

COUNCIL ADDENDUM

4.30PM, THURSDAY, 19 APRIL 2018

COUNCIL CHAMBER - BRIGHTON TOWN HALL

ADDENDUM

ITEM		Page
85	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.	1 - 2
	List of written questions received from members of the public (copy attached).	
86	DEPUTATIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.	3 - 10
	List of deputations received from members of the public (copy attached).	
87	PETITIONS FOR COUNCIL DEBATE	11 - 12
(i)	Single Use Plastics: Amendment from the Green Group. Proposed by Councillor Druitt (copy attached).	
89	WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS.	13 - 28
	List of written questions received and the responses from councillors (copy attached).	
94	THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS TO NOTICES OF MOTION HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS FOR CONSIDERATION:	29 - 32
	Amendments to Notices of Motion:	
(2)	Unite Construction Charter. Proposed by Councillor Mears (copy attached).	
(3)	Hove Library Planning Application. Proposed by Councillor Daniel (copy attached).	

FOR INFORMATION

The following are responses from Government Ministers and Organisations to previous Notices of Motions. These are not part of the agenda for the meeting and are being circulated for information only.

- 1 Mental Health Services. Response from Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Mental Health and Equalities.
- 2 Universal Credit and New Homes Bonus. Response from the Minister of State for Housing.
- Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle (PHV) Licensing. Response from the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Transport.
- 4 Brexit. Response from the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government.
- 5 Brexit. Response from Eurocities Network.

Council	Agenda Item 85
19 April 2018	Brighton & Hove City Council

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.

1. QUESTION From: Christopher Hawtree

Would Councillor Daniel please tell us why the cross-Party working group for Hove's Carnegie Library was not told that proposals for basement use would entail further loss of public space on the ground floor?

Councillor Daniel, Chair of the Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities & Equalities Committee will reply.

2. QUESTION From: Valerie Paynter

Can you explain, please, the motive and reasoning behind the Planning Department's unusual decision not to provide any neighbour consultee lettering whatsoever for either BH2017/03940 or BH2018/00469 - the 2 currently controversial planning applications intended to alter Hove's Grade 2 Listed Carnegie Library both physically and functionally?

Councillor Cattell, Chair of the Planning Committee will reply.

3. QUESTION From: Ninka Willcock

What factors does the Council take into account when determining a planning application submission date for its own land or property?

Councillor Cattell, Chair of the Planning Committee will reply.

4. QUESTION From: Michael Edwards

In 2015, the Surrenden and Fiveways Area was consulted on a controlled parking zone. With a 47% turnout, the area voted yes. Subsequently, two controlled zones have been designated over parts of the consulted area, at Fiveways and Balfour (where 55% voted against a scheme in the first consultation). On 20 March, ETS Chair told us we are 'at the back of the queue'

for a new consultation because we voted against a scheme in 2015. But we didn't (50% of roads voted yes). Why can't the democratic rights of Surrenden Area residents be recognised with a parking consultation now?

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

5. QUESTION From: Nigel Furness

It has recently come to my attention, Councillor Mitchell, that any number of trees in Benfield Valley South, directly behind houses in Hangleton Road, have been brutally mutilated with a BLUNT chainsaw and the wood apparently stolen for fuel by an adjoining resident.

As the upkeep of these trees is the sole responsibility of this Council, can you please indicate how you, as Chair of Environment, plan to rectify this outrage and when?

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

6. QUESTION From: Rohan Lowe

How much funding has been set a-side to repair the footbridge at Hove station?

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

7. QUESTION From: Mark Strong

There is overwhelming evidence that cycling has huge physical and mental health benefits, as well as for air quality.

The city has had an excellent record of delivering cycling, with increased usage across the community (which has recently stalled). However, there remains no overall direction for development of cycling (or walking) as recommended by Government guidance.

In July 2017 full Council unanimously agreed a motion to develop "a specific and ambitious cycling strategy". Despite further support at ETS and Council there has been no progress.

When work will start on a Cycling Strategy and Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan?

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

Council	Agenda Item 86
19 April 2018	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 two Deputations have been received. The spokesperson is entitled to speak for 5 minutes.

(1) Deputation concerning the PVP St James' Street Party

Spokesperson Mr R. Rolfe

Supported by: David Hainsworth Trevor Scoble Janie Thomas Robert Edwards Teresa Scoble

Ward affected: All

Councillor Robins, Chair of the Tourism, Development & Culture Committee will reply.

(2) Deputation concerning Music Venues

Spokesperson Mark Stack

Supported by:
Jacqueline Mitrovic
Robin Coward
Alex Fraser
Simon Hill
John Robertson

Ward affected: All

Councillor Robins, Chair of the Tourism, Development & Culture Committee will reply.

Council	Agenda Item 86(1)
1 February 2018	Brighton & Hove City Council

(1) Deputation concerning the PVP St James' Street Party

We the under listed members of The Kingscliffe Society wish to make a deputation for moving the PVP (St James's Street Party) down onto Madeira Drive, at the next full Council Meeting on the 19th April 2018.

We therefore would refer to the Economic Development & Culture Committee meeting 13/11/2014 and to Agenda item 35 (ref 3.28.21) in support.

Introduction

We the Kingscliffe Society and on behalf of many other businesses and residents have sent the Council a notification of a Declaration dated 7th April 2018. The subject of the Declaration is a list of the effects imposed on us, without any effective consideration of our needs, by the St James's Street Party (PVP). We will introduce a copy of an Email from the Pride organisation issued prior to the actual event for the comparison of our list of effects with their proposed action plan.

There are amongst our residents the old – some housebound, some less able and some who require help two or three times a day. There are young families that cannot afford simply to move away and rent, because it is the most expensive time of the year. The late night noise of the street party disturbs everyone young & elderly well into the night. Many of our more lucky residents simply move away temporarily, but some of our local businesses have to bite the bullet and close, losing a valuable weekend's income and more.

The resulting street conditions can only be described as a disgusting nightmare. All of these problems have been growing from year to year without being resolved and without respect and consideration for us all. In past years pre---event public meetings have been called without informing all the businesses and residents, yet still claiming a favourable response, even though the real views and/or consent of all those concerned have never been sought.

The original purpose of this party as a celebration of the gay community has been completely undermined by the presence of a vast army of hangers--on, who appear intent only on unlicensed excess and drink/drug taking, and who have no natural connection to the city at any other time of the year. We are obliged to live with the effects for days afterwards and we then dread the fact that it will all happen again next year, getting worse each time.

There are no real reasons why this event should not be moved to the adjacent seafront at Madeira Drive. Proper controls could be more easily instituted, while few, if any, of the residents would be seriously affected. At least any acts of appalling drunkenness and bad behaviour would not be occurring close to our homes, properties and businesses. [It might even become an event to which people would be proud to bring grandparents or nieces and nephews.]

With due respect, we cannot imagine that any of our Councillors would like the St James's Street party imposed on their own home and front doorstep for a full weekend Friday night to Sunday night. We therefore respectfully request Council not to give permission for this event to take place in the St James's Street area.

We are grateful to all members and businesses who have taken the time to send us feedback about last year's event. The following is a summary of last year's evet:

- No street cleaning until days after the event and only St. James Street was
- cleaned, the side streets were ignored
- No rubbish collectors during the event
- Nobody from Pride was visible or contactable during the event
- Sound systems not adhering to their contractual start/finish times
- Toilets were installed even though the contactors were aware they were not
- working
- Nobody in charge of the stewards who had at best a disinterested attitude in
- their role
- Feedback from many attendees at the event was that bags and wristbands were not

Supporting Information:

- checked
- No security in attendance in any of the side streets
- External Police Forces were used who did not know the area they did not know
- where evacuation points were
- Excessive on-line 'administration' fees as well as processing fees for wristbands
- How it is always Aeon Productions and its associates who wins the tender for the
- event even when they are offered cheaper and better alternatives
- No local consultation regarding the event
- Residents were refused access by the security guards at the bottom of Dorset
- We used to enjoy the street party when it was actually focused on the gay
- community rather than the economically motivated, overcrowded heterosexual
- Carnival now being promoted
- We were annoyed to have to wear wristbands to shop in our own community
- Police coverage in the St James' Street area virtually non-existent

Collated by The Kingsliffe Society.

