalent percentage is much lower. The casual worker with the longest work history with the council started at the Brighton Centre in 1983.

There are also 612 individuals that are employed through temporary, fixed term and secondment contracts across the council excluding schools.

The non-mutuality of obligation makes the arrangement attractive to individuals who have other commitments which include study and child care responsibilities. The majority of our casual workforce, approximately 80%, work

regularly supporting services across the council. Human Resources are continuing to review the casual workforce as part of our workforce planning including contractual requirements and this will be a key element of our evolving People Strategy.

The council also appoints casual workers to its staff pools as a route-way into employment. This includes both Care and Administration workers who are appointed through assessment centres.

Overall the flexibility of our workforce coupled with the skills they have is a valuable asset to the council”

**(b) Councillor Turton**

“How many call centres serving the public does the Council have?”

**Reply from Councillor Kitcat, Cabinet Member for Finance and Central Services.**

“The Council is committed to improving the public telephone service within its customer access strategy. Our objective is to improve the whole customer experience, as underlined in the Customer Promise (we will be easy to reach; we will be clear and treat you with respect; we listen and act to get things done). This means enhancing customer service across all access channels (telephones, face to face and digital) and improving how those channels inter-relate.

On the telephones, we need to strike a balance between timely and efficient call answering and ensuring customer’s speak to the correct officer who can fully resolve the query. We are developing our front and back office processes to get the right mix of processes, technology and officer skills.

The council delivers a vast amount of services across the city; the majority of which have a telephone line for external customers to contact them. There are 16 services that are considered to have high volume telephone use. They all employ call centre technology to different degrees depending on their customer base and the proportion of calls that need to be handled by specialists. However, they are not call centres as the public perception might imagine them, in that they are not each cubicle farms of people with headsets dealing with nothing but calls. They are staffed by council officers going about their daily duties, which include responding to public enquiries.

We are currently upgrading our telephony systems and, as part of the recently agreed ICT strategy, will be reducing the number of different IT systems used to handle customer information. We are also developing the next stage in our customer access plan focusing on ensuring we are providing the most appropriate access be that face-to-face, post, telephone or internet. This includes looking at options to drive more calls through a single number. The plan will also link even more closely to other major initiatives (such as workstyles).”

**(c) Councillor Turton**

“Since May 2010 to date, have any individuals who are not either councillors or employees of the Council been provided with a Council email account and, if so, for what reason?”

**Reply from Councillor Kitcat, Cabinet Member for Finance and Central Services.**

“The creation of email accounts is administered through the new starters process and is applicable to all Council employees, officers of the council employed by partner organisations, casual/agency workers and contractors.

Since May 2010 the following individuals, who are not councillors or employees of the Council, have been set up with an email account:

1 x agency worker	Temporary arrangement contracted by the council to process caseload. Now ceased.
1 x South Downs Health Officer	Joint working with South Downs Health.
1 x Sussex Police Officer	Joint working with Sussex Police.
3 x employees of FutureGov	Contracted on behalf of the council to engage in development of Patchwork initiative 24/10/11 – 27/04/12.

All users of council provided email are subject to the controls outlined in:

- a. BHCC Acceptable use of ICT Policy which defines the acceptable use of ICT services for all Elected Members, employees and contractors of the council
- b. BHCC Email Use Policy covering the use of all Council email systems on any computer system including any access to the Councils email via the internet.”

**(d) Councillor G Theobald**

“Will the Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety please give me an update on progress with the Council’s bid for the March 2012 round of Government Armed Forces Community Covenant Grant funding?”

## **Reply from Councillor Duncan, Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety**

“The Communities & Equality Team has started work on ensuring the inclusion of the armed forces community as part of the council’s wider work to tackle inequality.

We are waiting for the results of the Veteran’s Health needs analysis to provide data on the number and needs of local veterans. This will be released in May 2012. In the meantime we are working with local armed forces organisations and our commissioned community development workers to identify issues and possible activities to support local people.

In developing the Community Covenant Partnership our intention is to build on the existing Armed Forces network to include community and voluntary sector representatives. This will support broader community activity which can be funded from our existing discretionary grants. We are unsure at this stage whether the people involved would prefer a Brighton & Hove only approach, or one that covers the whole of Sussex.

Although there are no national resources still available this financial year there will be an opportunity to access government funding in 2012/13 – with quarterly decision-making panels.

In Brighton & Hove we are also planning to re-launch the Heroes Welcome campaign. We are also working with Armed Forces representatives to build a larger presence at People’s Day in June. We are also mindful that it is the WW1 centenary in 2014 and we’re already actively looking to resource an event to mark this.”

### **(e) Councillor G Theobald**

“Will the Leader of the Council list the meetings he has had with other local authority Leaders and heads of other organisations in the city about the possibility of sharing central services such as Human Resources and what was the result of these meetings?”

### **Reply from Councillor Randall, Leader of the Council.**

“I have continued the previous administration’s commitment to working alongside other local authorities in the region through the South East 7 partnership. This comprises Kent, Hampshire, East Sussex, West Sussex, Surrey and Medway alongside Brighton & Hove. This group has focused on areas where we consider we could achieve financial savings through better procurement and we are collaborating on a whole range of policy initiatives and are getting excellent support from many government departments. Brighton & Hove, through the Director of Finance, are leading work on ICT across the region and great progress has been made in improving our ICT infrastructure through a project known as the “network of networks”.

All the councils have been jointly funding some ICT category management expertise to make sure we get the best available deals from ICT suppliers across the region. There is also work on property asset management and commodities procurement through the SE7 partnership.

The Strategic Director Resources is also discussing with East Sussex possible areas for sharing support services and it has been agreed to consider a few areas in more detail. One specific area that is showing great promise is the combined development of a local Public Service Network (called LINK). This initiative, started as part of SE7 work, is a joint procurement on behalf of various partners that will initially deliver cheaper, secure connections to each organisation. In the future, there will be additional benefits such as shared applications (e.g. telephony and video-conferencing) and a platform for shared services and processes. The OJEU notice for this procurement was published on 26 October 2011, with an estimated value of between £10 million and £100 million

We are also pleased to be working alongside the South Downs National Park Authority as their provider of financial services, including payroll, and Chief Finance Officer support over the last two years. We have recently tendered for a 3-5 year contract for this service through a full OJEU procurement exercise and I am delighted to be able to announce that our bid has been successful.

Within the City, the Public Service Board has asked us, through the Strategic Director Resources, to lead a steering group to look at sharing support services across all public sector organisations. Partners have indicated a wish to look in detail at several possibilities including customer access, property, HR, ICT, learning and development, communications and others. The development of the Clinical commissioning Group opens up specific opportunities for sharing and several areas have been identified for further review. A City property group meets to specifically look at opportunities in sharing accommodation and discussions with the Police on their use of rooms in Hove Town Hall are ongoing.

We strongly believe that shared service arrangements are a positive way to distribute the costs of our support services and save money. We recognise that strong leadership and good planning is required to ensure success.”

**(f) Councillor Brown**

“How many applications has the Council so far received for Diamond Jubilee street parties and what is the Administration doing to encourage community events over the weekend of 2nd-4th June?”

**Reply from Councillor Bowden, Cabinet member for Culture, Recreation and Tourism.**

“To date we have had one completed application for a street party to celebrate the Diamond Jubilee and around 20 calls and enquiries on the subject.

However in the run-up to the Royal Wedding, we had a large number of late applications for street parties, and we expect this to happen this year also.

We are not charging fees for road closures for the Diamond Jubilee, making it easier and cheaper for groups to run street parties. We will be advertising small-scale funding to support community groups wanting to put on celebratory events during the summer, now that we have confirmation of community funding budgets for 2012/13.”

**(g) Councillor C Theobald**

“What is the Council doing to take advantage of the Government’s new £24 million Coastal Communities Fund, either by submitting a bid directly, or by helping other organisations in the city to bid?”

**Reply from Councillor Randall, Leader of the Council.**

“We received notification of the launch prospectus in mid February and the expressions of interest must be complete by the end of March.

