



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

**COUNCIL
ADDENDUM**

4.30PM, THURSDAY, 23 OCTOBER 2014

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
28	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. List of written questions received from members of the public (copy attached).	1 - 4
29	DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. Deputation regarding Hollingbury Road Closure (copy attached).	5 - 10
30	PETITIONS FOR COUNCIL DEBATE 30(b) Mile Oak Improvements. Amendment from the Labour & Co-operative Group (copy attached).	11 - 12
31	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS. List of written questions from councillors and responses to the questions from the Chairs of the respective committees (copy attached).	13 - 18
34	REVIEW OF MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES - 2014 Extract from the proceedings of the Policy & Resources Committee meeting held on the 16 th October (copy attached).	19 - 22
37	RESPONSE TO THE BULLYING SCRUTINY PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS Extract from the proceedings of the Children & Young People Committee meeting held on the 13 th October (copy attached).	23 - 26
39	NOTICES OF MOTION. The following amendments to the Notices of Motion listed in the agenda have been submitted, (copies attached): (d) NHS. Proposed by Councillor Morgan. (e) Christmas Parking and Roadworks Suspension. Proposed by Councillor Mitchell	27 - 32

Note: The Mayor has accepted a revision to the following Notice of Motion (copy attached):

(c) **'ActionAid' Towns Against Tax Dodging Campaign.** Proposed by Councillor Littman.

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 written questions have been received from members of the public.

(a) Mr. A. Morris

“Considering the increase in the public incidents of rape, sexual and physical assaults, alcohol drinking, anti-social behaviour and breaches of noise levels, what measures across the city, including appropriate positioning of CCTV cameras, are being put in place by this Green Council?”

Councillor J. Kitcat, Leader of the Council will reply.

(b) Mr. L. Kelly

“In the last 4 months Denmark Villas has been blighted by ever more graffiti. This beautiful part of the city has gone from being virtually graffiti free to a situation where almost every piece of street furniture & some of the private garden walls have been grafittied. What action will the council take to clear this up & prevent its reappearance?”

Councillor West, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee will reply.

(c) Mr. J. Hooper

"Stanmer Stakeholders Forum was established to discuss matters of importance both to council and stakeholders. Since 2011 the frequency of meetings has become erratic and only matters that the council identifies placed on the agenda. At the last meeting in April, it was promised once the two HLF bids were submitted in October; a meeting would be held in November.

Would the Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee shows his support for the Forum and agree to request the Forum's Chair to arrange a meeting for early November and allow stakeholders to put forward items for the agenda."

Councillor West, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee will reply.

(d) Mr. K. Smith

“Where is the £3 million pounds to fund the junction and the surrounding area coming from when there is a severe shortage of council money?”

Councillor West, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee will reply.

(e) Ms. V. Paynter

"Cllrs from the King Alfred Project Board along with Cllrs on Policy & Resources have created and endorsed a planning brief which BHCC has now been put out to tender for the job of redeveloping that site.

To what extent and in what ways were Hove residents involved in the creation of the planning brief given to prospective developers?"

Councillor Bowden, Chair of the Economic, Development & Culture Committee will reply.

(f) Mr. N. Furness

“On my travels around Brighton & Hove recently, I have become aware of what to me appears to be, the totally needless destruction of a number of magnificent mature trees. These include yet another elm just inside the Western entrance to St. Anne's Well Gardens and three sycamores, two at the Floral Clock and one in the North-West corner of Brunswick Square.

Who is responsible for this apparent vandalism, Cllr. West, and why are you allowing it to continue?”

Councillor West, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee will reply.

(g) Ms. L. Reid

“On a daily basis I witness anti-social and aggressive behaviour up and down George Street in Central Hove, associated with both street drinkers and other local drinkers either using or hanging around outside Weatherspoons Pub. I have yet to witness any Police patrolling regularly, far less any firm action being taken by them to address this growing problem.

Could the Leader of the Council assure me that he will bring what powers he has to bare on ensuring that we have a regular Police presence who are prepared to enforce the law regarding this anti-social problem?”

Councillor J. Kitcat, Leader of the Council will reply.

(h) Mr. P. Lowe

“Two years ago I was given assurances about air quality by yourself in your current capacity as Chair of Environment. Can you please confirm whether the air quality has improved or got worse and whether it is still breaching European regulations?”

Councillor West, Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee will reply.

(i) Ms. P. Mountain

“I understand that the Council has Empty Property Officers who work towards bringing unused/empty properties back into use. Does this include Commercial Properties and is progress monitored and published?”

Councillor Phillips, Deputy Chair of the Housing Committee will reply.