We will be meeting the event organisers shortly to discuss this and we will also present feedback to a meeting of the full Council in due course.

From: Sent date:

paul@brighton-pride.org 13/07/2017 - 15:39

To:

trevor.scoble894@btinternet.com

Cc:

jayne@brighton-pride.org, david.hainsworth@gmail.com, rogerrolfe@icloud.com, becky@brighton-

pride.org

Subject:

Re: PVP St James's Street Party 2017

Attachments: PVPmap2017 v1.pdf 1.4 MB

Pride: Police: BHCC: Statement 2017].docx 344.3 KB

PVP 2017 St James St.pdf 104.8 KB

image001.png 57.9 KB

Dear Kingscliffe Society,

Thank you for your most recent correspondence the content of which has been noted. With regard to your request to be provide with copies of our plan and risk assessment i must once again state that these are not for public distribution.

These documents are not distributed in the public domain as they contain detailed security plans, which if publicly distributed, would undermine the safety and security of the entire event.

As explained previously Sussex Police carry out a threat assessment on the event and implement plans accordingly. At this time we have not been advised that there is a change to the threat assessment carried out by Sussex Police

I am not saying that our plans are secret but they do contain our security plans and therefore Pride will not share these plans with individuals outside of our agreed event planning team.

I have to disagree with you comment that I have for years strongly disagreed with moving the PVP to another location, this is not my view and we have already raised possible alternative options with statutory partners.

What I have said is, we believe that large numbers of people (not necessarily visitors to Pride) would simply return to St James Streets for what would be seen as a free public gathering; without the management and safety measures that Pride CIC have put in place. We are concerned about the negative and potentially dangerous consequences of such an un-managed gathering.

It would be irresponsible to request a relocation change for the Village party without fully exploring the consequences of what would happen in St James St & surrounding streets but I'm confident that should Kingscliffe Society or others produce a detailed plan to ensure the management and safety of large gathering on St James St or Marine parade or surrounding Streets that the appropriate authorities will give then due consideration to your plans.

Pride would also be seeking view of detailed plans before we would be able to embark on a funding and managing an event on Madeira Drive or other locations.

My response to two of your other questions are set out below.

1 Police Barricades

I would like to clarify with you that these are not barricades but barriers that are installed by the police counter terrorism team and are there to prevent unauthorised vehicles from entering the area at speed. These are staffed for the duration, from installation to removal they are not 3m high fences and would not in an emergency prevent people leaving the area.

Street Plan

have attached a copy of the Street Plan that will be circulated to residents over the next two weeks along with nformation about the event, a contact number and email. for the weekend. This shows the venues that are participating in the event but they don't all have sound systems or stages those that do are...

George St - Queen Arms & Kings Arms share a stage
Broad St - Marine Tavern Stage
St James St - The Zone, Bulldog, Block - One music zone for this area DJs
St James St - Shortts Bar- DJs
Vanchester Street - Mucky Duck Latest Music Bar & Bella Cafe share or one music zone
Varine Parade - RBar, CharlesSt, Bar Patterns, Amsterdam - One music zone
Varine Parade - Funky Fish/ New Madeira Hotel one music zone
Rock Place - Brighton Rock One music zone

Marlborough - Stage and Music

We would advise that you or others submit your plans to your local councilor who can then take this up with the relevant departments at BHCC.

Although Pride will continue community dialog around the PVP after this years event I would be grateful that you take up any further concerns with BHCC or Sussex Police as ultimately, the statutory authorities have the final say on any events held in the City.

Kind Regards

Paul Kemp



Pride Arts and Film 21st July – 6th August 2017 Pride weekend 4th –6th August 2017

Paul Kemp Managing Director

The Old Ironworks Unit 2 30 Cheapside Brighton BN14GD W: brighton-pride.org

E: paul@brighton-pride.org
W: brighton-pride.org

Brighton and Hove Pride is the UK's biggest Pride Festival and is operated by Brighton Pride CIC, a not for profit community interest company.

All tickets revenue raised goes directly to the operational and running costs of producing the Pride Festival, LGBT Community Parade, Pride Village Party and community fundraising for the Rainbow Fund and Pride social impact fund.

From: TREVOR SCOBLE <trevor.scoble894@btinternet.com>

Reply-To: <trevor.scoble894@btinternet.com>

Date: Tuesday, 11 July 2017 12:01pm

To: <paul@brighton-pride.org>

Subject: PVP St James's Street Party 2017

Dear Paul

Council	Agenda Item 86(2)
1 February 2018	Brighton & Hove City Council

(2) Deputation concerning Music Venues: A thank you; a request; and still - who is VisitBrighton.com for?

Three years ago, I stood before you presenting one of the larger petitions you receive; bringing with me so many supporters they had to be accommodated in an anteroom with a video link. Such is the passion for live grassroots music in this city.

It was not a hostile petition and it was non-party political. Likewise, this deputation is neither hostile or party political. The petition was the grassroots music scene of Brighton and Hove reaching out to you saying get to know us, understand us and work with us. And you did. Thank you.

In truth, I expected you to slap the petition down, to somehow use council procedure to negate it, or just side-line it. But you didn't. Thank you.

The petition was backed unanimously and furthermore, you moved to create a Policy Panel to explore the issues affecting live music venues in the city. That process reached a milestone last month with the publication of the council's Brighton & Hove Live Music Venue Partnership Report.

This deputation is a big thank you for the work so far, to explain why I feel it is so important all Councillors keep an eye on the developments not just the specific committee members and also to mention a couple of new threats that have appeared since I last stood before you. I want to explain why the council's own Live Music Venue Partnership Report is so important. The second part of the deputation revisits my passionate feelings towards the Visit Brighton website.

The Music...

I appreciate that with your council workload, for some of you, the live music scene only triggers into your council consciousness when something goes wrong or there are negatives involved. These negatives you come across as Councillors only feed into that feeling that the city's nightlife is a problem to be tolerated rather than something wonderful to be celebrated. I'd like you to see past those over-emphasised negatives and join in with the positives.

The B&H Live Music Venue Report is an important step forward and I urge to read it (it's not that long). It's sets out the background and history of live music in the city, some of the current challenges for the sector both locally and nationally, and places it within a worldwide perspective. Our city is known worldwide as a grassroots musical hub that attracts a wealth of creative talent across all the creative industries. It's one of the reasons this city has such a high graduate retention.

The report makes 4 key recommendations.

The first of which is to set up two groups: a 'Live Music Roundtable' and a 'Live Music Venue Partnership'. To me this is the most important of the recommendations and an expansion of the forum idea that I put forward in the original petition. It is suggested in the report that the Roundtable will consist of around 20 members from across the sector from musicians and sound engineers, promoters, festival organisers, venue owners, etc., and key representatives from relevant council departments

This fledgling initiative needs treating with great care. The right inclusive balance is crucial from the off to get the local music scene fully onboard. If the Roundtable seen as a clique then musicians and small promoters will distance themselves from it en masse.

On a personal note, I feel it is imperative that a representative from police licencing is on the Roundtable. They and the local music scene need to bridge that gap of trust and understanding to work together for the benefit of both. For the economic survival of our venues I see this as paramount.

Supporting Information:

The Roundtable is to be supported by a Live Music Venue Partnership open to anyone working within the live music industry in the city to join. It's a forum of individuals supporting and passing ideas forward to the Roundtable.