Whilst these deadlines are tight, I can confirm that we, as the local authority, will be making a formal expression of interest to the Fund. I am also pleased to say that officers from across the Council have supported awareness of the Fund among local partners as well as considering where we can match existing priorities to the Fund objectives.

Given the extremely tight deadlines, the expression of interest from the authority will focus on two key areas:

- Two bids related to training and skills development will be worked up jointly with partners involved in the City Employment and Skills Training Group. The group includes City College, Brighton & Hove Chamber of Commerce, Albion in the Community, the Economic Partnership, the LEP, CVSF, Job Centre Plus and others.
- o One funding application will be submitted for the Build Green project which aims to raise awareness of new technologies and develop the skills of local residents and businesses in sustainable construction methods through training.
- o The second bid is looking to research, develop and implement training programmes and develop business employment strategies and activities in order to equip and encourage young people to work in the Shoreham Port Regeneration area.
- A bid related to the seafront, specifically Madeira Drive, to support economic growth and wider regeneration in the area. This focus on Madeira Drive partly arises from cross-party work into the seafront strategy at a Culture Scrutiny meeting.

If successful in the shortlisting phase, the authority will be required to submit a full application and business plan by September with a decision due in December.

DCLG has also indicated that it expects to run two further rounds of funding in 2013 and 2014 and we will be looking to apply in future rounds to both of these to ensure that local community organisations, charities and others can make the most of the funds available to enhance our City and promote employment and jobs.”

**(h) Councillor Cox**

“What steps are being taken to ensure that the Olympic Torch parade and other planned Olympic events in the city, are not disrupted following recent threats to do so by prominent Trade Union leaders?”

**Reply from Councillor Randall, Leader of the Council.**

“We have heard of no planned action from the local Trade Union leadership during the Olympic Torch Parade.

In terms of our general plans for the Torch parade and other associated events, a full Event Management Team (EMT) has been convened and has already met twice. This group consists of the police, fire, ambulance service, civil contingencies, the council's health, safety and licensing department and others. We are working closely with both Sussex and the Metropolitan Police.

These plans are reviewed by the city-wide Safety Advisory Group, comprising of senior officers from the emergency services, healthcare providers and council personnel, including civil contingencies (emergency planning).

The council is also employing both volunteers and paid traffic management stewards to assist the police with the torch relay route.

Finally, we have every faith in our excellent local police and if Cllr Cox has any information, perhaps he can share it with Chief Superintendent Graham Bartlett.”

**(i) Councillor Cox**

“Overall, communal bins have been widely welcomed as a success when sited in suitable locations, with less rubbish spoiling the street scene. What plans does the Administration have for extending the use of communal bins to other suitable neighbourhoods?”

**Reply from Councillor West, Cabinet Member for Environment and Sustainability.**

“Communal bins have indeed been widely welcomed and resulted in cleaner streets in areas of high density housing.

This week we have begun a communal recycling trial with 3200 households in Brunswick and Adelaide ward to see if this makes recycling easier for residents. When we consulted these residents 87% of them were willing to give the trial a go, which is very encouraging.

If it is successful, and results in increased recycling rates, we will consult residents on rolling this service out more widely in the communal bin area.

Officers are also working with ward councillors in Hanover to see whether communal refuse could be introduced here. The streets in Hanover are very narrow and refuse containment is a problem. A trial in a few streets has been successful but further assessment and consultation with residents is needed before a decision is made.

No other areas are currently being considered for communal refuse. However officers are happy to discuss any particular suggestions for streets to be included in the scheme”

**(j) Councillor Wealls**

“Will the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People please identify the total value of services for children and young people that were commissioned ‘intelligently’ with an open tendering process in the year 2011/12, and those that will undergo a similar process in 2012/13?”

**Reply from Councillor Shanks, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People.**

“Details of services for children and young people commissioned during 2011/12 and plans for 2012/13 are set out in the City Commissioning Work Plan agreed by Cabinet.

This includes services to address child poverty, to support families in multiple disadvantage and to improve outcomes for young people. A significant proportion of services are jointly commissioned with health including services for children with a disability, child and adolescent mental health services and provision for vulnerable teenagers.

Collaboration and co-production underpins intelligent commissioning - fully engaging service users, communities and partners to understand need and existing services, to define outcomes and design care pathways and to prioritise efficiency and value for money.



In this context Intelligent commissioning may include an open tendering process if there is evidence this is the best option to develop the market, reduce costs and sustain the local economy.

That has not been the case during 2011/12. The approach taken with youth work provision, for example, has been to give established local providers the opportunity to work together to meet the challenges set out in the joint commissioning strategy. This approach has received considerable national attention and last week praise from Tim Loughton.

However, during 2012/13 the council, in partnership with West Sussex Council, will re-tender the framework for accredited and preferred providers of children's residential and fostering services which has been in place since 2008. The total value for these services in 2011/12 was £13.3m out of a children, youth and families commissioning budget of £17.127m."



**Council**

22 March 2012

**Agenda Item 83**

Brighton &amp; Hove City Council

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Traveller Scrutiny Review – Extract from the proceedings of the Cabinet Meeting held on 15 March 2012</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>22 March 2012</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director; Resources</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Mark Wall</b>	<b>Tel: 29-1006</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

**CABINET**

**4.00 pm 15 March 2012  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Randall (Chair), Bowden, Davey, Duncan, Jarrett, J Kitcat, Shanks, Wakefield and West

**Also in attendance:** Councillors G. Theobald and Mitchell.

**Other Members present:**

**PART ONE****221. TRAVELLER STRATEGY SCRUTINY REVIEW**

- 221.1 Councillor Littman introduced the report which detailed the findings and recommendations of the Traveller Scrutiny Panel and the response to those recommendations from the Administration. He stated that he wished to thank the Chair of the Panel, Aidan McGarry from the University of Brighton, and the other panel members for undertaking such a positive piece of work. He also commended the support and work of the scrutiny team in servicing the panel and helping to formulate the report. He welcomed the draft Traveller Commissioning Strategy and the response from the Executive to the Panel's recommendations.
- 221.2 Councillor West stated that he wished to thank the panel for their work and the various witnesses that had given evidence and welcomed the report. He believed it had been a valuable piece of work and stated that it had contributed to the development of the strategy. It was an excellent example of how the scrutiny process could be utilised to formulate policy and he hoped that it would continue to be used in such a way under the proposed new governance arrangements.
- 221.3 The Chair noted the comments and stated that he believed it was an excellent piece of work and was pleased to see that scrutiny would continue under the new arrangements.

221.4 Councillor Mitchell stated that she agreed with the previous comments and believed that the report had helped to improve the commissioning strategy that was also on the agenda and hoped that the scrutiny resource would continue to be used in such an effective way.

221.5 Councillor G. Theobald welcomed the review and hoped that it might lead to a joint Sussex-wide protocol being developed for addressing unauthorised encampments in the future. He also stated that there were a few of recommendations that he did not agree with, in particular recommendation 22.

221.6 Councillor West stated that with regard to the Sussex-wide protocol he would raise it with colleagues from East and West Sussex and in relation to recommendation 22, he felt that councillors had a responsible role to play and should therefore have the opportunity to keep abreast of matters through training.

221.7 The Chair thanked the Panel for the report and put the recommendations to the Cabinet for agreement.

221.8 **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That Scrutiny Panel's report and recommendations as detailed in appendix 2 to the report be noted;
- (2) That the responses and associated actions as detailed in appendix 1 to the report be approved; and
- (3) That the Cabinet's thanks be passed on to the Traveller Scrutiny Panel, those providing evidence and the officers supporting the panel for carrying out such a valuable and comprehensive piece of work to such a tight timescale.