Council	Agenda Item 29
23 October 2014	Brighton & Hove City Council

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 Hollingbury Road Closure
(Spokesperson) – Ms. R. Entwistle**

Supported by:
John Anderson
Tim Clark
Paco Torres
Ian Elwick

Application for permanent closure of the junction between Hollingbury Road and Upper Hollingdean Road to non-essential motorised through traffic

In the middle of August this year the junction between Hollingbury Road and Upper Hollingdean Road was closed for essential sewage works for a period of 4 weeks. This closure had a substantial positive effect on us, the residents of Hollingbury Rd. Normally Hollingbury Rd carries a lot of through traffic and the absence of this meant that the street became an area of focus for the community. In that, people began socialising, meeting new neighbours, hanging out in the street and parents allowing their children to play in the street. A small group of us got together and agreed this change had brought about a positive experience for the residents and after carrying out a more extensive survey of the street (the results of which are included with this deputation) we decided to apply to the council for the permanent closure of Hollingbury Road to non-essential through traffic. We do not doubt that this will have displacement effects which will impact negatively on residents living on adjacent streets. However, in the main, we believe that most of these can be mitigated by the implementation of traffic calming measures. We believe this proposal aligns well with Brighton & Hove council's current transport document in terms of contributing to better safety and health and improving quality of life. There already exists a precedent for closure as set by a nearby road, Hollingbury Park Avenue.

Before I conclude I would like to mention that on a few recent occasions, a neighbour went to observe what the traffic flow was like on Hollingbury Road compared to Ditchling Road. After several minutes observation on both of these roads, it was found that whilst Hollingbury Road was backed up along the street with through traffic, Ditchling Road was fairly empty of cars. In view of the evidence we have presented, the result of the street survey, and of an ongoing petition with 117 signatures to date that we submit here with this deputation, we ask the council to explore with us the possibilities of a permanent closure of Hollingbury Road to non-essential through traffic.

Rachel Entwistle

Hollingbury Road Residents' Deputation Supporting Information

Negative outcomes

1. Displacement effects. There are likely to be several displacement effects of closing Hollingbury Road, mainly due to increased traffic flow in neighbouring streets. However, Ditchling Road, which is a main road, and Roedale Road are both fairly wide streets where the impact is likely to be relatively small.
2. Increased accident risks on neighbouring streets. It is likely that one effect of traffic flow displacement will be to increase accident risks on other streets. However, most of the increased traffic flow is likely to be on Ditchling Road rather than any of the residential side streets. Given the provision of controlled crossing sites on the main streets, the increase in accident risk might be quite minor.
3. Provision for controlled access maybe costly to implement. There would need to be a provision at the junction onto Upper Hollingdean Road to give access to essential motor vehicles (e.g. police/fire/ambulance & bin lorries). However, although we did not witness this, it appears that the bins were effectively collected without access through the lower end of the street.
4. Hollingbury Road residents will be forced onto alternative routes. This may well be considered a negative aspect of closure.

Positive Outcomes

1. Elimination of a rat-run. Much of the traffic that uses Hollingbury Road does so to short cut the route between Fiveways and Upper Hollingdean Road. Forcing this traffic onto the wider Ditchling Road would be safer and unlikely to impact negatively on journey times and fuel usage.
2. General reduction in accident risk. Although the street has recently been provided with pedestrian crossing build-outs, the volume of motor traffic means that this is still not an especially safe road to cross. Vehicles still tend to accelerate above the 20mph limit between speed ramps and the crossing at the junction with Upper Hollingdean Road which receives a high volume of pedestrian traffic associated with the school run can be quite tricky to navigate when traffic is queuing on the downhill side. Closure of street will substantially reduce the volume and speed of traffic using the road.
3. Elimination of HGV through traffic. Although large HGVs are officially barred from using Hollingbury Road it is not that uncommon for these to make use of this route and struggle to negotiate the turn at the bottom of the hill safely.
4. Decreased pollution. Elimination of through motor traffic will decrease pollution on the street. It is not that uncommon for motor vehicles to queue for fairly long periods on the downhill side of Hollingbury Road with their engines running.
5. Safe pedestrian route connecting to the Dip. Hollingbury Road provides an important pedestrian route used extensively during the school run. For younger children, parental supervision is generally necessary to cross Hollingbury Road. However, closure of the road to through-traffic would provide a much safer pedestrian route linking Hollingbury Place to the pelican crossing at the junction of Upper Hollingdean Road and Ditchling Road. This would encourage more walking, rather than driving to school.
6. Improved social amenity. Within hours of the street being closed it was apparent that a quite substantial change in the atmosphere on the road had occurred. The most obvious effect was one of increased social activity between neighbours, particularly children. Permanent closure of the street would maintain this change making the road a focal community space.
7. Improved amenity for maisonettes and upper floor flats. Many houses on Hollingbury Road are divided into separate dwellings, commonly a maisonette and garden flat. The upper dwellings rarely have any access to an outside space. Closure of the street makes the road area much more attractive as a recreational space and this is likely to have a substantial positive impact on these residents.