The reason why I suggest you all keep an eye on developments is because you get people like me helping you out of passion not money. Like 90% of the people who are part of the grassroots live music scene, I don't make any money from it, actually quite the reverse. Yet I am intensely passionate about it though; and willing to put the time and effort in to help the music scene progress - and I'm by no means unique in that. In these times of budget cuts these passionate people are a resource that can really help you. If this initiative is successful, and I am so hoping it is, then the model should be portable to other sectors of council business in this climate of austerity. Please consider how cost-effective that can be.

Since I presented the petition new threats have emerged. The Business Rate review is a major concern. It has levied increases to some venues of 250 and 300 percent.

To put that into perspective for you, I was told by one venue owner that equates to a £2 per ticket rise, assuming the night was fully sold out (and of course that is not the norm). When you consider the normal ticket price for the venue is £3 to £7 you can understand what a big hike that is. What is galling, is that you Councillors don't even get to spend the money increase, as you just collect it and send it off to the government.

Though they are smaller, our local neighbours can offer some pointers that can be useful to you. Hastings has an evolving music scene, I'm told supported by the council and is definitely attracting positive reviews. The high cost of living here is making it attractive to some people on the music scene and I know of some grassroots musicians who have moved there and some promoters moving a number of their gigs there too.

Worthing Councillors on the other hand have made the retrograde step of issuing a music venue 70db limit without actually understanding what that means. The decibel scale is not linear - each reduction of 10db reduces the sound level by half. I ask you to keep this in mind if you ever plan to put decibel restrictions on venues.

- Most grassroot venues operate at around 100db without complaint from their neighbours.
- > 90db is half that 100db volume (50%),
- > 80db is a quarter of 100db loudness (25%).
- In asking for a live music venue to operate at 70db that is less than 13% of the volume that venues normally operate at. It is the sound of a vacuum cleaner, less than the average noise level of your TV or radio in your own home.

Three years ago, I asked you to remember my petition every time you saw a musician on the city's streets. Whether it was someone with a guitar strapped to their back, a towering stack of drums walking down the street, a jazz band unloading into a venue, a proud grandpa escorting one of the city's many young musicians to their first gig or an out of town band arriving at the station because Brighton is such a great place to play. I asked you to remember the petition.

This was because live music is everywhere in this city. It is so common we don't notice it any more. It's akin to how we forget to hear the waves when we take a long walk on the beach, because it's there ever present. I still need you to notice it, even now, because it is still under threat, it still needs your help and understanding. Thank you.

The Tourist website

The comments I am making here are because I am passionate about this city live, work and play in. I love being a party of this city. I mean no personal disrespect to anyone but I feel I should it point out if something is not working.

Regardless of your political position, Brexit is going to make a difference. We are spoilt in this city with what the influx of tourists awards us - an abundance of shops, restaurants and leisure amenities we wouldn't normally be able to support. Will Brexit change all that? Will the foreign tourists and language students still come in the same numbers? Will it increase the number of the country's Staycationers and how can we keep ahead of that game?

In the past seaside resorts like Margate, Blackpool and Rhyl became complacent over what they had and then declined dramatically as times changed. We must make sure Brighton & Hove doesn't become complacent in the face of Brexit and other changes.

Supporting Information:

Which brings me back to the council's tourist website VisitBrighton.com – our shop window as a city, how we offer what we have to the world to entice them in.

When I presented the petition back in 2015 one Councillor accused me of taking a pop at Visit Brighton when I highlighted the complete lack of music scene visibility on the site. Well if 7 of the official 'Top 50' things the city has to offer are not even in the city (including a golf club as far away as Uckfield) and it didn't reflect the live music scene at all, then I felt it far to take 'a pop'. I asked at the time "Who is this website made for?" and I'm now asking the same question again.

Since then the site has had a revamp. It's pretty, it's glossy, lots of huge pictures. It is not pushing faraway golf courses as a city attraction anymore but apparently out of town llama farms are a 'Must See'. Please do not get me wrong, I've no beef nor wish to disrespect the designer here. They will have been working to a brief and done that job very well.

The site reminds me of one of those glossy publications where companies get featured for buying adverts in the magazine. It looks wonderful but when you get down to it, it is devoid of real content. [Councillors I appreciate that for most of you with your normal council workload you may not have extensively looked at this site or be aware of its lack of actual content]

The layout of the site is extra large pictures scrolling across there screen. It's intuitive to click them as links but most of which do not take you anywhere if you do. The pictures are so big you do not realise there is text below them when you scroll, it's almost deliberate to hide the fact that there's not much text at all.

On the new 'Top 50 things to do in Brighton & Hove' page - 7 of the 50 are outside the city with "Go Ape Crawley" having 2 separate entries as does "Laughter Yoga and Chocolate Chuckles Brighton (Activity Organiser)". This isn't something to be laughing over though it is a complete joke. What is the criteria for being feature on the site? There is not a single mention of the live music scene.

The actual Music Venues page [https://www.visitbrighton.com/things-to-do/entertainment-and-nightlife/music-venues] is pretty sparse with mainly council own venues and – WOW! - Newhaven Fort as the top music venue on the list. Ironically buried deep on the council's .gov website is a much more informative page that captures most of the city's main venues and other music scene links [https://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/content/leisure-and-libraries/arts-and-culture/live-music]. Please compare the two sites and you'll understand what I mean. Surely with its importance to the city, the live music scene and its venues should have its own tab on Visit Brighton.

I could go on and on citing other neglected areas not just live music but I think you get the drift by now. Rather than be negative I'd prefer to give some positive pointers.

- Why not have a breakdown of the beaches and what you'll find there each with its own page. From Hove lagoon through to the marina the family orientated beaches, basketball, i360, beach volleyball, even the nudist beach. Expand it further with the restaurants, cafes, bars and other points of interest around that section.
- Map out the city with link pages of all the local mini-neighbourhoods and what you'll find there.
- How about a map of where all the cycle stations are in the city and the cycle routes you can use them?
- Ask video bloggers to send you their take on the city and what it has to offer. For a link back to their blogging channel you'll get plenty of potential subscriptions for free.

These are just ideas off the top of my head. Open it up to the people who live and work in the city to come up with their suggestions for the top 50 and what should be and they'll tell you what we should be broadcasting about the city.

Councillors, Visit Brighton shouldn't be just pretty pictures on a website for the sake of it. It needs to be an integral part of the council's strategy to attract new people to the city and make it as appealing and informative as possible.

Many thanks for listening and please, each time you see a musician on the city's streets, remember this deputation and our amazing live music scene. Thank you.

Council	Agenda Item 87(i)
19 th April 2018	Brighton & Hove City Council

SINGLE-USE PLASTICS PETITION FOR DEBATE GREEN GROUP AMENDMENT

To add additional recommendation 2.2 as shown in bold italics below:

- 2.2 That a report be brought to the Tourism, Development &Culture Committee exploring the proposals set out in the petition including:
 - the possibility of requiring event organisers and vendors to avoid Single Use Plastic as a condition of their event permission

Proposed by: Cllr Druitt Seconded by: Cllr Mac Cafferty

Recommendations if carried to read:

- 2.1 That the petition is noted and referred to the Tourism, Development & Culture Committee for consideration at its meeting on 21st June 2018;
- 2.2 That a report be brought to the Tourism, Development & Culture Committee exploring the proposals set out in the petition; including:
 - the possibility of requiring event organisers and vendors to avoid Single Use Plastic as a condition of their event permission.

Council	Agenda Item 89
19 April 2018	Brighton & Hove City Council

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

The following questions listed on pages 43 - 46 of the agenda have been received from Councillors and will be taken as read along with the written answers listed below.

(1) Councillor West

Unsightly rubbish is piling up beside the city's arterial roads. Whilst not only threatening the nearby flora and fauna, this detritus also risks blowing into the national park and going into the drainage system. Given that some of the litter is large sheets of polythene that may get blown across the carriageway it also poses a worrying threat to road users.