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Traveller Commissioning Strategy 2012 – Extract from the proceedings of the Cabinet Meeting held on 15 March 2012</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>22 March 2012</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director; Resources</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Mark Wall</b>	<b>Tel: 29-1006</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

**CABINET**

**4.00 pm 15 March 2012  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Randall (Chair), Bowden, Davey, Duncan, Jarrett, J Kitcat, Shanks, Wakefield and West

**Also in attendance:** Councillors G. Theobald and Mitchell.

**Other Members present:**

**PART ONE****222. TRAVELLER COMMISSIONING STRATEGY 2012**

- 222.1 Councillor West introduced the report and stated that he was delighted to present to the Traveller Commissioning Strategy to the Cabinet. He believed that it outlined a strategy which responded to balancing the needs of the travelling community as well as local people. The strategy was based on four underlying principles, to improve site availability, to improve health, safety and wellbeing, to improve education outcomes and to improve community cohesion. He believed that it was already making a difference and was proving to be a significant step forward.
- 222.2 Councillor Mitchell welcomed the report and stated that the Labour & Co-operative Group fully supported the strategy, which struck the right balance for both travellers and local people. She hoped that there would be some greater clarification around tolerated sites and further consideration on how to manage unauthorised encampments.
- 222.3 Councillor G. Theobald noted that the Government was expected to issue guidance shortly in regard to dealing with unauthorised encampments and he hoped that discussions with colleagues from other authorities and the police would lead to an agreed protocol in relation to the process for dealing with such unauthorised encampments. He also referred to pages 187 and 259 of the report and asked for

clarification with regard to the figures and level of service charges that remained uncollected.

222.4 Councillor West stated that the numbers did vary and the figures used showed a snap shot in time. He stated that he would raise the question with the Secretary of State in regard to having a National Framework for dealing with unauthorised encampments and noted that improvements had been made recently to prevent incursions to certain areas within the city.

222.5 The Chair noted that officers would provide Councillor Theobald with a briefing on the points raised and stated that he wished to thank everyone involved in the development of and bringing forward of the strategy. He then put the recommendations to the Cabinet for agreement.

222.6 **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That Full Council be recommended to approve the Traveller Commissioning Strategy 2012 (Appendix 1) and accompanying Action Plan (Appendix 2);
- (2) That Full Council be recommended to delegate authority to the Strategic Directors and Heads of Delivery to take all steps necessary or incidental to the Traveller Commissioning Strategy 2012 and accompanying Action Plan; and
- (3) That Full Council be recommended to thank the local residents, Travellers, Community & Voluntary Sector Organisations, community representatives, officers from other public sector organisations and the Traveller Scrutiny Panel who have given their time to help develop the Strategy.

**Council**

22 March 2012

**Agenda Item 85**

Brighton &amp; Hove City Council

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>The Council's Equality Policy and Action Plan – Extract from the proceedings of the Cabinet Meeting held on 15 March 2012</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>22 March 2012</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director; Resources</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Mark Wall</b>	<b>Tel: 29-1006</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

**CABINET**

**4.00 pm 15 March 2012  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Randall (Chair), Bowden, Davey, Duncan, Jarrett, J Kitcat, Shanks, Wakefield and West

**Also in attendance:** Councillors G. Theobald and Mitchell.

**Other Members present:**

**PART ONE****224. THE COUNCIL'S EQUALITY POLICY AND ACTION PLAN**

224.1 Councillor Duncan introduced the report which set out the new Equality & Inclusion Policy 2012-15 for the council and replaced the council's Single Equality Scheme and Working Towards and Inclusive City Policy. He noted that the new approach took key priorities and city issues from the Corporate Plan and sought to address them within the new Equality Objectives. He hoped that the new policy would lead to greater joint working and improved accessibility to all thereby creating a more equal city for everyone.

**224.2 RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the draft Equality and Inclusion Policy (2012-15) as set out in appendix 1 to the report be agreed;
- (2) That the draft Equality and inclusion Policy (2012-15) be recommended to the Full Council for approval; and
- (3) That it be noted that the corporate actions to deliver on the objectives as set out in Section 2 of the Policy, and that a full, measurable action plan will be developed through consultation to support the agreed objectives, for submission to the appropriate Committee after consultation.





**Council**

22 March 2012

**Agenda Item 86**

Brighton &amp; Hove City Council

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Youth Justice Strategic Plan 2012-13 – Extract from the proceedings of the Cabinet Meeting held on 15 March 2012</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>22 March 2012</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director; Resources</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Mark Wall</b>	<b>Tel: 29-1006</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

**CABINET**

**4.00 pm 15 March 2012**  
**COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Randall (Chair), Bowden, Davey, Duncan, Jarrett, J Kitcat, Shanks, Wakefield and West

**Also in attendance:** Councillors G. Theobald and Mitchell.

**Other Members present:**

**PART ONE****225. YOUTH JUSTICE STRATEGIC PLAN 2012-13**

- 225.1 Councillor Shanks introduced the report which set out how the Youth Offending Team (YOT) would be resourced and the services that would be available in relation to the statutory primary aim of YOTs to prevent youth offending in the area. She stated that the team had been recently restructured and was working closely with other agencies to ensure a comprehensive service was provided. She noted that there had also been a recent peer review and as a result changes to the service were being implemented on an ongoing basis.
- 225.2 Councillor Mitchell noted the report and expressed her concern over the information provided and lack of detail that was available to Members. She believed that there was a need for further information to be made available and hoped that this could be addressed as currently it appeared that there was a lack of support to the young people that should be provided for. She was concerned about the lack of individual support plans and smart targets to ensure progress could be identified.
- 225.3 Councillor Shanks acknowledged that the report could have had more detail, however there had been changes made to the team and its role which were only just beginning to settle in and she would be happy to ask officers to provide separate briefings for

Members on how things were progressing. There was a need to develop a strategic plan for 2012/13 and to seek council approval of that plan and this was the essence of the report.

225.4 Councillor G. Theobald stated that he felt that the report could have had more information but noted that his colleagues who had a direct interest in Children's Services had met with the service manager and were very positive about how the team was moving forward.

225.5 The Service Manager informed the meeting that following the recent peer review an agreed programme of improvement had been identified and would be taken forward. There had been a need to prepare the strategic plan for the current year and it was then intended to develop targets and on-going objectives that would feed into an action plan and a more comprehensive strategic plan for 2013/14.

225.6 The Chair noted the comments and suggested that officers provide a separate briefing for Councillor Mitchell, and therefore put the recommendations to the vote.

225.7 **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Youth Justice Plan 2012-2015 as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report be agreed; and
- (2) That Cabinet authorises the Strategic Director of People to proceed with the Youth Justice Plan for 2012-2015.

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Admissions Arrangements for Brighton and Hove Schools 2013/14 – Extract from the proceedings of the Cabinet Meeting held on 15 March 2012</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>22 March 2012</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director; Resources</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Mark Wall</b>	<b>Tel: 29-1006</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All		

**CABINET**

**4.00 pm 15 March 2012  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Randall (Chair), Bowden, Davey, Duncan, Jarrett, J Kitcat, Shanks, Wakefield and West

**Also in attendance:** Councillors G. Theobald and Mitchell.

**Other Members present:**

**PART ONE****220. ADMISSIONS ARRANGEMENTS FOR BRIGHTON AND HOVE SCHOOLS 2013/14**

- 220.1 Councillor Shanks introduced the report which detailed the proposed school admission arrangements for 2013/14 in Brighton and Hove. She stated that there had been a consultation process and as a result some changes to the proposals had been made and a further consultation process was proposed for Dorothy Stringer and Varndean catchment areas, which meant that the existing boundary would be retained for next year's intake. She also noted that the sibling link was to be retained for children within the catchment areas but that it would cease for those living outside a catchment area from 2013.
- 220.2 Councillor Mitchell stated that she had concerns with regard to the sibling link but accepted the point in relation to distance measurement. She also noted that there was a need for at least one new secondary school and queried how this was to be achieved.
- 220.3 Councillor G. Theobald stated that there was a need to take account of the impact of 'free' schools and the boundaries for existing schools such as Hove Park and Blatchington Mill. He noted that Patcham High had a number of places available yet it was proposed to expand Dorothy Stringer and Varndean Schools and not Patcham High.

220.4 Councillor Shanks stated that the School Organisation Plan was currently out for consultation and it should address a number of the points raised. She noted that there was pressure for the popular schools and again was happy to ensure the next round of consultation included the possibility of expanding Patcham High, which was improving.