Hollingbury Road Residents' Deputation
Supporting Information

Survey of Hollingbury Road residents (number of participants = 62)

1) I would like Hollingbury Road closed permanently to non-essential through traffic

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
0%	0%	0%	17.74%	82.26%

2) Hollingbury Road is used as a rat run

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1.61%	0%	3.23%	17.74%	77.42%

3) Cars travelling on Hollingbury Road invariably speed even though there are speed bumps

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
0%	1.61%	3.23%	22.58%	72.58%

4) Even though HGV's are not supposed to use Hollingbury Road, we still have a high volume of HGV's that do come down from the five-ways junction

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
0%	1.61%	1.61%	30.65%	66.13%

5) Elimination of through motor traffic will decrease pollution on the street

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
0%	0%	4.84%	14.52%	80.64%

6) The crossing at the Hollingbury Road/ Upper Hollingdean Road site is dangerous with the amount of traffic that uses this road as a cut through (particularly during the school run)

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
0%	0%	0%	19.35%	80.65%

7) Closure of Hollingbury Road will improve social amenity for all residents of the street

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
0%	0%	0%	22.58%	77.42%

8) Closure of Hollingbury Road will create a safer cycling route (connecting Ditchling Road to Upper Hollingdean Road)

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
0%	1.61%	3.23%	16.13%	79.03%

9) Closure of Hollingbury Road will create a safer pedestrian route connecting to the dip (particularly during the school run)

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
0%	0%	1.61%	22.58%	75.81%

Council	Agenda Item 30(b)
23 October 2014	Brighton & Hove City Council

PETITION REPORT

LABOUR & CO-OPERATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

MILE OAK IMPROVEMENTS

Add further recommendations 2.2 and 2.3 as shown in bold italics:

RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the petition is noted and referred to the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for consideration;
- 2.2 ***That the committee be requested to consider having an Improvement Plan for the Mile Oak Recreation Ground play area drawn up in consultation with users of the play area that will demonstrate how investment and refurbishment will be undertaken; and***
- 2.3 ***That in regard to 2.2 above, the proposals for the Improvement Plan are reported to the committee without undue delay.***

Proposed by: Cllr Gilbey

Seconded by: Cllr Carden

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

The following questions listed on pages 37 - 40 of the agenda have been received from Councillors and will be taken as read along with the written answers listed below:

(a) Councillor Cox

“At the last Full Council of 17 July I was advised in answer to a written question that there had been just 2 prosecutions for fly-tipping in the last 3 years. I have been informed that the Council does have specialist surveillance equipment which was purchased for the purpose of catching fly-tippers.

1. How much did this equipment cost?
2. How many times has it been deployed since 1 April 2013?”

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

“City Clean does not have any specialist surveillance equipment and has not had any since early 2013, but could either hire or buy as required. City Clean are working with the Travellers Services who will be piloting the use of portable CCTV cameras to deter criminal damage and flytipping in the city’s parks.

Previously the council was in possession of CCTV cameras worth £5k. In 2013 cameras deployed to catch flytippers were destroyed, we assume by those flytipping.”

(b) Councillor Duncan

“Can the Chair of the Economic Development & Culture Committee tell me what plans he has to compensate residents of Queens Park ward for their limited access to Madeira Drive and any part of the beach between Brighton Marina and the Palace Pier during privately-run events?”

Reply from Councillor Bowden, Chair of the Economic Development & Culture Committee.

“There are specific provisions under the East Sussex Act which permit the use of Madeira Drive for outdoor events for up to 28 days each year. There is no requirement in the Act to compensate residents of Queens Park or any other ward for any restricted access to Madeira Drive or the beach. The overwhelming majority do not restrict public access to Madeira Drive as they are open public events. Outdoor events are important both to the city’s tourism economy by attracting visitors to the city, and to residents as part of the vibrant city that they live in.

Therefore, there are not any plans to provide compensation to Queen’s Park residents.”

(c) Councillor Duncan

“In July of this year I informed the Head of Democratic Services that I intended to submit a Notice of Motion for discussion at this meeting of the City Council. The NoM would have addressed the City Council’s ethical procurement policy with respect to contracts with companies and other providers complicit in Israel’s illegal occupation of Palestinian territories. I was subsequently informed that the proposed NoM would not be accepted onto the agenda. Can the Leader of the Council specify which democratically-elected councillors were consulted about, or otherwise involved in, the decision to exclude this NoM from the agenda?”

Reply from Councillor J. Kitcat, Leader of the Council.