In January 2017 Greens pushed the Council to write directly to the Secretary of State for Environment urging them to increase the additional funding required for Highways England to adequately conduct litter picking and detritus removal across all areas of our natural environment. This included our key arterial roads. The Government response ignored this request and unfortunately focused solely on fixed penalty fines for littering. It also did not address the discrepancy between the role of Highways England and of the local Council to maintain this land.

I am disappointed to learn recently that Highways England refused to give permission for the road closures. Greens are increasingly concerned that there appears to be little management of the relationship between the Labour Council and Highways England in order to deal with roadside litter. This urgently needs to be addressed. It would also be positive if signage was introduced, as it is in neighbouring West Sussex.

Can the Chair of Environment say what action is being taken to urgently address these issues?

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

Street cleansing is the responsibility of the Brighton and Hove City Council and this includes the verges of all our high speed dual carriageways. The A27 and A23 are cleaned twice yearly alongside the maintenance works that involve lane closures.

Although, it is the responsibility of Brighton and Hove City Council to organize the work, prior to that it has to be authorised and carried out in accordance with instruction from Highway England and its contractor.

We were proposing to schedule a clean up in March /April of this year, however due to the prolonged resurfacing works on the A27, our permission was denied and we are currently awaiting for a new time slot to be agreed. We have been informed by the HE contractor that access will be provided in the forthcoming months, but to date this has not been confirmed.

Together with Lewes District Council Brighton and Hove City Council is organizing training relating to cleansing of the high speed roads whilst they are closed for maintenance. This will mean that for the future we will have staff who are trained so that they can undertake cleaning tasks at times when HEclose either the A27 and A23. This will prevent us from needing to apply for separate permissions.

In the meantime our crews have undertaken litter picks of most of the slip roads leading to A27 as well as areas by lay buys. Once we will receive permission from HE we will publicise the dates on the web site and our social media. Cllr West's own robust remarks in relation to Highways England are recorded in the minutes of the March meeting of the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee.

2) Councillor Lewry

New Homes

Please can the Administration advise how many new homes have been started and completed since 2015 that were not already in the pipeline from the previous Administration? Can they also advise how much has been spent in providing these homes and what the rents are for each of them? Can the Administration also advise how many are in construction now and will actually be completed by May 2019 and the associated costs with the proposed rents for each of them?

Reply from Councillor Meadows Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

Scheme	Actual spend £'000	Number of Units	Tenure Mix	Housing / Housing New Homes Committee approval date	Completion Date	Rents per week (excl Service charges)	HB Eligible Service Charges per week	Total charge to Tenant per week
Brooke Mead	12,041	45	1 Bed	17-Jun- 2015*	15-Dec-17	£121.80	£31.10	£152.90
		10	1 Bed			£144.50	£7.30	£151.80
Kite Place	14,338	33	2 Bed	17-Jun-15	11-Apr-18	£183.60	£7.30	£190.90
		14	3 Bed			£221.00	£7.30	£228.30
		7	1 Bed			£146.90	£6.12	£153.02
Hobby Place	6,983	16	2 Bed	02-Mar-16	May-18	£186.36	£6.12	£192.48
		6	3 Bed			£224.16	£6.12	£230.28
Lynchet			2 Bed			£154.15	£1.48	£155.63
Close & Salehurst Close	2,116	6	4 Bed	28-Jun-17	25-May-18	£205.54	£1.48	£207.02

35,477 137

Schemes under construction to be completed by May 2019

Kensington		11	1 Bed	14- Jan-	01-		£153.02
Street **	3,681	1	2 Bed	15	May-19		£192.48

^{**} scheme approved prior to May 2015

(3) Councillor Wares

Cityclean

Please can the Administration provide performance details for its initiatives to provide both commercial waste and green waste collections and compare those performances against the business plans used to establish these initiatives?

Can the Administration also provide details on progress for supplying the new recycling wheelie bins?

How many remain to be delivered and how many bins that have been delivered still have to be swapped for smaller and to a lesser extent, larger bins.

Can the Administration confirm when the roll-out programme will be complete taking account of residents actually having the right size bins they need?

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

As part of the City Environmental Management Modernisation Programme, working is being undertaken to review the commercial operations of Cityclean. This review includes an analysis of both the commercial waste and garden waste services to ensure they are supported by appropriate business plans and financial forecasts.

Following the end of the financial outturn we will be conducting a review of the income generated as well as the overall performance of each service and incorporating this into an update report being taken to Policy Resources & Growth Committee in July 2018.

It was always anticipated that the roll-out of the recycling wheelie bins was not a 'one size fits all' solution and as the programme reached the city centre areas, a mixed approached would be needed and so area audits are being undertaken. The most recent area audits carried out were for the Moulsecoomb and Bevendean, Hollingdean & Stanmer and Hanover and Elm Grove areas to ascertain whether streets are suitable for the new bins or are to stay with black boxes.

^{*} Original approval for scheme to be explored was in 2013

The audits identified 6,000 households as being appropriate to receive recycling wheelie bins. These residents have been written to week commencing 3rd April explaining the changes.

The number of bins remaining to be delivered will depend on the outcome of the audits being carried out. From the first phase of the roll-out there are 124 swaps to be completed during w/c 16th April. In the second phase, following the audits, residents will be able to request a swap taking into consideration constraints such as pavements widths.

The programme of audits and delivery of bins for suitable, central areas of the city will continue. This will include responding to feed-back from ward councillors, crews and residents in relation to both phases of the roll-out.

4) Councillor Taylor

Hospital for Hove

Can the Administration outline the steps they intend to take via the Health and Wellbeing Board to provide a 'Hospital for Hove', that will include a Multidisciplinary Community Diagnostic Centre, a GP Hub and small A&E Unit, given that the demand for a school in Toads Hole Valley no longer exists?

Reply from Councillor Yates - Chair of the Health & Wellbeing Board

Brighton and Hove Clinical Commissioning Group is responsible for the commissioning of local hospital and urgent care facilities and GP Practices, the latter in conjunction with NHS England under co-commissioning arrangements. As part of this role the CCG considers the local requirements for these facilities. The CCG is represented on the Health and Wellbeing Board and engages Board members in the development of NHS plans in relation to these service Areas. As councillors will be aware we are actively working to more closely integrate with the local health economy and will explore appropriate opportunities to maximise and enhance primary and community service provision where there is a demonstrable need across the city, including Hove.

(5) Councillor Simson

Mesh verges

Residents across the city are fed up with vehicles parking on grass verges because of the damage caused, the unsightly impression it gives and the cost to the public purse for repairs. However, residents would not be so concerned especially in neighbourhoods like Woodingdean and Hangleton & Knoll, where it is impossible for houses to have off road parking, if no damage was being caused.

So will the council look at a long-term solution and cost the provision of grasscrete or cheaper rubber grass-road blocks as a spend to save measure? This could be done on a rolling basis and would allow grass to grow through and be mowed in the usual way without having the ongoing annual damage caused by parked vehicles that is expensive to repair and causes so many complaints.

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

Thank you for your question regarding the use of Grasscrete on verges which are being damaged by parked vehicles. We are very much aware that certain areas of the city suffer ongoing vehicle damage to verges, which has been particularly bad this year due to the sustained wet weather.

Using Grasscrete is a costly solution and requires a lot of work to excavate a stable foundation on which it would sit. However, we do have a policy which allows the installation of posts to prohibit parking on grass verges in areas which are most affected.

In order to manage the limited resources available, posts are installed on a priority basis. But ultimately we do hope drivers park their vehicles in an appropriate place and do not choose to park in locations that causes damage to the highway. Officers would be happy to be contacted with the details of any particular locations which are causing most concern.