220.5 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote.

**220.6 RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE COUNCIL:**

- (1) That the proposed school admission numbers set out in the consultation documents be adopted for the admissions year 2013/14, with the exception of Portslade Infant School which it is proposed will become a primary school with an admission number of 60, and St Nicolas' CE Junior School which it is proposed will admit 60 reception children in addition to the 64 year 3 children proposed. Both of these proposed changes are currently going through the statutory processes in order to take effect in September 2013;
- (2) That the admission priorities for Community Schools set out in the Consultation documents be adopted for all age groups, with the amendments set out below;
- (3) That priority 1 (Children in the Care of a local authority) should be extended to include 'children who were looked after, but ceased to be so because they were adopted (or became subject to a residence order or special guardianship order);
- (4) That the proposal to alter the boundary between the catchment areas for Portslade Aldridge Community Academy (PACA) and Blatchington Mill/Hove Park be adopted so that the shaded area on Map 4 of the consultation documents be included in the catchment area for PACA and not the catchment area for Blatchington Mill/Hove Park; and
- (5) That the proposal to amend the sibling link so that it only applies within catchment area be adopted, but that the protection for those living in areas which have changed catchment area be adopted as described in the consultation document.

**220.7 RESOLVED:**

- (6) That the proposed change to the method of measuring distance for Infant, Junior and Primary Schools to 'as the crow flies' not be adopted, but that the existing method of measuring by the shortest available route be retained;
- (7) That the proposal to alter the boundary between the catchment areas for Dorothy Stringer/Vardean and Blatchington Mill/Hove Park not be adopted for 2013/14, but be postponed until 2014/15 to allow for a wider consultation to take place, and that the existing boundary be retained for 2013/14;
- (8) That the Council should review the final version of the Cardinal Newman Roman Catholic Secondary School admission arrangements fro 2013/14 (as amended in light of the Diocesan response and parental and school responses) to decide whether it should comment further;

- (9) That the co-ordinated schemes of admission be approved; and
- (10) That the City boundary be retained as the relevant area for consultation for school admissions.



<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Pay Policy Statement – Extract from the proceedings of the Governance Committee Meeting held on 20 March 2012</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>22 March 2012</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director; Resources</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Mark Wall</b>	<b>Tel: 29-1006</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All		

## **GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

**4.00 pm 20 March 2012  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

### **MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Littman (Chair), A Norman (Deputy Chair), Cox, Mitchell, Morgan, Powell, Randall, G Theobald, MacCafferty and Shanks.

**Also in attendance:** Mr. S. Keane, Chairman of the Independent Remuneration Panel.

### **PART ONE**

#### **75. PAY POLICY STATEMENT**

- 75.1 The Committee considered the report of Strategic Director Resources on the Pay Policy Statement. The committee were advised that the Localism Act 2011 required Local Authorities to produce a pay policy statement for 2012/13 and for each subsequent financial year. The statements should set out the council's policies on a range of issues relating to the pay of its workforce, particularly its senior and lowest paid staff. The committee were asked to recommend Council to adopt the Pay Policy Statement as set out in the report.
- 75.2 Councillor Mitchell said that the Labour and Cooperative Party could not recommend the proposed policy to Council as the party had issues with the higher paid members of staff. Councillor Mitchell referred to paragraph 3 of the Pay Policy Statement relating to the lowest paid members of staff, and asked if all those who were casual workers would be paid the Living Wage. Councillor Mitchell was advised that were different categories of casual staff. There were two thousand casual staff on the council's books, but only 500 currently working for the council with many of them only working one day a week. The agency staff were different in that the council paid the agency a set rate for the job. All workers were paid at least the Living Wage.

- 75.3 Councillor Norman referred to paragraph 4 of the Pay Policy Statement, which stated that council would have the opportunity to vote on salary packages of over £100,000 prior to an appointment being made. Councillor Norman was concerned that due to the number of Full Council meetings being held there may be a delay in getting agreement and thereby appointing staff. Councillor Norman was advised that there could be problems with timing and suggested that consideration of salary packages could be delegated to a committee. Councillor Randall thought that it would be sensible to delegate that duty to a committee. The committee were advised that there was Code of Recommended Practices and the council were looking to follow that Code.
- 75.4 Councillor Theobald noted paragraph 3.7 of the report which referred to the system of 'earn back'. Councillor Theobald was advised that the council didn't operate performance related pay and so 'earn back' could not be implemented.
- 75.5 Councillor Powell asked if the Living Wage were paid to agency staff. Councillor Powell was advised that agency workers were covered by an Agency Workers Directive, but once they had been employed for eight weeks by the council they would be covered by the Living Wage.
- 75.6 Councillor Powell referred to paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Pay Policy Statement and asked if comparators were used to set the salary of the most senior members of staff. It was confirmed that comparators from other local authorities were used.
- 75.7 **RESOLVED:**
- (1) That the committee recommend to Council the adoption of the Pay Policy Statement as set out in appendix A to the report.
  - (2) That the proposal to extend the role of the current Member Appointment Panel to become a Recruitment and Remuneration Panel which would be responsible for the provision of advice on the council's pay policy and the starting salary of new appointees to Chief Officer posts be noted. The extended role of the Panel would come into force when the new constitution was approved and adopted by full council on 26 April 2012.
  - (3) That the requirement that Council approve a Pay Policy Statement annually be noted.



<b>Subject:</b>	<b>South Downs National Park Authority – Delegation of Development Control Function to Constituent Authorities – Extract from the proceedings of the Governance Committee Meeting held on 20 March 2012</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>22 March 2012</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director; Resources</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Mark Wall</b>	<b>Tel: 29-1006</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All		

## **GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

**4.00 pm 20 March 2012  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

### **MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Littman (Chair), A Norman (Deputy Chair), Cox, Mitchell, Morgan, Powell, Randall, G Theobald, MacCafferty and Shanks.

**Also in attendance:** Mr. S. Keane, Chairman of the Independent Remuneration Panel.

### **PART ONE**

#### **73. SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY – DELEGATION OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FUNCTION TO CONSTITUENT AUTHORITIES**

73.1 The committee considered the report of the Strategic Director, Place regarding the South Downs National Park Authority and the termination of Development Control Agency Arrangements in Brighton and Hove. The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) became the Local Planning Authority for the National Park on 1 April 2011. The Council entered into an Agency Agreement under s101 of the Local Government Act 1972 with the SDNPA to provide Development Control services for that part of the National Park within the City on a temporary basis of up to three years. The report sought to terminate that agreement. The number of application reviewed over the last year had been low, with 23 applications having been received. The SDNPA now had its own planning department.

73.2 Councillor Theobald said that termination of the agreement had been expected, but had concerns over where the planning meetings would be held. Councillor Theobald was advised that the meetings would be held in Midhurst, unless there were a high number

of residents involved in a matter when an alternative more locally based venue would be considered. Councillor Theobald was concerned that Midhurst was difficult to travel due, with a lack of public transport, and felt that an alternative venue such as Arundel should be considered. The Chair asked if those comments could be passed to the SDNPA.

- 73.3 **RESOLVED:** That the Council be recommended to agree that the Agency Agreement dated 21 June 2011 between South Downs National Park Authority and the Council relating to the provision of planning services in Brighton and Hove be terminated on a date to be agreed by the South Downs National Park Authority and the Strategic Director, Place.

**Council**

22 March 2012

**Agenda Item 90**

Brighton &amp; Hove City Council

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Review of Part 9.4 of the Constitution – Extract from the proceedings of the Governance Committee Meeting held on 20 March 2012</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>22 March 2012</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director; Resources</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Mark Wall</b>	<b>Tel: 29-1006</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

**GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

**4.00 pm 20 March 2012  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Littman (Chair), A Norman (Deputy Chair), Cox, Mitchell, Morgan, Powell, Randall, G Theobald, MacCafferty and Shanks.