“The issue of the Gaza conflict was primarily a matter concerning international relations, which is the responsibility of national government rather than local authorities like Brighton & Hove as a local authority. The Council’s constitution, under Standing Order 8.10, provides: “Every motion shall be relevant to some matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties or which affects the authority, the area of Brighton & Hove and/or its inhabitants.” The proposed notice of motion did not satisfy this requirement.

The Council’s protocol on Notices of Motion, which provides more detailed guidance, states: “Council procedure rule [8.10] requires a Notice of Motion to relate to Council functions or affect the Council or the area of Brighton and Hove. The connection has to be real and not too indirect, tenuous or theoretical. For example, the closure of a local post office, or changes introduced by utility companies, although not necessarily primary Council functions, are likely to affect the wellbeing of the inhabitants of Brighton and Hove and would be appropriate to raise by way of a Notice of Motion. By comparison something that is the primary responsibility of central government and does not have particular direct impact on Brighton and Hove (for example, foreign policy generally that has no particular impact on Brighton and Hove) would not be admissible. The Council should, as far as possible, concentrate on issues and services that it has the responsibility for or where there is direct impact on Brighton and Hove.” The notice of motion did not comply with this requirement.

The Council has a duty to promote good community relations. Given polarity of views and the strength of opinion held by members of the community on both sides, debating the motion at a time when tensions were already high would not have been conducive to promoting good community relations. This is evidenced by the number of e-mails and representations the Council was getting from representatives of different communities with diametrically opposing views. Holding a debate would simply have inflamed the situation further.

There is a statutory limitation on taking non-commercial considerations into account in the awarding of contracts. Although there is the social value exemption, it is not clear that that would apply in the present case due to the absence of links with Brighton & Hove. The proposal would have had

significant resource implications and it was not clear how practicable it would be.

Having regard to the above considerations, the notice of motion was assessed as being unsuitable and you were advised of that by the Head of Democratic Services as is the normal practice. The Mayor was briefed about this and the reasons for the advice as part of the Council agenda setting meeting.

I believe that your proposed notice of motion was dealt with properly and in accordance with normal practice.”

(d) Councillor Duncan

“Can the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board give this Council an assurance that no services currently provided by an NHS trust will be provided by a private company or any other non-NHS body in future?”

Reply from Councillor J. Kitcat, Chair of the Health & Wellbeing Board.

“Unfortunately not. The Health and Social Care Act introduced by this government builds on the marketisation introduced by previous governments and enshrines the principle of ‘any willing provider’ in law. Under national legislation virtually all new or changed services must be opened to a competitive bidding process.

We are however able to take social value into account, and hope to see local and not for profit providers like NHS Trusts stepping forward to run local public services.”

(e) Councillor Duncan

“Can the councillor responsible for procurement tell me which contracts in the areas of waste, transport, security services, education, healthcare or IT, worth in excess of £10,000, are due to be awarded, or renewed, between now and the end of 2017?”

Reply from Councillor Sykes, Deputy Chair (Finance) of the Policy & Resources Committee.

“The council’s Contract Register is published on the Website and the information sought is available there.”

(f) Councillor Duncan

“Can the Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee confirm how many sheep taking part in this Council's 'lookerer' scheme have been injured or killed, either by members of the public (or their animals), or to be sold as meat, since May 2011, and what steps this Council plans to introduce to prevent such accidents and deaths in future?”

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

“It is not possible to give an exact number of sheep as our grazier does not run a flock exclusive to our land, the sheep move between our sites and other sites that he grazes. However we generally have about 800 sheep on our sites between September and April with low numbers of sheep at other times of the year.

All sheep are eventually slaughtered (and generally enter the food chain) because as sheep age their teeth wear down and they are unable to get enough nutrition to maintain good health. Leaving them to slowly starve is considered inhumane and Defra’s “Code of conduct for the welfare of sheep” states “Sheep with poor teeth should preferably be culled.”

We take the welfare of the sheep seriously and for that reason have instigated a volunteer shepherding scheme. Our sheep are generally checked at least twice a day (many of the volunteers look in on the sheep even when they are not on the official rota) by volunteers with additional checks a couple of times a week by the grazier. In addition to the shepherding we also use permanent fencing where possible and electric netting in other places to help deter dog attacks. We also endeavour to maintain up to date signage on our sites, warning of the pending arrival or presence of sheep with the aim that no dog walker should come across the sheep without having seen a sign warning of their presence. We also maintain a twitter account @BHSheep to keep people informed of the sheep movements.

This high visible presence encourages responsible behaviour in the majority of dog walkers and we get less dog attacks than might be expected in an urban fringe location, probably on a par with more rural farms. We do get 2 or 3 serious dog attacks a year however most sheep recover (with veterinary attention if necessary) so the number killed in a year is generally 1 or less.