The City Council has for many years been lobbying central government for powers to ban pavement and verge parking in the city, in the same way it has been banned in London since 1974. The Department for Transport confirmed in April that the Minister has asked for evidence to be gathered over the summer about the effectiveness or not of the current regulatory framework in tackling this issue. We hope to work with the Department for Transport to find a regulatory solution that works to protect and save the city's pavements and verges from problem parking.

(6) Councillor Gibson

How much under the HRA borrowing cap was BHCC on 1st April 2015 and the 1st of April 2018?

Reply from Councillor Meadows – Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

As at 1/4/15, the HRA had total borrowing of £115.8m and was therefore £41.0m under the borrowing cap of £156.8m. As at 1st April 2018, the HRA had borrowed £126.3m (this is based on draft outturn figures for 2017/18 and so subject to change) and was therefore £30.5m under the borrowing cap of £156.8m. However, other commitments in the HRA capital programme for 2018/19 – 2020/21 show that the HRA will be very close to the cap in 2022/23 with headroom (available borrowing) of only £2.134m. (This forecast has yet to be updated for the 2017/8 outturn).

(7) Councillor Gibson

What was the net borrowing taken up between 1st April 2015 and 1st April 2018 when expressed as a percentage of the maximum borrowing available to the HRA on the 1st of April 2015?

Reply from Councillor Meadows – Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

The net borrowing undertaken between 1st April 2015 and 2018 is £10.5m. As at 1st April 2015, the HRA had £41m of borrowing headroom. Therefore, the net borrowing of £10.5m represents 25.6% of the borrowing available. However, a large proportion of this borrowing headroom is already committed for the HRA three year capital programme, including spend on the New Homes for Neighbourhoods programme, buy backs, hidden homes works and works to council dwellings. Current planned capital spend in the HRA mean a further net borrowing of £28.4m in the next 5 years to 2022/23 where the forecast level of borrowing headroom is £2.134m.

(8) Councillor Gibson

Financial modelling of new council homes

Having provided the figures for the estimated surplus/deficit over the 60 year financial modelling period for:

- Aldwick Mews
- Brook Mead
- Darwell Court
- Flint Close
- Hobby Place
- Kite Place
- Pierre Close
- Preston Rd
- Robert Lodge (N)
- Robert Lodge (S)
- Lynchet Close
- Kensington St

And used assumptions to calculate these answers for each scheme (above). For each scheme model, please can you indicate what the assumptions used were in the calculations on each of the above schemes for the following elements of the model:

- Initial Management costs per property (+ inflation assumption for future years)
- 2) Initial Major repair costs per property (with inflation assumption for future vears)
- Initial rent and assumptions about future rent increases over the 60 year model
- 4) Initial Maintenance costs per property (+ inflation assumption for future years)
- 5) Service charge costs and inflationary assumptions on these costs over the period of the model

Reply from Councillor Meadows – Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

See the updated table below which has added rows for the management, maintenance and service charge information (in grey). As for inflation, the

model strips out inflation as it is all discounted to a net present value – the value as at today. This effectively means that we are assuming inflation will be the same for costs and income. The rational for this is that inflationary changes to rents are affected by Government policy and are not easily predictable in the longer term and similarly, build cost inflation and maintenance cost inflation over the years, is very difficult to predict. Therefore the model assumes they will inflate by the same amount over the 60 years.

Comparison of scheme viability using 40 year modelling and current 60 year cash flow modelling

Response to Cllr Gibson question for Council on 19th April 2018

The rows coloured grey below are new rows added to answer the latest questions on service charges, management and maintenance costs.

	Preston Road	Aldwick Mews	Flint Close	Pierre Close	Robert Lodge (N)	Robert Lodge (S)
Total Budget approved (£'000)	445	1,220	1,041	1,002	911	1,461
Number of units	2	5	4	4	6	9
Build cost per unit (£'000)	223	244	260	251	152	162
Management costs	1,072	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078
maintenance costs	912	914	914	914	914	914
Major repairs costs	700	700	700	700	700	700
Tenure mix	2 x 3 Bed Bungalows	1 x 2 Bed, 4 x 3 Bed	4 x 3 Bed house	4 x 3 Bed house	4 x 1 Bed Flats, 2 x 2 Bed Flats	9 x 1 Bed Flats
Rent p/w (excluding s/c						
1 Bed					151.50	151.50
2 Bed		184.00			191.00	
3 Bed	228.00	224.00	211.50	224.00		
4 Bed						
Service charge per week	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subsidy / (Surplus) reported previously (£'000)	38	128	174	83	107	329
Subsidy / (Surplus) using new modelling (£'000)	54	64	114	39	(12)	162

ı	\sim
	_
-	_

Payback period (years)	60+	60+	60+	60+	54.1	60+
Discount Rate (Equivalent to interest Rate at point of approval)	4.20%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%

Financial Services

13/04/18

Comparison of scheme viability using 40 year modelling and current 60 year cash flow modelling

Response to Cllr Gibson question for Council on 19th April 2018

The rows coloured grey below are new rows added to answer the latest questions on service charges, management and maintenance costs.

, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Darwell Court	Kensington Street	Kite Place	Brooke Mead	Hobby Place	Lynchet Close
Total Budget approved (£'000)	1,119	1,832	14,100	12,000	7,077	2,532
Number of units	5	12	58	45	29	8
Build cost per unit (£'000)	224	153	243	267	244	317
Management costs	1,000	1,078	1,071	1,070	303	290
maintenance costs	912	914	911	891	921	887
Major repairs costs	773	773	770	773	697	648
Tenure mix	2 x 1 Bed Flat, 2 x 2 Bed Flat, 1 x 3 Bed Flat	9 x 1 Bed Flat, 2 x 2 Bed flat 1 x 2 Bed House	15 x 1 bed, 31 x 2 bed and 12 x 3 bed	45 x 1 Bed Flats	7 x 1 bed, 16 x 2 bed and 6 x 3 bed	2 x 2 Bed Flats, 6 x 4 Bed Houses

Rent p/w (excluding s/c						
1 Bed	151.50	143.00	146.00	140.55	146.00	
2 Bed	191.00	186.30	185.46		185.46	175.87
3 Bed	228.00		223.26		223.26	
4 Bed						234.84
Service charge per week	0	0	7.02	12.47	7.02	1.04
Subsidy / (Surplus) reported previously (£'000)	286	570	1,020	2,125	512	(203)
Subsidy / (Surplus) using new modelling (£'000)	66	332	1,768	2,888	379	(391)
Payback period (years)	60+	60+	60+	60+	60+	60+
Discount Rate (Equivalent to interest Rate at point of approval)	4.25%	4.25%	4.18%	4.07%	4.19%	2.85%

Financial Services

13/04/18

(9) Councillor Gibson

Where schemes are part funded by borrowing, the modelling makes different assumptions for the rate of interest payable on the borrowing to reflect market expectations. For each the schemes actually undertaken, please can you indicate for that scheme what the assumed rate of borrowing was and what the actual rate was when the borrowing was undertaken?

Reply from Councillor Meadows – Chair of the Housing & New Homes Committee

The table above in relation to question 8 includes the assumed rates of borrowing that were included in the modelling of each scheme. At the time of viability modelling the interest rate assumptions used are based on prevailing market conditions and our external Treasury Management advisors best estimate of interest rates for the timing and type of borrowing required. This may be based on a forecast of the interest rate in a year's time, say, when the likely need to borrow may arise. Over the last few years there has been an expectation in the money markets that interest rates would rise and initially they were expected to rise sharply. However, rates have stayed low and are only just beginning to increase.