**Also in attendance:** Mr. S. Keane, Chairman of the Independent Remuneration Panel.

**PART ONE****76. REVIEW OF PART 9.4 OF THE CONSTITUTION**

- 76.1 The committee considered the report of the Strategic Director Resources on the review of Part 9.4 of the Council's Constitution, which covered guidance to Members and officer serving on outside bodies. A number of changes to the regulatory framework relevant to outside appointments had occurred since Part 9.4 was last reviewed. The report highlighted those changes and proposed an amended version. Governance Committee was asked to agree the amendments and recommend them to Council.
- 76.2 **RESOLVED:** That the amended version of Part 9.4 of the Council's constitution, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report be agreed, and recommended to Council for approval.



**Council**

22 March 2012

**Agenda Item 90 A**

Brighton &amp; Hove City Council

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Annual Investment Strategy – Extract from the proceedings of the Cabinet Meeting held on 15 March 2012</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>22 March 2012</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Strategic Director; Resources</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Mark Wall</b>	<b>Tel: 29-1006</b>
	<b>E-mail:</b>	mark.wall@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
<b>Wards Affected:</b>	All		

**CABINET**

**4.00 pm 15 March 2012  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors Randall (Chair), Bowden, Davey, Duncan, Jarrett, J Kitcat, Shanks, Wakefield and West

**Also in attendance:** Councillors G. Theobald and Mitchell.

**Other Members present:**

Note: The Mayor has agreed to take this item as a matter of urgency on the agenda as Item 90 A as the Annual Investment Strategy 2012/13 needs to be considered by the Council.

The special circumstances for non-compliance with Council Procedure Rule 3, Access to Information Procedure Rule 5 and Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (items not considered unless the agenda is open to inspection at least five days in advance of the meeting) were that the report had been inadvertently missed from the agenda papers and should have been referred to the Council meeting following the Cabinet meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> March.

**PART ONE****215. ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY**

215.1 Councillor J. Kitcat introduced the report which detailed the Annual Investment Strategy for 2012/13 and recommended that it be agreed and submitted to the Council for approval. He stated that in having regard to the current economic climate the number of institutions that could be used for financial investment was being reduced and officers were investigating whether other bodies which were not part of the credit rating scheme could be used.

215.2 Councillor G. Theobald welcomed the report and the work of the officers concerned in the financial management of the council's investments.

215.3 Councillor Mitchell noted the report and asked if in future there could be details of which institutions were determined by officers as possibly being invested in.

215.4 Councillor J. Kitcat noted the comments and agreed to raise the matter with the officers.

215.5 The Chair then put the recommendations to the vote.

215.6 **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Annual Investment Strategy 2012/13 as set out in Appendix 1 to the report be agreed; and
- (2) That the Annual Investment Strategy 2012/13 be recommended to Council for approval.

**Subject:** Annual Investment Strategy 2012/13  
**Date of Meeting:** Cabinet – 15 March 2012  
Council – 22 March 2012  
**Report of:** Director of Finance  
**Contact Officer:** Name: Peter Sargent Tel: 29-1241  
E-mail: peter.sargent@brighton-hove.gov.uk  
**Key Decision:** Yes Forward Plan No. CAB 21063  
**Wards Affected:** All

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE****1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:**

- 1.1 The Local Government Act 2003 introduced a prudential capital finance system whereby levels of borrowing and investments are decided locally by each council.
- 1.2 Guidance issued under the Act requires a local authority to approve an annual investment strategy which gives priority to security and liquidity and requires the council to set out:
- its policy on determining the credit-worthiness of its investment counterparties and the frequency at which such determinations are monitored;
  - its policy on holding investment instruments other than deposits held in financial institutions or government bodies;
  - its policy on determining the maximum periods for which funds may be invested;
  - its policy on the minimum level of investments to be held at any one time.
- 1.3 The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet approval to the Annual Investment Strategy 2012/13 and to recommend the Strategy to full Council for adoption at its meeting on 22 March 2012.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 Cabinet is recommended to:
- agree the Annual Investment Strategy 2012/13 as set in Appendix 1 to this report; and
  - recommend Council to approve the Strategy at the meeting on 22 March 2012.
- 2.2 Council is recommended to approve the Annual Investment Strategy 2012/13 as set out in Appendix 1 to this report.

**3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:**

*Strategy 2012/13*

- 3.1 The Annual Investment Strategy (AIS) for 2012/13 is set out in Appendix 1 to this report and covers investments made by the in-house treasury team and the council's external cash manager. The council uses a cash manager to take advantage of investment opportunities in specialist markets not covered by the in-house team, such as government stock. The AIS gives priority to security and liquidity.
- 3.2 Security is achieved by;
- selecting only those institutions that meet stringent credit rating criteria or, in the case of non-rated UK building societies, have a substantial asset base, and
  - having limits on the amount invested with any one institution.
- 3.3 The council uses independent credit rating agencies to assess the creditworthiness of investment counterparties. The AIS 2012/13 continues with the policy of assessing creditworthiness by applying the lowest rating issued by the three main rating agencies – Fitch, Moody's and Standard & Poor's. In the majority of cases the ratings issued by the three agencies are aligned but this is not always the case.
- 3.4 Rating criteria is only one factor taken into account in determining investment counterparties. Other factors, such as articles in the financial press, will continue to be monitored and action will be taken where it is felt the risk attached to a particular counterparty has or is likely to worsen. Action will include the suspension of a counterparty in appropriate circumstances.
- 3.5 Liquidity is achieved by limiting the maximum period for investment and matching investment periods to cash flow requirements.

*Revision to Strategy in 2012/13*

- 3.6 The AIS continues with the low risk strategy adopted in previous years. However since the AIS 2011/12 was approved, the rating agencies have downgraded most of the institutions on the council's approved investment counterparty list. These downgrades have resulted in a number of counterparties having a reduction in the maximum period of investment and / or a reduction in the maximum amount invested. Two counterparties have been removed from the list. Details are set out in the table below.

Counterparty	AIS 2012/13		Change from AIS 2011/12
	Amount	Period	
Barclays Bank	£5m	1 yr	Previously £10m for 2 yrs
HSBC Bank	£10m	1 yr	Previously £10m for 2 yrs
Santander UK plc	£5m	1 yr	Previously £10m for 2 yrs
Leeds Building Soc	£5m	6 mths	Previously £5m for 1 yr
Clydesdale Bank	Removed		Previously £5m for 1 yr
West Bromwich Building Soc	Removed		Previously £5m for 6 mths



#### 4. CONSULTATION

4.1 The council's external treasury advisor has been consulted.

#### 5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

##### Financial Implications:

5.1 The financial implications arising from the recommendations in this report are included in the Financing Costs budget.

Finance Officer consulted: Peter Sargent Date: 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2012

##### Legal Implications:

5.2 The council must have regard to the guidance issued by the Secretary of State in determining its policies for investment. The Director of Finance is satisfied that the recommendations in this report are consistent with the guidance issued.

5.3 There are no direct human rights implications arising from this report.

Lawyer consulted: Abraham Ghebre-Ghiorghis Date 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2012

##### Equalities Implications:

5.4 None directly arising from this report.

##### Sustainability Implications:

5.5 The council's ethical investment statement requests that institutions apply council deposits in a socially responsible manner.

##### Crime & Disorder Implications:

5.6 None directly arising from this report

##### Risk & Opportunity Management Implications:

5.7 The investment guidance issued under the 2003 Act requires the council to assess credit worthiness by reference to an independent rating agency. The AIS 2012/13 will use the ratings assigned by Fitch, Moody's and Standard & Poor's.

5.8 The ratings provide an opinion on the relative ability of an institution to meet financial commitments, such as interest, preferred dividends, repayment of principal, insurance claims or counterparty obligations. The council uses credit ratings as an indication of the likelihood of receiving its' money back in accordance with the terms of the investment. Other sources of information are used to supplement that provided by the rating agencies.