We do work with the police in situations where dogs are in with the sheep or an attack has occurred as it is an offence under the Dogs (Protection of Livestock) Act 1953 to allow your dog to worry livestock. While prosecution is a possibility in these situations in the majority of cases the dog attack has not resulted from malicious intent (most dog owners are upset that their pet can have done such a thing) and the offence is unlikely to reoccur so we (and the police) have considered that it would not be constructive to pursue this option.

It is no more possible to prevent all dog attacks on sheep than it is to prevent all dog attacks on humans. The law is quite clear that it is the responsibility of dog owners to keep their dogs under control and we feel that we have taken all the reasonable steps that we can to minimise such attacks.”

(g) Councillor Duncan

“Can the Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee tell me what plans he has to compensate residents of the city for the poor refuse collection service being delivered during the ongoing dispute between CityClean staff and this council?”

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

“We are disappointed that GMB members felt they had to take industrial action. I apologise to our residents for the inconvenience and disruption to collections caused as a result. Managers have proposed a full service redesign that will review job roles and make CityClean the modern, flexible and responsive service that residents rightly expect. Importantly this would maintain fair pay for all men and women across the organisation. We remain committed to dialogue with the GMB to resolve this dispute.”

(h) Councillor G. Theobald

“The recent Peer Review of Brighton & Hove City Council by the Local Government Association concluded that the Council’s relationship with the Trade Unions is poor. Just 23% of Council staff themselves think that the Council and Trade Unions have an effective working relationship. The Council currently pays for 7 full-time staff to carry out Trade Union activity in addition to 161 ‘Workplace Representatives’ whose paid time off is not monitored or collated. The Trade Union Facilities Agreement which sets out these various arrangements has never been formally reviewed since it was drawn up in 1997 despite it being written into the Agreement that it should be subject to ‘regular review’. In the light of all this, will the Leader of the Council commit to an urgent and fundamental review of the Council’s Trade Union Facilities Agreement?”

Reply from Councillor J. Kitcat, Leader of the Council.

“The facilities agreement in respect of GMB and Unison as our recognised trade unions for collective bargaining purposes has not been formally reviewed since 1999. However over the years there have been changes agreed to the facilities time for both unions which means that the formal agreement is not up to date. Officers have informed both unions of the intention to review the facilities agreement in terms of both its spirit and its practical operation. This will include introducing a central monitoring system for recording time against trade union duties. The scope for the review will be agreed and consulted on in the usual way.”

(i) Councillor Carden

“At the Council last December, I raised the need for a bus shelter at the junction of Thorn Hill Rise and New England Rise and the Chair of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee replied

'I appreciate the point Councillor and officers will certainly come and have a look at the place and check that we've got our understanding correct. With regard to the other shelter, we'll listen to what you have to say about the usage rates and whether that potentially could be different but I do hear what you're saying.'

Can the Chair now confirm that officers have re-visited the site and that a bus shelter is going to be provided?"

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

"The 'New England Rise' bus stop site has now been assessed and I'm pleased to confirm that it should be feasible to install a shelter there. As soon as new shelters do become available we will prioritise the list of requests that we currently hold, which includes the New England Rise bus stop.

The council is in the process of retendering the contract for bus shelter provision and, unfortunately, we do not anticipate any additional shelters becoming available until the new contract is awarded. We are at the stage of drafting the Invitation to Tender for the new contract. Meanwhile the existing contract with Clear Channel Adshel has been extended until the end of February 2015.

At present we are unable to indicate when a shelter could be installed at the New England Rise bus stop."

Council

23 October 2014

Agenda Item 34

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: **Review of Members' Allowances 2014 - Extract from the Proceedings of the Policy & Resources Committee meeting held on 16 October 2014**

Date of Meeting: **16 October 2014**

Report of: **Monitoring Officer**

Contact Officer: Name: **Ross Keatley** Tel: **29-1064**

E-mail: ross.keatley@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Wards Affected: All

FOR GENERAL RELEASE***Action Required of Council:***

To receive the item referred from the Policy & Resources Committee for approval:

Recommendation:

- (1) That the Council be recommended to adopt the new Members Allowances Scheme for the payment of allowances in 2015/16 with effect from the Annual Council Meeting in May 2015; subject to the implementation of the Basic Allowance from the 11th May 2015 as detailed in the IRP's report and the Scheme in appendix B;
- (2) That the Chief Executive be authorised to issue the Brighton & Hove Members' Allowances Scheme in accordance with the regulations following council approval;
- (3) That where there are any changes to any role listed as attracting a Special Responsibility Allowance under the scheme, and the revised role is substantially the same as the previous role in terms of the nature or level of responsibility; the Special Responsibility Allowance shall continue to apply to the new role. This is subject to the Independent Remuneration Panel being consulted and agreeing that it is substantially the same role;
- (4) That the allowance payable to each of the members of the Independent Remuneration Panel be increased by 1% in line with the Public Sector pay award with effect from 21st May 2015, in recognition of the time commitment and the role of the Panel.