Actual borrowing does not take place on a scheme by scheme basis but is reviewed periodically to ensure the total capital programme is fully funded making use of any capital receipts, reserves and revenue contributions first. So, for example, if there were unexpected underspends in the revenue budget, it may reduce the level of borrowing required as more of the programme could be funded by revenue contributions. Therefore it is difficult the give the exact rate for each scheme as the borrowing is undertaken in relation to the whole programme. However, the table below shows when borrowing was undertaken during the lifetime of these schemes and the actual rates of interest.

A table showing all of the borrowing taken on since 2015 is as follows:

	Loan	Interest		Maturity
Loan Number	Value	Rate	Start date	Date
505117	5,000,000	2.47	20/06/2016	31/03/2064
505274	3,000,000	2.09	09/08/2016	31/03/2065
505280	2,000,000	2.09	10/08/2016	31/03/2063
507150	4,000,000	2.99	27/03/2018	27/03/2067
Internal from GF	3,292,500	0.83	31/03/2017	31/03/2018
Internal from GF	2,932,500	1.47	31/03/2018	31/03/2019

repaid

(10) Councillor Gibson

Given the rise in rough sleeping in the city of 128% since the rough sleeping strategy was launched in 2015 compared with a 33% increase in the rest of the country, do you believe there are any changes that can be made to improve our performance compared to the national average? And what might these changes be?

Reply from Councillor Moonan – Lead Member for Rough Sleeping

The Rough Sleeping Strategy was launched in summer 2016. Since the launch, the Rough Sleeping Estimate figures have risen by 24% (2016; 144 - 2017; 178). The year before the strategy was launched there was a much larger increase, which was one of the reasons why the Labour administration prioritised rough sleeping and together with key partners, developed the city wide strategy.

Over 50% of rough sleepers in Brighton and Hove come here from other areas, which has contributed to such a high increase. In fact, if the percentage increase was calculated for local people alone, the 2017 increase would be below the national average. This demonstrates that the strategy is starting to have an impact on rough sleepers numbers from Brighton and Hove.

The city continues to work on reducing the actual numbers and the need for people to rough sleep on our streets. Housing has expanded its homeless prevention work and the council is exploring new ways to accommodate rough sleepers and move them off the streets quickly. This includes expanding 'housing led' services for people with complex needs; launching the city's first Social Investment Bond to support rough sleepers to access a range of services; targeted reconnection work to support people to move to areas they have connections and applying for grant funding to boost our resources as opportunities arise. Whilst we continually strive to improve upon our existing performance, this must be placed in the context of the national picture of increased homelessness and locally the challenges of a supply of affordable accommodation.

The city wide Rough Sleeping Strategy is implemented through a Partnership Board, which includes all the relevant statutory and non-statutory agencies and organisations. At this Board new ideas and development are continually explored to ensure the city is at the forefront of best practice with regard to rough sleeping.

(11) Councillor Nemeth

Beach huts

Why was no urgent public statement made by the City Council following breakins to 34 beach huts at the end of March, and prior to 33 break-ins the following week, in order to alert owners to security and safety concerns?

Reply from Councillor Robins – Chair of the Tourism, Development & Culture Committee

The owners of the beach huts that were affected in both instances were contacted directly and the Police notified due to the criminal damage that occurred. The Police have been requested to consider additional patrols and the issue will be raised at the Police Tactical Tasking Group to see if any support can be provided by partners. The first incident was dealt directly with the affected beach hut owners and the Police rather than promote this act of vandalism.

(12) Councillor Mac Cafferty

Pool Valley

Anyone arriving in the city via National Express coaches does not have a warm welcome. Pool Valley has sadly become run down and is unwelcoming. A decade after the plans to upgrade the National Express bus depot for the city were put on ice, what work will the administration commit to improve Pool Valley with National Express and other partners?

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

I fully recognise the significant role that Pool Valley plays as an interchange in the city's transport system for residents and visitors alike in terms of being a well-used arrival and departure point for coach journeys. However, I am aware of its current condition and that previous administrations have sought to maintain and enhance it.

Works at Pool Valley Coach Station were one of the headline schemes included in the council's second 5-year Local Transport Plan [known as LTP2], which was published in 2006.

The aims of the Pool Valley Coach Station Enhancement Scheme were focused on personal safety, road safety and the urban realm to improve the character of the area for the passengers using it. The overall plan was based around enabling National Express, the coach operator, to construct a new, purposebuilt ticket office.

The urban realm works were planned to include improved paving and entry and exit treatments, and new street furniture such as benches, bollards, cycle racks and bins, as well as lighting.

Most of the urban realm works were completed in 2009, but the construction of the National Express ticket office was delayed.

The council did eventually receive and consider a planning application for National Express's single-storey building to provide ticket purchase facilities, sheltered waiting area and customer toilets. Planning permission was granted in June 2012, but it is understood that these facilities were not built owing to other financial priorities at that time for the company, and there has been no recent indication that that situation has changed.

Since then, senior council officers have written to National Express about this matter in order to seek to work with them to progress it, and therefore help address some of the problems that you and other people have raised with us in recent years. Regrettably, those approaches have not resulted in any change in National Express's position.

Therefore, the council did install a passenger shelter in 2014 in order to provide some cover and comfort for coach passengers in the short term, and it has also continued to try to secure funding through the planning process for improvements at the coach station, when possible.

Issues with the coach station were identified in the council's current and fourth Local Transport Plan [LTP4], which was approved in March 2015, and refers to the development of a coach strategy which will include the Pool Valley Coach Station.

The council subsequently agreed a number of further priorities in 2015, which included the development of a Transport Interchange Strategy, including provision for coaches and their drivers and passengers.

Until very recently, it has not been possible to identify and allocate sufficient officer time to start that, and some other workstreams, owing to staff vacancies and reduced budgets. However, I am pleased to say that with some new appointments to key posts in the City Transport Division it will now be possible to make progress against that commitment.

Once that Interchange Strategy is developed, with the input and assistance of various partners and stakeholders such as National Express, its content and conclusions will no doubt be considered by the ET&S Committee in due course.

I certainly expect the strategy to provide a clearer indication of the future options for the city's coach station and its passengers, especially as that investment could also help to support the council's wider vision and strategy for the seafront.

As the current access to Pool Valley, and the main arrival and departure routes for coaches are linked with the Valley Gardens Phase 3 area, I also expect that scheme to take into account the current location of the coach station, and possibly provide an opportunity to improve it.

(13) Councillor Mac Cafferty

Bins on Wilbury Road

Currently there are 3 communal waste and recycling bins and 8 commercial bins, in a 10 metre stretch of pavement and road at the foot of Wilbury Road. This is too often smelly and messy. The bins are poorly sited and a crowded pavement mean neighbours, businesses and pedestrians are suffering. Every day residents and visitors have to negotiate their way around the bins, any overspill and a BT phone box. As several businesses use their premises nearby for client meetings, the smell and mess are embarrassing. Although we flagged this concern to Cityclean for an investigation, 2 years after being first flagged the issue is still as persistent.

Can Councillor Mitchell please have the situation investigated and acted upon? Ideally this would involve combined action to locate some of the bins elsewhere and/ or collection frequency raised.

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

The Cityclean enforcement and operational teams always aim to respond promptly to complaints to commercial bins that have been placed on the public highway, such as those referred to in Willbury Road.

The city council does have the power to remove bins but we aim to provide business with options for appropriate alternative sites to place their bins.

Given the repeat nature of this complaint, Officers will be arranging to meet with the individual businesses concerned to explore alternative locations for their waste bins.

(14) Councillor Mac Cafferty

York Road collisions data

Further to residents' concerns about safety, please can road collisions data for the junction of York Road, York Avenue and Lansdowne Road be tabulated for the last 3 years, detailing date, severity (fatal, serious or slight severity) and vehicle type?