5.9 The minimum ratings set out in the AIS have the following meaning:

	<u>Generic criteria</u>	<u>Fitch</u>	<u>Moody's</u>	<u>Standard</u>
--	-------------------------	--------------	----------------	-----------------

				<u>&amp; Poor's</u>
--	--	--	--	---------------------

For investment up to 1 year

Short-term	Strong capacity for timely payment of financial commitments. Where the credit risk is particularly strong, a "+" is added to the assigned rating by Fitch and S&P	F1	P-1	A-1
------------	---	----	-----	-----

For investment in excess of 1 year

Long-term	Very strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. This capacity is not significantly vulnerable to foreseeable events.	AA-	Aa3	AA-
-----------	---	-----	-----	-----

- 5.10 Investment risk is managed by selecting only institutions that meet the council's stringent credit rating criteria. Liquidity risk is managed by applying maximum investment periods to institutions.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.11 Investment income is a resource used by the council to fund revenue expenditure. The recommendations in this report will help to minimise capital risk whilst optimising investment returns over both the short and longer term.

**6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):**

- 6.1 This report sets out the council's annual investment strategy for the year commencing 1 April 2012. The AIS continues with the strong emphasis on risk management and liquidity, two cornerstones to the draft guidance issued by the Secretary of State and the impact these have on investment performance.

**7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 Guidance issued under the Local Government Act 2003 requires the council to approve an annual investment strategy. This report fulfils that requirement.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Appendix:**

1. Annual Investment Strategy 2012/13

**Documents in Members' Rooms**

None

**Background Documents**

1. Guidance issued by the secretary of State under Section 15(1)(a) of the Local Government Act 2003 effective from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010
2. The Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities published by CIPFA – fully revised third edition 2011



**BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY**  
**COUNCIL**

**ANNUAL INVESTMENT**  
**STRATEGY**  
**2012/2013**

The Annual Investment Strategy 2012/2013 is subject to approval by Cabinet on 15 March 2012 and full Council on 22 March 2012

**Brighton & Hove City Council**  
**Annual Investment Strategy 2012/2013**

This Strategy complies with guidance issued by the Secretary of State on investments.

The following sets out the council's policy on investment criteria and counterparties. It should be noted that the minimum criteria set out in this document is only one factor taken into account for the investment of council funds. Other factors, such as Government guarantees and support and information available from the financial press and similar publications will also be taken into account when determining investment decisions. Counterparties that satisfy the minimum criteria are not automatically included on the council's approved investment list.

**1 Criteria to be used for creating / managing approved counterparty lists / limits**

Each counterparty included on the council's approved lending list must meet the criteria set out below. Without the prior approval of the council, no investment will be made in an instrument that falls outside the list below.

**1.1 Capital security**

Table 1 sets out the minimum capital security requirements for an investment to be made.

<u>Table 1 – Minimum capital security requirements</u>	
Banks/building societies with a credit rating	the institution must have a minimum short term rating of highest credit quality
Building societies that do not satisfy the minimum rating criteria above	the society must have an asset base in excess of £5 billion
Money market funds	the rating of the fund meets the minimum requirement of triple A ('AAA' / Aaa)
Debt Management Account Deposit Facility	the deposit is made in accordance with the rules and regulations relating to such investment as issued by the Debt Management Office from time to time

**1.2 Maximum permitted investment by sector**

Table 2 sets out the maximum permitted investment for each sector.

<u>Table 2 – Maximum permitted investment by sector</u>	
<u>Sector</u>	<u>%age of total investment portfolio at the time the investment made</u>
Banking sector	100%
Building society sector	75%
Local authority sector	100%
Money market funds	100%

Debt Management Account Deposit Facility	50%
Maximum amount invested for more than 1 year	25% (excl funds administered by external cash manager)

### 1.3 **Maximum permitted investment by counterparty**

#### 1.3.1 **General**

With the exception of money market funds and the Debt Management Account Deposit Facility no one counterparty may have more than 75% of the relevant sector total at the time the investment is made.

#### 1.3.2 **Rated counterparties**

Table 3 sets out the exposure limits and maximum periods for deposits based on various credit ratings.

<u>Table 3 – Exposure limits and maximum periods per counterparty (with rating)</u>				
	<u>A rating of at least (lowest of Fitch (F) / Moody's (M) / Standard &amp; Poor's (SP))</u>			
Short-term rating	F = F1+ M = P-1 SP = A-1+	F = F1+ M = P-1 SP = A-1+	F = F1+ M = P-1 SP = A-1+	F = F1 M = P-1 SP = A-1
Long-term rating	F = AA+ M = Aa1 SP = AA+	F = AA- M = Aa3 SP = AA-	F = A M = A2 SP = A	F = A M = A2 SP = A
Exposure Limit	£10m	£10m	£10m	£5m
Maximum period – fixed deposits	3 years	2 years	1 year	1 year
Maximum period – negotiable instruments	5 years	5 years	1 year	1 year

In addition investment in money market funds and open ended investment companies with a rating of 'triple A' (i.e. AAA / Aaa) is permitted up to a value of £10 million per fund.

The only exception to Table 3 is investment in the council's banker, the Co-operative Bank plc. The maximum period and exposure limit for investment in this bank will be one month and £10 million respectively.

Where there is a significant or sudden deterioration in one or more of the other ratings (e.g. financial strength, support) allocated to a counterparty, the Director of Finance will undertake a review and, where necessary, suspend the counterparty from the council's approved lending list.

#### 1.3.3 **Non-rated counterparties**

Table 4 sets out the exposure limits and maximum periods for deposits for counterparties that are not rated.

<u>Table 4 – Exposure limits and maximum periods per counterparty / fund</u> (with no rating)		
<u>Counterparty</u>	<u>Exposure Limit</u>	<u>Maximum period</u>
Local authority	£5 million	1 year
Non-rated building society with an asset base in excess of £5bn	£5 million	6 months
Debt Management Account Deposit Facility	£10 million	6 months

#### **1.3.4 Cash manager**

For the purposes of investments made by the council's external cash manager, the criteria in Table 5 will apply:

<u>Table 5 – Exposure limits and maximum periods per counterparty</u> (Cash manager)		
<u>Instrument</u>	<u>Exposure Limit</u>	<u>Maximum period</u>
Government stock	100% of Fund	10 years
Supra-national with minimum long-term rating of 'AA-' / Aa3 / AA-'	100% of Fund	10 years
Regulation collective investment schemes	100% of Fund	n/a
Fixed term investments – minimum short-term rating of 'F1 / P-1 / A-1'	10% of Fund or £2.5m whichever is the greater	1 year
Fixed term investments – minimum long-term rating of 'AA- / Aa3 / AA-'	10% of Fund or £2.5m whichever is the greater	5 years

In addition to Table 5 the maximum average duration of the fund managed by the cash manager shall not exceed 4 years. All instruments used by the cash manager with a maturity of 3 months or more shall be negotiable.

#### **1.4 Investment classification (regulatory)**

The investment guidance issued by the Secretary of State requires the council to identify investments as either 'specified' or 'non-specified'. Table 6 sets out the requirements for each type.

<u>Table 6 – Investment classification</u>		
<u>Requirement</u>	<u>Specified</u>	<u>Non-specified</u>
Currency	Must be in Sterling	Any currency
Maturity period	Up to 12 months	Over 12 months



Credit worth	Counterparty with high credit rating or UK government or local authority	Other
--------------	--	-------

All investments made by the council are denominated in Sterling and are made only in counterparties as set out in paragraph 1.3 above.

The maximum amount invested in non-specified investments will be 50% of the total value of investments. The use of non-specified investments is limited to:

- (a) investment in non-rated building societies with an asset base in excess of £5bn, or
- (b) investment for longer than 12 months in counterparties that meet the minimum long-term rating detailed in Tables 3 and 5 above.

**2 Approved methodology for changing limits and adding / removing counterparties**

A counterparty shall be removed from the council’s list where a change in their credit rating results in a failure to meet the criteria set out above.

A new counterparty may only be added to the list with the written prior approval of the Director of Finance and only where the counterparty meets the minimum criteria set out above.

A counterparty’s exposure limit will be reviewed (and changed where necessary) following notification of a change in that counterparty’s credit rating or a view expressed by the credit rating agency warrants a change.