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL**POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE****4.00pm 16 OCTOBER 2014****COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL****MINUTES**

Present: Councillor J Kitcat (Chair) Councillors Sykes (Deputy Chair), G Theobald (Opposition Spokesperson), Morgan (Group Spokesperson), Bowden, Hamilton, Lepper, A Norman, Peltzer Dunn and Shanks

PART ONE**59 REVIEW OF MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES - 2014**

- 59.1 The Committee considered a report of the Head of Law & Monitoring Officer in relation to the Review of Members' Allowances 2014. In accordance with the council's recommendations the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) had undertaken a comprehensive review of the scheme. The IRP had conducted an online survey of Members and met with each of the Group Leaders, Chairs & Deputy Chairs of Committees, Opposition Spokespersons and other Members in July, and had taken on board the comments received. It was the view of the IRP that the new scheme should come into effect from Annual Council in May 2015. The Chair of the IRP, Mr Childerhouse, was also invited to address the Committee, and stated the IRP had been fully aware of the difficult financial position of the Council. The IRP had looked carefully at the Council's objectives and tried to attract a wider range of individuals into public service. It was also added that the report was clearly evidence based, and much of the information came from the serving Members themselves.
- 59.2 The Chair thanked Mr Childerhouse for the work of the IRP – especially in relation to the projected reduction in cost of the new scheme. It was noted that this scheme would be for the incoming Council after the 2015 local elections.
- 59.3 Councillor Morgan reiterated thanks and stated that it was appropriate that Members should also take their share of the savings over the next few years. Members often had to give up a great deal to undertake the role, and it was important that they did not suffer financially as a consequence. The pool of Members should not always be drawn from the retired and financially independent. Councillor Morgan noted his support for the report and asked that colleagues did the same.
- 59.4 Councillor Sykes noted his thanks to the work of the IRP, and agreed it was important a wide range of individuals were attracted to public service. On a separate note he

highlighted his disappointment at the withdrawal of the Local Government Pension Scheme for elected councillors.

- 59.5 Councillor A. Norman thanked the IRP for their work; in response to some of the points she raised Mr Childerhouse stated that to attract younger candidates the dependency allowance had been bought more in line with the living wage, and he noted that the IRP had been aware of the much higher than estimated number of hours some Members put into their role each week. Councillor A. Norman noted this response, but added that not all young people would have dependants.
- 59.6 Councillor Peltzer Dunn agreed with others in the debate that all Members should contribute to the wider savings of the Council, but noted this was not explicitly set out in the report. He went on to explain his view that there was a vital role for the main opposition party with in the city, and as such he opposed the removal of Special Responsibility Allowances for certain Opposition Spokespersons – for this reason he would be unable to support the recommendations in the report. In response Mr Childerhouse noted that whilst the proposals were for the next four year administration there would always be the possibility of review by the IRP if any part of the new proposals were found to be causing issues or impacting on Members' ability to effectively undertake their roles.
- 59.7 Councillor Bowden noted that all Members undertook their roles as part of a sense of public duty, and he welcomed the comments of others on the Committee in relation to ensuring the pool of Members was wide and diverse.
- 59.8 Councillor Lepper noted she would support the report, but noted that she would be standing down at the end of this term in office – she also added that on the whole Brighton & Hove remunerated 'quite well' compared to other authorities. She also highlighted that it had been an ongoing source of frustration that she was unable to use her free older-persons bus pass before 9.00 a.m.; whilst younger colleagues on the Council who had annual bus-passes purchased for them, as part of the allowances scheme, could use them before 9.00 a.m.
- 59.9 The then put the recommendation to the vote.

59.10 **RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the Panel's report as detailed in appendix A be received and endorsed and the recommendations therein be recommended to the Council for approval;

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND:

- 2) That the Council be recommended to adopt the new Members Allowances Scheme for the payment of allowances in 2015/16 with effect from the Annual Council Meeting in May 2015; subject to the implementation of the Basic Allowance from the 11th May 2015 as detailed in the IRP's report and the Scheme in appendix B;
- 3) That the Chief Executive be authorised to issue the Brighton & Hove Members' Allowances Scheme in accordance with the regulations following council approval;

- 4) That where there are any changes to any role listed as attracting a Special Responsibility Allowance under the scheme, and the revised role is substantially the same as the previous role in terms of the nature or level of responsibility; the Special Responsibility Allowance shall continue to apply to the new role. This is subject to the Independent Remuneration Panel being consulted and agreeing that it is substantially the same role;
- 5) That the allowance payable to each of the members of the Independent Remuneration Panel be increased by 1% inline with the Public Sector pay award with effect from 21st May 2015, in recognition of the time commitment and the role of the Panel.