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

The most recently published three-year records for the junction of Lansdowne Road with York Road and York Avenue, those being January 2015 to December 2017, show that there have been five (5) road traffic injury accidents. The details of these are as follows: -

24th April 2015, a slight injury occurred resulting from a collision between a taxi/private hire car and a pedal cyclist;

29th July 2017, a slight injury occurred resulting from a collision between a car and a taxi/private hire car;

18th September 2017, a slight injury occurred resulting from a collision between a taxi/private hire car and a car;

2nd October 2017, a serious injury occurred resulting from a collision between a taxi/private hire car and a powered two-wheeled vehicle (a moped or motorcycle); and

7th December 2017, a slight injury occurred resulting from a collision between a car and a pedal cycle.

(15) Councillor Mac Cafferty

Dangerous driving around Norfolk Square

The hit and run collision on 28th March at the junction of Borough Street and Western Road and the car crashing at the junction of Norfolk Square and Western Road on 9th February are the latest expression of dangerous driving in this area. This is often experienced in the one way streets being used as rat runs with vehicles often travelling at dangerous speeds. Please can road collisions data for Borough Street, Temple Street, Norfolk Road and Norfolk Square be tabulated for the last 3 years, detailing date, severity (fatal, serious or slight severity) and vehicle type?

And, what work, if any, has been undertaken with the Police and Crime Commissioner and Sussex Police to ensure safety for all road users in this area is prioritised?

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

The most recently published three-year records for Norfolk Square, those being January 2015 to December 2017, show that there have been six (6) road traffic injury accidents. The details of these are as follows: -

18th June 2015, a slight injury occurred resulting from a collision between a taxi/private hire car and a pedal cycle;

11th September 2015, a slight injury occurred resulting from a collision between a car and a pedestrian;

10th April 2016, a fatal injury occurred resulting from a confrontation between two adult males resulting on one male landing under a heavy goods vehicle;

23rd April 2016, a serious injury occurred resulting from a collision between a car and a pedestrian;

25th November 2016, a slight injury occurred resulting from a collision between a car and police car on an emergency call; and

20th November 2017, a slight injury occurred resulting from a collision between a pedal cycle and a car door opening into the cyclist's way.

Officers advise me that the level of such accidents is decreasing within Brighton and Hove and is decreasing faster than both the National average and in areas with other transport characteristics, which is to be welcomed. This has been partly achieved by focusing the Council's resources on those locations with the worst problems via the Council's High Risk programme which tackles those streets, roads and junctions with the highest risks and this focus will continue.

(16) Councillor Mac Cafferty

Floral Clock

Brunswick in Bloom will be soon with us once again (early July), can the Floral Clock mechanism be repaired in time for this?

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

Officers have commissioned a survey of the floral clock. Once this survey is received officers will tender for the repairs if there is sufficient funding to do so.

Council	Agenda Item 94 (2)
19 April 2018	Brighton & Hove City Council

NOTICE OF MOTION

UNITE CONSTRUCTION CHARTER

CONSERVATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

That the motion be amended to delete the words as struck through and insert those shown in **bold italics**.

This council resolves to support **note** the Unite the Union Construction Charter and request that a report come to the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee regarding signing up to the Charter, recognising that:

- As a Local Authority we are responsible for the procurement of construction projects.
- It is therefore appropriate that as a responsible client we consider sign up to
 this Charter, and commit to working with the appropriate trade unions, in order
 to achieve the highest standards in respect of; direct employment status, Health
 & Safety, standard of work, apprenticeship training and the implementation of
 appropriate nationally agreed terms and conditions of employment.
- As more local authorities support the Charter this may lead to policy change at a national level leading to improved minimum standards in local authority procurement of construction projects.

Proposed by: Cllr Mears Seconded by: Cllr Bell

Supported by: Conservative Group of Councillors

Recommendation if carried to read:

This council resolves to note the Unite the Union Construction Charter and request that a report come to the Policy, Resources & Growth Committee regarding signing up to the Charter, recognising that:

- As a Local Authority we are responsible for the procurement of construction projects.
- It is therefore appropriate that as a responsible client we consider this Charter, and commit to working with the appropriate trade unions, in order to achieve the highest standards in respect of; direct employment status, Health & Safety, standard of work, apprenticeship training and the implementation of appropriate nationally agreed terms and conditions of employment.
- As more local authorities support the Charter this may lead to policy change at a national level leading to improved minimum standards in local authority procurement of construction projects.

NM02 – 19.04.18 Status: Proposed

Council	Agenda Item 94(4)
19 th April 2018	Brighton & Hove City Council

NOTICE OF MOTION

LABOUR AND CO-OPERATIVE GROUP AMENDMENT

HOVE LIBRARY PLANNING APPLICATION

That the motion be amended to delete the words as struck through and insert those shown in **bold italics**.

This Council *requests* resolves to:

- Immediately call a halt to the proposed works to Hove Library Ftollowing issues
 raised by criticism from residents, campaigners, conservation societies and the
 Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) about the way in which the planning process
 was handled, until the go-ahead is given by the Cross-Party Hove Library Working
 Group (which was not consulted on the proposal) revisits as soon as possible its
 discussions on 12th March, where the scheme was considered and no
 changes requested; and
- 2. Requests t The Chair of Planning to ensure the briefing note prepared for Planning Committee is circulated to the members of the Tourism, Development & Culture Committee and Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities and Equalities Committee, to call for an officer report on the way in clarify the process by on the way in which application BH2017/03940 for works to the Library was advertised during the Christmas period and granted planning permission Listed Building consent. during the Christmas period without either resident, councillor or CAG scrutiny, that includes specific proposals on both consultation period and councillor intervention to ensure that such an event does not happen again.

Proposed by: Cllr Daniel Seconded by: Cllr Cattell

Recommendation if carried to read:

This Council requests:

- Following issues raised by residents, campaigners, conservation societies and the Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) about the way in which the process was handled, the Cross-Party Hove Library Working Group revisits as soon as possible its discussions on 12th March, where the scheme was considered and no changes requested; and
- 2. The Chair of Planning to ensure the briefing note prepared for Planning Committee is circulated to the members of the Tourism, Development & Culture Committee and Neighbourhoods, Inclusion, Communities and Equalities Committee, to clarify the process by which application BH2017/03940 for works to the Library was granted Listed Building consent.

NM03- 24.10.13 Status: Proposed



Parliamentary Unu.

Jackie Doyle-Price MP من Stac عن المساور Stac الم

39 Victoria Street London SW1H 0EU

020 7210 4850

Your Ref: MW/GR

PMPO-1121801

Mr Geoff Raw Chief Executive, Brighton and Hove City Council Hove Town Hall Norton Road Hove BN3 2SU

2 7 MAR 2018

Dear Mr Rom

Thank you for your letter of 19 February to the Prime Minister about mental health services. As this is a health-related matter, your letter has been passed to the Department of Health and Social Care for reply.

I appreciate your concerns about the funding of mental health services. I would like to assure the Council that we continue to take mental health as seriously as physical health and hold the NHS to account for achieving the objectives set out in the last NHS Mandate, ensuring that mental and physical health conditions are given equal priority. We have legislated for parity of esteem between mental and physical health through the Health and Social Care Act 2012.

We were the first Government to set up waiting times for mental health and increased spending on mental health to £11.6billion in 2016/17, with a further investment of £1billion every year by 2020/21, so that we can ensure that clinically appropriate mental health services continue to be provided to those who need them.

The Government has invested over £120million to introduce waiting time standards for mental health services. Over the last Spending Review, we also invested over £400million in the Improving Access to Psychological Therapies programme to ensure access to talking therapies for those who need them, and this has contributed to achieving very real improvements in the lives of people with anxiety and depression.

We have also announced plans to recruit 21,000 new people to the mental health workforce, who will be able to treat an extra million patients each year.

With regard to treating people locally, in line with the recommendations of the Independent Mental Health Taskforce published in February 2016, the Government set a national ambition in April 2016 to eliminate inappropriate out-of-area placements for adult acute inpatient care by 2020/21. We are also committed to ending inappropriate out-of-area placements for children by 2021.