A counterparty’s exposure limit will also be reviewed where information contained in the financial press or other similar publications indicates a possible worsening in credit worth of a counterparty. The review may lead to the suspension of a counterparty where it is considered appropriate to do so by the Director of Finance.

**3 Full individual listings of counterparties and counterparty limits**

For 2012/13 direct investment by the in-house treasury team will be restricted to UK banks and buildings societies, local and public bodies, money market funds and the DMADF.

A full list of counterparties in which the council will invest surplus funds, together with limits and maximum investment periods is contained in Schedule 1 to this AIS.

There is no pre-determined list for investments made by the cash manager but all counterparties must meet the minimum criteria as set out in Table 5 above.

**4 Details of credit rating agencies’ services**

Credit ratings will be based on those issued periodically by the Fitch Ratings Group, Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s.

**5 Permitted types of investment instrument**

All investments must be denominated in Sterling.

The in-house treasury team may invest in fixed term and variable term cash deposits, money market funds and open ended investment companies. The in-

house treasury team may only invest in negotiable instruments where to do so offers additional value in terms of investment return and appropriate and supporting advice has been sought from the council's external treasury advisors on the suitability of such an investment.

The cash manager may invest in government stock, supranational institutions, regulation collective investment funds and fixed term instruments. All investments with a maturity of 3 months or more shall be negotiable.

## **6 Investment risk**

### **6.1 Assessment of credit risk**

Whilst the AIS relies primarily on the application of credit ratings to provide a pool of appropriate counterparties for the in-house treasury team to use, additional operational market information will be applied before making any specific investment decision from the agreed pool of counterparties. This additional market information (for example Credit Default Swaps, negative rating watches/outlooks) will be applied to compare the relative security of differing investment counterparties.

### **6.2 Investment risk matrix**

The benchmark risk factor for 2012/13 is recommended at 0.05%, the same as 2011/12. This benchmark is a simple target (not limit) to measure investment risk and so may be breached from time to time, depending on movements in interest rates and counterparty criteria. The purpose of the benchmark is that the in-house treasury team will monitor the current and trend position and amend the operational strategy depending on any changes. Any breach of the benchmarks will be reported with supporting reasons in the mid year or end of year review.

### **6.3 Investment advisors**

The council appoints treasury advisors through a regular competitive tendering process. One of the services provided by Sector is the provision of updated credit ratings and "watches" issued by the three rating agencies. In addition Sector are proactive in providing additional market information as set out in paragraph 6.1 above.

### **6.4 Investment training**

The council's advisors have a wide ranging programme of training giving council officers access to seminars and printed material. The council's in-house treasury team is experienced in dealing with investments but where necessary further training and updates will be provided. Cabinet has previously endorsed the need for Members who are involved in the treasury management decision-making process to receive training. A programme of events will be set for 2012/13.

### **6.5 Investment of money borrowed in advance**

The Council has the flexibility to borrow funds in advance of need (i.e. to fund future debt maturities). The Director of Finance may do this where, for instance, a sharp rise in interest rates is expected, and so borrowing early at fixed interest rates will be economically beneficial over the life of the loan or meet budgetary constraints.

Borrowing in advance will be made within the constraints set out in the treasury management strategy. The risks associated with such borrowing activity will be

subject to appraisal in advance and subsequent reporting through the mid-year or end of year reviews.

### **6.6 Investment liquidity**

Liquidity is achieved by limiting the maximum period for investment and by investing to dates where cash flow demands are known or forecast.

### **7 Ethical investment statement**

The council has approved the following ethical investment statement that will apply to all cash investments made by, or on behalf of, the council

*“Brighton & Hove City Council, in making investments through its treasury management function, fully supports the ethos of socially responsible investments. We will actively seek to communicate this support to those institutions we invest in as well as those we are considering investing in by:*

- *encouraging those institutions to adopt and publicise policies on socially responsible investments;*
- *requesting those institutions to apply council deposits in a socially responsible manner.”*

Counterparties shall be advised of the above statement each and every time a deposit is placed with them.

### **8 Glossary**

Long-term – period in excess of 12 months

Negotiable instrument – an investment where the council can receive back the amount invested earlier than originally agreed (subject to conditions)

Non-specified investment – see Table 6 above

Short-term – period up to and including 12 months

Specified investment – see Table 6 above

Supra-national – an organisation that encompasses more than one nation, such as the World Bank

**Brighton & Hove City Council**

**Banks and Other Institutions**  
**Annual Investment Strategy 2012/2013**  
**In-house Treasury Team**

<u>Counterparty</u>	<u>Specified/ Non- specified</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Short-term (*)</u> F = Fitch M = Moody's SP = Standard & Poor's			<u>Long-term (*)</u> F = Fitch M = Moody's SP = Standard & Poor's			<u>Max amount</u>	<u>Max period – fixed deposit s</u> <sup>2</sup>
		F	M	SP	F	M	SP		
<b><u>UK BANKS</u></b>									
Barclays	Both (**)	F1+	P-1	A-1	AA-	Aa3	A+	£5m	1 year
Co-operative Bank plc	Non- Specified	F2	P-2		A-	A3		£10m	1 mth
HSBC Bank plc	Both (**)	F1+	P-1	A-1	AA	Aa2	AA-	£10m	1 year
Lloyds TSB Bank	Specified	F1+	P-1	A-1	AA-	A1	A	£5m	1 year
Royal Bank of Scotland	Specified	F1+	P-1	A-1	AA-	A2	A	£5m	1 year
Santander UK plc	Both (**)	F1	P-1	A-1+	A+	A1	AA-	£5m	1 year
<b><u>UK BUILDING SOCIETIES (+)</u></b>									
Coventry (3)	Non- Specified	F1	P-2		A	A3		£5m	6 mths
Leeds (5)	Specified	F2	P-2		A-	A3		£5m	6 mths
Nationwide (1)	Specified	F1	P-1	A-1	A+	A2	A+	£5m	1 year
Principality (7)	Non- Specified	F2	NP		BBB+	Ba1		£5m	6 mths
Skipton (4)	Non - Specified	F3	NP		BBB	Ba1		£5m	6 mths
Yorkshire Society (2)	Non- Specified	F2	P-2	A-2	BBB+	Baa2	A-	£5m	6 mths
<b><u>OTHER</u></b>									
Other Local Authorities	Specified							£5m	1 year
Debt Management Acc	Specified							£10m	6 mths
Deposit Facility									
Money market funds	Specified							£10m	Liquid

(\*) Ratings as advised by Sector January 2012

(\*\*) investments repayable within 12 months are classified as 'Specified', investments for a longer period are classified as 'Non-specified'

(+) UK Building Societies ranking based on Total Asset size – Source: BSA factsheet February 2012

<sup>1</sup> see para 1.4 of main report – distinction is a requirement under the investment regulations

<sup>2</sup> for negotiable instruments maximum period should read '5 years' instead of '2 years' and '3 years'. All other periods remain the same

<b>Council</b>	<b>Agenda Item 91(c)</b>
22 March 2012	Brighton & Hove City Council

## NOTICE OF MOTION

### GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT

#### CONDEMNATION OF PROPOSED SMASH EDO DISRUPTION

*Insert new wording in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 as shown in bold italics and delete wording as struck through. Insert new paragraph 4 as shown in bold italics and replace the three resolutions as struck through with those as set out in bold italics below:*

~~“This Council notes *plans for a ‘Smash EDO’ demonstration to on June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2012*, condemns Smash EDO over their plans to disrupt the Queen’s Diamond Jubilee celebrations, as part of a wider ‘Summer of Resistance’ in Brighton & Hove, and that the proposed demonstration will co-incide with the bank holiday to mark the Queen’s Diamond Jubilee.~~

~~This Council *notes* welcomes the fact that the right to protest is a basic human right, *guaranteed by international law, and that Sussex Police have stated their aim to ‘facilitate peaceful protest’ in the city, and welcomes current and recent pro-peace and pro-democracy demonstrations by trade unionists and others in Syria, Gaza, and across the Arab region.* in the UK but also agrees that with that right comes a concurrent responsibility to the wider community. Smash EDO has demonstrated, over a number of years of activity in Brighton & Hove, that they have little regard to upholding these responsibilities.~~