Council

23 October 2014

Agenda Item 37

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject:	Response to the Recommendations of the Bullying Scrutiny Panel – Extract from the proceedings of the Children & Young People Committee meeting held on the 13th October 2014.		
Date of Meeting:	23 October 2014		
Report of:	The Monitoring Officer		
Contact Officer:	Name: Lisa Johnson	Tel: 29-1228	
	E-mail: lisa.johnson@brighton-hove.gov.uk		
Wards Affected:	All		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE***Action Required of the Council:***

To receive the item referred from the Children & Young People Committee for information:

Recommendation:

That Council note the report.

CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE COMMITTEE**4.00 pm 13 October 2014****COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL****MINUTES**

Present: Councillor Shanks (Chair), Littman (Deputy Chair), Wealls (Opposition Spokesperson), Cox, A Kitcat, Lepper, Mitchell, Morgan, A Norman and Powell

PART ONE**40. RESPONSE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BULLYING SCRUTINY PANEL**

40.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Children's Services in relation to the response to the recommendations of the Bullying

Scrutiny Panel. The report was introduced by the Acting Head of Scrutiny and the Partnership Adviser: Health and Wellbeing, Standards and Achievement Team. The Head of Scrutiny noted that Amanda Mortensen was a member of the Scrutiny Panel and apologised for omitting her name from the title of the Scrutiny Panel Report, and said that the papers would be updated.

- 40.2 Councillor Lepper thanked members of the Scrutiny Panel for their report, and said that it was good that schools were taking the issue of bullying seriously and that she was happy to agree to the recommendations.
- 40.3 Alex Boyle thanked officers for the report and said it had been an honour to be involved with the Scrutiny Panel.
- 40.4 Councillor Wealls thanked everyone for the report and said he would be supporting the recommendations.
- 40.5 Councillor Mitchell thanked officers and Scrutiny Panel members, and wanted to highlight Recommendation 4(c) in Appendix 1 to the report as being particularly useful.
- 40.6 Riziki Millanzi welcomed the report and in particular the suggestion that the Youth Council be invited to become co-opted members of the Anti-Bullying & Equality Strategy Group.
- 40.7 Martin Jones said the report was very useful, and thought it was a good idea that the Youth Council be invited to join the Anti-Bullying & Equality Strategy Group.
- 40.8 Councillor Powell thanked all those involved for the report, and asked if people with disabilities had had the opportunity to be involved with the Scrutiny Panel and whether the possibility of teacher/pupil bullying had been addressed. The Partnership Adviser: Health and Wellbeing, Standards and Achievement Team advised that those with a disability had been included, but the issue of teacher/pupil bullying hadn't as that was a different area and would be covered by the HR department within the Council.
- 40.9 Ben Glazebrook referred to paragraph 7.3.1 of the report and noted that children with SEN weren't listed as being included. He was advised they were included and the support group Amaze had given evidence to the Panel. The wording of that paragraph reflected the categories used in the Equalities Act, and children with SEN weren't listed as a separate category.
- 40.10 Councillor Cox asked what steps were being taken to tackle those who were perpetual bullies. The Partnership Adviser: Health and Wellbeing, Standards and Achievement Team advised that schools were provided with guidance on good practice.
- 40.11 Alex Boyle referred to Recommendation 4 and noted that the suggestion of producing a leaflet, and suggested that one be produced just for children; some people may not want to access information over the internet and may prefer a paper leaflet. He noted Recommendation 5 and welcomed the suggestion of holding exit interviews. The Assistant Director - Education & Inclusion thanked

Alex for his comments and suggested it may be useful to involve young people when implementation of those Recommendations was undertaken.

40.12 Councillor A Norman thanked everyone for the excellent report and said she agreed with the suggestion that a separate leaflet be provided for children.

40.13 Councillor Littman welcomed the report and felt that implementing the Recommendations would have a positive impact.

40.14 **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the Committee welcomes the scrutiny report, and noted its findings;
- (2) That the Committee accepts the responses made to the recommendations;
and
- (3) That the Committee forward its response to Full Council for information.

NOTICE OF MOTION - REVISED**GREEN GROUP****'ACTIONAID' TOWNS AGAINST TAX DODGING CAMPAIGN**

"This Council resolves:

To offer its support to the ActionAid 'Towns Against Tax Dodging' campaign, and, to that end:

- (1) Asks the Chief Executive to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to request an urgent review of the taxation system to remove all loopholes which currently allow for corporate tax avoidance; and
- (2) To write to all local MPs, asking for them to also pledge their support for this campaign.