For many people with mental health issues, especially anxiety or stress, seeing their GP or going to A&E will not be the right intervention. Alternative provision, whether it is places of safety, crisis cafes or community clinics that are often run by local charities, offer a less intimidating option for people. The Department of Health and Social Care is expanding the existing funding for alternative places to support a wider range of preventive services in the community, and ensure that charities, churches and community organisations can run them too. Throughout the country, initiatives such as street triage schemes (mental health nurses accompanying police) and crisis cafes are being put in place to address local needs and give vulnerable people support and treatment in the most appropriate environment. All police forces in England now have access to street triage schemes.

The £15million *Beyond Places of Safety* scheme, launched in October 2017, will improve support services for those needing urgent and emergency mental healthcare. This includes conditions such as psychosis, bipolar disorder, and personality disorders that could cause people to be a risk to themselves or others.

Police and health colleagues working in local Crisis Care Concordat partnerships have reduced the number of mental health patients being held inappropriately in police cells to just over 1,000 cases in 2016/17. It is expected that such use will fall still further thanks to changes to legislation that were introduced on 11 December 2017 that ban the use of police cells for under-18s in mental health crisis and put in place stringent controls on their use for adults.

The Government will continue to invest in new and better services across the whole spectrum of mental health conditions. In particular, we will make further improvements in early intervention, investing in community services and expanding access to round-the-clock crisis care support both in the community and in A&E.

I hope this reply is helpful.

JACKIE DOYLE-PRICE



Clir Geoff Raw
Chief Executive
Brighton & Hove City Council
Hove Town Hall
Norton Road
Hove
BN3 3BQ

Dominic Raab MP *Minister of State for Housing*

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government

Fry Building 2 Marsham Street London SW1P 4DF

Tel: 0303 444 3430

Email: Dominic.Raab@communities.gsi.gov.uk

www.gov.uk/dclg

Our Ref. 3602685

6 March 2018

Dear Councillor Raw,

Thank you for your letter of 15 December about Universal Credit and the New Homes Bonus, and for providing me with details of the outcome of a debate at the full council meeting on 2 November, including the 3 Notices of Motion passed there.

The New Homes Bonus was introduced in 2011 with the aim of providing a financial incentive to reward and encourage local authorities, to help facilitate housing growth.

The Bonus is not ring fenced and flexible in terms of how receipts are spent, so authorities can choose how to allocate the funding to meet local priorities such as dealing with homelessness. Local authorities are in the best position to make decisions about local priorities. Local authorities should engage with their local community to decide how the money is spent, so that residents feel the direct benefits of growth. However, it is for authorities to decide how this should be achieved.

It is important that the cost of the Bonus remain within budget, should there be an unexpected surge in house building levels. It is consistent with the Government's intention to ensure that the Bonus acts as a true incentive to housing growth.

Government continues to be committed to incentivising local authorities to support housing growth in their areas. We will continue to consider the best approach in the context of the wider Local Government Finance Settlement and will consult on any further changes to the Bonus before implementation.

I hope you find this information helpful.

DOMINIC RAAB MP



Geoff Raw
Chief Executive
Brighton and Hove Council
Hove Town Hall
Norton Road
Hove
BN3 3BQ

From the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State **Nusrat Ghani MP**

Great Minster House 33 Horseferry Road London SW1P 4DR

Tel: 0300 330 3000

E-Mail: nusrat.ghani@dft.gsi.gov.uk

Web site: www.gov.uk/dft

Our Ref: MC/216191 Your Ref: MW/GR

0.8 FEB 2018

Dear Geoff

Thank you for your letter of 20 December 2017 to Chris Grayling, about taxi and private hire vehicle (PHV) Licensing. I am replying as the Minister responsible for this issue.

The Government attaches the utmost priority to passenger safety in the licensed taxi and PHV trade. The Department will consult on statutory guidance enabled under the Policing and Crime Act 2017. This guidance will contain robust standards that we expect all licensing authorities to adopt; these will ensure all passengers, particularly children and vulnerable adults, are protected when using taxi and PHV services. Also, we will be consulting on revised best practice guidance which will include recommendations to licensing authorities to assist them in setting appropriate standards to enable the provision of services the public demand.

At a Westminster Hall Debate on the 'Regulation of working conditions in the private hire industry', my predecessor, John Hayes, announced his intention to set up a working group to consider how PHV and taxi licensing authorities use their powers, and produce focussed recommendations for action. The Task and Finish Working Group is considering the regulation of the trade as one of its key areas for discussion and will report its findings to Ministers early this year.

Yours sincerely

NUSRAT GHANI



Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government

Cllr Geoff Raw Brighton & Hove City Council King's House Grand Avenue Hove East Sussex BN3 2SU The Rt Hon Sajid Javid MP

Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government

Fry Building 2 Marsham Street London SW1P 4DF

Tel: 0303 444 3450

Email: sajid.javid@communities.gsi.gov.uk

www.gov.uk/mhclg

Our Ref:3620329 Your ref:MW/GR

D- how-

Thank you for your letter of 20 December about Brighton and Hove Council's debate on Brexit.

You asked me to consider the council and the city's strong desire for a referendum on the final terms of an EU Exit deal, including the option to maintain full European Union membership. Whilst I note your request, this Government is delivering what the British public voted for, and the Prime Minister has made clear that there will not be a second referendum.

Since June, we have worked intensively with our European partners to settle the issues in the first phase of our negotiations to leave the EU. We have made good progress and have reached agreement with the EU's negotiators on some very difficult issues. Government has published a series of papers on the new deep and special partnership the UK wants to build with the EU, and we will continue to negotiate our positive and ambitious future relationship.

Parliament will be given time to debate and scrutinise the legislation implementing the final agreement we strike with the EU. Our commitment to bring forward the Withdrawal Agreement and Implementation Bill - to implement our final agreement with the EU - will be over and above the long-standing commitment to a vote in both Houses on the final deal, which the Prime Minister and the Department for Exiting the European Union both confirmed on 24 October 2017.

I hope this response satisfies your request.

THE RT HON SAJID JAVID MP



THE NETWORK OF MAJOR EUROPEAN CITIES

Geoff Raw Chief executive Brighton & Hove City Council Hove Town Hall Norton Road Hove BN3 3BQ

Brussels, 31 January 2018

Dear Mr Raw,

I would like to thank you for your letter of 20 December presenting the outcome of the Council debate on Brexit.

EUROCITIES, as the network of major European cities, representing over 140 cities in Europe, is engaged to working with all cities being them part of the EU or not. EUROCITIES has committed to supporting ongoing engagement of UK cities in the network post Brexit, as it was formally declared at EUROCITIES Mayors Summit in March 2017.

The membership status of UK cities within EUROCITIES will be safeguarded after Brexit negotiations, as our network is dedicated to all cities in Europe wishing to cooperate on common priorities and shape a sustainable future for its citizens.

I invite you to contact Cllr Ian Ward, Leader of Birmingham City Council and member of EUROCITIES executive committee (Lloyd Broad, head of International and European affairs, lloyd.braod@birmingham.gov.uk), should you wish to receive more information about EUROCITIES cooperation with UK cities in the Brexit framework.

I am convinced that the way forward is to strengthen the cooperation between cities. And we, as city leaders, have a role to play in mobilising and proving that we can contribute to revitalising the spirit of a peaceful, undivided and democratic Europe, closer to its citizens. This is why we have launched the campaign 'Cities4Europe - Europe for citizens' (http://bit.ly/2DMjFw4) which I invite you to join.

your sincerely,

Daniël Termont Mayor of Ghent EUROCITIES president

1, Square de Meeûs B-1000 Brussels tel +32-2-552.0888 vat be 0 447 820 987 www.eurocities.eu info@eurocities.eu