~~*Furthermore, this Council laments the fact that arms manufactured at the EDO-ITT factory have, reportedly, been used by armed forces using military force to crush such demonstrations, notably in Gaza.* deeply regrets that Smash EDO consistently refuse to work with Sussex Police, and other agencies in the city, to ensure that the danger to the general public, the impact on city businesses and the cost of policing the protests themselves is minimised. This Council also believes that the current Administration’s policy of designating Brighton & Hove a ‘protest city’ will inevitably encourage Smash EDO to cause further disruption and endangers the city’s reputation as a top national and international tourist destination.~~

~~*But this council also notes with regret that previous Smash EDO demonstrations in the city have caused some disruption to residents going about their lawful and peaceful business, and hopes the planned protest on June 4<sup>th</sup> will not do so.*~~

Therefore, this Council:

- 1) Reaffirms the right to peaceful protest in the city, but also its belief that no such demonstration should either threaten public safety nor pose any impediment to residents, businesses or visitors to the city from going***

~~**about their lawful businesses;** Calls on Smash EDO to abandon their plans to disrupt the Diamond Jubilee celebrations in the city;~~

- ~~2) **Notes the threat any such disruption, especially to those celebrating the Queen's Diamond Jubilee, may cause to the city's reputation;** Calls on Smash EDO to work with Sussex Police at the earliest opportunity in order to minimise the cost and disruption of any future demonstrations;~~
- ~~3) **Calls on Sussex Police and the organisers of the planned demonstration to work together in a spirit of trust and openness to ensure that the planned demonstration passes off peacefully, and causes no significant disruption to anyone celebrating the Queen's Diamond Jubilee, or engaged in any other lawful activity** Calls on the City's 3 MPs to write to Smash EDO, urging them to abandon their plans to disrupt the Diamond Jubilee and calls on the Leader of Brighton & Hove City Council to consider doing likewise."~~

Proposed by: Cllr Ben Duncan

Seconded by: Cllr Jason Kitcat

Supported by: Cllrs. Cllrs Bowden, Buckley, Davey, Deane, Follett, Hawtree, Jarrett, Jones, Kennedy, A Kitcat, Littman, MacCafferty, Phillips, Powell, Rufus, Shanks, Summers, Sykes, Wakefield and West.

<b>Council</b>	<b>Agenda Item 91(e)</b>
22 March 2012	Brighton & Hove City Council

## NOTICE OF MOTION

### LABOUR & CO-OPERATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

#### **'END THE BIG SIX ENERGY FIX'**

*Insert additional paragraphs and resolutions at the end of the motion as shown in bold italics:*

"This council notes with concern the oligopoly in the energy market, which sees excessive profiteering by the Big Six energy suppliers who control more than 99% of the market. \*(i)

It also notes an OFGEM report that the Big Six are increasing the margins on their bills above the increase in fossil fuel price rises, and that a recent think-tank report found the Big Six overcharge as many as 5.6 million customers through their pricing policies. Furthermore, complex pricing systems mean many people, often the most vulnerable, are stuck on tariffs that don't offer them the best deal. As a result, the poor pay more.

This is a particular concern for Brighton & Hove, where many homes are not energy efficient and the number of households living in fuel poverty has increased during the last three years - mainly as a result of the price of domestic energy almost doubling during this period.

This council therefore resolves to:

- Join Friends of the Earth, Oxfam, the NUT, War on Want, and Church Action on Poverty among others, in supporting the 'End the Big Six Energy Fix' campaign.
- Ask the City Council's Chief Executive to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Secretary of State for the Department of Energy and Climate Change urging them to consider the following actions, supported by a majority of voters in a recent poll: \*(ii)
  - Impose a levy on the Big Six and ring-fence the proceeds for investment in home insulation and energy efficiency programmes, lifting the poorest out of fuel poverty and creating thousands of jobs.
  - Give OFGEM the power to cap and control energy. Any price cap could be linked to the wholesale price of energy to make energy costs fairer.
  - Launch an independent public inquiry into the Big Six energy companies in order to identify other market reforms that could help make energy prices fairer, reduce fuel poverty and increase trust between consumers and companies."

**Furthermore,**

**This council calls on the coalition government:**

- **To ensure that those aged 75 and over are automatically on the cheapest tariff.**
- **To target the energy company obligation on families in fuel poverty.**
- **To improve energy efficiency by setting tough new standards for the private rented sector.**

Proposed by: Cllr Pissaridou

Seconded by: Cllr Mitchell

Supported by: Cllrs Morgan, Marsh, Turton, Lepper, Farrow, Fitch, Gilbey, Robins, Carden, and Hamilton.

**Notes**

(i) *Department for Energy and Climate Change figures on market share.*

(ii) *A YouGov poll commissioned by Compass and Friends of the Earth found that:*

*- 71% of voters support a levy on the profits on the Big Six.*

*- 77% of voters support the money raised from a levy being spent on home insulation and energy efficiency measures to remove people from fuel poverty.*

*- And an overwhelming 86% of voters support an independent public inquiry.*



<b>Council</b>	<b>Agenda Item 91(e)</b>
22 March 2012	Brighton & Hove City Council

## NOTICE OF MOTION

### CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

#### 'END THE BIG SIX ENERGY FIX'

*Delete the wording as struck through in paragraphs 1 and two and replace with the text shown in bold italics. Delete the first resolution and the wording in the second resolution as struck through and delete the first bullet point and amend the second bullet point with deletion of wording as struck through and the insertion of text as shown in bold italics:*

"This council notes ~~with concern the oligopoly in the energy market, which sees excessive profiteering by~~ **that** the Big Six energy suppliers ~~who~~ control more than 99% of the market. \*(i)

It also notes an OFGEM report that the Big Six are increasing the margins on their bills above the increase in fossil fuel price rises, and that a recent think-tank report found the Big Six overcharge as many as 5.6 million customers through their pricing policies. Furthermore, complex pricing systems mean many people, often the most vulnerable, are stuck on tariffs that don't offer them the best deal. As a result, the poor **and low users** pay more.

This is a particular concern for Brighton & Hove, where many homes are not energy efficient and the number of households living in fuel poverty has increased during the last three years - mainly as a result of the price of domestic energy almost doubling during this period.

This council therefore resolves to:

- ~~— Join Friends of the Earth, Oxfam, the NUT, War on Want, and Church Action on Poverty among others, in supporting the 'End the Big Six Energy Fix' campaign.~~
- Ask the City Council's Chief Executive to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Secretary of State for the Department of Energy and Climate Change urging them to consider the following actions, ~~supported by a majority of voters in a recent poll:~~ \*(ii)
  - ~~• — Impose a levy on the Big Six and ring-fence the proceeds for investment in home insulation and energy efficiency programmes, lifting the poorest out of fuel poverty and creating thousands of jobs.~~
  - **Encourage** Give OFGEM **to use their existing** the power to cap and control energy **if they assess that there is a lack of competition in the energy market**. Any price cap could be linked to the wholesale price of energy to make energy costs fairer.

- Launch an independent public inquiry into the Big Six energy companies in order to identify other market reforms that could help make energy prices fairer, reduce fuel poverty and increase trust between consumers and companies.”

Proposed by: Cllr Geoffrey Theobald

Seconded by: Cllr Garry Peltzer Dunn

Supported by: Cllrs Cobb, C. Theobald, A. Norman, K. Norman, Cox, Wealls, Brown, Bennett, Barnett, Simson, Wells, Janio, Hyde, Mears, Smith, and Pidgeon.

#### *Notes*

- (i) Department for Energy and Climate Change figures on market share.*
- (ii) A YouGov poll commissioned by Compass and Friends of the Earth found that:*

- 71% of voters support a levy on the profits on the Big Six.
- 77% of voters support the money raised from a levy being spent on home insulation and energy efficiency measures to remove people from fuel poverty.
- And an overwhelming 86% of voters support an independent public inquiry.