This Council also notes that local people who rely on Council services could benefit as the council could avoid some reductions in provision currently being made due to the Government's austerity programme, as this could be relaxed if they collected the billions of pounds of unpaid corporate tax."

Proposed by: Councillor Littman Seconded by: Councillor Wakefield

Supported by: Councillors Bowden, Davey, West, Shanks, Kennedy, Rufus, Jarrett, Sykes, Randall, West, Buckley, Mac Cafferty, Hawtree, J. Kitcat, A. Kitcat, Phillips, Deane, Jones and Duncan.

Supporting Information:

At a time when Local Government is being starved of the funding it requires in order to maintain the levels of service it can provide to the citizens of this country, it is both morally and financially unacceptable that the UK Treasury loses as much as £12 billion to tax dodging by multinational companies every year.

Brighton and Hove has an unusually high number of small businesses. Closing loopholes which allow large corporations to avoid paying tax could 'level the playing field' and thus make these smaller businesses more competitive with their larger competitors. This could have a positive impact on both these businesses and the wider local economy in the city.

Brighton and Hove City Council has faced and is facing eight-figure funding shortfalls every year from 2010 to 2020. Our ability to continue to provide high quality local services would be significantly enhanced by the increased revenues from the government tackling corporate tax dodging.

As ActionAid so eloquently puts it:

“The UK Treasury has been estimated to lose up to £12 billion to tax dodging by multinational companies every year, and it’s even worse in developing countries, where they lose three times more to tax dodging than they receive in aid every year. That’s enough to provide a basic education to the 57 million children currently missing out. The use of tax havens by some UK companies is rife, with 98 of the FTSE 100 companies routinely using tax havens. All who benefit from public spending, including multinational companies, should contribute their fair share.

Corporate tax avoidance is unjust as it harms ordinary people around the world, increasing poverty and inequality. It must be stopped. The UK must take a lead role in creating a fairer tax system.

While many ordinary people face falling household income and rising costs of living, some multinational companies are avoiding billions of pounds of tax from a tax system that fails to make them pay their fair share. Local governments in developing countries and the UK alike would benefit from a fairer tax system where multinational companies pay their fair share, enabling authorities around the world to provide quality public services. The UK government must listen to the strength of public feeling and act to end the injustice of tax dodging by large multinational companies, in developing countries and the UK.”

NOTICE OF MOTION**NHS****LABOUR & CO-OPERATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT**

To delete the following text in paragraphs 1 and 3:

~~“calls for the last fifteen years of privatisation of the National Health Service to be overturned, and the NHS returned to” and~~

~~Therefore this council opposes the legislation and changes introduced by current and previous governments, of; and~~

To replace with the following text in paragraphs 1 and 3 as shown in bold italics:

“believes in a National Health Service free at the point of use”

“This council supports commitments to repeal”

~~“Brighton & Hove City Council calls for the last fifteen years of privatisation of the National Health Service to be overturned, and the NHS returned to~~
believes in a National Health Service free at the point of use being a public service funded by, run by and accountable to local and national government.

This council believes that the NHS should be a cradle to grave service that works in tandem with social care services. However this council is concerned that instead of proper funding from general taxation, desperately-needed budgets are being directed to overheads involved in schemes such as commissioning healthcare and PFI contracts. This negatively impacts residents of our city who use local NHS services, as well as social care services provided by this council.

~~Therefore this council opposes the legislation and changes introduced by current and previous governments, of~~ ***This council supports commitments to repeal*** the Health and Social Care Act, which forces those with commissioning responsibilities to put out virtually all services to tender.

We therefore also support campaigns such as Defend the NHS who campaign for markets for profit to be kept out of health care delivery.”

Proposed by: Councillor Morgan

Seconded by: Councillor Robins

NOTICE OF MOTION**CHRISTMAS PARKING AND ROADWORKS SUSPENSION****LABOUR & CO-OPERATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT**

To insert a new resolution 2 and renumber accordingly:

2. ***“Request that the report includes an alternative option using an amount equivalent to the estimated loss in parking income from (1) above, to subsidise free travel on Brighton & Hove Buses on ‘Small Business Saturday (6th December) and”***

“This Council resolves to:

1. Request that officers bring a report to the appropriate Committee which, if agreed, would introduce free parking at Norton Road, London Road, Regency Square, High Street and Trafalgar Street car parks on Small Business Saturday (6th December) and the 3 Sundays before Christmas (7th, 14th and 21st December);
2. ***Request that the report includes an alternative option using an amount equivalent to the estimated loss in parking income from (1) above, to subsidise free travel on Brighton & Hove Buses on ‘Small Business Saturday (6th December) and***
3. Request that the Executive Director of Environment, Development & Housing seeks the suspension of all non-urgent roadworks in the city centre during December.”

Proposed by: Councillor Mitchell

Seconded by: Councillor Robins

